
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



Date: Wednesday, November 12, 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**

Discussion Item:

4. **Alternative Measure #7 – Alternative Transportation Funding** **Paige Townsend**

Background: This measure has been developed to demonstrate the RVMPO’s commitment to implementing alternative transportation projects. RVMPO jurisdictions have agreed to direct 50% of Surface Transportation Program (STP) of this revenue stream, historically used for vehicular capacity expansion projects, towards alternative transportation projects.

Attachment: Materials will be handed out at meeting.

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** **Chair**

- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO TAC Committee meeting: Wednesday, December 10, 2014, at 1:30 p.m. in the Adams Room at the Medford Library.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, December 1, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- Cancelled: 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.

Please Note: Alternative Measures Steering Committee Meeting Immediately Follows

RVMPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ALTERNATIVE MEASURES STEERING COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

1. Review Final Data Collection Memo and Activity Centers Maps..... Dan Moore

Background: The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on the proposed Alternative Measures data collection memorandum at their October 8, 2014 meeting. Revisions based on the TAC's comments are in red font. Also, a new table is included on Page 7 that shows the total amount of RVMPO discretionary funds awarded to transit, bike/ped/TOD projects from 2000 to 2010. Also, revisions were made to the proposed Activity Center maps based on the TAC's comments and a meeting with Josh LeBombard, DLCD.

Attachment: #2 - Final Alternative Measures Data Collection Memo and previous meeting minutes. Revised Activity Center map will be presented at the meeting and is available to view at the following link:
http://rvmpo.datacw.com/images/technical-advisory-committee/2014/meeting-materials/RVMPOActCent_Esize.pdf

Action Requested: Review and comment on revised memo.

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

October 8, 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
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh Le Bombard	DLCD
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Maria Harris	Ashland
Matt Brinkley	City of Phoenix
Matt Samitore	City of Central Point
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, Jenna Stanke, Bob Cortwright, Nick Fortey, Mike Quilty, Bruce Sophie, Brian Hurley, Tara Weidner.

RVCOG Staff

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln, Sue Casavan, Dick Converse

1. Call to Order / Introductions -

Chairman Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

2. Review / Approve Minutes -

Chairman Kuntz asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the August meeting minutes. (NOTE: There was no meeting in September.)

Alex Georgevitch did not attend the meeting. Page #3. T. Humphrey referenced page 3 of the minutes, clarifying that there was no action on the additional match discussion.

On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Paige Townsend, the minutes were approved by unanimous voice, as amended. Kelly Madding and Alex Georgevitch abstained.

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

4. Strategic Assessment –

Bob Cortwright opened the Strategic Assessment presentation, explaining that it was a joint effort between ODOT and DLCDC and related to reducing greenhouse gasses around the State. Tara Weidner explained her role in the process, and working with the newest Regional Strategic Planning Model.

Mr. Cortwright explained Strategic Assessment and walked through the recently completed Corvallis Plan, the first completed Assessment. He reviewed the following items:

- Historical project background 2009-10.
- Portland's Scenario Planning
- Scenario Planning Guidelines, a broader process than strategic planning (required for Metros)
- The 20% reduction goal
- Statewide Transportation Strategy (ODOT implementation)

At this point, the MRMPO has no reduction targets or obligation to comply with same.

Strategic Assessment is a new “tool” to assess how existing, adopted plans/data can help to meet the established GHG reduction goals by 2035. RTP & Land Use Plans, as well as census information are used in the process.

The Base Case is set at 2010 for Current Conditions (the most recent data available).

The Reference Case is established at 2035.

The members discussed various aspects related to the categories upon which the Assessment is expected to provide information:

- Household travel costs
- Transportation & energy costs
- Air quality
- Mixed-Use development
- Health impacts
- Vehicle miles traveled
- Travel delay
- Fuel consumption
- Walk trips & bike miles
- Greenhouse gas emissions

Other items discussed included:

- How the Assessment could help local municipalities and agencies evaluate and update their transportation plans and make informed investment decisions
- How the Regional Strategic Planning Model (RSPM) allows for the analysis of smaller geographic areas and the understanding of future transportation trends, as well as identification of potential policy actions to successfully reach local goals. Statistics and data used include census data, Oregon travel data & surveys, national travel study trends, adopted land use & transportation plans and TAZ-level travel models.
- Assessments can usually be completed within six months.
- Funding and no-cost technical assistance are available through ODOT.

- Technical assistance (no-cost) is also provided b DLCDC.

Mr. Cortwright and Ms. Weidner shared more specific details of the Corvallis Assessment (CAMPO), with Power Point slides covering:

1. State agency assistance provided
2. Key Findings and Factors on per capita greenhouse gas declines to 2035
3. Key Factors and Findings on public health improvements
4. Key Findings on reaching the target GHG reductions
5. The availability of multiple options to reach the reduction goal
6. Policy impacts by reductions in emissions, household travel costs and road congestion
7. Factors evaluated by RSPM
 - ❖ Regional Context
 - ❖ Local Actions: Community Design, Marketing & Incentives
 - ❖ Collaborative Actions: Vehicles & Fuels, Pricing

Mike Quilty brought up the subject of electric vehicles and related power generation, and Mike Kuntz asked about a margin of error factor in the Assessment process. Tara Weidner shared that these were an area of unanswered questions to date, but that some areas (fuel prices and land use densities) had been evaluated to a certain degree.

Bob Cortwright stated that participating in the Strategic Assessment did not create any regional mandate for doing further analysis or moving on to Scenario Planning. The SA creates no obligation for doing anything more. The DLCDC will be updating the GHG targets next year.

Mike Upston was concerned about duplication of effort, and its impact on staff time/costs.

Mr. Cortwright spoke about how the SA process is a “tool” to help with the next update to the RTP, providing additional baseline information for future decision making and alternative measures.

Mike Kuntz pointed out the importance of recognizing the significant diversities, actual and philosophical, throughout the Rogue Valley municipalities, and the need to be judicious in not pushing those diversities all together in under common scenario.

Tara Weidner used Eugene/Springfield as an example of different districts and policies being combined into a plan that recognizes various philosophies while working toward a common goal. Members agreed that no single municipality will cede its land use planning to others.

Josh LeBombard brought up the RPS adopted plan, and that the accepted land use densities would undoubtedly remain the same for a significant period of time.

Cortwright said that existing Land Use Plans are starting point. Alex Georgevitch pointed out that Medford’s RTP does not include future growth. Non-RTP alternatives could be used for future land use. OEA population projections would be used, but discussion and review might be needed when looking at the model. It was agreed that adjustments might be needed.

Local resources were used in gathering Corvallis’ information and data. MPO Staff was mainly used to assess existing data.

The Committee discussed funding mechanisms and manpower allocations/staff time required to

provide data and complete the SA. Mike Quilty said that the Policy Committee would need a better understanding of these issues before committing to any SA participation.

The next steps in the process are: 1) A TAC recommendation to the Policy committee to proceed with the SA, 2) A Policy Committee letter to ODOT expressing support for the MPO to conduct the SA, 3) Development of an IGA with ODOT to fund local work, and 4) Begin the SA in late 2014.

Paige Townsend made a motion to recommend that the Policy Committee proceed with a Strategic Assessment for the Rogue Valley. Tom Humphrey provided the second.

Discussion:

Mike Kuntz expressed concern that not enough procedural information had been provided for continuing with the SA. Paige Townsend said that she felt comfortable with everything that had been presented, and felt a recommendation to the Policy Committee was warranted.

Alex Georgevitch said he was still unclear on the final outcome of the SA. Cortwright responded that the 2009 legislature had provided direction. There is NO mandate at this point. It is strictly a voluntary approach at this time, but GHG issue won't go away. The SA information established will allow the rogue valley

Alex Georgevitch said the potential for non-validated information made him very nervous.

Next year, DLCD will be creating targets for years beyond 2035. Jonathan David expressed concern about unfunded mandates in the future.

Alex Georgevitch stressed that he wanted to be sure that any SA output needed to be based on fully informed decisions. Kuntz spoke about an inherent margin of error in the untested model, and that he was compelled to vote against the motion. Josh LeBombard commented that the SA would have the least bearing on Jackson County, and that he felt there would be more effect on the various cities involved. Mike Quilty was concerned about the SA becoming a political document without designated future funding sources or binding obligation, and how it might be viewed others. Tom Humphrey said the SA would create a legitimate analysis/assessment, with relative scientific benefit.

Mike Upston pointed out that Strategic Assessment Vs Scenario Planning needs to be clearly defined, and that the SA is designed to be just another analytical "tool" to benefit the region.

Alex Georgevitch said he was comfortable supporting the SA, but that the document must be defined as an informational document only, and must also be expected to be refined over time.

Kuntz speculated about the merits of being the "second guinea pig" behind Corvallis.

Chairman Kuntz called for the vote. Kelly Madding and Mike Kuntz voted no. The motion passed on a majority voice vote.

Chairman Kuntz thanked Mr. Cortwright and Ms. Weidner for their time and presentation.

5. MPO Planning Update –

Jonathan David said staff is working on the Limited Maintenance Plan. Dan Moore is working with

the EPA and DEQ, with a scope of work expected next week. The 2010 model will be probably be used. Dues will be used to pay for additional costs.

6. Public Comments – None.

7. Other Business / Local Business

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:44 p.m.



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Alternative Measures Steering Committee

October 8, 2014

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Alternative Measures Steering Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Matt Samitore	City of Central Point
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Paige Townsend	RVTD

Others Present:

Mike Montero, Nick Fortey, Josh LeBombard, Brian Hurley, Tara Weidner, Bob Cortwright, Jenna Stanke

RVCOG Staff

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln, Sue Casavan, Dick Converse

1. Call to Order

Chairman Kuntz called the meeting to order.

2. Alternative Measures Data Collection

Dan Moore presented the collected data on the seven Alternative Measures, referencing the Sept. 29th memo:

- **Measure 1 – Transit and Pedestrian/Bicycle Mode Share**

#1 Transit/Bike-Ped Mode Share – (Oct 6th memo) Dan is recommending Table #1 with data from the updated TPAU model used to demonstrate 2010 benchmarks. No more data analysis needs to be done. The baseline is the 2000 RVCOG model data. The Bike/Ped goals are being exceeded.

Josh LeBombard reiterated that Dan is recommending using the data in the October 6th TPAU data memo, and suggested using Dan's data.

Table #2 – October 6th has “Journey to Work” 2013 data.

Table #1 is the most accurate for 2010 benchmark analysis.

Fresh data will come from census information, and will be available more frequently. The TPAU

data will not be updated for at least five (5) years.

The group agreed Table #1 (Oct. 6th memo) would be used for measure #1.

- **Measure 2 – Percent Dwelling Units within ¼ Mile Walk to 30 Minute Transit Service**
Table #2 used JACO tax lot data, and is recommended for this measure. Paige Townsend suggested 30-minutes or better for transit accessibility, and the data will be analyzed accordingly.

- **Measure 3 - Percentage of Collectors/Arterials with Bicycle Facilities**
Table #3 – GIS data was provided by each municipality, and will be analyzed by COG staff. The Greenway is being included too. Bike lanes on arterial and collectors were briefly discussed. Further discussion was viewed as important by the Committee, and changes warranted.

Sue Casavan stressed the need for definite criteria associated with each of the Measures.

The current methodology for this Measure was deemed appropriate by the members.

- **Measure 4 - Percentage of Collectors and Arterials in TOD Areas With Sidewalks**
The methodology is identical to Measure #3, except for the fact that the data has not been collected yet. COG Staff has asked jurisdictions for GIS sidewalk data in activity centers. The outcome must be based upon a common definition of “activity centers”. A separate meeting will be set for this discussion.

Measures #4-6 are related to definitions of activity centers, and also need further discussion before proceeding with those Measures.

- **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**
- **Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding**

STP funding provided to RVTD were measured, but other funding should be considered too (additional STP \$, enhanced and CMAQ). It was not broken down by alternative transportation funding or mode share. Only the RVTD 50% was measured. The current data exceeds the benchmark, but it was felt that all funding should be considered.

More data will be collected for this Measure.

Paige Townsend said projects that exceed minimum standards should get extra points.

Bob Cortwright shared it was important to determine if projects actually met adopted Bike/ped benchmarks.

The goal is to present the completed data in November, but it may go out to December or January.

3. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 PM.



**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: November 5, 2014
TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator
SUBJECT: Final Draft Alternative Measures Data Collection Memorandum

The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on the proposed Alternative Measures data collection memorandum at their October 8, 2014 meeting. Revisions based on the TAC's comments are in red font. Also, a new table is included on Page 7 that shows the total amount of RVMPO discretionary funds awarded to transit, bike/ped/TOD projects from 2000 to 2010.

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 RVMCOG 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 RVMCOG 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: Transit and bicycle/pedestrian mode share</i>	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%		

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

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).

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 or less 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 (Route 10 provides 20 minute service during peak morning and afternoon hours), 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 RVTD, 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

<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 3: % Collectors and arterials w/ bicycle facilities</i>	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: % Collectors and arterials in TOD areas w/ sidewalks</i>	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>
<i>Measure 5:</i> % 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>
<i>Measure 6:</i> % 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>
<i>Measure 7:</i> 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

Alternative transportation funding data is derived from RVMPO TIPs, STP and CMAQ 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 alternative transportation projects.

Funding Committed to Transit or Bike/Ped/TOD Projects - 2000 to 2010						
Jurisdiction	Project	Federal Fiscal Year	Federal		Federal Required Match	Total Fed+Req Match
			\$	Source	\$	
RVTD	MPO STP Transfer	2002	\$252,622	STP	\$ 28,914	\$ 281,536
		2003	\$368,077	STP	\$ 42,128	\$ 410,205
		2004	\$563,380	STP	\$ 64,481	\$ 627,861
		2005	\$607,439	STP	\$ 69,524	\$ 676,963
		2006	\$644,533	STP	\$ 73,770	\$ 718,303
		2007	\$605,354	STP	\$ 69,285	\$ 674,639
		2008	\$625,354	STP	\$ 71,575	\$ 696,929
		2009	\$645,467	STP	\$ 73,877	\$ 719,344
Sub-Total			\$4,972,275		\$569,099	\$5,541,374
Jackson County	Bear Creek Greenway	2000	\$1,775,000	CMAQ	\$ 203,157	\$ 1,978,157
Phoenix	N. Rose & South C Street; Sidewalks & Bike Lanes	2004	\$170,000	CMAQ	\$ 19,457	\$ 189,457
Central Point	N. 9th & Laurel; Sidewalks & Bike Lanes	2006	\$993,138	CMAQ	\$ 113,669	\$ 1,106,807
RVTD	Employer Trip Reduction	2006	\$59,222	CMAQ	\$ 6,778	\$ 66,000
RVTD	Rogue Valley TMA Programs	2006	\$109,471	CMAQ	\$ 12,529	\$ 122,000
RVTD	Multi-model Enhancements	2006	\$21,535	CMAQ	\$ 2,465	\$ 24,000
RVTD	Diesel Bus Replacement	2006	\$940,000	CMAQ	\$ 107,587	\$ 1,047,587
RVTD	Passenger Information Systems	2006	\$325,720	CMAQ	\$ 37,280	\$ 363,000
RVTD	On-Board Diagnostics	2006	\$98,703	CMAQ	\$ 11,297	\$ 110,000
Medford	Oak St - McAndrews to Taft; Sidewalks & Bike Lanes	2007	\$481,000	CMAQ	\$ 55,053	\$ 536,053
RVMPO	TDM Plan	2007	\$41,823	CMAQ	\$ 4,787	\$ 46,610
Medford	Mace Road Sidewalks	2008	\$457,624	CMAQ	\$ 52,377	\$ 510,001
Talent	Talent Ave: Rogue River Parkway to Creel Rd. - Sidewalks & Bike Lanes	2008	\$202,000	CMAQ	\$ 23,120	\$ 225,120
Medford	Barnett Bike/Ped Bridge	2010	\$500,000	CMAQ	\$ 57,227	\$ 557,227
Medford	Garfield Ave: Columbus to Lillian - Sidewalks & Bike Lanes	2010	\$1,500,000	CMAQ	\$ 171,682	\$ 1,671,682
Sub-Total			\$ 7,675,236		\$ 878,465	\$ 8,553,701
			Total STP & CMAQ 2000 to 2010		Total Match	Match & Federal Funding Total
			\$ 12,647,511		\$1,447,564	\$ 14,095,075

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.