

---

# Meeting Minutes

## Jackson County TSP Update

### Kick-off Meeting

Wednesday, January 28<sup>th</sup>, 2015 – 9:30 to 11:30 a.m.

Jackson County Roads – 200 Antelope Road, White City, OR 97503 – Conference Room A

---

**Attendees:** Mike Kuntz, Craig Anderson, Jenna Stanke, John Vial, James Philp, Alexandra Coates, Susan Wright, Matt Bell, Darci Rudzinski, Kelly Madding

**Meeting Purpose:** The purpose of the Kick-off Meeting was to provide a general overview of the project, discuss the project schedule and initial work tasks on Tech Memos 1 and 2, and to answer any questions about project scope.

#### Discussion Topics:

##### 1. Introductions, Roles/Responsibilities

- Mike is the primary point of contact for the County
- Craig will be the point person on technical work, including GIS
- Jenna will be the point person on ped/bike work
- John and James will provide oversight and participate in the PMT and TAC Meetings

##### 2. Project Objectives

- The County views the TSP in three ways:
  - The TSP is needed to demonstrate compliance with statewide land use and transportation planning goals. The County needs help to meet the requirements.
  - The TSP is needed to guide the County in the development of their transportation system.
  - The TSP is also needed to help applicants understand the County's goals and policies and to ensure that requirements on new development are clear. Current goals and policies are not clear. The County currently has to come to consensus with developers on requirements.
- More detailed objectives:
  - The County has completed a majority of the current CIP. Most of what has not been built, the County no longer intends to build. Therefore, the CIP is not reflected by the TSP.
  - The County wants to revisit many of their current standards, such as cross sections, v/c standards, virtually all standards need to be reviewed, confirmed or modified.

- The County wants to clarify how they handle management issues that come up on a regular basis. They want to formalize what they currently do.
- Other areas where they need help are listed in section 8.1 of the scope of work and include:
  - Jurisdictional exchanges – they have a policy document that needs to be incorporated.
  - Managing transportation facilities – have a good idea (ex, classification of road that may need to change) – will need to go to council.
  - How to pave gravel roads – currently, when the County paves a gravel road they are required to bring it up to full current standards and that is about 1 million per mile – They want to re-write standards for utilizing ASHTO low-volume road standards, other geometric changes – They want to know how to create an adequate base that will last for 20 years.
  - Managing capital improvements for local road – current policy is to maintain, but not improve local roads.
- The county currently has two TSPs: one for the County and one for White City. They would like them to be combined but still addressed separately.
- The County would like to enhance the ped/bike plans - There will be some overlap with the active transportation plan that kicks off in October 2015, which will be a more detailed look at ped/bike. The County received a grant from the RVMPO to do the plan – nothing currently connects, the active transportation plan will tie the bike and ped plans from all other plans to create a continuous network within the RVMPO area.
  - The Rogue River Greenway is located outside the MPO area so it will be important for the TSP update to address the connection.

### 3. Project Overview

- We will meet with public and technical groups at each step of the process.
- The first round of open houses will be used to gain a sense for what the alternatives will look like – TM5 is the alternatives analysis. The preferred plan will follow.
- The preferred plan is the full plan needed to accommodate growth – the preferred plan will be taken back to the advisory committees to gain feedback on priorities or start to define high priorities for the constrained plan.
- Will have all building blocks of TSP for the final set of advisory committees as well as the OH and PC/CBC.
- Have a contingency item to meet with committees again following development of draft plan.
- Will have input from county and ODOT that will be revised prior to joint work session.

- Will then have separate hearing for PC and CBC.
- Would make sense to get into a flow and stick with it – Wednesday afternoons the county has board meetings related to land use – would prefer not to have the meetings on Wednesday afternoon. Tuesdays or Thursdays are open the county had no regular meetings on either days. RVMPO has policy committee meetings on 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of each month, bike committee is first Tuesday. Will aim for meetings on Thursdays.
- We are targeting completion of Tech Memo 1 and 2 in early March, which will provide enough time to prepare for first TAC/CAC meeting – three weeks with one week for PMT review, one week for us to edit, one week to get it to the committees. PMT members also involved in the TAC will have more time to review.
- First open house – we will identify the critical issues that the county should be planning for – will want feedback from them on what should be considered in the alternatives analysis – the meetings help kick-off the alternatives process – is important to go to public before we have a plan to get confirmation we are on the right path and to give them an opportunity to tell us what should be included in the plan. Same approach for the first PC and CBC meetings. We will also be able to share what we learned at the open house.
- Will come back to committees in mid-September with alternatives and potential solutions, gain input and you will see building blocks for draft plan, project list.
- Might make sense to move the draft policy and standards memorandum to be delivered with TM6.
- May need to move the last PC commission hearing ahead one week to provide enough separate between the PC and CBC hearings.
- What is new for the joint work session? – provide them the final document, prepare them for adoption – this will be the first time that they will see that their feedback has been received and that it has been included in the final version – provides an opportunity for the PC and CBC to see that their changes have been made, which should prevent them from derailing the process during the adoption hearing. There is also a lot of time between February and June – the formal meeting is also different than the work session and the hearing at the end.
- We will have received feedback in February, provided them with an update in May, and tell them that we will be back in June for adoption. There is always the possibility that there could be substantial changes in February that it will take until May to be resolved. Not just an informational piece, it is a living document.
- Allie can investigate the possibility of pushing the due date beyond June 2016.
- Susan will add the year to the schedule.
- Consultants would like feedback on the schedule for Task 10 – working backward from June 30.

---

#### 4. CAC/TAC Roster

- The County has not finalized the rosters yet. They are still deciding who they want to pull into the group – realtors, chamber of commerce. They will have the roster in place by the end of February. Have White City charitable foundation. The TAC includes everyone in the meeting, with more from the surrounding cities, most will decline, but it will be good to keep them in the loop. There will also be some ODOT staff on the TAC. Allie will confirm how they want to participate – not everyone that reviews the document will come to the meetings – someone from freight, transit, MPO, emergency services, public health (CAC/TAC), planning commissioners, board members. Kelly was thinking of asking someone in the planning commission, road advisory committee (standing committee).
- Do we ask them if they want to join? The county can distribute a letter to the MPO and cities and let them decide who they want to go. Invite someone from Talent, Medford, ask others who they should include on the TAC mailing list. Open houses also give them opportunity to participate.

#### 5. Tech Memo 1: Goals and Objectives, Policy Review, and Financial Funding Forecast

##### Goals and Objectives

- We will start with the County's current goals and objectives and input changes based on what has changed over the last several years – growth, priorities, etc.
- Even though Wimer, Rush, and Prospect are not urban, they are suburban and people and walking and biking there. The goals and policies should address these locations as well as White City. However, it is difficult to imagine the county's limited capital dollars will go to improving these areas. The plans/policies can lead toward urbanization of these areas.
- We need to establish what are the goals and objectives of the TSP so we can know how to create the policies, how to develop the evaluation the criteria, and what are the objectives. Do the County's goals still make sense, are they still relevant? What are the minimum statewide goals/requirements?
- When the County reviews long-range planning applications they require applications to meet requirements in comprehensive plan. The practical effect of the policies rarely comes into play. Curious if the policies should be shortened to make them easier to use.
- Review STIP enhance criteria to identify criteria for selecting/prioritizing projects.
- County will take a look at the goals and objectives, have policies included in urban agreements, that may find their way into the document, but from an implementation standpoint, at least they will be consistent. Can add some language to that effect.
- Do we want to look at an economic development goal? Yes, when opportunities come up like table rock, economic development goals would be helpful.

- The goals identified in the comp plan include, safety, convenience, energy efficient, and economic. Feedback on goals, policies, and strategies would be helpful in crafting goal statements. KAI will provide an updated version of goals and objectives and matrix for evaluation. What will help is to know which policies and strategies are required by law.
- It would be interesting to see if there are many cities that have objectives for energy efficiency/greenhouse gases, public health, healthy living, would be interested to know from us what is the new wave of transportation thinking – climate change is a hot button that may not get a good reaction, but other things might – planning for aging population, transit, walking, biking, ITS systems, smart roadway systems.

#### Policy review

- Set the framework, compliance with requirements from regional and state, flagging places where city/county policies do not line-up.
- The only outstanding document is the RVMPO's TDM plan – there could be some applications for the county, but it seems more applicable to the Cities.
- Also talked about review (high level) of white city, or other incorporated areas – Ashland, Medford, talent, phoenix, etc. standards safety, obligation to make sure plans are synched up.
- Our expectation is that we are not making plans for county facilities within cities.
- Policy direction from board is to not provide the cities with a Cadillac road to force the cities to take the road. They should be willing to pay at least 50%.

#### Action Items:

- Kittelson to provide a matrix of the existing goals, policies, and strategies for County review and comment. (attached)
- County to organize transfer of GIS data to the consultant.
- Allie to obtain a copy of the field data count map. (completed)
- Mike to send consultant spreadsheet on county facility classifications. (completed)
- Planning to review the Task 10 schedule and provide feedback.
- KAI to finalize schedule based on Task 10 feedback.
- County to organize TAC and CAC rosters.