

**SUMMARY MINUTES
ROGUE VALLEY MPO POLICY COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 22, 2016**



The following attended:
MPO Policy Committee

<u>Member</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Colleen Roberts	Jackson County	646-2878
Mike Quilty, Chairman	City of Central Point	664-7907
Rich Rosenthal	City of Ashland	941-1494
Mike Zarosinski	City of Medford	
Tonia Moro	RVTD	973-2063
Jim Lewis	City of Jacksonville	899-7023
Darby Strickler	City of Talent	

<u>Staff</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Bunny Lincoln	RVCOG	944-2446
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369

Others Present -

<u>Name</u>	<u>Organization</u>	<u>Phone</u>
John Vial	Jackson County	
Mike Montero	Montero & Assoc.	944-4376
Paige Townsend	RVTD	608-2429

John Vial	Jackson County
Cody Meyer (Phone)	DLCD
Mike Baker	ODOT
Julie Brown	RVTD
Mike Kuntz	JACO
Jenna Marmon	JACO
Tim D'Alessandro	RVTD
Tom Fink	Ashland
Allen Halmark	United Oregon
Dan Daris	RVTD

1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda –

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. The Committee began with introductions.

2. Review / Approve Minutes -

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

On a motion by Jim Lewis seconded by Rich Rosenthal, the minutes the previous meeting were approved as presented.

3. Public Comment -

None.

4. Discussion and Possible Action Regarding Proposed Recommendations by the Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reduction

Karl Welzenbach presented information on the Greenhouse Gas Reduction issue. The Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reductions has been meeting for almost a year. The Committee is working towards having recommendations back to the Land Conservation and Development Commission by the end of December. The TPR is not concerned with Greenhouse Gasses.

On November 4th the greenhouse gas advisory committee met to begin finalizing recommendations to bring back to the Commission. The agenda for this meeting included (1) a discussion of policy approaches for increasing transportation choices and (2) a discussion of

Green House Gas reduction targets. Included in the discussion of reduction targets was the issue of whether or not to include the newly formed MPOs (Middle Rogue and Albany) in the mix.

(1) **Transportation Planning Rule** - The overall policy approach was to let MPOs focus on the RTP and the accompanying federal requirements and allow each region a choice for coordination. This could mean that the goal is set by the members of the MPO and there could be an exclusion for smaller cities (population 2500 and below) for meeting these goals. The effort would be to try to look towards those things that local governments, rather than MPOs, control – land use, zoning, development, etc.

(2) **Green House Gas Targets** - LCDC staff provided three options to consider when developing GHG targets for communities within MPO areas: (1) establish one target for every area; (2) establish one target for the Portland Metro area and another target for everyone else; (3) establish individual targets for each area. After a great deal of discussion the committee settled on to two versions of the second option – one target for Metro and one for everyone else. These two options are:

Option 5.2.3

Year	Portland Metro Area	Other MPO Areas
By 2040	26%	13%
By 2050	37%	26%

Option 5.2.4

Year	Portland Metro Area	Other MPO Areas
By 2040	25%	20%
By 2050	35%	30%

Whether or Not to Include the New MPOs in Target Rules

Although the data indicates that there is “an insignificant effect on the targets by including [or excluding] the two Metropolitan Areas” LCDC staff recommends inclusion. Mr. Welzenbach doesn’t believe that the Middle Rogue MPO will agree, and the MRMPO Policy Committee will be making a decision on it soon.

A draft Statement of Support for Approach to GHG Reduction Target Setting and Policy Approach was provided for the Committee’s review:

November 22, 2016

Mr. Jim Rue
Director, Land Conservation and Development Commission
635 Capitol St. NE, Suite 150
Salem 97301-2540

Dear Mr. Rue,

The Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO) Policy Committee is responsible for conducting a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive transportation planning process for the areas of Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jackson County, Jacksonville, Medford, Phoenix, RVTD, Talent, and White City. This organization has played a critical role in

addressing the reduction of air pollutants in the Rogue River Valley and has also been actively involved in the Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reduction.

At its November 4th meeting the Advisory Committee discussed at great length two critical issues: it is anticipated that the Advisory Committee should have a set of recommendations to the Commission before the end of the year. Since these are critical issues staff felt it necessary to bring a summary of these discussions before the Policy Board and seek direction as to how to proceed. The Policy Board of the Rogue Valley MPO has concluded and supports the following:

(1) It agrees with the Advisory Committee that MPOs should focus on the Regional Transportation Plan and the pertinent federal requirements and that local government currently has greater control over developing, supporting and implementing transportation alternatives and thereby affecting Greenhouse Gas reduction. Having acknowledged this the committee felt that MPOs should not be charged with accomplishing the actual reductions necessary to meet the Greenhouse Gas reduction targets.

(2) The Advisory Committee agreed that a two level approach to target setting – one target for Metro and one for the remaining MPOs - would be the most logical and the fairest for the state. The actual reduction targets are still being discussed however the target range for Metro would be somewhere around 35% to 37% by the year 2050 and between 26% and 30% by 2050 for all of the other metropolitan areas combined.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michael Quilty, Chair
RVMPO Policy Committee
C: RVMPO Board Members

Tonia Moro commented that the TPR may be amended to offer multiple choices for members through land use planning at local jurisdictional levels, but regional planning goals may still be the desire of some MPOs. She felt that part of local future planning should include this discussion beyond just vehicle trips. Ultimately, the rule will allow various alternatives. The State and FHWA have noticed the regions efforts and cooperation on these issues. Feedback is also needed on GHG issues, which is only mandatory for Metro. If Metro is required to have a larger reduction share, they may well be awarded more funding in the future, which could have a negative effect on the smaller, urban areas. Ms. Moro urged that Option 5.2.4 was the better one for our area in terms of potential access to future funding.

Cody Meyer conveyed that hitting the targets was not mandated except for Portland, but were designed to use as reduction guides/measurements. Dan Moore shared that the 2015 Strategic Assessment (SA) showed that implementing some of the alternative measures could lead to a regional reduction of up to 17%, depending on which alternatives were used. (Local jurisdictional policy changes.) The MPO cannot use any Federal \$\$\$ for this work. Under the SA, ODOT is currently paying for the work. Cody Meyer again reiterated that this was a “guide”. Paige Townsend stated that Portland did not dedicate street funding in their SA.

Quilty asked about land use decisions by individual jurisdictions, and their current plan differences. The MPO cannot mandate the actions of the member jurisdictions. Allen Hallmark (Talent citizen) expressed his advocacy for local planning geared to those goals related to transit, and encouraged local officials to work toward GHG reductions as a region. Darby Strickler said that the gap is so wide that it is too early to make these decisions, and that future opportunities need conversation for funding opportunities. She felt strongly that now is not the time to pull back from the discussion.

Tonia Moro suggested that input and consensus from the members was warranted to take back to the State Commission. Cody Meyer asked for direct input from the Policy Committee for the Commission meeting in January. A letter can also be sent.

The members discussed future scenario planning, and that the State would be asked to pay for that. Dan Moore shared that the SA next steps could voluntarily move to scenario planning for alternatives that the region could agree upon. Individual jurisdictions would have to adopt their own portions of any plan. The scenario planning could focus on non-compliant areas, i.e. increased densities & jobs within HD areas. Cody Meyer said that scenario planning was mainly a voluntary “what if” exercise designed for effective use of limited funding. The comment was made that significant land use changes would be required, and there could be a public backlash associated with them. The effects of an aspirational goal of 20% were briefly discussed.

Rich Rosenthal said that Ashland had set forth an 8%/year reduction based on science based methodologies, in their proposed plan.

Tonia Moro and Karl Welzenbach shared that they felt they had enough input from the Committee to take to the State Commission.

Discussion Items:

5. Alternative Measure #7 – Alternative Transportation Funding

This issue was placed on the agenda at the request of Colleen Roberts, Karl Welzenbach explained that, in 2001 as part of the RVMPO’s efforts to meet the per capita VMT reduction goals the MPO developed, in close coordination with staff of the LCDC, a series of seven (7) alternative measures to be tracked during updates to the RTP.

Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding

This measure has been developed to demonstrate the RVMPO’s commitment to implementing the alternative transportation projects upon which many of the proposed measures rely. Funds made available to the RVMPO through the Surface Transportation Program (STP) are the only funds over which the RVMPO has complete discretion. RVMPO jurisdictions have agreed to direct 50% of this revenue stream, historically used for vehicular capacity expansion projects, towards alternative transportation projects. STP funds would be used to expand transit service, or, if RVTD is successful with a local funding package, to fund bicycle/pedestrian and TOD-development supportive projects. Table 11 shows proposed 5-year benchmarks and 20-year targets for this measure.

Table 11 – Proposed 20-Year Target for Alternative Transportation Funding

Measure	How Measured	Current 2000	Benchmark 2005	Benchmark 2010	Benchmark 2015	Target 2020
Measure 7: Alternative Transportation Funding	Funding committed to transit or bicycle/pedestrian/TOD projects. Amounts shown represent ½ of the MPO's estimated accumulation of discretionary funding (STP*)	N/A	\$950,000	\$2.5 Million	\$4.3 Million	\$6.4 Million

*STP revenue estimates developed by Oregon Department of Transportation.

Without the additional operating revenues provided through this measure (or through some other source), current revenue projections show that RVTD will be required to cut service and eliminate routes in the MPO. The RTP identifies a financially constrained (Tier 1) transit system that provides greatly reduced service in the MPO, along with a “preferred” (Tier 2) transit system, providing several additional routes as well as faster headways. RVTD will be pursuing a local funding package in the near future to finance the Tier 2 transit plan. If voters approve this package, RVTD will not require STP funds in order to cover funding shortfalls. It is therefore proposed that, should RVTD's new fund source become a reality, the STP transit allocation proposed in this measure instead be directed to RTP bicycle/pedestrian projects and projects that facilitate the development of TOD sites.

The following list of priorities for STP-funded transit projects has been developed in consultation with MPO jurisdictions. The list is intended as a starting point for determining how STP funds will be spent by the Rogue Valley Transportation District. Projects are not listed in any particular order.

STP Funding Priorities for Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD):

Central Point

- RVTD will increase service on Route 40 (Central Point) to 30 minute headways and provide service to the TOD site when feasible.

Medford

- RVTD will serve the Southeast Plan Area (Medford TOD) when feasible.

Phoenix

- RVTD will improve transit stops within Phoenix.
- RVTD will explore ways to improve Hwy 99 (Main Street) pedestrian crossing to a northbound transit stop, and in the interim, will provide shuttle service for this purpose.

Jackson County

- RVTD will increase transit service to White City (unincorporated Jackson County).

Mike Baker shared that there are still a lot of unanswered questions on the Alternative Measures, and his personal thoughts were that analysis results aren't available yet, and no decision was appropriate until that time.

Mike Quilty said that there is an aggressive funding package being worked on for next spring, and he wants to see how much money will be available. Baker said it wasn't RVMPO's responsibility to fund RVT, although it is a vital way to reduce VMTs. Chairman Quilty said RVT has done a good job providing increased headway on routes where they committed to do so. When the questions of state mandates arose with respect to VMTs and GHG reductions, Mike Baker said Federal dollars can be used for State mandates as related to transportation. Mr. Welzenbach said that his experience in other states was different, and he would like to see Oregon's policy in writing.

Tonia Moro questioned whether Alternative Measure #7 might need to be amended in the future to secure a LCDC signoff on a stable RVT funding source. The matter would be a separate discussion topic. Ultimately, RVT needs to establish a stable funding source. Michael Zarosinski asked for clarification on the 2001 Alternative Measures that were adopted by the Policy Committee. Any money not going to RVT had to go exclusively toward other measures for designed to reduce VMTs.

Dan Moore stipulated that the adoption of the RTP in 2013 resulted in an LCDC letter stating that the MPO did not do benchmark analysis. The MPO then received a grant and completed benchmarks. The Alternative measures are ongoing, and tied to each four (4) year update of RTP (now extended to 2042). The two Alternative Measures analyses have been funded by State.

John Vial commented that Measure #7 is not a new issue. Staff needs to develop recommendations for the Policy Committee on how to deal with this issue in the future. Tom Fink (Ashland) shared that a stable funding source, rather than a tax measure with a "sunset", was essential. Julie Brown said that she was in favor of RVCOG staff working on a set of potential funding recommendations to be brought back to the Policy Committee.

6. CMAQ Funding & Advisory Committee

Karl Welzenbach went over the potential funding changes (reductions) to CMAQ allocations. With the addition of two new MPOs being eligible for CMAQ funding, Salem and Eugene, the distribution of those funds will be impacted. In an attempt to develop a fair and equitable formula for the new distribution of funds the Oregon DOT has put together an advisory committee. The following is a summary of the current situation:

In August 2016, ODOT informed the Oregon Air Quality Maintenance Areas (including the RVMPO and MRMPO) that both Salem and Eugene are now Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) eligible areas, which will require an update to the current funding allocation formula that was last approved back in 2006 with the passage of SAFETEA-LU. Table 1 includes an estimate prepared by ODOT, based on population, of what the allocations could look like when Salem and Eugene are added. The table also includes the differences in funding with and without Salem/Eugene and the percent reduction.

**Table 1 - Oregon CMAQ Funding - FAST Act
Annual Amounts**

	Without Salem/Eugene	% Share	With Salem/Eugene	% Share	\$ Difference	% Reduction
Metro	\$14,086,017	79.1%	\$10,561,701	59.3%	-\$3,524,316	25%
Medford	\$2,465,053	13.8%	\$1,307,833	7.3%	-\$1,157,220	47%
Grants Pass	\$704,300	4.0%	\$532,341	3.0%	-\$171,959	24%
Klamath Falls	\$352,150	2.0%	\$427,221	2.4%	\$75,071	-21%
Eugene	\$0	0.0%	\$2,263,636	12.7%	\$2,263,636	
Salem	\$0	0.0%	\$2,514,788	14.1%	\$2,514,788	
Lakeview	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,000	.04%	0%	0%
Oakridge	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,000	.04%	0%	0%
La Grande	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,000	.04%	0%	0%
	\$17,802,520	100%	\$17,802,520	100%		

*Distribution based on population, which closely matches 2006 CMAQ allocation formula

ODOT recognizes that the timing of this presents some challenges for the MPO Maintenance Areas developing Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). ODOT recommends taking a conservative approach as the MPOs go through the CMAQ project solicitation/selection process. The RVMPO is using the annual estimate of \$1,307,833 (Table 1 with Salem/Eugene column) for our 2018-21 TIP development.

ODOT hired a public involvement consultant, Jeanne Lawson, to conduct some preliminary interviews with a select number of eligible CMAQ entities. ODOT felt it was important to have a neutral, non-ODOT person conduct these conversations. On October 31st, the RVCOG Executive Director, Planning Program Manager and MPO Coordinator participated in an interview with Ms. Lawson to talk about how the MPO is currently distributing CMAQ funds, the opportunities and barriers to our method, impacts on planned investments, and what kind of approach should be used to distribute the funds. Ms. Lawson will provide a summary of the interviews in the near future.

Currently, ODOT is in the process of forming a Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Committee to develop program recommendations for (CMAQ) funds. Mike Quilty, RVMPO Policy Committee Chair, will be serving on the CMAQ PAC. The first meeting is likely to be held prior to the end of the year.

The CMAQ currently belong to the State of Oregon, not any specific MPO or local jurisdiction. Mr. Welzenbach shared that the RVMPO is the only one in the state under conformity, and only one of two that have to deal with two (2) pollutants. All other areas are under maintenance. Mike Montero shared that the OTC needed to clearly state the intent of CMAQ \$\$\$\$. Mike Quilty said that no other area in Oregon had volunteered to restrict their industrial air shed to the extent that southern Oregon has.

7. PL Funding Discussion

Karl Welzenbach shared that Eugene and Salem also feel that they are entitled to additional PL funds. The advent of changes to CMAQ distribution also impacts the distribution formula for PL and Sec 5303 funds. Provided in this agenda packet is an attachment summarizing the ongoing

discussion regarding changes to the amount of funds that the different MPOs might be receiving under the FAST Act.

The eligibility of both Salem and Eugene for CMAQ funds has an impact on the distribution of federal planning (PL) funds as well. The current funding distribution formula includes points awarded for those MPOs which must meet certain requirements for maintenance or limited maintenance plans as well as administering CMAQ funds. Under the current formula, with the addition of Salem and Eugene, the agreed upon formula would reduce PL funds to four (4) of the affected MPOs in Oregon. The Oregon DOT sought to develop a fairer distribution that would impact fewer MPOs. A new proposal, points would be awarded for the complexity of dealing with air quality issues. In this scenario, the Rogue Valley MPO would garner the highest score since, by October of 2017, the Rogue Valley MPO would be the only agency still required to perform conformity analysis (see Table 1).

Table 1

MPO	Proposed AQ Complexity Points
Metro	2
SKATS	2
CLMPO	2
MRMPO	2
RVMPO	4

The newly proposed scoring criteria would recognize that any jurisdiction/MPO receiving CMAQ funding is subject to additional work, oversight, and analysis than those not eligible for those funds. Additionally, it is clear that a MPO that is required to oversee a full maintenance plan (such as the Rogue Valley MPO) has significant air quality analysis, data, and reporting requirements. The newly proposed formula would score additional points to address these two concerns:

- CMAQ eligibility = 2 points
- Maintenance Plan = 2 points

This proposal would result in all of the MPOs receiving an increase in PL funding except for the Middle Rogue MPO which would see a reduction. **Table 2** demonstrates these changes:

Table 2

MPO	Net change in funding between 2016 and 2017 with Existing Formula adding SKATS/CLMPO for CMAQ Eligibility	Net change in funding between 2016 and 2017 using Revised AQ Factors and Point System
Metro	\$ 11,292	\$ 23,877
SKATS	\$ 40,604	\$ 25,730
Albany	\$ (1,826)	\$ 462
Corvallis	\$ (1,727)	\$ 561
Central Lane	\$ 40,800	\$ 25,926
Middle Rogue	\$ (6,224)	\$ (23,385)
Rogue Valley	\$ (4,347)	\$ 24,256
Bend	\$ 84	\$ 1,228

It is felt that the smaller MPOs (including the MRMPO) should be held harmless. The discussions are still in progress. As of Tuesday, November 15, 2016 this new formulaic distribution had not been officially agreed to by all of the MPOs and ODOT.

8. Other Business / Local Business

- Staff shared an LOC request for a Letter of Support for “Go Oregon” finding package. Seismic preparedness triage is included. Transit is also included. The Committee concurred that support of the funding package was warranted at the upcoming OMPOC meeting. Mike Quilty talked about his proposal for a gas tax. increase of \$.30/gallon to increase state revenues for roads.
- Paula Brown has been asked to be appointed to the OTC. The Committee consensus was to send an MPO Letter of Support for Ms. Brown’s appointment.

9. Public Comment

- Paige Townsend outlined the service enhancements that RVTD is implementing as part of the approved, 5 year tax levy.
- Bunny Lincoln thanked RVTD for the service that they provide for the disabled tenants in the apartment complex she manages.
- The Dec. 27th meeting was cancelled.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:05 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings:

RVMPO PAC	Tuesday, Jan. 17th @ 5:50 pm
RVMPO TAC	Wednesday, Dec. 14th @ 1:30 pm
RVMPO Policy	Tuesday, Dec. 27th @ 2:00 pm (Cancelled)