

DATE: Revised: February 13, 2024
 TO: ODOT Climate Office; City of Salem; City of Keizer; Marion County
 FROM: Nadine Appenbrink, Parametrix; Garth Appanaitis, DKS; Reid Haefer, RSG
 SUBJECT: Final Work Plan - Salem-Keizer
 PROJECT NAME: Salem-Keizer Region Scenario Planning

WORK PLAN: Salem-Keizer Region Scenario Planning

This work plan document guides the Salem-Keizer Climate Friendly and Equitable Communities (CFEC) scenario planning effort.

Who is involved:

- The cities of Salem and Keizer, along with Marion County and the Salem Area Mass Transit District (Transit) will be involved in this scenario planning effort. Jurisdictional staff and Transit will provide guidance on day-to-day project issues, including data needs and helping to advance scenario testing. An advisory committee composed of representatives from each jurisdiction and Transit, described in subsequent sections, will meet at key project milestones to discuss and make key decisions.
- The region's MPO, SKATS, will provide assistance with data and coordination, as needed.
- ODOT and DLCD staff will provide ongoing support for the jurisdictions and manage the contract and scope of work with the Parametrix consulting team.

Role	Name	Organization	Contact
ODOT project manager	Brian Hurley	ODOT	brian.j.hurley@odot.oregon.gov
ODOT technical lead	Tara Weidner	ODOT	Tara.J.WEIDNER@odot.oregon.gov
DLCD policy lead	Cody Meyer	DLCD	Cody.MEYER@dlcd.oregon.gov
Consultant project manager	Ryan Farncomb	Parametrix	RFarncomb@parametrix.com



Planning co-lead	Nadine Appenbrink	Parametrix	NAppenbrink@parametrix.com
Planning co-lead	Garth Appanaitis	DKS	gaa@dksassociates.com
Modeling co-lead	Jonathan Slason	RSG	jonathan.slason@rsginc.com
Modeling co-lead	Reid Haefer	RSG	reid.haefer@rsginc.com
Engagement lead	Brandy Steffen	JLA	brandy.steffen@jla.us.com
Salem Transportation Lead	Julie Hanson	City of Salem	jhanson@cityofsalem.net
Salem Land Use Lead	Eunice Kim	City of Salem	ekim@cityofsalem.net
Transit Lead	Ted Stonecliffe	Cherriots	ted.stonecliffe@cherriots.org
Keizer Lead	Shane Witham	City of Keizer	withams@keizer.org
Marion County Transportation Lead	Carl Lund	Marion County	clund@co.marion.or.us

Project timeline. The project schedule provides a proposed timeline for completing this work by December 2024, the date requested by the participating jurisdictions. If the advisory committee decides to pursue additional scenario testing (which is a contingency task associated with task 2.3), the schedule will need to be extended four to six months, with a new end date of April to June 2025.

Outcomes. The process will result in a **preferred regional scenario** that meets the established GHG reduction target and a single final **scenario report** for the region that details the policy actions, such as capital investments and the adoption of policies or programs, that the jurisdictions will undertake to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase equitable outcomes for underserved populations.

Additionally, the consultant team will coordinate with each jurisdiction to develop **performance measures** (in line with [OAR 660-012-0905](#)) and future year **performance targets** (described in [OAR 660-012-0910](#)) to track progress towards the emissions reduction target.

Start Up Tasks

Work Plan for Salem-Keizer Scenario Planning

This document has been developed in coordination with the involved jurisdictions to provide a high-level summary of the process to complete scenario planning requirements for each jurisdiction.

This work plan:

- Provides timelines and check-in points for all efforts included in CFEC Salem Keizer Scenario Planning.
- Provides a schedule to accommodate the dates in the CFEC Work Program submitted to state agencies by local jurisdictions. Through this process, the region will determine the preferred future scenario by December 2024.
- Accounts for the timing and inputs necessary to construct the base and future reference scenario of the model.
- Provides considerations as to how the scenario tool (VisionEval or "VE" or "VE-RSPM") will be run to inform the exploratory scenario planning.

1. Governance Structure & Project Management

This governance structure for scenario planning was developed by the participating jurisdictions.

Staff involvement from Salem, Keizer and Marion County: A staff project management team will engage with ODOT and consultants on day-to-day decisions, determining assumptions and providing input.

Advisory committee: The advisory committee will be composed of members from each jurisdiction and the transit district. This group will weigh in at key regional decision points, making decisions by consensus of members present. This group will ultimately recommend the preferred scenario, including regional performance measures. The committee will be composed of elected and/or appointed officials (e.g. Planning Commissioners) as follows:

- City of Salem – 3 members
- City of Keizer – 2 members
- Marion County – 2 members
- Transit District (Cherriots) – 1 member

Local direction on local measures and targets: Local jurisdictions will provide direct input on how their jurisdiction wants to pursue implementation through jurisdiction-specific plan and policy updates. The Advisory committee will weigh in at key regional decision points. Ideally, the agencies will work together toward performance measures and

targets that are consistent with the other jurisdictions. Local jurisdictions will have the final say on measures and targets applied to their region.

Final action on preferred scenario by each local jurisdiction: Following recommendation from the Advisory Committee, the preferred scenario plan will be forwarded to each jurisdiction for final action (submittal) to meet the requirements of Division 44. Each individual jurisdiction will have authority to implement the regional scenario plan how they see fit. Individual jurisdiction staff will be responsible for discussing and presenting the preferred scenario results to decision-makers.

At any point, if any individual jurisdiction does not agree with the direction of the regional planning process, that jurisdiction may withdraw from the regional scenario plan.

Staff and Advisory Committee Engagement

The table below describes the planned engagement touchpoints with staff representatives and the advisory committee. Additional ad-hoc meetings will be scheduled as needed with jurisdictional and MPO staff to advance the project. The consultant team is scoped for up to 24 coordination meetings total.

Group	Subject/Discussion Topics	Approximate Timeframe
1. Project Management Team (Includes Agency Staff, Consulting staff and Jurisdictional staff): <i>Confirm Work Plan and Communications Plan with Jurisdictions</i>	Workplan will be developed in consultation with the local agencies and satisfy CFEC requirements. Jurisdictions will help determine outreach needs and opportunities.	September 2023
2. Project Management Team: <i>Discussion on reference scenario inputs and assumptions, including land use</i>	Local agencies and ODOT will be consulted for data input.	October 2023
3. Project Management Team: <i>Review Future Reference Scenario with Jurisdictions – Begin Future Scenario Development</i>	Review reference scenario. Local agencies and ODOT will review iterations of the base model.	January 2024
4. Project Management Team: <i>Confirm approach, discuss initial model</i>	Confirm approach – including application of STS assumptions. Work with local jurisdictions and MPO representative to determine the number of future scenarios	February 2024

<i>findings with Jurisdictions (Progress Update)</i>	and develop inputs. Coordination with regional partners will be important to understand the limitations or interests in how land use strategies are to be received by certain jurisdictions. Discuss initial take on future scenarios with jurisdictions.	
Advisory Committee #1	Introduce the overall process and workplan, review reference scenario results compared to targets, discuss next steps	March 2024
5. Project Management Team: <i>Review scenario testing results with Jurisdictions – begin discussions of preferred scenario</i>	Work with jurisdictions to determine how scenario testing findings may influence selection of preferred scenario.	May 2024
Advisory Committee #2	Review scenario testing results, determine additional scenario and testing needs and/or committee agreement on preferred scenario; review outreach findings from milestone 1 Decision point: proceed with STS scenario or activate contingency task C7 for additional scenario testing	June 2024
<i>Note: depending on Advisory Committee review, additional staff and Advisory Committee meetings may be necessary after Advisory Committee #2 to obtain concurrence on how to advance the scenario.</i>		
Project Management Team	<i>[If required]</i> Review refined scenario testing results, staff agreement on preferred scenario	July 2024
6. Project Management Team: <i>Review initial results of preferred scenario</i>	Work with local jurisdictions and state agencies to identify a path for preferred scenario adoption.	August 2024
Advisory Committee #3	Review draft preferred scenario results; Review outreach findings from milestone 2	October 2024
7. Project Management Team: <i>Confirm Preferred Scenario</i>	Confirm preferred scenario with jurisdictions. Discuss performance measures and targets development and outline for Scenario Report.	October 2024
8. Project Management Team: <i>Review Draft Performance Measure Targets</i>	Review and confirm performance measure targets with jurisdictions.	November 2024

Advisory Committee #4	Review Draft Scenario Report and draft performance measures and targets; recommend preferred scenario	December 2024
-----------------------	---	---------------

2.1 Public and Stakeholder Engagement

This task provides information to the public on the process and requirements and gathers public feedback at two milestones to inform scenario development, analysis and identification.

Communications Plan

The consultant team (JLA) developed a communication plan detailing public outreach activities and timing throughout the scenario planning process, including the development of future scenarios and identification of the final preferred scenario.

- The consultant team will develop materials to educate and gather feedback from the public about the scenario planning process through workshops, virtual engagement opportunities and virtual open house. The consultant team will use the existing CFEC local jurisdiction community engagement plan to inform needs and opportunities.
- The plan includes target audiences, key messages, types of feedback needed, communication and outreach tools, and a schedule designed to reach optimal users in the project areas.
- The plan includes community-based conversations and other efforts to solicit input from underserved communities.
- The plan details Agency, local jurisdiction and Consultant roles and responsibilities.

Engagement Milestones and Tools

This project will include two significant public engagement milestones, occurring in March 2024 and August 2024. The engagement milestones are sequenced to provide public input for the Advisory Committee as they make key decisions in the process.

The first milestone in March 2024 will introduce the project to the public and ask for input on how the region should change to meet State-mandated GHG reduction goals; this input will inform key decisions about scenario testing and the preferred scenario. Key elements in the first milestone include informing and consulting with the public.

The second milestone in August 2024 will ask for feedback on the proposed preferred future scenario as well as policies and strategies for implementation; this input will inform key decisions about performance measures and targets. Key elements in the second milestone focus on consulting with and involving the public in the shaping of the preferred future scenario.

- Milestone 1: March/April 2024 – Introduce the Project
 - Ask for input on how region should change to meet climate goals and reduce emissions.
- Milestone 2: August/September 2024 – Introduce Preferred Future Scenario
 - Ask for feedback on preferred future scenario, including policies and strategies.

Given the technical nature of this effort, public engagement will seek to inform the community about the process throughout the project, and we will seek input about policies and strategies during the second milestone. The public involvement approach, key audiences, key messages, tools and timeline are detailed in the Public Involvement and Communications Plan.

Engagement tools will include:

- Communications materials for local agencies to use
- Project website
- Online survey
- Virtual open house
- Meeting in a box materials for local agencies to use
- 1-2 focus groups for hard to reach segments of the community
- Engagement summary for each milestone
- Ongoing outreach support, as needed

Deliverables:

- Public Involvement and Communications Plan
- Materials and formatted content for activities to go to the public
- Engagement activities
- Engagement summaries

Scenario Planning

2.2 Future Reference Scenario Development

This task covers the overall development of the base VisionEval model for the Salem-Keizer region and the creation of the future reference scenario (2050) to set a baseline for progress towards the regional GHG reduction target. The base model is intended to demonstrate compliance with the CFEC rules that designate a change in VMT and GHG emissions from a year 2005 base. The development of the VisionEval Regional Strategic Planning Model (VE-RSPM) will need to include developing inputs for the year 2005, the year 2021 (base year), and the future 2050 reference scenario.

Inputs will be collected with help from the local jurisdictions and the MPO as well as using ODOTs statewide models and data. The model is intended to use available previous travel model data, historical data from 2017 to compare to the 2021 model data, and any other resources including Oregon Statewide Integrated Model (SWIM) and the statewide VE-State model to develop a comparison dataset to calibrate the 2005 model. The base year 2021 model will be validated to available data.

Reference Case Model Development

1. Reference case model development
 - The consultant team will design the calibration year and base year for the new VE-RSPM for the metropolitan area in consultation with ODOT and local agencies considering local data availability and links to existing SKATS region model data.
 - Reference year for GHG reduction targets: 2005
 - Base year will be validated using observed data and ODOT validation processes, where possible. The geography and input data will be consistent with the local travel demand model and CFEC land use requirements, where possible.
 - The current adopted plan version of VE-State will provide the overall control totals and inputs for this scenario.
 - The VE-State adopted plans input scenario will be the initial source of inputs for the regional application.
 - Close coordination will be required to design the VE-RSPM from VE-State inputs, as the VE-State “default” data will not be adequate to configure the Salem-Keizer VE-RSPM. The process for disaggregating the VE-State inputs into the RSPM model will be clearly documented with assumptions, scripts, and other processes shared with the project stakeholders.
2. The consultant team will run the reference case model for year 2005.

3. The consultant team will validate the model for year 2021.
4. Documentation on the model development process, sources of data for the input files and calibration/validation results for the VE-RSPM.

Future Reference Case Inputs

Once calibrated and validated to 2021 conditions, inputs will be developed for the 2050 future reference scenario. Again, ODOT models as well as current long-range plans from the region will be used to develop the input files.

The consultant team will work with local jurisdictions, MPO representatives and state agencies to develop inputs for the future reference case.

1. Consultant team will collaborate with jurisdictions and ODOT to understand metrics for inputs. SKATS will provide available travel model information to understand what metrics will be needed, including land use inputs.
 - Land use inputs are a critical factor for the future reference case and alternative scenarios. As land use is more time-consuming to adjust in VE-RSPM, land use assumptions must be established early in the process. While land use scenarios are not currently included as part of the scenario planning effort, alternatives may be considered given the opportunity. The consultant team will work with the jurisdictions to ensure that the reference case land use represents 2050 land use assumptions, including assumptions about future “climate friendly areas” (CFA) land use designations within the jurisdictions.
2. Consultant team will do a background review of existing plans and policies that would affect the future baseline scenario.
 - Model inputs and planning horizon years will be developed using state-level policy assumptions and adopted local and regional transportation plans.
 - The future reference scenario will reflect *currently adopted plans* for the region.
 - The consultant team will review:
 - Existing RTP
 - Other long-range work will be used to validate the adopted plan inputs for the Salem-Keizer VE-RSPM.
 - Land use plans
 - Transportation System Plans
 - Long Range Transit Plans
 - Regionally significant projects reasonably likely to be funded through the planning period
 - Regionally significant projects that would require additional funding

3. ODOT and local jurisdictions (including Transit) will review inputs.
4. The consultant team will run the future reference case model for year 2050.
5. The consultant team will validate the model for year 2050.

The inputs required for VisionEval broadly fit into three categories: changes in demographics and land use; local policy actions and pricing; and changes in transportation supply. The table below details more specifically what inputs are needed within each of these categories.

Category	Scenario Input
Changes in demographics and land use	Changes in population and demographics
	Changes in average income per capita
	Changes in employment
	Changes in the proportion of houses located in mixed-use and unprotected areas available for development
	Residential and workplace plug in electric vehicle (PEV) charging infrastructure
Local policy actions and pricing	Parking pricing programs
	Demand management policies
	Suitability for active transportation
	Diversion of single-occupancy vehicle trips by bikes, e-scooters, or other personal modes
	Congestion fees
	Pay-as-you-go auto insurance and other road fees
	VMT fee / Road User Charges
Changes in transportation supply	Changes in freeway and arterial lane miles
	Powertrain proportions for light-duty, transit, and heavy-duty vehicles (by internal combustion engines (ICE), hybrid electric vehicle (HEV), and petroleum-equivalent fuel economy (PEF))
	Ride-hailing and carsharing availability, substitutability, and access time
	Amount of regional transit service
	ITS strategies for freeways and arterials

Deliverables:

- Future Reference Scenario Inputs documentation
- Future Reference Scenario Findings documentation

2.3 Future Scenario Testing

This task covers the development and testing of alternative future scenarios to investigate how changes to local policies and programs impact progress towards the regional GHG reduction target when compared to the reference scenario.

1. Consultant team will develop initial inputs for future scenarios; alternative future scenarios for testing various paths to achieve the regional GHG reduction target will be based on local goals and stakeholder feedback, including advisory committee input.
 - Initial scenario will use the STS Vision inputs where possible (additional details will be needed in greater detail than what the statewide inputs have).
2. Advisory committee and public engagement on future goals and/or investment areas to emphasize in meeting desired scenario planning outcomes.
3. Model run(s) and validation –
 - The runs will be done in a way to create new inputs to achieve the target. The team may need to derive details for implementation actions to demonstrate how the region will achieve the target. Individual jurisdictions might have to review and decide if they accept the actions or whether we need to iterate to determine the acceptable set of actions.
4. Some iterating may be required with VE-RSPM to adjust inputs to meet scenario planning outcomes. For example, applying STS assumptions may not reach emissions reduction targets, or jurisdictions may conclude that the jurisdictional actions and investments implied by the STS assumptions are not acceptable. If this is the case, the consultant team will meet with the jurisdictional representatives to determine which assumptions to adjust to develop acceptable outcomes that can achieve the reduction targets. The consultant team will determine the number of iterations and scenarios possible in close collaboration with ODOT and jurisdictions to ensure the work will fit within the existing established budget.
 - Based on review of the scenario testing results, the Advisory Committee will make a recommendation on whether to recommend additional scenario testing. ODOT, in coordination with local agency staff, will then activate the contingency task to support additional consultant effort.
5. Once scenario testing is complete, the preferred scenario assumptions and outcomes will be reviewed and confirmed with jurisdictions and Advisory Committee.

Deliverables:

- Future Scenario Testing Inputs documentation
- Future Scenario Testing Findings documentation
- Determine preferred scenario

2.4 Identify Performance Measure Targets

The consultant team will coordinate with each jurisdiction to set customized performance measures and future year performance targets based on adopted plans and the preferred regional scenario. Performance targets set by each city and county must be set for each reporting year for each performance measure, and they must be set at levels that are reasonably likely to achieve the jurisdiction's share of regional performance targets ([OAR 660-012-0910](#)).

The project management team will hold an initial meeting post-approval of the preferred scenario to review the proposed performance measures and the process for developing targets. The first step is to develop a baseline for each performance measure.

Performance measures and methodologies that jurisdictions will use to report on implementation of the preferred land use and transportation scenario, must include:

- **Regional performance measures** to determine whether outcomes are progressing to achieve the projected reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. The regional performance measures must include actual performance for the data elements used to project greenhouse gas emissions as described in [OAR 660-044-0030](#).
- **Local implementation performance measures** to determine whether cities and counties are taking the actions necessary to implement the preferred land use and transportation scenario.
- **Equity performance measures** to determine whether implementation of the preferred land use and transportation scenario is improving equitable outcomes for underserved communities.
 - The zone structure of the VE-RSPM will most likely be designed at the scale of a Census block group level. That means all spatial results can be summarized and compared with equity related socio-economic and demographic factors.

The performance measures must include:

- A set of performance measures including methods, details, and assumptions to calculate the value
- Baseline current data, or historical data, for each performance measure
- A reporting schedule repeating every four or five years through the planning period

- A target for each performance measure for each reporting point
- Best available demographic information for underserved populations

Local jurisdictions in the Salem-Keizer region can choose their performance measures; the list is not determined by the State. Some examples of possible local implementation **performance measures** (from [OAR 660-012-0905](#)) include:

- Compact mixed-use development
 - Number of publicly supported affordable housing units in climate-friendly areas (CFAs)
 - Number of existing and permitted dwelling units in climate-friendly areas and percentage of existing and permitted dwelling units in climate-friendly areas relative to total number of existing and permitted dwelling units in the jurisdiction.
 - Share of retail and service jobs in climate-friendly areas relative to retail and service jobs in the jurisdiction.
- Active transportation
 - Percent of collector and arterials streets in climate-friendly areas and underserved population neighborhoods with bicycle and pedestrian facilities with Level of Traffic Stress 1 or 2.
 - Percent of collector and arterial roadways in climate-friendly areas and underserved population neighborhoods with safe and convenient marked pedestrian crossings.
 - Percent of transit stops with safe pedestrian crossings within 100 feet.
- Transportation options
 - Number of employees covered by an Employee Commute Options (ECO) program.
 - Number of households engaged with Transportation Options activities.
 - Percent of all Transportation Options activities that were focused on underserved population communities.
- Transit
 - Share of households within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor.
 - Share of low-income households within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor.
 - Share of key destinations within one-half mile of a priority transit corridor.
- Parking costs and management
 - Average daily public parking fees in climate-friendly areas.
- Transportation System
 - Vehicle miles traveled per capita.

- Percent of jurisdiction transportation budget spent in climate-friendly areas and underserved population neighborhoods.
- Share of investments that support modes of transportation with low pollution.

Deliverables: Documentation of benchmarks and associated data for each region and jurisdiction

2.5 Preferred Scenario Reporting

This task covers development of a single preferred scenario that meets the regional GHG reduction target, as well as local and regional performance measures to track progress towards the target.

- Document the process, scenario assumptions, and outcomes determined through the process. These will be contained in a draft report and that will be reviewed by ODOT and jurisdictions, followed by a final report.
- The report will also identify needs, process and timing for local approval of the preferred scenario and develop reporting documentation and presentations for local planning commissions, advisory groups and other local needs.
- The report will demonstrate and document compliance with state agency requirements. The report will be included in state agency compliance reporting.
- Must include collaboration with jurisdictions/MPO to assess the housing and transportation needs of underserved populations.
- Develop presentations for impacted jurisdictions.
- If the region elects a scenario other than the STS following a recommendation from the Advisory Committee, contingency task C7 would be activated. Alternative scenarios will explore changing the inputs to reflect local input.

Deliverables:

- Preferred Scenario Report for impacted jurisdictions
- Presentation for impacted jurisdictions
- Documentation for Agency reporting