
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



Date: Wednesday, October 8, 2014

Time: 1:30 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.rvmpos.org

1. **Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda** **Mike Kuntz, Chair**
2. **Review/Approve Summary Minutes** (Attachment #1)..... **Chair**
3. **Public Comment** (Items not on the Agenda)..... **Chair**

Action Item:

4. **Strategic Assessment**..... **Bob Cortright / Tara Weidner**

Background: Bob Cortright, DLCD and Tara Weidner, ODOT will give a presentation about an opportunity to participate in a strategic assessment of the RVMPO region's transportation and land use plans. They will discuss results of the Corvallis area assessment and provide information about the Regional Strategic Planning Model (RSPM).

Attachment: #2 – Strategic Assessment information; links below provided by ODOT and DLCD (hard copies of documents will be available at meeting)

- Corvallis Area MPO report:
http://www.corvallisareampo.org/files/Strategic%20Assessment%20Report_20140710_FINAL.pdf
- Corvallis Area MPO scenario viewer:
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/scenarioviewer.html>
- ODOT Strategic Assessment video:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?feature=player_embedded&v=x2OV9KowEyE

Action Requested: Forward recommendation to Policy Committee.

5. **MPO Planning Update** **Jonathan David**
6. **Public Comment**..... **Chair**

7. **Other Business / Local Business** **Chair**
Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.

8. **Adjournment** (See note below)** **Chair**

****Please Note****

****Alternative Measures Steering Committee Meeting Immediately
Follows****

**RVMPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ALTERNATIVE MEASURES STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION**

1. **Alternative Measures Data Collection** **Dan Moore**

Background: MPO staff will provide the TAC with an overview and rationale behind each of the seven Alternative Measures and describe the data collected for the 2010 benchmark analysis. Staff will revise the data collection memo based on the TAC's comments.

Attachment: #1 – Memo; Activity Center map will be available at the meeting

Action Requested: Comment on information provided in technical memorandum.

- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO TAC Committee meeting: Wednesday, November 12, 2014, at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 28, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 18, 2014 at 5:30 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 Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee

August 13, 2014

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Desmond McGeough	City of Medford
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh Le Bombard	DLCD
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Sandy Brown (for Kelly Madding)	Jackson County
Matt Brinkley	City of Phoenix
Mike Kuntz	Jackson County
Mike Upston	Eagle Point
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Robert Miller	City of Eagle Point

Others Present:

Mike Montero, Greg Holmes

RVCOG Staff

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln

1. Call to Order / Introductions

Chairman Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

Chairman Kuntz asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the July meeting minutes.

Tom Humphrey pointed out several typographic mistakes on page 3, and they were corrected. Mike Montero stated that “**potential curtailment**” should be added, in place of the word “**sanctions**” to the following paragraph:

“Mike Montero put forth some historic information about problems associated with a previous, budgetary overrun sanction in the 1990s, causing the **potential curtailment** of some industry facilities, and spoke to the need for everyone to be aware of the “worst case scenario” should a

resolution not be found quickly.”

On a motion by Tom Humphrey and seconded by Kelli Sparkman, the minutes were approved as corrected. Ian Horlacher abstained. The remainder of the Committee voted in favor of the motion.

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

4. Proposed Regional Significance Screening Criteria

Jonathan David reviewed the problems associated with the CO budget overruns, and spoke about the work being done toward creation of a Limited Maintenance Plan. Regional Air Quality Conformity has not been exceeded. Modeling changes and previous flawed data related to not including “cold starts” caused the current problem. Staff is working with state/federal agencies to establish criteria to be used in determining regional significance, which will then be applied when evaluating various transportation project applications. No emissions analysis will be required for future projects determined not to be regionally significant. The goal is complete the LMT by March, 2016.

Mike Kuntz suggested that a (federal) definition of “principle arterial” was warranted in the criteria.

Paige Townsend referenced #2 on pg. 2, asking if the projects were still going into the VMT model, and was assured by Staff that this was the proper protocol.

Dan Moore shared that all affected agencies (DEQ, EPA, etc.) had reviewed the screening criteria, and found them to be completely appropriate.

On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Paige Townsend, the Committee concurred with the Policy Committee approval of the regional significance screening criteria. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Regional Transportation Plan Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination

- Dan Moore said that all the projects had been coordinated with member jurisdictions.
- RVTB made several changes, adding the “E Fare” Project to the STP, and dropping the Job Access Reverse Commute.
- ODOT changed the Highway 99 project name to “Oregon 99 - Rapp Road to Talent City limits”.
- Project #863 (Jackson County) was dropped from the TIP list.
- Revised TIP updates will be emailed to the membership for final review.

On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the Committee recommended Policy Committee approval of the 2015-18 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Regional Transportation Plan Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination, with the added changes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. Discretionary Funding: Revisions to Project Scoring Criteria/Application

Andrea Napoli reviewed the previous process used by Staff to revise the scoring criteria and project application. Included revisions are transit, livability, bike facilities. An evaluation criteria focus is to improve transit accessibility and support “fixed route transit”. Additional bike facilities would also receive an added score. Mike Upston questioned removing the draft reference to increased housing

in Measure #2 in favor of transit accessibility. The Committee discussed the fact that increasing housing and densities were decidedly interconnected with the concept of transit accessibility, agreeing that they were key to meeting that goal. Paige Townsend said that improvement projects could be evaluated, and perhaps awarded additional points for their location within 1/4 – 1/2 mile of an existing or planned transit route. She also concurred that densities would play a part in determining project priorities. Dan Moore said that employment densities could also be considered.

Under Measure #3 evaluation criteria, Mike Kuntz asked that “lane” be changed to “facility” in relation to bike projects.

Andrea Napoli next noted proposed changes to the project applications, including whether the proposed project is in an existing plan, specific location within a jurisdiction’s TSP (page and project number), and a description of CMAQ funding eligibility. She also said she would add the modifications requested by the Committee during its discussions.

Paige Townsend questioned whether higher scores were awarded for provision of more non-federal match funding on a project. Mike Kuntz questioned the philosophy of not using maximum federal dollars Vs local dollars. Members briefly discussed this issue, with Kelli Sparkman stressing the importance of being really careful when looking at matching funds, and viewing projects with a more technical eye. She stipulated that funding matches can sometimes change over the life of a project.

7. Central Point Conceptual Plan – Tom Humphrey

Tom Humphrey presented details of Central Point’s Concept Plan, which covers the City’s urban reserves adopted as part of the Regional Plan. Don Burt created a template that can be used by other jurisdictions, and the Plan has been refined over the past few months, following the Regional planning element in terms of land use and transportation, with a residential target density of 6.9 units per acre.

The Plan includes the following:

- Introduction
- Concept Plan (defined as a “guide” with no force of law)
- Findings (Rural/urban services)
- Graphics
- Performance Indicators

Open Space and Parkland are identified in the concept area.

The draft has been presented to the Planning Commission on an informal basis. Affected agencies have also reviewed the Plan, and adjustments were made by the City based upon their input and suggestions. The Council will eventually adopt the Plan by resolution, with it then being submitted to JACO for UGB amendment approval, at which point it will become a more formal document. It is not viewed to be a formal land use action at this time.

The concept area (CP4D) is comprised of 83 areas located north of town. 50 acres are useable. All but one acre is designated as open space, and the Greenway is the transportation key. Humphrey stated that only approximately 30 acres could be justified for UGB inclusion at this time, and gave a brief overview of the area demographics. He included a description of provision of urban services as referenced in the Plan. The Rogue River Irrigation District is also part of the area, and will be

considered as part of any Plan implementation. No amendments to the Regional Plan street system are anticipated.

Mr. Humphrey said that the Plan was deliberately crafted to be a simple document at this point, allowing for future refinements.

Greg Holmes stated that the Plan was a good start.

Based on a suggestion by Jonathan David, Tom Humphrey said that he could easily make a courtesy, informational presentation to the MPO Policy Committee. Others concurred, but mentioned that the County would be the final approval entity.

Dan Moore asked if the members wanted Staff to draft a memo to document stating that the TAC agrees that the Concept Plan meets RTP goals.

After extended discussion on the specific wording, including withdrawal of a previously stated motion, Mike Upston made a final motion that directed RVCOG Staff, on behalf of the RVMPO, to respond in writing, acknowledging the August 13th discussion of Central Point's Concept Plan for CP4D, and soliciting any additional comments and feedback. The motion was seconded by Ian Horlacher.

Members then discussed how coordination process was intended be implemented, with Tom Humphrey referencing page 22, Section 4.1.17 as the ultimate guideline for the process. Mike Upston said that the Committee was belaboring the point, and asked the Chairman to call for the vote.

The motion subsequently passed unanimously by voice vote.

8. MPO Planning Update

Jonathan David said that Staff efforts have been directed toward the LMP and TIP. The approved RVCOG Staff car is on its way.

9. Public Comment

None received.

10. Other Business / Local Business

- Paige Townsend announced that commuter between Grants Pass and Medford would begin September. A ribbon cutting has been scheduled for Sept. 23rd.
- Ian Horlacher shared that ODOT held an open house the Oregon 99 project, and it had been well attended.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Strategic Assessment of Transportation and Land Use Plans and Policies

Frequently Asked Questions

What is a strategic assessment?

A strategic assessment evaluates the region's adopted plans and policies, assesses how far those plans help the region reach its goals over the next 20 years, and identifies alternative paths to achieving those goals. It also identifies the value of state-led actions such as newer clean vehicles and fuels. Largely a technical exercise, the assessment provides information that can help inform decisions about the future, helping communities to understand where the current path will take us and what options exist for the region. This can inform plan updates and general decision-making. Additional work may be desired to help answer specific policy questions or to evaluate scenarios to formulate a vision for the region. If additional work is desired, support for scenario planning or additional analysis may be provided. You can view a short video about strategic assessments at

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/Pages/scenario_planning.aspx.



The purpose of the strategic assessment is to estimate travel (all modes) and emissions likely to result if adopted plans are implemented and current trends continue. The assessment can provide information about:

- Household travel costs
- Transportation and energy costs
- Air quality
- Mixed-use development
- Health impacts
- Vehicle miles traveled
- Travel delay
- Fuel consumed
- Walk trips and bike miles
- GHG emissions

How does it work?

A strategic assessment uses the Regional Strategic Planning Model (RSPM) to estimate future greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and other outcomes based on state and local conditions. ODOT and DLCD staff work with MPO and local government staff to gather the data needed to develop the model inputs, and ODOT staff run the model. ODOT and DLCD staff then work with the MPO staff to develop a report of the model outputs. The report also includes possible next steps for the region.

Why should our region conduct a strategic assessment of our plans?

The results of a strategic assessment can help the region determine whether current plans and trends are achieving the outcomes the region wants to see, and identify potential actions to better meet the region's goals. The results of the assessment can also help local governments better understand issues and quantify the effect of adopted policies as they review and update the area's transportation plans and make investment decisions. It can also bolster collaboration on policies such as transit, parking, and state-led actions such as implementation of pay-as-you-drive insurance, by quantifying the value of such policies. The effort can inform the public of new policies and the tradeoffs of alternative paths to meet regional goals. In addition, the information provided in the assessment is intended to

help local officials decide whether to pursue a more comprehensive analysis of land use and transportation options through formal scenario planning.

How will the results of a strategic assessment be used?

It is entirely up to the region and individual jurisdictions how the information is used. A strategic assessment can inform planning efforts and general decision-making and can be further expanded upon to develop a detailed vision and even performance measure of interest to the area. *It's important to note that conducting a strategic assessment doesn't obligate a region to conduct scenario planning or to make any changes to current plans.*

What is RSPM?

The Regional Strategic Planning Model (RSPM), a regional-level version of the award-winning GreenSTEP model, is a model ODOT has developed specifically for planning in metropolitan areas. The RSPM allows smaller geographic areas to quantify the potential future effects of existing or new policies. These might include various transportation and land use strategies to meet state GHG reduction targets and other regional goals. The RSPM models the households in the metropolitan planning area, and assigns specific attributes and land use characteristics to each household to determine their travel and emissions. This modeling tool is strategic, in that it supports analysis when there are a number of unknowns about the future. RSPM is a valuable new addition to the region's planning toolbox. It can help a region understand future trends and identify policy actions to reach local goals. Traditional models, such as urban travel demand models, can be used to help implement the regional vision and specific policy actions identified by the RSPM analysis.

How long does a strategic assessment take to complete?

The timeline for a strategic assessment can vary from region to region, but because a strategic assessment is primarily a technical exercise based on adopted plans, it can generally be completed within about six months.

How much staff time is required to complete a strategic assessment?

The amount of staff time required on the part of the MPO is relatively small, mainly to coordinate with local jurisdictions and with ODOT and DLCD staff on information-gathering efforts for RSPM inputs. The time and effort required on the part of the local government staff could vary depending on the level of interest and desired involvement by the local governments.

Is there funding available to help our region complete an assessment?

Yes, funding is available from ODOT through an intergovernmental agreement to offset MPO staff time costs for the strategic assessment effort. In addition, technical assistance from ODOT and DLCD is provided at no cost to the MPO. Dedicated funding is available for this work through the end of the biennium.

More questions? Contact us!

Brian Hurley
Oregon Department of Transportation
brian.j.hurley@odot.state.or.us
503-986-4398

Bob Cortright
Oregon Department of Land Conservation & Development
rcortright@dlcd.state.or.us
503-934-0020



**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

DATE: September 29, 2014
TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator
SUBJECT: Draft Alternative Measures Data Collection Memorandum

The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on the proposed methodologies for analyzing Alternative Measures at their June 11, 2014 and July 9, 2014 meetings. The final methodologies for analyzing the Alternative Measures are listed in Appendix A - Table 1.

The purpose of this memo is to provide the TAC with an overview and rationale behind each of the seven Alternative Measures and to describe the data collected for the 2010 benchmark analysis. The TAC is being asked to comment on the information provided. Staff will revise the data collection memo based on the TAC's comments.

Overview of Measure and Description of Data Collected

Measure 1 – Transit and Pedestrian/Bicycle Mode Share

This measure is intended to demonstrate a shift in travel behavior away from the automobile. This shift is anticipated to result from the region's planned improvements in the transit, bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, as well as from the implementation of planned Transit-Oriented Developments (TODs). The benchmarks and target for this measure are shown in Table 1. A three-fold increase in transit mode share (from 1% to 3%) and a 35% increase in bicycle and walking (non-motorized) mode share (from 8.2% to 11%) have been set as 20-year targets for this measure.

In 2000, the RVCOG travel demand model was used to predict mode share over the 20-year planning period (2000 – 2020). The analysis showed that the transit mode share would remain about the same (increase to 1.2%) and bicycling and walking mode share would decrease from 8.2% to 7.7%. This modeling effort assumed that transit service levels would be reduced and that only three of seven proposed TOD sites would be developed. Conservative assumptions concerning bicycling and walking were also implemented in the model.

Given the mode share levels predicted by the RVCOG travel demand model, the benchmarks and target identified for the mode share measure represent significant increases in alternative mode use. The mode share target is based on the belief that changes in the urban environment to which the model currently lacks a high degree of sensitivity, such as the development of mixed-use, pedestrian friendly areas, will result in the higher figures shown in Table 1. Due to the timing of construction of the mixed-use, pedestrian friendly areas, changes in travel behavior will proceed more slowly in the first 10 years of the planning period than in the final 10 years. The 2005

benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that the percent of daily trips for transit was 0.9% and bike/ped was 7.3%.

Table 1 - 20-Year Target for Mode Share

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>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	The percent of total daily trips taken by transit and the combination of bicycle and walking (non-motorized) modes. Determined from best available data (e.g., model output and/or transportation survey data).	% 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: 8.4	% daily trips transit: 2.2 bike/ped: 9.8	% daily trips transit: 3.0 bike/ped: 11

Mode Share Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

ODOT's Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) ran the RVMPO-v3.1 model to produce the 2006, 2010 & 2015 mode share percentages. The model is calibrated to the 1995/1996 Oregon Household Travel Survey¹, and 2010 is interpolated between 2006 and 2015. Results are depicted on Table 1.1 below.

Table 1.1 – 2006, 2010 & 2015 Mode Share Percentages – RVMPO v3.1

2006, 2010 & 2015 Mode Share - RVMPO v3.1 Model								
2006 RVMPO-v3.1	Drive-Along	Drive-w-Passenger	Passenger	Bus-Walk	Bus/Park & Ride	Bike	Walk	Sub-Total
Daily Period Total	267,501	200,755	248,498	3,622	360	11,200	54,694	786,630
Daily Period Mode %	34.01%	25.52%	31.59%	0.46%	0.05%	1.42%	6.95%	100%
2006	Auto			Transit		Bike/Walk		
	91.12%			0.51%		8.38%		
2010 RVMPO-v3.1 Interpolated	Drive-Along	Drive-w-Passenger	Passenger	Bus-Walk	Bus/Park & Ride	Bike	Walk	Sub-Total
Daily Period Total	287,260	234,723	266,054	3,618	328	9,336	54,762	856,081
Daily Period Mode %	33.56%	27.42%	31.08%	0.42%	0.04%	1.09%	6.40%	100%
2010	Auto			Transit		Bike/Walk		
	92.05%			0.46%		7.49%		
2015 RVMPO-v3.1	Drive-Along	Drive-w-Passenger	Passenger	Bus-Walk	Bus/Park & Ride	Bike	Walk	Sub-Total
Daily Period Total	311,959	277,182	287,999	3,613	289	7,007	54,847	942,896
Daily Period Mode %	33.09%	29.40%	30.54%	0.38%	0.03%	0.74%	5.82%	100%
2015	Auto			Transit		Bike/Walk		
	93.03%			0.41%		6.56%		

¹ The 2010 Oregon Household Activity Survey (OHAS) mode share data is not available at this time (data is still being validated and will be available later in October 2014).

Other sources of mode share data include the U.S. Census and American Community Survey (ACS). Both of these sources only provide “Journey to Work” data, and not for any other activity or trip purpose. The v3.1 model does show all household trips by mode for seven trip purposes, and is calibrated to the 1995/1996 household travel survey. TPAU recommends using the 2010 OHAS statistics which will be available later in October and, calibrated to the v4.1 model.

Measure 2 – Percent Dwelling Units within ¼ Mile Walk to 30 Minute Transit Service

This measure is intended to demonstrate improvements in transit accessibility. A walking distance of ¼ mile from a dwelling is assumed to provide reasonable pedestrian access to a transit line. Only those transit lines that provide at least 30-minute service will be counted towards meeting the benchmarks and target shown in Table 2. Progress on this measure is tracked through GIS.

To determine the year 2000 baseline, a GIS analysis of tax-lot, street, geographic and transit data was used to determine the percentage of dwelling units in the MPO that were within ¼ mile walking distance to RVTD transit lines. The GIS analysis showed that 12% of dwelling units in the MPO were within ¼ mile walking distance to 30-minute transit service.

Currently, four of RVTD’s transit lines provide 30-minute service, one provides 45-minute service, and two provide 60-minute service. During the 20-year planning period, all of these routes are planned to go to at least 30-minute service frequency with 15-minute service during the peak hours to routes serving TOD areas (assuming increased transit revenues). In addition, a large percentage of new development in the RVMPO area is planned to occur along existing or future transit lines. These changes are expected to result in an increase in the transit accessibility measure from 12% to 50% over the 20-year planning period². Table 2 shows the 5-year benchmarks and 20-year target for the proposed measure. The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that 34% of dwelling units are within ¼ mile walking distance of RVTD 30-minute transit routes.

Table 2 - 20-Year Target for Transit Accessibility

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
<i>Measure 2: % Dwelling Units (DU's) w/in ¼ mile walk of 30-minute transit service</i>	Determined through GIS mapping.	12%	20%	30%	40%	50%

Dwelling Unit Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

Staff collected tax lot data from the Jackson County’s Assessor’s Office that will be used to identify dwelling-units within a ¼ mile along 30-minute transit lines. GIS transit route data was provided by RVTD. Below is a progress report on this measure.

² The increases are based on analyses completed for the 2000 Alternative Measures.

1. All GIS data layers have been obtained. Updated/new files include 30 minute bus routes from RVTB, and tax lots from Jackson County. Other data files to be used include the RVMPO Boundary. **Completed.**
2. Create new shape files with the data layers using intersects and buffers. **In process.**
3. Create the non-vacant housing layer using the property class look up codes created by Jackson County. Layer was created by querying selected property classes and looking at the value of some improvements on selected property classes. **In process.**

Measure 3 - Percentage of Collectors/Arterials with Bicycle Facilities

The RVMPO programs projects along collector and arterial streets within the MPO boundaries. Consistent with the TPR, the RVMPO's policy is for these facilities to include bicycle lanes or, in rural areas, shoulders with a width greater than four feet. This measure is intended to track the progress of including these facilities on the MPO's street network and as a way to demonstrate improved accessibility for bicyclists.

Progress on this measure is determined through GIS analysis. In 2000, 21% of collectors and arterials in the MPO had provisions for cyclists, i.e., 4 foot or greater shoulders or bike lanes. Also, in 2000, an analysis showed that by 2020 bike lanes on collectors and arterials would increase to approximately 60%. The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that 37% of collectors and arterials in the MPO had provisions for bicycles.

5-year benchmarks and 20-year targets are shown below in Table 3.

Table 3 - 20-Year Target for Bicycle Facilities

Measure	How Measured	2000	Benchmark 2005	Benchmark 2010	Benchmark 2015	Target 2020
Measure 3: % Collectors and arterials w/ bicycle facilities	Determined through GIS mapping.	21%	28%	37%	48%	60%

Bicycle Facility Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

Each RVMPO member jurisdiction was sent a hardcopy map depicting existing bicycle facilities within their jurisdiction. The maps were created using data provided by Jackson County and/or individual jurisdictions. The data provided to RVMPO did not specifically identify shoulders and bike lanes 4-ft in width, or greater. Jurisdictions were asked to identify these facilities using the map provided. All of the bicycle lane data has been collected and ready to be analyzed.

Measure 4 - Percentage of Collectors and Arterials in TOD Areas With Sidewalks

The RVMPO has areas that are currently planned for mixed-use, pedestrian friendly development or are in downtown areas. This measure is intended to demonstrate improvements in pedestrian accessibility in these portions of the MPO area - where pedestrian access is most critical. For purposes of this entire analysis - not just this specific measure - a TOD area is considered to be one of three things:

1. A transit-oriented development
2. An activity area, and/or
3. A downtown/central business district.

In 2000, 47% of the collectors and arterials in the TOD/Downtown areas of Central Point, Medford, and Phoenix had sidewalks³. An analysis completed in 2000 showed that another 29% of these facilities will have sidewalks by the year 2020. This will bring the total sidewalk coverage within the TOD/Downtown areas in the MPO to approximately 75%. The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that 56% of collectors and arterials in the MPO had sidewalks. Proposed 5-year benchmarks and 20-year targets are shown below in Table 4.

Table 4 – 20-Year Target for Pedestrian Facilities

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
<i>Measure 4:</i> % Collectors and arterials in TOD areas w/ sidewalks	Determined through GIS mapping.	47%	50%	56%	64%	75%

Sidewalk Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

Jackson County does not have GIS sidewalk data. Jurisdictions will be asked to provide GIS sidewalk data (if available) for arterials/collectors located in the Activity Centers. Data is still being collected.

Measure 5 - Percentage of New Dwelling Units in Mixed-Use/Pedestrian-Friendly Areas

Measure 6 - Percentage of New Employment in Mixed-Use/Pedestrian-Friendly Areas

The objective of these measures is to demonstrate progress towards creating mixed use, pedestrian-friendly developments in the MPO. Progress towards meeting the benchmarks and targets for these measures is determined by monitoring development after the appropriate land use and development regulations have been adopted. Mixed use, pedestrian-friendly development occurring within downtown areas in Ashland, Talent, Phoenix, Jacksonville, Medford, Central Point and Eagle Point, as well as within proposed TOD sites, will count towards meeting the benchmark and target figures shown below in Tables 5 & 6. The benchmarks and targets shown in the tables represent the projected development for 2000 to 2020.

³ Analysis was completed prior to the expansion of the RVMPO to include; Ashland, Talent, Jacksonville and Eagle Point.

Table 5 – 20-Year Target for New Dwelling-Units in Mixed-Use Pedestrian Friendly Areas

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
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%	26%	41%	49%

The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that 10% of new development was mixed-use.

Table 6 – 20-Year Target New Employment for Mixed-Use Pedestrian Friendly Areas

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
Measure 6: % Mixed-use employment in new development	Estimated from annual employment files from State - represents the ratio of new employment in TODs over total regional employment.	0%	9%	23%	36%	44%

The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that 17% of new employment (over regional employment) occurred in mixed-use areas.

Dwelling Unit & Employment Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

Staff collected tax lot data from the Jackson County's Assessor's Office that will be used to identify new dwelling-units and employment (that fit the criteria) within the Activity Centers that were developed by each jurisdiction.

Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding

This measure has been developed to demonstrate the RVMPO's commitment to implementing the alternative transportation projects upon which many of the proposed measures rely. Funds made available to the RVMPO through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) are the only funds over which the RVMPO has complete discretion. RVMPO jurisdictions have agreed to direct 50% of this revenue stream, historically used for vehicular capacity expansion projects, towards alternative transportation projects. STP funds would be used to expand transit service, or, if RVTD is successful with a local funding package, to fund bicycle/pedestrian and TOD-development supportive projects. Table 7 shows 5-year benchmarks and the 20-year target for this measure.

Table 7 – 20-Year Target for Alternative Transportation Funding

<i>Measure</i>	<i>How Measured</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>Benchmark 2005</i>	<i>Benchmark 2010</i>	<i>Benchmark 2015</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>
Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding	Funding committed to transit or bicycle/pedestrian/TOD projects. Amounts shown represent ½ of the MPO's estimated accumulation of discretionary funding (STP*).	N/A	\$950,000	\$2.5 Million	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million

*STP revenue estimates developed by Oregon Department of Transportation.

Alternative Transportation Funding Data Collected for 2010 Benchmark Analysis

RVTD MPO STP funding data is derived from RVMPO STP Status Excel spreadsheets (maintained by RVCOG). The 2005 benchmark analysis completed in 2007 showed that \$1.4 million in MPO STP funds was committed to transit.

50% RVMPO STP Funds to RVTD 2002 - 2010					
Federal Fiscal Year	Federal		Federal Required Match		Total Fed+Req Match
	\$	Source	\$	Source	
2002	\$252,622	MPO STP	\$ 28,914	RVTD	\$ 281,536
2003	\$368,077	MPO STP	\$ 42,128	RVTD	\$ 410,205
2004	\$563,380	MPO STP	\$ 64,481	RVTD	\$ 627,861
2005	\$607,439	MPO STP	\$ 69,524	RVTD	\$ 676,963
2006	\$644,533	MPO STP	\$ 73,770	RVTD	\$ 718,303
2007	\$605,354	MPO STP	\$ 69,285	RVTD	\$ 674,639
2008	\$625,354	MPO STP	\$ 71,575	RVTD	\$ 696,929
2009	\$645,467	MPO STP	\$ 73,877	RVTD	\$ 719,344
2010	\$660,049	MPO STP	\$ 75,546	RVTD	\$ 735,595
Total	\$4,972,275		\$ 569,099		\$ 5,541,374

50% RVMPO STP Funds to RVTD 2002 - 2015					
Federal Fiscal Year	Federal		Federal Required Match		Total Fed+Req Match
	\$	Source	\$	Source	
2002	\$252,622	MPO STP	\$ 28,914	RVTD	\$ 281,536
2003	\$368,077	MPO STP	\$ 42,128	RVTD	\$ 410,205
2004	\$563,380	MPO STP	\$ 64,481	RVTD	\$ 627,861
2005	\$607,439	MPO STP	\$ 69,524	RVTD	\$ 676,963
2006	\$644,533	MPO STP	\$ 73,770	RVTD	\$ 718,303
2007	\$605,354	MPO STP	\$ 69,285	RVTD	\$ 674,639
2008	\$625,354	MPO STP	\$ 71,575	RVTD	\$ 696,929
2009	\$645,467	MPO STP	\$ 73,877	RVTD	\$ 719,344
2010	\$660,049	MPO STP	\$ 75,546	RVTD	\$ 735,595
2011	\$688,237	MPO STP	\$ 78,772	RVTD	\$ 767,009
2012	\$814,368	MPO STP	\$ 93,208	RVTD	\$ 907,576
2013	\$838,505	MPO STP	\$ 95,971	RVTD	\$ 934,476
2014	\$887,953	MPO STP	\$ 101,630	RVTD	\$ 989,583
2015	\$940,163	MPO STP	\$ 107,606	RVTD	\$ 1,047,769
Total	\$9,141,501		\$1,046,286		\$10,187,787

APPENDIX A

Table 1 – Alternative Measures Analysis Methodologies

Measure	How Measured
Measure 1: Transit and bicycle/pedestrian mode share	Mode share to be determined by utilizing data output from RVMPOv3.1 (or v4.0 if available) travel demand model, 2012 Household Survey, Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) ridership and passenger survey data, and 2010 Census information.
Measure 2: % Dwelling Units (DUs) w/in ¼ mile walk to 30-min. transit service	Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping software will be used for the Measure 2 analysis. The data will be compiled by utilizing GIS and Jackson County Assessor tax codes for (existing) 2014 taxlots to determine the total of non-vacant housing in the RVMPO in 2014. Using GIS, the analysis will look at total dwelling units in the RVMPO area compared to those dwelling units that are within ¼ mile of the 30-minute transit service.
Measure 3: % Collectors and arterials w/ bicycle facilities	GIS software will be utilized to determine the total linear feet of collectors and arterial roadways within the RVMPO. Then, each RVMPO arterial and collector roadway will be analyzed to determine the presence of dedicated bike lanes using Jackson County GIS data, inventories from jurisdictions, completed urban roadway upgrade projects, aerial photos, Google Map, and windshield surveys (as necessary). For purposes of this analysis the RVMPO will inventory dedicated bike lanes at least four feet in width or wider.
Measure 4: % Collectors and arterials in TOD areas w/ sidewalks	For purposes of this entire analysis - not just this specific measure - a TOD area is considered to be one of three things: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A transit-oriented development 2. An activity area, and/or 3. A downtown/central business district. GIS software will be utilized to determine the total linear feet of collectors and arterial roadways in TOD areas within the RVMPO. Then, each RVMPO arterial and collector roadway in the TOD areas will be analyzed to determine the presence of sidewalks using Jackson County GIS data, inventories from jurisdictions, aerial photos, Google Map, and windshield surveys (as necessary). A review of urban roadway upgrade projects noted in Measure #3 applies to this measure as well.
Measure 5: % Mixed-use DUs in new development	Measurements here will be determined by researching building permits and comparing the ratio between new dwelling units in TODs (considered a mixed-land-use overlay) and total new dwelling units in the MPO from 2000 to 2014.
Measure 6: % Mixed-use employment in new development	Data and measurements here will be estimated through review of annual employment files issued from the State of Oregon Employment Division. The percentages will represent a ratio of new employment in TODs (mixed-use developments) as compared with total new employment in the MPO.
Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding	This represents funding committed to transit or bicycle/pedestrian/TOD projects. Amounts listed are intended to represent half of the RVMPO's established accumulation of discretionary Surface Transportation Program (STP) funding. As of 2007 this amount was determined to be \$1.4 million. The specific sums shown as benchmarks and the target for this measure are estimates based on the best financial forecasts available at the time the measure was adopted (2002). The actual financial commitment of this measure is half of the total STP allocation.