



---

## Agenda

### Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Public Advisory Council

---

*Date:* Tuesday, May 19, 2015  
*Time:* 5:30 p.m.  
*Location:* Rogue Valley Council of Governments  
Jefferson Conference Room  
155 N. First Street, Central Point  
**Transit: served by RVTD Route #40**  
*Phone:* 541-423-1360 (Sue Casavan, RVCOG)  
**RVMPO website:** [www.rvmppo.org](http://www.rvmppo.org)

---

- 1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda .....Aaron Prunty, Chair**
- 2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1) .....Chair**
- 3. Public Comment (3-minute limit for each speaker).....Chair**
  
- 4. Alternative Measures Final Report..... Dan Moore**

*Background:* Staff prepared a draft Alternative Measures Report for Public Advisory Council review and comment. The report is being presented to the RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) at their May 13, 2015 meeting for their review/comment and recommendation to the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee will conduct a Public Hearing on June 23, 2015 to consider adoption of the Alternative Measures Report.

*Attachments:* #2 – Executive Summary

#2A – Draft Report / click on the following link for full report:  
[http://rvmppo.datacw.com/images/public-advisory-council/2015/meeting\\_materials/Attach2A\\_DraftAlt-M\\_Report.pdf](http://rvmppo.datacw.com/images/public-advisory-council/2015/meeting_materials/Attach2A_DraftAlt-M_Report.pdf)

#2B – Appendix A / click on the following link:  
[http://rvmppo.datacw.com/images/public-advisory-council/2015/meeting\\_materials/Attach2B\\_-Alt-M-Update-APPENDIX\\_A.pdf](http://rvmppo.datacw.com/images/public-advisory-council/2015/meeting_materials/Attach2B_-Alt-M-Update-APPENDIX_A.pdf)

*Action Requested:* Review, comment and recommend that the Policy Committee approve the final report.

5. MPO Planning Update ..... Dan Moore
  6. Other Business.....Chair
  7. Public Comment.....Chair
  8. Next Meeting.....Chair
- \*\* The next Public Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for July 21, 2015,  
at 5:30 p.m. at Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room \*\*
9. Adjourn..... Chair

***Other RVMPO  
meetings***

**Technical Advisory Committee:** 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, June 10, 2015,  
Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.

**Policy Committee:** 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, May 26, 2015, Rogue Valley  
Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.

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

## Summary Minutes Rogue Valley MPO Public Advisory Council March 17, 2015



The following attended:

### **MPO Public Advisory Council**

Al Willstatter	Mass Transit	482-2807
Brad Inman	East Medford	734-5409
David Lewin	Phoenix	512-0436
Edward Danehy	Senior Citizens	858-0367
Eric Heesacker	Talent	455-7138
Mark Earnest	East Medford	899-8080
Mary Wooding	Ashland	482-1066
Michael Stanek	Eagle Point	821-1804
Mike Montero	Freight Industry	779-0771
Mike Stitt, Vice Chair	Phoenix	535-2504
Ron Holthusen	Jacksonville	878-3019
Thad Keys	Talent	774-8273

### **Staff**

Jonathan David	RVCOG	423-1338
Sue Casavan	RVCOG	423-1360

### **Others Present**

None

### **1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda**

Mike Stitt, Vice Chairman, called the meeting to order at 5:35 PM. Council members welcomed new members Mary Wooding and Michael Stanek.

### **2. Review/Approve Minutes -**

The Vice Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the January meeting minutes. Ron Holthusen said he was listed as 'Others Present', the meeting time should be changed to 5:35 PM, and change the year date on Page 2 to 2015.

**On a motion by Al Willstatter and seconded by Mary Wooding, the Council unanimously approved the minutes with subsequent changes.**

### **3. Public Comment -**

Jonathan David informed members that David Chapman, Ashland representative had resigned.

#### **4. Review Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2015-2016 –**

Jonathan David said the TAC and government agencies had reviewed the document, comments were submitted and included in the UPWP presented to the council this evening. He requested that PAC members get their comments back to him within a week.

Several members noted that the Public Advisory Council list was incomplete, some members were not listed.

Jonathan gave a brief summary of the UPWP work tasks and budget.

Ron Holthusen asked if the drop in revenue affected the ability of the organization to meet the MPO requirements without losing any services. Jonathan noted that there was a drop in state dollars and the smaller MPOs did not fare as well. There was a decrease in RVMPO funding and a slight increase in MRMPO funding.

Mary Wooding asked what it meant that there was no funding identified for transit. Jonathan responded that at this point there was no funding identified for transit. Thad Keays pointed out that the UPWP document was for transit planning purposes only.

Mike Montero mentioned that on Subtask 3.2 there was an obligation for the RVMPO to coordinate transportation planning to ensure the comprehensive plans for Regional Problem Solving (RPS) are consistent. Many of the jurisdictions are going through their urban growth boundary (UGB) amendment processes. The MPO was vested with the responsibility that local land use decisions did not compromise the capacity of our regional transportation system. Much like ODOT has an Interagency Management Plan (IAMP) and basically the plan goes in place before land use decisions are made by the locals. The reason is to ensure that local land use decisions do not consume that capacity important to the region. He asked if this was considered when allocating the budget for this item. Montero asked for updates on the air quality conformity document and Jonathan indicated that MPO staff is working on getting a Limited Maintenance Plan (LMP). Montero informed the council that the container firm at the Port of Portland had permanently withdrawn from Oregon and he had concerns that this might impact the air quality in the region. Jonathan noted that the MPO was well within the CO budget and did not think that would be an issue.

Members requested the PAC list be updated on Page 3. They asked what the procedure was for addressing member vacancies. Jonathan David responded that staff would notify the city and ask for another Ashland representative.

Jonathan David asked members for tentative approval and said the record would be open for a week for comments.

**Mike Montero made a motion for approval contingent upon the recommendations from Federal Highway Administration and that the record is left open for 7 days for PAC input to staff.**

**Jonathan David noted that Federal Highway Administration had provided input.**

**Brad Inman seconded the motion. Council passed the motion unanimously.**

Ed Danehy asked if the RVMPO brochures were available yet and Jonathan David said they will be worked on in the future, this calendar year. Danehy requested that they be available to PAC members for distribution.

Eric Heesacker pointed out that on Pages 44-45 there are acronyms that are great to carry around for reference.

## **5. Annual Listing of Obligated Projects 2014 –**

Jonathan David informed members that the document was reviewed by the TAC and recommended for approval to the Policy Committee. He noted that a project will need to be added.

Mike Montero added that perhaps a brief summary of the purpose of the document would be helpful to the new members. Jonathan David gave brief explanation of funding sources. He noted that equity was considered.

Ron Holthusen asked if the new Middle Rogue MPO had any effect on funding and Jonathan David replied that there is less money with more MPOs.

Al Willstatter how much effect does the new MPO in Grants Pass have on this region, JD there is no direct influence.

Ed Danehy asked why Jacksonville showed up negative, JD unsure.

Mike Stitt both Talent and Phoenix are at zero, JD they have not applied for funding. Montero suggested that there might be a lack of local funds for some jurisdictions.

JD – staff will review the pie chart and look into adding the compressed natural gas fueling station project in White City.

**David Lewin made a motion to approve the 2014 Annual Listing of Obligated Projects. Seconded by Al Willstatter with the caveat that the record would be kept open for 7 days. Council passed unanimously.**

## **6. MPO Planning Update –**

Jonathan David announced that there will be a Strategic Assessment public meeting on Wednesday, April 8 at 5:30 p.m.

## **7. Other Business -**

Ron Holthusen asked members if they reported to any of their city staff or councilors, any reporting at meetings. Members shared information with their respective jurisdictions but did not do any formal reporting.

Mary Wooding informed members that RVTD will be out of funding in 2017. She asked members to encourage the public to support transit next time it makes it to the ballot. Mike Stitt felt that more public education might have been necessary.

## **8. Public Comment -**

None received.

## **10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 PM.



# ***Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization***

## ***Alternative Measures Update***

### ***Executive Summary***

***May 2015***



**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**

The RVMPO is staffed by the Rogue Valley Council of Governments

## Introduction

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) (OAR 660-012) requires that cities and counties prepare and adopt transportation system plans (TSPs). These plans identify transportation facilities and services to support future planned land uses. In metropolitan areas, TSPs are required to accomplish a significant reduction in reliance on automobiles. Local governments in Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) areas of less than 1 million population can meet this requirement by showing that per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will be reduced by 5 percent over the 20-year planning period. The TPR also allows for local governments to propose “alternative standards” to be used in place of the VMT reduction requirement. The TPR established a five-part test for approval of such alternative standards. The purpose of this test is to assure that the alternative standard accomplishes the goal in the TPR for a significant reduction in reliance on the automobile.

1. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures will result in a reduction in reliance on automobiles.
2. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures will accomplish a significant increase in the availability and convenience of alternative modes of transportation.
3. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures is likely to result in a significant increase in the share of trips made by alternative modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit.
4. VMT per capita is unlikely to increase by more than 5%.
5. The proposed alternative measures are reasonably related to achieving the goal of reduced reliance on the automobile as described in OAR 660-012-0000.

On April 3, 2002, the Land Conservation and Development Commission approved seven Alternative Measures adopted by the RVMPO in place of the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction standard contained in the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The Alternative Measures meet requirements for an alternative measure of reduced reliance on the automobile as specified in OAR 660-012-0035(5).

The seven Alternative Measures include:

1. Measure 1 - Transit and Bike/Pedestrian (Ped) Mode Share
2. Measure 2 - % Dwelling Units (DUs) within ¼ mile walk to 30 minute Transit Service
3. Measure 3 - % Collectors/Arterials with Bike Facilities
4. Measure 4 - % Collectors/ Arterials in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas with Sidewalks
5. Measure 5 - % Mixed-Use Dwelling Units (DUs) in New Development
6. Measure 6 - % Mixed-Use Employment in New Development
7. Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding

Table 1 below depicts the RVMPO Alternative Measures, five-year benchmarks and 2020 target.

**Table 1 – RVMPO Alternative Measures, Benchmarks and 20-Year Target**

<i>Measure</i>	<i>Current 2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
<i>Measure 1:</i> Transit and bicycle/pedestrian mode share	% daily trips transit: 1.0 bike/ped: 8.2	% daily trips transit: 1.2 bike/ped: 8.4	% daily trips transit: 1.6 bike/ped: 8.8	% daily trips transit: 2.2 bike/ped: 9.8	% daily trips transit: 3.0 bike/ped: 11
<i>Measure 2:</i> % Dwelling Units (DU's) w/in ¼ mile walk to 30-min. transit service	12%	20%	30%	40%	50%
<i>Measure 3:</i> % Collectors and arterials w/ bicycle facilities	21%	28%	37%	48%	60%
<i>Measure 4:</i> % Collectors and arterials in TOD areas w/ sidewalks	47%	50%	56%	64%	75%
<i>Measure 5:</i> % Mixed-use DUs in new development	0%	9%	26%	41%	49%
<i>Measure 6:</i> % Mixed-use employment in new development	0%	9%	23%	36%	44%
<i>Measure 7:</i> Alternative Transportation Funding	N/A	\$950,000	\$2.5 Million	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million



## Background

The RVMPO completed a 2005 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis as part of the 2009 – 2034 RVMPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The 2013 – 2038 RTP update did not include a 2010 benchmark analysis due to a misunderstanding on behalf of the RVMPO that the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) had been amended to remove the Alternative Measures requirement. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) provided a letter to the RVMPO Policy Committee during the 2013-38 RTP adoption hearing that clarified the Alternative Measures TPR requirements. Below is an excerpt of that letter.

*“Until such a time as Alternative Measures are amended by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) assumes that the benchmarks and targets of the acknowledged Alternative Measures will be extended on subsequent updates of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation System Plan to correspond with the timeframe of each update, unless the RVCOG can show that there will be a 5% decline in Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita over the planning period. Additionally, it is assumed that an analysis of the RVCOG’s performance regarding each of the Alternative Measures be conducted during subsequent RTP updates. The current RTP does not comply with this requirement.”*

The RVMPO Policy Committee concurred with DLCD’s comments and recommended that staff identify funding to conduct an analysis of the seven (7) adopted Alternative Measures. In 2013, RVCOG applied for a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to complete the work. RVCOG was awarded a TGM grant in January 2014 to analyze Alternative Measure performance and, if necessary, modify existing or develop new Alternative Measures that comply with the TPR, meet local needs, and are consistent with local objectives.

Staff prepared a series of technical memoranda for the Alternative Measures update that included;

1. Alternative Measures Analysis Methodologies,
2. Data Collection, and
3. Alternative Measures Analysis.

The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on each of the technical memos, which were revised by staff. ODOT’s Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) provided technical assistance and comment throughout the process. The technical memoranda are included in Appendix A. The Findings & Conclusions section of the final report includes a description of the measure, results of the analysis, observations, and recommendations for changing specific elements of each Alternative Measure.

## Executive Summary

The Executive Summary focuses on the findings and recommendations from the 2010 benchmark analysis conducted in 2014. More details on each measure are included in the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations section of the report. Table 2 below depicts the 2007 & 2014 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis results. The 2005 benchmark was measured in 2007 and the 2010 benchmark was measured in 2014.

**Table 2 – Alternative Measures 2007 & 2014 Benchmark Analysis Results**

Measure	How Measured	2000	Benchmark 2005	Measured 2007	Benchmark 2010	Measured 2014	Benchmark 2015	Target 2020
Measure 1: Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian Mode Share	The percent of total daily trips taken by transit and combination of bicycle and walking (non-motorized) modes. Determined from best available data (e.g., model output and/or transportation survey data).	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips
		Transit: 1.0 Bike/Ped: 8.2	Transit: 1.0 Bike/Ped: 8.2	<b>Transit: 0.9 Bike/Ped: 7.3</b>	Transit: 1.6 Bike/Ped: 8.4	<b>Transit: 1.45 Bike/Ped: 8.20</b>	Transit: 2.2 Bike/Ped: 9.8	Transit: 3.0 Bike/Ped: 11
Measure 2: % Dwelling Units (DUs) w/in 1/4 Mile Walk to 30-Min. Transit Service	Determined through GIS mapping.	12%	20%	<b>34%</b>	30%	<b>36%</b>	40%	50%
Measure 3: % Collectors and arterials w/bicycle facilities	Determined through GIS mapping.	21%	28%	<b>37%</b>	37%	<b>54%</b>	48%	60%
Measure 4: % Collectors and Arterials in TOD Areas w/Sidewalks	Determined through GIS mapping.	47%	50%	<b>55%</b>	56%	<b>30%</b>	64%	75%
Measure 5: % Mixed-Use DUs in new development	Determined by tracking building permits - the ratio between new DUs in TODs and total new DUs in the region.	0%	9%	<b>10%</b>	26%	<b>22%</b>	41%	49%
Measure 6: % Mixed-use employment in new development	Estimated from annual employment files from State - represents the ratio of new development in TODs over total regional employment	0%	9%	<b>17%</b>	23%	<b>12%</b>	36%	44%
Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding	Funding Committed to transit or bicycle/pedestrian/TOD projects. Amounts shown represent 1/2 of the MPO's estimated accumulation of discretionary funding (STP).	NA	\$950,000	<b>\$1.4 Million</b>	\$2.5 Million	<b>\$3.1 Million</b>	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million

### **Findings - Measure 1 – Mode Share 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The analysis shows that the transit, bike and pedestrian mode share percent of daily trips decreased from 2006 to 2010, and fell short of the 2010 benchmarks. Data shows that transit makes up 1.45% of the mode share, which is 0.15 percentage points below the 2010 benchmark of 1.6%. The 2010 Bike/Walk data shows 8.20% mode share which is 0.20 percentage points below the 8.4% benchmark.

### **Recommendations – Mode Share 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC determined that the model used to estimate mode share may not be the best tool to use, and recommend that “observed data” be used to measure mode share. Observed data is regional data such as bicycle and pedestrian counts and transit ridership numbers. This type of analysis would not provide mode share data, but actual numbers that could be tracked over time to demonstrate increases (or decreases) in transit ridership, biking and walking. This would achieve the policy outcome of tracking increases/decreases in transit, biking and walking

### **Findings - Measure 2 – Transit Accessibility 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Based on the GIS analysis, thirty-six percent (36%) of dwelling units in the RVMPO are located within ¼ mile walking distance of 30-minute RVTB bus routes, which is 6 percentage points above the 2010 benchmark of 30%.

### **Recommendations – Transit Accessibility 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Continue using the methodology approved by the TAC to measure transit accessibility

### **Findings – Measure 3 - Bicycle Facilities 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

There is a total of 4,640,107 linear feet of arterials and collectors within the RVMPO planning area (both directions). The jurisdictions in the RVMPO reported a total of 2,507,130 linear feet of bicycle facilities on arterials and collectors. The percentage of bike facilities is 54% within the RVMPO, which is 17 percentage points greater than the 2010 benchmark of 37%.

### **Recommendations – Bicycle Facilities 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Continue to use the methodology approved by the TAC.

### Findings – Measure 4 - Sidewalks 2010 Benchmark Analysis

There is a total of 1,512,648 lane feet of arterials and collectors (both directions) and 461,445 linear feet of sidewalks in Activity Centers located in the RVMPO. The 2014 analysis shows that 30% of arterials and collectors within RVMPO Activity Centers have sidewalks, which falls below the 2010 benchmark of 56% by 26 percentage points.

### Recommendations – Sidewalks 2010 Benchmark Analysis

The TAC recommends changing the name of Measure 4 to, “Measure 4 - Percentage of Collectors and Arterials in *Activity Centers* with Sidewalks.” The TAC also recommends revising the benchmarks and target to reflect the larger geographic Activity Center areas.

### Findings – Measure 5 - Dwelling Unit 2010 Benchmark Analysis

Staff found a total of 12,530 units constructed since 2000 throughout the MPO, of which 2,785 units met the benchmark requirements. This represents 22.2 percent of the total. The number of units built in activity centers since 2000 is significantly higher, but the methodology requires that only those developments meeting the target density of ten units per acre may be counted.

### Recommendations – Dwelling Unit 2010 Benchmark Analysis

The TAC recommends changing the measure description to, “Measure 5 – Percentage of New Dwelling Units in *Activity Centers*.” Another recommendation is to revise the “How Measured” description to read, “Determined by reviewing assessor’s data to determine the ratio between new DUs in Activity Centers and total new DUs in the region.” The evaluation criteria for this measure needs to be revised to avoid confusion on what dwelling units should count towards the benchmarks and target. In addition, a new way of measuring density may need to be developed in order to ensure that proper credit is given to new development within Activity Centers. Another suggested option is to establish the existing density for residential development in all identified activity centers and then document the increase in density from one benchmark to the next.

Because some of the newly identified activity centers do not have commercial uses at their hub, consideration should be given to amending or eliminating the requirement that the dwellings be within ¼ mile of a commercial center having a minimum of 20,000 square feet.

### **Findings – Measure 6 - Mixed-Use Employment 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Using formulas that calculate the number of employees based on the size of the structure, staff estimated that 209 employees work in the qualifying businesses, which is only 12 percent of the estimated total of 1,740 employed in businesses constructed since 2000.

### **Recommendations – Mixed-Use Employment 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC recommends changing the measure description to, “Measure 6 – Percentage of New Employment in *Activity Centers*.” Another recommendation is to revise the “How Measured” description to read, “Determined by reviewing assessor’s data to determine the number of jobs per square footage of new commercial/industrial development in Activity Center to number of jobs per square footage of new commercial/industrial development in the region.” The evaluation criteria for this measure needs to be revised to remove obstacles to counting new employment, particularly regarding building entrances and parking between the building and the street.

### **Findings - Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The analysis showed a total of \$1,184,079 for 2002 – 2004 (\$234,079 more than the 2005 benchmark of \$950,000); \$3,128,147 for 2005 – 2009 (\$628,147 more than the 2010 benchmark of \$2.5M); and \$3,889,112 for 2010 – 2014 (\$410,888 less than the 2015 benchmark of \$4.3M). The net difference between the 3 benchmarks is \$451,338 additional funds.

### **Recommendations – Alternative Transportation Funding 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC did not have any recommendations for Measure 7.