



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

February 10, 2016

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
John Adam	Medford
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Mike Kuntz, Chair	Jackson County
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Zach Moody	Talent
Matt Brinkley	Phoenix

Others Present:

Mike Montero	
Scott Turnoy	ODOT
Cody Meyer	DLCD
Alison Wiley	ODOT
Tara Weidner	ODOT
Tranh Nguyen	ODOT
Matt Samitore	

RVCOG Staff

Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln, Ryan MacLaren

1. Call to Order / Introductions

Mike Kuntz 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 January meeting minutes.

On a motion by Ian Horlacher, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the minutes were approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

Action Items:

4. Strategic Assessment Final Report

Scott Turnoy, ODOT and Cody Meyer, DLCD gave a Power Point presentation on the final draft report.

Review of Strategic Assessment

Report Contents

Key Findings -

- **Mobility** – Congestion & Auto Delay @ 41% if local plans are implemented. The draft document provides key factors for this increase. A “Menu of Local Policy Options” (suggestions only) is also included. The presenters explained their sensitivity testing methodologies for the Committee.
- **Livable Communities** – With adopted plans implementation the region makes progress with more residents in mixed areas. Focused growth in activity centers. The consultants focused on regional areas outside downtown Medford & Ashland. The members discussed the fact that may be downtown residential growth to be considered by the policy makers in the future. The work that Medford is doing on its RTP update would allow for this consideration. Local Policy Options Menus accompany all these findings. Public health improvement is found to accompany improved air quality, etc.
- **Household Travel Costs** – Vehicle operating costs remain relatively constant, but future conditions can easily affect them.
- **Environment** – Air quality, while showing a slight reduction (16%), needs more of a decrease to meet the 19% MPO target. Transportation energy declines significantly. A question was raised about other factors (agricultural, etc.) that would reduce greenhouse gasses. The presenters stated that this report focused on transportation issues, and they explained Table A1 (pg. 43) RVMPO Sensitivity Results for Policy Actions in Isolation, and the results of full, local plan implementation. They also discussed the 2005-2038 GHG per Capita Reduction figures, as well as other percentages. Several Committee members suggested that additional narrative explanation should precede Table A1. It was reiterated that the Target Rule is quite complicated and that this draft is just related to travel emissions. The State is requiring that local jurisdictions assist them in reaching the target goals by adopting appropriate strategies in their local plans. Examples of the various Levels of Ambition were felt to be warranted. The presenters pointed out that the Appendices and Table 5 contained some of the information that was being suggested. The region received credit for CNG use. This is included in Table A1. Future fuel price uncertainties affect policy impacts. Analysis can help inform more resilient plans. Figure 8. (pg. 31) Adopted Plans Resilience to Low Income, Vehicle Turnover, Light Truck Share, and Low Carbon Fuel Standards Removal, Relative Impacts of Policies by Outcome Measure and Effects of Policy Bundles on GHG, Impact of More Ambitious Scenarios on GHG Reduction and Impact of More Ambitious Scenarios on Other Outcomes were explained to the Committee. Figure 4 (pg. 25) explains this visually. Sensitivity testing/analysis followed the less extreme levels. Paige Townsend spoke about how little transit is available in this area, as opposed to others of the same size.

Upon questioning from the presenters, the Committee suggested that a somewhat lesser amount of the information would be appropriate for sharing with the Policy Committee.

RVTD expressed interest in working with other agencies/jurisdictions in their current ITS plan updates.

- **Future Choices (Options for Moving Forward) –**
 1. Use information for other planning efforts (TSP, RTP, etc.).
 - a. Alternative Measures
 - b. Land Use for RTP Update
 2. Scenario Analysis
 3. Scenario Planning.

Dan Moore said further analysis would be warranted, and a recommendation to the Policy Committee needs to be made.

Mike Kuntz said that he didn't feel that it was the TAC's job to suggest policy. Tara Weidner offered that there are other options available for this. Cody Meyer, DLCD, said the region could work to access a group of scenarios in order to endorse a Regional Preferred Scenario. It was pointed out that this might have an adverse effect on smaller, local jurisdictions. Josh LeBombard said that adjustments could be flexible enough to benefit different needs.

Paige Townsend said that lack of any official goals adoption process would make it difficult for local jurisdictions to use the information when adopting new Transportation System or Comp Plan updates.

Committee members discussed the three Options, especially Alternative Measures. An IGA would be required if the Measures Analysis was undertaken under an Option #2 designation. The question was raised about the potential for additional costs, and funding requirements were discussed. Tom Humphrey said that he was in favor of continuing the "handshake agreement" existing now (Option #1), with further financial/contract, resource funding discussions occurring if the process moved into Option #2. He felt that no "Option" recommendation to the Policy Committee was warranted at this time. Alex Georgevitch said that he felt the "next steps" should be up to the COG Staff, with more information coming back to the TAC.

On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Mike Upston, the Strategic Assessment Final Report was unanimously recommended as presented, by voice vote, to the Policy Committee for approval.

The "Options for Moving Forward" slide will be held back from the Policy Committee presentation for future consideration as needed.

5. Elect Chair and Vice Chair

On a motion by John Adam, seconded by Tom Humphrey, Mike Kuntz was nominated to serve as TAC Chairman for the coming year. The nomination was unanimously approved by voice vote.

On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, Jon Sullivan was nominated to serve as TAC Vice Chairman for the coming year. The nomination was unanimously approved by voice vote.

6. Proposed MPO Dues/Review Draft Work Plan 2016-17

Dan Moore presented the 2016 Dues Recommendations. Staff proposes maintaining the dues formula and rate that was approved by the Policy Committee in February 2013. The rate, \$0.16 per capita, would generate a total of \$27,815 for the 2017 fiscal year.

FY 2016-17. Illustrative memo tables included:

- #1 - Proposed dues by jurisdiction and estimated population rates
- #2 - Anticipated dues expenditures (Policy Committee dues and travel, plus UPWP work activities support)

Dues provide funding for general operations, primarily activities that require local funds including lobbying and local match obligations. Dues pay for Policy Committee participation in advocacy activities for which federal funds cannot be used, including the Oregon MPO Consortium, the Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations and the West Coast Corridor Coalition. Dues can also be used to supplement the MPO's planning budget.

On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the dues schedule was unanimously recommended as presented, by voice vote, to the Policy Committee for approval.

Moore next presented UPWP Budget tables #3 and #4 (included in the 2/3/16 memo) representing:

- **#3 - Proposed FY 2017 Budget** - Transportation Planning Funds by Source/Activity (same funding amounts as current FY, but the amount could change, based on upcoming discussions at the State level) Delineated Work Tasks include:
 1. **Program Management**
 2. **Short Range Planning**
 3. **Long Range Planning**
 4. **Data Development**
 5. **Transit**
- **#4 - Proposed Program Activity** - outlining work tasks for program management, short/long range planning, data development/maintenance and transit. The main focus is RTP development. Proposed activities include:
 1. **Program Management** - Continue previous tasks, update website, Update Public Involvement Plan.
 2. **Short Range Planning** - Maintain current MTIP, Develop 2018-21 TIP, solicit for CMAQ/STP funded projects, Develop AQCD for RTP/TIP, publish Obligated Projects List FFY2017, Coordinate CO LMP & Air Quality Conformity, MOVES modeling for RTP/TIP, Assist with local planning as warranted.
 3. **Long Range Planning** - Work with ODOT/FHWA MPO performance measures, continue 2017-42 RTP work, Maintain RTP Safety Profile, Commence 2015 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis, continue ITS plan update.
 4. **Data Development** - R&A continue support for improved travel demand model, continue 2017-42 RTP update, continue ODOT model training as available.
 5. **Transit** - No projects identified.

The draft UPWP will be submitted for review by federal and state planning partners (Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration and ODOT). Staff is asking jurisdictions, to suggest changes to the draft UPWP, which could be incorporated into a final draft for public hearing in April. The Policy Committee will be asked to adopt the work plan at that time. The Plan will be brought back to the TAC in April.

7. Greenhouse Gas Target Rule Advisory Committee

Dan Moore passed out informational flyers on the GHG Target Rule, and explained the Target Rule process.

8. MPO Planning Update

9. Public Comment

None received.

10. Other Business / Local Business

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings:

- RVMPO TAC March 9, 2016 1:30 PM
- RVMPO Policy March 22, 2016 2:00 PM
- RVMPO PAC March 15, 2016 5:30 PM