

COIC - COSTOP

Meeting Notes – Technical Committee Meeting #1 (8-12-10)

Meeting Attendance:

James Lewis - COIC, Karen Swirsky - COIC, Eric Porter - Sisters, Hal Littlejohn - Metolius, Nick Snead - Madras, Tyler Deke – Bend MPO, Scott Edelman - Prineville, Chris Doty - Redmond, Jim Bryant - ODOT, Peter Russell – Deschutes County, Heidi Bauer – Crook County, Lonny Macy – Warm Springs

The meeting started with introductions of the group and then an introduction of the project (grant background, scope of work, expected products/tasks, process, and the expected final policy document).

The scope of work was discussed with regard to the overall intent of the project (an assessment of a variety of scenarios to determine the most cost-efficient manner in which the anticipated increases in inter-community vehicular trips can be accommodated over the next 20 years), and the individual tasks that are required to complete the project.

The primary discussion was centered around the data sources, the assumptions and estimates, and the methodology used to complete all the tasks, but initially Task 2b, Technical Report One – Baseline Regional Transportation Related GHG Emissions.

Karen Swirsky led a discussion on the data sources available and methodology to determine Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) – in the absence of specific data for the region – and as the basis for the Technical Reports. A specific example of GHG emissions for various Highway links was provided by Karen as the basis for TC understanding and support.

Specific questions and discussion related to the following topics took place – these items were agreed upon by the TC:

GHG Analysis

1. The State of Oregon GreenSTEP model and methodology is not necessary for this project – it is more complicated and goes into more detail than is required to develop the estimate of baseline 1990 and 2010 GHG emissions from intercommunity trips as required by the scope.
2. The estimates can utilize “averages” generated from state, regional and national source documents.
3. For this purpose, it is ok to calculate VMT by multiplying the ADT with the highway segment length – per ODOT data
4. The calculated VMT can be inserted into the EPA formula for calculating GHG emissions.
5. It was suggested by Chris Doty that the link length (which is available from city boundary to city boundary) possibly be extended from City center to City center to since trips do not begin at the city edge. The thought is that even if

used as an average, the increased link length is closer to the actual miles traveled and will give more accurate baseline GHG measures.

Intercommunity Trips vs. Pass-through Trips

1. The project requires “intercommunity trips” to be analyzed – it does not specify which roads are to be evaluated. However, it was acknowledged that for the purpose of this project, the intercommunity trips via state highways is the primary focus and that other non-highway trips (local, county roads) were not significant enough to affect the overall outcome or drive policy.
2. The primary source of data for the region is from ODOT. This includes: traffic volume data by Highway segment; VMT data; vehicle classification data; and, transportation trends.
3. A primary issue that affects the data is the ratio of true intercommunity trips to pass-through trips. A local estimate is that roughly 15% of the trips on Highway 97 are “pass through.” However, it was determined that it was not necessary for this project to separate out the pass through trips for further analysis.
4. The TPAU modeling done for Deschutes County covers an area from northern Klamath County to an area between Redmond and Madras. It also includes data to/between Prineville.
5. The individual highway link data for intercommunity trips (minus pass-through) does not currently exist, but could possibly be extracted from the aforementioned Deschutes County model. However, based on the decision that the pass-through trips did not need to be extracted from the data, this will not be required.

General

1. The most accurate data available will be obtained and be the basis for the analysis – on the premise that some data will consist of averages or other estimates, the analysis techniques will strive for overall consistency for true comparative purposes, rather than a high degree of precision (in keeping with the “30,000 foot view”)
2. It is assumed and agreed upon that the variations in data/analysis utilizing precise detailed methodologies versus estimates and averages as envisioned by the scope would not drive significant differences in the 20-year policies.
3. The primary factor to keep in mind during the analysis is consistency. It was agreed that a consistent methodology would deliver the same percentage of change during the scenario analysis and would be adequate for comparison purposes to develop policy.
4. It is OK to use 1991 and 2009 data rather than 1990 and 2010 (per the scope of work) – the 91 and 09 data is the best available – the differences were considered to be insignificant for the purposes of this project.

There was a brief discussion of potential scenarios for later analysis – it was determined that the group would be solicited for ideas in the regard for discussion and creation of a formal list at a future meeting.