



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

March 9, 2016

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPPO Technical Advisory Committee – Quorum Not Present

Member	Organization	Phone
Alex Georgevitch – Public Works	Medford	774-2114
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	774-6399
John Adam	Medford	
Jon Sullivan, Vice Chair	RVTD	608-2448
Josh LeBombard	DLCD	414-7932
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT	774-6383
Kelly Madding	Jackson County	774-6519
Mike Kuntz, Chair	Jackson County	774-6228
Paige Townsend	RVTD	608-2429
Tom Humphrey – Community Development	Central Point	423-1025
Staff		
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Bunny Lincoln	RVCOG	944-2446
Others		
Bob Parker	ECONorthwest	
Mike Montero	Montero & Assoc.	

1. Call to Order / Introductions

Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:45 p.m. **There was no quorum.**

Agenda Item #2 (Minutes Approval) was dropped due to lack of a quorum.

Agenda Item #5 was dropped from the agenda because a Policy Committee recommendation cannot be made without a quorum.

Those present introduced themselves.

2. Approval of Minutes Dropped (Lack of Quorum)

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

Information Item:

4. Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Under-Served Populations

Andrea Napoli gave a Power Point presentation on the Needs Assessment recommended by the Policy Committee.

Background

- **Traditionally Underserved Populations Definition**
- **Assessment Layout**
 - **Map Series**
 - **Text Document**

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Methodology

Chapter 3: Survey Analysis and Findings

Chapter 4: Mapping Analysis and Findings, *Areas of Concern*

Chapter 5: Mapping Analysis and Findings, *Transportation Investments*

- **CH 1 Introduction**

Brief description of RVMPO Title VI & Environmental Justice Plan

Main purpose of this assessment

To help the region identify gaps, barriers, and needs in the transportation system for target populations, and to assure a “fair share” of investment.

- **CH 2 Methodology, Mapping**

Establish contacts with organizations that serve/represent target populations

Develop short survey, distribute online link

Identify “Areas of Concern” with very high percentages (twice the regional rates) of:

- > 36.6% Low Income Households (Series 1)
- > 37.8% Minority Population (Series 2)
- > 40.2% Younger Persons in Household (Series 3)
- > 34.3% & > 51.3% Senior Population (Series 4)
- > 16.6% Zero-car households (Series 1-4)

Mapped within each Area of Concern:

Transit routes

Sidewalks, bike lanes (*arterials/collectors*) and multi-use paths

Public schools (*¼ mile walk buffer*)

Grocery stores (*1/4 mile walk buffer*)
Vehicle crash locations w/ bicyclist or pedestrian (*2013 data*)

Additional Mapping:

Planned Investments (2013-2038)
2015 RVTD Routes
2013 Major employers
RTP Projects relative to Areas of Concern #2 - Medford & Phoenix

2014 arterials/collectors were used for mapping.

Identify areas with high target populations, common destinations, existing transportation options/limitations, and locations of future investment.

- **CH 3 Survey Analysis & Findings - 102 responses from 39 local organizations**
 - Agency Responding?
 - Target Population served?
 - Largest Transportation Challenges?
 - Most Common Barriers for Target Population?
 - Beneficial improvements?

Main Findings of Survey Responses:

#1 Challenge: Lack of public transit service to employment, education, and residential areas
W. White City employment and education areas & service to Eagle Point
A lack of evening and weekend transit service was the second-most common challenge noted

#1 Barrier: The overall lack of available public transportation in the region
The distance of affordable housing to services, shopping, and jobs was the second-most common barrier noted

#1 Future Improvement: Expanding transit service to more areas
W. White City employment and education areas & service to Eagle Point
Adding weekend and **evening transit service was the second-most frequent type of answer given**

Main Findings of Planned Investment Analysis:

The majority of investments for projects (67%) include three types of improvements: roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian. Second largest investment type are roadway only projects (28%) with 1% going to bike/ped only projects.

The investment ratios appear favorable to areas containing very high concentrations of seniors, minorities, and younger persons, but not to low income areas.

- **CH 4: Mapping Analysis and Findings, Areas of Concern**

Low Income (Map 1 series)	Minority (Map 2 series)
- Ashland	- Downtown & W. Medford
- Downtown & W. Medford	- White City
- White City	

Younger Persons (Map 3 series)

- W. Medford
- N. Medford / Central Point
- White City
- Eagle Point

Seniors (Map 4 series)

- Talent
- Phoenix
- S.E. Medford

Described within each of the twelve (12) Areas of Concern:

- General Description of Area
- Access to Grocery Stores
- Households without Access to a Vehicle
- Access to Public Schools
- Access to Transit
- Access to Employment Areas
- Sidewalk Connectivity (Arterials/Collectors)
- Bike/Ped Accidents & Fatalities
- Bike Lane Connectivity (Arterials/Collectors)

Main Findings of Areas of Concern Analysis:

All Areas of Concern have some level of indication of need, barriers, or gaps in the transportation system based on the factors analyzed in this chapter. The findings identified below are simply based on those areas that contain MULTIPLE target populations *and* MULTIPLE need indicators. This should not substitute for the findings provided in each Area of Concern described in this chapter, however.

Downtown/West Medford

Low Income, Minority, Younger Persons, Zero-Car
Lack of bike lane connectivity
Distance of West Medford low income/minority/zero-car household residential areas to grocery stores
Highest count of vehicle crashes involving a bicyclist/pedestrian in low income and minority Areas of Concern

White City Low Income, Minority, Young Persons

No grocery stores exist in White City
Lack of transit to western White City major employment areas

• **CH 5 Mapping Analysis and Findings, Transportation Investments**

Looking at “fair share” of investments

Where \$ going, not positive/negative impacts of projects, but does look at project type

Map and categorize all RTP projects relative to Areas of Concern

Location specific projects, only – no transit!

The biggest deficiency appears to be lack of transit. Paige Townsend said the RVTD Title 6 Report (a separate process) shows how transit serves the subject populations. Josh LeBombard said he would like to see how the document could be used to help score proposed transportation projects. Ms. Napoli will add additional information. The more precise information was felt to be better for scoring and evaluations. Dan Moore pointed out that there are specific sub areas that need further analysis. It was pointed out that “senior” areas are not necessarily low income.

Main Findings of Planned Investment Analysis:

The majority of investments for projects (67%) include three types of improvements: roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian. Second largest investment type are roadway only projects (28%) with 1% going to bike/ped only projects.

The investment ratios appear favorable to areas containing very high concentrations of seniors, minorities, and younger persons, but not to low income areas.

Early Outcomes of the Survey:

- La Clinica surveys indicated that more pedestrian facilities were needed from the transit stop on Hwy.99 to the clinic, and they were added to an ODOT project proposal.
- A gap in the Phoenix-Fern Valley bike facility was remedied.

Alex Georgevitch suggested that “Areas of Concern” might be better phrased as “Areas of Evaluation”. The committee discussed this concept, as well as several other possible titles, but reached no conclusion about it.

RVTD does its own Title 6 Reporting.

Staff will increase the one (1) year crash data to five (5) years.

Future Use of Information?

Any next steps?

5. 2015 Annual List of Obligated Projects - Dropped (Lack of Quorum)

6. RVMPO Model Update (TAZ Allocation Process)

Bob Parker, ECONorthwest, gave a Power Point presentation on the Population and Employment Forecasts in the model update. 2010 is the base year.

- **Steps –**
 - Prepare MPO and UGB level population and employment forecasts to serve as control totals
 - Develop 2017 initial year TAZ allocations
 - Develop 2042 future year TAZ allocations
 - Develop interim year (2027 and 2037) TAZ allocations
- **Local input MPO/UGB level population & MPO and UGB level population and employment forecasts**
 - Development between 2010 and 2017
 - Building permits
 - Addresses
 - Census data
 - Expected timing and location of development
 - Planned land use
 - RVTD capacity analysis
 - Planned or anticipated UGB expansions
 - Other considerations

- **Allocation Categories**
- **Comprehensive Plan – Economic Element Goals & Strategies**
- **2010 TPAU Data Base**
- **Population Forecasts**
 - HB 2253 established PSU PRC as entity to develop coordinated population forecasts
 - Developed on a 4-year cycle
 - Jackson County forecasts acknowledged July 2015
 - Forecasts must be used for planning purposes
 - PSU forecast is considerably lower than previous coordinated forecast
- **PSU Forecast for UGBs**
 - (White City, as an “Urban Containment Area” does not have a UGB)
- **Comparison**
- **Employment Forecast**
- **Employment Forecast – UGBs**
- **Population/Employment Ratios**
- **Next Steps**
 - Input on forecasts by UGB
 - Input from cities on location and timing of housing and employment
 - Develop 2017 initial year allocation
 - Develop 2042 future year allocation
 - Circulate to cities for review and comment
 - Make adjustments as necessary

Mr. Parker asked Committee members to review the information provided, and offer any comments felt to be warranted.

7. MPO Planning Update

- Staff is working with jurisdictions to get their financial forecasts for the RTP.
- The final UPWP will come to the TAC next month for final recommendations to the Policy Committee.
- Updating of the Safety Profile continues. Crash data should be available in April or May.
- Needs Assessment - Updating of project evaluation criteria is ongoing.
- STP/CMAQ criteria need to be reviewed by the TAC.

8. Public Comment

None received.

9. Other Business / Local Business

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:04 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings:

- RVMPO TAC April 13, 2016 1:30 PM
- RVMPO Policy March 22, 2016 2:00 PM
- RVMPO PAC March 15, 2016 5:30 PM