



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

**April 8, 2015**

*The following people were in attendance:*

**RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee**

*Voting Members in Attendance:*

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
John Adam for Desmond Mc Gough	City of Medford
Jon Sullivan, Vice Chairman	RVTD
Ian Foster	Jacksonville
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Matt Brinkley	City of Phoenix
Mike Kuntz, Chairman	Jackson County
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Edem Gomez for Paige Townsend	RVTD
Robert Miller	City of Eagle Point
Zach Moody	City of Talent

*Others Present:*

Mike Montero, Bruce Sophie, Al Densmore, Greg Holmes, Tara Weidner, Bob Cortwright (phone), Bianca Petrou, Jenna Stanke, Kathy Conway, Kathy Conway, Dave Cornell, Alan Jornet, John Vial, Scott Turnoy, Cody Meyer, and Terry Bateman.

**RVCOG Staff**

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

**1. Call to Order / Introductions**

The Chairman 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 March meeting minutes.

**On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the minutes were approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.**

**3. Public Comment**

No public comment was forthcoming.

***Presentation/Update Items:***

### **3A. RTP/TIP Amendment**

Andrea Napoli presented information on the ODOT requested RTP/TIP amendment to add the Antelope Road CNG facility. The project was awarded an ODOT CNG grant (CMAQ funds), with the 10.27% match, as well as additional funding provided by the developer, Shadow Properties, LLC. Total project cost is \$2,213,575.

**On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Matt Brinkley, the RTP/TIP amendment was recommended to the Policy Committee for approval by unanimous voice vote.**

### **4. Strategic Assessment (SA) Workshop**

Dan Moore explained the RSPM and Strategic Assessment process and introduced the State representatives in attendance. Bob Cortwright (by phone), Cody Meyer, Scott Turnoy and Tara Weidner presented a Power Point illustrating the SA process.

The presentation covered:

- Introduction
- What is Strategic Assessment?
- Regional Strategic Planning Model (RSPM) – Model & RVMPO Inputs using local data, plans & national studies
- The Regional Strategic Planning Model: Input Evaluation Factors affecting household travel  
Regional Context
  - Local Actions - Community Design, Marketing & Incentives
  - Collaborative Actions – Fleet & Technology, Pricing
- Policy issues informed by RSPM Outputs/Outcomes
- Sharing of Results (SA Report & Web-based scenario Viewer)
- Sensitivity Testing
- RVMPO questions asked during data gathering
- RVMPO Geographic Study Area (10 RPS Districts & 39 RSPM Districts (TAZ zones))
- Overview of Inputs & Assumptions – Regional Context, Vehicles & Fuels (Fleet & Technology), Pricing, Community Design (Land Use), Marketing & Incentives
- Years: 2010 & 2038 Place Types (Regional Role + Neighborhood Character)
- Built Environment Variables (Accessibility, Density, Design, Diversity & Transit Level Service)
- Regional Role (Area Type)
- Neighborhood Character (Development Type) - Mixed Use, Employment, Residential, Transit Supported Development, Low Density Residential
- Place Types Map – RVMPO 2038
- Dwelling Units (2010-38 New Dwellings by Type)
  - Census = 2010 types. New Units = Zoning Coverage
- TAC Review Packet
  - Link to Survey
  - Inputs Overview Handout
  - Land Use Inputs – Method Memo, Place Type Map, 2010 & 2038 Visualizer, New Dwelling Units Table
  - Accurate Reflections of Adopted Plans
- Next Steps in the Process
  - Immediate: Packet & Survey
  - Looking Ahead: Finalize inputs, RSPM Calibration & Adopted Plans scenario

## Sensitivity Testing

- Product:  
Strategic Assessment Report  
RVMPO Committee Meetings

Population growth estimates are based upon State Office of Economic Analysis figures.

Household sizes are the same.

Incident Response was based upon statistics within the study area.

Access Management will receive more input.

Dwelling units will be divided into five types for modeling purposes.

LCDC will send packets to each jurisdiction for further, individual input.

## 5. Target Rule Review

Bob Cortwright, DLCD, spoke about the Target Rule Review. The Report is currently in “draft” form, intended for public review and comment. He started with a 2011 historic background of the Rule, the requirement for greenhouse gas reductions and the need to update/amend the targets to 2040. 2005 is the base year.

Portland Metro, Eugene-Springfield, Corvallis (Strategic Assessment) and ODOT (Statewide Transportation Strategy) have conducted scenario planning projects, reaching some consistent conclusions:

- 2035 emission reduction targets are achievable
- Meeting the targets will require coordinated State, regional and local efforts to reduce dependency on driving.
- Major efforts and new funding will be needed to expand public transit, make walking/cycling more convenient, promote dense, mixed use development and better manage parking
- GHG reduction policies and actions benefit citizens, businesses, communities and the transportation system
- Beyond existing plans, additional strategies will be required to expand transit and associated options, better manage parking and promote compact land use in order to achieve targets.

Recent studies, as well as new federal/State laws and programs indicate improvements in vehicle technology, fleet and fuels in 2035, and beyond. Most metropolitan areas are now looking at 2040 targets, and on to 2050.

Recommendation has been made to analyze new information and review/update the targets for 2040 in order to assure that targets are relevant with existing plans.

The assumptions on use of electric/hybrid vehicles have surpassed those initially created. Older, conventional fuel vehicles are lasting longer now, so fleets are not turning over as quickly as was estimated. Vehicle types are also not moving away from the high use of SUVs and pickups as was assumed. The LCDC will be working with DEQ, the Energy Dept. and ODOT gather more details in order to amend the targets for 2040 (possibly up to 30%, per capita), in order to be further along toward the 2050 goals. It is not being recommended that scenario planning be implemented in metropolitan areas outside Portland Metro. Opportunities are being sought to integrate Transportation and Scenario Planning and Strategic Assessments.

Strategic Assessments are being used to begin the information gathering process at the local,

regional level.

Comments on the draft rule are requested by April 17<sup>th</sup>, in preparation for the DLCD presentation to the State Transportation Commission in May. If the Commission concurs that the targets should be updated, an Advisory Committee would be established and the rulemaking process for 2040 would begin in summer, 2015.

## **6. Regional Problem Solving (RPS) Growth Areas**

Dick Converse presented a TAC memo on RPS growth areas and conceptual planning coordination. A unified proposal needs to go to the Policy Committee on the **Implementation Indicators**:

- Conceptual Transportation Plans (Infrastructure)
- Conceptual Land Use Plans (Target Residential Densities)
- Land Use Distribution
- Transportation Infrastructure
- Mixed Use/Pedestrian Friendly Areas

The TAC has the responsibility of collaboratively reviewing/endorsing the various cities' conceptual plans.

The last sentence in paragraph immediately following section 2.8.4 was amended to read... **“During the review of a UGB amendment, both the City and the County will ensure that the land use allocation percentages, density requirements, transportation connectivity and other performance indicators, such as agricultural buffering, established in the Regional Plan are met.”**

Section 2.6 states that “each city shall achieve the 2020 benchmark targets for the number of dwelling units (Alternative Measure #5 ) and employment (Alternative Measure #6) in mixed-use, pedestrian friendly areas as established in the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or most recently adopted RTP.”

The memo has not gone to the Policy Committee.

Josh Le Bombard mentioned that irrigation districts need to be included in City discussions because of the infrastructure they may have within UGB amendment areas. The importance of the technical review process was emphasized.

**On a motion by John Adam, seconded by Kelly Madding, the planning coordination process as amended above, was recommended for Policy Committee approval by unanimous voice vote.**

TAC members were encouraged to attend the Policy Committee meeting on April 28<sup>th</sup>.

## **7. Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2015-16**

Dan Moore went over changes to the original draft budget document, and asked the TAC for a recommendation to the Policy Committee to adopt the Program. Highlighted budget changes for FY 2015-16 include:

- (Adopted) dues proposal
- ODOT identified carry over funds (+\$84,000 planning funds) - \$20,000 to update ITS Plan and + \$64,000 RTP (Safety Plan updates, etc.)
- A -\$9,700 reduction in FHA planning funds
- A -\$1200 FTA funding reduction

Due to increased RVCOG Staff workloads on several levels, an additional planner position (FT) is justified.

**On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Mike Upston, the 2015-2016 UPWP was recommended to the Policy Committee for adoption by unanimous voice vote.**

**8. MPO Planning Update**

- Jonathan David is back to work on a half time basis.
- Recruiting is underway for an associate transportation planner.
- Alternative Measures are close to Final Report completion.

**9. Public Comment**

Al Densmore commented that the greenhouse gas issue is dependent upon the legislature getting behind appropriate transportation support and funding.

**10. Other Business / Local Business**

Phoenix will be holding a community open house, April 16<sup>th</sup>, from 4-7 pm, to inform its citizens about ongoing Urban Renewal plans and projects.

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:25 p.m.