

Meeting Summary

Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting #3

October 1, 2019 | 9:30 – 11:30am

Medford Library, Carpenter Conference Room | 205 S Central Ave, Medford

Attendees: Mike Kuntz, Jackson County Roads; Karl McNair, City of Medford; Scott Fleury, City of Ashland; Josh Lebombard, DLCD; Chris Olivier, City of Medford; Edem Gomez, RVTD; Jennifer Boardman, ODOT; Jenna Marmon, ODOT; Susan Wright, Kittelson; Ryan Maclaren, RVMPO; Matt Samitore, Central Point; Stephanie Holtey, Central Point; Nick Gross, Kittelson.

Introductions: Mike kicked off the meeting and introduced Susan Wright as the new project manager since Karla's departure from Kittelson. Susan provided an overview of the agenda and updated project schedule, noting that there will be one more TAC meeting; however, the project team intends to check-in with the TAC prior to the final TAC meeting for feedback on the prioritization results.

General Discussion:

Mike explained that the Active Transportation Plan (Plan) will be adopted Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and referenced by the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Various local jurisdictions would also reference the Plan within their local transportation system plans (TSPs) or other planning documents. As part of the adoption of the Plan, it will be important to describe how the Plan is intended to be used and how to incorporate the identified projects within local jurisdiction TSPs for consistency purposes.

Susan explained that conceptual design for the top 10 priority projects will be produced as part of the draft Active Transportation Plan.

Susan noted there are opportunities to remove, degrade, or swap regional route and connector route designations as needed; however, the project team only intends on prioritizing the regional routes (discussed further later in the meeting). Connector routes will fall onto the responsibility of local jurisdictions to implement and point to within their local planning documents.

Chris: We need to think about activity centers, Northgate is an activity center and only getting bigger. There are going to be a lot of apartments. Quickest travel path is OR 99.

Potential Route Changes:

- Jenna: Ashland Street from E. Main Street across I-5: Upgrade to Regional Route.
- Karl: South Stage Road east of I-5: Upgrade to Regional Route; it will be one of the only crossings of I-5 that will not an interchange.
- Stephanie: Central Point is going through an urban growth boundary (UGB) amendment along Taylor Road. Grant Road from Taylor Road south to Beale Lane would be a good connector route.
- Matt: Beale Lane and Merriman Road should remain as a connector routes. OR 99 has more flexibility with roadway options and roadway configuration.

Existing Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Inventory: Nick Gross provided an overview of the existing bicycle and pedestrian facility inventory as well as the level of traffic stress (LTS) analysis for bicycles and pedestrians. Nick requested that representatives of local jurisdictions provided detailed feedback on the facility attributes to refine the inventory; noting that updates to the facilities inventory may modify the LTS results.

General Discussion:

Mike: The Velo bike group has made a big push to the MPO that LTS 1 is needed for all facilities; however, this Plan will strive for LTS 2 on the regional and connector network.

Group discussion: It seems appropriate to remove the pedestrian LTS on rural facilities with the exception of several “urban-feeling” areas between South Medford and Phoenix and the OR 99 corridor. Rural pedestrian accommodations and access to transit must be addressed as part of the Plan from a policy perspective. Access to transit should specifically address pedestrian crossings at transit facilities as well.

- Jenna: Path symbology should combine shared-use paths and sidepaths as “paths”.
- Jenna: Ashland Central Bike Path is missing; Siskiyou Boulevard path missing, OR 99 path missing.
- Karl: On LTS maps, future connections should be shown as “future connections” without an LTS value.
- Jenna: W. Main Street doesn’t feel like LTS 2.
- Jenna: Table Rock Road has a sidepath, it should be shown on the pedestrian facilities but not on the bicycle facilities.
- Karl: Within the urbanized areas, there are a lot of barriers at signalized intersection. Not all seem to be justified.
- Kittelson will update barriers map to include criteria for individual barriers.

Design Toolkit for Regional and Connector Routes: Susan provided an overview of the design guidance toolkit. The objective of the document is to identify potential facilities to achieve the goals of the plan and LTS 2 facilities on urban and rural facilities.

- Jenna: Madrona Street on the west side of Medford may be an appropriate facility for advisory bike lanes or limited shoulders.
- Mike: It would be useful to indicate which pedestrian crossing facilities are more appropriate at intersections versus mid-block and identify treatments for signalized intersections vs unsignalized locations.
- Kittelson to provide language in design guidance toolkit.
- Jenna: The Plan must provide policy guidance on the recommended crossing distance between pedestrian crossing facilities, auto-recall for pedestrian crossings in the downtown area, and access management standards.

Regional and Connector Route System Needs: Susan provided overview of the needs identified along the Regional and Connector Routes to achieve an LTS 2 rating for the bicycle network.

- Jenna: Buffered bike lanes along OR 62 and across the “Big X” do not feel like an adequate facility. Interchange areas need the highest level of separation.

Prioritization Process: Susan provided overview of the proposed prioritization process, evaluation criteria, and draft weights for each variable and factor.

- Scott: Are we prioritizing pedestrian and bicycle routes separately?
- Kittelson: The intent is to prioritize regional routes with the goal that regional routes will provide the highest level of pedestrian and bicycle treatments within the active transportation network.
- Josh: It would be useful to show a heat map for the activity centers rather than the conceptual yellow circles.
- Kittelson to include heatmap in prioritization process for activity centers.

Evaluation Criteria and Weighting Discussion:

- Josh: "Opportunity" scores high and "Connectivity" scores low. Decrease "Opportunity" and give some more weight to "Connectivity." Take 20 points from "Opportunity" and include in "Connectivity"
- Karl: Opportunity – multi jurisdiction should be based on number of jurisdictions not just 0 – 40.
- Susan: It sounds like opportunity should be decreased to 20 and move 20 points to connectivity.
- Josh: Under safety, let's combine total crashes and severity to 20. Move 20 points to "Existing Conditions".

Group Discussion:

Focus on prioritization of regional routes; connector routes may score higher than regional routes due to land use when compared; therefore, only regional routes should be prioritized or prioritized separately as the information would be helpful to local jurisdictions

Jenna: W. Main to W Medford more important than S Stage Road.

Next Steps and Meeting Close: Kittelson will update the facility inventory maps, LTS maps, and needs based on the comments received from the TAC. Kittelson will begin the prioritization process once inventory and subsequent maps have been updated.

- Mike: The intent of the prioritization process is to identify one regional connection between each activity node.
- Jenna: The scope does not call for it, but it is likely worth convening this group one more time between now and our next TAC. The intent will be for TAC members to attend.
- Mike: TAC comments due October 11; please send them to Mike.