

## TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM #3

**Date:** May 2, 2018  
**To:** Susan Wright, PE, Kittelson & Associates, Inc.  
Paige West, RVTD  
**From:** Andrea Napoli, AICP, Rogue Valley Council of Governments  
**Subject:** Plan Review

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction .....	1
Plan Review .....	1
Statewide Plans .....	1
Rogue Valley Area Plans & Studies .....	2
RVTD Plans & Studies .....	11

### INTRODUCTION

This memorandum provides an overview of existing plans and studies in a format that identifies content that may be applicable to the development of the Rogue Valley Transit District (RVTD) Transit Master Plan. A general summary stating the purpose of the plan or study is provided, and specific content related to transit is indicated.

### PLAN REVIEW

STATEWIDE PLANS	
<b>Oregon Highway Plan (1999)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guides the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Highway Division in planning, operations, and financing through goals, policies, actions, and standards or targets.</li><li>• Applies directives to state highway system, including intent of various highway designations that do/do not accommodate or prioritize transit. Policy 1B includes highway segment special designations that give consideration or prioritization to bicycle, pedestrian, and transit modes.</li><li>• Goal 4 (Travel Alternatives) contains policies directly related to transit.</li></ul>
<b>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2016)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Guides ODOT, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), cities and counties in Oregon, and other agencies in developing bikeway and walkway systems given planning considerations such as land use, transit, and access management.</li><li>• Provides goals and policies related to improving biking and walking, including</li></ul>

<p><b>Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (2016), CONT.</b></p>	<p>connections to transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains laws and rules pertaining to the establishment of bikeways and walkways (including transit-related facilities); justifies importance of walking/biking infrastructure in relation to transit.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Oregon Transportation Options Plan (2015)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Directed towards the education and advertisement of different transportation strategies. States commitment to providing investment and awareness within the current system to enable the public to make informed decisions on how to travel in a way that has a healthy impact on our economy, environment, and society.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (1991, updated 2011)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implements Statewide Planning Goal 12 (Transportation) to provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economic transportation system and to coordinate the planning and development of the transportation system with land use development.</li> <li>Requires that local land use regulations be adopted to address pedestrian, bicycle, and transit access in Sections -0045(3) and -0045(4).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Oregon Public Transportation Plan (1997, update in progress)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides guidance for ODOT and public transportation agencies regarding the development of public transportation systems through goals, policies, and strategies.</li> <li>The updated OPTP establishes a new statewide vision for public transportation. The plan will help guide and support decisions by state, regional, and local government agencies.</li> <li>Updated OPTP policies and strategies to support local providers in collaboration and coordination to improve service, adopting new technologies, supporting environmental goals, and helping create a more seamless system for riders.</li> <li>The Plan is currently being updated and is expected to be adopted in 2018.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Oregon Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets, Rulemaking and Policies (2017)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sets a 20% greenhouse gas reduction target (to 75% below 1990 levels by 2050) for the Rogue Valley.</li> <li>Metropolitan areas are to evaluate what changes to local and regional land use and transportation plans and programs would be needed to meet the target by completing a Strategic Assessment (see "RVMPO Strategic Assessment Report" under Rogue Valley Area Plans &amp; Studies).</li> </ul>

**ROGUE VALLEY AREA PLANS & STUDIES**

<p><b>Interchange Area Management Plans (IAMPs)</b></p>	<p>An IAMP is an ODOT long-term transportation facility plan with a basic purpose of establishing an agreement with a local government on management of transportation facilities and land use actions within an interchange area.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 35 IAMP (Seven Oaks, 2013)</u>: Includes Jackson County action of consideration of transit demand management (TDM) strategies in the vicinity of the interchange.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 33 IAMP (Central Point, 2015)</u>: Includes transit-related TDM strategies, facility management measures, and transportation system management (TSM)</p>
---	---

<p><b>Interchange Area Management Plans (IAMPs), CONT.</b></p>	<p>measures. Recommendations include Rogue Valley Intelligent Transportation System (RVITS) projects related to transit/RVTD systems and TDM actions be implemented.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 30 IAMP (North Medford)</u>: Currently under development.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 27 IAMP (South Medford, 2007)</u>: TDM and TSM strategies noted as potential future management measures and are explained in depth in Appendix A.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 24 IAMP (Fern Valley, 2011)</u>: Section 2 (IAMP Measures) includes the following transit-related subsections: Motor Vehicle Trip Reduction Designs and Programs, Bus stop and Transfer Site Coordination, and Shared Park-and-Ride Lot Help.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 21 IAMP (Talent, 2016)</u>: Appendix E contains existing and future deficiencies (including bike/pedestrian/transit) and a multi-modal Level of Service (LOS) assessment.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 19 IAMP (North Ashland, 2011)</u>: Includes transit-related TDM strategies that may be employed and requires traffic engineering measures to consider transit movements. Recommends that RVITS projects related to transit/RVTD systems and TDM actions be implemented.</p> <p><u>I-5 Interchange 14 IAMP (Green Springs, 2013)</u>: Contains TDM strategies and discussion on implementation issues. Provides recommendations on traffic engineering measures and facility management systems related to transit.</p>
<p><b>2017-2042 Regional Transportation Plan</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A multi-modal plan designed to meet anticipated transportation needs over a 25-year planning horizon within the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) planning area.</li> <li>• Serves as a guide for management of existing facilities and implementation of future facilities and services. Includes transit-related strategies and improvements that could be implemented in the future.</li> <li>• Identifies all regional transportation actions anticipated to occur within the RVMPO planning area through 2042 and demonstrates fiscal constraint. RVTD financial assumptions are included.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RVMPO Alternative Measures (2002)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A set of seven measures, with 5-year benchmarks and 20-year targets, adopted by the RVMPO to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).</li> <li>• The measures are intended to reduce vehicle miles traveled. Three of the measures directly relate to transit by tracking mode share, residences within ¼ mile of transit service, and MPO federal funding to RVTD.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RVMPO Strategic Assessment Report (2016)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes transit by stressing mixed-use development and affordable transportation options instead of a single occupancy vehicle.</li> <li>• Identifies challenges facing RVTD such as funding streams and necessary service expansions, and provides “what if” scenarios for expanding per capita service without identifying funding.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RVMPO Freight Study (2012)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No mention of transit found, however, designated freight routes in the RVTD transit district boundaries are identified as Interstate 5, Highway 140, and Highway 62 between Interstate 5 and Highway 140. Recommends assigning</li> </ul>

<b>RVMPO Freight Study (2012), CONT.</b>	<p>higher priority to fund projects on freight routes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study contains a list of the region’s largest shippers based on number of employees, with Harry &amp; David Operations Corp, Amy’s Kitchen, and Boise Building Solutions listed as the top three, respectively.</li> </ul>
<b>RVMPO Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations (2016)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluates and identifies transportation needs and barriers for three identified Areas of Concern, based on concentrations of underserved populations and zero-car households.</li> <li>• Includes results of survey distributed to organizations and agencies that serve or represent target populations. Survey results show that top challenges and barriers are related to limited transit.</li> </ul>
<b>Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Problem Solving Plan (2012)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promotes urban land use and transportation planning in a regional context for the Greater Bear Creek Valley, while preserving the area’s agricultural resources to the greatest possible extent.</li> <li>• Includes the following “performance indicators” related to transit: minimum residential densities and percent new dwelling units in activity centers, percent of new employment in activity centers, and development of conceptual transportation and land use plans for urban reserve areas (including identifying future transit corridors).</li> </ul>
<b>Bear Creek Greenway Management Plan (2006)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides background and framework for the Bear Creek Greenway Joint Powers Agreement, outlining management of various aspects of the Greenway by local jurisdictions.</li> <li>• No mention of transit or transit-related connections are contained in this document.</li> </ul>
<b>Comprehensive Plans of Study Area Cities and County</b>	<p>A comprehensive plan is designed to guide the future actions of a community. In Oregon, a transportation system plan (TSP) is a state-required element of a city or county comprehensive plan. Therefore, the transportation policies of a jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan will be contained in its TSP. A review of relevant TSPs is provided in the next section of this table under, “Transportation System Plans (TSPs) of Study Area Cities and County.” A summary of each comprehensive plan (excluding the TSP element) is provided, below.</p> <p><u>Jackson County (2004)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Land use goals address and support transit service through proposed concentration of residential development where service by transit (among other things) can be provided.</li> <li>• Restricts outward expansion of urban areas to those areas serviced by transit.</li> <li>• Looks to transit as a major component of meeting Air Quality Conformity.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ashland (2016)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looks to transit as a system that would help increase the city’s carrying capacity; identifies the need for expanded transit service to ensure that residents and tourists can get around the city without the need for personal automobiles.</li> <li>• Housing Element policies include regulation of residential design that includes street design and construction standards that promote energy efficiency, air</li> </ul>

**Comprehensive Plans of Study Area Cities and County, CONT.**

quality, and minimal use of land. States that City shall incorporate bicycle and pedestrian traffic planning in street design.

- Economic Element policy states that development along Siskiyou Boulevard and Ashland Street will not be primarily automobile-oriented and will include attractive landscaping and designs that encourage walking, biking, and taking transit.

Central Point (update years by element)

- Regional Plan Element (2012) identifies locations of the eight urban reserve areas (future growth areas) and the planned uses for each. It also identifies existing mixed-use transit-oriented development (TOD) corridors/districts.
- Population and Demographics Element (2016) notes plans for development of the Eastside TOD and expansion of the urban growth boundary (UGB).
- Housing policies potentially related to transit include: supporting higher density residential development within or near downtown; requiring new vacant residential land use mix to support not less than 6.9 dwelling units per acre; encouraging mix of densities for larger developments and mixed uses at neighborhood level; and supporting minimum parking standards for multi-family developments served by transit.

Eagle Point (update years by element)

- Downtown Element (“Town Center Plan”) (2010) policies include: developing design standards and criteria that acknowledge the Town Center serving as a transit center and a TOD node; coordinating with RVTD to extend services to make Town Center the nodal urban service center for the Upper Rogue Region; and encouraging design of transit facilities to match the Town Center’s historic integrity.
- Regional Plan Element (2012) describes Urban Reserve Area 1a as providing primarily future light industrial employment with potential transit options; includes map of future growth areas (urban reserves) by level of priority.

Jacksonville (update years by element)

- Historic policy discourages concrete sidewalks but does allow for walkways of other materials. Contains sidewalk standards that do not appear to be ADA compliant. Identifies bus loading/parking on Main, Third, and North Oregon streets.
- Economic Element (2009) objectives promote transit-oriented development. It identifies an artesian district on north side of town with transit accessibility. A potential need is demonstrated for an additional 10 acres of commercial and industrial land beyond its current UGB.
- Livability policy states that where commercial and cottage industry areas are designated, workforce housing in a TOD format also needs to be provided.

Medford (update years by element)

- Economic Element states the following: the City is projected to need 708 gross acres of employment land outside of its 2008 UGB; inadequate capacity of transportation facilities (including transit) is significant constraint to

<p><b>Comprehensive Plans of Study Area Cities and County, CONT.</b></p>	<p>supplying employment lands, especially commercial; policy implementation item includes adding a Master Planned Employment or Business Park overlay district or zone designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element policy implementation measures include pursuing transit-supportive density near transit, upzoning to medium and high density residential, and developing special areas plans supporting high density and mixed-use.</li> <li>• General Land Use Plan Map locates urban reserve areas (areas of future growth).</li> <li>• Neighborhood Element, Southeast Plan area is identified as a transit-oriented district with targeted land use, zoning, density, and multi-modal transportation facilities. Contains goals and policies promoting multi-modal travel and notes that transit will be extended to the Southeast Commercial Center, as well as a major transit stop/station to be located at the Southeast Village Center TOD.</li> <li>• Regional Plan Element identifies Medford’s four TODs (Downtown, Southeast Area, West Main, and Delta Waters Road area) and describes future growth areas and planned land uses.</li> </ul> <p><u>Phoenix (update years by element)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing Element contains a goal for residential development within one-mile of transit to have safe bicycle and pedestrian connections.</li> <li>• City Center Element marketing and development strategies state that the successful city center will provide for alternate forms of transportation including bicycle, pedestrian, and covered bus stops. Includes goal of being “safe and attractive for pedestrians.”</li> <li>• City Center Element refers to a “transportation center” but does not define or describe such a center.</li> </ul> <p><u>Talent (update years by element)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies state to create a sense of place with the following strategies: “...promote use of paved pedestrian paths in areas where urban style curb/gutter/sidewalk development is inappropriate and by adoption of development standards allowing minimal street widths without compromising public safety, utilities, or public transportation.”</li> <li>• Livability policy objective is to support development of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities based on recommendations from the Talent TSP.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Transportation System Plans (TSPs) of Study Area Cities and County</b></p>	<p>A TSP is adopted as the refined transportation element of a city’s or county’s comprehensive plan. TSPs are developed to comply with state transportation planning regulations and to provide standards, projects, and programs that address local current and projected (20-year) transportation needs. TSPs also establish goals, objectives, and policies to coordinate and guide transportation and land use decision making. TSP policies may be duplicated in the comprehensive plan or may complement, supersede, or be superseded by transportation policies in the comprehensive plan. Content relevant to transit from applicable city and county TSPs is identified below.</p>

<p><b>Transportation System Plans (TSPs) of Study Area Cities and County, CONT.</b></p>	<p><u>Jackson County TSP (2017)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains Transit System Policies and Transit Component Policies sections under Integration and Modal Components goals. Also includes transit-related policies, generally those that promote better access to transit, under the following sections: General Policies and Transportation and Land Use Coordination Polices.</li> <li>• Includes a Public Transportation Plan section; lists county roadway segments currently served by transit where transit enhancements could be implemented.</li> <li>• Contains roadway and bike/pedestrian project lists; no transit specific list.</li> </ul> <p><u>Ashland TSP (2012)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains policies, projects, programs, and studies to improve bike/pedestrian facilities and enhance transit; Goals 1, 3, and 4 contain objectives specific to transit, such as providing modal equity, establishing multi-modal targets and land use patterns that promote transit use, and development of alternative mobility standards that allow for planned congestion.</li> <li>• Key transportation connections sought specifically at Railroad District and Croman Mill mixed use areas to facilitate development.</li> <li>• Notes only arterial functional classification as appropriate for transit; transit stop improvement deficiencies; existing bike and pedestrian facilities; history of transit ridership; pedestrian risk analysis; bicycle volumes/collisions; population and job forecast/employment growth; bike, pedestrian, and transit LOS with opportunities to improve; and future funding sources for transit.</li> <li>• The Transit Plan section includes policies to enhance transit amenities, service, and usage; contains planned transit service map. The Transit Service Program section provides guidance on transit priorities and how to allocate funds.</li> </ul> <p><u>Central Point TSP (2008)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains transit-related goals, objectives and policies in the following sections: Land Use &amp; Transportation Planning (TOD best practices), Transportation Management (TDM and TSM), Street System (multi-modal accommodation), Bicycle and Pedestrian System (bike racks at stops/on busses, pedestrian safety improvements), and Public Transit System (transit accessibility).</li> <li>• Recommends TDM and parking strategies supportive of transit; lists transit/pedestrian-related street system projects; and prioritizes infill of pedestrian connections with transit.</li> <li>• Includes transit priorities, immediate needs, and future needs for Central Point. Lists strategies to improve transit service such as site plan standards to encourage TODs, code amendments, amenities, sidewalks, crossings, ADA improvements, and wayfinding.</li> </ul> <p><u>Eagle Point TSP (2010)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies inclusion in a transit service district or contract for services as a need and a goal.</li> <li>• Transit and Alternative Transportation Services section contains the goal of accessible transit and alternative transportation services to Eagle Point. Policies</li> </ul>
---	---

<p><b>Transportation System Plans (TSPs) of Study Area Cities and County, CONT.</b></p>	<p>of this goal include investigating options to annex into the RVTD, provide park-and-ride facilities, and implement TDM programs and dial-a-ride services.</p> <p><u>Jacksonville TSP (2009)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains transit-related goals and policies, such as supporting increased travel options, implementing TDM measures, and expanding Gateway TOD as UGB expands.</li> <li>• Identifies Route 30 as smallest ridership of all routes; contains a mode-loss scenario considering impacts of loss of transit service, and a TDM and transit alternative.</li> <li>• Identifies feasibility study for Rogue River Valley Railway (bike/ped/trolley corridor) as high priority; indicates need for alternative travel options between communities due to tourism and growth projections.</li> <li>• Includes discussion on parking in Medford and utilizing RVTD for service during BRITT festivals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Medford TSP (Update in progress; Draft Documents, 2017/2018)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summary of transit-related goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Goal 1 includes objectives and actions related to vulnerable citizens mobility impediments and participation in RVTD programs;</li> <li>○ Goal 2 includes objectives and action items related to new street design standards for all-modes and improved connections with transit;</li> <li>○ Goal 3 includes a transit signal priority action item and RVTD partnership to maximize investments;</li> <li>○ Goal 5 action item states increasing transit service in lieu of increasing roadway capacity, and an objective related to completing TODs and TOD plans; and</li> <li>○ Goal 6 includes actions for City to partner with employers to implement TDM strategies and to work with RVTD to identify transit expansion.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Project list contains those potentially related to transit, which include a significant number of urban upgrade projects, new roadways, and a sidewalk infill program. Bus rapid transit and transit service improvement projects listed under I-5 Rogue Valley Corridor Plan. Pedestrian facilities map provides sidewalk gaps (for infill projects) relative to transit routes.</li> <li>• Contains a transit plan providing direction on planning for more transit-supportive areas, coordinating with RVTD, and improving transit operations and access to transit.</li> </ul> <p><u>Phoenix TSP (2016)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains an OR 99 multi-modal assessment (existing conditions) and a multi-modal analysis to reflect planned and funded roadway improvements on OR 99 to accommodate bike/pedestrian/transit.</li> <li>• Summary of deficiencies notes lack of bike, pedestrian and transit facilities along OR 99 corridor; includes new transit system alternatives for consideration to address deficiencies.</li> <li>• Contains list of funded and unfunded transit (service/TDM/amenities related) and pedestrian projects.</li> </ul>
---	---



<p><b>Transportation System Plans (TSPs) of Study Area Cities and County, CONT.</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes draft proposed amendments to the City of Phoenix Land Development Code, one of which includes changes to notification process (to RVTD) for land use applications that affect transportation facilities.</li> </ul> <p><u>Talent TSP (2015)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains transit-specific goal with objectives that include accessible service and an increase in ridership in Talent.</li> <li>Lack of transit amenities and sidewalks/crossings included as identified needs.</li> <li>Contains ‘complete street’ project list and ‘development driven’ project list that includes new roadways.</li> <li>Transit System Plan proposes options such as route service adjustments, city circulator, feeder service, and adding schedule information; notes pursuit of transit signal priority on Hwy 99.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Hwy 99 Corridor Study (2014)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan area includes South Medford to North Ashland.</li> <li>Identifies strategies to preserve and improve highway safety and capacity, and incorporates a number of multi-modal improvements (bike/pedestrian, not transit specific).</li> <li>Includes objectives to support and expand transit, and includes pedestrian projects specific to transit users.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Urban Reserve Concept Plans (URCPs)</b></p>	<p>The Greater Bear Creek Regional Plan requires that before any portion of an urban reserve area can be incorporated into a city’s UGB, the city must prepare a Conceptual Land Use Plan and Conceptual Transportation Plan identifying land uses, residential densities, arterials, transit corridors, bike/pedestrian pathways, and other regional mobility projects. To date, seven URCPs have been completed.</p> <p><u>Central Point URCPs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CP-5A and CP-6A (2018) land use is primarily designated Residential with two conceptual activity centers proposed at Taylor Road and Scenic Avenue. No new arterials, however realignment and extension of existing collectors are noted. No reference to transit is noted.</li> <li>CP-1B (2015) land use designation is entirely Employment with the intent to develop as a regionally significant employment hub. No new arterials proposed; no mention of transit in this plan.</li> </ul> <p><u>Phoenix URCPs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PH-5 (2016) dominant land use designation is Employment, with a smaller percentage of land designated for various densities of Residential. No new arterials are proposed.</li> <li>The PH-10 (2016) dominant land use designation is Residential. No new arterials are proposed. RVTD intends to construct a transit hub in the commercial portion of PH-10.</li> </ul> <p><u>Medford URCP:</u> The Urban Growth Boundary Amendment Map (2016) serves as the City’s URCP for each of its nine urban reserve areas. The URCP map and the City’s updated Functional Classification Map were used to identify land uses and future</p>

<p><b>Urban Reserve Concept Plans (URCPs), CONT.</b></p>	<p>arterials in the urban reserve areas. No references to transit.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="435 241 1401 613"> <thead> <tr> <th>UR Area</th> <th>Future Arterials</th> <th>Commercial</th> <th>Industrial</th> <th>Residential</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>MD-1</td> <td>No</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-2</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-3</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-4</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-5</td> <td>Yes</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-6</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-7</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-8</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>MD-9</td> <td>No</td> <td>X</td> <td>-</td> <td>X</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Talent URCPs:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TA-4 (2015) is restricted to Industrial zoning and does not identify any future regionally significant arterials or new transit corridors.</li> <li>• TA-5 (2015) land use designations primarily include Residential (high and medium density) and Employment. No future arterials or new transit corridors are identified.</li> </ul>	UR Area	Future Arterials	Commercial	Industrial	Residential	MD-1	No	-	-	-	MD-2	No	X	X	X	MD-3	No	X	-	X	MD-4	No	X	-	X	MD-5	Yes	X	X	X	MD-6	No	X	X	-	MD-7	No	X	-	-	MD-8	No	X	-	-	MD-9	No	X	-	X
UR Area	Future Arterials	Commercial	Industrial	Residential																																															
MD-1	No	-	-	-																																															
MD-2	No	X	X	X																																															
MD-3	No	X	-	X																																															
MD-4	No	X	-	X																																															
MD-5	Yes	X	X	X																																															
MD-6	No	X	X	-																																															
MD-7	No	X	-	-																																															
MD-8	No	X	-	-																																															
MD-9	No	X	-	X																																															
<p><b>Crater Lake Hwy Corridor Study (1997)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains the 20-year corridor strategy for the operation, preservation, and enhancement of transportation facilities within the Medford to Klamath Falls to California corridor.</li> <li>• Includes corridor overview of transit, policy analysis related to transit, and corridor strategies for transit such as increasing service and providing amenities.</li> </ul>																																																		
<p><b>United Way State of Poverty Report (2013)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pacific NW report that provides information to understand struggles of working households that do not earn enough to afford basic necessities (“ALICE”).</li> <li>• In Jackson County in 2013, 45% of households lived under ALICE and poverty thresholds.</li> <li>• Includes transportation challenges: unreliability, no insurance, long commute burden, no car.</li> </ul>																																																		
<p><b>2017 – 2021 United We Ride Plan</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seven categories of gaps in transportation service are identified: spatial and temporal gaps in the RVTD system; transit customer service and safety gaps; transit affordability issues for certain populations; difficulty understanding transit schedules; lack of specialized transportation options; and land use/built environment service gaps.</li> <li>• Focus group findings are concentrated on transportation barriers related to RVTD services, volunteer drivers, and lack of shuttles for students and for regular community events.</li> </ul>																																																		
<p><b>Other Plans</b></p>	<p><u>Ashland Railroad Property Master Plan (2001)</u> – A land use and transportation plan for undeveloped acreage centrally located in Ashland. Objectives include supporting transit service to this area.</p>																																																		

<p><b>Other Plans, CONT.</b></p>	<p><u>Transit Triangle Project</u> – A project currently underway to develop an infill strategy surrounding a triangle-shaped portion of the existing RVTB Route 10 line at Ashland Street, Tolman Creek Road, and Siskiyou Boulevard.</p> <p><u>Normal Avenue Area Plan (2015)</u> – A land use and transportation plan for 94 acres outside Ashland city limits, yet within the UGB. Supports land use development patterns increased that support transit service.</p>
<p><b>RVTB PLANS &amp; STUDIES</b></p>	
<p><b>RVTB Long Range Plan, 2007-2017 Hwy 62 Transit Element</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A multi-modal document focused on enhancing ridership through appropriate best practices; designed to address the community’s public transportation needs with the realization that there will be revenue constraints to be addressed throughout the Plan’s implementation.</li> <li>• Includes priorities, immediate needs, and future needs for each city in the RVTB service area. Provides revenue and service expansion scenarios.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2014 Onboard Passenger Survey</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides findings of one-week passenger survey to examine rider demographics and travel behavior. Results were/are used in route planning, modeling, and to inform decisions regarding service.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2011 District Boundary Assessment</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A study that looked at areas on the fringes of the district boundary that have become urbanized and could support transit services; Eagle Point was identified.</li> </ul>
<p><b>High Capacity Transit Community Engagement Project (2014)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes research and public engagement activities used to solicit feedback from stakeholders and the community regarding perceptions and sentiment towards RVTB, and potential transit enhancements (including bus rapid transit) in the Rogue Valley.</li> <li>• Findings include improving reliability, amenities, and expanding service hours; collaboration with external partners and better integration with local plans.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RVTB Bus Stop Facilities Design Guide (2011)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains policies for stop amenities, an existing conditions report, and design guidelines for various types of bus stops, an inter-agency framework for how bus stops are improved, and a budget and timeline for making bus stop improvements.</li> <li>• Includes a reference on the varying levels of authority RVTB has in each city.</li> </ul>
<p><b>RVTB Hazard and Security Plan (2015)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes RVTB’s strategies and procedures for maintaining a safe and secure environment for passengers, employees/volunteers, and the surrounding community.</li> </ul>
<p><b>2017 – 2021 RVTB Title VI Program</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describes how RVTB can and has taken steps to ensure that persons are not discriminated against, excluded from participation in, or denied benefits of RVTB programs and services.</li> <li>• Includes a Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Four Factor Analysis to determine appropriate actions on the part of RVTB in order to provide “meaningful access.”</li> </ul>