



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

Dec. 9, 2015

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Jon Sullivan, Vice Chairman	RVTD
John Adam	Medford
Mike Kuntz, Chairman	Jackson County

Others Present:

RVCOG Staff

Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Ryan MacLaren, Bunny Lincoln, Dick Converse

1. Call to Order / Introductions

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m., with six (6) member agencies required and only five (5) represented, thereby creating **NO** quorum present. The agenda was adjusted to bring the Travel Demand Model Update to Item #2 because it was an informational presentation only.

2. RVMPO Travel Demand Model Update Population Forecast

Dick Converse made an informational presentation on the PSU Population Forecasts and RTP Update. The TAC is not choosing which population numbers to use. Dan Moore said that the new model might have lower numbers. The current model may be outdated in a few months. Alex Georgevitch expressed concern that the revised numbers might cause problems for local jurisdictions. Control totals must be based on adopted PSU numbers. The members discussed potential problems with having the population/employment numbers change from those currently adopted. Old numbers cannot be used, so feedback from ODOT and DLCD will be required. Staff will bring more information back to the TAC, especially related to Medford's 2035 numbers.

TPAU is developing a Southern Oregon Activity Based Model that will add more than 60 new TAZ. TPAU apparently has a methodology for allocating population and employment estimates to each split TAZ, relieving MPO staff of that responsibility.

The existing RTP population forecasts are based on the Jackson County Comprehensive Plan Population Element (shown as JCCP in the table) acknowledged by DLCD March 6, 2007. The County Plan forecasts stop at 2040. The following table includes County 2035 and 2038 forecasts, and PSU 2035, 2040, and 2065 forecasts. The present TAZ structure includes Comprehensive Plan 2038 forecasts; I have marked the cities where these forecasts exceed the PSU 2065 forecast.

City	JCCP 2035	PSU 2035	JCCP 2038	PSU 2040	PSU 2065
Ashland	27,400	23,183	28,155	23,433	24,138
Central Point	28,469	22,680	30,105	24,599	27,485
Eagle Point	19,773	14,839	20,765	16,612	18,669
Jacksonville	4,013	4,316	4,232	5,031	6,687
Medford	125,342	99,835	130,132	108,917	124,582
Phoenix	7,531	6,883	7,828	7,847	9,775
Talent	9,328	9,020	9,619	10,702	14,290
County Total	291,150	255,840	300,219	264,660	306,858

Clearly, using the new PSU forecasts could significantly alter how we prepare our estimates, and while we are not yet recommending an approach to accommodate these changes, we wanted to open the discussion early in the process. Some of the difference may be attributed to the fact that the County modified its projections to accommodate city projections when allocations were being discussed during Regional Plan development, and OEA permitted counties to make a percentage adjustment above its projections.

Action Item:

3. Regional Plan/Transportation Plan (RTP) Goals & Policies

Staff has reviewed local TSPs and determined that the RTP goals and policies are consistent with those TSPs.

Alex Georgevitch expressed serious concerns with the proposed new Goals and Policies, saying that the MPO RTP did not “develop” standards, but “supports” them. He felt that the text should be edited accordingly. The members agreed with this observation. He also wondered about greater streetscapes as traffic calming under performance indicators. He asked for a definition of “sustained growth” and “quality”. He also mentioned language that he thought was quite appropriate. He went on to call out a number of other items that caused him additional concern. Dan Moore said Staff would work to address these various issues. Ian Horlacher said that the Goals and Policies could remain unchanged if deemed appropriate. Jon Sullivan concurred. Alex Georgevitch again stipulated that the RTP should be “supportive” of local jurisdiction plans, and, after a query from Chairman Kuntz, said that he would send his notes to Staff. Jon Sullivan also spoke about RVTD’s interests in some changes to the Goal 1 language.

4. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

5. MPO Planning Update

- Dan Moore presented the latest version of the MPO Coordination Policy, including minor changes requested by Art Anderson, on behalf of ODOT.
- The Strategic Assessment is still ongoing. Members will be asked to review/comment on the draft document by Dec. 21st.
- Staff is updating the transportation model with 851 analysis zones. The local jurisdictions will need to vet the TAZ statistics. Staff will send shape files for this task.
- TRADCO may be informed about the Strategic Assessment if/when it is requested. This could be through and Executive Summary scenario.

7. **Public Comment.** None was received.

8. **Other Business / Local Business**

- Jackson County is holding an Open House on updates to the TSP Dec. 9th, 4:30 - 6:30 pm.

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

The next **RVMPO Policy Committee** meeting will be held on Dec. 15th at 2:00 p.m.

The next **RVMPO PAC** will be held on Jan. 19th at 5:30 p.m.

The next **RVMPO TAC** will be held on Jan. 13th at 1:30 p.m.