# 2024-2050 COLUMBUS AREA METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION PLAN

## Chapter 9: Plan Implementation & Monitoring

The Metropolitan Transportation Plan is updated every four years, but the planning process is continuous. Key elements of this ongoing process are implementing the strategies and projects identified in the MTP and monitoring the progress in advancing the established goals. Implementation is primarily accomplished through state or local government action on the strategies and to advance projects through their respective Capital Improvements Programs and the MPO Transportation Improvement Program. MORPC program activities are accomplished through the development and execution of the annual Planning Work Program.

Monitoring of the progress in achieving the MTP goals is accomplished through the release of an annual report card, which tracks advancement toward the objectives and meeting the targets. The benchmarked data will provide a quantifiable way to measure the progress. This chapter summarizes the measurable objectives and quantifiable performance measures.

# 9.a Regional Performance Measures

The progress of advancing each of the six established goals will be measured by several objectives. Two to five objectives have been identified for each goal. Objectives were chosen to measure certain aspects of each goal that can be impacted through transportation or the transportation system, and are based on data availability and measurability. For each objective, the existing condition, or benchmark, is documented and used to establish a short– and long-term target (years 2030 and 2050). Also associated with each objective is the rationale for how the objective is measuring an aspect of the goal. The region's progress toward reaching these targets will be reported on annually. The objectives, benchmarks, and targets are shown in Table 9.1.

MORPC develops an annual report card that identifies if the region is on track for reaching the established targets for each of the objectives. This is done by comparing current data to the benchmarks and targets, to assess if the region is moving in the right direction, and on track to meet the short– and long-term targets.

Objectives and targets were also adopted as part of the 2020-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan, which precedes this plan. Upon adoption of the 2024-2050 MTP, the new objectives, benchmarks, and targets will be reported on in an annual report card.

## FEDERAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

As the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Columbus Urbanized Area, MORPC is also required to include measures identified by US DOT's Performance Management process.

This process requires that states develop baseline data and establish performance measure targets in three areas: safety (TPM1); pavement and bridge conditions (TPM2); and system performance (TPM3). Safety targets are re-established annually while the targets for the others are established every four years. ODOT establishes their safety targets in August of each year. ODOT established their targets for the others on May 17, 2018. MPO's establish targets not later than 180 days after the date on which the State DOT establishes targets for the required performance measures. For all but two of the measures, MPO's can choose to either support the state DOT's targets or identify their own. For two of the measures--Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) and Percent Non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (Non-SOV) Travel--State DOTs and MPOs must establish a single urbanized area target. In addition, MPO's must also establish targets with regard to transit in conjunction with the transit operators and their Transit Asset Management Plan requirements. 4-year targets are required for all measures and 2- and 4-year targets are required for some. Both ODOT and the corresponding MORPC targets are provided in Table 9.2.

## GOAL: Position central Ohio to attract and retain economic opportunity to prosper as a region and compete globally

★ **Objective:** Increase the average number of jobs reachable within 20 minutes and within 40 minutes via automobile, transit, cycling, and walking.

**Rationale:** Access to jobs within reasonable travel time is important for the vitality of a region's economy.

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • **490,000** average jobs reachable within 20 minutes via automobile; **981,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via automobile<br>• **14,000** average jobs reachable within 20 via transit; **63,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via transit.<br>• **492** average jobs within 20 minutes via low stress bike network; **541** average jobs within 40 minutes via low stress bike network;<br>• **677** average jobs within 20 minutes via pedestrian network; **813** average jobs within 40 minutes via pedestrian network | • **515,000** average jobs reachable within 20 minutes via automobile; **1,031,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via automobile<br>• **15,000** average jobs reachable within 20 via transit; **66,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via transit.<br>• **520** average jobs within 20 minutes via low stress bike network; **568** average jobs within 40 minutes via low stress bike network<br>• **710** average jobs within 20 minutes via pedestrian network; **850** average jobs within 40 minutes via pedestrian network | • **539,000** average jobs reachable within 20 minutes via automobile; **1,079,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via automobile<br>• **16,000** average jobs reachable within 20 via transit; **70,000** jobs reachable within 40 minutes via transit.<br>• **550** average jobs within 20 minutes via low stress bike network; **610** average jobs within 40 minutes via low stress bike network<br>• **745** average jobs within 20 minutes via pedestrian network; **900** average jobs within 40 minutes via pedestrian network |

★ **Objective:** Minimize the percentage of total vehicle miles traveled under congested conditions .

**Rationale:** Efficient mobility of people and freight is an important element of a vibrant economy.

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • **Percent of total vehicle miles traveled under congested conditions: 11% during peak hours and 7% daily**<br>• **Number of Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita: 4.1** | • **Total vehicle miles traveled under congested conditions:**<br>• **Daily: <5%**<br>• **Peak Periods <10%** | • **Total vehicle miles traveled under congested conditions:**<br>• **Daily: <5%**<br>• **Peak Periods <10%** |

★ **Objective:** Minimize the amount of extra, or buffer, travel time necessary when planning expected trip travel time.

**Rationale:** Freight carriers, commuters and businesses need reliable and consistent travel times to ensure the on time delivery of goods and most efficiently use their time.

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • **Region-wide Uncertainty Index: AM 1.24, PM 1.26**<br>• **Travel time reliability ratio less than federal threshold: 94% interstates, 93% non-interstates**<br>• **Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: 1.41** | • **Region-wide Uncertainty Index: AM <1.25, PM <1.25**<br>• **Travel time reliability ratio less than federal threshold: >95% interstates,>95% non-interstates**<br>• **Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: <1.5** | • **Region-wide Uncertainty Index: AM <1.2, PM <1.2**<br>• **Travel time reliability ratio less than federal threshold: >95% interstates,>95% non interstates**<br>• **Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: <1.5** |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Provide transportation and mobility options to benefit the health, safety, and welfare of all people

★ **Objective:** Ensure trip travel time for disadvantaged populations is comparable or better than the average of the entire population

**Rationale:** The transportation system should equitably serve all of the region's population

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • Average trip travel time for disadvantaged populations compared to the regional average.<br>• **Auto Travel:**<br>*average travel time all population:* **9.6 minutes**<br>*average travel time minority population:* **8.95 minutes** (**90.6%** of regional average)<br>*average travel time poverty population:* **8.1 minutes** (**83.2%** of regional average).<br>• **Transit Travel:**<br>*average travel time all population:* **55.7 minutes**<br>*average travel time minority population:* **53.9 minutes** (**95%** of regional average)<br>*average travel time poverty population:* **50.1 minutes** (**88.8%** of regional average) | • Average trip travel time for disadvantaged populations within 5% or better of regional average | • Average trip travel time for disadvantaged populations within 5% or better of regional average |

★ **Objective:** Maintain infrastructure in a state of good repair by minimizing the percentage and pavements in poor ocndition and maintaining transit fleet of a useful life

**Rationale:** Mainenance and enhancement of existing infrastructure ensures the maximum lifespan and safe use of public investments

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • 60% of pavements of the Interstate System in good condition<br>• 1.7% of pavements of the interstate system in poor condition<br>• 29% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in good condition<br>• 3.1% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in poor condition<br>• 33% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in good condition<br>• 6.1% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in poor condition<br>• 73% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• 4% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in poor condition<br>• 65% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• 1.4% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified in poor condition | • >50% of pavements of the Interstate System in good condition<br>• <1% of pavements of the interstate system in poor condition<br>• >35% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in good condition<br>• <3% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in poor condition<br>• >50% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in good condition<br>• <5% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in poor condition<br>• >70% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• <5% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in poor condition<br>• >60% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• <10% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified in poor condition | • >50% of pavements of the Interstate System in good condition<br>• <1% of pavements of the interstate system in poor condition<br>• >35% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in good condition<br>• <3% of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in poor condition<br>• >50% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in good condition<br>• <5% of Federal-aid non-NHS pavements in poor condition<br>• >70% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• <5% of NHS bridge deck area classified as in poor condition<br>• >60% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified as in good condition<br>• <10% of Non-NHS bridge deck area classified in poor condition |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Provide transportation and mobility options to benefit the health, safety, and welfare of all people *(Continued)*

| ★ **Objective:** Reduce the number of fatalities and serious injuries from crashes. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Rationale:** Crash reduction is a direct measurement of safety | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • 1.09 fatalities per 100 million VMT<br>• 6.63 serious injuries per 100 million VMT<br>• Number of fatalities: 138.2<br>• Number of serious injuries: 844.6<br>• Number of non-motorized fatal and serious injuries: 155.6 | • 2% annual reduction | • 2% annual reduction |

## GOAL: Create sustainable neighborhoods to improve all residents quality of life

| ★ **Objective:** Encourage and support MORPC member communities to adopt complete streets policies or policies that contain those elements | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Rationale:** Complete streets allow for transportation choices, which enhance quality of life | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • **16%** of MORPC member communities that have adopted complete streets policies that contain those elements. | • **20%** of MORPC member communities that have adopted complete streets policies that contain those elements. | • **100%** of MORPC member communities that have adopted complete streets policies that contain those elements. |
| ★ **Objective:** Increase the amount of interconnected bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure | | |
| **Rationale:** Sustainable neighborhoods provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to provide viable transportation options | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • **844** miles of low to moderate stress bikeways<br>• **69%** of arterials and collectors within urbanized area that have pedestrian facilities (sidewalk or MUP) | • **905** miles of low to moderate stress bikeways<br>• **75%** of arterials and collectors within urbanized area that have pedestrian facilities (sidewalk or MUP) | • **1,100** miles of low to moderate stress bikeways<br>• **100%**of arterials and collectors within urbanized area that have pedestrian facilities (sidewalk or MUP) |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Create sustainable neighborhoods to improve all residents quality of life *(Continued)*

| ★ **Objective:** Target infrastructure development to serve a higher number of people and jobs. | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Rationale:** Sustainable neighborhoods provide adequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure to provide viable transportation options. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • **Percent of population** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - 98% \| Transit Stop - 59% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 0% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - 74%<br>• **Percent of jobs** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - 99% \| Transit Stop - 75% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 0% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - 81% | • **Percent of population** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - >99% \| Transit Stop - 65% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 25% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - 80%<br>• **Percent of jobs** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - 99% \| Transit Stop - 80% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 25% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - 85% | • **Percent of population** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - >99% \| Transit Stop - 70% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 50% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - >99%<br>• **Percent of jobs** within 1/2 mile of: Arterials/ Collectors - 99% \| Transit Stop - 85% \| High-Capacity Transit Stop - 50% \| Low/Moderate Stress Bikeway - 90% |

## GOAL: Increase regional collaboration and employ innovative transportation solutions to maximize the return on public expenditures

| ★ **Objective: Maximize the amount of non-regional transportation dollars (i.e. federal discretionary programs) utilized on regional transportation projects.** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Rationale: Creative funding partnerships are a result of regional collaboration and seeking out innovative solutions.** | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • **11.6% of funding from non-regional sources.**<br>• **$128,000,000 non-regional discretionary dollars annually (Source: TRAC + Federal Discretionary)** | • **5% increase annually** | • **5% increase annually** |
| ★ **Objective: Increase the number of projects utilizing innovative initiatives on functionally classified Principal Arterials and above** | | |
| **Rationale: Encourage initiatives that advance innovation and partnership to deliver and build projects efficiently.** | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • **Number/percent of projects utilized innovative initiatives: 6%** | • **5% increase annually** | • **5% increase annually** |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Increase regional collaboration and employ innovative transportation solutions to maximize the return on public expenditures

| ★ Objective: Increase the percentage of functionally classified Minor Arterials and above facilities employing coordinated Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technologies, and increase the mileage of facilities with vehicle to infrastructure communication capabilities. | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rationale: ITS provides for maximization of capacity on existing facilities and real-time response to incidents and security issues. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • Percent of mileage that utilizes coordinated ITS technologies<br>• Percent of network that incorporates digital infrastructure | • 5% increase annually | • 5% increase annually |
| ★ OBJECTIVE: Increase the number of transit vehicles and facilities with surveillance capabilities and increase the miles of functionally classified Principal Arterials and above with video surveillance | | |
| Rationale: Surveillance capabilities allow for real-time response to incidents and security issues. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • 58% of functionally classified Principal Arterials and above with video surveillance<br>• 100% of fixed route transit/COTA+ vehicles with video surveillance | • 65% of functionally classified Principal Arterials and above under video surveillance | • 85% of functionally classified Principal Arterials and above under video surveillance |
| OBJECTIVE: Encourage and support MORPC member communities to adopt Smart Streets policies or policies that contain those elements | | |
| Rationale: Smart streets policies are a tool communities can use to integrate technology into transportation projects. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • 0% of MORPC member communities that have adopted smart streets policies or policies that contain those elements. | • 20% of MORPC member communities that have adopted smart streets policies or policies that contain those elements. | • 100% of MORPC member communities that have adopted smart streets policies or policies that contain those elements. |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Increase regional collaboration and employ innovative transportation solutions to maximize the return on public expenditures

### ★ Objective: Reduce the percentage of commuters driving alone, and increase the percentage of commuters riding transit, bicycle, or walking.

**Rationale: Reducing single occupancy auto commutes and increasing commuters using alternative transportation modes will reduce per capita fuel and energy consumption.**

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • Percent of commuters that drive alone: 77.5%<br>• Percent of commuters that ride transit, bicycle, or walk: 3.4%<br>• (19.1 percent reported other, including telecommute, as primary mode) | • Percent of commuters that drive alone: 80%<br>• Percent of commuters that ride transit, bicycle, or walk: 7% | • Percent of commuters that drive alone: 75%<br>• Percent of commuters that ride transit, bicycle, or walk: 10% |

### ★ OBJECTIVE: Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) per capita.

**Rationale: Reducing vehicle miles traveled per person for any trip purpose will reduce per capita fuel and energy consumption.**

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • 7,777 VMT per capita | • 7,388 VMT per capita (5% reduction) | • 5,444 VMT per capita (30% reduction) |

### ★ OBJECTIVE: Increase the percentage of vehicles using alternative fuels.

**Rationale: Reducing vehicle miles traveled per person for any trip purpose will reduce per capita fuel and energy consumption.**

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • Percent of registered vehicles that use alternative fuels: 1.22% (Source: Franklin/ Delaware County vehicle registration data) | • 5% of registered vehicles use alternative fuels | • 40% of registered vehicles use alternative fuels |

### ★ OBJECTIVE: Increase the number of alternative fuel stations.

**Rationale: Reducing vehicle miles traveled per person for any trip purpose will reduce per capita fuel and energy consumption.**

| 2024 Measure | 2030 Target | 2050 Target |
|---|---|---|
| • Number of electric vehicle charging ports (does not include private home charging): 534 total (36 Multi-Unit Dwelling ports, 75 Public Access Ports, 248 Workplace Ports, 175 Fleet Charging Ports) Source: Smart Columbus (7-county region) | • 620 EV charging ports | • >900 EV charging ports |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

## GOAL: Protect natural resources and mitigate infrastructure vulnerabilities to maintain a healthy ecosystem and community.

| ★ Objective: Reduce emissions from mobile sources to continuously meet EPA air quality standards for each criteria pollutant | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rationale: Clean air an essential natural resource and is a key indicator of a healthy community. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • Ozone Attainment Status<br>• PM2.5 Attainment Status | • Ozone Attainment Status<br>• PM2.5 Attainment Status | • Ozone Attainment Status<br>• PM2.5 Attainment Status |
| ★ OBJECTIVE: Maintain the condition of critical transportation infrastructure to enhance the resiliency of the transportation system. | | |
| Rationale: Maintenance of critical infrastructure during extreme weather events or other disruptions is important for emergency response and the region's economy. | | |
| **2024 Measure** | **2030 Target** | **2050 Target** |
| • Amount of PROTECT-like investments in resilient regional infrastructure.<br>• Condition rating of "critical infrastructure" for resiliency goals | • Methodology in development | • Methodology in development |

Table 9.1: Regional Benchmarks and Targets

| *National Performance Measure* | *Benchmark (MPO Area Baseline)* | *ODOT 2-year Target* | *ODOT 4-year Target* | *MORPC 2-year Target* | *MORPC 4-year Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TPM1: Safety | **1.09** fatalities per 100 million VMT<br>**6.63** serious injuries per 100 million VMT<br>Number of fatalities: **138.2**<br>Number of serious injuries: **844.6**<br>Number of non-motorized fatal and serious injuries: **155.6** | 2% Annual Reduction | 2% Annual Reduction | Support ODOT's Target | Support ODOT's Target |
| *National Performance Measure* | *Benchmark (Urbanized Area Baseline)* | *ODOT 2-year Target* | *ODOT 4-year Target* | *MORPC 2-year Target* | *MORPC 4-year Target* |
| TPM2: Pavement & Bridge | **60%** of pavements of the Interstate System in Good condition<br>**1.7%** of pavements of the Interstate system in Poor condition<br>**29%** of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in Good condition<br>**3.1%** of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition<br>**72%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Good condition<br>**0.9%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Poor condition<br>*2024 ODOT* | **n/a**<br><br>**n/a**<br><br>**>35%** of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in Good condition<br>**<3%** of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition<br>**>50%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Good condition<br>**<5%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Poor condition | **>50%** of pavements of the Interstate System in Good condition<br>**<1%** of pavements of the Interstate system in Poor condition<br>**>35%** of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in Good condition<br>**<3%** of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition<br>**>50%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Good condition<br>**<5%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Poor | **n/a**<br><br>**n/a**<br><br>**>35%** of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in Good condition<br>**<3%** of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition<br>**>70%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Good condition<br>**<5%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Poor condition | **>50%** of pavements of the Interstate System in Good condition<br>**<1%** of pavements of the Interstate system in Poor condition<br>**>35%** of pavements of the non-interstate NHS in Good condition<br>**<3%** of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition<br>**>70%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Good condition<br>**<5%** of NHS bridge deck area classified as in Poor condition |

Table 9.2: Federal Performance Measures & Targets

| *National Performance Measure* | *Benchmark (MPO Area Baseline)* | *ODOT 2-year Target* | *ODOT 4-year Target* | *MORPC 2-year Target* | *MORPC 4-year Target* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TPM3: Travel Time Reliability, Truck Travel Time Reliability | **94%** of Interstate System has Level of Travel Time Reliability Ratio less than federal threshold<br>**93%** of non-Interstate NHS has Level of Travel Time Reliability Ratio less than federal threshold<br>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: **1.85**<br><br>*2017 ODOT, RITIS* | **85%** of Interstate System has Level of Travel Time Reliability Ratio less than federal threshold<br>**n/a**<br><br>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: **<1.5** | **85%** of Interstate System has Level of Travel Time Reliability Ratio less than federal threshold<br>**80%** of non-Interstate NHS has Level of Travel Time Reliability Ratio less than federal threshold<br>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: **<1.5** | Support ODOT's Target<br><br>**n/a**<br><br>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: **<1.5** | Support ODOT's Target<br><br>Support ODOT's Target<br><br>Truck Travel Time Reliability Index: **<1.5** |
| ***National Performance Measure*** | ***Benchmark (Urbanized Area Baseline)*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 2-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 4-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 2-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 4-year Target*** |
| TPM3: Person Hours of Excessive Delay | **4.1** Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita | **n/a** | **<12** Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita | **n/a** | **<12** Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay Per Capita |
| ***National Performance Measure*** | ***Benchmark (MPO Area Baseline)*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 2-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 4-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 2-year Target*** | ***Columbus Urban Area 4-year Target*** |
| TPM3: Non-SOV Travel | **18%** non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel<br><br>*2012-2016 American Community Survey* | **18.2%** non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel | **19%** non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel | **18.2%** non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel | **19%** non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) travel |

Table 9.2: Federal Performance Measures & Targets

| National Performance Measure | Benchmark (Urbanized Area Baseline) | ODOT 2-year Target | ODOT 4-year Target | MORPC 2-year Target | MORPC 4-year Target |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| TPM3:<br>Total Emission Reductions | VOC (kg/day): 183.86<br>NOx (kg/day): 411.87<br>PM2.5 (kg/day): 12.55 | VOC (kg/day): 69.0<br>NOx (kg/day): 537.0<br>PM2.5 (kg/day): 36<br><br>*(Statewide target)* | VOC (kg/day): 69.0<br>NOx (kg/day): 537.0<br>PM2.5 (kg/day): 36<br><br>*(Statewide target)* | VOC (kg/day): 14.0<br>NOx (kg/day): 42.0<br>PM2.5 (kg/day): 1.1 | VOC (kg/day): 24.0<br>NOx (kg/day): 74.0<br>PM2.5 (kg/day): 2.3 |
| **National Performance Measure** | **Benchmark (MPO Area Baseline)** | **ODOT 2-year Target** | **ODOT 4-year Target** | **MORPC 2-year Target** | **MORPC 4-year Target** |
| Transit Asset Management | **12%** of revenue vehicles (all asset classes) exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**53%** of non-revenue automobiles exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**57%** of non-revenue trucks exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**41%** of other non-revenue equipment exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**73%** of Passenger & Parking facilities are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale<br>**14%** of Admin/Maintenance facilities are rated less than 3.0 on TERM Scale<br><br>*2018 COTA, DATABus & MORPC TAM Plans combined percentages* | ODOT established targets for their own Transit Assets. | ODOT established targets for their own Transit Assets. | **0%** of revenue vehicles exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**16%** of non-revenue automobiles exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**40%** of non-revenue trucks exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**20%** of other non-revenue equipment exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**50%** of Passenger & Parking facilities are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale<br>**0%** of Admin/Maintenance facilities are rated less than 3.0 on TERM Scale | **0%** of revenue vehicles exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**16%** of non-revenue automobiles exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**40%** of non-revenue trucks exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**20%** of other non-revenue equipment exceed the useful life benchmark<br>**50%** of Passenger & Parking facilities are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale<br>**0%** of Admin/Maintenance facilities are rated less than 3.0 on TERM Scale |

# 9.b Plan Implementation

This Metropolitan Transportation Plan identifies numerous strategies and projects for the purpose of advancing the established regional transportation goals. MORPC will work with the state and local governments and regional planning partners to execute the strategies identified.

Some of the strategies identify specific infrastructure projects. While it is estimated that these projects will be financially feasible by the year 2050, specific funding has not yet been allocated to most of the projects. When ODOT or local governments decide to secure and commit funding for the design and construction of a project, the project is then added to the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The TIP is a schedule of transportation infrastructure projects within MORPC's transportation planning area that have specific funding committed and are expected to have design or construction work begin within a four-year horizon. The TIP is updated every two years. For a project to be included in the TIP, it must first be included in the MTP.

The TIP was most recently updated in 2022 to include the schedule of projects for SFY 2024-2027. Many local governments also maintain their own Capital Improvements Program (CIP), which identifies projects within the local jurisdiction with committed funding. MORPC incorporates the most significant projects into the TIP.

## CONCLUSION

The 2024-2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan was developed through a continuous, coordinated, and comprehensive planning process, which includes ongoing public and stakeholder outreach, as well as active performance monitoring and reporting. This plan provides the framework for achieving the transportation goals of the region and improving residents' quality of life through the collaboration of local and regional planning partners.

As part of the continuous planning cycle, the Columbus Area Metropolitan Transportation Plan will be updated again in 2028.