

# AGENDA

## Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



*Date:* Wednesday, August 13, 2014

*Time:* 1:30 p.m.

*Location:* Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG 155 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Street, Central Point

*Transit:* served by RVTD Route #40

*Phone:* Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360

*RVMPO website :* [www.rvmpo.org](http://www.rvmpo.org)

1. **Call to Order/Introductions/Review Agenda** ..... **Mike Kuntz, Chair**
2. **Review/Approve Summary Minutes** (Attachment #1)..... **Chair**
3. **Public Comment** (Items not on the Agenda)..... **Chair**

### ***Action Items:***

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.

*Attachments:* #2 - Memo, Screening Criteria and Project Evaluation Spreadsheet

*Action Requested:* Forward recommendation to Policy Committee to approve screening criteria.

5. **Transportation Improvement Program, Regional Transportation Plan Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination**..... **Dan Moore**

*Background:* This item addresses three project programming decisions: Adoption recommendation on the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program; amendments to the 2013-38 RTP and adoption of the 2014 Air Quality Conformity Determination.

*Attachments:* #3 - Memo – RTP Amendments

- 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: Recommendations to Policy Committee

**6. Discretionary Funding: Revisions to Project Scoring Criteria / Application ..... Andrea Napoli**

*Background:* Per TAC direction at their June meeting, staff has made revisions to the discretionary funds project scoring criteria and project application document.

*Attachments:* #4 - Memo, Discretionary Funds - Proposed Revisions to Scoring Criteria and Application

*Action Requested:* Review, comment, and approve revisions.

**7. Central Point Conceptual Plan (Dick) ..... Don Burt, Central Point**

*Background:* Central Point prepared a Conceptual Transportation and Land Use Plan for its Future Growth Area CP-4D, identified as an Urban Reserve in the Greater Bear Creek Valley Regional Plan. The Performance Indicators in the Plan require Central Point to collaborate with the RVMPO in preparing the Conceptual Plan. The Planners group monitoring implementation of the Regional Plan determined that the TAC is the appropriate body to consider the plan. The RVMPO Planning Program Manager will communicate the TAC decision to the Policy Committee.

*Attachment:* #5 - Future Growth Area CP-4D

*Action Requested:* Motion to recommend support of the Conceptual Transportation and Land Use Plan of Future Growth Area CP-4D.

**8. MPO Planning Update ..... Jonathan David**

**9. Public Comment..... Chair**

**10. Other Business / Local Business ..... Chair**

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.

**11. Adjournment ..... Chair**

- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO TAC Committee meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, September 10, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, August 26, 2014, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 16, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

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



**SUMMARY MINUTES**  
*Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization*  
*Technical Advisory Committee*

**July 9, 2014**

*The following people were in attendance:*

**RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee**

*Voting Members in Attendance:*

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh Le Bombard	DLCD
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
Mike Kuntz	Jackson County
Mike Upston	Eagle Point
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Robert Miller	City of Eagle Point

*Others Present:*

Mike Baker, Mike Montero.

**RVCOG Staff**

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Bunny Lincoln, Sue Casavan, Mike Cavallaro

**1. Call to Order / Introductions**

Chairman Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:38 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

**2. Review / Approve Minutes**

Chairman Kuntz asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the June meeting minutes.

**On a motion Tom Humphrey and seconded by Kelli Sparkman, the minutes were unanimously approved as presented.**

**3. Public Comment**

No public comment was forthcoming.

**4. RVMPO Environmental Justice and Title VI Plan**

Andrea Napoli explained updates to the Plan. New mapping is based on 2010 data (Census and American Community Survey)

New data includes:

- New sources
- Geography levels
- Population Identification Categories

Ms. Napoli explained new mapping methods. More accurate information and better depiction of local conditions has been created. Basic changes remain untracked, but substantive changes were documented. Senior and minority populations, low income, and limited English speaking were mapped. Regional averages were used to identify populations in the entire MPO area. A single map, combining various minority populations (non-white) was created.

The public comment period has begun, and the updated draft document(s) will go to the Policy Committee in August.

During a discussion period, Committee members spoke about:

- Possible map color changes (no gradations) to allow for better definition and ease of reading
- Future discussion of senior demographics (higher income levels Vs low income cohorts)
- Ms. Napoli stated that the region has a higher than national average senior population, and reviewed the scoring criteria. If the scoring was changed, the document would have to be amended accordingly.
- Mike Cavallaro said that seniors' special needs are not necessarily met, and that they need to remain as a minority population category to account for ways in which their needs may be met in the future. The region is working with AARP, and its Lifelong Housing concept is the first in US.
- As part of comments on transportation, signage & mapping routes for slower moving vehicles were mentioned as future improvements for seniors.
- Whether the Plan could be used to apply for CDBG grants
- The Plan is primarily used to demonstrate compliance with Federal requirements.
- RVTD needs more maps to delineate the Latino and disadvantaged populations, and must prove any proposed RVTD service changes are not negatively affecting any disadvantaged populations. Provisions of service to all population categories must be demonstrated.

**On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Mike Upston, the Committee recommended Policy Committee approval of the Plan (with inclusion of the additional minority population maps discussed). The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

## **5. Review of Draft 2015-18 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) amendments**

Dan Moore presented information that the COG just received notice (today) that a recently completed analysis (conducted by Sierra Research) demonstrated that CO emissions are found to be three times over the allowed budget. The errors in past conformity analysis were caused by CO model estimates which did not include cold starts. All previous reviews have been approved with the erroneous information (based on a flawed model) included. The COG must petition DEQ for new CO emissions budget, and cannot move forward at this point. Monitors continue to work properly, but the model was not calibrated correctly. When the cold starts data was run from the previous models, the results corresponded with those found by Sierra Research. The CO budgetary overrun only affects Medford.

Mike Cavallaro asserted that the budget is based on bad data, caused by a flawed model, and the Region should not be punished because it has remained under national standards for years. It is felt by COG that there is an excellent case for not affecting the current TIP. The COG will push on every available level (interagency consultation group, petitioning the Governor's office, DEQ and EPA) to resolve the conformity lapse issue in order to assure that currently modeled, approved projects in the TIP and conforming RTP can move forward. Some long range projects could be in jeopardy, and need to need moved to short range category.

Jonathan David is drafting a memo to DEQ requesting an adjustment to the CO budget.

Members discussed potential timelines for resolving the problem, the fact that the current RTP is approved until April, 2017, and the dynamics, including funding sources, surrounding the Foothill, Lozier, and Columbus projects. Alex Georgevitch questioned how this situation might affect Medford's current loan process, but there was no answer forthcoming.

Mike Cavallaro outlined the potential for other problems, and the fact that other jurisdictions may be similarly affected. As a "fallback", Dan Moore will be creating an interim TIP list, to be available for presentation to the interagency consultants, should the COG plan to push forward aggressively to get an adjustment to the budget issue as soon as possible not be viable. Concern was expressed that the ODOT STIP might be affected as well. Budget adjustments are the only option to correct the problem. With receipt of the final Sierra Research memo, the issue is ready to go to the interagency consultants immediately.

Mike Montero put forth some historic information about problems associated with a previous, budgetary overrun sanction in the 1990s, causing the shutdown of some industry facilities, and spoke to the need for everyone to be aware of the "worst case scenario" should a resolution not be found quickly.

Dan Moore shared that the DEQ will be pressed to create a regional PM10 and CO Limited Maintenance Plans (because limits have not been exceeded in the past ten years), which would then preclude the need for future modeling.

It was suggested that the TIP might be carried through to Policy Committee adoption, with Findings and a determination that the region is in conformity because of past practice with respect to cold starts. It would then fall to the affected agencies to find otherwise.

The public comment solicitation notice will go out next week. Mike Kuntz said it was only fair to notice affected agencies about the current MPO direction on the matter.

Alex Georgevitch reiterated his query as to whether this could be a statewide issue, and asked that Medford remain fully informed on the status of this issue as they are at the end of their loan application process, and have a huge stake in the outcome.

Dan Moore stipulated that the TIP projects must be included in the RTP. Jurisdictions need to review their project lists, and comment on any changes by July 16<sup>th</sup>. TAC recommendations to the Policy Committee will be considered at the August meeting.

## **6. Alternative Measures Analysis Areas**

Dan Moore shared a memo created by the Alternative Measures Steering Committee. Main discussion points were:

- Increasing alternative housing and employment opportunities
- What areas should be considered?
- A definition of activity centers based on Medford's TSP
- Creation of other activity centers for member jurisdictions
- Membership agreement with mapped activity centers
- Potential redefinition of activity centers (TODs? Others areas demonstrating increased densities and/or reduced need for vehicular use?)
- Multi-modal focus needed for pedestrian/bike friendly environments
- The need to improve internal pedestrian/bike mobility with larger activity centers (RV Mall, hospitals, etc.)
- Repurposing commercial properties to mixed use developments, thereby increasing densities
- 2005 LCDC approved activity centers are defined in the Steering Committee memo
- Designations must be consistent with Comp Plans

Sue Casavan suggested that each jurisdiction provide their specific activity center determinations and comments, with RVCOG providing tax lot maps. The Committee would then conduct an overall review of the maps. LCDC approved definitions outlined in the memo would be used for Measures #5 & #6. The focus for the exercise will be high density residential (10+ units/acre) and commercial activity centers. Definitions will include planned, but unconstructed developments. The COG will provide individual maps, and once the member jurisdictions have completed their reviews and changes, the TAC will be allowed to make general comments.

#### **7. MPO Planning Update**

Jonathan David said that resolving the air quality issue is the primary Staff focus at the moment.

#### **8. Public Comment**

None received.

#### **9. Other Business / Local Business**

RVTD – Transportation Options meeting in Ashland on Friday, July 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mike Kuntz shared that the Bear Creek Greenway near EXPO and Upton Road is now open.

Meeting Information:

- RVMPO TAC meeting will be held Wed., August 13<sup>th</sup>, at 1:30PM.
- RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be held Tues., July 22<sup>nd</sup>, at 2:00 PM.
- RVMPO PAC scheduled for 5:50 PM, Tuesday, July 15<sup>th</sup> has been cancelled.

#### **10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m.



**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 4, 2014  
**TO:** RVMPO TAC  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** Regional Significance Screening Criteria

---

The RVCOG 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 RVCOGs 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



Interagency Consultation Group (IACG)  
 Regional Significance Project Screening  
 For New Non-Exempt Projects in the CO Maintenance Area  
 July 21, 2014

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.

\*Table 1 - from RVMPO Regional Significance Screening Criteria, July 21, 2014



**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 4, 2014  
**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Coordinator  
**SUBJECT:** 2015-18 TIP, RTP Amendments and Air Quality Conformity Determination

---

The TAC 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.



***Rogue Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization***

---

**Regional Transportation Planning**

---

*Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City  
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation*

**DATE: July 31, 2014**

**TO: RVMPO TAC**

**FROM: Andrea Napoli, Associate Planner**

**SUBJECT: Discretionary Funds - Proposed Revisions to Scoring Criteria and Application**

---

The TAC is being asked to review, comment, and approve revisions to the scoring criteria language and the discretionary funds project application document. The purpose is to clarify and improve the project review and prioritization process while continuing to support the goals of the RTP and Alternative Measures.

Scoring Criteria Language

The scoring criteria language has been revised by staff per TAC direction during their discussion regarding discretionary funding project evaluation scoring at their June meeting.

The criteria language revisions relate to transit and bicycle facilities, which were sections most questioned during the last project ranking process. The proposed revisions can be found highlighted on the attached *Goals and Project Funding Criteria Table*.

Discretionary Funds Project Application

Based on the recent processing of project applications, staff has made revisions to the application document for TAC review. The revised application is attached with changes highlighted.



**RVMPO Evaluation Measures – Goals and Project Funding Criteria**

**Proposed Changes Highlighted – New language italicized, strike-through for deleted language**

	RVMPO Goal	2034 RTP Goal	SAFETEA-LU / MAP-21 MPO Requirements	Evaluation Criteria	How Measured
1: <i>Mobility</i>		Plan for, develop and maintain a balanced multi-modal transportation system to address existing and future needs.	Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes for people and freight.	1. Safety or security issue addressed; Accident/injury reduction	Describe safety problem, and how project would reduce number and severity of crashes. <b>(If project demonstrates air quality benefit it will be evaluated for CMAQ.)</b>
				2. Congestion relief/reduce delay	<b>Level of Service improvement; idle time reduced. HDV may be calculated separately. (To qualify for CMAQ project must provide cost-effective congestion mitigation that provides an air quality benefit. If project adds capacity, it will not be considered for CMAQ.)</b>
		Optimize safety and security of the transportation system.	Increase accessibility and mobility.	3. Promote connectivity (more direct travel, network infill)	Describe connectivity feature. If project reduces VMT it could help the region meet greenhouse emission requirements.
			Increase safety of the transportation system.	4. Population # served (ADT; pop/jobs w/in 1/2-mi)	Provide traffic count; estimate # jobs and population that will be served by this project. Objective is to show the number of people who will be served by the project. Staff will estimate population & employment using RVMPO model data. Numbers generated will be used to estimate VMT reduction and air quality benefit.
2: <i>Community Vitality &amp; Livability</i>	Continue to work toward more fully integrating transportation and land use planning.	Use transportation investments to foster compact, livable communities. Develop a plan that builds on the character of the community, is sensitive to the environment and enhances quality of life.	Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and planned growth and economic development.	1. Benefit/impact on senior, disabled, low-income, or minority populations	Does the project impact protected populations based on RVMPO Environmental Justice Plan
				2. Support Alternative Measure 2: increase housing on transit route improve transit accessibility	<b>Does the project promote or support an increase in housing along fixed route transit (If VMT reduction can be directly linked)</b>
		Use transportation investments to foster economic opportunities.	Support economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.	3. Support Alternative Measure 5: Increase % housing in downtowns, mixed use/ pedestrian friendly areas Support Alternative Measure 6: Increase % employment in downtowns, mixed use/ pedestrian friendly areas	Is the project located in a downtown, activity center, designated TOD or other mixed-use (residential/employment) area? Does the project support, or is it part of, a high-density (at least 10-unites/acre for housing) area? Describe the relationship
				4. Benefit to freight movement, commercial traffic	Describe the benefit to movement of commercial vehicles. <b>(If project reduces truck VMT or emissions – esp. pre 1986 trucks – project will be evaluated for CMAQ.)</b>
3: <i>Transportation Options</i>	Increase integration and availability of transportation options.	Use incentives and other strategies to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.		1. Encourage/support SOV reduction; Reduce auto dependence.	Does the project reduce SOV use; what elements of project contribute?
				2. Support Alternative Measure 1: increase transit, bike, ped mode share	Describe how the project will increase use of alternative modes
				3. Support Alternative Measure 3: increase bike facilities on collectors, arterials	<b>Provide total length of qualifying bicycle lane and/or describe other improvement</b>
				4. Support Alternative Measure 4: increase sidewalks on collectors, arterials in TOD areas	Provide total length of qualifying sidewalks
4: <i>Resource Conservation</i>	Incorporate environmental and energy conservation into the RVMPO planning process.	Maximize efficient use of transportation infrastructure for all users and modes.	Promote efficient system management and operation.	1. Address/mitigate environmental impacts	Describe project's benefit to natural environment. Does project include conservation features (ex. permeable surface)
				2. Air quality benefit, long term including NOX and VOC.	<b>If there are air quality benefit in addition to responses provided to RED-TEXT criteria, describe. Emission reductions and cost/benefit analysis will be done based on responses provided to items in red. Numbers supplied or staff-generated for Mobility item 4 will be used in this analysis.</b>
				3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (CO) <sub>1</sub>	Does the project reduce reliance on travel by combustion vehicles, or shift to lower-carbon fuel? (It's anticipated that projects contributing to the Alternative Measures will reduce GHG emissions.)
		Encourage use of cost-effective emerging technologies to achieve regional transportation goals.	Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.	4. Use emerging/new technology	Describe technology to be incorporated into project.
				5. Preserves existing transportation asset	How does the project extend the life of facility without the construction of new facilities? Does the project refurbish existing facility? <b>(If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.)</b>
				6. Reduce VMT	Reduction formula based on project type.
				7. Improve system efficiency	Describe efficiency: Facility able to handle greater ADT without expansion; Improve other transportation function with smaller investment; reduced operational costs; other?
				8. Lifespan	Useful life of investment. For roadway projects, uniform lifespan applies as determined by predominate material used: concrete = 30 yrs; asphalt = 20 yrs; bike lanes = 20 yrs.
				9. Other public, private funding sources (leverage)	List overmatch, other funds

**Goals and Project Funding Criteria-Table**

Items in red will be part of CMAQ funding evaluation unless specifically disqualified (adds capacity, maintains existing facility/service)

(1) Greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced by reducing congestion, increasing operational efficiency, supporting alternative modes reducing use of combustion vehicles, and shifting to lower-carbon fuels (<http://www.deq.state.or.us/eq/committees/lowcarbon.htm>).