

Jackson County Talking Points - Alternative Measure #7, Regional Transportation Plan
Rogue Valley MPO
July 24, 2018

*Original Trans. Report
Now STBG FUNDS*

1. Attached is the briefing paper provided to the Board of Commissioners previously, the letter Jackson County provided to the RVMPO and a spreadsheet showing distributions to RVTD since the Alt. Measure #7 was implemented.
2. **Alternative Measure #7 was clear – If the voters passed an RVTD Levy, then the 50% STP funds go to bike and pedestrian projects. The levy passed. Why are we not following the direction we set 15 years ago?**

Alternative Measure #7 reads: “If voters approve this package, RVTD will not require STP funding 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 the measure instead be directed to RTP bicycle/pedestrian projects and projects that facilitate the development of TOD sites.”

3. **The cities and county have huge unmet transportation needs.**

This discussion always focuses on potential impacts to the Rogue Valley Transportation District and completely missed is the impact to the cities and county with the current direction. Generally the number one transportation complaint the county and many cities receive is the lack of adequate bike lanes, sidewalks and shoulders. The citizens are correct, the county and many cities have huge unmet transportation needs and these funds can help remedy those conditions.

Additionally, recent changes by ODOT for the allowable uses of CMAQ funds, a federal funding source used to complete many bike lanes, sidewalks and shoulder widening projects, has further limited the cities and county access to the federal funds managed by RVMPO. We need access to STP funds now more than in the past.

4. **There will always be a reason to delay a decision – Always.**

RVTD’s letter recommends delaying a decision and waiting until the Transportation Planning Rule update is completed. This rule, which led to the implementation of the Alternative Measure #7 is being updated, a process that started in 2016. However, the timeframes, outcomes and the future process to meet VMT reductions are not clear. The change in the rule may have no impact on the Alternative Measure #7 process, we simply don’t know and won’t know for an undetermined time period. Secondly, arguments have been made that the RVTD levy was only a five-year program and we are already in year two, therefore, the MPO shouldn’t make any decisions until voters reapprove the levy. There will always be reasons to delay.

5. **The MPO hasn’t made a final decision on the future use of Alt Measure #7**

The RVTD letter references “final decisions” made by the RVMPO Policy Committee in April 2017. Actually no final decisions have been made. The policy committee directed staff to draft an IGA to address this issue and that has not happened. Additionally, this direction was provided before the passage of HB 2017 which provides a very large increase of stable funding to RVTD. Certainly the additional funding provided by HB 2017 should be taken into consideration when considering the use of scarce federal STP (STBG) funds.

6. RVTD is receiving more than double what was projected

The total distributions to RVTD have been more than double projected amounts and have totaled over \$9,275,000 since 2002. See attached spreadsheet for annual distributions to RVTD.

7. RVTD receives the 50% STP allocation AND they compete for remaining STP funds

In addition to the 50% STP allocation, RVTD regularly submits project requests for STP funds. These requests directly compete with the cities and county for the remaining 50% STP funds. Since 2002, RVTD has been awarded numerous projects increasing their allocation to more than 50%.

8. Changing the 50% allocation from RVTD to Bike and Pedestrian projects is reversible

A decision by the RVMPO Policy Committee to follow the requirements of Alternative Measure #7 and move the 50% STP allocation from RVTD to bike and pedestrian projects can be reversed. If future funding for RVTD indicated service cuts would be required due to a change in district financing, the 50% allocation can be revisited by the Policy Committee.