



Agenda
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Public Advisory Council

Date: Tuesday, September 20, 2016
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.rvmppo.org

- 1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda Justin Hurley, Chair**
- 2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1)Chair**
- 3. Public Comment (3-minute limit for each speaker).....Chair**

4. Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding Update Dan Moore

Background: Salem and Eugene are air quality maintenance areas that became eligible this year for CMAQ funding due to a recent FHWA determination. This affects the amount of funding that will be allocated to the RVMPO in the future.

Attachments: #2 – Memo from ODOT staff to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Action Requested: Review and discuss

5. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Project List..... Dan Moore

Background: The Policy Committee approved the 2017 – 2042 RTP project list at their August meeting. Staff will provide the PAC with an overview of the projects and answer questions.

Attachments: #3 – 2017-42 Short, Medium, and Long Range projects. Also attaches is a Tier 2 project list.

Action Requested: Review and discuss

6. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Financial Forecast Dan Moore

Background: The Policy Committee approved the 2017-42 RTP financial forecasts at their August meeting. Staff will provide the PAC with an overview of the forecasts and answer questions.

Attachments: #4 – Memo

Action Requested: Review and discuss

7. RTP Public Involvement Update.....Ryan MacLaren

Background: The RVMPO will have a booth at the Southern Oregon Harvest Festival held at the Jackson County Expo. MPO Staff will provide an overview of the survey results obtained at the three day event.

Attachments: None – Survey results will be presented at the meeting.

Action Requested: Review and discuss

8. Scenario Viewer.....Dan Moore

Background: ODOT developed an online tool call a “Scenario Viewer” that staff will demonstrate at the PAC meeting. This online tool allows you to explore the results of the Strategic Assessment to see how levels of air pollution, driving, cycling, and other outcomes in the region might change as a result of policy decisions. Use the 'action' sliders below to select a level of investment for each strategy, higher levels represent more ambitious policies with greater amounts of investment.

Attachments: None – Link to the viewer: <http://scenarioplanner.com/>

Action Requested: Review and discuss

9. MPO Planning Update Dan Moore

10. Other Business.....Chair

11. Public Comment.....Chair

12. Next Meeting.....Chair

** The next Public Advisory Council meeting is scheduled for November 15, 2016, at 5:30 p.m. at Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room **

13. Adjourn..... Chair

Other RVMPO meetings	<p>Technical Advisory Committee: 1:30 p.m., Wednesday, October 12, Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.</p> <p>Policy Committee: 2:00 p.m., Tuesday, September 20, Rogue Valley Council of Governments, Jefferson Conference Room.</p>
-----------------------------	---

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.

Summary Minutes
Rogue Valley MPO Public Advisory Council
July 19, 2016



The following attended:

MPO Public Advisory Council

Justin Hurley, Chairman	Central Point	
Glen Anderson	East Medford	770-6577
Kay Harrison	Central point	664-1066
Mary Wooding	Ashland	
Michael Stanek	Eagle Point	
Ron Holthusen	Jacksonville	
Mark Earnest		
Thad Keys	Talent	
Mike Polich	Public Health	
Mike Montero	Freight	
Edgar Hee	Bike/Ped	

Staff

Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1369

Others Present

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:30 pm.

2. Review/Approve Minutes

The Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the minutes of the previous meeting (May 17, 2016).

On a motion by Edgar Hee, seconded by Mary Wooding, the Council unanimously approved the minutes as submitted on a voice vote.

3. Public Comment -

Edger Hee shared a newsletter on Pursuing Equity in Bike Planning.

4. MPO Orientation

Dan Moore gave a Power Point on function(s) of an MPO (MPO 101). The presentation covered:

- **Laws pertaining to MPOs** – Federal legislation: “3C” Program = Cooperative, Coordinated & Continuing, 1991 - ISTEA, 1998 – TEA-21, 2005 – SAFETEA-LU, 2012 – Map-21, 2015 - FAST
- **MPO Membership** – (Elected officials, State/Federal agencies, Municipalities, Counties and Regional agencies, Transit, Public, Private Sector and Interest Groups) Each jurisdiction has one (1) vote, with Medford being split into several sections, thereby allowing additional voting power due to its significantly larger size.
- **Public Advisory Council Membership**
- **What is an MPO?**
- **Why are MPOs created** – to share transportation alternatives, solutions, etc. in an expanded arena
- **MPO Structure** (Policy & Technical Advisory Committees, Public Advisory Council, Other Committees, MPO Staff), responsibilities and products (RTP, TIP and UPWP) **NOTE:** The Policy Committee is the sole decision making body.
 RTP – 20 year plan, updated every 4 years, revenues and costs must balance.
 TIP – Sets regional transportation priorities in cooperation with MPO members, RVTD and ODOT.
 AQCD – RTP/TIP must meet AQ emissions regulations. If not, federal funding withheld due to (Non-conforming” status.
- **Federally Required Products** (Public Participation Plan, Title 6/Environmental Justice Plan, funding, etc.
- **The FAST Act (Fixing America’s Surface Transportation).** Focus on performance based planning The MPO is working on performance based planning, addressing safety, air quality, etc. Tourism planning is on the horizon. MPO must address intermodal facilities (transit, etc.).

Mr. Moore shared that it is a somewhat challenging and time sensitive process to comply with all the transportation work schedules and changes. All entities an agency TSPs are coordinated. No one entity TSP has control over another, but the documents must be in the Regional Plan. Goals and Policies must be similar. Inconsistencies must be reconciled. Conformity issues would be adjudicated by the Federal Highway Commission, etc. Local TSP updates must be in compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan. Higher level, local roads (arterials/collectors) are the systems subject to the various requirements. Mr. Anderson stated that the whole, interactive process works pretty well in our region, with very little dissention when sending recommendations to the Policy Committee. Ms. Harrison asked about inclusion of taxi service as part of public transportation. Mr. Moore responded that taxis were part of the private sector, and spoke about other services for senior transportation. The members discussed other aspects of private taxis, i.e. pricing, Uber, regulatory methods, etc., and the feasibility of studying this issue in the future.

The comment was made that specific issues may be brought to the attention of the policy makers, but groups such as the PAC, which had not been previously brought to the table.

5. Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding Update

Dan Moore Presented an update on the changes to CMAQ funding changes for southern Oregon based upon the inclusion of Salem and Eugene AQMAs in the statewide funding formula.

Shared attachments included an RVMPO letter signed by Mike Quilty, Chairman, and addressed to the Oregon Transportation Commission. The letter was approved by both the TAC and the Policy Committee, and

expressed the MPO's serious concerns regarding potential harm to the region's air quality should significant, proposed reductions in funding occur, as well as recommendations for solving The problem of having funded approved projects that may have their funding significantly reduced.

The second attachment was a whitepaper from Sierra Research, "Air Quality Factor Comparison between Medford/Grants Pass, Eugene and Salem", and featured:

- Summary
- Table 1 – Air Quality Planning Area Designations
- Ambient Air Quality Levels
- Figures 1 & 2 – Air Quality Level Comparisons
- Meteorology and Topography
- Table 2 – Comparison of Key Meteorological Variables
- Vehicle Control Programs

The final attachment was a Q&A report – **“What is happening with CMAQ?”**

1) What is the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program?

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program is a U.S. Department of Transportation (U.S. DOT) funding program intended to “provide a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act.” With the creation and implementation of the CMAQ program in 1991 as part of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), funding became available to areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas). The CMAQ program is housed and administered through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

2) Does the Rogue Valley MPO receive CMAQ funds?

Yes, the Rogue Valley MPO has received CMAQ funding since the start of the CMAQ program in 1991 because the region was formerly a non-attainment area for carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter 10 micrometers or less (PM10) and is currently required to implement maintenance plans to address CO and PM10 emissions.

3) How are CMAQ funds distributed? (Federal Government to State Government)

Since the creation and implementation of the CMAQ funding program, CMAQ funding has been disbursed through state departments of transportation (DOT). The State DOT then decides how to allocate the CMAQ funds to eligible areas. Formulas which prescribe the amount of CMAQ funding to each state have evolved since the implementation of the program in 1991. In 2009 the authorization bill SAFETEA-LU changed the distribution formula from one that varied each year based on impacted populations and levels of exposure to emissions to one based on the proportion of funds each state received in 2009. Therefore, the proportion of funds to each state has not changed since 2009, even through the landscape of eligible areas and the air quality context has changed.

4) How are CMAQ funds distributed? (State Government to Local Government)

Because State DOTs have the discretion for determining the allocation of CMAQ funding to those eligible areas in the state, the CMAQ funding program differs from state to state. FHWA does not have statewide distribution requirements for State DOTs aside from establishing eligible areas. In Oregon, ODOT has taken a sub-allocation approach to distributing CMAQ funding to eligible areas. Since 2006, ODOT has used the same sub-allocation formula for CMAQ funding, which was based on multiple factors including air quality status, pollution severity and population. Eligible areas outside of MPOs have received an “off the top” allocation of \$65,000 per year, typically spent in one obligation of funds accumulated over several years.

5) How much of that CMAQ funding comes to the RVMPO?

The RVMPO currently receives approximately \$2.5 million per year to implement transportation projects which address air quality issues. Amounts change slightly each year consistent with the rate of annual growth of overall federal transportation funding to the state. In general, the funds have grown slightly over time and with no changes in the sub-allocation formula would be approximately \$2.8 million by the end of the current federal authorization bill in 2020.

6) What is currently happening with CMAQ in Oregon and why is this discussion happening now?

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) has elected to make the CMAQ program a local program, allowing federal funds to go to eligible local governments. The CMAQ program is a reimbursement program requiring non-federal matching funds of 10.27%, with a higher match rate for projects that are public-private partnerships. In Oregon, the only areas that qualified for CMAQ funds until recently are:

- Portland Metro area (CO maintenance area)
- Medford/ Ashland Metro area (CO maintenance, PM-10 maintenance area)
- Klamath Falls (CO and PM-10 maintenance area)
- La Grande (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Lakeview (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Oakridge (PM-10 nonattainment area)
- Grants Pass (CO and PM-10 maintenance area)

It was noted during the 2005 Statewide CMAQ Committee funding allocation meetings, which even though the Salem and Eugene-Springfield areas are designated as nonattainment or maintenance for CO, these areas did not qualify for CMAQ funding due to the following reason:

Areas which were designated nonattainment prior to December 31, 1997, but were not classified in accordance with [the Clean Air Act, Sections 181(a), 186(a) or 188(a) or (b)] are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds. These include but are not limited to areas that were formerly considered as ozone “transitional” and “incomplete data” areas and CO “not classified” areas.

FHWA recently made a determination that the Eugene and Salem regions are eligible to receive CMAQ funding.

1. Eugene/Springfield is eligible because it's PM-10 Maintenance Area. It became eligible in June 2013, the effective date of its PM-10 Maintenance Plan. This supersedes previous policy which said: Areas that were designated nonattainment prior to Dec. 31, 1997 but were not classified in accordance with the Clean Air Act—sections 181(a), 186(a), or 188(a) or (b)—are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds.

2. Salem is eligible at least through March 2017 because it's an Unclassified CO Maintenance Area that has prepared and filed a maintenance plan. It became eligible in March 2009, the effective date of its CO Limited Maintenance Plan. As with Eugene, this supersedes previous policy which said: Areas that were designated nonattainment prior to Dec. 31, 1997 but were not classified in accordance with the Clean Air Act—sections 181(a), 186(a), or 188(a) or (b)—are not eligible to receive CMAQ funds. The Salem and Eugene MPOs have now requested ODOT to update the state distribution method to account for their eligibility. ODOT is considering how to update the distribution process and is expected to propose a process in the very near future.

7) If new places become eligible for CMAQ funding, does that mean the State of Oregon receives more CMAQ funding?

No, the federal transportation reauthorization does not increase or decrease the level of CMAQ funding each state receives based on the current air quality conditions and newly eligible areas.

8) How soon can the RVMPO be affected/impacted by the outcomes of the statewide CMAQ allocation discussions?

The impacts to the funding amounts will be determined by the Oregon Transportation Commission when they adopt a new distribution process, including the date the new process will go into effect.

9) How can the RVMPO contribute to the conversation about the statewide CMAQ funding allocation?

To date, ODOT has communicated a general description to undergo a process over the summer and looks to bring forward to the OTC a new recommendation on how to allocate CMAQ funds in the state by autumn 2016. As ODOT prepares to define a more specific process proposal, the RVMPO may consider sending a message to ODOT asking that there be adequate time to consider options.

After Mr. Moore's explanation of the issue, upcoming OTC meetings, and speaking about the Policy Committee letter, the Council members discussed their support for the Policy Committee's letter and position. Comments and concerns included:

- PM10 emissions.
- Local political advocacy and support at the State level?
- How Salem and Eugene became eligible for inclusion in CMAQ funding.
- The locations of PM2.5 problem areas and the prevalence of wood stoves.
- Mike Montero – Specific, regional factors to be brought to the OTC/State's attention -
 - a. Unique, topographic problems within the region that create particular air quality challenges, as well as associated public health issues due to this naturally occurring situation.
 - b. **VOLUNTARY**, regional efforts being made to mitigate air quality problems (EXAMPLE: I&M Testing Program).
 - c. The Rogue Valley area is the only area in the State mandated to do **dispersion modeling**.
 - d. The region is economically hamstrung for putting certain types of industrial users into the region, as opposed to other areas of the State where this is not a problem.

Mr. Montero brought up the possibility of submitting a letter on behalf of the PAC to substantiate their expressed concerns on this issue. Glen Anderson and the rest Council members went on record as endorsing Mike Quilty's concerns about the availability of accurate data, not currently available. Mr. Moore pointed out page 2 of the CMAQ printout in response to a question about the history of Eugene/Salem's desire to be part of the CMAQ funding allocations. The Policy Committee letter was provided for the Council member's information.

On a motion Mike Montero, seconded by Glen Anderson, the PAC directed Staff to write a letter to the Policy Committee articulating their additional concerns about the CMAQ funding issue. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

6. Air Quality (PM 2.5)

Dan Moore made a presentation on air quality and related, local PM 2.5 issues, including a short Power Point summary of the issue. **NOTE:** The area's AQMA is used for analysis purposes.

During the June 14th TRADCO meeting, there was discussion about a recent presentation by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ) concerning Medford's PM 2.5 levels. ODEQ has been soliciting comments for a statewide workgroup in preparing a report for the legislature. Mr. Moore was asked to follow-up with ODEQ to find out more information, and how exceeding the PM 2.5 standard might affect the Medford area. Below are responses from ODEQ.

ODEQ

Medford is currently just below the daily standard for PM2.5. ODEQ determines if an area is above the standard by monitoring for PM2.5 throughout the year and taking the 98th percentile value for that year. Then ODEQ averages the 98th percentiles for the last three years to compare with the standard. This happens every year to

determine if an area is in violation of the standard. When an area has been designated as an in attainment, nothing regulatory happens for each year when it violates the standard. What ODEQ really has to watch out for is the EPA re-designations that happens every 10 years or so (ODEQ does not know exactly when EPA will start re-designation). During re-designation, EPA selects a three year span to determine whether an area is above or below the standard. If they are above the standard, they re-designate the area as non-attainment. ODEQ does not know which three year period the EPA will use. If an area is designated as non-attainment, the state, county, city, and EPA will have to work on a State Implementation Plan (SIP) that will require the area to take actions to lower PM_{2.5} emissions. Once the area comes in below the standard, a maintenance plan is designed to keep you there.

The impact of non-attainment: Mr. Moore shared a document ODEQ found on line that summarizes the impact. Medford was in non-attainment for PM₁₀ and is in a maintenance status now, so the Medford area has experienced this already. As for the standard, EPA revisited the standard in 2012 and kept the daily standard at 35ug/m³. They did lower the annual average standard from 15ug/m³ to 12ug/m³. Medford is in danger of violating the daily standard. ODEQ has not heard of any talk of lowering the daily standard to 30ug/m³, but EPA always looks at new health data and this is always on the table. Since EPA did not lower the daily standard in 2012, it would be surprising if they lowered it in the next few years, but ODEQ does not have any inside information on this.

The EPA web page on the PM_{2.5} standard is: <https://www3.epa.gov/pmdesignations/>

Additional comments from ODEQ:

- EPA, under the Clean Air Act is supposed to review the PM_{2.5} standard every 5 years. As mentioned, EPA last reviewed the standard in 2012, and the next review is supposed to occur by 2017, but sometimes EPA does not complete its review within the 5 year timeframe. EPA has started its review process.
- EPA, in previous reviews of the standard has considered dropping the standard down to 30ug/m³, but as mentioned above, EPA did not do so in 2012. It's hard to predict what EPA will do, since it is based on the latest available health effects information, but ODEQ has mentioned the 30ug/m³ level to many communities as a caution and perhaps even a goal for communities to target to ensure they do not have to worry about a nonattainment designation.
- If Medford were to exceed the standard in the near future (and EPA has not changed the standard), then Medford could develop a voluntary "PM plan" that would identify any strategies the community is putting in place to bring levels down. That would give EPA the assurance that the area is working diligently to address the PM levels and would not designate the area as nonattainment. ODEQ has developed similar plans with the communities of Lakeview and Prineville, since they are violating the standard right now but have not yet been designated nonattainment by EPA. However, if EPA were to revise the standard, then federal law requires that any area not meeting the standard, even if they've developed a voluntary PM plan, would have to be designated as nonattainment.

Jackson County Health is very interested in seeing coordination among the county and the cities to reinvigorate the woodstove program to help address the PM_{2.5} issue. Jackson County and the cities have established programs and it should be effective to place a fresh emphasis on the outreach aspects in the coming winter seasons. Some of the recommendations from the local ODEQ presentations have been to include the desirability of providing funding for outreach efforts and other projects.

Finally, Mr. Moore asked ODEQ if the Rogue Valley area should be concerned about the PM_{2.5} standard. ODEQ thinks it's a concern, but the Medford-area has had the previous experience of dealing with nonattainment in the 1980's and we've already got the tools in place to address this. For example, both Jackson County and all the cities in the area have ordinances to require woodstove curtailment on poor air quality days. Now it's just a matter of going back and re-educating the public and making sure people are following the

curtailment calls. This effort could involve sending informational letters to folks who are burning, and ODEQ has found in other communities that folks usually comply after receiving the letter. ODEQ also thinks if we were to revive the air quality committee it would be really helpful just to make sure all the cities are checking in with each other and coordinating any outreach and education efforts. This could also include putting together a voluntary PM plan, if that's how the region wanted to proceed. Typically, you send a notification letter to EPA that you'd like to be part of the voluntary program and then you submit your plan to them. EPA usually requests that you develop a 5 year voluntary plan, with strategies for how you plan to reduce emissions, and provide annual updates to them. Here's more information on the program. <https://www.epa.gov/advance/advance-basic-information>

Mr. Moore shared his understanding that Jackson County Public Health, (Jackson Baures with Chad Peterson and Danielle Morvan) are very interested in seeing coordination among the County and the cities to reinvigorate the woodstove program. Beyond that effort, he is not aware of any other organization that has shown interest in organizing any other local efforts such as; developing a voluntary PM plan, or reconvening the Air Quality Committee. It depends upon who has the resources to help take the lead. ODEQ could offer technical assistance and support.

The presentation included charts and a graph that depicted the PM2.5 monitoring data. This helped tell the story about why there needs to be a focus on woodstoves and burning – you can see its influence in the data. The graph shows levels rise in the winter months (mid-October through end of February) all primarily due to woodstove smoke. The huge spike shown in the summertime is due to wildfires, which is not counted against the data that gets reported to EPA and determines if the area is over the standard. In other words, wildfire data can be excluded.

There are some ways that the RVMPO can help:

- Reducing the amount of winter road sanding material placed on the roadway. For example, the RVMPO could ask ODOT and the city and county public works departments in the areas to utilize de-icing agents and salt instead of sand, increased plowing of roads and sweeping up of cinders during storms, and reduced sanding to intersections only.
- Another idea would be in the contracts that cities and counties have with construction companies (or even in-house) would be to require anti-idling measures for construction equipment or other diesel powered engines.

The Council mentioned that the abolition of wood burning (for heat) might be a viable answer to reducing the PM 2.5 emissions in the AQMA. It was also observed that some of the EPA reduction suggestions were perhaps not the most effective in light of the conditions existing in our region.

7. MPO Planning Update –

- The Program Manager position has been offered to Carl Rosenbach. Negotiations are in process to formalize h
- The RTP update continues, and portions of the document will be brought to the PAC in September.
- Staff is working with ODOT/DLCD on development scenario planning with the goal of improving bike/ped opportunities and air quality.

8. Other Business -

- The regional Sierra Research information went to OTC.
- Staff will compose a memo on the CMAQ issue from the PAC to the Policy Committee.
- Jackson County Health Department will be doing a community outreach on wood burning issues.

9. Public Comment -

There were no public comments.

10. Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for Sept. 20, 2016, in the RVCOG conference room, at 5:30 PM.

11. Adjournment

It was moved and seconded to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Meeting schedule:

RVMPO TAC	Wed., Aug. 10 @ 1:30 PM
RVMPO Policy	Tues., July 26 @ 2:00 PM



Oregon

Kate Brown, Governor

Oregon Transportation Commission

Office of the Director, MS 11

355 Capitol St NE

Salem, OR 97301-3871

DATE: August 4, 2016

TO: Oregon Transportation Commission

[Original signature on file]

FROM: Matthew L. Garrett
Director

SUBJECT: **Agenda I** – CMAQ Funding Program

Requested Action:

Provide input related to the process for making changes to the allocation and use of the federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding in Oregon. The discussion will include how to engage appropriate stakeholders and expected timelines.

Background:

The CMAQ program is a federal-aid funding source for transportation projects that reduce traffic congestion and improve air quality, specifically for the pollutants of ozone, carbon monoxide and particulate matter. Within this general purpose, the program can fund a wide variety of projects, with each project meeting three basic criteria: *it should be a transportation project, it should generate an emissions reduction, and it should be located in or benefit a nonattainment or maintenance area.* Some general project categories include: dust reduction, traffic flow improvements, transit vehicles, initial operations assistance for new transit service, transit infrastructure, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, Transportation Options, alternative fuels and vehicles, data systems and planning, and education/outreach.

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) determines which nonattainment and maintenance areas CMAQ funds are eligible to be used within. The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT), as the state department of transportation, has the discretion on how to allocate the funds for projects within these eligible areas. Historically, almost all of the CMAQ funds have been allocated to the individual eligible areas that control project selection and investment decisions at their local level. The allocation formula was last modified in 2006 and agreed to by representatives from the specific Oregon eligible nonattainment and maintenance areas and ODOT staff. That formula remains in effect currently and sets the percentage of available annual funding that each eligible area has control of. Until recently the qualifying areas were: the Portland metro area, Medford-Ashland, Grants Pass, Klamath Falls, Lakeview, Oakridge, and La Grande.

New Considerations:

In March 2016, at the urging of the Salem-Keizer and Central Lane Metropolitan Planning Organizations and with ODOT staff support, the FHWA Oregon Division Office in coordination with their Washington, D.C. program office, confirmed that both the Salem and Eugene areas are now eligible CMAQ areas. Upon this determination, all eligible CMAQ areas in Oregon were notified of the two additional eligible areas and the need to reevaluate future distributions of CMAQ funds.

In April 2016, the proposed National Performance Management Measures for Assessing the CMAQ Improvement Program were released as part of the MAP-21 required performance measures. While not approved yet, the proposed rules would require states to estimate statewide emission reductions and set 2 and 4-year total emission reduction targets, based on the reductions for each CMAQ funded project.

Next Steps:

Originally, ODOT staff planned to convene stakeholders in summer 2016 to form a recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission by fall 2016 on how to allocate CMAQ funding and how to include all nine eligible areas. After further consideration, taking into account the feedback heard from various stakeholders, ODOT staff now recommends taking the necessary time to work the issues with stakeholders and ensure the CMAQ funds are used in a strategic and effective manner. Because CMAQ funds were identified in the current 2015-2018 STIP for the previous eligible areas, the focus will be on funding decisions for 2019 and beyond.

To thoroughly engage the eligible CMAQ areas, the potential recipients of these funds, and other interested stakeholders, this process is anticipated to take 9-12 months. This is in alignment with stakeholder engagement and program development for other large funding programs. The goals of this effort will be to set clear objectives for this funding source in Oregon, ensure the strategic use of these funds, and consider on-going stakeholder engagement for this funding source, possibly through an advisory committee.

Attachments:

- Attachment 1 – CMAQ letters from local governments

Copies (w/attachments) to:

Jerri Bohard	Travis Brouwer	Tom Fuller	Bob Gebhardt
Mac Lynde	Rian Windsheimer	Sonny Chickering	Frank Reading
Bob Bryant	Craig Sipp		

Short Range 2017 - 2021								
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Ashland								
120	Laurel St. RR Crossing	R/R X-ing improvements, surface improvements	short	\$ 813,552			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
160	Hersey St: N. Main to Oak St Sidewalk	Sidewalk Construction	short	\$ 591,776			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
161	E. Nevada Street Extension	Extend street over Bear Creek to link roadway at Kestrell; sidewalks, bicycle lanes	short	\$ 5,055,500			Non-Exempt	PM10
162	Independent Way	Extend street from Washington St to Tolman Creek Rd; sidewalks, bicycle lanes	short	\$ 1,055,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
Ashland Short Range (2017-2021)				Total	\$ 7,515,828	\$ 7,635,000	\$ -	
Central Point								
	Twin Creeks Rail Crossing	Add new at grade crossing and signal, sidewalks at OR99 and Twin Creeks Crossing	short	\$ 3,900,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
234	IAMP 33 - N. Bound off ramp	Add second right turn lane	short	\$ 1,300,000			Exempt - Table 3	PM10
233	E. Pine Street Downtown Improvement Projects	New Sidewalks, street lights, and new signals at 2nd and 4th Streets. New Pedestrian Crossing at 6th Street	short	\$ 5,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Central Point Short Range (2017-2021)				Total	\$ 10,200,000	\$ 11,473,000	\$ -	
Eagle Point								
330	Stevens Road - East Main Street to Robert Trent Jones	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	short	\$ 2,700,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
331	Linn Rd: OR62 to Buchannan	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	short	\$ 2,098,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
329	South Shasta Avenue - Alta Vista Road to Arrowhead Trail (Phase I)	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	short	\$ 450,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	Stevens Road - Riley Road	Pedestrian Path to EP National Cemetery	short	\$ 300,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Eagle Point Short Range (2017-2021)				Total	\$ 5,548,000	\$ 6,626,000	\$ -	
Jackson County								
809	Foothill Rd., Corey Rd. to Atlantic St.	New two lane rural major collector, add signal	short	\$ 2,500,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
810	Regional Active Transportation Plan		short	\$ 200,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
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	PM10/CO
873	Table Rock Rd. at Gregory	New traffic signal	short	\$ 350,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
874	Kirtland to Gold Ray	Rogue River Greenway extension	short	\$ 400,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Jackson County Short Range (2017-2021)				Total	\$ 11,333,540	\$ 9,253,000	\$ 2,080,540	
Jacksonville								
No Short Range Projects Proposed			short	\$ -				
Jacksonville Short Range (2017-2021)				Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
ODOT								
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	PM10/CO
906	I-5 S. Medford - N. Ashland Paving	Grid/Inlay	short	\$ 7,358,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
907	Antelope Road, White City	CNG Fueling Station	short	\$ 2,213,575			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
908	Jackson & Josephine Counties	Sign and Delineation Upgrades	short	\$ 729,191			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
910	Jackson County	I-5: Barnett Road Overpass Deck Overlay	short	\$ 759,600			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
912	OR99 Ashland Creek Bridge	Repair Concrete Deterioration, Bridge #0M274	short	\$ 660,460			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
913	I-5: Siskiyou Rest Area (Ashland)	Relocate rest area at new location	short	\$ 14,715,185			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
914	I-5 Southern Oregon	Install cable barriers at various locations	short	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
917	Hwy 62 & Hwy 140 Intersection Improvements	Relocate signal, modify lane configuration	short	\$ 1,622,500			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
945	OR99: Rapp Road to Ashland	Reducing to 3 lanes, consolidating accesses, adding bike/ped improvements	short	\$ 3,341,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
946	I-5: Bear Creek Bridges NB & SB, Scour Repair	Scour Repair, Bridges 08771N & 08771S	short	\$ 1,994,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
950	I-5 California State Line - Ashland Paving	Grind/Inlay	short	\$ 13,631,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
953	OR99: Laurel Street Signal Upgrade	Upgrade traffic signal	short	\$ 620,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
954	Rogue Valley VMS Replacement Project	Replace boards: I-5/MTN Ave, I-5 Table Rock, Hwy 199	short	\$ 700,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
955	I-5 Medford Viaduct	Environmental Assessment Study	short	\$ 4,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
956	OR-99: Coleman Crk to Birch Street	Restripe highway to add bike lanes. Adds Sidewalks. Adds Bus Signal Prioritization Ashland to Central Point.	short	\$ 7,300,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
ODOT Short Range (2017-2021) Total			Total	\$ 180,629,511	\$ 180,629,511	\$ -		

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Medford								
5012	Columbus Ave, McAndrews to Sage	Realign, extend Columbus to Sage Rd, and widen to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks	short	\$4,000,000			Non-Exempt	PM10/CO
5014	Delta Waters Rd, Provincial to Foothill	Widen to three lanes with curb, gutter, bike lanes and sidewalks	short	\$1,200,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5015	Springbrook at Spring	Install new traffic signal or roundabout	short	\$575,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5016	4th at Riverside	Add NBR lane (City/MURA)	short	\$500,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5017	Main St at Barneburg	Install new traffic signal	short	\$300,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5018	Crater Lake at Jackson	Add left-turn lanes on all approaches and protect movements	short	\$2,500,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5020	Arterial and collector streets as needed	Install ITS equipment to facilitate traffic flow and enhance system communications	short	\$400,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
Medford Short Range (2017-2021) Total			Total	\$ 9,475,000			\$ 67,887,000	\$ -
Phoenix								
627	N. Church: W. 1st to w. 6th & N. Pine W. 1st to W. 5th	Asphalt overlay, roadway widening to City standards, curb, gutter, sidewalks and storm drainage, AC waterline replacement, sharrows	short	\$ 1,197,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Phoenix Short Range (2017-2021) Total			Total	\$ 1,197,000			\$ 776,000	\$ 421,000
Talent								
<i>No Short Range Projects Proposed</i>			short	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Talent Short Range (2017-2021) Total			Total	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -		
Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)								
1054	TDM Rideshare Projects: Transportation Demand Management program operated by Rogue Valley Transportation District, 2015 program		short	\$ 150,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1057	Urban Operations Support, FFY2015		short	\$ 4,900,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1058	Urban Operations Support, FFY2016		short	\$ 5,000,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1059	Urban Operations Support, FFY2017		short	\$ 5,100,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1060	Urban Operations Support, FFY2018		short	\$ 5,200,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1064	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2015)		short	\$ 1,047,769			Exempt - Table 2	
1065	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2016)		short	\$ 1,034,726			Exempt - Table 2	
1066	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer, FFY2017)		short	\$ 1,049,214			Exempt - Table 2	
1067	Capitalization of Maintenance (MPO STP Transfer FFY2018)		short	\$ 1,063,903			Exempt - Table 2	
1073	Valley Feeder		short	\$ 111,445			Exempt - Table 2	
1077	Drive Less Connect Outreach		short	\$ 149,000			Exempt - Table 2	
1078	E-Fare System		short	\$ 764,516			Exempt - Table 2	
1078	FTA 5310 E&D Transit Capital STP Transfer (2015-2017)		short	\$ 1,329,533			Exempt - Table 2	
1079	FTA 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program (2016)		short	\$ 233,042			Exempt - Table 2	
1080	FTA 5310 Enhanced Mobility Program (2015)		short	\$ 233,042			Exempt - Table 2	
RVTD Short Range (2017-2021) Total			Total	\$ 27,366,191	\$ 27,366,191			
Total Short Range (2017-2021)				\$ 253,265,070	\$ 311,645,702	\$ 2,501,540	MPO Discretionary Funds Needed	
						\$ 9,479,000	Short Range Discretionary Funds Available	
						\$ 6,977,460	Balance	

Medium Range 2022 - 2030								
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Ashland								
163	Intersection Improvements: Ashland-Oak Knoll-E. Main	Realign intersection, install speed-reduction treatments	medium	\$ 1,184,195			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Ashland Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 1,184,195	\$ 6,499,000	\$ -		
Central Point								
215	OR 99: Traffic Calming Unit 3	Traffic Calming	medium	\$ 259,043			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
227	W. Pine St., Hanley St. to Haskell St.	Widen to add center turn lane, bike lanes , sidewalks	medium	\$ 3,286,685			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Central Point Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 3,545,727	\$ 18,276,000	\$ -		
Eagle Point								
322	North Royal Avenue - Loto Street to E. Archwood Drive	Little Butte Creek Pedestrian Trail	medium	\$ 150,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
325	Arrowhead Trail - Black Wolf lane to Pebble Creek Blvd	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	medium	\$ 1,800,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
334	South Royal Avenue - OR62 to Loto Street	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	medium	\$ 5,100,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
323	Barton Road - Highway 62 to Reese Creek Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	medium	\$ 475,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
327	Havenwood Drive - Barton Road to UGB	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	medium	\$ 525,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
308	Sienna Hills Drive - Barton Road to UGB	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	medium	\$ 625,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 8,675,000	\$ 4,912,000	\$ 3,763,000		
Jackson County								
858	Foothill Rd., Delta Waters to Coker Butte	Improve (widen) to rural major collector standards	medium	\$ 2,220,366			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
859	Foothill Rd., Coker Butte to Vilas	Improve (widen) to rural major collector standards	medium	\$ 2,220,366			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
875	Gold Ray Rd, Blackwell Rd to Upper River Rd.	Rogue River Greenway extension	medium	\$ 2,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Jackson County Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 6,440,733	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 2,440,733		
Jacksonville								
No Medium Range Projects Proposed			medium	\$ -				
Jacksonville Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ -	\$ 485,000	\$ -		

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
ODOT								
957	OR-99: Birch Street to Garfield	Add sidewalks and bikelanes; Upgrade Storm Drain	Medium	\$ 10,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
958	OR-99: Talent to Phoenix	Restripe to 3-lane cross section; Add transit pullouts	Medium	\$ 3,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
959	OR-140 @ Agate and @ Leigh Way	Improve intersections alignments and change thru movement to favor the highway alignment.	Medium	\$ 7,000,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
ODOT Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 20,000,000	\$ -		
Medford								
5024	Barnett at N. Phoenix	Widen and add WBR lane and second EBL lane	medium	\$ 500,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5025	Crater Lake at Delta Waters	Add EBL and WBL turn lanes and protect movements. Add EBR lane	medium	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5026	Main at Columbus	Add NBL and SBL lanes and protect movements. Extend second WB lane further west. Add SBR lane.	medium	\$ 1,500,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5027	Springbrook, Cedar Links to Delta Waters	Widen to three lanes with curb, gutter, bike lanes and sidewalks	medium	\$ 3,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5028	Highland, Barnett Rd to Siskiyou Blvd	Widen to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks	medium	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5029	Arterial or collector locations as needed	2070 signal controller upgrades	medium	\$ 650,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5031	10th Street Bridge at Bear Creek	Repair bridge (assume 80% federal share/20% city share – city share shown)	medium	\$ 2,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5032	Garfield, Holly to Kings Highway	Widen to provide curb, gutter, bike lanes and sidewalk	medium	\$ 1,602,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
Medford Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 14,752,000	\$ 52,283,000	\$ -		

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Phoenix								
628	Urban Reserve Areas PH-5, PH-10	Construct new street network	Medium	\$ 20,000,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
629	Rose St, Oak to 1st	Install sidewalks	Medium	\$ 346,500			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
630	Camp Baker Road, Hilsinger to Colver	new or improved sidewalks on both sides	Medium	\$ 445,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
631	Oak St. Rose to Main	Install sidewalks	Medium	\$ 363,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
611	Colver Rd., First St. to 4th	Widen and construct sidewalks, bike lanes	Medium	\$ 595,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
632	Colver Rd., First St. to Southern UGB Boundary	Construct multi-use path on east side	Medium	\$ 250,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Phoenix Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 21,999,500			\$ 2,307,000	\$ 19,692,500
Talent								
717	Rapp Rd.: 150' South of Graham Way to Wagner Creek Rd.	Rebuild and upgrade to urban major collector standard (widen lanes, add bicycle lanes, sidewalks)	medium	\$ 3,430,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
728	Wagner St.: Talent Ave to West Valley View Rd.	Construct new collector street (50 feet)	medium	\$ 730,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
729	Wagner Creek Greenway Path: West Valley View Rd to Bear Creek Greenway	Construct new 10-foot-wide multimodal path near Wagner Creek connecting to Bear Creek Greenway (install new creek crossing)	medium	\$ 880,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Talent Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 5,040,000	\$ 2,607,000	\$ 2,433,000		
Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)								
Medium Range Projects, Funding in Financial Chapter			medium	\$ 65,788,000				
RVTD Medium Range (2022-2030)			Total	\$ 65,788,000	\$ 65,788,000			
Total Medium Range (2022-2030)				\$ 147,425,155	\$ 177,157,000	\$ 28,329,233	MPO Discretionary Funds Needed	
						\$ 32,131,000	Medium Range Discretionary Funds Available	
						\$ 6,977,460	Short Range Discretionary Funds Carryover	
						\$ 10,779,227	Balance	

Long Range 2031 - 2042								
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Ashland								
164	Normal Avenue Extension	Extend roadway to East Main; sidewalks, bicycle lanes	long	\$ 5,916,032			Non-Exempt	PM10
165	Clear Creek Drive Extension	Extend road to connect with N. Mountain Ave.	long	\$ 4,601,359			Non-Exempt	PM10
Ashland Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 10,517,391	\$ 12,754,000	\$ -		
Central Point								
214	Scenic Ave., Mary's Way to Scenic Middle School	Widen to add bike lanes and sidewalks (urban upgrade)	long	\$ 865,078			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
219	Table Rock Rd. & Vilas Rd Intersection	Widen to add turn lanes	long	\$ 1,751,803			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
224	Scenic Ave, 10th St. to Scenic Middle School	Widen to add continuous turn lane with bike lanes and sidewalks	long	\$ 1,117,473			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
235	IAMP 33- South Bound on ramp	Add second left turn lane	long	\$ 1,700,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
Central Point Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 5,434,354	\$ 9,001,000	\$ -		
Eagle Point								
343	Havenwood Drive - UGB to Rolling Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 575,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
344	Sienna Hills Drive - UGB to Rolling Hills Drive	Extension (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 750,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
335	Alta Vista Road - Robert Trent Jones to Riley Road	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 1,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
332	Alta Vista Road - S. Shasta Avenue to Robert Trent Jones	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 750,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
333	North Royal Avenue - Loto Street to Reese Creek Road	Urban Upgrade (Arterial) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 1,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
336	Hannon Road - West Linn Road to Nick Young Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 1,600,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
337	Nick Young Road - OR 62 to Hannon Road	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 375,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
339	West Linn Road - OR 62 to Dahlia Terrace	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 1,800,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
341	Reese Creek Road - Royal Ave to Barton Rd	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 550,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
342	South Shasta Avenue - Highway 62 to Arrowhead Trail (Phase II)	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 1,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	Royal Ave/Old Highway 62 Intersection	Intersection Realignment	long	\$ 550,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
New	Little Butte Park Pedestrian Bridge	New Pedestrian Bridge Near Teakwood	long	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	S. Shasta Ave - Arrowhead Trail to Loto Street	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes	long	\$ 650,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	Cottonwood at Hwy 62	Realign Intersection	long	\$ 250,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
New	Linn Rd at Hwy 62	Dual Left Turn Lanes	long	\$ 120,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
New	Onyx St Extension	Extension Collector with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	long	\$ 225,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
New	Hwy 62 @ Rolling Hills Dr	Signalization	long	\$ 250,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10
Eagle Point Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 15,445,000	\$ 8,289,000	\$ 7,156,000		

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Jackson County								
860	Foothill Rd., Vilas to Corey	Improve (widen) to rural major collector standards	long	\$ 3,286,685			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
861	Table Rock Rd., Mosquito to Antelope	Widen to 4 lanes	long	\$ 2,191,123			Non-Exempt	PM10
862	Old Stage Rd., Winterbrook to Taylor	Improve (widen) to rural major collector standards	long	\$ 3,286,685			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
866	Beall Ln., Highway 99 to Merriman	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$ 6,573,369			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
868	Kings Highway, S Stage to Medford UGB	Upgrade to 3 lane urban standard	long	\$ 3,286,685			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
870	Beall Ln. at Bursell	New traffic signal	long	\$ 438,225			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
876	Upper River Rd., Gold Ray Rd to RVMPO Boundary	Rogue River Greenway extension	long	\$ 1,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
877	Old Stage Rd, Taylor to RVMPO Boundary	Rogue River Greenway extension	long	\$ 3,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	E. Vilas Rd, Medford city limits to McLouglin	Improve (widen) to rural major collector standards	long	\$ 1,815,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	Wilson Rd, Upton to Table Rock	Improve (widen) to rural minor collector standards	long	\$ 1,680,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
New	Table Rock Rd, Biddle to Wilson	Install enhanced bicycle facility	long	\$ 850,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Jackson County Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 27,907,771	\$ 6,600,000	\$ 21,307,771		
Jacksonville								
No Long Range Projects Proposed			long	\$ -				
Jacksonville Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ -	\$ 787,000	\$ -		
ODOT								
951	South Valley View Bridge Replacement	Realign and widen the Bear Creek Bridge over South Valley View Rd, located off Exit 19 near Ashland. It will also widen and add turning lanes to South Valley View Rd from the Interstate to Hwy 99 and connect peds and bikes with the Bear Creek Greenway.	Long	\$ 15,000,000			Exempt-Table 3	
960	OR-238: West Main to N. Ross Lane	Realign and widen highway; add adequate shoulders and/or bikelanes, add pedestrian improvements in urban areas.	Long	\$ 18,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	
ODOT Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 33,000,000	\$ 33,000,000	\$ -		

PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	Local Funds Available	MPO Discretionary Funds	Conformity Status	Within PM10/CO Maintenance Areas
Medford								
5037	Hillcrest at N. Phoenix	Add EBR turn lane and provide signal overlap	long	\$ 750,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5038	McAndrews at Royal	Add second NBL lane from Royal onto McAndrews	long	\$ 750,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5039	McAndrews at Springbrook	Add SBR lane	long	\$ 750,000			Exempt-Table 3	PM10/CO
5040	Black Oak, Hillcrest to Acorn	Widen to two lanes with curb, gutter and sidewalks	long	\$ 750,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5041	Cherry Lane, N Phoenix Rd to Hillcrest	Widen to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks (eastern ¾)	long	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
568	Lear Way, Coker Butte to Vilas	Construct new two lane road with bike lanes and sidewalks	long	\$ 2,500,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5042	Arterial and collector streets as needed	Install ITS equipment to facilitate traffic flow and enhance system communications	long	\$ 200,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5043	Foothill Rd, McAndrews to Delta Waters	Widen to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks	long	\$ 22,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
5044	Kings Hwy, South Stage Rd to Stewart Ave	Widen to three lanes with bike lanes and sidewalks	long	\$ 4,000,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10/CO
Medford Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 34,200,000	\$ 125,574,000	\$ -		
Phoenix								
633	Hilsinger, Colver Road to UGB Boundary	Total reconstruct with addition of bike lanes and sidewalks, stormwater management facilities	long	\$ 770,000			Exempt-Table 2	PM10
Phoenix Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 770,000	\$ 3,236,000	\$ -		
Talent								
720	Railroad District Collector: Belmont Rd. to Rapp Rd.	Construct new railroad district collector street	long	\$ 4,100,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
730	Belmont Rd.: Talent Ave to Railroad District Collector	Upgrade to collector standard and upgrade railroad crossing & restrict other crossings (Pleasant View, Hill Top)	long	\$ 800,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
731	Westside Bypass: Wagner Creek Rd/Rapp Rd to Colver Rd.	Construct new collector street west of city in Urban Reserve area TA-1	long	\$ 2,730,000			Non-Exempt	PM10
Talent Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$ 7,630,000	\$ 3,881,000	\$ 3,749,000		
Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)								
<i>Long Range Projects, Funding in Financial Chapter</i>			long	\$141,592,000				
RVTD Long Range (2031-2042)			Total	\$141,592,000	\$ 141,592,000			
Total Long Range (2031-2042)				\$ 276,496,517	\$ 340,691,000	\$ 32,212,771	MPO Discretionary Funds Needed	
						\$ 62,603,000	Long Range Discretionary Funds Available	
						\$ 10,779,227	Medium Range Discretionary Funds Carryover	
						\$ 41,169,456	Balance	

2017 - 2042 RVMP0 Tier 2 Project List			
PROJECT NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	COST
Ashland			
			\$ -
Central Point			
			\$ -
Eagle Point			
			\$0
Jacksonville			
401	Pair-a-Dice Ranch Rd., OR 238 to city limits	Construct two lane truck route connection (city share w/ in UGB)	\$7,032,000
			\$7,032,000
Medford			
			\$0
Phoenix			
			\$0
Talent			
			\$0
Jackson County			
			\$0
ODOT			
			\$0
Tier 2 Total			\$7,032,000



**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: September 13, 2016
 TO: RVMPO Public Advisory Council
 FROM: Dan Moore, AICP, Planning Program Manager
 SUBJECT: 2017 – 2042 RTP Financial Forecasts

The Policy Committee approved the financial forecasts for the 2017–2042 RTP included in the memo. The Table below outlines the different sources of funding that make up the RVMPO financial forecast.

Revenue Sources	Type
Federal	Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
	Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
State (ODOT)	Highway Fund
	Enhance & Fix-It
	Maintenance, Operations, Safety & Preservation
Local Jurisdictions	Street Utility Fees (SUF's)
	System Development Charges (SDC's)
	Other (Urban Renewal, developer fees, etc.)

The forecasts are divided into short, medium and long range timeframes of the 2017-2042 RTP. Short Range forecasts include all committed (in the 2015-18 TIP) federal funds for 2015 to 2018 (see Table 3 – RVMPO Revenue Summary 2017-42). Proposed RVMPO Discretionary Funds which include; Enhance & Fix-It, STBG and CMAQ are depicted in Table 4. Discretionary funds can be used for medium and long range projects that are in need of funding. RVTD's financial forecasts are depicted in Tables 6 – 9.

Table 1 – Highway Funds

State Funds Distribution in Millions					
	Year	State Share 59.5%	County Share 24.52%	City Share 15.98%	Total
Short	2017	\$ 676	\$ 279	\$ 182	\$ 1,137
	2018	\$ 691	\$ 285	\$ 186	\$ 1,162
	2019	\$ 707	\$ 291	\$ 190	\$ 1,188
	2020	\$ 723	\$ 298	\$ 194	\$ 1,215
	2021	\$ 739	\$ 305	\$ 198	\$ 1,242
Medium	2022	\$ 756	\$ 311	\$ 203	\$ 1,270
	2023	\$ 773	\$ 319	\$ 208	\$ 1,299
	2024	\$ 790	\$ 326	\$ 212	\$ 1,328
	2025	\$ 808	\$ 333	\$ 217	\$ 1,359
	2026	\$ 827	\$ 341	\$ 222	\$ 1,390
	2027	\$ 846	\$ 349	\$ 227	\$ 1,422
	2028	\$ 865	\$ 357	\$ 232	\$ 1,455
	2029	\$ 885	\$ 365	\$ 238	\$ 1,488
	2030	\$ 906	\$ 373	\$ 243	\$ 1,523
	Long	2031	\$ 927	\$ 382	\$ 249
2032		\$ 949	\$ 391	\$ 255	\$ 1,595
2033		\$ 971	\$ 400	\$ 261	\$ 1,632
2034		\$ 994	\$ 410	\$ 267	\$ 1,671
2035		\$ 1,017	\$ 419	\$ 273	\$ 1,710
2036		\$ 1,041	\$ 429	\$ 280	\$ 1,750
2037		\$ 1,066	\$ 439	\$ 286	\$ 1,792
2038		\$ 1,092	\$ 450	\$ 293	\$ 1,835
2039		\$ 1,118	\$ 461	\$ 300	\$ 1,879
2040		\$ 1,145	\$ 472	\$ 307	\$ 1,924
2041		\$ 1,159	\$ 478	\$ 311	\$ 1,949
2042		\$ 1,175	\$ 484	\$ 315	\$ 1,974
		\$ 23,647	\$ 9,746	\$ 6,352	\$ 39,745

Table 2 – Highway Funds Distribution

State Funds Distribution to Cities \$ x 1,000				PSU 2015 Pop Incorp Cities	MPO % of Incorp Statewide Total*	RVMPO Jurisdiction % of MPO Total Population
Time Frame	Short	Medium	Long			
Years	2017 - 2021	2022 - 2030	2031 - 2042			
Total City Share	\$949,812	\$2,003,010	\$3,399,038	2,776,867	6.0%	
Ashland	\$6,979	\$14,719	\$24,977	20,405	0.0073	0.1229
Talent	\$2,145	\$4,523	\$7,675	6,270	0.0023	0.0378
Phoenix	\$1,568	\$3,307	\$5,612	4,585	0.0017	0.0276
Jacksonville	\$985	\$2,077	\$3,525	2,880	0.0010	0.0174
Medford	\$26,561	\$56,014	\$95,054	77,655	0.0280	0.4679
Central Point	\$5,981	\$12,612	\$21,403	17,485	0.0063	0.1053
Eagle Point	\$2,974	\$6,272	\$10,643	8,695	0.0031	0.0524
Jackson Cty	\$10,166	\$21,438	\$36,380	27,998	0.0070	0.1687
*Includes Rural Jackson County population within MPO				165,973	6.0%	100.0%
Total City Share = Total of all funds available to incorporated cities in Oregon						
Current Law - RVMPO City Share = % of city's population divided by incorporated cities total population						
e.g., Ashland population - 20,405 / 2,776,867 = 0.0073 * \$182 million (2017 current law + Additional Funds) = \$1.337 million						

Table 3 – RVMPO Revenue Summary 2017-42

Jurisdiction	Time Frame	Street System Revenues (\$ x 1,000)						Non-Capital Needs	Capital Funds Avail.	Tier 1 Regional & Federally Funded Projects	RVMPO Future Discretionary Funds
		Federal	State	Local			Total				
				SDC's	Fees	Other					
Ashland	short	\$2,789	\$6,979	\$289	\$8,392	\$2,855	\$21,305	\$13,670	\$7,635	\$7,516	\$0
	medium		\$14,719	\$619	\$19,272	\$1,539	\$36,149	\$29,650	\$6,499	\$1,184	\$0
	long		\$24,977	\$1,072	\$36,991	\$2,052	\$65,091	\$52,338	\$12,754	\$10,517	\$0
Central Point	short	\$0	\$5,981	\$921	\$2,597	\$8,000	\$17,499	\$6,026	\$11,473	\$10,200	\$0
	medium		\$12,612	\$1,906	\$5,374	\$11,750	\$31,643	\$13,367	\$18,276	\$3,546	\$0
	long		\$21,403	\$3,132	\$8,831	\$0	\$33,366	\$24,365	\$9,001	\$5,434	\$0
Eagle Point	short	\$4,287	\$2,974	\$925	\$1,919	\$0	\$10,105	\$3,478	\$6,626	\$5,548	\$0
	medium		\$6,272	\$1,982	\$4,111	\$0	\$12,365	\$7,453	\$4,912	\$8,675	\$3,763
	long		\$10,643	\$3,431	\$7,115	\$0	\$21,189	\$12,900	\$8,289	\$15,445	\$7,156
Jacksonville	short	\$0	\$985	\$58	\$750	\$0	\$1,793	\$1,579	\$215	\$0	\$0
	medium		\$2,077	\$124	\$1,453	\$0	\$3,654	\$3,170	\$485	\$0	\$0
	long		\$3,525	\$214	\$2,026	\$0	\$5,766	\$4,979	\$787	\$0	\$0
Medford	short	\$9,730	\$26,561	\$12,503	\$37,503	\$12,850	\$99,148	\$31,261	\$67,887	\$9,475	\$0
	medium		\$56,014	\$13,004	\$40,006	\$1,350	\$110,374	\$58,091	\$52,283	\$14,752	\$0
	long		\$95,054	\$27,007	\$82,003	\$1,800	\$205,865	\$80,318	\$125,547	\$34,200	\$0
Phoenix	short	\$0	\$1,568	\$424	\$681	\$384	\$3,057	\$2,281	\$776	\$1,197	\$421
	medium		\$3,307	\$973	\$1,564	\$1,350	\$7,195	\$4,888	\$2,307	\$22,000	\$19,693
	long		\$5,612	\$3,475	\$5,586	\$3,808	\$18,481	\$15,245	\$3,236	\$770	\$0
Talent	short	\$0	\$2,145	\$520	\$841	\$500	\$4,006	\$2,213	\$1,793	\$0	\$0
	medium		\$4,523	\$1,080	\$1,746	\$0	\$7,349	\$4,742	\$2,607	\$5,040	\$2,433
	long		\$7,675	\$1,687	\$2,726	\$0	\$12,087	\$8,206	\$3,881	\$7,630	\$3,749
Jackson Co. (RVMPO Area)	short	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$9,253	\$11,334	\$2,081
	medium	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$4,000	\$6,441	\$2,441
	long	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$6,600	\$27,908	\$21,308
ODOT (RVMPO Area)	short	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$180,630	\$180,630	\$0
	medium	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$22,000	\$22,000	\$0
	long	These figures are not applicable to the MPO area - see assumptions table.							\$33,000	\$33,000	\$0
Street System Totals		\$79,851	\$315,607	\$75,347	\$271,487	\$48,238	\$727,486	\$380,219	\$602,749	\$444,441	\$63,045

Table 4 – Discretionary Funds

CMAQ (\$ X 1,000)			STBG (\$ X 1,000)					Enhance - It (\$ X 1,000)				
YEAR	Total CMAQ	Available CMAQ (by time frame)	YEAR	Total STBG	Alternative Measure #7 Funds	Available STBG	Available STBG (by time frame)	YEAR	Total Enhance	RVMP0 Share (50%)	Available Enhance (by time frame)	
2017	Funds Committed to 2018		2017	Funds Committed to 2018				2017	\$0	\$0	Funds are Committed to 2018	
2018			2018					2018	\$0	\$0		
2019	\$1,308	\$3,995	2019	\$1,990	\$995	\$995	\$3,054	2019	\$1,620	\$810		
2020	\$1,331		2020	\$2,036	\$1,018	\$1,018		2020	\$1,620	\$810		
2021	\$1,355		2021	\$2,083	\$1,041	\$1,041		2021	\$1,620	\$810		\$2,430
2022	\$1,380		2022	\$2,131	\$1,065	\$1,065		2022	\$1,620	\$810		
2023	\$1,405		2023	\$2,180	\$1,090	\$1,090		2023	\$1,620	\$810		
2024	\$1,430		2024	\$2,230	\$1,115	\$1,115		2024	\$1,620	\$810		
2025	\$1,456		2025	\$2,281	\$1,140	\$1,140		2025	\$1,620	\$810		
2026	\$1,482		2026	\$2,333	\$1,167	\$1,167		2026	\$1,620	\$810		
2027	\$1,508		2027	\$2,387	\$1,194	\$1,194		2027	\$1,620	\$810		
2028	\$1,536		2028	\$2,442	\$1,221	\$1,221		2028	\$1,620	\$810		
2029	\$1,563	2029	\$2,498	\$1,249	\$1,249	2029	\$1,620	\$810				
2030	\$1,591	\$13,350	2030	\$4,500	\$2,250	\$2,250	\$11,491	2030	\$1,620	\$810	\$7,290	
2031	\$1,620	\$21,485	2031	\$4,604	\$2,302	\$2,302	TMA in 2030	2031	\$1,620	\$810		
2032	\$1,649		2032	\$4,709	\$2,355	\$2,355		2032	\$1,620	\$810		
2033	\$1,679		2033	\$4,818	\$2,409	\$2,409		2033	\$1,620	\$810		
2034	\$1,709		2034	\$4,929	\$2,464	\$2,464		2034	\$1,620	\$810		
2035	\$1,740		2035	\$5,042	\$2,521	\$2,521		2035	\$1,620	\$810		
2036	\$1,771		2036	\$5,158	\$2,579	\$2,579		2036	\$1,620	\$810		
2037	\$1,803		2037	\$5,276	\$2,638	\$2,638		2037	\$1,620	\$810		
2038	\$1,836		2038	\$5,398	\$2,699	\$2,699		2038	\$1,620	\$810		
2039	\$1,869		2039	\$5,522	\$2,761	\$2,761		2039	\$1,620	\$810		
2040	\$1,902		2040	\$5,649	\$2,824	\$2,824		2040	\$1,620	\$810		
2041	\$1,936		2041	\$5,779	\$2,889	\$2,889		2041	\$1,620	\$810		
2042	\$1,971		\$21,485	2042	\$5,912	\$2,956		\$2,956	\$31,397	2042		\$1,620
	\$38,830	\$38,830		\$91,884	\$45,942	\$45,942	\$45,942		\$38,880	\$19,440	\$19,440	
1.8% annual increase			2.3% annual increase		50% of STBG funds to go to meet Alternative Measure #7 and/or RVTD. RVMP0 will become a TMA in 2030 - STBG funds will double			\$1.62M/year available for eligible projects in Jackson & Josephine Counties. Competitive project selection process. Some projects may not be eligible for funding. Criteria may change. MPO assumes on 50% of these funds will be available for projects in the MPO area.				

28
Table 5 – Revenue & Expenditure Assumptions

Jurisdiction	Revenues						Non-Capital Needs	Capital Funds Avail.
	Federal	State	RVTD	Local				
				SDC's	StreetUtilityFees (SUFs)	Other		
Ashland				SDC's are expected to be about \$55K in 2017 and increase at 2.5% through 2042.	Street Utility Fees are expected to be about \$1,565K in 2017 and increase by 3.5% per year through 2042.	Other revenues include intergovernmental and misc. and are expected to average about \$171K per year.	2017 expenses include: admin (\$1.1M), maintenance (\$1.4M) and RVTD bus passes (\$50K). An annual increase of 3% and 2.5% is assumed for admin&maintenance expenses, respectively, through 2042.	
Central Point	ODOT (2013) estimates that approximately \$39 million in Enhance funds will be available to the RVMPO from 2019-2042. ODOT (April 2016) estimates that \$1.3 million in CMAQ funds will be available to the RVMPO from 2016-2042 (RVMPO used a 1.8% annual increase (funds for 2017-2018 already committed). ODOT (February 2013) estimates that \$63 million in STP funds will be available to the RVMPO from 2019-2042 @ 2.3% annual increase (funds for 2017-2018 already committed), 50% of these funds have been committed to transit (RVTD) through the year 2042. \$3M in STP remains unprogrammed through the short-range (through 2021). Short-range unprogrammed STP, as well as all medium and long-range STP funds are assumed to be available for projects included in the RTP. Other federal sources have been assumed for the short-range period only. These include CMAQ (\$4M), Transportation Enhancement (\$4.84M).	ODOT (February 2011) provided estimates for Hwy Funds for 2017-2042 for total MPO area: \$58M - Short Range \$121M - Medium Range \$205M - Long Range Total City Share = Total of all funds available to incorporated cities in Oregon. Current Law - RVMPO City Share = % of city's population divided by incorporated cities total population e.g., Ashland population - 20,405 / 2,776,867 = 0.0073 * \$182 million (2017 current law) = \$1.3 million Current Law - Jackson County City Share (population within RVMPO) = % of population divided by incorporated cities total population	Revenues: 5307 - \$2.5 in 2017, 3.5% annual increase. Title XIX - \$330K in 2017, 2% annual increase. TDM - \$140K in 2017, 1% annual increase. STF - \$667K in 2017, 5% annual increase. In-Lieu-of Tax - \$303K in 2017, 1% annual increase. Property Taxes - \$2.3M in 2017, 3% annual increase. Farebox - \$1.2M in 2017, 3% annual increase. RVMPO STP - 50% of RVMPO projected STP out to 2042. 5309 - \$3.2M in 2017(ODOT long range financial projections). 5310 - \$703K annually. Expenditures: Operations - \$4.2M in 2017, 5% annual increase. Alt Operations - \$2M in 2017, 4% annual increase. Maintenance - \$2.5M in 2017, 4% annual increase. Admin - \$1M in 2017, 4% annual increase. Capital Projects: amounts vary per year (see RVTD funding tables).	SDC's are expected to be about \$177K in 2017 and increase by about 2% per year through 2042.	Street Utility Fees are expected to be \$499K in 2017 and increase by 2.5% per year until 2042.	Other revenues are expected to be \$8M Short Range, \$11.7M Medium Range and \$0 Long Range. Revenues are from developer and urban renewal contributions.	2017 expenses include administration and maintenance (\$698K). An annual increase of 3% has been assumed for these expenses through 2042.	
Eagle Point				SDC's are expected to be about \$38K in 2017 and increase at 2.5% per year.	Street Utility Fees are expected to be about \$331K in 2017 and increase by 2.5% per year.	No other revenues are expected between 2017 and 2042.	2017 expenses include: admin (\$299K) and maintenance (\$427K). An annual increase of 2.5% is assumed for these expenses through 2042.	
Jacksonville				SDC's are expected to be about \$11K per in 2017 and increase at 2.5% per year.	Franchise Fees are expected to be about \$147K in 2017 and increase by 1.0% per year.	There are no "other" revenues expected.	Expenses include: admin (\$39K) and maintenance (\$267K). An annual increase of 2% has been assumed for admin and 1.5% for maintenance to 2042.	
Medford				SDC's are expected to be about \$850K in 2017 with a 3% annual increase.	Street Utility Fees are expected to be about \$5.2M in 2017 with a 1.5% annual increase per year thereafter.	Other revenues include plan review fees at \$150K per year.	Expenses include:admin, maintenance and debt service. Short Range - \$55M; Medium Range - \$115M and Long Range - \$195M	
Phoenix				SDC's are expected to be about \$79K in 2017 and increase at an average of 3.5% per year.	Street Utility Fees are expected to be about \$127K in 2017 and increase by about 3.5% per year.	Includes \$595K in developer contributions in medium range and \$1.807M from Urban Renewal in long range.	2017 expenses include: admin (\$41K) and maintenance (\$393K). An annual increase of 2.5% has been assumed for these expenses through 2042.	
Talent				SDC's are expected to be about \$67K in 2017 and increase at 1.5% per year out to 2042.	SUFs are expected to be about \$128K in 2017 and increase 1.5%/yr out to 2042.	Medium-range includes \$500K in urban renewal funds.	2017 expenses include: admin (\$135K) and maintenance (\$309K). An annual increase of 2.5% has been assumed for these expenses through 2042.	
Jackson Co. (MPO Area)	Based on historic allocations, capital funding availability is assumed to be \$.4 million per year in short term years, \$.5 million in medium term years, and \$.6 million in long-term years. Added to short-term funding availability is: \$7.3 million for Table Rock Rd - I - 5 Crossing to Biddle; and 180k for Active Transportation Plan.							
ODOT (MPO Area)	Short term (2017-2021) project funding is \$180,630,000. Medium term (2022-2030) project funding is \$22,000,000. Long term (2031-2042) project funding is not reported. Funding for Interstate maintenance, operations, safety, and preservation at \$3,540,000/year.							

Capital funds available for cities in the RVMPO equal the amounts in the "Revenues" column minus the amounts in the "Non-Capital Needs" column.

29
Table 6 – RTVD Revenue Assumptions

Tier 1 Revenues		Short	Medium	Long										
Revenues X 1,000														
Year	5307	Title XIX	TDM/Ride	STF	In-Lieu-of	Prop Tax	Special Levy	Farebox	STBG	Special Project Grants	5309 & Capital	5310	Fund Balance Reserves	TOTALS
2016	\$2,400	\$324	\$139	\$635	\$300	\$2,280	\$1,865	\$1,165	\$925	\$523	\$3,294	\$730	\$6,750	\$21,330
2017	\$2,484	\$330	\$140	\$667	\$303	\$2,348	\$1,921	\$1,200	\$944	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$6,750	\$17,817
2018	\$2,571	\$337	\$142	\$700	\$306	\$2,419	\$1,979	\$1,236	\$962	\$0	\$2,000	\$730	\$6,750	\$20,132
2019	\$2,661	\$344	\$143	\$735	\$309	\$2,491	\$2,038	\$1,273	\$982	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$6,750	\$18,456
2020	\$2,754	\$351	\$145	\$772	\$312	\$2,566	\$2,099	\$1,311	\$1,001	\$0	\$2,000	\$730	\$6,750	\$20,791
2021	\$2,850	\$358	\$146	\$810	\$315	\$2,643	\$0	\$1,351	\$1,021	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$6,400	\$16,625
2022	\$2,950	\$365	\$148	\$851	\$318	\$2,722	\$0	\$1,391	\$1,042	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$4,000	\$15,517
2023	\$3,053	\$372	\$149	\$894	\$322	\$2,804	\$0	\$1,433	\$1,063	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$1,200	\$12,019
2024	\$3,160	\$380	\$151	\$938	\$325	\$2,888	\$0	\$1,476	\$1,084	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$12,131
2025	\$3,271	\$387	\$152	\$985	\$328	\$2,975	\$0	\$1,520	\$1,105	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$11,454
2026	\$3,385	\$395	\$154	\$1,034	\$331	\$3,064	\$0	\$1,566	\$1,128	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$12,787
2027	\$3,504	\$403	\$155	\$1,086	\$335	\$3,156	\$0	\$1,613	\$1,150	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$12,131
2028	\$3,627	\$411	\$157	\$1,140	\$338	\$3,251	\$0	\$1,661	\$1,173	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$13,487
2029	\$3,753	\$419	\$158	\$1,197	\$341	\$3,348	\$0	\$1,711	\$1,197	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$12,855
2030	\$3,885	\$428	\$160	\$1,257	\$345	\$3,449	\$0	\$1,762	\$2,250	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$15,265
2031	\$4,021	\$436	\$161	\$1,320	\$348	\$3,552	\$0	\$1,815	\$2,295	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$14,679
2032	\$4,162	\$445	\$163	\$1,386	\$352	\$3,659	\$0	\$1,869	\$2,341	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$16,106
2033	\$4,307	\$454	\$165	\$1,455	\$355	\$3,768	\$0	\$1,926	\$2,388	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$15,548
2034	\$4,458	\$463	\$166	\$1,528	\$359	\$3,882	\$0	\$1,983	\$2,435	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$17,004
2035	\$4,614	\$472	\$168	\$1,605	\$362	\$3,998	\$0	\$2,043	\$2,484	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$16,476
2036	\$4,775	\$481	\$170	\$1,685	\$366	\$4,118	\$0	\$2,104	\$2,534	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$17,963
2037	\$4,943	\$491	\$171	\$1,769	\$370	\$4,241	\$0	\$2,167	\$2,585	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$17,467
2038	\$5,116	\$501	\$173	\$1,858	\$373	\$4,369	\$0	\$2,232	\$2,636	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	\$0	\$18,988
2039	\$5,295	\$511	\$175	\$1,950	\$377	\$4,500	\$0	\$2,299	\$2,689	\$0	\$0	\$730	\$0	\$18,526
2040	\$5,480	\$521	\$176	\$2,048	\$381	\$4,635	\$0	\$2,368	\$2,743	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	0	\$20,082
2041	\$5,672	\$532	\$178	\$2,150	\$385	\$4,774	\$0	\$2,439	\$2,798	\$0	\$0	\$730	0	\$19,657
2042	\$5,870	\$542	\$180	\$2,258	\$389	\$4,917	\$0	\$2,512	\$2,854	\$0	\$1,000	\$730	0	\$21,252
Totals	\$102,622	\$11,128	\$4,145	\$34,080	\$8,946	\$90,538	\$8,037	\$46,262	\$46,882	\$0	\$15,000	\$18,980	\$38,600	\$425,218
Assumptions	3.5% annual increase	2% annual increase	1% annual increase	5% annual increase	1.0% annual increase	3.0% annual increase	3.0% annual increase	3% annual increase	50% of RVMPO annual allocation of STBG funds 2% inc.	1 Time Projects with expenses included in CY	First Year Actual - RTVD Asset replac. Plan	\$730k annually		

Table 7 – RVTB Expenditure Assumptions

Tier 1 Expenses		Short	Medium	Long			
Tier 1 Expenses X 1,000							
Year	Ops	Alt Ops	Maint	Support SVCS	Admin	Capital Projects	TOTALS
2016	\$4,079	\$1,807	\$2,442	\$974	\$932	\$4,043	\$14,277
2017	\$4,283	\$1,879	\$2,540	\$1,013	\$969	\$0	\$10,684
2018	\$4,497	\$1,954	\$2,641	\$1,053	\$1,008	\$2,205	\$13,360
2019	\$4,722	\$2,033	\$2,747	\$1,096	\$1,048	\$0	\$11,645
2020	\$4,958	\$2,114	\$2,857	\$1,139	\$1,090	\$2,205	\$14,364
2021	\$5,206	\$2,198	\$2,971	\$1,185	\$1,134	\$0	\$12,694
2022	\$5,466	\$2,286	\$3,090	\$1,232	\$1,179	\$1,103	\$14,357
2023	\$5,740	\$2,378	\$3,214	\$1,282	\$1,226	\$0	\$13,839
2024	\$6,027	\$2,473	\$3,342	\$1,333	\$1,276	\$1,103	\$15,553
2025	\$6,328	\$2,572	\$3,476	\$1,386	\$1,327	\$0	\$15,088
2026	\$6,644	\$2,675	\$3,615	\$1,442	\$1,380	\$1,103	\$16,858
2027	\$6,976	\$2,782	\$3,759	\$1,499	\$1,435	\$0	\$16,452
2028	\$7,325	\$2,893	\$3,910	\$1,559	\$1,492	\$1,103	\$18,282
2029	\$7,692	\$3,009	\$4,066	\$1,622	\$1,552	\$0	\$17,940
2030	\$8,076	\$3,129	\$4,229	\$1,687	\$1,614	\$1,103	\$19,837
2031	\$8,480	\$3,254	\$4,398	\$1,754	\$1,678	\$0	\$19,565
2032	\$8,904	\$3,384	\$4,574	\$1,824	\$1,746	\$1,103	\$21,535
2033	\$9,349	\$3,520	\$4,757	\$1,897	\$1,815	\$0	\$21,338
2034	\$9,817	\$3,661	\$4,947	\$1,973	\$1,888	\$1,103	\$23,388
2035	\$10,307	\$3,807	\$5,145	\$2,052	\$1,964	\$0	\$23,275
2036	\$10,823	\$3,959	\$5,351	\$2,134	\$2,042	\$1,103	\$25,412
2037	\$11,364	\$4,118	\$5,565	\$2,220	\$2,124	\$0	\$25,390
2038	\$11,932	\$4,282	\$5,787	\$2,308	\$2,209	\$1,103	\$27,622
2039	\$12,529	\$4,454	\$6,019	\$2,401	\$2,297	\$0	\$27,699
2040	\$13,155	\$4,632	\$6,260	\$2,497	\$2,389	\$1,103	\$30,035
2041	\$13,813	\$4,817	\$6,510	\$2,597	\$2,485	\$0	\$30,221
2042	\$14,504	\$5,010	\$6,770	\$2,700	\$2,584	\$1,103	\$32,671
Totals	\$218,916	\$83,274	\$112,538	\$44,886	\$42,950	\$16,541	\$519,105
Assumptions	5% annual increase	4% annual increase	4% annual increase	4% annual increase	4% annual increase	First Year Actual - RVTB Asset replac. Plan	

Table 8 – RVTD Revenue & Expenditure Summaries

Tier 1 Revenue Summary					
Revenue Source	Fund	Time Frame			Totals
		Short	Medium	Long	
Federal	S5307	\$13,320	\$30,589	\$58,712	\$102,622
	Title XIX	\$1,720	\$3,559	\$5,848	\$11,128
	TDM/Rideshare	\$716	\$1,382	\$2,047	\$4,145
State	STF	\$3,684	\$9,383	\$21,013	\$34,080
	In-Lieu-of (Tax)	\$1,546	\$2,983	\$4,417	\$8,946
Local	Property Taxes	\$12,468	\$27,658	\$50,412	\$90,538
	Farebox Returns	\$6,371	\$14,132	\$25,759	\$46,262
	Special Levy	\$8,037	\$0	\$0	\$8,037
Other Federal	RVMPPO STP	\$4,910	\$11,191	\$30,781	\$46,882
	5309 & Capital	\$4,000	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$15,000
	5310	\$3,650	\$6,570	\$8,760	\$18,980
Fund Reserves C/O		\$33,400	\$5,200	\$0	\$38,600
Total Revenues		\$93,821	\$117,648	\$213,749	\$425,218
Tier 1 Expense Summary					
Expenses	Time Frame			Totals	
	Short	Medium	Long		
Operations	\$23,666	\$60,274	\$134,976	\$218,916	
Alt Operations	\$10,179	\$24,197	\$48,899	\$83,274	
Maintenance	\$13,756	\$32,700	\$66,082	\$112,538	
Administration	\$5,250	\$12,480	\$25,221	\$42,950	
Capital Projects	\$4,411	\$5,514	\$6,616	\$16,541	
Support Svcs	\$5,487	\$13,042	\$26,357	\$44,886	
Total Expenses	\$62,748	\$148,207	\$308,151	\$519,105	
Total Revenues	\$93,821	\$117,648	\$213,749	\$425,218	
Total Expenses	\$62,748	\$148,207	\$308,151	\$519,105	
Shortfall	\$31,074	(\$30,559)	(\$94,402)	(\$93,887)	

Table 9 – RVTD Revenue & Expenditure Assumptions

Assumptions					
Tier 1 Revenues	Assumptions				
S5307	\$2.5M in 2017; 3.5% annual increase				
Title XIX	\$330K in 2017; 2% annual increase				
TDM/Rideshare	\$140K in 2017; 1% annual increase				
STF	\$667K in 2017; 5% annual increase				
In-Lieu-of (Tax)	\$303K in 2017, 1% annual increase				
Property Taxes	\$2.3M in 2017; 3.0% annual increase				
Farebox Returns	\$1.2M in 2017; 3% annual increase				
RVMPPO STP	50% of RVMPPO projected STP allocation -assuming agreement renewed				
5309	ODOT long range financial projections & RVTD estimate for 2016				
5310	\$730K / year				
Tier 1 Expenses	Assumptions				
Operations	\$4.2M in 2017; 5% annual increase				
Alt Operations	\$2M in 2017;				
Maintenance	\$2.5M in 2017; 4% annual increase				
Administration	\$1M in 2017; 4% annual increase				
Support Svcs	\$1M in 2017; 4% annual increase				
Capital Projects	See column as amount changes				