

---

## AGENDA

### Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



---

*Date:* Wednesday, May 13, 2015  
*Time:* 1:30 p.m.  
*Location:* Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG 155 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Central Point  
*Transit:* served by RVTD Route #40  
*Phone:* Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360  
*RVMPO website :* [www.rvmpos.org](http://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**

***Action Item:***

4. **Alternative Measures Final Report**..... **Dan Moore**

*Background:* Staff prepared a draft Alternative Measures Report for TAC review and comment. The report will also be presented to the Public Advisory Council at their May 19, 2015 meeting for their review/comment and recommendation to the Policy Committee. The Policy Committee will conduct a Public Hearing on June 23, 2015 to consider adoption of the Alternative Measures Report.

*Attachments:* #2 – Executive Summary

#2A – Draft Report / click on the following link for full report:

[http://rvmpos.datacw.com/images/technical-advisory-committee/2015/meeting\\_materials/Attach2A\\_DraftAlt-M\\_Report.pdf](http://rvmpos.datacw.com/images/technical-advisory-committee/2015/meeting_materials/Attach2A_DraftAlt-M_Report.pdf)

#2B – Appendix A / click on the following link:

[http://rvmpos.datacw.com/images/technical-advisory-committee/2015/meeting\\_materials/Attach2B\\_-Alt-M-Update-APPENDIX\\_A.pdf](http://rvmpos.datacw.com/images/technical-advisory-committee/2015/meeting_materials/Attach2B_-Alt-M-Update-APPENDIX_A.pdf)

*Action Requested:* Review, comment and recommend that the Policy Committee approve the final report.

***Discussion / Update Item:***

**5. Regional Problem Solving (RPS) Concept Plan Process ..... Dick Converse**

*Background:* On April 28, 2015, the Policy Committee reviewed the Concept Plan Process recommended by the TAC. The Policy Committee asked staff to revise the memo to require that TAC review of concept plans be in the form of a recommendation, with final review being the responsibility of the Policy Committee. This will include review of the draft letter to the jurisdiction prepared by staff, documenting comments about the concept plan, and the letter will be signed by the Policy Committee chair rather than MPO staff.

*Attachment:* #3 – Memo, RPS Growth Area Planning Coordination

*Action Requested:* Review and comment

**6. MPO Planning Update ..... Dan Moore**

**7. Public Comment ..... Chair**

**8. Other Business / Local Business ..... Chair**

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.

**9. Adjournment ..... Chair**

- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO TAC Committee meeting: Wednesday, June 10, at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for May 26, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, May 19, at 5:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

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*

**April 8, 2015**

*The following people were in attendance:*

**RVMPPO 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
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
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 Jorner, 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 and 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.



# *Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization*

## *Alternative Measures Update*

### *Executive Summary*

*May 2015*



**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**

The RVMPO is staffed by the Rogue Valley Council of Governments



## Introduction

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) (OAR 660-012) requires that cities and counties prepare and adopt transportation system plans (TSPs). These plans identify transportation facilities and services to support future planned land uses. In metropolitan areas, TSPs are required to accomplish a significant reduction in reliance on automobiles. Local governments in Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) areas of less than 1 million population can meet this requirement by showing that per capita vehicle miles traveled (VMT) will be reduced by 5 percent over the 20-year planning period. The TPR also allows for local governments to propose “alternative standards” to be used in place of the VMT reduction requirement. The TPR established a five-part test for approval of such alternative standards. The purpose of this test is to assure that the alternative standard accomplishes the goal in the TPR for a significant reduction in reliance on the automobile.

1. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures will result in a reduction in reliance on automobiles.
2. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures will accomplish a significant increase in the availability and convenience of alternative modes of transportation.
3. Achieving the targets for the proposed alternative measures is likely to result in a significant increase in the share of trips made by alternative modes, including walking, bicycling, and transit.
4. VMT per capita is unlikely to increase by more than 5%.
5. The proposed alternative measures are reasonably related to achieving the goal of reduced reliance on the automobile as described in OAR 660-012-0000.

On April 3, 2002, the Land Conservation and Development Commission approved seven Alternative Measures adopted by the RVMPO in place of the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) reduction standard contained in the state Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The Alternative Measures meet requirements for an alternative measure of reduced reliance on the automobile as specified in OAR 660-012-0035(5).

The seven Alternative Measures include:

1. Measure 1 - Transit and Bike/Pedestrian (Ped) Mode Share
2. Measure 2 - % Dwelling Units (DUs) within ¼ mile walk to 30 minute Transit Service
3. Measure 3 - % Collectors/Arterials with Bike Facilities
4. Measure 4 - % Collectors/ Arterials in Transit Oriented Development (TOD) areas with Sidewalks
5. Measure 5 - % Mixed-Use Dwelling Units (DUs) in New Development
6. Measure 6 - % Mixed-Use Employment in New Development
7. Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding

Table 1 below depicts the RVMPO Alternative Measures, five-year benchmarks and 2020 target.

**Table 1 – RVMPO Alternative Measures, Benchmarks and 20-Year Target**

<b>Measure</b>	<b>Current 2000</b>	<b>Benchmark 2005</b>	<b>Benchmark 2010</b>	<b>Benchmark 2015</b>	<b>Target 2020</b>
<i>Measure 1:</i> Transit and bicycle/pedestrian mode share	% 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: 8.8	% daily trips transit: 2.2 bike/ped: 9.8	% daily trips transit: 3.0 bike/ped: 11
<i>Measure 2:</i> % Dwelling Units (DU's) w/in ¼ mile walk to 30-min. transit service	12%	20%	30%	40%	50%
<i>Measure 3:</i> % Collectors and arterials w/ bicycle facilities	21%	28%	37%	48%	60%
<i>Measure 4:</i> % Collectors and arterials in TOD areas w/ sidewalks	47%	50%	56%	64%	75%
<i>Measure 5:</i> % Mixed-use DUs in new development	0%	9%	26%	41%	49%
<i>Measure 6:</i> % Mixed-use employment in new development	0%	9%	23%	36%	44%
<i>Measure 7:</i> Alternative Transportation Funding	N/A	\$950,000	\$2.5 Million	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million

## Background

The RVMPO completed a 2005 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis as part of the 2009 – 2034 RVMPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update. The 2013 – 2038 RTP update did not include a 2010 benchmark analysis due to a misunderstanding on behalf of the RVMPO that the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) had been amended to remove the Alternative Measures requirement. The Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) provided a letter to the RVMPO Policy Committee during the 2013-38 RTP adoption hearing that clarified the Alternative Measures TPR requirements. Below is an excerpt of that letter.

*“Until such a time as Alternative Measures are amended by the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC), the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) assumes that the benchmarks and targets of the acknowledged Alternative Measures will be extended on subsequent updates of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Transportation System Plan to correspond with the timeframe of each update, unless the RVCOG can show that there will be a 5% decline in Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita over the planning period. Additionally, it is assumed that an analysis of the RVCOG’s performance regarding each of the Alternative Measures be conducted during subsequent RTP updates. The current RTP does not comply with this requirement.”*

The RVMPO Policy Committee concurred with DLCD’s comments and recommended that staff identify funding to conduct an analysis of the seven (7) adopted Alternative Measures. In 2013, RVCOG applied for a Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grant to complete the work. RVCOG was awarded a TGM grant in January 2014 to analyze Alternative Measure performance and, if necessary, modify existing or develop new Alternative Measures that comply with the TPR, meet local needs, and are consistent with local objectives.

Staff prepared a series of technical memoranda for the Alternative Measures update that included;

1. Alternative Measures Analysis Methodologies,
2. Data Collection, and
3. Alternative Measures Analysis.

The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed and commented on each of the technical memos, which were revised by staff. ODOT’s Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) provided technical assistance and comment throughout the process. The technical memoranda are included in Appendix A. The Findings & Conclusions section of the final report includes a description of the measure, results of the analysis, observations, and recommendations for changing specific elements of each Alternative Measure.

## Executive Summary

The Executive Summary focuses on the findings and recommendations from the 2010 benchmark analysis conducted in 2014. More details on each measure are included in the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations section of the report. Table 2 below depicts the 2007 & 2014 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis results. The 2005 benchmark was measured in 2007 and the 2010 benchmark was measured in 2014.

**Table 2 – Alternative Measures 2007 & 2014 Benchmark Analysis Results**

Measure	How Measured	2000	Benchmark 2005	Measured 2007	Benchmark 2010	Measured 2014	Benchmark 2015	Target 2020
Measure 1: Transit and Bicycle/Pedestrian Mode Share	The percent of total daily trips taken by transit and combination of bicycle and walking (non-motorized) modes. Determined from best available data (e.g., model output and/or transportation survey data).	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips	% Daily Trips
		Transit: 1.0 Bike/Ped: 8.2	Transit: 1.0 Bike/Ped: 8.2	<b>Transit: 0.9 Bike/Ped: 7.3</b>	Transit: 1.6 Bike/Ped: 8.4	<b>Transit: 1.45 Bike/Ped: 8.20</b>	Transit: 2.2 Bike/Ped: 9.8	Transit: 3.0 Bike/Ped: 11
Measure 2: % Dwelling Units (DUs) w/in 1/4 Mile Walk to 30-Min. Transit Service	Determined through GIS mapping.	12%	20%	<b>34%</b>	30%	<b>36%</b>	40%	50%
Measure 3: % Collectors and arterials w/bicycle facilities	Determined through GIS mapping.	21%	28%	<b>37%</b>	37%	<b>54%</b>	48%	60%
Measure 4: % Collectors and Arterials in TOD Areas w/Sidewalks	Determined through GIS mapping.	47%	50%	<b>55%</b>	56%	<b>30%</b>	64%	75%
Measure 5: % 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%	<b>10%</b>	26%	<b>22%</b>	41%	49%
Measure 6: % Mixed-use employment in new development	Estimated from annual employment files from State - represents the ratio of new development in TODs over total regional employment	0%	9%	<b>17%</b>	23%	<b>12%</b>	36%	44%
Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding	Funding Committed to transit or bicycle/pedestrian/TOD projects. Amounts shown represent 1/2 of the MPO's estimated accumulation of discretionary funding (STP).	NA	\$950,000	<b>\$1.4 Million</b>	\$2.5 Million	<b>\$3.1 Million</b>	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million

### **Findings - Measure 1 – Mode Share 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The analysis shows that the transit, bike and pedestrian mode share percent of daily trips decreased from 2006 to 2010, and fell short of the 2010 benchmarks. Data shows that transit makes up 1.45% of the mode share, which is 0.15 percentage points below the 2010 benchmark of 1.6%. The 2010 Bike/Walk data shows 8.20% mode share which is 0.20 percentage points below the 8.4% benchmark.

### **Recommendations – Mode Share 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC determined that the model used to estimate mode share may not be the best tool to use, and recommend that “observed data” be used to measure mode share. Observed data is regional data such as bicycle and pedestrian counts and transit ridership numbers. This type of analysis would not provide mode share data, but actual numbers that could be tracked over time to demonstrate increases (or decreases) in transit ridership, biking and walking. This would achieve the policy outcome of tracking increases/decreases in transit, biking and walking

### **Findings - Measure 2 – Transit Accessibility 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Based on the GIS analysis, thirty-six percent (36%) of dwelling units in the RVMPO are located within ¼ mile walking distance of 30-minute RVTB bus routes, which is 6 percentage points above the 2010 benchmark of 30%.

### **Recommendations – Transit Accessibility 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Continue using the methodology approved by the TAC to measure transit accessibility

### **Findings – Measure 3 - Bicycle Facilities 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

There is a total of 4,640,107 linear feet of arterials and collectors within the RVMPO planning area (both directions). The jurisdictions in the RVMPO reported a total of 2,507,130 linear feet of bicycle facilities on arterials and collectors. The percentage of bike facilities is 54% within the RVMPO, which is 17 percentage points greater than the 2010 benchmark of 37%.

### **Recommendations – Bicycle Facilities 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Continue to use the methodology approved by the TAC.

### **Findings – Measure 4 - Sidewalks 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

There is a total of 1,512,648 lane feet of arterials and collectors (both directions) and 461,445 linear feet of sidewalks in Activity Centers located in the RVMPO. The 2014 analysis shows that 30% of arterials and collectors within RVMPO Activity Centers have sidewalks, which falls below the 2010 benchmark of 56% by 26 percentage points.

### **Recommendations – Sidewalks 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC recommends changing the name of Measure 4 to, “Measure 4 - Percentage of Collectors and Arterials in *Activity Centers* with Sidewalks.” The TAC also recommends revising the benchmarks and target to reflect the larger geographic Activity Center areas.

### **Findings – Measure 5 - Dwelling Unit 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Staff found a total of 12,530 units constructed since 2000 throughout the MPO, of which 2,785 units met the benchmark requirements. This represents 22.2 percent of the total. The number of units built in activity centers since 2000 is significantly higher, but the methodology requires that only those developments meeting the target density of ten units per acre may be counted.

### **Recommendations – Dwelling Unit 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC recommends changing the measure description to, “Measure 5 – Percentage of New Dwelling Units in *Activity Centers*.” Another recommendation is to revise the “How Measured” description to read, “Determined by reviewing assessor’s data to determine the ratio between new DUs in Activity Centers and total new DUs in the region.” The evaluation criteria for this measure needs to be revised to avoid confusion on what dwelling units should count towards the benchmarks and target. In addition, a new way of measuring density may need to be developed in order to ensure that proper credit is given to new development within Activity Centers. Another suggested option is to establish the existing density for residential development in all identified activity centers and then document the increase in density from one benchmark to the next.

Because some of the newly identified activity centers do not have commercial uses at their hub, consideration should be given to amending or eliminating the requirement that the dwellings be within ¼ mile of a commercial center having a minimum of 20,000 square feet.

### **Findings – Measure 6 - Mixed-Use Employment 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

Using formulas that calculate the number of employees based on the size of the structure, staff estimated that 209 employees work in the qualifying businesses, which is only 12 percent of the estimated total of 1,740 employed in businesses constructed since 2000.

### **Recommendations – Mixed-Use Employment 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC recommends changing the measure description to, “Measure 6 – Percentage of New Employment in *Activity Centers*.” Another recommendation is to revise the “How Measured” description to read, “Determined by reviewing assessor’s data to determine the number of jobs per square footage of new commercial/industrial development in Activity Center to number of jobs per square footage of new commercial/industrial development in the region.” The evaluation criteria for this measure needs to be revised to remove obstacles to counting new employment, particularly regarding building entrances and parking between the building and the street.

### **Findings - Measure 7 - Alternative Transportation Funding 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The analysis showed a total of \$1,184,079 for 2002 – 2004 (\$234,079 more than the 2005 benchmark of \$950,000); \$3,128,147 for 2005 – 2009 (\$628,147 more than the 2010 benchmark of \$2.5M); and \$3,889,112 for 2010 – 2014 (\$410,888 less than the 2015 benchmark of \$4.3M). The net difference between the 3 benchmarks is \$451,338 additional funds.

### **Recommendations – Alternative Transportation Funding 2010 Benchmark Analysis**

The TAC did not have any recommendations for Measure 7.



**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:** May 6, 2015  
**TO:** RVMPO Policy Committee  
**FROM:** Dick Converse, Principal Planner  
**SUBJECT:** RPS Growth Areas Planning Coordination

---

The adopted Greater Bear Creek Regional Plan includes a chapter requiring monitoring and implementation of the Plan. Section 2 of the chapter establishes Performance Indicators, mandated by ORS 197.656(2)(b)(C) to ensure that the objectives of the Plan are met. Three of the performance indicators specify participation by the MPO in reviewing conceptual plans that must be prepared before an urban reserve area may be added to an urban growth boundary.

- 2.6 Mixed-Use/Pedestrian-Friendly Areas. For land within a URA and for land currently within a UGB but outside of the existing City Limit, 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. Beyond the year 2020, cities shall continue to achieve the 2020 benchmark targets, or if additional benchmark years are established, cities shall achieve the targets corresponding with the applicable benchmarks. Measurement and definition of qualified development shall be in accordance with adopted RTP methodology. The requirement is considered met if the city or the region overall is achieving the targets or minimum qualifications, whichever is greater. This requirement can be offset by increasing the percentage of dwelling units and/or employment in the City Limit. This requirement is applicable to all participating cities.
- 2.7 Conceptual Transportation Plans. Conceptual Transportation Plans shall be prepared early enough in the planning and development cycle that the identified regionally significant transportation corridors within each of the URAs can be protected as cost-effectively as possible by available strategies and funding. A Conceptual Transportation Plan for a URA or appropriate portion of a URA shall be prepared by the City **in collaboration with the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**, applicable irrigation districts, Jackson County, and other affected agencies, and shall be adopted by Jackson County and the respective city prior to or in conjunction with a UGB amendment within that URA.
- 2.7.1 Transportation Infrastructure. The Conceptual Transportation Plan shall identify a general network of regionally significant arterials under local jurisdiction, transit corridors, bike and pedestrian paths, and associated projects to provide mobility throughout the Region (including intracity and intercity, if applicable).
- 2.8 Conceptual Land Use Plans. A proposal for a UGB Amendment into a designated URA shall



include a Conceptual Land Use Plan prepared by the City **in collaboration with the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**, applicable irrigation districts, Jackson County, and other affected agencies for the area proposed to be added to the UGB as follows:

- 2.8.1 Target Residential Density. The Conceptual Land Use Plan shall provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the residential densities of Section 2.5 above will be met at full build-out of the area added through the UGB amendment.
- 2.8.2 Land Use Distribution. The Conceptual Land Use Plan shall indicate how the proposal is consistent with the general distribution of land uses in the Regional Plan, especially where a specific set of land uses were part of the rationale for designating land which was determined by the Resource Lands Review Committee to be commercial agricultural land as part of a URA, which applies to the following URAs: CP-1 B, CP1C, CP-4D, CP-6A, CP-2B, MD-4, MD-6, MD-7mid, MD-7n, PH-2, TA-2, TA-4.
- 2.8.3 Transportation Infrastructure. The Conceptual Land Use Plan shall include the transportation infrastructure required in Section 2.7 above.
- 2.8.4 Mixed Use/Pedestrian Friendly Areas. The Conceptual Land Use Plan shall provide sufficient information to demonstrate how the commitments of Section 2.6 above will be met at full build-out of the area added through the UGB amendment.

These conceptual plans must be in place before the County may review an amendment to any participating jurisdiction's urban growth boundary. County and City planners representing each jurisdiction have continued to meet since the Plan was adopted to discuss items of general interest, but also to review implementation of the Plan as issues arise. Among the first issues after Plan adoption was review of conceptual plans. As noted in the Performance Indicators, cities adopt the conceptual plans before or in conjunction with the UGB amendment process. During the review of a UGB amendment, both the City and the County will ensure that the land use allocation percentages, density requirements, and other performance indicators such as agricultural buffering established in the Regional Plan are met.

After reviewing a proposal from jurisdiction planners and Technical Advisory Committee to review conceptual plans at the TAC level, the Policy Committee determined that the TAC review should function as a recommendation to the Policy Committee. Final review will be the responsibility of the Policy Committee. The MPO staff will document the TAC review in a letter to the affected jurisdiction that the Policy Committee will review and endorse or modify prior to the Policy Committee Chair's signature. The primary focus of the review is to determine how the plans address inter-jurisdictional connectivity and other Regional Plan performance indicators, in addition to relevant Regional Transportation Plan topics such as Alternative Measures.