



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

June 11, 2014

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
John Adam	City of Medford
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Karl Johnson	City of Ashland
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Kevin Caldwell	Phoenix
Matt Samitore	City of Central Point
Mike Faught (for Maria Harris)	City of Ashland
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:

Matt Brinkley (Phoenix Planning Director), Desmond McGeough (Medford), Mike Stitt, Mike Montero.

RVCOG Staff

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln, Sue Casavan, Pat Foley

1. Call to Order / Introductions

Vice Chair Tom Humphrey called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Those present introduced themselves. John Adam introduced Desmond McGeough, and said that he (McGeough) would be replacing him as Medford's representative to the TAC. Chairman Mike Kuntz arrived, and took over the meeting.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

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

On a motion by Kelli Sparkman and seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and TIP amendments

Andrea Napoli presented details about the proposed amendments. Highway 273 has been deleted because it is outside the MPO boundary. ODOT has asked that the Highway 140 project (Exit 35 to Blackwell Rd.) be added to the TIP and RTP project list (\$410,000) in order to bring the project to completion by 2017.

On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded Tom Humphrey, the Committee unanimously recommended the Highway 140 project be amended into the RTP and TIP.

5. Discretionary Funding Project Evaluation Scoring

Based upon a previous request from the Committee, Andrea Napoli explained the TAC project scoring, and presented three spreadsheets to the Committee:

1. Project Scoring Sheets
2. Comparisons to Final Rankings
3. Project Measures Table

A Committee discussion included the following comments and concerns:

- Scoring difficulties due to lack of available time for full technical evaluation of projects
- Value of Staff scoring as implemented
- Movement away from a more technical analysis
- CMAQ Air Quality technical analysis should not be ranked low, medium and high.
- Staff highlights are good but Committee fell short of its responsibility
- The Committee does a good job making concessions to benefit smaller jurisdictions.
- Compromise and politics play a part
- The technical side is more important
- Some criteria are not as clear as they could be
- RP goal need to be considered
- Core issues should be established
- Articulate specific scoring issues and project details
- Is the current process properly justified
- What is the actual difficulty with the scoring process used
- Come up with a clear process and outline for future application presentations and scoring
- Benefit of COG Staff touring future proposed projects prior to scoring process implementation
- Amount of time needed to process applications. Enough time for Staff to do its work.
- Value in discussing the process further for potential wording refinements
- Importance of TAC responsibility to do the job completely in order to make the process easier for everyone involved
- Make changes just prior to next process cycle
- Seek DLCD input
- Plan for extra time needed to complete the presentation and scoring process
- Application changes may be prudent
- Do it now (90-120 days)

- CMAQ application modifications (especially for split funding requests) are important (ODOT)

6. Surface Transportation Project (STP) Funds for Sidewalk Infill

Johnathan David queried the group about creating a mechanism (a separate “pot” of money) for funding small projects to build infill sidewalks. Members discussed issues with federal funding, benefits of the concept, possible STP fund exchange, potential archeology requirements, Alternative Measures (perhaps the greatest benefit?). The Committee expressed the desire to explore the concept in greater detail over time.

Paige Townsend said that RVTD would be supportive of a joint jurisdictional project for sidewalk infill for transit stops currently lacking adequate connectivity. Approximately half the Hwy. 99 bus stops need more (infill) sidewalks to satisfy FTA criteria.

7. RVACT Draft Bylaws

Pat Foley spoke to expressed concerns regarding the 2015-19 STP Enhancement Project application and selection process. One concern was that the creation of an RVACT TAC is felt to be needed. The RVCOG was asked to start the process, and has met with both MRMPO and RVMPO TACs. The previous JJTC Committee created draft bylaws in 2006, but they ever were adopted. The current draft is based upon that draft. The COG is asking for TAC direction to proceed on this matter. The MRMPO TAC has already approved moving forward with discussions on forming a TAC.

A group discussion and questions on this matter included:

- Whether it is appropriate for the MPO TAC to be making decisions
- Primary function would be to rank Enhancement projects and others
- Involvement of those with previous technical experience would be really beneficial
- RVACT TAC function would be different than MPO TAC functions because of potential funding sources
- RVACT could have non-MPO members
- The potential number of Committee members could be quite large (42-46)
- A formula for manageable representation is needed
- How to be sure all stakeholders, including non-MPO agencies and jurisdictions, are adequately and fairly represented
- Ideal number might be under twenty (20) members
- Possible single representative for multiple small jurisdictions
- The ability of the best projects to rise to the “top” in the approval process with proper professional/technical evaluation
- An RVACT TAC would bring strengths of both MPOs together to evaluate and recommend projects to OTC
- Potential project ranking process and who would be involved in rankings (additional layers of review/recommendations after MPO TAC and Policy level reviews)
- Without an RVACT TAC, the existing system may be sufficient to avoid redundancy
- ODOT does not want to rank project any longer
- The feasibility of an Executive Committee
- Why DEQ inclusion?
- Mike Baker has created a seventeen (17) member Committee makeup list, including transit, freight, etc.
- Concern about ACT members being left out of discussion.

- The ACT is looking for additional technical expertise on project evaluations
- RVACT responsibilities are different from the MPOs.
- MPO process must be preserved
- Is RVACT TAC creation a “knee jerk” reaction to a one time problem? Are there other solutions

Mike Montero shared that Federal and State requirements create additional challenges for the ACT. The Area Commission needs to wrestle with technical solutions, and the MPO TAC input on the expressed challenges will be invaluable to the RVACT. He suggested that the COG develop a bullet list of the TAC’s concerns, questions and discussion points be created for RVACT to address.

Paige Townsend said that the State scoring criteria was problematic on several levels. Ian Horlacher stated that the ODOT scoring process would change for next funding cycle.

Pat Foley will send out a bullet list gleaned from the Committee’s comments. Predominant focus fell upon:

- Committee size
- Potential process redundancy with additional TAC
- Meeting schedule (Ad hoc? As needed?)
- Purpose of the TAC
- Across the board, common scoring criteria
- Small cities representation

8. MPO Planning Update

Jonathan David announced that the hybrid vehicle had been ordered (under \$25,000) and arrival is anticipated in August.

9. Public Comment

None received.

10. Other Business / Local Business

Alex Georgevitch shared that the Adaptive Traffic Signal Timing is in place on Highway 62, near Costco, Delta Waters and north Fred Meyer. To date, the system appears to be working well.

Page Townsend reported on RVTD, including a potential tax levy on the November ballot, creation of new bus routes and the fact that a transit volunteer is needed for the Public Advisory Committee.

Meeting Information:

- RVMPO TAC meeting will be held Wed., July 9th, at 1:30PM.
- RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be held Tues., June 24th, at 2:00 PM.
- RVMPO PAC meeting will be held at 5:50 PM, Tuesday, July 15th.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:05 p.m.