



**SUMMARY MINUTES**  
*Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization*  
*Technical Advisory Committee*

**March 11, 2015**

*The following people were in attendance:*

**RVMPPO Technical Advisory Committee**

*Voting Members in Attendance:*

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Desmond Mc Gough	City of Medford
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
Mike Kuntz, Chairman	Jackson County
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Robert Miller	City of Eagle Point
Zach Moody	City of Talent

*Others Present:*

**RVCOG Staff**

Dan Moore, Dick Converse, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln

**1. Call to Order / Introductions**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

**2. Review / Approve Minutes**

Chairman Kuntz asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the February meeting minutes. Tara Weidner (TPAU) submitted a request that the discussion on Alternative Measures benchmarks be amended to read:

“The members engaged in a discussion of the benchmarks and how to properly document the increases in transit usage, as well as reduction of VMTs and the relationship to measurements of children being taken to school. Omitting the “Auto” section was mentioned, and the fact that it does not accurately reflect carpools. In general, it was felt that the entire process was extremely complex and confusing. Staff will remove the sub categories. Josh Le Bombard lauded the process so far, adding that it was time to refine the Recommendations section, acknowledging that the modeling data is not **a-reliable the best historical** benchmarks indication **at-this time**, and move forward with additional monitoring and analysis follow up. Alex Georgevitch reiterated that he did not feel the benchmarks demonstrating regression in VMT reduction were showing an accurate picture of actual conditions. Paige Townsend said that it shouldn’t be assumed that RVTD ridership had increased (with new passengers) to an extent that it reduced the auto share, and impacted citizens who could choose to use transit. She did not want to see the process further convoluted by repeatedly reworking the data, feeling that a simpler method of securing accurate information was preferable.

Mike Upston suggested moving forward with this issue by adding recommendation comments that the model and data **are confusing when applied to the Alternative Measures, perhaps not accurately reflecting statistics on, particularly the definitions for** counting passengers, driving with passengers or pulling out sections that should be placed the Transit column instead.”

**Several members expressed concern that Ms. Weidner was recommending changes to the minutes, but had not attended the meeting in question. It was felt that the minutes, while not verbatim, should reflect what actually happened during the meeting.**

**On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the minutes were approved as presented, with the addition of the TPAU memo comments from Tara Weidner, by unanimous voice vote. Ian Horlacher abstained.**

### **3. Public Comment**

No public comment was forthcoming.

#### ***Action Items:***

### **4. Annual list of Obligated Projects - 2014**

Andrea Napoli presented an overview of the obligated funding process and the actual obligated projects. All obligated amounts in the document were provided by ODOT and RVTD. The listing includes several pie charts showing fund distributions by jurisdiction, agency and project type. The purpose of the Listing is to provide process transparency and track funding obligations Vs anticipated commitments, and to show that programmed projects are advancing. The listed projects were originally approved by the RVMPO Policy Committee by adoption of the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). A recommendation from the TAC will go onto the Policy Committee. Obligation timeframe is Oct. 1, 2013 to Sept. 30, 2014.

The Listing includes:

- Introduction
- Federal Requirements Federal Funding Sources (STP, CMAQ, National Highway Performance Program, Interstate Maintenance, MPO, FTA)
- Other Funding Sources
- Distribution of Funds by Jurisdiction & Type
- Distribution of Funds by Project Type (Roadway, Transit, Planning, Alternative Mode)
- Project Delivery, Phasing (Planning, Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way, Construction, Environmental)
- List of Obligated Projects
- Obligated Projects Map
- Appendix A – Federal Regulations

Alex Georgevitch asked about Medford’s CMAQ and Map 21 dollars for adaptive timing, total allocations, and what years the funding represented.

Paige Townsend said that there was a project duplication for RVTD. Ms. Napoli will check on this.

**On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by Rob Miller, the Project List was approved with changes. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

***Discussion Items:***

**5. Talent Conceptual Land Use & Transportation Plan (TA-4/TA-5)**

Dick Converse presented an overview and maps of the Talent Conceptual Plan – Transportation Alternatives and requested input from the TAC. The results of all the input on this matter will go to TPAU for scenario planning.

TA4 is confined to Industrial. A discussion with the Land Use Planners group will be held on March 12<sup>th</sup>. A report will be made to the Policy Committee.

Discussion comments/input during the presentation included:

- How the process will move forward at the technical level, and beyond
- The need to coordinate with other cities for the various concept plans
- The Policy Committee’s authority
- Hwy 62 RPS development sequence. Candidate lands must be justified for UGB expansions
- The importance of reporting to the Policy Committee
- Letters are not felt to be necessary
- Coordination vetting amongst jurisdictions should occur at the TAC
- All cities will have an interface with the County
- How traffic impacts would be modeled (TSP updates would be implemented)
- The modeling done through the RPS process
- Traffic analysis was to be between ODOT and the various jurisdictions
- How to get the Policy Committee to buy off on the framework
- What role does the TAC actually play in the process
- Arterial locations must be agreed upon by involved jurisdictions and agencies
- The need to complete Talent’s process by May
- RPS never anticipated Medford taking over Highway 62 jurisdiction

**TA4 - Street Alignment (Industrial with small commercial component)**

- Three options were shown, with Option 2 being preferred (access exclusively off Colver Road).

**TA5 (Mixed Use)**

- Ag buffer is required to the north
- Three options were depicted
- FD5 is located in the area
- The area has open space carrying a National Wetlands designation
- There are some access constraints
- Coordination with JACO is required
- Actual access design up in the air right now
- More planning is required

- The commercial/industrial area will consider Alternative Measures criteria
- All the options avoid conflicts with existing property development
- The options are trying for a balance between the various involved properties
- No specific transportation option has been selected
- Suggestions on potential street alignments
- Wetlands design options (visible amenity Vs hidden behind private development)

Dick Converse will prepare a letter to the Policy Committee articulating the TAC's comments.

**6. MPO Planning Update**

- Jonathan David is coming back to work, half time, in March.
- April 8<sup>th</sup> has been set for a Strategic Assessment Workshop & PAC meeting.
- Draft GHG Target Rule input is being sought by Staff. (Dan Moore provided a copy of the draft document for the TAC members.)

**7. Public Comment**

None received.

**8. Other Business / Local Business**

- Freeman Road work has begun.
- The Jackson County TSP will be putting a TAC together. Kittlesen is doing the work.
- RVTD service changes are going into effect on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

**9. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.