# Summary Minutes
# Rogue Valley MPO Technical Advisory Committee
# August 8, 2018

The following attended:

| Voting Members | Organization | Phone Number |
|---|---|---|
| Alex Georgevitch, Vice Chair | Medford \| PW | 774-2114 |
| Craig Anderson | Jackson County \| PL | 774-6907 |
| Ian Horlacher | ODOT | 423-1362 |
| Kyle Kearns | Medford \| PL | 774-2375 |
| Mike Kuntz, **Chair** | Jackson County \| R&P | 774-6228 |
| Paige West | RVTD \| PL | 608-2429 |
| Ray DiPasquale | Phoenix \| PW | 535-2226 |
| Tom Humphrey | Central Point \| PL | 423-1025 |
| **Alternate Voting Members Present** | **Organization** | **Phone Number** |
| | | |
| **Staff** | **Organization** | **Phone Number** |
| Karl Welzenbach | RVCOG | 423-1360 |
| Ryan MacLaren | RVCOG | 423-1338 |
| Nikki Hart-Brinkley | RVCOG | 423-1378 |
| **Interested Parties** | **Organization** | **Phone Number** |
| Mike Montero | Montero & Associates | 944-4376 |

RVMPO TAC August 8, 2018 Agenda Packet

Full meeting recording: 2018-08-08 RVMPO TAC Meeting Audio

**1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda** 00:00-00:56
1:35p.m. | *Quorum*: Central Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD

**2. Review / Approve Minutes** 01:04-01:46

**01:31 |** *Ian Horlacher moved to approve the July 11, 2018 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as presented. Tom Humphrey seconded. Alex Georgevitch abstained.*

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

**3. Public Comment** 00:57-00:59, 01:47-02:33

## *Action Items*

**4. Public Participation Plan** 02:34-15:21

**14:53 |** *Ian Horlacher moved to recommend the approval of the revised Public Participation Plan with the changes and comments provided. Alex Georgevitch seconded.*

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

## *Discussion Items*

**5. Public Comment** 15:11-15:21

## *Presentations*

**6. TPAU: Southern Oregon Activity Based Model for RVMPO** 15:22- 01:39:57

45:11 | Alex Georgevitch raised concern with the geography of the model including the northwest corner of Jackson County and the western part of the county between Interstate 5 and Highway 238 (areas within the boundary of the current model, but outside the MPO boundary) being regions of low population density that may not be practical to include in the model.

48:55 | Paige West raised question about the geography of the breakdown of the Micro Analysis Zones (MAZs) versus the Traffic Analysis Zones (TAZs) affecting the accuracy of data on transit ridership when a MAZ with more projected growth is farther from transit corridors. The model may not accurately capture transit use now or in the future.

53:47, 56:24, 57:47 | Karl Welzenbach questioned if the expectation is for the RVMPO to be on the same timeline as the MRMPO? The RVMPO is still in the process of data review for the MAZs. Will the review impact the timing of the model being able to run? With more clarification from Alex B., Karl then asked, with changes to the data for the RVMPO being input into the model during the MRMPO update, will it have minimal effects? Lastly, will those involved be able to proceed with the update to the MRMPO while finalizing the TAZ and MAZ information in the Rogue Valley.

57:36 | Alex Bettinardi, ODOT representative, addressed the concerns Karl raised by answering that refinement of the different zones' data in the RVMPO should not have impacts on the update process for the MRMPO.

58:06 | Paige asked about the connections between the bike/pedestrian trips and transit trips. The current Travel Demand Model assumes certain percentages for mode split for pedestrians and transit trips. Are there attributes from other MPOs being used to assume percentage of pedestrian trips or is the model going to rely on transit's trips?

58:58 | Alex B. explained that the Trip and Activity Based Models (TBM, ABM) are both calibrated to the local survey data that is available. Currently, there is only regional level data to calibrate to. The ABM offers more detail for how a project will affect pedestrian and bike modes. Better data is still needed such as for the Greenway Trail and the pedestrian bridge in Grants Pass.

01:02:41 | Paige asked how the ABMs are being used by other MPOs? What are the advantages and best practices?

01:02:58 | Joel, ABM technical expert from ODOT, explained that the model for Southern Oregon was originally developed and adopted by the San Diego Association of Governments, and widely adopted across the country. All MPOs use them for their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) process to test the kinds of policies that are being discussed. Common applications include changes in the transportation network, changes in land use density, mixed-use development, investments in bike lanes, and studying the effects of autonomous vehicles.

01:05:44, 1:10:36 | Karl asked if shape files for the MAZs and the associated data will be made available so that individual jurisdictions can review them. The local jurisdictions would like to review the 2016 base year MAZ, TAZ associated data for accuracy. Alex B. is looking for growth in those areas for 2045 projections for the data.

01:06:54 | Alex B. directed that whatever data Nikki has, to please distribute it to anyone wanting to review it.

01:11:06 | Nikki Hart-Brinkley: Are all the inputs for the 2045 criteria the same as the 2010 and 2016 data? Or are you looking for certain criteria?

01:11:28 | Alex B.: ODOT will need to create and fill in data for all 78 criteria fields for the MAZs for 2045, but ODOT wants to be flexible with local jurisdictions. If jurisdictions would prefer to collect the data that is similar to the TBM and not at the MAZ detailed level, that is an option.

01:12:13 | Paige: Can we have the list of criteria that is required for the MAZs so they can be narrowed down and prioritized?

01:13:37 | Nikki: It would help to know exactly what is needed at a minimum for the criteria inputs for the 2045 data. All the criteria categories are broken down into really narrow categories making a minimum necessary to facilitate filling in the data efficiently.

01:14:26 | Alex B.: We have a Word document that walks through all the major milestones that need to be reviewed. We can send that file to everyone so we are on the same page. There is a follow-up document that gets down to the specifics for exactly what is needed.

01:15:26 | Nikki: Would you be looking for a way for jurisdictions to be able to access, review, and comment on the boundary information as well as receiving all of the 2016 data, down to the TAZ and MAZ levels as well as a list of 2045 value inputs so that data sources can be sought out? Does that sound right?

01:16:33 | Alex B.: Yes that sounds great. Those are the right steps for moving forward.

01:17:24 | Alex G.: I have a couple questions/concerns: Medford's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) just expanded and we have new known boundaries, probably creating a need to review the TAZ and the breakdown for the MAZs. Also, what type of results are we going to get out of this and what are the ramifications of having shifting models? This reminds me of the alternative measure process, where we had a change in benchmarks. Also the changes in the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) are moving forward, but now each jurisdiction will have to rely on data, and how readily available will it be, when it's not housed locally, and jurisdictions have to rely on Transportation Planning Analysis Unit (TPAU) for the output?

01:18:57 | Alex B.: Our intent is to shadow the TBM with the ABM, running it in the background to evaluate how different the models are. We need a future year for the ABM that is relatively close to the TBM; we are thinking of propping up a future year with the existing inputs of the Rogue Valley TBM and the Grants Pass TBM, just to get something close, to test it in the background where no one can see it running. We have anticipated this question, and with the calibration work that was done, which we can share, we have three sensitivity tests where we tried to create common scenarios, that have been run in the TBM, including one that was expanding transit, one that was developing a new retail area, and one that was aging the population to 2040 type retiree scenario. So far, in addition to the model looking good in calibration, it also did a reasonable job, or comparable job, to the TBM, with the sensitivity scenarios. We are pretty confident we won't get completely blindsided by a weird result; it performs the way we had hoped, at least with these initial tests. When you asked about how do we provide the data information, in some ways the information will be more approachable than the TBM … The end result of an ABM is essentially a fully expanded household survey, that is a tabular report that can be used for equity and performance measure reports, that can be analyzed any way you want to use it. There might be future opportunity for us to provide the information from different requested scenarios in a much more approachable way than ever before.

01:22:42 | Karl: I was thinking about Alex's question about Medford's expanded UGB. If to accommodate in a future year, such things as expanded UGBs, instead of redrawing the TAZs, would it not be easier or more feasible to just add MAZs in the TAZs to accommodate it?

01:23:12 | Alex B.: That is one perk of the ABM, so the TAZs are also used for calculating the travel time for autos. Everything else happens at the MAZ levels, all the people moving around, even the auto travelers. The TAZ is not as critical for tabulating outputs; all the outputs will be tabulated at the MAZ level. If you wanted to go ahead and add MAZs to better, or more perfectly capture new boundaries.

01:24:01 | Karl: But those would be added for the out years, does it mess up the model to have different MAZ numbers in the base year as opposed to the out year?

01:24:12 | Alex B.: The model stills runs, and the trip based would still too. The issue comes with if you try to compare a base year to a future year and the zone numbers are different, you end up with

problems with joins, but the result would still be valid. It might be problematic from a data analysis perspective but not the results.

01:24:44 | Alex G.: My comment about the UGB expansion is for the future, because we're going to have to populate new boundaries. We tried to account for that by pushing to the edge of our current TAZs, without leaving the TAZs, and we have new boundaries so we can now populate in the new TAZs appropriately. And based on our Regional Problem Solving (RPS) guidelines, which tells us what our percentages are, we should have a good idea if we are anticipating full buildout on a TAZ, we should know what the single family, multifamily, and commercial uses are. This sounds like we get more granular so we will then have to make further assumptions, but for 2042 or 2045, these are obviously going to be [ball parked anyway]. It also sounds like subarea analysis is going to be less important with MAZs, is that correct?

01:26:02 | Alex B.: Yeah, you mean like refining an area and looking at it in more detail, like that should be easier with an ABM, is that the question?

01:26:10 | Alex G.: Yes, because in the past, I've always struggled with some of the analysis that is done from a transportation perspective and a traffic engineering perspective, when you look at one or two TAZs in Medford, in a regional model, it was always very challenging, if your project was small enough, it wouldn't leave the TAZ and there may be no impact to the system shown by a larger model. In this case it sounds like it can be very refined and therefore, if we know the number of households, we can actually get down to the household level of impact.

01:26:57 | Alex B.: Yeah, it should be easier; every time you want to cut up a MAZ into smaller MAZs, you have to deal with all the 78 or so attributes and split them appropriately. We will manage it though; it's not that much different than the trip based model, it's the same thing as splitting a zone in the TBM and dealing with the attributes at the zone level. The ABM gives you the ability to split the zone in ways that weren't available in the TBM, and in practice it should be more simplistic, although there are complications that can come up as well.

01:29:04 | Nikki: We have been working very hard to build all of the data for this model. The issue is that there are about 78 different bins of information for around 2500 different MAZs for the whole ABM model. ODOT said we've got the 2010 information; they hired a consultant to work with 2010 census data and some other data sources to determine the baseline year. Then they said we need you to do the 2016 data for 78 attributes for each of the 2500 MAZ zones. This is economic data, it's really detailed demographic data, I mean it gets into the nitty gritty … working with the data sources we had available I tried to repopulate all of the TAZ and then down to the MAZ level for 2016. We are working with completely different data sources from the 2010 baseline data and 2016. 2010 had real census data, and at 2016 we're working with some American Community Survey (ACS) 5 year estimates and ESRI's packaged demographics information that can be isolated into nonstandard polygon boundaries. The smaller you get the more wrong you become. You can take 2010 census data and use ACS with varying degrees of accuracy, based on 2010 and going out five years. As you go further and further out from the baseline data, and smaller and smaller boundaries, the tools we use take into account certain things like roads and bodies of water. For example, in the TAZ, you've got a high school with 100 employees in that sector, but when the TAZ was split into two, it moved all the employment information into an empty field across the street rather than that employment sector being based at the high school. So there are a number of problems with taking the 2010 data and trying to create 2016 data that not only reflects accurately what is going in 2016, but also calibrates to a data year where you're using completely different data and methodologies. What we decided was that they

would take all of the data that I provided and run it through their systems and change things. What you are all going to get for your review should you choose to do that is the result of that whole process that I just talked about. A lot of different data sources and a lot of different calibration. I don't doubt that there are going to be discrepancies. I will try to develop a way that people can review this by looking at exactly what is in the model and then being able to comment. It is really time intensive.

01:33:49 | Mike Kuntz: And then they want us to presume that same group of information and project it to 2045. I think you're going to, I mean what percentage is home-based business, how's the nuclear family going to disintegrate or reconvene as grandparents, parents, and children. There are so many variables.

01:34:58 | Alex G.: You know like having employees across the street is not going to affect the model.

01:35:04 | Karl: And what they are doing is comparing it to the TBM so they know they are not way off.

01:35:10 | Paige: That doesn't seem right, if we know the TBM isn't accurately capturing non-auto trips, why are we calibrating to a model that we know is flawed in the modes?

01:35:26 | Karl: That is a separate issue. Well, what they want to know right now is does the ABM reflect what the TBM does. The TBM is pretty good for cars. So if we know it's got that, and at the MAZ level its better at the other stuff, it's going to give you a better percentage for pedestrian, bike, and transit because it runs at the MAZ level. But they need to first see if its working at the TAZ level and the trip based model. So that's what he is doing on a regular basis is running it against that to see if its way off or not.

01:35:58 | Alex G.: Well you have to keep in mind what are your known data sources. Trip counts—you put a tube across the road, cars run over it, you have a very good idea of how many cars are going across it. So when you calibrate to a known trip count, it is the closest thing you can calibrate to. I hope no one is under the illusion that this is precise data.

01:36:23 | Paige: Right, because we haven't given them really good data sets for this.

01:36:27 | Karl: Well there aren't any really good data sets—that's the problem. The census, the best is the census block.

01:36:55 | Karl: What they did is they took the census, the ACS, the national household survey, and the Oregon Household Activity Survey, and used all that stuff to feed into the model … they are also including a population synthesizer.

01:37:36 | Nikki: So I just wanted to say that we expect that if you go through your jurisdictions or your areas of interest, there are going to be discrepancies between what you know is real and what you see in the data.

01:37:52 | Karl: And to Alex's point, you're right as far as trip making and automobiles, it doesn't matter if it's across the street but at the MAZ it will make a difference. So that's the critical area you want to be focusing on. Are the populations and the employment centers in the right MAZ?

## *Regular Updates*

**7. Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects** 01:39:56-01:40:21

*RVMPO Project updates were tabled until the next TAC meeting on September 12, 2018.*

**8. MPO Planning Update** 01:47:58-01:50:15

*Julie Brown, Alex Georgevitch, John Vial, Mike Baker, Karl Welzenbach and Ryan MacLaren will meet to discuss Alternative Measure 7, September 17, 2018 from 1:30-2:30pm.*

**9. Other Business / Local Business** 01:40:22-01:47:57, 01:50:15-01:57:43

01:40:22 | Craig Anderson: The TAC meeting back in May, where we discussed moving the money for Ashland over to the Washington Street Independent Way Project. So what happened was the agenda packet for the policy committee went out without any mention of the TAC's recommendation, so I emailed Stephanie, and then Karl responded that a memo would be sent out. And then 15 minutes later a memo was sent out that incorrectly stated what the TAC's recommendation was, but nevertheless went to the Policy Committee and then there was no discussion at the Policy Committee of the TAC's recommendation, and listening to the recording of the policy committee, there was no mention of the median issue that we spent a half an hour discussing. And certainly looking at the policy committee's decision, there's no indication that the median was included as part of that approval. Before the meeting, Ian and I had a discussion earlier today, and he indicated that no the policy committee is aware that the median is part of that project and the median will be completed as part of that project's construction. I mean if that's the case, I guess I still have a concern that the TAC spent a half an hour discussing an issue which wasn't carried forward to the policy committee.

01:42:17 | Karl: I'll grant you it wasn't specifically carried forward, we brought five amendments to them that day, I think, and we didn't summarize all the amendments, but they did approve what the TAC recommended. The extra 30,000 dollars is in there and it is going to be in the contract between ODOT and Ashland.

01:42:36 | Craig: But there is no tie in that 30,000 dollars and there is no tie to the median, there was no discussion.

01:42:41 | Karl: That is going to be addressed in the contract between ODOT and Ashland.

01:42:44 | Craig: That wasn't the TAC's recommendation.

01:42:47 | Karl: The TAC's recommendation was an additional 30,000 dollars; he's the one who made it.

01:42:51 | Ian: Specifically for the engineering of the median and installation of the median. That was the direct tie.

01:42:57 | Karl: Ian was the one who made the motion.

01:42:59 | Craig: No, I made the motion and the motion was that the project goes forward with the completion of the median and here's 30,000 dollars for that piece of it. And the way that you characterized it in the memo was that it was a two part recommendation, the first part being the completion of median and the second part being an additional 30,000 dollars. It doesn't mention anything about the connection to the median and the discussion that the policy committee had didn't mention it, it mentioned the 30,000 dollars, it didn't mention that it was connected to the median. In fact, Art bought it up, he was questioning what the money was and Ryan responded that there was a supplemental memo that explains that the TAC revised and added 30,000 dollars to the project that they thought was appropriate. And that's it. So the summary of what the discussion that we had here is reduced to that the TAC added 30,000 dollars into the project.

01:44:04 | Ian: For the median.

01:44:06 | Craig: Well, no. The median was …

01:44:08 | Karl: That wasn't specifically raised at the policy committee.

01:44:12 | Ian: No, but the recommendation from the, I mean again, maybe it wasn't specifically said at the policy committee but in the, at the contract level, when the City of Ashland comes back, that will be part of it.

01:44:26 | Craig: The point is that the TAC spent a half an hour discussing an issue that had to do with the safety, it had to do with IAMP, it had to do with the rational for the project to begin with, the rational for the expenditure of a million dollars of the public's money. And that wasn't brought to the City of Ashland, who specifically didn't adopt the IAMP.

01:44:51 | Ian: Well neither did ODOT, I mean so we don't have an adopted IAMP there, we have a document, but we don't have an adopted IAMP. The city never adopted it.

01:45:04 | Craig: Why didn't we adopt it?

01:45:05 | Ian: Why would we adopt a document that's not ….

01:45:07 | Craig: No, why didn't the city adopt it?

01:45:09 | Ian: I have no idea.

01:45:10 | Craig: I'll tell you why, and it's because of that median. So they sure as hell didn't want to have a paved condition that requires that median.

01:45:17 | Ian: Well, and as I stated at the TAC, and as identified at the TAC, that's fine, it's not necessarily a requirement, but we will monitor it, and if the City of Ashland doesn't use that 30,000 dollars to put in the median, we will certainly spend 5,000 dollars to put in candlesticks and call it good, and restrict the movement.

01:45:40 | Alex: Craig can I ask you a question? I thought your point isn't about the details you're now discussing, it's about the process. Karl has already acknowledged it, from what I've heard a little bit over there, that it wasn't specific. I think, my concern is, and the way you framed it when you called me, is if we're having a discussion and this is our recommendation, that needs to be brought forward. I

think that's a fair comment. And so, the details of this, or why or why not Ashland didn't do something is outside of our control. I think when we make recommendations, your concern was, those need to be properly brought to the attention of the decision makers, which is the policy committee. And I think that was the purpose, so we had this discussion, and I agree 100 percent, that that should occur because we're here for a reason and if we don't need to be here, we all have better things to do so let's make sure that is passed on properly.

01:46:49 | Craig: Okay so then can we get another memo to the policy committee that indicates by the way when you approved this project we didn't mention it, but you approved a median.

01:47:00 | Karl: I'll put together a clarifying memo and I'll bounce it off of you first.

01:47:03 | Craig: Okay. And you know as long as in the future when we discuss and make a recommendation, that's carried forward—I'm good, I just um …

01:47:20 | Tom Humphrey: Well, if you need back-up, you know if it's a controversial issue, or potentially controversial I guess, and you wanted members of the Technical Advisory Committee to show up at the committee meeting to reiterate or to back you up, we'd be happy to do that.

01:47:37 | Ian: Alex is already there so…

01:47:39 |Alex G: Most of the time, apparently more often now maybe.

01:47:43 | Karl: You're now the official.

01:47:47 | Alex: I found that out after they made that decision, so.

01:47:50 | Karl: On both, the TAC and the RVACT.

01:47:55 | Mike: No more counselors huh?

01:47:56 | Alex: No, uh, the alternate.

**10. Adjournment** 01:57:44
3:33p.m.

*Scheduled Meetings*

RVMPO PAC | September 18, 2018 | 5:30 p.m.

RVMPO Policy Committee | August 28, 2018 | 2:00 p.m.

RVMPO TAC | September 12, 2018 | 1:30 p.m.