

# Meeting Summary

---

## **Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #2**

January 24, 2019

Rogue Valley Council of Governments | 155 N 1st. Street, Central Point | 2:00pm

---

**Attendees:** Ray DiPasquale, City of Phoenix; Matt Samitore, City of Central Point, Scott Fleury, City of Ashland; Edem Gomez, RVTD; Matt Brinkley, Karl MacNair, Chris Olivier, City of Medford; Ryan MacLaren, Nikki Hart-Brinkley, RVCOG; Josh LeBombard, DLCD; Jenna Marmon, Ian Horlacher, ODOT; Mike Kuntz, Jackson County; Karla Kingsley, Nick Gross, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.;

### **Introductions:**

The meeting kicked-off with a roundtable of introductions and a review of project schedule.

### **Project Vision and Goals:**

Karla Kingsley reviewed the project vision statements and provided an overview of the input received from the TAC/CAC vision statement survey. Vision statement 1 received the highest rating based on input received from TAC and CAC members through the survey.

*"The Rogue Valley's comfortable, convenient, and attractive walking and biking networks connect communities and people around the region. Coupled with transit, all users, regardless of age, ability, need, or interest, can safely access destinations, employment, and schools via these networks."*

The project team concluded that vision statement 1 will be used moving forward with minor tweaks based on input regarding positive components from vision statements 2 and 3. The TAC agreed with this approach.

### **Summary of Online Open House:**

Nick Gross provided an overview of the input received on the virtual open house (online survey and interactive map). There were 178 comments on the interactive map and 193 responses collected on the survey. Nick reviewed the key takeaways from the visual preference survey: there was strong support for separated pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Nick also reviewed key walking and bicycling barriers identified by community members, as well as the types of improvements that would encourage them to walk or bike more for short trips. Nick also provided an overview of the level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis which will be conducted on the identified regional route network.

### *General Discussion:*

A discussion of an appropriate LTS target for the RVATP concluded that the plan should strive for LTS 2; however, LTS 3 may be appropriate along rural roadways. The City of Medford TSP update used the LTS analysis with an LTS 2 threshold and decided to use an LTS 1 target for new roadways, providing physically separated bicycle facilities along arterial streets and buffered bike lanes along collector streets. The Medford TSP update also recognizes "legacy streets" as streets that may never be feasible to upgrade in order to accommodate pedestrian and bicycle facilities to an LTS 2 or better.

Foothill Road was noted as a roadway that will be reconstructed with 7-foot shoulders and should be prioritized as regional route based on its future ability to accommodate bicyclists within the shoulder.

### **Defining the Regional Active Transportation Network:**

Karla Kingsley led a discussion to determine the preferred terminology for the active transportation routes identified within the map. For the purposes of the draft memorandum, the terms “Arterial Route” and “Collector Route” were used; however, the general consensus was that these terms related too closely to vehicular classifications and may create confusion since the active transportation routes do not necessarily align with the same roadway facilities.

The preferred terminology for the “Arterial Routes” was:

- Regional Routes

The preferred terminology for the “Collector Routes” was:

- Connector Routes

*\*It is worth noting that the CAC also preferred the term “Connector Routes” for the secondary route network.*

*General Discussion:*

It was noted that Northeast Medford should connect to Central Medford in the concept map graphic. Jenna Marmon questioned if the regional route connections should be called regional bicycle routes, recognizing that pedestrians will not walk the distances of many of these routes. The TAC generally agreed; however, it was noted that this terminology may appear to disregard pedestrian travel. Instead, pedestrians are typically served along the regional routes by riding transit. For pedestrians, the Connector Routes will provide important connections to the regional routes that have transit service. Nick and Karla shared some of the findings from a survey done for the RVTD Master Plan, where responses revealed that the “catchment area” of transit in the Rogue Valley is likely about ¾ mile from each stop, which is greater than a typical ¼ mile “rule of thumb”. The TAC agreed that serving pedestrian travel would focus on making connections to transit hub locations and transit corridors.

### **Defining the Collector Routes – Map Exercise**

The project team asked the TAC members to provide input on potential Connector Routes on zoomed in maps. See scanned Connector Route exercise.

*General Discussion:*

Connections to Dead Indian Road and other rural roadways should be shown on scenic route map even though the majority of the route is outside the RVMPO boundary.

### **Evaluation and Prioritization Process:**

Karla Kingsley gave an overview of the evaluation and prioritization approach and asked for TAC input on the evaluation criteria. The TAC noted that identified regional routes should be “ground truthed” by the project team and/or advisory committee members before we finalize the networks. Goal 5: Regional Collaboration – consider multi-jurisdictional routes was debated as a criterion to be used in prioritization. Some members felt that it shouldn't be a prioritization factor, but included simply for implementation purposes. Others felt that it was an important prioritization factor, since this is a regional plan and it should focus on the regional connections and the connections between jurisdictions, which are more often

multi-jurisdictional. TAC members noted that emphasis should be placed on routes that provide alternatives to existing barriers or options that overcome barriers. Other evaluation criteria mentioned for consideration included route directness, grades (steep hills), and distance. The TAC generally agreed with the idea of applying a higher LTS threshold (e.g. LTS 3) for longer-distance, rural connections that are less likely to attract less confident users, with an LTS 2 threshold used for more urban connection. However, the TAC also noted that in some cases, there may be a desire for an LTS 1 facility (e.g. a trail) that is a longer distance, such as a trail connection to Jacksonville.

TAC members considered prioritization that would classify needs into time-frames (near, medium, and long-term) vs. priority levels (e.g. high, medium, low). The TAC recognized that no money is currently allocated for construction and therefore, time-frames may not be helpful.

#### **Next Steps:**

- The project team will compile the input from the TAC and CAC on the Regional Routes and the Connector Routes to prepare updated route maps. These will be circulated to the CAC and TAC for additional comment.
- Next, comprehensive data will be collected for the routes within the network that will be used to inform the evaluation and prioritization analysis.
- The project team will then initiate the evaluation of the routes to inform prioritization, which will be the main topic of discussion at the next TAC/CAC meetings.