
Meeting Minutes

Jackson County TSP Update

Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #1

Tuesday, April 21st, 2015 – 2:00 to 4:00 p.m.

Jackson County Roads – 200 Antelope Road, White City, OR 97503 – Conference Rooms B and C

Meeting Organizer: Mike Kuntz, County Project Manager

Attendees: Robert Miller, Eagle Point; John Sullivan (Paige Townsend), RVTD; Mike Kuntz, Jackson County Roads; John Krawczyk, Rogue River; John Vial, Jackson County Roads; Alex Georgevitch, Medford; Josh Lebombard, DLCD; Jenna Stenke-Marmon, Jackson County Development; Matt Samitore, Central Point; John McDonald, ODOT; Darci Rudzinski, AGP; Susan Wright, KAI; Matthew Bell, KAI.

Meeting Purpose: The purpose of Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting #1 was to introduce TAC members to the project and to review and receive feedback on Tech Memos 1 and 2.

Project Overview

- The Technical Advisory Committee will meet five to six times throughout the course of the project. Our next meeting is in June, where we will talk about existing and future conditions. This will provide the baseline assessment of what needs to be addressed. In September we will talk about alternatives and in November the draft preferred plan.
- We will also host two meetings to get feedback from the community – we tend to get more participation on-line through the virtual open house, which provides the same opportunities for involvement.

Binders

- The binders include tentative dates for all future meetings.
- Alex will look for a potential meeting location in Medford (Library, City Hall, Carnegie Center) to provide a more centralized location. However, no one seems to have an issue with meeting at the roads department.
- Mike will send outlook appointments for all TAC meetings once confirmed.
- We ask that the TAC provide all comments to Mike the Monday following the meeting. He will summarize the comments and send them to us.
- We will not bring hard copies of the reports to the TAC meetings.

- A more detailed project schedule is provided under Tab 3, the scope of work is provided under Tab 4, and the agenda and power point slides (we will bring copies of these to all meetings) are provided under Tab 5.

Tech Memo 1

- Biggest change to goals is the inclusion of an economic development goal.
- Objectives were developed for each goal to help make progress toward meeting goal
- Evaluation criteria were developed based on objectives
- The evaluation criteria will be revisited throughout the project as they are applied

Goal 1

- Bike and ped crash data is limited, rather than saying there has to be crash, injury A, etc., maybe it should be less about the crashes than the potential for crashes.
 - It would be difficult to quantify the potential for crashes given that there are no crash modification factors specific to ped/bike yet.
- The County has every reported incident. If you count the number of pedestrian and bicycle crashes on the system, it will be low. It is also random. It could happen at any time, any place. Auto crashes are the same way, it is difficult to solve unless they are very apparent.
- Would like to look at both; HSM predictive measures and raw data, prefer to look at all crashes to see if there is a pattern or problem area.
- Comments at public events typically provide some insights into some of the more problematic areas

Goal 2

- 2C5, in an urban or fringe facility, it either has a facility or not and it either meets standard or it does not, they change the standard so often that it is hard to keep up.
 - We will not be inventorying the ADA facilities, but we will be able to say if a project will improve ADA facilities
- **2C2, 2C3 quality should be a factor as well. An increase in bike lanes of five miles, but to minimum standard on high speed facilities is not an improvement**
- The Active Transportation Plan, which will be developed subsequent to the TSP update, will provide the baseline for County bike and ped facilities

Goal 3

- No comments

Goal 4

- **Freight capacity at railroad crossings is not an issue in Jackson County – consider removal.**
- There are competing interests/objectives that will impact how a project is scored - example: major employers and freight
- White City and that west side of the highway is less pedestrian friendly
- **4C1 – not every road needs to have great facilities. Consider adding “without potential impacts to other modes” and add an “*” you can violate this if there are alternative routes.**
- If you are increasing turning radii, it will impact other modes
- Bikes tends to go out of direction if there is better a better route
- That statement works well outside of urban areas, but not within white City. Should consider major attractors, major employers, etc.
- Discussion on bike ped is different in urban versus rural areas
- Would like to see something that recognizes the vitality of transportation options – you can’t talk about congestion and travel time without the balance.
- Do you think these objectives will meet the goals? How do you think the rest of Jackson County will view these goals, particularly on some of the gravel roads?
- One of the challenges the county has is that it serves a lot of masters. Have paved and unpaved roads, the rural is really more about safety.
- The primary concern in rural areas is whether they have a place for people to walk and ride their bikes. Think the goals and policies capture this well.
- When we begin evaluating potential projects, we will pay attention to urban versus rural (white city versus outside white city).
- Can define urban versus rural in many ways. The areas between the urbanized areas are urbanizing and we are seeing more pedestrians and bicyclists on the roads.
- We will revisit the evaluation criteria throughout the project. Some projects will help us meet goals, others will not. Some goals may represent one area, not another. Some goals may be at odds with other goals. Some projects may score high in one goals and low in another, not just focusing on one goal.
- These are the question we want to present to county board of commissioners, to provide something that is quantitative and not just qualitative.
- The criteria include both qualitative and quantitative measures.
- Will be curious to see how this works, you may end up favoring one mode over another.
- That is something else we will want to look at is whether we are biasing one mode over another; however, we were deliberate in emphasizing ped/bike.

- We have been given direction to focus capital dollars outside of city limits unless we have participation from the cities. We don't want all the projects within City limit to bubble to the top because that will violate that directive.
- Ultimately, this is the County plan so we could drop to evaluation criteria
- I think it is good to go through the process and have the numbers
- It will be key to pay attention to the process to make sure
- We will need to figure out how to address projects within city's urban areas

Policy Review

- Need to update tables to remove error messages
- May make recommendations that the City's update their policies to be more consistent with the County
- Look differently at local documents, land ordinance, look at what the requirements are for development with a mind toward the TPR
- Would be nice to know whether it is relevant, if things have been completed, if things are no longer relevant
- It would be helpful if each of the cities could review their own sections and pay close attention to what shows up in the review.
- There are two TGM sponsored conceptual plans currently underway, one for Phoenix and one for Talent. Central Point also has one, Medford has another.
- Medford has made some significant changes to TPAU's model as part of their TSP update. It is important to note that these changes are to the base case assumption for the Medford TSP. Not sure if those changes will be incorporated into the model. Would strongly suggest that we coordinate with Joe Bessman, to determine how it will be used for Jackson County.
- It is possible that the model will be changed as part of this TSP update, but we do have a sensitivity analysis scoped to reflect the RPS scenario

Funding Forecast

- How do you do this, when the chances of this funding forecast are not high?
- You will have a complete plan with a list of prioritized projects needed to address needs for all roads.
- We have to show in the plan a rational basis for what goes into the plan and that it could be accomplished if.

Tech Memo 2

- Could you consider RVMPO area as the focus of one map?

-
- We are not planning for that area, inside the MPO boundaries is the purview of the cities, not the County
 - County has a lot of facilities within the MPO, most of their major projects are within the MPO.
 - **Increase the White City scale to include all of the urban areas to the east and west**
 - Consider adding the MPO boundaries to the maps and/or showing the White City map as the MPO boundary
 - **All BLM and forest service roads are shown as 25 miles, but most of them are basic rule.**
 - **Map 13 is missing from the plan set.**
 - **Confirm sidewalk network near VA hospital**
 - The County considers the striped space along the side of a roadway a shoulder unless there is a sidewalk, in which case it is a bike lane
 - Surprised that some of the percentages of minority groups are so high.
 - We took into consideration how people identify as minority for ethnicity, not just race.