
AGENDA

**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee**



Date: Tuesday, June 24, 2014
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG 155 N. 1st Street, Central Point
Transit: served by RVTD Route #40
Phone : Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360
RVMPO website : www.rvmppo.org

1. **Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda** **Mike Quilty, Chair**
2. **Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1)**..... **Chair**
3. **Public Comment, Items not on the Agenda** **Chair**
(Comments on Agenda Items allowed during discussion of each item)

Action Item:

4. **Transportation Growth Management (TGM) Letter of Support** **Jonathan David**
Background: The City of Phoenix submitted a TGM application to prepare conceptual plans for two urban reserve areas (PH-5 and PH-10) identified in the Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan. Cities must approve conceptual plans before adding urban reserve area to an urban growth boundary, and PH-5 in particular will play a significant role in regional economic development. Transportation issues will be a significant component of this planning effort. The letter of support must be submitted to the TGM program no later than June 27, 2014.

Attachment: #2 –Draft letter of support

Action Requested: Consider approval of letter of support.

Presentation Item:

5. **Transit Alternatives in the Highway 99 Corridor** **Paige Townsend, RVTD**
Background: In early 2013, the Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) submitted a project concept to the Sustainable City Year (SCY) to conduct a feasibility assessment of a BRT system along the Highway 99 corridor. The purpose of the study was to consider the feasibility for a Bus Rapid Transit service between Central Point to the North and southwards to Ashland. Results of the assessment will be presented to the Policy Committee.

- 6. **RVMPO Planning Update**..... **Jonathan David**
- 7. **Public Comment**.....**Chair**
- 8. **Other Business / Local Business****Chair**
Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.
- 9. **Adjournment****Chair**

The next MPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 22 at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

- The next MPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 15 at 5:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next MPO TAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 9 at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT SUE CASAVAN, 541-423-1360. REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE NEED FOR ACCOMMODATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING (48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE IS PREFERABLE) WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**SUMMARY MINUTES
ROGUE VALLEY MPO POLICY COMMITTEE
MAY 27, 2014**



The following attended:

NAME	REPRESENTING	PHONE
Al Densmore, Vice Chairman	City of Medford	282-1415
Art Anderson	ODOT	774-6353
Bill Cecil	City of Talent	535-1566
Bruce Sophie	City of Phoenix	535-1634
Don Skundrick	Jackson County	774-6118
Jim Lewis	City of Jacksonville	899-7023
Julie Brown	RVTD	608-2143
Mike Quilty, Chairman	City of Central Point	664-7907
Rich Rosenthal	City of Ashland	941-1494
<u>Staff</u>		
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Bunny Lincoln	RVCOG	944-2446

Others Present

Mike Montero, Mike Kuntz, Mike Faught and Alex Georgevitch

1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda -

Chairman Mike Quilty called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

2. Review / Approve Minutes -

2 (a.) – Additional Agenda Item –

Dan Moore stated that Mike Montero had applied to change from Central Point to Freight representative on the Pubic Advisory Committee.

On a motion by Jim Lewis, and seconded by Al Densmore, Mr. Montero’s request was unanimously approved.

Chairman asked if there were any additions or corrections to the March meeting minutes.

On a motion by Rich Rosenthal and seconded Bruce Sophie by the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

Committee members acknowledged the need to advertise for vacant seats on the PAC.

On a motion by Rich Rosenthal and seconded Bruce Sophie by the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

3. Public Comment -

None.

Public Hearing

4. RVMPO Public Participation Plan

The Chair read the public hearing procedure for the hearing.

Andrea Napoli presented an overview of the updated Plan, emphasizing the proposed amendments to the draft. Last update was completed in 2007. Basic changes were not tracked in the update. Substantive changes were tracked.

The PAC and TAC have recommended approval of the draft update.

Section 3. – Goals & Objectives No goals were changed, but language was added to reflect a greater use of electronic and social media for dissemination of MPO related public information.

Goal 1 #10 was changed to encourage “**designated**” Committee members to speak with the media on various MPO planning activities.

Goal 2 #1. The 30 day notice was changed to 21 day because the current notification time frame causes longer review delay.

Section #7 – Review, Evaluation & Revision of the Public Participation Plan. Staff and Committee (as opposed to public) will review public participation activities.

Appendix C was created to demonstrate public outreach efforts for the 2013 RTP update.

One comment was received on the updated Plan. A specific Bike/Ped seat on the PAC was requested. (Public Health currently covers this.) The PAC did not see this request. Committee members talked about the PAC composition, and expressed agreement that the issue had definite merit. Mike Quilty felt that a representative actually involved in the Public Health field would be a much greater benefit to the PAC, and it was agreed that the matter needed to be returned to the PAC for their review and input.

The Chair opened public testimony.

In support: None received

In opposition: None received

Chair closed the public hearing.

As additional input on potential enhancements to the public notice issue, the RTVD Public Forum and direct mailings were mentioned as an excellent public information tool.

The Committee held a brief discussion on getting an appropriate “mix” on the PAC, perhaps shifting representations around, and various ways, especially utilizing social media options, that the public could be better informed about MPO activities.

Art Anderson made a motion to adopt the Public Participation Plan as presented. (The PAC will consider amendments as necessary, and the makeup of the PAC, and possible changes thereto, may be considered at a future date.) The motion was seconded by Don Skundrick. Motion passed unanimously.

5. RVMPO Planning Update –

Dan Moore attended a recent meeting on the updates to the Regional Travel model (transit & ridership). The new model is expected to be much more accurate than previous Consultation work has been initiated for the Air Quality Conformity TIP. A new emissions model will be used.

RVCOG has started ODOT Alternative measures Benchmark Analysis (TGM grant). An early project start was authorized by ODOT.

6. Public Comment

None.

7. Other Business / Local Business

Mike Quilty outlined Connect Oregon 5 final review committee activities coming up soon.

Art Anderson said that Grants Pass and JOCO were returning to RVACT in July. Don Skundrick and Mike Quilty commended ODOT for the manner in which it has handled this sensitive matter.

June 6 is the date set for the Clean Cities Alternative Fuel Conference. The event will be held in the JACO Public Works PW Auditorium on Antelope Road.

The next meeting will be held on June 24th @ 2:00 PM.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.



**Rogue Valley
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Regional Transportation Planning

Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation

June 24, 2014

Cindy Lesmeister
Transportation and Growth Management Program
555 13th St NE, Ste 2
Salem, OR 97301

Dear Ms. Lesmeister:

The City of Phoenix applied for a Transportation and Growth Management (TGM) grant to develop a concept plan for land use and transportation for the urban reserve areas, PH-5 and PH-10. This concept plan will be the basis for further land use and transportation planning for Phoenix. This area offers tremendous economic potential to Phoenix as well as the Bear Creek Valley region. It is an opportunity to recruit in major industrial businesses looking for park-like settings with easy access to I-5 and the Bear Creek Valley communities.

The transportation portion of the concept plan will have an engineering base that assures the transportation system through the urban reserve area (URA) will be able to serve this URA as well as the communities to the north and south of the area. It will be a transparent public process that will involve working closely with the property owners within and adjacent to the URA as well as other agencies such as ODOT, Jackson County and the Rogue Valley MPO.

The development of the concept plan is a requirement of the process defined in the Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan. With the concept plan, the City can move forward to develop the housing and economic needs analysis that meets the needs of the City and region.

At its meeting held on June 24, 2014, the RVMPO Policy Committee voted to support Phoenix's application for a TGM Grant. On behalf of the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization, I urge approval of the grant request. If you need any additional information about RVMPO planning and the consistency of this project with the organization's goals and planning efforts, please contact the RVMPO coordinator, Jonathan David, at jdavid@rvcog.org.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Quilty, Chair
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2013, the Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) submitted a project concept to the Sustainable City Year (SCY) to conduct a feasibility assessment of a BRT system along the Highway 99 corridor. The submittal summarized the project as follows:

“The purpose of this study is to consider the feasibility for a Bus Rapid Transit service between Central Point to the North, southwards to Ashland.”

From the start of the project to date, this executive summary outlines research and public engagement activities related to scoping community attitudes, opportunities and issues related to transit enhancements, including a potential bus rapid transit (BRT) in the Highway 99 corridor. The material in this summary describes how the University of Oregon Community Planning Workshop (CPW) approached the project, outlines specific tasks, and provides some preliminary high-level findings learned from the community engagement process.

The community engagement strategy includes **four** components:

- Key Person Interviews
- Surveys
- Focus Groups
- Policy Analysis

Key Person Interviews

The CPW team completed 20 key person interviews that produced a variety of different perspectives and viewpoints about the feasibility of transit enhancements, perceptions of RVTD, and opinions of the current and future status of transit in the region. The following bulleted list summarizes significant interviewee comments:

- Deliver a strong case for the need for transit enhancements, especially a large-scale project such as enhancing the services to the level of Bus Rapid Transit. This will need to be packaged in terms of a Cost-Benefit-Analysis or with strong data based assumptions.
- Pursue engagement with the various stakeholder groups in the region, especially the business community and the key decision making bodies in the region. This will need to take place throughout every stage of the planning and development process.
- Collaborate with other jurisdictions, municipalities, regional planning organizations and ODOT to discuss, plan and prepare for a large project such as transit enhancements in the district. A large proportion of interviewees suggested an upmost importance for collaborative planning throughout all stages of the planning / design / build.

- Improve existing services including schedule reliability, current bus stops and routes to improve public transit ‘image’.

Surveys

CPW used three survey instruments as part of the community engagement process—an intercept survey of bus patrons, an online business survey, and an online community survey.

Figure—1 Survey Instruments

Survey	Stakeholders	Delivery Method
Online Local Business Survey	Regional business owners and managers	Online survey distributed through the local chambers, SOREDI and the Heart of Medford
Online Community Survey	Residents, employees, professionals, students and the community at large in the Rogue Valley Region	Online survey distributed with assistance from RVTD through the schools, organizations and other influential groups in the region
RVTD Patron Intercept Survey	Current RVTD patrons who use buses along the HWY 99 Corridor and RVTD service area	125 Intercept surveys on bus routes and stops with brief questionnaires about transit perceptions

Intercept Survey

The intercept survey was delivered in person as a short questionnaire that asked bus patrons about their transit usage habits, perceptions about the current status of transit and their opinions of transit modifications. The survey yielded 125 results from a variety of bus stop locations within the transportation district boundaries.

- Respondents indicated that the most important aspect of transit is ‘The Bus is on time to my destination’ (87%)
- Respondents has a low level of support for ‘Service that has faster travel times but requires passengers to walk longer distance to catch the bus’ (39%)
- Respondents indicated a strong support for more reliable transit options and were generally in favor of transit enhancements

- Respondents indicated moderate support ‘to accept the trade off of reduced stops along their normal routes for increased reliability and speed, presumably from the enhancement of a line servicing the Highway 99 corridor.’ (49%)

Online Business Survey

CPW conducted an online survey of business owners and employers in The Rogue Valley Region; the instrument collected 87 responses. Survey respondents represented thirteen different industries with the largest portion (26%) comprised from the service and hospitality industry.

The survey was disseminated to the chambers of commerce in Ashland, Medford, Jackson County, and The Hispanic Chamber. It was also delivered through the Southern Oregon Regional Economic Development Inc. The bulleted list below is a brief scan of the findings:

- 53% of respondents rated RVTD services as ‘good’ or ‘very good’
- 41% of respondents indicated that they were ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’ with the way that RVTD provides services to their businesses
- 87% of respondents described transit as either ‘valuable’ or ‘very valuable’ to the region
- 59% of respondents indicated that they believed transit could reduce parking demand in downtown areas
- Less than 30% of respondents indicated that they would be in favor of bus lanes that required the acquisition of private property
- 52% of respondents indicated that traffic light prioritization would neither have a positive or negative effect on their business
- 96% of respondents indicated that potential transit enhancements would either feel neutral toward very positive about potential transit enhancements near their property

Online Community Survey

An online survey instrument closed Friday the 20th. The purpose of the survey is to gauge the community at large to respond to transit related issues. The online community survey received approximately 60 respondents. The instrument was disseminated to SOU students and faculty, Twin Creeks Retirement residents, and to the public through a link on RVTD’s website.

Focus Group Meetings

CPW completed six focus groups with a variety of stakeholder groups and two mini-focus groups with (RVTD) core staff and Lane Transit (LTD) District managers. The focus group participants were comprised from a broad spectrum of stakeholder areas, Figure—2 below details each focus group and the time and location of the meeting. The purpose of the meetings

was to create a group for open discussion about transit in the region. Each focus group ran for approximately 60-90 minutes.

Figure 2—Focus Groups

Focus Group	Stakeholders	Where	Completed
1	MPO Technical Advisory Committed	RCC Facilities	November 12 th , 2014
2	Twin Creeks TOD Retirement Community	Twin Creeks TOD	April 4 th , 2014
3	SOU staff, faculty and students	SOU Facilities	April 18th, 2014
4	Crater High School	Crater High School	May 20th, 2014
5	Business Community	RTVD Facilities	May 20th, 2014
6	MPO Public Advisory Committee	Rogue Valley COG	May 20th, 2014

The focus group participants held a mixture of perceptions and opinions about transit in the Rogue Valley Region. The community generally had favorable opinions of transit’s role in the region and many participants agree with the importance of a transit system for the area. Themes emerged from the six groups such as: the importance of bus services for the community and concern about the functionality of existing services and how they can be improved.

Each group discussed a variety of topics during the meetings, including current opinions of transit, how residents use transit, and their opinions on potential transit enhancements. At the meetings, large conceptual renderings were placed in front of the participants and used as a tool for discussing the ‘look and feel’ of enhanced bus stops and services. A brief description of common themes from across the focus groups is described below:

- Improve schedule reliability and expand service hours
- Improve current bus stops to accommodate passengers with increased shelter, safety and seating
- Integrate transit enhancements in phases and ensure connectivity to existing transit lines
- Continue to engage and build support for transit enhancements when appropriate







- Build case for transit enhancements internally with robust data and information
- Collaborate with schools, hospitals, major employers, and attractions in the area to provide better access and information about bus programs, schedules and proposed transit enhancements.
- Integrate future planning and potential transportation enhancements into the Regional Transportation System Plan and ODOT plans and infrastructure

Policy Analysis

The policy analysis document will be provided to RVTB as a separate technical memorandum describing the research found from the CPW team. It has indicated key plans, regulations, street design standards and other jurisdictional documents that indicate areas of opportunity and constraint for potential transit enhancement elements such as road width, signal prioritization, designated bus lanes and enhanced bus platforms.

TYPES OF HIGH-CAPACITY TRANSIT

The following table provides approximations of services provided by different forms of high-capacity transit (HCT). Service levels vary heavily by locality; population and job density needed to support HCT varies by capital costs. According to a study by the University of California Transportation Center, successful mass transit requires “unwavering local commitment” to raise population and employment densities along the transit corridor.¹

TYPE	DESCRIPTION & AMENITIES	SPEED (Including Stops)	FREQUENCY OF STOPS	FREQUENCY OF SERVICE (Peak-Off Peak)	SEATING CAPACITY	DENSITY NEEDED ¹ (Jobs & Pop.)
 COMMUTER RAIL	Typically used to connect commuters in suburbs to a central city.	30-50 MPH	1-10+ miles	30-60 minutes	70-80 (per car)	76/acre at \$75m in Capital Cost/Mile
 LIGHT RAIL	Typically used to connect suburbs and a central city with capability to turn into a streetcar for local service in urban settings.	20-30 MPH	.25-2+ miles	10-30 minutes	60-70 (per car)	56/acre at \$50m in Capital Cost/Mile
 BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT)	Typically used to travel along corridors with high ridership potential within and between cities. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operates in designated lane for buses and emergency vehicles. Fewer stops; larger, sheltered stations with elevated platforms. Coordination with traffic signals to improve efficiency. 	20-30 MPH	.5-1+ miles	10-20 minutes	40-60	17/acre at \$10m in Capital Cost/Mile
 BRT LITE	Similar to BRT, but with more frequent stops and more operation in mixed traffic. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> May have some elements of BRT, but not as comprehensive (may not include enhanced stations or coordination with traffic signals, for example). 	12-18 MPH (in urban setting)	.25-1+ miles	10-30 minutes	40-60	2/acre at \$5m in Capital Cost/Mile
 EXPRESS BUS	Typically used to connect commuters between cities via highway or freeway, with minimal stops in between. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can operate in High Occupancy Vehicle/“Carpool” lane on freeways/highways (operates in mixed traffic, otherwise) Avoids detours and local stops between key destinations Increased service and circulation in peak commute hours 	Varies depending on traffic	.5-10+ miles	30-60 minutes	40-60	N/A
 EXISTING SERVICE	Provides service to users with wide range of trip purposes and destinations, both within and between cities.	16 (Route 10) -22 MPH (Route 40)	.25-.5 miles	20-30 minutes	30	N/A

Images, top to bottom: CalTrain (<http://babyops.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/img-104534143-caltrain-926-in-mountain-view-m.jpg>), TriMet MAX (http://www.rtdands.com/media/k2/items/cache/19752c6956f4179b00e3ff6c4ff19c54_XL.jpg), Lane Transit District EmX (<http://ti.org/EugeneBRTReal400.jpg>), Nashville BRT Lite (http://wkrn.images.worldnow.com/images/21466566_BG1.jpg), Golden Gate Transit (http://farm9.staticflickr.com/8435/7870912162_b6c22c861a_m.jpg), Rogue Valley Transportation District (<http://www.kdrv.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/RVTD.jpg>).

¹Guerra, Erick and Robert Cervero. “Cost of a Ride: The Effects of Densities on Fixed-Guideway Transit Ridership and Capital Costs.” University of California Transportation Center. August 2010. <http://www.uctc.net/research/papers/UCTC-FR-2010-32.pdf>