
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Policy Committee



Date: Tuesday, August 27, 2019

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: Jefferson Conference Room
 RVCOG, 155 N. 1st Street, Central Point
Transit: served by RVTD Route #40

Contact: Rebecca Schexnayder, RVCOG: 541-423-1375
 RVMPO website: www.rvmppo.org

1	Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda	Mike Quilty, Chair
Consent Agenda		
2	Review / Approve Minutes	Chair
Attachment	#1 RVMPO Policy Committee Meeting Draft Minutes 20190723	
Action Items		
3	Review/Approve Project Application	Karl Welzenbach
Background	At the July meeting, the Policy Committee requested that the Project Application be brought back to the Committee for review, comment, and approval.	
Attachment	#2 Project Application for CMAQ and STBG Funds #3 Memo: Project Selection Criteria Working Group Summary	
Action Requested	Review and approve the project application.	

Discussion Items		
4	Public Comment	Chair
Regular Updates		
5	RVMPO Planning Update <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Household Activity Survey • Update on Projects from 2018–2021 TIP 	Karl Welzenbach
<i>Attachment</i>	#4 Tracking Spreadsheet for Currently Active RVMPPO Projects	
6	Other Business / Local Business Opportunity for RVMPPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.	Chair
7	Adjournment	Chair

- The next RVMPPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, September 24, at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPPO TAC meeting will be **Wednesday, September 11, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPPO PAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, September 17, at 5:30 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 RVCOG, 541-664-6674. 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 Meeting
July 23, 2019



The following attended:

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Mike Baker for Art Anderson	ODOT	774-6353
Rick Dyer	Jackson County	774-6118
Al Densmore, Vice Chair	City of Medford	601-0704
Tom Humphrey for Mike Quilty, Chair	City of Central Point	664-7907
Rich Rosenthal	City of Ashland	488-5347
Ruth Jenks	City of Eagle Point	941-8537
Sarah Westover	City of Phoenix	972-0869
Julie Brown for Tonia Moro	RVTD	973-2063
Alternate Voting Members Present	Organization	Phone Number
John Vial	Jackson County	774-6238
Scott Fleury	City of Ashland	552-2412
Eric Zimmerman	City of Medford	
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Rebecca Schexnayder	RVCOG	423-1375
Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford	774-2114
Paige West	RVTD	608-2429
Melissa Lowry	RVTD	608-2448
Jerry Brienza	RVI Airport/Jackson County	776-7222
Gary Shaff	Siskiyou Velo	

[RVMPO Policy Committee Agenda Packet, July 23, 2019](#)

Full meeting recording: [2019-07-23 RVMPO Policy Committee Meeting Audio](#)

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00–01:21

2:00 p.m. | *Quorum*: Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD

2. Review / Approve Minutes 01:22–02:03

01:46 | *Rick Dyer moved to approve the June 25, 2019 Policy Committee meeting minutes as presented. Seconded by Mike Baker.*

No further discussion.

Julie Brown abstained.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Public Hearing

**3. Amendment to the 2018–2021 RVMPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
02:04–12:49**

The Chair read the public hearing procedures and public comment rules.

Staff and Mike Baker of ODOT, provided background on the STIP amendments.

The Chair opened the hearing to public comment. No public comment was made. The hearing was closed.

12:12 | *Rich Rosenthal moved to approve the 2018–2021 STIP Rebalance Amendments as presented. Seconded by Tom Humphrey.*

No further discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Action Items

4. Letter of Support for CP's URA CP-2B 12:50–42:35

42:11 | *Rick Dyer moved that the Policy Committee authorize the committee chair to sign the letter of support for the City of Central Point's Urban Reserve Area CP-2B. Seconded by Ruth Jenks.*

No further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Items

5. Public Comment 42:36–44:53

Gary Shaff, Siskiyou Velo, provided [comment](#) regarding bicycle/pedestrian project funding and bicycle facilities/mode share priorities for the Rogue Valley. (Please click on the link to review his full public comment submission.)

Regular Updates

6. RVMPO Planning Update 44:54–01:10:40

- Bicycle/Pedestrian Project Applications

The policy committee discussed the application process and the role of the Technical Advisory Committee and the Policy Committee regarding the application itself, the methodology of review and scoring, and getting input from their jurisdictions.

01:09:53 | *Ruth Jenks moved that the TAC should develop draft methodology and selection criteria and return it to the Policy Committee for input and vetting. Seconded by Julie Brown.*

No further discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

7. Other Business / Local Business 01:10:41–01:17:07

8. Adjournment

3:18 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPO Policy Committee | August 27, 2019 | 2:00 p.m.

RVMPO TAC | August 14, 2019 | 1:30 p.m.

RVMPO PAC | September 17, 2019 | 5:30 p.m.



Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Project Funding Application:

Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)

Federal Fiscal Years: 2022, 2023, 2024

Applications Due: Sept. 30, 2019

Eligibility

This application is to be used to apply for RVMPO STBG and CMAQ funds. RVMPO will attempt to establish eligibility prior to funding consideration by the Policy Committee. Final eligibility determinations will be made by Federal Highway Administration. Please refer to the instructions for details about information required below.

Project Readiness

Federal funds from both programs to be awarded to projects through this solicitation will be available Oct. 1, 2021 (Federal Fiscal Year 2022), Oct. 1, 2022 (FFY 2023), and Oct. 1, 2023 (FFY 2024). This project will be ready to start, with funds available for match (generally 10.27 %) and additional funds necessary to complete project/phase, in **(you must be able to check at least one time frame below to proceed with this application):**

Oct. 1, 2021 (FFY 2022) Oct. 1, 2022 (FFY 2023) Oct. 1, 2023 (FFY 2024)

Maps & Photographs

As applicable, maps illustrating project location (with termini) and photographs of area (especially illustrating need or deficiency) **are required**. These items along with the information provided below will be used to evaluate the project and will be viewed by the Policy Committee as members make funding decisions.

1. APPLICANT & PROJECT INFORMATION - Fill out this part completely	
Applicant (Must be RVMPO Member)	Partner (if any)
Project Title	
Mode:	Roadway Transit Bike/Ped Other
Project Description: (Include existing conditions, define need, and describe proposed project.) <u>Attach map and photos</u>	
Project Location Detail: (as applicable)	
Street(s) Name (or Nearest Street): _____ • Functional Class: _____	
Cross Streets, Termini: _____ Total Lineal Feet of Grant-Funded Improvement _____	
Is this project included in an existing plan? No Yes	
Plan Name, Page #, Project #:	
Staff Contact	Phone & Email:

2. COST ESTIMATE & FUNDING REQUESTED - Fill out this part completely

Total Estimated Project Cost: For construction projects, attach RVMPPO cost estimator or engineer's stamped estimate						
	Year	Federal Funds Requested		Local Funds*	Other	Total
		STBG	CMAQ			
Project Devel.		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Design/Engineer		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Right-of- Way		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Construction		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Other		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
Total		\$	\$	\$	\$	\$

*Highly leveraged projects earn higher rating)

Fund Preference- if any	STBG	CMAQ	If preference checked, please explain:
--------------------------------	------	------	--

For CMAQ Funding: Describe how the project is CMAQ eligible. For partial CMAQ funding, note which eligible elements of the project are seeking CMAQ funding.
(Eligibility Guidelines: https://www.rvmpp.org/images/asstd%20misc/ODOT_CMAQ_Guidelines_February2018.pdf)

3. PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA - Complete as applicable to project

Applications will be scored according to how well the project fulfills RVMPPO goals in the four areas itemized below: **Mobility, Community Vitality & Livability, Transportation Options** and **Resource Conservation**. Evaluation criteria are based on the region's transportation goals and federal planning requirements. A full explanation of these goals-based criteria is in the attached guidance. Reviewing the goals may help in providing the best information about your project. **It is not anticipated that any one application would respond to all items in this section.**

Information provided in the shaded areas may be used to evaluate project for CMAQ funding.

3.a) MOBILITY

Safety: Project anticipated to reduce or prevent the potential number and severity of crashes.

Location: Roadway Bike/Ped Transit Other Explain "Other":

Crash Data / History:

How does the project increase safety or address/reduce a current safety concern? (Please see ARTS Crash Reduction Factor List on the RVMPPO's website for examples of project types).

Congestion Relief – Reduce Delay: Improve LOS Reduce Delay/Idle Time

How Will Project Reduce Congestion and Delay? Include idle time estimate. Measurable heavy-duty vehicle improvements should be entered in section 3.b

Promote Connectivity: Roadway Bike/Ped Transit

Does the project remove or mitigate a current barrier? Is the project part of a systematic approach?

3.b) COMMUNITY VITALITY & LIVABILITY

Traditionally Underserved Population Benefit: *Applicants should consult both Title VI & Environmental Justice Plan and Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations.* Applicant may provide additional information below regarding investment in population areas (Low-Income, Minority, Seniors, Children, Limited English Proficiency) and/or identified needs addressed.

Will project improve disabled access?

Benefits Freight Movement

Check appropriate:

Reduce Truck VMT

Reduce Truck Idle

Other (explain at right)

Provide as appropriate:

Truck ADT _____

Truck Idle Hrs/yr _____

Anticipated Truck Idle Reduction/yr _____

Truck VMT/yr _____

Anticipated Truck VMT Reduction/yr _____

Additional Information:

(If project reduces truck VMT or emissions, project may be evaluated for CMAQ funds. Light-duty vehicle reductions should be entered in 3a –Mobility, above.)

3.c) TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

[illegible]

3.d) RESOURCE CONSERVATION

Environmental Mitigation: Describe conservation features to be incorporated (*e.g.: permeable surface, wetland protection, etc.*).

Air Quality Benefits (*in addition to those identified elsewhere*)

Diesel Vehicle Project (check one)

Diesel Retrofit
Diesel Fuel Conversion
Alt Fueling Station
Other (explain at right)

Project Description:

New Fuel Type: _____
Number on-road vehicles covered or served: _____ vehicles
Annual mileage all project vehicles within RVMPO area: _____ miles/yr

Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions (CO₂) Yes

(Generally, project that reduces travel by combustion vehicle)

Explain:

Emerging Technology Yes

(Describe technology to be incorporated)

Explain:

System Preservation Yes

Pavement Preservation Yes

(How project extends the life of existing facility)

Explain:

VMT Reduction: (Explain how project will reduce travel) / (For Bike/Pedestrian Utilize Methodology in Attachment A)

Estimate VMT Reduction _____ miles/yr.

System Efficiency

Yes

(Project expands capacity without major investment; improves function without increasing capacity.)

Explain:

Project Lifespan _____ yrs.

For CMAQ Funding: Duration of PM10 & CO Benefit _____ yrs.

(Duration of improvement, program or service in this application)

4. ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION Optional; Information not submitted elsewhere



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: July 24, 2019
TO: RVMPO Policy Committee Members
FROM: Karl Welzenbach, Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: Summary of Efforts to Improve Project Selection Criteria

The following is my attempt to summarize the efforts of the Project Criteria Working Group that was established by the RVMPO's Technical Advisory Committee. The working group consisted of RVCOG staff, and representatives from ODOT, Jackson County, the City of Medford, the City of Central Point, RVTD, and DLCD.

The initial meeting of the working group took place on March 19, 2019 and staff had provided some suggestions as to an approach that could be taken. By the end of that first meeting it became quite clear that this was going to be a longer process than anticipated and the working group decided to focus, initially, on bicycle and pedestrian projects.

At the completion of the first meeting the working group was in agreement on the elements that should be addressed in the selection criteria. Those elements were:

- Safety
- Removal of impediments (this might be duplication of connectivity)
- Connectivity to a local activity centers (as defined in the Jurisdiction's Transportation System Plan or by the Jurisdiction itself)
- Level of Traffic Stress estimate – as calculated utilizing ODOT's version
- Connection to the traditionally underserved – Environmental Justice and Title VI

At subsequent meetings the working group spent a good deal of time on how to incorporate these issues into the criteria discussing many different approaches but all the while attempting to ensure that the criteria would be as objective as possible and could be measured. Discussions also centered around how to best differentiate between a separated bike path like the green way from a bike lane in the application and selection process.

Additionally, members of the working group considered whether or not some key questions should be asked up front before getting into the actual application form itself. These questions included:

- Is the local jurisdiction prepared to provide local match for the project?
- Is the project in the Jurisdiction's TSP/CIP? (If not then a letter of support from the Mayor or City Manager is required)
- What happens if the project is not funded this cycle? Would denial impact other funding?

In an effort to standardize the process the working group recommended that for the safety aspect of the project the local jurisdiction must identify the issue and make use of ODOT's ARTS Crash Reduction Factor List for addressing the problem.

As a final addition, and with assistance from ODOT, the working group agreed to utilize the Pima County Diversion rate calculator once it was tailored to the Rogue Valley. For this effort staff incorporated the Annual Daily Traffic Counts from the City of Medford. This was an effort to create a more defensible air quality analysis process that would stand up to scrutiny from both ODOT and FHWA.

For assessing the level of traffic stress for either bicycle or pedestrian improvements, the working group decided to make use of Chapter 14 of ODOT's Analysis Procedure Manual which deals with multi-modal analysis methodologies.

The attached document was the final selection criteria that were taken to the TAC by the working group at the July meeting. After much discussion, the TAC directed staff to incorporate the selection criteria into the existing application.

ATTACHMENT A

The following three questions must be answered in order for your jurisdictions application to be considered and ranked:

1. Is the local jurisdiction prepared to provide local match for the project?
2. Is the project in the Jurisdiction's TSP/CIP? (If not, then a letter of support from the Mayor or City Manager is required)
3. What happens if the project is not funded this cycle? Would denial of this application impact other funding?

Safety -

- How does the project increase safety or address/reduce a current safety concern? (Please see ARTS Crash Reduction Factor List on the RVMPO's website for examples of project types).

Accessibility/Connectivity -

- Does the project remove or mitigate a current barrier?
- Is the project part of a systemic approach?
- Does the project connect to key destinations (banks, churches, hospitals, health care facilities, park and ride lots, office parks, post offices, public libraries, shopping areas or grocery stores, universities or junior colleges, parks, schools, commercial, high density residential, transit stops)?

Level of Traffic Stress (Bicycle/Pedestrian): 1= low; 4= high;

(Please see Handout entitled "Level of Traffic Stress" and refer to Multi-modal Analysis APMv2_Ch 14 on RVMPO's website)

What are the posted speed limits?

What is the number of travel lanes?

What is the AADT?

Equity –

Will this project serve traditionally underserved communities such as:

Seniors?

Disabled?

Low Income?

Calculation of Vehicle Diversion Rates

Vehicle Diversion Rates for Bike/Ped Projects

$$AADT = ADT * 0.93$$

Vehicles Reduced (VR) = AADT * (Adjustment Factor + Activity Center Credit)

$$VR = AADT * (A + C)$$

Vehicle Miles Reduced (VMTR) = VR * Trip Length

$$VMTR = VR * TL$$

Where: Trip Length = the length of bicycle trip is assumed to be 4 miles and the length of a pedestrian trip is 0.5 miles. For multi-use path average trip length is assumed to be 2.5 miles.

Table 1: Adjustment Factors

Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)	Length of Project	Adjustment Factor (A)
AADT ≤ 11,271 vehicles/day	≤ 1 mile	0.0019
	> 1 mile and ≤ 2 miles	0.0029
	> 2 miles	0.0038
11,271 < AADT ≤ 18,142 vehicles/day	≤ 1 mile	0.0014
	> 1 mile and ≤ 2 miles	0.002
	> 2 miles	0.0027
AADT > 18,142 vehicles/day	≤ 1 mile	0.001
	> 1 mile and ≤ 2 miles	0.0014
	> 2 miles	0.0019

Table 2: Activity Center Credits

banks, churches, hospitals, health care facilities, park and ride lots, office parks, post offices, public libraries, shopping areas or grocery stores, universities or junior colleges, parks, schools, commercial, high density residential, transit stops.

Number of Activity Centers	Activity Center Credit (C)	
	Within 1/2 mile	Within 1/4 mile
At least three	0.0005	0.001
> 3 but < 7	0.001	0.002
≥ 7	0.0015	0.003

Ongoing RVMPO Projects 08-14-19

Attachment #4
(Agenda Item 5)

Agency	Project Name	TIP	Year Programmed (20XX)	Project Status (Phase / Status)		Comments Received
				P	S	
Ashland	Washington Street Extension	15–18	16,17,18	PL		Substitute project approved 06/25/18. Waiting on some permitting issues.
				D		
				LP		
				UR		
				CN		
				OT		
Eagle Point	E. Main St./Stevens Rd. Improvements	15–18	16,17,18	PL	3	Break ground July 2019—construction for one year on E. Main St and Stevens Rd.
				D	3	
				LP	3	
				UR	2	
				CN	2	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan	15–18	16	PL	2	Consultant working on GID data collection. Setting up next CAC meetings for late Sept/early Oct.
				D	0	
				LP	0	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Medford	Foothill Rd. - Hillcrest to McAndrews	15–18	16,17	PL	3	Two ROW properties left. Waiting on environmental. Working on utilities, including with Medford Water Commission on water line. Bid August 2019. Start Fall 2019.
				D	2	
				LP	2	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	
RVTD	Valley Feeder Pilot Project	15–18	16	OT		Valley Feeder and Eagle Point route were awarded STIF funding. RFP issued for software vendor of Uber-style platform for reserving trips. Purchased two vans. CMAQ grant for operations only. Expected service start date of Jan. 2020.

Ongoing RVMPO Projects 08-14-19

Attachment #4
(Agenda Item 5)

Ashland	Chip Seal	18–21	20	PL	2	IGA complete. RFP is in process. Project start possibly in Fall 2019.
				D	1	
				LP	0	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	
Central Point	W. Pine St. Reconstruction - Glenn Way to Brandon Ave.	18–21	19,20	PL	1	Requesting slight delay until Twin Creeks is complete.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	1	
Eagle Point	S. Royal Ave. Improvements - Design & ROW	18–21	19	PL	1	IGA for funds exchange requested. RFQ pending.
				D	2	
				LP	0	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Foothill Rd. - Delta Waters to Dry Creek	18–21	19,20,21	PL	3	Contract almost complete for PE. Scheduled for construction in 2021.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	

Ongoing RVMPO Projects 08-14-19

Attachment #4
(Agenda Item 5)

Jackson County / ODOT	Bear Creek GW - Hwy 140 Shared-Use Path	18-21	19	PL	3	Construction in 2021. Project has been combined with OR 140: Exit 35 Blackwell Road project. Preliminary plans in Aug. 2019. Separate path is designed.
				D	2	
				LP	2	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	
Phoenix	North Couplet Pedestrian Crossing	18-21	19	PL	2	TSP Amendment approved. No current funds for design and construction.
				D	1	
				LP	0	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Status</u>
PL= Planning	0 = N/A
D = Design	1 = Not Started
LP = Land Purchase	2 = In Process
UR = Utility Relocate	3 = Complete
CN = Construction	
OT = Other	