

**Summary Minutes
Rogue Valley MPO Technical Advisory Committee
MAY 10, 2017**



The following attended:

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Alex Georgevitch	Medford	774-2114
Dan Roberts	ODOT	774-6383
Evan MacKenzie	Phoenix PL	535-2050 x316
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	423-1362
Jon Sullivan, Vice Chair	RVTD	608-2448
Kyle Kearns	Medford	774-2380
Mike Faught for Maria Harris	Ashland PL	552-2045
Matt Samitore	Central Point	664-3321 x205
Mike Kuntz, Chair	Jackson County R&P	774-6228
Mike Upston	Eagle Point PL	826-4212
Paige Townsend	RVTD	608-2429
Ray DiPasquale	Phoenix	535-2226
Stephanie Holtey for Tom Humphrey	Central Point	423-1031
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Nikki Hart-Brinkley	RVCOG	423-1378
Stephanie Thune	RVCOG	423-1368

Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
Al Densmore	JWA	
Kelly Madding	City of Medford	
Matt Brinkley	City of Medford	
Mike Montero	Montero & Associates	

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda

Chair Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m.; introductions followed. Welcome to first-time attendees:

- *Central Point* | Stephanie Holtey, Community Planner II (will serve as committee alternate for Tom Humphrey/Matt Samitore);
- *Phoenix* | Evan MacKenzie, Planning Director.

A quorum was confirmed, with voting members from Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, and RVTD in attendance.

Chair Kuntz announced that agenda items 6 and 10 would be moved immediately prior to item 4 in order to accommodate Karl Welzenbach’s early departure from the meeting.

Note: *Despite this procedural alteration, the minutes reflect all agenda items in their original order.*

2. Review / Approve Minutes

The Chair asked if there were any changes or additions to the minutes of the April 12 meeting.

On a motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the Committee recommended approval of the April 12 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as submitted.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

3. Public Comment

None voiced.

Action Items:

4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Ryan MacLaren presented eight proposed amendments to the 2015-2018 TIP; a detailed memo was provided for review. The amendments are necessary in order to fully satisfy the requirement that all projects that 1) add capacity, 2) are regionally significant, or 3) use federal funds are included in the TIP. A 21-day public comment period regarding the amendments was advertised on May 2 in the Medford Mail Tribune and, with TAC approval, the amendments will be considered at a public hearing during the RVMPO Policy Committee on May 23.

On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Mike Upston, the TAC recommended approval of the 2015-2018 TIP as amended to the RVMPO Policy Committee.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. Alternative Measures 2015 Benchmark Analysis | Draft Tech Memo 2: Data Collection

Andrea Napoli explained that the RVMPO is currently in the third five-year benchmark analysis for the seven Alternative Measures, which were adopted in 2001 as a result of the MPO being unable to demonstrate a 5% reduction in VMT per capita over the twenty-year plan horizon at that time.

Summary findings for “Draft Tech Memo 2: Data Collection” were presented with two goals in mind: 1) update the TAC on each Measure’s data collection status, and 2) elicit TAC direction related to Measure 1 for the final report. Highlights and related commentary follow:

Measure 1 | Transit and Pedestrian/Bicycle Mode Share

TAC input/guidance was solicited regarding the four data source options best suited for calculations in the final report.

- A. Travel Demand Model Output (RMVPO-v4.2) [bike/ped/transit]
 - i. Used to establish baselines in 2000 and also for past two benchmarking rounds.
 - ii. Model is only updated approximately every four years, so carries the potential for redundant information if two benchmarking periods fall within that time span. RVMPO-v4.2, however, is new since the 2014 benchmarking and includes transit enhancements.
- B. Bike/Ped Counts
 - i. Medford counts: bicycles on the roadway are counted as vehicles, while those on the sidewalk are counted as pedestrians, leading to inaccurate mode share counts. Per Alex Georgevitch, the counting method was designed for signal timing analysis rather than mode share concerns.
 - ii. Ashland counts: accurately distinguish bike/ped traffic, but represent such a small sample that the collected data cannot be legitimately extrapolated into viable benchmark figures.
- C. RVTM PMT/RVMPO VMT [transit only]
 - i. The comparison of passenger miles traveled versus vehicle miles traveled lacks equity as vehicles may contain more than one passenger.
- D. Census Journey to Work Data [bike/ped/transit]
 - i. Only takes work trips into consideration.
 - ii. The average annual sample size for Oregon is only about 8% of households.

Discussion resulted in Option A being chosen for use in the final calculations, but with reservations, since RVMPO-v4.2 – despite its inclusion of transit enhancements – is still not sensitive to bike/ped traffic.

All agreed that research should take place into the cost/feasibility of investing in bike/ped counting equipment throughout RVMPO jurisdictions in order to enhance the accuracy of future analyses. Dan Moore stated that he knows of a program in existence elsewhere in the state that could provide a starting point for estimating funding, effectiveness, etc. Napoli indicated willingness to look into bike/ped counter options to bring back to the TAC at a future date.

Measure 2 | Percent Dwelling Units Within ¼-Mile Walk to 30-Minute Transit Service

Data collection details were reviewed; Paige Townsend and Nikki Hart-Brinkley will collaborate to gather information related to 60-minute service figures.

Measure 3 | Percentage of Collectors/Arterials with Bicycle Facilities

Bike lanes of any width, and shoulders three feet or greater were identified for this data set. Evan MacKenzie commented that rider comfort level is also a major factor related to bike/ped usage on busy roads; despite their presence, people avoid them due to safety concerns.

Measure 4 | Percentage of Collectors/Arterials in Activity Centers with Sidewalks

Alex Georgevitch recommended a proposal in the final report for LCDC to adjust the benchmark downward for this measure, because – since the original benchmark was established – the MPO boundary

has been changed as has the definition of activity center, which now includes numerous activity areas without sidewalks.

Measure 5 | Percentage of New Dwelling Units (DUs) in Activity Centers

Data for this measure will be reported in three sets: 1) total dwelling units in activity centers as compared to dwelling units within the region as a whole, 2) dwelling units that meet the 10 unit/acre density requirement, and 3) units that are in an activity center, that meet density, and that are within ¼ mile of a retail center with connecting pedestrian networks.

As with Measure 4, it was suggested that the final report make a recommendation that the benchmarks for Measure 5 be lowered, given the low-level land zoning for 10 units/acre and the fact that the activity center definition has changed.

In light of Measures 5 and 6 dealing with land use (i.e. zoning), over which the MPO has no authority, it may be worth considering having the city handle them in the future.

Measure 6 | Percentage of New Employment in Activity Centers

Building permit data collection is still in process. The data for this measure will be reported in five sets where there is new employment: 1) within activity centers, 2) within activity centers with no parking between the street and the front entrance, 3) within activity centers and ¼-mile of minimum 10unit/acre density dwelling units with connecting sidewalk, 4) within activity centers and has a vertical mix of uses (i.e. commercial on bottom, residential on top), and 5) all criteria combined.

Measure 7 | Alternative Transportation Funding

This measure continues to be carried out as specified.

Despite the coverage of this topic as an action item, there is no motion required at this time by the TAC. The input received will be utilized by staff in moving forward with the benchmark analysis and to present data in the final report.

Discussion Items:

6. CMAQ Project Funding Recommendation

- Karl Welzenbach reported that the CMAQ distribution formula was still under discussion, with the “state requirements” issue being the main point of contention. Due to staff and PAC workgroups’ failure to reach consensus on the matter, the OTC may need to render the final decision. Potential outcomes would include:
 1. The CMAQ distribution formula *will not include* consideration of state mandates unique to the various MPOs.
 2. The formula *will include* consideration of state mandates. This decision could be carried out in one of two ways:
 - a. Funding for the state requirements will be a factor of the distribution formula.
 - b. Funding for the state requirements will be paid “off the top” of the CMAQ funds.
- Federal interpretation of whether Portland’s CMAQ funds will be affected by their upcoming attainment status as of October 1, 2017 is still pending. CMAQ regulation language from Title 23 Section 149 indicates that, although Portland would still be eligible to receive CMAQ funds (having been a nonattainment area in the past), they would not be able to spend the funds (having no further need to work towards attainment or continue in maintenance).

- Regretfully, the TACs decision at their April meeting to move forward with fully funding the remainder of selected TIP projects as well as funding the first two waitlisted projects will have to be put on hold.
 - The April decision had been based on estimated available CMAQ funds of \$3.4 million, but that amount has now been called into question, since ODOT's funding arrangement with Salem/Eugene will lapse at the end of 2019 instead of 2021 as originally thought.
 - Additionally, three separate financial reports – all issued by different offices within ODOT – indicate widely varying CMAQ balances for the RVMPO, ranging from <\$967,270.31> to just over \$4 million. These figures will need to be reconciled before any accurate forecasting of CMAQ funds can occur.

Welzenbach will keep the TAC updated over the coming months as the CMAQ funding distribution formula is finalized and as ODOT reconciles its financial accounts and is able to provide an accurate CMAQ balance to the RVMPO.

7. Critical Urban Freight Corridors Update

Dan Moore reported that ODOT is updating its freight plan and designations of critical urban freight corridors. Oregon is planning to add 77 new miles to its urban freight system, with those miles being allocated throughout the state on a formula developed with input from Oregon MPOs.

Portland is receiving 34.6 of the 77 miles, leaving 42.4 for the non-Metro Oregon MPOs. Table 2 in Moore's memo (provided for review) details the specific allocations, and shows that the RVMPO will receive a 5.2 mile share. With the requirement to apply the CUFC miles to projects currently listed in the TIP, RVMCOG staff worked in conjunction with Mike Baker (Region 3 ODOT) to allocate the 5.2 miles to the following projects:

- .62 mi | 809 Foothill Road: Corey to Atlantic
- .91mi | 821 Table Rock Road: I-5 Crossing to Biddle
- 1.29mi | 858 Foothill Road: Delta Waters to Coker Butte
- .97mi | Foothill Road: Hillcrest to McAndrews
- .15mi | 923 OR238: At West Main
- 1.25mi | OR99: I-5 to Scenic
- **5.19mi**

A map was provided showing those specific CUFC locations, and Table 3 of the memo described the work to be done at each site. With these areas designated, the RVMPO can now proceed to submit the 5.2 miles to compete for project funds (\$80 million available in freight funds through the Fast Act) for the two CUFC segments. Per request by Alex Georgevitch, Moore will attempt to secure details regarding the other MPOs specific CUFC designations.

Mike Kuntz inquired as to whether the additional .01mi not yet allocated could be added to the Foothill Road roundabout (being added via amendment as Project 924 to the 2015-2018 TIP; reference also existing Project 809, which called for a signal at the same location). Moore will look into the possibility of including the Foothill Road roundabout in the CUFC designations in order to utilize the full 5.2mi allotment.

The TAC expressed disagreement with ODOT's requirement that the selected CUFC segments be allocated only to projects already in the TIP, since these projects are already funded. Moore acknowledged the validity of this concern; he addressed it by explaining that the funding, if secured, could possibly supplant currently allocated funds, or add new components to existing projects. Further,

successfully competing for this round of CUFC funds would give the RVMPO a toehold in expanding the CUFC along the chosen segments as more miles/funds are awarded over the years.

Ultimately it was decided that Moore will let the Policy Committee know at their May 23 meeting that the TAC *reservedly* recommends approval of the CUFC segment designation. He will convey the TAC's disagreement with the selection criterion of all identified segments being located within already fully-funded TIP projects.

8. Public Comment

None voiced.

Regular Updates:

9. Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects

This item is being added as a standing agenda item in order to keep communication and accountability related to active projects flowing among the jurisdictions. The idea was suggested by John Vial, Chair of the MRMPO TAC and was considered worth adopting for the RVMPO as well.

- *Jackson County* (Chair Kuntz):
 - Table Rock between I-5 and Biddle: The project was planned and funded before Costco chose Table Rock and Hamrick for construction. Work will begin in January 2018, with plans for completion by late October 2018.
 - As mentioned at the April meeting, the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) is getting going; discussions are underway with ODOT regarding drafting an IGA.
- *Central Point* (Matt Samitore):
 - Costco is about to break ground and anticipates taking only 110 days to build their new facility; they are obtaining the permit now and hope to open before Thanksgiving.
 - The Twin Creeks Railroad Crossing was slightly stalled due to the need to obtain a revised rail order, which is now in process. The project will go to bid in August, begin mid-September, and be largely completed by Christmas.
- *Eagle Point* (Mike Upston): No current projects.
- *RVTD* (Paige Townsend): The Valley Feeder project (i.e. demand response general public service) remains completely conceptual at this point; RVTD is watching Salem's program to see what happens regarding the labor pool situation (i.e. transit union vs. private).
- *Ashland* (Mike Faught): Project details will be brought to next month's meeting.

10. MPO Planning Update

While the MRMPO 2018-2021 TIP was submitted ahead of deadline, ODOT forgot to include several projects, which they did, however, include in their Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). As a result, the TIP will need to be *re-adopted* (versus simply amended) with the ODOT projects included. A public hearing will be required, so a notice will be published in the Medford Mail Tribune to allow for a 30-day public comment period prior to the public hearing and subsequent Policy Committee vote at the June 27 meeting.

Welzenbach reported that the FHWA has stated that the chronic (six years running) inadequate communication/coordination between ODOT and the MPOs – resulting in discrepancies between the TIP and the STIP – needs to be resolved, or future project funding could be affected. Welzenbach will engage in process redesign discussions with Jeffrey Flowers, ODOT Program and Funding Services Manager/STIP Coordinator, and keep the committee apprised as to progress.

In the meantime, for the *current* adoption/re-adoption process by the MPOs, Flowers is requiring that each MPO submit a letter along with their adopted (or re-adopted) 2018 – 2021 TIP stating that the TIP contains the MPO’s best estimates of CMAQ funds and that, should funding scenarios change, the MPO will amend the TIP accordingly.

Pursuant to inquiries by Mike Faught and Paige Townsend, Welzenbach explained that amendments to the 2015 – 2108 TIP may be made anytime between now and September 30 and that amendments to the re-adopted 2018 – 2021 TIP will be possible after October 1.

11. Other Business / Local Business

- *Ashland*: Mike Faught requested the addition of two items to the June 14 TAC meeting agenda:
 - An update regarding the State Transportation Funding Package.
 - A discussion of options/alternatives to the East Nevada Street Bridge project, which is meeting neighborhood opposition.

12. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:33 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPPO Policy Committee | May 23, 2017 | 2:30 p.m.

RVMPPO TAC | June 14, 2017 | 1:30 p.m.