



**Agenda**  
**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**  
**Public Advisory Council**

***Special Meeting***

*Date:* Tuesday, August 13, 2014  
*Time:* 5:30 p.m.  
*Location:* Rogue Valley Council of Governments  
Jefferson Conference Room  
155 N. First Street, Central Point  
**Transit: served by RVTD Route #40**  
*Phone:* 541-423-1360 (Sue Casavan, RVCOG)  
**RVMPO website:** [www.rvmpo.org](http://www.rvmpo.org)

- 1. **Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda** .....Aaron Prunty, Chair
- 2. **Review/Approve Minutes (Approve at regular September meeting)** .....Chair
- 3. **Public Comment (3-minute limit for each speaker)** .....Chair

***Discussion Item:***

- 4. **Proposed Regional Significance Screening Criteria** ..... Jonathan David / Dan Moore

*Background:* Staff prepared proposed regional significance screening criteria (attached) intended to serve as a tool for assisting the IACG 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 proposed regional significance screening criteria is a new document prepared by the RVMPO to address the screening of non-exempt projects within the CO boundary.

*Attachment:* #1 - Memo, Screening Criteria document and project evaluation spreadsheet.

*Action Requested:* None – Information item.

***Action Items:***

- 5. **2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) / Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Amendments / Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)**..... Dan Moore

*Background:* The final draft of the 2015-18 TIP projects and amendments to the 2013-38 RTP are ready for the TAC to review before being included in the draft document

*Attachment:* #2 - Memo, Amendment #7 of the 2013-38 RTP which includes adding new projects and removing completed projects from the RTP project list for each jurisdiction.

- MTIP 2015-2018 (available on link below)  
[http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/1\\_MTIP\\_2015-2018\\_Draft.pdf](http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/1_MTIP_2015-2018_Draft.pdf)
- 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination (available on link below)  
[http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/2\\_2014%20AQCD\\_Draft2.pdf](http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/2_2014%20AQCD_Draft2.pdf)

*Action Requested:* Recommend approval of documents.

- 6. **MPO Planning Update** ..... **Jonathan David**
- 7. **Other Business**.....**Chair**
- 8. **Public Comment**.....**Chair**
- 9. **Next Meeting**.....**Chair**

\*\* The next Public Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for September 16, 2014,  
at 5:30 p.m. at Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room \*\*

- 10. **Adjourn**..... **Chair**

***Other RVMPO meetings***

**Technical Advisory Committee:** 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, September 10, 2014, Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.

**Policy Committee:** 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, August 26, 2014, Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.

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



***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 5, 2014  
**TO:** RVMPO Public Advisory Council  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Significance Screening Criteria

---

The RVMCOG hired the consulting firm Sierra Research to run the Motor Vehicle Emissions Simulator (MOVES) model for the RVMPO air quality conformity analysis for the 2015-18 TIP and amendments to the 2013-38 RTP. Unfortunately, the results showed CO emissions two to three times greater than the RVMCOGs current CO budget, due to prior models (MOBILE5b and MOBILE6) not including - or significantly underestimating - CO emissions from cold starts (i.e., starting exhaust).

The air quality interagency consultation group (IACG) held a conference call on July 14, 2014 to discuss how to address the RVMPO CO emissions budget issue, and move forward with adoption of the 2015-18 TIP and RTP amendments. It was stated that the current air quality conformity is good until April 2017. The group explored several options:

- Adopt a new CO emissions budget
- Develop a limited maintenance plan (LMP)
- Amend the State Implementation Plan (SIP)

These strategies would require a full public rulemaking process, require six to twelve months to complete, and would not be done in time for approval of the 2015-18 TIP and amendments to the 2013-38 RTP scheduled for August 2014.

A member of the IACG questioned whether the non-exempt projects located within the CO boundary were regionally-significant due to the roadway classifications, average daily traffic, and length of the projects. If these projects were deemed “not regionally-significant,” then the projects could be included in the TIP and RTP without having to do a CO emission analysis (since current CO conformity is good until April 2017).

On Monday, July 21, 2014 the air quality interagency consultation group (IACG) met concerning whether certain non-exempt projects to be included in the RVMPO 2015-18 TIP and 2013-38 RTP are regionally-significant in terms of carbon monoxide (CO) emissions. For clarification, determining the “regional significance” of the non-exempt projects within the CO boundary is only to determine the regional significance of the project’s impact on air quality, not whether the project provides a higher level of benefits to the regional transportation system.

Staff prepared proposed regional significance screening criteria (attached) intended to serve as a tool for assisting the IACG 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 proposed regional significance screening criteria is a new document prepared by the RVMPO to address the screening of non-exempt projects within the CO boundary. The document is modeled after similar screening criteria used by the Knoxville Regional Transportation Planning Organization, NW Indiana Regional Planning Commission, and the St. Louis E-W Gateway Council of Governments.

The IACG concurred that the following projects located within the CO boundary are not regionally-significant due to the fact that they met the threshold criteria in *Regional Significance Screening Criteria, Table 1*, their low average daily traffic (ADT), and their minimal impact on the increase in CO emissions over time. Because the following projects in the Medford CO maintenance area are not regionally-significant, a regional emissions analysis for CO is not required (see 40 CFR 93.122(g)(2)(i)). However, the VMT from these projects must be estimated (see 40 CFR 93.122(a)(1)).

- Lozier Extension to Cunningham
- Columbus Avenue Extension
- Foothill Rd: Hillcrest to McAndrews
- Table Rock Rd; I-5 Crossing to Biddle

Because the focus of the IACG meeting was to review new projects for the Medford CO maintenance area, the IACG did not review new projects that will be added in the Medford PM10 maintenance area that are not also located within the Medford CO maintenance area. Although the IACG determined that a new a regional emissions analysis for CO is not required for the new projects in the Medford CO maintenance area, a regional emissions analysis for PM10 will be conducted for any new non-exempt regionally significant projects in the Medford PM10 maintenance area.

Staff presented the proposed screening criteria to the RVMPO Policy Committee at their July 22, 2014 meeting. The Policy Committee tentatively approved the criteria pending the TAC’s review and recommended approval.

## **RVMPO Regional Significance Screening Criteria**

**July 21, 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
- **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

## **Proposed 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 a Principal Arterial 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?
  - 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.

<b>TABLE 1</b>	
<b>RVMPO Thresholds of Regional-Significance for Transportation Projects</b>	
<b>Criteria A</b>	
<b>Interstate and Expressways</b>	
<b>Criteria A-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria A-2 Threshold</b>
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
<b>Criteria B</b>	
<b>Principal Arterials</b>	
<b>Criteria B-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria B-2 Threshold</b>
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
<b>Criteria C</b>	
<b>Minor Arterials</b>	
<b>Criteria C-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria C-2 Threshold</b>
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
<b>Criteria D</b>	
<b>Rail and Fixed Guide-way Transit</b>	
<b>Criteria D-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria D-2 Threshold</b>
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
<b>Criteria E</b>	
<b>Bus and Demand Response Transit</b>	
<b>Criteria E-1 Expansion Type</b>	<b>Criteria E-2 Threshold</b>
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 <sup>1</sup>.

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 <sup>1</sup>.

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: <sup>1</sup> In PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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 PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> 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]

DRAFT

Project Name	Project Description	RTP Status	Expected to be in 15-18 TIP/STIP?	Notes	Road Classification Table 1*	Project Length Linear Feet	Project Length Miles	Expansion Type Table 1	Threshold - Table 1	Regionally-Significant per IACG Concurrence?	2015 VMT	2020 Built VMT	Percent Increase in VMT	Notes
Lozier Extension to Cunningham	New road section, urban collector, 3 lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks	Not in RTP	Yes	NA	Urban Collector (Criteria C)	152	0.03	New Segment (Criteria C-1a)	3/4 to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required (Criteria C-2a)	NO (not-regionally-significant)	NA	NA	NA	Less than 3/4 of a mile in length.
Columbus Avenue Extension	New road section and urban upgrader, 5 lane major arterial	Not in RTP	Yes	NA	Minor Arterial (Criteria C)	3400	0.64	New Segment (Criteria C-1a)	3/4 to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required (Criteria C-2a)	NO (not-regionally-significant)	NA	NA	NA	Less than 3/4 of a mile in length.
Foothill Rd: Hillcrest to McAndrews	Widen to 5 lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk and bike lanes	Not in RTP	Yes	Eastern portion of project abuts area outside of CO boundary	Minor Arterial (Criteria C)	5000	0.95	New Segment (Criteria C-1a)	3/4 to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required (Criteria C-2a)	NO (not-regionally-significant)	113183	137549	22%	Less than one mile in length.
Table Rock Rd., I-5 Crossing to Biddle	Widen to 3 & 5 lanes, curb, gutter, sidewalk and bike lanes	In 2013-38 RTP	Yes	Moving from Long Range to Short Range.	Minor Arterial (Criteria C)	5000	0.95	Added Through Lanes (Criteria C-1d)	3/4 to 1 mile - AQ Consultation Required (Criteria C-2a)	NO (not-regionally-significant)	NA	NA	NA	Less than one mile in length.



## **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 5, 2014  
**TO:** Public Advisory Council  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** 2015-18 TIP, RTP Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination

---

The PAC is being asked for recommendations regarding the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) as summarized below:

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://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/1\\_MTIP\\_2015-2018\\_Draft.pdf](http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/1_MTIP_2015-2018_Draft.pdf)
2. **2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination:** RVMPO presents all newly funded projects in the program of projects. A PM<sub>10</sub> 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://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/2\\_2014%20AQCD\\_Draft2.pdf](http://rvmpo.org/SIB/files/2_2014%20AQCD_Draft2.pdf)
3. **Amendments to 2013-2038 RTP:** making it consistent with the draft 2018 TIP by adding, moving and deleting projects.

#### **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 TAC is being asked to recommend adoption of both documents and RTP amendments, and specify any corrections to be made.

#### **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

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Ashland</b>							
122	Walker Avenue: Safe Walk To School	Sidewalk Construction, west side Walker Ave. between Ashland and Iowa; includes improvements at railroad crossing.	short	\$ 793,000			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	\$ 591,776			Exempt (Table 2) Safety, pedestrian
161	<b>E. Nevada Street Extension</b>	<b>Extend street over Bear Creek to link roadway at Kestrell; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</b>	<b>short</b>	<b>\$ 5,055,500</b>			<b>Non-Exempt</b>
162	<b>Washington Street Extension</b>	<b>Extend street from Mistletoe Road to Ashland Street; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</b>	<b>short</b>	<b>\$ 1,055,000</b>			<b>Non-Exempt</b>
<b>Short Range Total</b>					<b>\$ 8,308,828</b>	<b>\$ 8,308,828</b>	
<del>161</del>	<del>E. Nevada Street Extension</del>	<del>Extend street over Bear Creek to link roadway at Kestrell; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</del>	<del>medium</del>	<del>\$3,404,562</del>			<del>Non-Exempt</del>
<del>162</del>	<del>Washington Street Extension</del>	<del>Extend street from Mistletoe Road to Ashland Street; sidewalks, bicycle lanes</del>	<del>medium</del>	<del>\$1,628,269</del>			<del>Non-Exempt</del>
163	Intersection Improvements: Ashland-Oak Knoll-E. Main	Realign intersection, install speed-reduction treatments	medium	\$1,184,195			Exempt-Table 2
<b>Medium Range Total</b>					<b>\$1,184,195</b>	<b>\$1,184,195</b>	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Central Point</b>							
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	\$1,961,000			Exempt-Table 2
<del>230</del>	<del>Central Point &amp; Talent Parking Lot Improvements</del>	<del>Pave and improve alleys and parking facilities, both cities</del>	<del>short</del>	<del>\$1,191,001</del>			<del>Exempt-Table 2</del>
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
<b>Short Range Total</b>					<b>\$5,931,000</b>	<b>\$5,931,000</b>	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Eagle Point</b>							
<del>324</del>	<del>Mattie Brown Park Improvements</del>	<del>Pave parking area, construct sidewalks at park</del>	<del>Short</del>	<del>\$175,000</del>			<del>Exempt-Table 2</del>
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	<b>Stevens Road - East Main Street to Palima Drive</b>	<b>Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>\$2,715,413</b>			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
340	<b>Linn Rd: OR62 to Buchanan</b>	<b>Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks</b>	<b>Short</b>	<b>\$2,098,000</b>			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
<b>Short Range Total</b>					<b>\$12,862,413</b>		Exempt-Table 2
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Jacksonville</b>							
<del>404</del>	<del>First St. &amp; Main St. Sidewalk and Streetscape</del>	<del>Install lighting, sidewalks, bike parking, pedestrian improvement</del>	<del>Short</del>	<del>\$1,061,346</del>			<del>Exempt-Table 2</del>
<b>Short Range Total</b>					<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Medford</b>							
5002	<del>Garfield Ave., Columbus to Lillian</del>	<del>Reconstruct roadway, add curbs, gutters, sidewalk and bike lanes</del>	<del>short</del>	<del>\$1,673,625</del>			<del>Exempt</del>
506	<del>S. Holly St. Extension -- Garfield Ave. to Holmes Way</del>	<del>Construct street with center turn lane, bike lanes, sidewalks</del>	<del>short</del>	<del>\$3,700,000</del>			<del>Non-Exempt</del>

Red-Lined projects have been completed or moving to short range time frame.

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
598	Crater Lake Ave & Jackson St. Alley Paving	Pave and improve alleys	short	\$1,425,000			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
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					\$28,042,897	\$28,042,897	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Phoenix</b>							
616	OR99 @ Oak St Sidewalk & Ped Crossing	Sidewalks & Pedestrian Crossing w/activated signals	short	\$618,000			Exempt
Short Range Total					\$618,000	\$618,000	
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	Conformity Status
<b>Talent</b>							
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
<b>Jackson County</b>							
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	\$7,885,000			Non-Exempt
Short Range Total					\$10,386,000	\$10,386,000	
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
<b>ODOT</b>							

Red-Lined projects have been completed or moving to short range time frame.



902	<del>I-5: Fern Valley Interchange, Phase 2</del>	<del>Reconstruct interchange; realign, widen connecting roads; replace Bear Creek Bridge</del>	short	\$75,000,000			<del>Non-exempt</del>
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
904	<del>OR 140 Freight Improvements</del>	<del>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 widening shoulders, adding turn lanes, other improvements on segments of Blackwell, Kirtland, High Banks, Antelope, Table Rock, Agate roads and Leigh Way.</del>	short	\$5,000,000			<del>Exempt (Table 2)</del>
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
941, 942	<del>OR62: Linn Rd to Hwy 234</del>	<del>Install two-way center left turn lane between Barton and Rolling Hills</del>	short	\$5,224,000			Exempt-Table 2
945	<b>Hwy 99 &amp; Creel Road Improvements</b>	<b>Widen OR 99 and provide left turn channelization for Creel Rd. Provide sidewalk</b>	short	\$3,621,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
949	<del>Talent/OR 99 Creel</del>	<del>Widen OR 99 and provide left turn channelization for Creel Rd. Provide sidewalk</del>	short	\$3,290,000			Exempt-Table 2
950	<b>I-5 California State Line - Ashland Paving</b>	<b>Grind/Inlay</b>	short	\$13,631,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
951	<b>I-5 S. Medford - N. Ashland Paving</b>	<b>Grind/Inlay</b>	short	\$7,358,001			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
952	<b>OR99: Ashland - Talent Lane Realignment</b>	<b>Continue lane configuration</b>	short	\$250,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
953	<b>OR99: Laurel Street Signal Upgrade</b>	<b>Upgrade traffic signal</b>	short	\$620,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
954	<b>Rogue Valley VMS Replacement Project</b>	<b>Replace boards: I-5/MTN Ave, I-5 Table Rock, Hwy 199</b>	short	\$700,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
955	<b>I-5 Medford Viaduct</b>	<b>Environmental Assessment Study</b>	short	\$4,000,000			<b>Exempt-Table 2</b>
				<b>Short Range Total</b>	\$165,374,186	\$165,374,186	
PROJECT NUMBER	DESCRIPTION		TIMING	COST	Cost by Phase	Funds Available	
<b>Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)</b>							
1039	<b>Urban Operations Support, FFY2013</b>		short	\$ 4,821,770			
1056	Urban Operations Support, FFY2014		short	\$ 3,850,000			
1057	Urban Operations Support, FFY2015		short	\$ 4,900,000			
1058	<b>Urban Operations Support, FFY2016</b>		short	\$ 4,900,000			
1059	<b>Urban Operations Support, FFY2017</b>		short	\$ 4,900,000			
1060	<b>Urban Operations Support, FFY2018</b>		short	\$ 4,900,000			
1061	<del>Expanded Transit Service: Extending transit service to week nights and Saturdays, for three years.</del>		short	\$ -1,949,103			
1062	<del>Radio Communications System Replacement and Upgrade</del>		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	<b>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2016)</b>		short	\$ 1,034,726			
1066	<b>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2017)</b>		short	\$ 1,049,214			
1067	<b>Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2018)</b>		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	<b>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2016 program</b>		short	\$ 150,000			
1075	<b>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2017 program</b>		short	\$ 150,000			
1076	<b>TDM Rideshare Projects: TDM program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2018 program</b>		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	<b>Replacement of two (2) buses</b>		short	\$ 1,367,000			
1073	<b>Valley Feeder</b>		short	\$ 111,445			
1077	<b>Job Access/Reverse Commute Transit operations</b>		short	\$ 206,102			
1046	<b>Support for ADA Service</b>		short	\$ 806,715			
1047	<b>Support for ADA Service</b>		short	\$ 792,000			
1053	<del>Veterans Transportation Call Center</del>		short	\$ -1,353,000			
				<b>Short Range Total</b>	\$ 41,117,002	\$41,117,002	

Red-Lined projects have been completed or moving to short range time frame.