
AGENDA

**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee**



Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2014
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Location: Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG 155 N. 1st Street, Central Point
Transit: served by RVTD Route #40
Phone : Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360
RVMPO website : www.rvmppo.org

1. **Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda** **Mike Quilty, Chair**
2. **Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1)**..... **Chair**
3. **Public Comment, Items not on the Agenda** **Chair**
(Comments on Agenda Items allowed during discussion of each item)

Information Item:

4. **Regional Significance Screening Criteria** **Jonathan David**

Background: The regional significance screening criteria is a new document prepared by the RVMPO to address screening of non-exempt projects within the carbon monoxide (CO) boundary. It is a tool to assist the Interagency Consultation Group in determining whether a roadway facility in the RVMPO planning area is “Regionally Significant” with respect to the air quality conformity requirements found in the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93).

Attachment: #2 – Screening Criteria Document

Public Hearing #1:

5. **RVMPO Environmental Justice and Title VI Plan** **Andrea Napoli**

Background: The plan has been updated from its 2010 version which utilized 2000 Census data. The focus of the update includes a revised demographic profile based on 2010 Census and 2007-2011 American Community Survey data.

Attachments: #3 - Memo, Environmental Justice and Title VI Plan (separate attachment)

Action Requested: Consider approval and adoption of the plan.

Public Hearing #2:

6. Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD), and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments.....Dan Moore

Background: This item addresses three project programming decisions: Adoption of the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program; amendments to the 2013-38 RTP and adoption of the 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination.

Attachments: #4 - Memo, RTP Amendments

- MTIP 2015-2018 (available on link below)
[http://www.rvmppo.org/SIB/files/RVMPO%202015-18mtip_Final\(1\).pdf](http://www.rvmppo.org/SIB/files/RVMPO%202015-18mtip_Final(1).pdf)
- 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination (available on link below)
[http://www.rvmppo.org/SIB/files/FinalRevised2014%20AQCD_Draft-8-19-14\(1\).pdf](http://www.rvmppo.org/SIB/files/FinalRevised2014%20AQCD_Draft-8-19-14(1).pdf)

Action Requested: Consider approval of TIP, AQCD and RTP amendments

7. RVMPO Planning Update..... Jonathan David

8. Public Comment.....Chair

9. Other Business / Local BusinessChair

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.

10. AdjournmentChair

The next MPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 23 at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

- The next MPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 16 at 5:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next MPO TAC meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 10 at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT SUE CASAVAN, 541-423-1360. REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE NEED FOR ACCOMMODATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING (48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE IS PREFERABLE) WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.

**SUMMARY MINUTES
ROGUE VALLEY MPO POLICY COMMITTEE
JULY 22, 2014**



The following attended:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>	<u>PHONE</u>
Al Densmore, Vice Chairman	City of Medford	282-1415
Art Anderson	ODOT	774-6353
Bill Cecil	City of Talent	535-1566
Bruce Sophie	City of Phoenix	535-1634
Don Skundrick	Jackson County	774-6118
Julie Brown	RVTD	608-2143
Mike Quilty, Chairman	City of Central Point	664-7907
Rich Rosenthal (Mike Faught)	City of Ashland	941-1494
Ruth Jenks	City of Eagle Point	826-4212
<u>Staff</u>		
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Jonathan David	RVCOG	
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Bunny Lincoln	RVCOG	944-2446
Mike Cavallero	RVCOG	

Others Present

Ian Horlacher, Mike Kuntz, Alex Georgevitch, Mike Montero, Paige Townsend, Dan Bunn.

1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda -

Chairman Mike Quilty called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. Introductions followed.

2. Review / Approve Minutes -

The Chairman asked if there were any additions or corrections to the June meeting minutes.

On a motion by Bruce Sophie, seconded by Ruth Jenks, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.

3. Public Comment -

None.

Public Hearing

4. 2012-2015 TIP amendment

The Chair read the public hearing procedure for the hearing.

Andrea Napoli explained that ODOT needed to have the Interstate 5, Exit 35 to Blackwell Road, project entered into the 2015 TIP as a TIP (not RTP) amendment in order to deliver the project on time (2017). The amendment will simply move \$410,000 from one fund into another.

The Chair opened public testimony.

In support: None received
In opposition: None received

Chair closed the public hearing.

Art Anderson made a motion to approve the proposed 2012-2015 TIP amendment, moving the Highway 140 engineering project into the TIP. The motion was seconded by Don Skundrick.

Art Anderson pointed out that the OTC must still approve the amendment.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. Air Quality Conformity Determination –

Jonathan David explained Sierra Research (using the MOVES model) found that the CO budget was exceeded by 2-3 times the allowed limits. This scenario was created because “cold starts” had never been factored in as part of previous modeling exercises. He then went on to outline the recent COG efforts to resolve this situation through interagency consultations. The Governor’s office and the City of Medford were involved as well. The result of this effort was a determination by the consultants that the various transportation projects under scrutiny represented no regional CO significance in terms of negative impacts.

Dan Moore presented additional information on the CO modeling and budget, stipulating that the consultant group concurred that the existing budget was inadequate. ODOT officials identified that the projects were not that long in length, and, therefore, not regionally significant in terms of negative CO impacts. It was suggested that Staff research how other MPOs use adopted criteria and screening processes for this type of situation. After doing so, Staff found that many MPOs use such a screening process, and created draft screening criteria for the RVMPO.

The ODOT Transportation Planning Analysis Unit helped Staff evaluate the ADT and VMT data for each of the projects. With the interagency consultants’ concurrence that the projects within the CO boundary are not regionally significant, they can move into the 2015-18 TIP. Based upon this determination, CO modeling is not required.

Jonathan David shared that the DEQ and EPA are on board with proactive, forward movement on this issue. With the anticipated adoption of a Limited Maintenance Plan (LMP) next year, no

further modeling will be required. Members discussed the benefit of further involving the governor's office, and other congressional delegations, in this issue. They also talked about the definitions of a "regionally significant" project. Al Densmore thanked the COG Staff, on Medford's behalf, for their diligence on resolving this issue in such a timely manner.

On a motion by Al Densmore moved, seconded by Mike Faught the Committee recommended tentative approval of the regionally significant project criteria. Final approval will be subject to TAC review, with the matter returning to the Policy Committee in August for final approval.

Mike Cavallero commented that this "bad data" scenario had occurred elsewhere, in other regions. No current provisions are available for updating CO budgets. Members agreed that it would be appropriate to notice the State delegation about this issue, with Staff requested to draft a letter accordingly.

The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

6. MPO Planning Update –

- Jonathan David will be making Strategic Assessment (with ODOT and DLCD) presentations to the TAC and PAC in October. The Policy Committee will be invited to participate as well.

7. Public/Audience Comment

Ian Horlacher shared that ODOT will be holding a Hwy. 99 Corridor Open House on July 24th. Alex Georgevitch thanked Staff for their efforts on CO emissions issue on behalf of Medford and the entire MPO. A \$10 million loan has been approved for the Foothills Road improvements, with construction expected to begin in 2017, and completion expected in 2018. Mike Montero shared that Hwy. 99 ROW reservations are being identified and worked on by the various jurisdictions and agencies involved.

Members discussed Highway 62 – Phase #2 timing, and future JACO Foothills improvements. Al Densmore shared information about the Oregon Transportation Forum, and frustrations surrounding federal transportation funding. States are beginning to consider budgeting outside federal processes to assure that their infrastructure is preserved. Little federal change is expected at least until after the 2106 elections.

Al Densmore will attend the September RVACT for Mike Quilty. Chairman Quilty reported on OTC activities, Connect Oregon 5, and local projects.

8. Other Business / Local Business

The next meeting will be held on August 26th @ 2:00 PM.

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

RVMPO Regional Significance Screening Criteria

August 13, 2014

Background

This document is intended to serve as a tool for assisting with determining whether a roadway facility in the RVMPO planning area is “Regionally Significant” with respect to the air quality conformity requirements found in the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 93). The purpose is to provide pertinent information to the Interagency Consultation Group (IACG) on the characteristics that would normally be used to consider the regional significance of a transportation project and in particular one that is on a roadway facility classified as a Minor Arterial or lower. The IACG will make the final determination of regional significance on a case-by-case basis as needed, and additional criteria beyond what is being presented in this document may be used at the IACG’s discretion.

The RVMPO shall provide initial determinations regarding exemption and significance status for each project to the interagency consultation group (IACG) for review and comment. Following consultation, the RVMPO shall make a final determination for the project pool.

Federal Conformity Rule Definition of Regional Significance

Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than an exempt project) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals themselves) and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area’s transportation network, including at a minimum all principal arterial highways and all fixed guide way transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel.

Examples of Regionally-Significant Projects

Below are examples of projects which must be included in the network modeling for the regional emissions analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), and amendments to RTP and TIP.

- **Interstates and Expressways**
 - New segment
 - Added through lane
 - Continuous auxiliary lane
 - New interchange
- **Other Principal Arterial**
 - New segment
 - Added through lane
 - Continuous auxiliary lane
 - New interchange
- **Rail and Fixed Guide-Way Transit**
- **Major expansion of fixed rail or fixed guide-way system**

Examples of Non-Exempt Projects that are not Regionally Significant

- Addition of thru traffic lanes on arterial roads that do not extend the full distance between major intersections
- Addition of thru traffic lanes on roads that are not functionally classified as an arterial or higher and do not serve regional transportation needs
- New collector roads that serve minor developments
- New or expanded park-and-ride lots that do not serve regional transportation needs
- New collector road overpasses

Regional Significance Screening Criteria

The proposed screening process is in two parts. Part 1 includes seven questions that should be addressed prior as part of the consultation process. Part 2 is applying the threshold criteria in Table 1(below) to determine if the project is regionally-significant, non-regionally significant, or requires consultation.

Part 1 – Initial Project Review

- 1.) What are the Exempt status and Functional Classification of the roadway project?
 - A non-exempt project on a roadway facility classified as an Other Principal Arterial¹ or higher, and in some cases minor arterials will generally be considered Regionally Significant.
 - A project determined to be Exempt under 40 CFR 93.126 or 93.127 (see Appendix A) will generally be considered Non-Regionally Significant unless the IACG group determines that it will have regional impacts for any reason.
- 2.) Is the facility either included in the Regional Travel Demand Forecasting Model, or would it be if it does not currently exist?
 - It is the practice of the RVMPO to include most “major” roadways (most major collectors and above) in order to improve model performance so if a roadway is not modeled it can generally be considered to be Non-Regionally Significant.
- 3.) Does the facility provide direct connection between two roadways classified as a Principal Arterial or higher?

¹ Other Principal Arterials serve major centers of metropolitan areas, provide a high degree of mobility and can also provide mobility through rural areas. Unlike their access-controlled counterparts, abutting land uses can be served directly. Forms of access for Other Principal Arterial roadways include driveways to specific parcels and at-grade intersections with other roadways. For the most part, roadways that fall into the top three functional classification categories (Interstate, Other Freeways & Expressways and Other Principal Arterials) provide similar service in both urban and rural areas. The primary difference is that there are usually multiple Arterial routes serving a particular urban area, radiating out from the urban center to serve the surrounding region. In contrast, an expanse of a rural area of equal size would be served by a single Arterial. (FHWA: *Highway Functional Classification Concepts, Criteria and Procedures*).

- Direct connections between major principal arterials and in particular connections to the Interstate can generally be considered Regionally Significant.

4.) Does the facility provide the primary regional connectivity to a “Major Activity Center”?

- This is a criterion listed in the federal Regional Significance definition; however there can be different interpretations as to what constitutes a major activity center. Below is a list of general types of major activity centers, with specific locations to be determined on a case-by-case basis:
 - Major Hospitals and Regional Medical Centers
 - Central Business Districts of cities
 - Major Regional Retail Centers and Malls
 - Colleges and Universities
 - Tourist Destinations
 - Airports
 - Freight Terminals and Intermodal Transfer Centers
 - Sports Complexes

5.) Does the project add significant vehicular capacity?

- A project adding general purpose through lanes will typically be more significant than one that is adding “auxiliary” lanes or a continuous center turn lane or other projects that do not add significant roadway capacity.

6.) What is the length of the roadway segment being improved and what is the overall corridor length?

- Projects extending (or completing) long sections (typically greater than 1 mile) will tend to be more regionally significant.
- If the corridor is lengthy and there is an absence of other principal arterials in the vicinity then the roadway will tend to be more regionally significant.

7.) What is the current Average Daily Traffic of the roadway segment?

This is less important in determining Regional Significance although it will provide additional information to be considered along with the above criteria. Obviously high traffic segments will tend to be more correlated with the increased regional significance of a roadway.

New segments or added through lanes on arterials that are also associated with large land development projects may need AQ consultation even if the project is below the threshold in the table. Land development projects can be regionally significant when they have the potential to generate many trips or vehicle-miles of travel. Such developments are incorporated into the regional model during the update of socioeconomic forecasts, at the beginning of the update cycle for a new regional transportation plan.

TABLE 1	
RVMPO Thresholds of Regional-Significance for Transportation Projects	
Criteria A	
Interstate and Expressways	
Criteria A-1 Expansion Type	Criteria A-2 Threshold
a. New Segment	a. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
b. Added Through Lanes	b. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
c. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	c. > ¼ mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
d. New Interchanges	d. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
e. Modification of Existing Interchanges	e. AQ Consultation Required
Criteria B	
Other Principal Arterials	
Criteria B-1 Expansion Type	Criteria B-2 Threshold
a. New Segment	a. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
b. Added Through Lanes	b. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
c. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	c. > 1 mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
d. New Interchanges	d. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
e. Modification of Existing Interchanges	e. AQ Consultation Required
f. Separation of existing railroad grade crossings	f. Not regionally significant
Criteria C	
Minor Arterials	
Criteria C-1 Expansion Type	Criteria C-2 Threshold
a. New Segment	a. ¾ to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required
b. New Segment	b. > 1 mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
c. Added Through Lanes	c. ¾ to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required
d. Added Through Lanes	d. > 1 mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
e. Continuous Auxiliary Lanes	e. > 1 mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
f. Separation of existing railroad grade crossings	f. Not regionally significant
Criteria D	
Rail and Fixed Guide-way Transit	
Criteria D-1 Expansion Type	Criteria D-2 Threshold
a. New Route or Service	a. No Minimum (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
b. Route Extension with Station	b. > 1 mile from current terminus (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
c. Added track or guide-way capacity	c. > 1 mile (<i>regionally-significant</i>)
d. New Intermediate Station	d. AQ Consultation Required
Criteria E	
Bus and Demand Response Transit	
Criteria E-1 Expansion Type	Criteria E-2 Threshold
a. New Fixed Route	a. AQ Consultation Required
b. New Demand Response Service	b. Not Regionally Significant
c. Added Service to existing	c. Not Regionally Significant

Appendix A

40 CFR 93.126 and 93.127

§ 93.126 Exempt projects.

Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in table 2 of this section are exempt from the requirement to determine conformity. Such projects may proceed toward implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed in table 2 of this section is not exempt if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see § 93.105(c)(1)(iii)), the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason. States and MPOs must ensure that exempt projects do not interfere with TCM implementation. Table 2 follows:

TABLE 2—EXEMPT PROJECTS

Safety

Railroad/highway crossing.

Projects that correct, improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature.

Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.

Shoulder improvements.

Increasing sight distance.

Highway Safety Improvement Program implementation.

Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.

Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.

Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.

Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.

Pavement marking.

Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125).

Fencing.

Skid treatments.

Safety roadside rest areas.

Adding medians.

Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.

Lighting improvements.

Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).

Emergency truck pullovers.

Mass Transit

Operating assistance to transit agencies.

Purchase of support vehicles.

Rehabilitation of transit vehicles ¹.

Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities.

Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.).

Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems.

Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks.

Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures).

Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way.

Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet ¹.

Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.

Air Quality

Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion activities at current levels.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Other

Specific activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as:

Planning and technical studies.

Grants for training and research programs.

Planning activities conducted pursuant to titles 23 and 49 U.S.C.

Federal-aid systems revisions.

Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.

Noise attenuation.

Emergency or hardship advance land acquisitions (23 CFR 710.503).

Acquisition of scenic easements.

Plantings, landscaping, etc.

Sign removal.

Directional and informational signs.

Transportation enhancement activities (except rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities).

Repair of damage caused by natural disasters, civil unrest, or terrorist acts, except projects involving substantial functional, locational or capacity changes.

NOTE: ¹ In PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} nonattainment or maintenance areas, such projects are exempt only if they are in compliance with control measures in the applicable implementation plan.

[62 FR 43801, Aug. 15, 1997, as amended at 69 FR 40081, July 1, 2004; 71 FR 12510, Mar. 10, 2006; 73 FR 4441, Jan. 24, 2008]

§ 93.127 Projects exempt from regional emissions analyses.

Notwithstanding the other requirements of this subpart, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 3 of this section are exempt from regional emissions analysis requirements. The local effects of these projects with respect to CO concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required prior to making a project-level conformity determination. The local effects of projects with respect to PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations must be considered and a hot-spot analysis performed prior to making a project-level conformity determination, if a project in Table 3 also meets the criteria in § 93.123(b)(1). These projects may then proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP. A particular action of the type listed in Table 3 of this section is not exempt from regional emissions analysis if the MPO in consultation with other agencies (see § 93.105(c)(1)(iii)), the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potential regional impacts for any reason. Table 3 follows:

TABLE 3—PROJECTS EXEMPT FROM REGIONAL EMISSIONS ANALYSES

Intersection channelization projects.

Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections.

Interchange reconfiguration projects.

Changes in vertical and horizontal alignment.

Truck size and weight inspection stations.

Bus terminals and transfer points.

[58 FR 62235, Nov. 24, 1993, as amended at 71 FR 12511, Mar. 10, 2006]



**Rogue Valley
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Regional Transportation Planning

*Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation*

DATE: August 18, 2014

TO: RVMPO Policy Committee

FROM: Andrea Napoli, Associate Planner

SUBJECT: Environmental Justice and Title VI Plan Update

The Policy Committee is being asked to review and approve the RVMPO Environmental Justice and Title VI Plan update.

Both ODOT and FHWA have been consulted with during the development of the update, the PAC has reviewed the update with one comment submitted, and the TAC has recommended approval of the draft plan update. The public comment period and public hearing were advertised in the Medford Tribune on Sunday, July 6th, with the draft plan having been made available on the RVMPO website (www.rvmppo.org) since July 3rd.

The push behind this plan update was driven by the need to update the mapping of environmental justice populations within the RVMPO area. The last update of the plan was in 2010 using 2000 Census data. New mapping uses both 2010 Census and 2007-2011 American Community Survey data.

We map four environmental justice populations: 1) Low-Income, 2) Senior, 3) Minority, 4) Limited English Proficiency (LEP).

There are **four changes** in regards to the new mapping contained in this plan:

1. Data Source:

American Community Survey (ACS) data is now used for mapping LEP and low-income populations, and 2010 Census data is used for senior and minority populations. This is because the decadal Census no longer collects socio-economic information; the American Community Survey now does. The ACS and 2010 Census are different in that the ACS conducts surveys every few months, rather than once every 10-years.

2. Geography:

The smallest geography available with the most current data was used. Since LEP and low-income population data now come from the ACS, and the ACS is fairly new with limited sample sizes, ACS data at the smaller block group level for the RVMPO area is not yet available. Therefore, LEP and low-income populations must be mapped at the larger census tract level. Senior and minority populations, however, continue to be mapped at the smaller block group level.

3. Population Identification:

The mapping now identifies areas within the MPO that have population concentrations higher than *regional* averages, rather than *national* averages, as previously used. Using regional averages produces a more functional map that better depicts local conditions.

4. Minority Populations:

Previously we had mapped Native Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Hispanic populations within the MPO. We now have a single “minority” map that identifies concentrations of those that did not identify themselves as “white alone” during the 2010 Census. A table which breaks down races within the minority category has also been included.

Other Areas of the Document...

In addition to the new mapping, other areas of the document have been updated. Similar to the recent Public Participation Plan update, changes to the document have been identified as “basic” (untracked) and “more substantial”, which have been tracked in red in the draft document.

Basic Changes – Untracked

- Changes to the general layout and formatting of the document
- Minor language revisions, moving information within the document, deleting repetitiveness
- Putting text into tables, figures, and maps

More Substantial Changes – Tracked in Red

- Include an outline of ODOT Title VI requirements for MPO’s (pg. 6 & 20)
- Included information on federally issued memorandums for MPO specific guidance on how to comply with Title VI requirements (pg. 8)
- Added information regarding the update of the Public Participation Plan (pg. 19)
- Updated information on how EJ maps are used in the STP/CMAQ project evaluation process (pg. 20)



**Rogue Valley
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Regional Transportation Planning

Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation

DATE: August 20, 2014
TO: RVMPO Policy Committee
FROM: Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator
SUBJECT: 2015-18 TIP, RTP Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination

The Policy Committee is conducting a public hearing on three related items, as identified below. Given the linked nature of these items, staff suggests conducting a single hearing, asking for testimony on each item:

1. **2015-2018 TIP:** draft project lists were developed in consultation with jurisdictions. Draft TIP was distributed by email to; posted online and advertised July 26, 2014. See draft document at: [http://www.rvmpo.org/SIB/files/RVMPO%202015-18mtip_Final\(1\).pdf](http://www.rvmpo.org/SIB/files/RVMPO%202015-18mtip_Final(1).pdf)
2. **2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination:** RVMPO presents all newly funded projects in the program of projects. A PM₁₀ emissions analysis was completed to demonstrate conformity. CO analysis was not done due to new projects within the CO area not being regionally-significant. The draft AQCD was distributed by email to the air quality interagency consultation group (IACG) on July 29, 2014; posted online and advertised July 29, 2014. See document at: [http://www.rvmpo.org/SIB/files/FinalRevised2014%20AQCD_Draft-8-19-14\(1\).pdf](http://www.rvmpo.org/SIB/files/FinalRevised2014%20AQCD_Draft-8-19-14(1).pdf)
3. **Amendments to 2013-2038 RTP:** making it consistent with the draft 2018 TIP by adding, moving and deleting projects.

Advisory Committee Recommendations

The Technical Advisory Committee and Public Advisory Council, consistent with the RVMPO's Public Participation Plan, have discussed these items in public, advertised meetings and recommend approval of all three items.

2015-2018 TIP, RTP Amendments, and Air Quality Conformity Determination

The 30-day public comment period of the draft TIP, RTP amendment and AQCD began July 26, 2014. The documents and the August 26, 2014 public hearing have been noticed in the Mail Tribune. Interagency consultation is continuing on the AQCD. The Policy Committee is being asked to adopt both documents and RTP amendments.

Amendments to 2013-2038 RTP

Several new projects are being included in the RTP. Some projects are moving from long and medium range to short range. Projects that have been completed are being removed from the RTP. The project list with the proposed changes is below

2012-2015 MTIP and Air Quality Conformity Determination

The 30-day public comment period of the draft MTIP and AQCD began July 26, 2014. The documents and the August 26, 2014 public hearing have been noticed in the Mail Tribune. Interagency consultation was held, and agency partners – Environmental Protection Agency, Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality and ODOT – have agreed on the adequacy of the draft 2014 AQCD. The synopsis from the draft 2014 AQCD is attached. Adoption resolutions for both documents also are attached.

The 2018 MTIP programs \$266,665,459 in federal, state and local funds for transportation system improvements. The draft MITP includes a comparison of funding levels from previous MTIPs broken down by jurisdiction, descriptions of funding sources, information on the amendment process in addition to the list of projects and project map. Also, as an appendix, the MTIP reports the status of all projects from the current MTIP—whether they've been completed or slipped to the new MTIP.

After Policy Committee adoption by resolution of the 2018 MTIP and 2014 AQCD, the project list is submitted to ODOT for inclusion in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. The STIP and MTIPs from all six Oregon MPOs are submitted to the governor for signature. Once signed, USDOT will consult with the Environmental Protection Agency and consider making air quality conformity determinations as necessary. For RVMPO, official approval of the MTIP occurs when USDOT makes the conformity determination.

Amend 2013-2038 RTP

The 2018 MTIP and the RTP are consistent in terms policy and goals, however the RTP project list needs to be updated to be consistent with the MTIP.

Synopsis

An Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) for a plan and program is a finding that the plan and program conform to appropriate air quality requirements.

This AQCD shows that with the implementation of the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) 2015-18 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and the amended 2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan, current federal and state on-road air quality requirements will continue to be met in the Medford carbon monoxide (CO) and Medford-Ashland particulate matter (PM₁₀) Air Quality Maintenance Areas.

The CO and PM₁₀ Air Quality Maintenance Areas (AQMA) are two distinct maintenance areas with different boundaries. The CO AQMA encompasses the City of Medford's Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). The Medford-Ashland PM₁₀ AQMA covers about 228 square miles and approximates the Bear Creek Basin. The area is generally described as the Rogue Valley.

For the Medford CO maintenance area, all non-exempt projects in the 2015-2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Project within the Medford Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) were reviewed under the interagency consultation process. Each of the projects was found to be not regionally significant based on screening criteria for regional significance established by the RVMPO in accordance with the Transportation Conformity Rule (40 CFR 93). Therefore, the RVMPO is relying on the previous emissions analysis (per 40 CFR 93.122(g)(2)(i) and including estimated vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for the projects, in accordance with 40 CFR 93.122(a)(1)).

Table of Carbon Monoxide Emissions

Analysis Year	2015	2020	2028	2038
CO Budget	26,693 lbs/day	32,640 lbs/day	32,640 lbs/day	32,640 lbs/day
Estimated CO Emissions <i>With</i> Transit Service	22,734 lbs/day	20,918 lbs/day	18,483 lbs/day	22,015 lbs/day
Estimated CO Emissions <i>Without</i> Transit Service	22,889 lbs/day	20,981 lbs/day	18,521 lbs/day	22,072 lbs/day

Analysis of future travel conditions shows that estimates of emissions of particulate matter (PM₁₀) within the Air Quality Maintenance Area are lower than permitted in corresponding state maintenance plans, which set emissions budgets. The table below show emissions budgets and summarizes estimated particulate matter emissions.

Table of Particulate Emissions

Analysis Year	2015	2020	2028	2038
PM ₁₀ Budget	3,754 tons/year	3,754 tons/year	3,754 tons/year	3,754 tons/year
Estimated PM ₁₀ Emissions <i>With</i> Transit Service	1,621 tons/year	1,705 tons/year	1,851 tons/year	2,047 tons/year
Estimated PM ₁₀ Emissions <i>Without</i> Transit Service	1,622 tons/year	1,706 tons/year	1,853 tons/year	2,049 tons/year

The purpose of this document

An AQCD is required whenever the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is updated, or every four years, whichever comes first. The U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) conformed the current RTP April 26, 2013. USDOT must make the conformity determination before the plan and program can go into effect.

In the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization area, the conformity document must show that through the horizon of the plan and program air quality requirements for CO and PM₁₀ will be met. Specifically:

Carbon Monoxide—The area encompassed by the Medford urban growth boundary (UGB) was re-designated from nonattainment to attainment by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in 2002. As summarized above, none of the non-exempt projects in the Medford UGB were found to be regionally significant for CO. Thus, the plan and program conform for CO without requiring a new regional emissions analysis, although estimates of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) for these projects must be provided in conjunction with this finding.

PM₁₀—The area within the Medford-Ashland Air Quality Maintenance Area, which is entirely within the RVMPO planning area, was re-designated from nonattainment to attainment by EPA in 2006, and the emissions budget shown above for PM₁₀ from transportation (mobile) sources was deemed adequate to maintain air quality.

Although the boundaries of the two maintenance areas are different and the pollutants are different, the process for showing conformity is similar. Analysis by the RVMPO found that through the horizon of the RTP (2038) and the MTIP (2018), and in intervening years, PM₁₀ and CO emissions from transportation will not exceed emission budgets, as shown in the tables above.

Actions to be taken

The RVMPO Policy Committee, as the policy board for the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization in the urbanized area that includes the cities of Ashland, Talent, Phoenix, Jacksonville, Medford, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jackson County, Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), must formally adopt the findings described in this report. Then USDOT and the federal Environmental Protection Agency confer on the analysis. Ultimately, USDOT will make a conformity determination based on this document. At that time, the RVMPO's 2015-2018 MTIP will go into effect, as will any necessary amendments to the 2013-2038 RTP.

Basis of the analysis

The analysis uses computer models to project the amounts of PM₁₀ anticipated in the respective planning area from on-road transportation. The region's travel demand model, developed jointly by RVMPO and ODOT, estimates the amount of vehicle travel anticipated, expressed as vehicle miles traveled (VMT). Emission factors are generated using an EPA-approved model. From these calculations, future emissions are estimated. The models takes into account several key factors that can change over time including population and employment growth, land-use changes, changes to the transportation system and motor vehicle technology.

Details of the Air Quality Conformity Determination

This report shows that with the implementation of the 2018 MTIP and amended 2038 RTP, all current federal and state requirements for on-road transportation emissions within the planning area will be met. For the entire Medford-Ashland Air Quality Maintenance Area, an area within the RVMPO planning area, PM₁₀ emissions from on-road transportation will not exceed the budget set by ODEQ and approved by EPA in 2006. This means that transportation projects will not impede the area in continuing to meet air quality requirements.

The report also describes the finding that the 2018 MTIP and amended 2038 RTP includes no non-exempt projects within the Medford Urban Growth Boundary CO planning area that are regionally significant. The implication of this finding is that the MTIP/RTP conform for CO without the need for a regional CO emissions analysis.

In addition to the analysis itself, this report details how required consultation among appropriate agencies and organizations and the public occurred.

**Resolution Number 2014-4
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Policy Committee**

**Adopting 2015-2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, and Amending
2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan**

Whereas, the Rogue Valley Council of Governments (RVCOG) has been designated by the State of Oregon as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the greater Medford Urbanized Area; and

Whereas, the RVCOG has delegated responsibility for MPO policy functions to the RVMPO Policy Committee, a Committee of elected officials from Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Medford, Phoenix, Talent, White City, Jackson County, the Rogue Valley Transportation District, and the Oregon Department of Transportation; and

Whereas, a project identification and selection process was carried out through the development of the 2015-2018 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP), and amended 2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

Whereas, a public involvement process was developed and implemented throughout the development of the MTIP and amended RTP; and

Whereas, the RVMPO advertised and held a 30-day public comment period and public hearing to secure input and comment on the proposed MTIP and amended RTP; and

Whereas, the improvements contained in the MTIP and amended RTP demonstrate financial constraint; and

Whereas, the 2015-2018 MTIP and amended 2013-2038 RTP have been shown to meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments and state law;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee approves and adopts the attached 2015-2018 MTIP and amendments to the 2013-2038 RTP.

Adopted by the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee on this 26th day of August 2014.

Michael G. Quilty
RVMPO Policy Committee Chair

Resolution Number 2014 - 6
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization - Policy Committee
Adoption of Air Quality Conformity Determination for the RVMPO 2015-2018 Transportation
Improvement Program and Amendments to the 2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan

Whereas, the Rogue Valley Council of Governments (RVCOG) has been designated by the State of Oregon as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the greater Medford Urban Area; and

Whereas, the RVCOG has delegated responsibility for MPO policy functions to the RVMPO Policy Committee, a committee of elected officials from Ashland, Eagle Point, Central Point, Jacksonville, Medford, Phoenix, Talent, White City, Jackson County, the Rogue Valley Transportation District and the Oregon Department of Transportation; and

Whereas, a project identification and selection process was carried out through the development of the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the amended 2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

Whereas, a public involvement process was developed and implemented consistent with the RVMPO Public Participation Plan throughout the development of the TIP, RTP amendments, and Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD); and

Whereas, the MPO, as required by law, held a 30-day public comment period to secure input and comment on the proposed conformity determination and the comments received were explicitly considered; and

Whereas, the amended 2013-2038 RTP and 2015-2018 amended TIP have been shown through this document to meet state and federal air quality requirements; and

Whereas, the demonstration of air quality conformity was based on inputs that produced conservative (high) emissions estimates including:

- Using annual average travel estimates rather than permitted lower winter estimates,
- Counting travel beyond air quality area boundaries in emission estimates,
- Using a constant length for unpaved roads through 2038 rather than assuming a continuation of the historic decline in unpaved-road miles,
- Not taking certain allowable emissions credits derived from transportation projects that improve air quality,
- Not assuming a transit mode share increase despite historic trend increases and planned projects and land use assumptions intended and expected to increase transit mode share, and
- Developing emissions estimates without transit service because the continuation of existing services is not fully constrained;

Whereas, the improvements contained in the amended 2013-2038RTP and the 2015-2018 TIP demonstrate financial constraint;

NOW THEREFORE, the Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee approves and adopts the attached Air Quality Conformity Determination for the Regional Transportation Plan and the Transportation Improvement Program.

Adopted by the Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee on this 26th day of August 2014.

Michael G. Quilty, MPO Policy Committee Chair

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Ashland							
122	Walker Avenue: Safe Walk To School	Sidewalk Construction, west side Walker Ave. between Ashland and Iowa; includes improvements at railroad crossing.	short	\$ 810,276			Exempt (Table 2) Safety, pavement resurfacing
120	Laurel St. RR Crossing	R/R X-ing improvements, surface improvements	short	\$ 813,552			R/R X-ing improvements, surface improvements
160	Hersey St: N. Main to Oak St Sidewalk	Sidewalk Construction	short	\$ 591,775			Exempt (Table 2) Safety, pedestrian
161	<i>E. Nevada Street Extension</i>	<i>Extend street over Bear Creek to link roadway at Kestrell; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</i>	<i>short</i>	<i>\$ 5,055,500</i>			<i>Non-Exempt</i>
162	<i>Washington Street Extension</i>	<i>Extend street from Mistletoe Road to Ashland Street; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</i>	<i>short</i>	<i>\$ 1,055,000</i>			<i>Non-Exempt</i>
Short Range Total					\$ 8,326,103	\$ 8,326,103	
161	E. Nevada Street Extension	Extend street over Bear Creek to link roadway at Kestrell; sidewalks, bicycle lanes	medium	\$3,404,562			Non-Exempt
162	Washington Street Extension	Extend street from Mistletoe Road to Ashland Street; sidewalks, bicycle lanes	medium	\$1,628,269			Non-Exempt
163	Intersection Improvements: Ashland-Oak Knoll-E. Main	Realign intersection, install speed-reduction treatments	medium	\$1,184,195			Exempt-Table 2
Medium Range Total					\$1,184,195	\$1,184,195	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Central Point							
231	Freeman Road Improvements	Urban Upgrade, adding center turn lane, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, curb, gutter and storm drain between Hopkins Road and Oak Street.	short	\$1,957,770			Exempt-Table 2
230	Central Point & Talent Parking Lot Improvements	Pave and improve alleys and parking facilities, both cities	short	\$1,191,001			Exempt-Table 2
232	Twin Creeks Rail Crossing	Construct new two-lane road, with bicycle lanes, sidewalks, extending Twin Creeks Crossing from Boulder Ridge Street to Hwy 99. Install signal at new Hwy 99 intersection	short	\$3,970,000			Non-exempt
Short Range Total					\$5,927,770	\$5,927,770	

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Eagle Point							
324	Mattie Brown Park Improvements	Pave parking area, construct sidewalks at park	Short	\$175,000			Exempt-Table 2
322	North Royal Avenue - Loto Street to E. Archwood Drive	Little Butte Creek Pedestrian Trail	Short	\$157,000			Exempt-Table 2
325	Arrowhead Trail - Black Wolf lane to Pebble Creek Blvd	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$2,344,000			Non-Exempt
323	Barton Road - Highway 62 to Reese Creek Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$500,000			Exempt-Table 2
326	Buchanan Avenue - Linn Road to Fargo Street	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$144,000			Non-Exempt
327	Havenwood Drive - Barton Road to Rolling Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$521,000			Non-Exempt
328	Lava Street/Stevens - Lava Street to Stevens Road	Extension (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$1,350,000			Non-Exempt
308	Sienna Hills Drive - Barton Road to Sienna Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$832,000			Non-Exempt
329	South Shasta Avenue - Highway 62 to Arrowhead Trail	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$2,201,000			Exempt-Table 2
330	Stevens Road - East Main Street to Palima Drive	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$2,715,413			Exempt-Table 2
340	Linn Rd: OR62 to Buchanan	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Short	\$2,097,403			Exempt-Table 2
Short Range Total					\$4,812,816		Exempt-Table 2
329	South Shasta Avenue - Highway 62 to Arrowhead Trail	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$2,201,000			Exempt-Table 2
322	North Royal Avenue - Loto Street to E. Archwood Drive	Little Butte Creek Pedestrian Trail	Medium	\$157,000			Exempt-Table 2
325	Arrowhead Trail - Black Wolf lane to Pebble Creek Blvd	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$2,344,000			Non-Exempt
341	Reese Creek Road - Royal Ave to Barton Rd	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2
323	Barton Road - Highway 62 to Reese Creek Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$500,000			Exempt-Table 2
326	Buchanan Avenue - Linn Road to Fargo Street	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$144,000			Non-Exempt
327	Havenwood Drive - Barton Road to Rolling Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$521,000			Non-Exempt
308	Sienna Hills Drive - Barton Road to Sienna Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$832,000			Non-Exempt
333	North Royal Avenue - Loto Street to Reese Creek Road	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$3,672,486			Exempt-Table 2
334	Old Highway 62/Royal Avenue - OR62 to Loto Street	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	Medium	\$5,060,955			Exempt-Table 2
Medium Range Total					\$17,932,441	\$17,932,441	
328	Lava Street/Stevens - Lava Street to Stevens Road	Extension (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$1,350,000			Non-Exempt
335	Alta Vista Road - Robert Trent Jones to Riley Road	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$7,278,911			Exempt-Table 2
332	Alta Vista Road - S. Shasta Avenue to Robert Trent Jones	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$6,166,698			Exempt-Table 2
328	Lava Street/Stevens - Lava Street to Stevens Road	Extension (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$1,350,000			Non-Exempt
336	Hannon Drive - West Linn Road to Nick Young Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$3,696,425			Exempt-Table 2
337	Nick Young Road - OR 62 to Hannon Drive	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$611,323			Exempt-Table 2
338	Riley Road - Stevens Road to Alta Vista Road	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$10,315,808			Exempt-Table 2
339	West Linn Road - OR 62 to Dahlia Terrace	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$8,882,813			Exempt-Table 2
Long Range Total					\$39,651,978	\$39,651,978	Exempt-Table 2
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Jacksonville							
404	First St. & Main St. Sidewalk and Streetscape	Install lighting, sidewalks, bike parking, pedestrian improvements	Short	\$1,061,346			Exempt-Table 2
Short Range Total					\$0	\$0	

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Medford							
5002	Garfield Ave., Columbus to Lillian	Reconstruct roadway, add curbs, gutters, sidewalk and bike lanes	short	\$1,673,625			Exempt
506	S. Holly St. Extension - Garfield Ave. to Holmes Way	Construct street with center turn lane, bike lanes, sidewalks	short	\$3,700,000			Non-Exempt
507	Columbus Ave., McAndrews Rd. to Sage Rd.	Extend Columbus to Sage, four lanes w/center turn lane, bike lanes, sidewalks	short	\$2,550,000			Non-Exempt
5007	Springbrook-Delta Waters Realignment	Realign intersection; add center turn lane, bicycle lanes, sidewalks	short	\$1,575,033			Exempt
5008	Larson Creek Trail	Build trail connecting Bear Creek Greenway Trail to Ellendale Drive	short	\$585,000			Exempt
5005	Adaptive Signal Timing	Install adaptive signal timing equipment along Hwy. 62 corridor	short	\$362,897			Exempt
598	Crater Lake Ave & Jackson St. Alley Paving	Pave and improve alleys	short	\$1,425,000			Exempt
5009	Lozier Lane Improvements	Urban Upgrade: add center turn lane, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, curb gutter and storm drain between W. Main and Stewart Ave.	short	\$7,500,000			Exempt
5010	Rail Safety Improvements	Downtown Medford: upgrade Third St. crossing; close 11th St crossing	short	\$670,000			Exempt
5011	Lozier Extension to Cunningham	Extend Lozier Lane to Cunningham	short	\$500,000			Non-Exempt
5012	Columbus Ave Extension	Extend Columbus Ave	short	\$4,000,000			Non-Exempt
863	Foothill Rd: Hillcrest to McAndrews	Widen to 5 lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk and bike lanes	short	\$13,000,000			Non-Exempt
Short Range Total					\$27,095,000	\$27,095,000	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Phoenix							
616	OR99 @ Oak St Sidewalk & Ped Crossing	Sidewalks & Pedestrian Crossing w/activated signals	short	\$618,100			Exempt
Short Range Total					\$618,100	\$618,100	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Talent							
230	Chuck Roberts Park Improvements	Project combined with #208, renamed Central Point & Talent Parking Lot Improvements	short				exempt
Short Range Total					\$0	\$0	

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
Jackson County							
854	Peachey Road Paving	Pave and improve road from Walker Ave. to Hillview, Ashland	short	\$720,000			Exempt-Table 2
857	Bear Creek Greenway	Construct multi-use trail from Pine St. to Upton Rd, Central Point	short	\$1,755,723			Exempt-Table 2
812	Table Rock Road—Wilson Rd to Elmhurst St.	Widen to add center turn lane, bicycle lanes, sidewalks;—align Gregory Road intersection	short	\$2,400,000			Exempt-Table 2
822	Table Rock Rd. at Wilson Rd.	New traffic signal	short	\$200,000			Exempt-Table 2
809	Foothill Rd., Corey Rd. to Atlantic St.	New two lane rural major collector, add signal	short	\$1,800,000			Non-Exempt
867	Bear Creek Greenway: Hwy 62 Connection (Medford)		short	\$501,000			Exempt
868	Regional Active Transportation Plan		short	\$200,000			Exempt
821	Table Rock Rd: I-5 Crossing to Biddle	Widen to 3 & 5 Lanes, curb, gutter, & Sidewalk + bike lanes	short	\$7,883,540			Non-Exempt
Short Range Total					\$10,384,540	\$10,384,540	
858	Foothill Rd., Delta Waters to Coker Butte	Improve (widen) to rural collector standards	medium	\$2,220,366			Exempt
859	Foothill Rd., Coker Butte to Vilas	Improve (widen) to rural collector standards	medium	\$2,220,366			Exempt
Medium Range Total					\$4,440,733		
860	Foothill Rd., Vilas to Corey	Improve (widen) to rural collector standards	long	\$3,286,685			Exempt
861	Table Rock Rd., Mosquito to Antelope	Widen to 4 lanes	long	\$2,191,123			Non-Exempt
862	Old Stage Rd., Winterbrook to Taylor	Improve (widen) to rural collector standards	long	\$3,286,685			Exempt
821	Table Rock Rd: I-5 Crossing to Biddle	Widen to 3 & 5 Lanes, curb, gutter, & Sidewalk + bike lanes	long	\$13,146,739			Non-Exempt
863	Foothill Rd., Hillcrest to McAndrews	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$10,955,616			Exempt
864	Foothill Rd., McAndrews to Delta Waters	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$43,822,463			Exempt
866	Beall Ln., Highway 99 to Merriman	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$6,573,369			Exempt
867	Stewart, Hull to Thomas	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$4,382,246			Exempt
868	Kings Highway, S Stage to Medford UGB	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$3,286,685			Exempt
869	Hanley Road, Beall to Pine	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$5,477,808			Exempt
870	Beall Ln. at Bursell	New traffic signal	long	\$438,225			Exempt
Long Range Total					\$83,700,904	\$83,700,904	

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
ODOT							
902	I-5: Fern Valley Interchange, Phase 2	Reconstruct interchange; realign, widen connecting roads; replace Bear Creek Bridge.	short	\$75,000,000			Non-exempt
904	OR 140 Freight Improvements	Upgrade existing roads to create freight corridor linking Hwy 140 at Hwy 62 (existing terminus), White City, to I-5 at Exit 35, Central Point; including sidening shoulders, adding turn lanes, other improvements on segments of Blackwell, Kirtland, High Banks, Antelope, Table Rock, Agate roads and Leigh Way.	short	\$5,000,000			Exempt (Table 2)
941, 942	OR62: Linn Rd to Hwy 234	Install two-way center left turn lane between Barton and Rolling Hills	short	\$5,224,000			Exempt-Table 2
949	Talent/OR 99 Creel	Widen OR 99 and provide left turn channelization for Creel Rd. Provide sidewalk	short	\$3,290,000			Exempt-Table 2
945	OR99: Rapp Road to Talent City Limits	Reducing to 3 lanes, consolidating accesses, adding bike/ped improvements	short	\$3,341,000			Exempt-Table 2
913	I-5: Siskiyou Rest Area (Ashland)	Relocate rest area at new location	short	\$14,715,185			Exempt (Table 2) Safety, pedestrian
946	I-5: Bear Creek Bridges NB & SB, Scour Repair	Scour Repair, Bridges 08771N & 08771S	short	\$1,994,000			Exempt-Table 2
903	OR 62: I-5 to Dutton Road (Medford), JTA Phase	Right of Way Acquisition and construct phase funded by Oregon Jobs and Transportation Act	short	\$118,485,000			Non-exempt
950	I-5 California State Line - Ashland Paving	Grind/Inlay	short	\$13,631,000			Exempt-Table 2
951	I-5 S. Medford - N. Ashland Paving	Grind/Inlay	short	\$7,358,001			Exempt-Table 2
952	OR99: Ashland - Talent Lane Realignment	Continue lane configuration	short	\$250,000			Exempt-Table 2
953	OR99: Laurel Street Signal Upgrade	Upgrade traffic signal	short	\$620,000			Exempt-Table 2
954	Rogue Valley VMS Replacement Project	Replace boards: I-5/MTN Ave, I-5 Table Rock, Hwy 199	short	\$700,000			Exempt-Table 2
955	I-5 Medford Viaduct	Environmental Assessment Study	short	\$4,000,000			Exempt-Table 2
Short Range Total					\$165,094,186	\$165,094,186	

PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available
Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVRTD)					
1039	<i>Urban Operations Support, FFY2013</i>	short	\$ 4,821,770		
1056	Urban Operations Support, FFY2014	short	\$ 3,850,000		
1057	Urban Operations Support, FFY2015	short	\$ 4,900,000		
1058	<i>Urban Operations Support, FFY2016</i>	short	\$ 4,900,000		
1059	<i>Urban Operations Support, FFY2017</i>	short	\$ 4,900,000		
1060	<i>Urban Operations Support, FFY2018</i>	short	\$ 4,900,000		
1061	Expanded Transit Service: Extending transit service to week nights and Saturdays, for three years	short	\$ 1,949,103		
1062	Radio Communications System Replacement and Upgrade	short	\$ 742,868		
1040	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2012)	short	\$ 907,576		
1041	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2013)	short	\$ 934,476		
1063	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2014)	short	\$ 989,583		
1064	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2015)	short	\$ 1,047,769		
1065	<i>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2016)</i>	short	\$ 1,034,726		
1066	<i>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2017)</i>	short	\$ 1,049,214		
1067	<i>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2018)</i>	short	\$ 1,063,903		
1055	TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2014 program	short	\$ 150,000		
1054	TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2015 program	short	\$ 150,000		
1074	<i>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2016 program</i>	short	\$ 150,000		
1075	<i>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2017 program</i>	short	\$ 150,000		
1076	<i>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2018 program</i>	short	\$ 150,000		
1068	5310 E & D STP XFER (FY13)	short	\$ 660,163		
1069	5310 E & D STP XFER (FY14)	short	\$ 587,823		
1070	5310 Enhanced Mobility E & D (FY13)	short	\$ 324,907		
1071	5310 Enhanced Mobility E & D (FY14)	short	\$ 211,829		
1072	<i>Replacement of two (2) buses</i>	short	\$ 1,367,000		
1073	<i>Valley Feeder</i>	short	\$ 111,445		
1077	Job Access/Reverse Commute Transit operations	short	\$ 206,102		
1046	<i>Support for ADA Service</i>	short	\$ 806,715		
1047	<i>Support for ADA Service</i>	short	\$ 792,000		
1078	<i>E-Fare System</i>	short	\$ 764,516		
1053	Veterans Transportation Call Center	short	\$ 1,353,000		
Short Range Total				\$ 41,675,416	\$41,675,416