
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



Date: Wednesday, June 8, 2016

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG 155 N. 1st Street, Central Point

Transit: served by RVTD Route #40

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

RVMPO website : www.rvmpos.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. Regional Plan / Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment Ryan MacLaren**

Background: The TAC is being asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed RTP/TIP amendments. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing will be advertised on or before June 2nd in the Medford Tribune and available on the RVMPO website.

Attachments: #2 – Memo, RTP/TIP Amendments

Action Requested: Forward recommendation to the Policy Committee.

- 5. Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) / Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Project Solicitation Process Andrea Napoli**

Background: This is a discussion about the project selection process for the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and the schedule for the 2018-21 TIP development. The tentative deadline for project applications is September 2, 2016.

Attachments: #3 – Draft application, instructions, scoring matrix

Action Requested: The TAC is being asked to concur with the project application deadline, and to review and revise the draft project application, scoring matrix and other associated materials as deemed necessary.

6. Central Point Conceptual Land Use & Transportation Plan (CP-3)..... Tom Humphrey

Background: Central Point prepared a Conceptual Transportation and Land Use Plan for its Future Growth Area CP-3, 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: Power Point presentation at meeting

Action Requested: Provide comments to be included in a Policy Committee letter of support for the conceptual plan.

Discussion Item:

7. CMAQ Funding Issues Dan Moore

Background: A. FHWA recently confirmed that Salem and Eugene are now eligible for CMAQ funds. This will require an update to the current funding formula. ODOT provided an example of what the new allocation could look like. Under the scenario, the RVMPO's CMAQ funds would go from \$2,465,053/year to \$1,307,833/year. The attached email from ODOT provides more details for discussion.

B. ODOT recently updated the RVMPO CMAQ-funded project balance spreadsheet and it shows a deficit of \$682,216 by 2018. This is due to the RVMPO not receiving anticipated CMAQ funding allotments. Staff is working with ODOT to identify the reason for the funding shortfalls. The attached memo provides more information for discussion.

Attachments: #4 – Email Memo: Mac McGregor, ODOT CMAQ Funding Allocation Update;

- Memo: RVMPO CMAQ Funding – Allocation Shortfalls;
- Excel Spreadsheets: CMAQ Funding for RVMPO 3-31-16 & CMAQ Funding for RVMPO 3-31-16 with Cuts.

Action Requested: None - discussion item

8. MPO Planning Update Dan Moore

- RVMPO TAC quorum discussion

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: Wednesday, July 13, at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for June 28, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, July 19, 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*

April 13, 2016

The following people were in attendance:

RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Jon Sullivan	RVTD
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
John Adam	Medford
Mike Kuntz, Chair	Jackson County
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Mike Upston	City of Eagle Point
Zach Moody	Talent
Matt Brinkley	Phoenix
Kelly Madding	Jackson County

Others Present:

Mike Montero	Montero & Associates
John Vial	Jackson County

RVCOG Staff

Dan Moore, Bunny Lincoln, Ryan MacLaren

1. Call to Order / Introductions

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 **February 10th** meeting minutes.

On a motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the February 10th minutes were approved as presented by unanimous voice vote.

Chairman Kuntz asked committee members if there were any additions or corrections to the **March 9th** meeting minutes. Mike Kuntz noted that “with” needed to be changed to “without” as related to the lack of a quorum for the meeting.

On a motion by John Adam, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the March 9th minutes were approved as amended by unanimous voice vote. Alex Georgevitch abstained.

3. Public Comment

No public comment was forthcoming.

Action Items:

4. 2015 Annual List of Obligated Projects

Ryan Maclaren presented the list of obligated projects. Federal law requires MPOs to publish annually a list of projects for which federal funds have been obligated in the preceding federal fiscal year. The attached draft report includes a list of projects obligated federal funds in FFY 2015 and includes information on the distribution of those funds by jurisdiction, agency, and project type.

All obligated dollar amounts contained in the list were provided by ODOT and RVTB. The purpose of the Annual Listing of Obligated Projects is to provide transparency in federal transportation planning, and to serve as a reference to track consistency in the year project funds are obligated versus the year they were programmed. Following TAC approval, the list will be presented to the Policy Committee and posted to the RVMPO website at the end of the month. The obligation timeframe is Oct. 1, 2014 to Sept. 30, 2015.

The list includes:

- Introduction
- Federal Requirements
- Federal Funding Sources
- Other Funding
- Distribution of Funds by Jurisdiction and
- Distribution of Funds by Project Type
- Project Delivery, Phasing
- List of Obligated
- Obligated Projects
- Map
- Appendix A Federal Regulations

There was a brief discussion on the Lozier Lane project, as related to the right of way. Paige Townsend asked about several items missing from the RVTB figures, including their operating grant. She will work with COG staff to remedy this situation.

On a motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Matt Brinkley, the 2015 Annual List of Obligated Projects was unanimously recommended for approval, by voice vote, to the Policy Committee for approval.

5. Regional Plan/Transportation Improvement (TIP) Amendment

Ryan Maclaren shared that the TAC is being asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed RTP/TIP amendments. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing has been advertised in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.

• Interstate 5: Exit 33 Off-Ramp Improvement

Description: Construct a second right turn lane on the northbound off-ramp at I-5 Exit 33 in response to development pressures in Central Point and to address safety concerns associated with queuing on the off-ramp. Without this improvement, queueing is expected to extend into

the I-5 mainline travel lanes, creating significant safety and operational concerns on I-5. The cost is budgeted at \$967,000. Costco, Central Point and ODOT will fund the project.

On a motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the Regional Plan/Transportation Improvement (TIP) Amendment was recommended for approval by the Policy Committee. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

6. Draft Unified Work Program (UPWP) 2016-17

Dan Moore presented the final draft of the 2016-17 UPWP. A draft UPWP for next year has been published. The planning time put in by the Policy Committee and the TAC will continue to be used as in-kind match for the FTA 5303 funds, freeing MPO dues for other expenses. The Policy Committee will conduct a public hearing and consider adopting the plan on April 26th. Anticipated carry over funds from the previous fiscal are included in the budget. The STP (Surface Transportation Program) has been changed to STBG (Surface Transportation Block Grant).

- **Table 1 - Proposed FY 2017 Budget - Transportation Planning Funds by Source/Activity** (same funding amounts as current FY, but the amount could change, based on upcoming discussions at the State level)

Delineated Work Tasks include:

- **Table 2 - Proposed Program Activity -** outlining work tasks for program management, short/long range planning, data development/maintenance and transit. Proposed activities include:
 1. **Program Management** - Continue previous tasks, update website, Update Public Involvement Plan.
 2. **Short Range Planning** - Maintain current MTIP, Develop 2018-21 TIP, solicit for CMAQ/STP funded projects, Develop AQCD for RTP/TIP, publish Obligated Projects List FFY2017, Coordinate CO LMP & Air Quality Conformity, MOVES modeling for RTP/TIP, Assist with local planning as warranted.
 3. **Long Range Planning** - Work with ODOT/FHWA MPO performance measures, continue 2017-42 RTP work, Maintain RTP Safety Profile, Commence 2015 Alternative Measures benchmark analysis, continue ITS plan update.
 4. **Data Development** - R&A continue support for improved travel demand model, continue 2017-42 RTP update, continue ODOT model training as available.
 5. **Transit** - No projects identified.

The draft UPWP has been submitted for review by federal and state planning partners (Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration and ODOT). Staff asked jurisdictions, to suggest changes to the draft UPWP, which have been incorporated into the final draft for public hearing in April. The Policy Committee will be asked to adopt the work plan at that time.

On a motion by Paige Townsend, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the Draft Unified Work Program (UPWP) 2016-17 was recommended for approval by the Policy Committee. The motion was unanimously approved by voice vote.

7. State Transportation Improvement Program Enhance Non-Highway Proposal

In July 2015, the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) approved Enhance program funding and a revised process for the FY 2018-2021 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Region 3 will receive -\$5.169 million. Enhance funds are mostly comprised of federal funds allocated to the State, and do not include federal or state formula disbursements to local jurisdictions. ODOT would like to share your input with the RVACT on the following STIP Enhance Non-Highway proposals:

- ODOT Region 3: OR99 Multimodal PH1: Coleman Creek to Birch - \$1,982,000 request

Also provided for the Committee were an ODOT cover letter with the RVMPO STIP Enhance Non-Highway Proposal, STIP Enhance Funding Guidelines and the OR 99 Multimodal PH1: Coleman Creek to Birch, Enhance Proposal Form;

The Committee was asked to provide input on proposal to the Policy Committee to be shared with the RVACT. Paige Townsend spoke about the transit corridor study that has recently been done, and stated that it was a very good document. She also spoke about upcoming improvements that will be made. RVTD is requesting upgrades for some signals to allow RVTD to notify signal boxes when it is possible to facilitate bus schedules. John Vial reviewed the three projects endorsed by the MRMPO. Mike Kuntz voiced his support for the projects.

On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Matt Brinkley, the Committee gave its support for the proposed Enhanced project as it works its way through the approval process with the Policy Committee. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

8. MPO Planning Update

- The model update (TAZ) continues, and a project list is being created for matching of RTP funds.
- Staff will be soliciting for CMAQ and STBG projects. It has been learned that CMAQ allocations will change to add Central Lane MPO and Salem MPO to the process. ODOT is working on forming a statewide committee in May to develop this scenario. Therefore, CMAQ funds may decrease. Staff recommends proceeding with the current process, with the understanding that, depending on the outcome of potentially adding more jurisdictions to the process, amendments might need to be made to the project list at a later date.

9. Public Comment

None received.

10. Other Business / Local Business

- John Vial said that no program/procedural changes are expected with the name change from STP to STBG.
- Paige Townsend shared that an RVTD bus has been “wrapped” to promote transit benefits and the “Go” campaign in the Rogue Valley.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings:

- | | | |
|----------------|----------------|---------|
| • RVMPO TAC | May 11, 2016 | 1:30 PM |
| • RVMPO Policy | April 26, 2016 | 2:00 PM |
| • RVMPO PAC | May 17, 2016 | 5:30 PM |



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: June 1, 2016
TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Associate Planner
SUBJECT: RTP/TIP Amendments

The TAC is being asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed RTP/TIP amendments described below and on the following pages. The Policy Committee will hold a public hearing at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 28, 2016 to consider adoption of the proposed TIP and RTP amendments. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing will be advertised on or before June 2 in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. Information on the new project is enumerated, below:

A. Amendment to RTP & TIP: Stevens Road - East Main Street to Palima Drive (KN19230)

Description: Advance construction phase from FFY 2018 to FFY 2017.

Project Name	Project Description	RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase	Federal		Federal Required Match		Total Fed+Req Match	Other		Total All Sources
							\$	Source	\$	Source		\$	Source	
Eagle Point														
Stevens Road - East Main Street to Palima Drive	Urban Upgrade (Collector) with Bike Lanes and Sidewalks	330	Exempt - Table 2, Safety	19230	2016	Design	\$ 69,521	STP-L (L200)	\$ 7,957	Eagle Point	\$ 77,478			\$ 77,478
				19230	2016	Design	\$ 208,564	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 23,871	Eagle Point	\$ 232,435			\$ 232,435
				19230	2017	Land Purchase	\$ 10,000	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 1,145	Eagle Point	\$ 11,145			\$ 11,145
				19230	2017	Construction						\$ 36,748	Eagle Point	\$ 36,748
				19230	2017	Construction	\$ 1,026,565	STP-L (L200)	\$ 117,495	Eagle Point	\$ 1,144,060			\$ 1,144,060
				19230	2017	Construction	\$ 1,088,917	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 124,631	Eagle Point	\$ 1,213,548			\$ 1,213,548
					Total FFY 15-18		\$ 2,403,567		\$ 275,099		\$ 2,678,666			\$ 2,715,414

B. Add New Project to RTP & TIP: *RVMPO Planning* (KN)Description: **RVMPO planning funds.**

Project Name	Project Description	RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase	Federal		Federal Required Match		Total Fed+Req Match	Other		Total All Sources
							\$	Source	\$	Source		\$	Source	
Rogue Valley Council of Governments														
RV/MPO PL	Planning and Research	914	Exempt - Table 2, Safety			Planning								
						Design								
						Land Purchase								
						Utility Relocate								
						Construction								
					2017	Other	\$ 263,378		\$ 30,145	ODOT	\$ 293,523			\$ 293,523
					Total FFY 15-18		\$ 263,378		\$ 30,145		\$ 293,523			\$ 293,523

C. Add New Project to RTP & TIP: *RVMPO FTA 5303* (KN)Description: **RVMPO FTA 5303 funds.**

Project Name	Project Description	RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase	Federal		Federal Required Match		Total Fed+Req Match	Other		Total All Sources			
							\$	Source	\$	Source		\$	Source				
Rogue Valley Council of Governments																	
FTA 5303		914	Exempt - Table 2, Safety			Planning											
						Design											
						Land Purchase											
						Utility Relocate											
						Construction											
					2017	Other	\$	83,738		\$	9,584	Local	\$	93,322		\$	93,322
					Total FFY 15-18		\$	83,738		\$	9,584					\$	93,322



Project Funding Application Packet

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

DRAFT

Federal Fiscal Years:

2019 (starting Oct. 1, 2018)

2020 (starting Oct. 1, 2019)

2021 (starting Oct. 1, 2020)

Projects must be ready to initiate during this timeframe.

APPLICATIONS DUE: Friday, September 2, 2016, 5pm
Emailed applications only

To file and obtain information: Rogue Valley Council of Governments
155 N. First St, Central Point
541.423. 1369
anapoli@rvcog.org

Table of Contents

Purpose	1
Application Checklist	1
Schedule	2
Application Process.....	3
Qualifying for Federal Funds	3
Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)	4
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program	7
Application Instructions – By Section	10
Applicant and Project Information	10
Cost Estimate and Funding Requested	10
Project Evaluation Criteria	12
Project Funding Application	13

Purpose

This document announces the **anticipated availability of federal funds for surface transportation projects within the RVMPO planning area**, and the intent of the RVMPO Policy Committee to award funds and program projects. RVMPO anticipates the following funds will be available for the 2019, 2020 and 2021 Federal Fiscal Years (beginning Oct. 1, 2018, Oct. 1, 2019, and Oct. 1, 2020):

	2019	2020	2021
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program	\$1,080,427*	\$1,080,427*	\$1,080,427*
Surface Transportation Block Grant**	\$971,015	\$984,609	\$1,996,787

Considerable uncertainty exists regarding future levels of federal funding for surface transportation, even whether programs and funds will continue to exist – at least in their present form. RVMPO staff will provide funding updates throughout the grant and MTIP process.

**Balance after accounting for \$682,216 in CMAQ funding shortfall from 2015-18 CMAQ project programming timeframe (-\$227,405 per year).*

***Balances after current obligations. Half of the Medford area's STBG allocation goes to Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTG) to meet state planning requirements (see RVMPO's 2013-2038 Regional Transportation Plan, Appendix B). The metro area expects to receive just over \$1.95 million in each of the three years.*

Application Checklist

Applications must include the following:

- ✓ Application form (2019, 2020 & 2021)
- ✓ Photographs of project site, illustrating project need if possible (not applicable to all projects)
- ✓ Map of project site, clearly identifying project termini (not applicable to all projects)
- ✓ For construction projects, completed RVMPO project estimator (available with this packet on line) or licensed engineer's estimate (The RVMPO estimator was developed and is used by ODOT Highway Division. It uses the most current and reasonable cost estimates available.)

Any additional material supplied by applicants will be made available to RVMPO committees for consideration. The application form in this packet must be used for all project applications.

Schedule

Planned schedule and summary of actions listed below. For greater detail or more up-to-date information, please consult RVCOG staff.

May 11, 2016	Technical Advisory Committee conducts final review of project evaluation process
May 24, 2016	Policy Committee conducts final review of project evaluation process
June 2016	Start project solicitation process
Sept. 2, 2016	Application period closes; RVMPO begins application evaluation
Sept. 14, 2016	Technical Advisory Committee application workshop (optional for applicants). Opportunity to present applications - <i>With TAC concurrence, applicants may submit minor changes to applications by email to RVCOG no later than noon, September 16, 2016.</i>
Sept./Oct. 2016	RVMPO advisory committees review applications, evaluate projects, make recommendations to Policy Committee
September 2016	RVMPO initiates Air Quality Conformity Consultation with EPA, FHWA, FTA, DEQ and ODOT
Oct. 25, 2016	Policy Committee awards funds (makes tentative funding decisions). <i>Applicant presentations.</i>
Oct.- Dec. 2016	RVMPO prepares Draft 2018-2021 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) and Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD)
Jan./Feb. 2017	Public Comment Period on Draft 2018-21 MTIP and AQCD
March 2017	Advisory committees make recommendations on Draft MTIP and AQCD
March 28, 2017	Policy Committee conducts public hearing, adopts Draft MTIP and AQCD
April 2017	RVMPO forwards MTIP project list to ODOT for Statewide Transportation Improvement Program; AQCD submitted to FHWA
April 2017	MTIP submitted to FHWA, FTA and to ODOT for Governor's signature; USDOT issues AQCD

Application Process

The application is an electronically fillable form. Applications must be submitted electronically. Contact RVMPO staff for assistance. Where appropriate, applications must include maps delineating project termini or boundaries and photographs of the project area that help show need for the improvement. Applications for construction must include either a completed estimator (on RVMPO website with this packet) or engineer's stamped estimate.

Project applications will be reviewed in a three-step process prior to consideration by the Policy Committee:

Step 1: Determine Project Funding Eligibility.

Each fund source has a set of qualification rules, which are described below. Applicants should review rules and may consult with RVMPO staff to determine eligibility prior to filling out an application. Applications will be reviewed by RVMPO staff in consultation with FHWA and ODOT to determine initial eligibility. Information provided by applicant must be sufficient to enable staff to determine initial eligibility; the application is designed to provide necessary information.

Step 2: Initial Project Evaluation.

This step also will be conducted by RVMPO staff, using the *Goals and Project Funding Criteria* table on page 10. Staff will evaluate candidate projects based on the extent to which they would contribute to meeting RVMPO goals, the goals of the Regional Transportation Plan and federal planning requirements, as summarized in the Funding Criteria table.

Step 3: RVMPO Committee and Public Review.

RVMPO advisory committees (Technical Advisory Committee, Public Advisory Council) in public meetings will review and discuss applications and staff evaluations, consider comments from applicants and the public, and make funding recommendations to the Policy Committee.

Recommendations and comments from the advisory committees and public will be forwarded to the Policy Committee at its public meeting to make tentative funding decisions. Those decisions will go into the draft 2018-2021 MTIP, and be subject to a public hearing by the Policy Committee.

Qualifying for Federal Funds

The STBG and CMAQ programs each have rules governing use of funds. General eligibility guidance appears below. All projects must meet basic eligibility requirements for funding under Titles 23 and 49 of the U.S. Code. Although the RVMPO Policy Committee is responsible for selecting projects for these funds, and amending funded projects into the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program and Regional Transportation Plan, FTA and FHWA make all final eligibility determinations and authorize release of funds. All funds not used as directed by the Policy Committee are returned to the region for reallocation. Please consult with RVMPO staff if your questions are not answered here.

Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)

This is a flexible funding source that may be used for projects to preserve and improve the conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals.

Qualifying STBG projects include:

- Location of Projects (23 U.S.C. 133(c)): STBG projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except—
 - (1) For a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location);
 - (2) For a project described in 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(4)-(11) and described below under “Eligible Activities” (b)(4) through (11);
 - (3) For transportation alternatives projects described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) before enactment of the FAST Act (these are described in 23 U.S.C. 133(h) and in separate TA Set-Aside guidance.); and
 - (4) As approved by the Secretary.
- Eligible Activities (23 U.S.C. 133(b)): Subject to the location of projects requirements in paragraph (a), the following eligible activities are listed in 23 U.S.C. 133(b):
 - (1) Construction, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4), of the following:
 - Highways, bridges, and tunnels, including designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads under 40 U.S.C. 14501;
 - Ferry boats and terminal facilities eligible under 23 U.S.C. 129(c);
 - transit capital projects eligible under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code;
 - Infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements, including the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment;
 - Truck parking facilities eligible under Section 1401 of MAP-21 (23 U.S.C. 137 note); and
 - Border infrastructure projects eligible under Section 1303 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 101 note).
 - (2) Operational improvements and capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management, and control facilities and programs. Operational improvement is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(18).
 - (3) Environmental measures eligible under 23 U.S.C. 119(g), 328, and 329, and transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) (other than clause (xvi) of that section) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7408(f)(1)(A)).

- (4) Highway and transit safety infrastructure improvements and programs, including railway-highway grade crossings.
- (5) Fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137 and carpool projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 146. Carpool project is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(3).
- (6) Recreational trails projects eligible under 23 U.S.C. 206, pedestrian and bicycle projects in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217 (including modifications to comply with accessibility requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.)), and the Safe Routes to School Program under Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. 402 note).
- (7) Planning, design, or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
- (8) Development and implementation of a State asset management plan for the National Highway System (NHS) and a performance-based management program for other public roads.
- (9) Protection (including painting, scour countermeasures, seismic retrofits, impact protection measures, security countermeasures, and protection against extreme events) for bridges (including approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels on public roads, and inspection and evaluation of bridges and tunnels and other highway assets.
- (10) Surface transportation planning programs, highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs, and workforce development, training, and education under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code.
- (11) Surface transportation infrastructure modifications to facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal.
- (12) Projects and strategies designed to support congestion pricing, including electronic toll collection and travel demand management strategies and programs.
- (13) Upon request of a State and subject to the approval of the Secretary, if Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) credit assistance is approved for an STBG-eligible project, then the State may use STBG funds to pay the subsidy and administrative costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance for the projects.
- (14) The creation and operation by a State of an office to assist in the design, implementation, and oversight of public-private partnerships eligible to receive funding under title 23 and chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, and the payment of a stipend to unsuccessful private bidders to offset their proposal development costs, if necessary to encourage robust competition in public-private partnership procurements.
- (15) Any type of project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 133 as in effect on the day before the FAST Act was enacted. Among these are:

- Replacement of bridges with fill material;
- Training of bridge and tunnel inspectors;
- Application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and deicing compositions for bridges (and approaches to bridges and other elevated structures) and tunnels;
- Projects to accommodate other transportation modes continue to be eligible pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 142(c) if such accommodation does not adversely affect traffic safety;
- Transit capital projects eligible for assistance under chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, including vehicles and facilities (publicly or privately owned) that are used to provide intercity passenger bus service;
- Approach roadways to ferry terminals to accommodate other transportation modes and to provide access into and out of the ports;
- Transportation alternatives previously described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) and described in 23 U.S.C. 213;
- Projects relating to intersections having disproportionately high accident rates, high levels of congestion (as evidenced by interrupted traffic flow at the intersection and a level of service rating of “F” during peak travel hours, calculated in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual), and are located on a Federal-aid highway;
- Construction and operational improvements for any minor collector if the minor collector and the project to be carried out are in the same corridor and in proximity to an NHS route; the construction or improvements will enhance the level of service on the NHS route and improve regional traffic flow; and the construction or improvements are more cost-effective, as determined by a benefit-cost analysis, than an improvement to the NHS route;
- Workforce development, training, and education activities discussed in 23 U.S.C. 504(e);
- Advanced truck stop electrification systems. Truck stop electrification system is defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(32);
- Installation of safety barriers and nets on bridges, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife;
- Electric vehicle and natural gas vehicle infrastructure in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 137;
- Data collection, maintenance, and integration and the costs associated with obtaining, updating, and licensing software and equipment required for risk-based asset management and performance based management, and for similar

activities related to the development and implementation of a performance based management program for other public roads;

- Construction of any bridge in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 144(f) that replaces any low water crossing (regardless of the length of the low water crossing); any bridge that was destroyed prior to January 1, 1965; any ferry that was in existence on January 1, 1984; or any road bridge that is rendered obsolete as a result of a Corps of Engineers flood control or channelization project and is not rebuilt with funds from the Corps of Engineers. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c); and
- Actions in accordance with the definition and conditions in 23 U.S.C. 144(g) to preserve or reduce the impact of a project on the historic integrity of a historic bridge if the load capacity and safety features of the historic bridge are adequate to serve the intended use for the life of the historic bridge. Not subject to the Location of Project requirement in 23 U.S.C. 133(c).

Location of Projects: In general, STBG projects may not be on local or rural minor collectors. However, there are exceptions to this requirement, such as: bridge and tunnel replacement and rehabilitation (not new construction), bridge and tunnel inspection, carpool projects, fringe/corridor parking facilities, bike/pedestrian walkways, safety infrastructure, Transportation Alternatives, recreational trails, port terminal modifications, and minor collectors in NHS corridors.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program

Eligibility is directly linked to air quality conditions in the RVMPO planning area. To qualify for funding an application must provide adequate information for staff to estimate reduction of on-road particulate emissions 10 microns and smaller (PM₁₀) within the RVMPO planning area and/or reduction of on-road carbon monoxide (CO) emissions within the Medford urban growth boundary (UGB). A cost/benefit analysis also is required. Information provided by applicant at a minimum must be sufficient to enable staff to determine these threshold eligibility requirements.

All CMAQ projects must demonstrate the three primary elements of eligibility: transportation identity, emissions reduction, and location in or benefitting a nonattainment or maintenance area. While project eligibilities are continued, there is some modification with new language placing considerable emphasis on select project types including electric and natural gas vehicle infrastructure and diesel retrofits. As in past authorizations of the program, projects must be included in a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) transportation plan and transportation improvement program (TIP), or the current Statewide TIP in areas that are not part of an MPO. The MPO plans and programs must also have a transportation conformity determination in place, where applicable. In addition, CMAQ investments must comply with the appropriate Federal cost principles, such as 2 CFR 225, the guidelines for State, local, and tribal governments.

Projects NOT ELIGIBLE for CMAQ funding are specifically identified in FHWA's *Final Program Guidance*, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/cmaq08gd.pdf as follows:

- Light-duty vehicle scrappage programs.
- Projects that add new capacity for SOVs are ineligible for CMAQ funding unless construction is limited to high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. HOV lane eligibility includes the full range of HOV facility uses authorized under 23 U.S.C §166, such as high-occupancy toll (HOT) and low-emission vehicles.
- Routine maintenance and rehabilitation projects (e.g., replacement-in-kind of track or other equipment, reconstruction of bridges, stations, and other facilities, and repaving or repairing roads) are ineligible for CMAQ funding as they only maintain existing levels of highway and transit service, and therefore do not reduce emissions. Other funding sources, such as STP and FTA's Section 5307 program, are available for such activities.
- Administrative costs of the CMAQ program may not be defrayed with program funds, e.g., support for a State's "CMAQ Project Management Office" is not eligible.
- Projects that do not meet the specific eligibility requirements of titles 23 and 49 U.S.C. are ineligible for CMAQ funds.
- Stand-alone projects to purchase fuel.
- Models and Monitors – Acquisition, operation, or development of models or monitoring networks are not eligible for CMAQ funds. As modeling or monitoring emissions, traffic operations, travel demand or other related variables do not directly lead to an emissions reduction, these activities or acquisitions are not eligible. Such efforts may be appropriate for Federal planning funds.
- Litigation costs surrounding CMAQ or other Federal-aid projects.

Examples of ELIGIBLE Activities (CMAQ):

Funds may be used for transportation projects likely to contribute to the attainment or maintenance of a national ambient air quality standard, with a high level of effectiveness in reducing air pollution, and be included in the MPO's current transportation plan and transportation improvement program (TIP). Some specific eligible activities are described below:

- Establishment or operation of a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility, including advanced truck stop electrification systems, if it contributes to attainment of an air quality standard.
- Projects that improve traffic flow, including projects to improve signalization, construct HOV lanes, improve intersections, add turning lanes, improve transportation systems management and operations that mitigate congestion and improve air quality, and implement ITS and other CMAQ-eligible projects, including projects to improve incident and emergency response or improve mobility, such as real-time traffic, transit, and multimodal traveler information.
- Purchase of integrated, interoperable emergency communications equipment.

- Projects that shift traffic demand to nonpeak hours or other transportation modes, increase vehicle occupancy rates, or otherwise reduce demand.
- Facilities serving electric or natural gas-fueled vehicles (except where this conflicts with prohibition on rest area commercialization) are explicitly eligible.
- Some expanded authority to use funds for transit operations.
- Workforce development, training, and education activities.
- Acquisition of diesel retrofits, including tailpipe emissions control devices, and the provision of diesel-related outreach activities.
- Intermodal equipment and facility projects that target diesel freight emissions through direct exhaust control from vehicles or indirect emissions reductions through improvements in freight network logistics.
- Alternative fuel projects including participation in vehicle acquisitions, engine conversions, and refueling facilities.
- Establishment or operation of a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility, including the installation of advanced truck stop electrification systems.
- Projects that improve traffic flow, including efforts to provide signal systemization, construct HOV lanes, streamline intersections, add turning lanes, improve transportation systems management and operations that mitigate congestion and improve air quality, and implement ITS and other CMAQ-eligible projects, including efforts to improve incident and emergency response or improve mobility, such as through real time traffic, transit and multimodal traveler information.
- Projects or programs that shift travel demand to nonpeak hours or other transportation modes, increase vehicle occupancy rates, or otherwise reduce demand through initiatives, such as teleworking, ridesharing, pricing, and others.
- Transit investments, including transit vehicle acquisitions and construction of new facilities or improvements to facilities that increase transit capacity. The MAP21 provision on operating assistance (23 USC 149(m)) is being reviewed and guidance interpreting the provision will be issued in the future.
- Non-recreational bicycle transportation and pedestrian improvements that provide a reduction in single-occupant vehicle travel.
- Vehicle inspection and maintenance programs.

CMAQ Public-Private Partnerships

Through the CMAQ program, RVMPO has funded public-private partnerships in certain instances where a private business or non-profit proposed a service or project that reduces vehicle emissions to the extent that it yields a measurable reduction in CO and PM₁₀ emissions as described above.

Organizations that are not RVMPO members must have their application sponsored by an RVMPO member jurisdiction, with the jurisdiction filing the project application and representing the project. Non-member applicants likely will be expected to provide their sponsoring jurisdiction with all data

and information needed to for the application. If the application is successful, either the sponsoring jurisdiction, or through separate agreement the RVCOG, will be the direct recipient of federal funds, reimbursing the non-member organization for approved project expenses through a separate contract. RVCOG or other direct recipient of project funds may retain a percentage of project funds to reimburse its project- related costs. RVCOG generally requires at least 3 percent of total project cost for its expenses.

Application Instructions – By Section

The attached application form must be filed electronically with RVMPO at the Rogue Valley Council of Governments by the application deadline to be considered for funding under this solicitation. Information below follows the layout of the application. Information to questions in shaded blocks in the application may be used in an evaluation for CMAQ funds.

1. **Application Information** - The applicant must be an RVMPO member jurisdiction. Member jurisdictions may sponsor projects for non-members, including private organizations. A member staff person must be listed at the bottom of this section as contact for RVMPO staff. **Use built-in attachment function** (click button in project description section) **to attach photographs, maps, charts etc. to help illustrate project need** (please insert files at end of application).
2. **Cost Estimate & Funding Requested** - Federal funds requested, plus other funds available to applicant must be listed here, by project phase. Include prior year funding, if any. This application covers both the STBG and CMAQ programs. RVMPO will consult with applicants on fund source but if the applicant has a preference, it should be noted and explained in this section. **For construction projects: Use built-in attachment function** (click button at bottom of section) **to attach RVMPO Project Cost Estimator** (provided by ODOT, link on page 1) **or engineer's stamped cost estimate** (please insert files at end of application).
3. **Project Evaluation Criteria** - This section has four focus areas, each containing criteria based on the RVMPO's organizational goals, long-range plan (2038 Regional Transportation Plan) goals and federal guidance for MPO planning. The *Goals and Project Funding Criteria* table can be found on page 12. Projects will be evaluated based on listed criteria and, where possible, project scoring will be quantitative. Where such data isn't available, projects will be scored on a high-medium-low scale. Additional guidance by focus area is provided below.
 3. a) **Mobility** Include specific data if available regarding accident history and delay. The *Population Served* section is intended to provide project evaluators with some idea of the number of people who could benefit from the project. If the applicant is unable to provide a number, RVMPO staff will use regional data to define a service area and estimate a population.

3. b) Community Vitality & Livability The source for Traditionally Underserved Population Benefit is both the RVMPO's [Environmental Justice & Title VI Plan](#) and [Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations](#). Questions regarding supporting housing along transit routes and housing and employment in Activity Centers are drawn from RVMPO Alternative Measures (see [Appendix B](#), 2013-2038 RTP), adopted to meet Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (land use) requirements. The Activity Center map can be found [here](#).

3. c) Transportation Options Questions in this section are based on RVMPO Alternative Measures. Refer to the [Activity Center](#) map, and for background see 2013-2038 RTP [Appendix B](#).

3. d) Resource Conservation Applicants for diesel vehicle projects note: vehicle replacements (to new vehicles using cleaner technologies) must be removing older vehicles before they would have been removed through normal fleet turnover or attrition. Replaced vehicle/equipment should be scrapped or remanufactured to a cleaner standard (see Appendix 3: 23 U.S.C. 104(b) (2) Considerations for Diesel Retrofit Projects at http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ENVIRonment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/2008_guidance/index.cfm#Appendix1).

RVMPO Evaluation Measures – Goals and Project Funding Criteria

Highlighted language indicates proposed changes.

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

	RVMPO Goal	2013-2034 RTP Goal	MPO Requirements (23 CFR, Part 450.306)	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. (If project demonstrates air quality benefit it will be evaluated for CMAQ.)
				2. Congestion relief/reduce delay	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.)
		Optimize safety and security of the transportation system.	Increase accessibility and mobility.	3. Promote connectivity (ex: 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 ½-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 & 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 to traditionally underserved populations (Low-Income, Minority, Seniors, Children, Limited English Proficiency)	Does the project invest in and/or provide benefit to an area identified in the Title VI and Environmental Justice Plan or the Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations, or meet a need identified in the Needs Assessment?
				2. Support Alternative Measure 2: improve transit accessibility	Is the project located along existing/planned transit route? Does the project promote or support an increase in housing along fixed route transit? Level of density w/in ¼ mile buffer of project area.
		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 Activity Centers. Support Alternative Measure 6: Increase % employment in Activity Centers.	Is the project located in an Activity Center? Link to map here. 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. (If project reduces truck VMT or emissions – esp. pre 1986 trucks – project will be evaluated for CMAQ).
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	Provide total length of bicycle lane/path, service to/within/between Activity Centers, and/or describe other improvement.
				4. Support Alternative Measure 4: increase sidewalks on collectors, arterials in Activity Centers	Provide total length of qualifying sidewalks/paths.
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.	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.
				3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (CO) ₂	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? (If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.)
				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

(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>).



Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Project Funding Application:

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

Federal Fiscal Years: 2019, 2020, 2021

Applications Due: Sept. 2, 2016 5pm

Eligibility

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

Project Readiness

Federal funds from both programs to be awarded to projects through this solicitation will be available Oct. 1, 2018 (Federal Fiscal Year 2019), Oct. 1, 2019 (FFY 2020), and Oct. 1, 2020 (FFY 2021). This project will be ready to start, with funds available for match (generally 10.27 %) and additional funds necessary to complete project/phase, in **(you must be able to check at least one time frame below to proceed with this application):**

Oct. 1, 2018 (FFY 2019) Oct. 1, 2019 (FFY 2020) Oct. 1, 2020 (FFY 2021)

Maps & Photographs

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

1. APPLICANT & PROJECT INFORMATION - Fill out this part completely

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

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

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

*Highly leveraged projects earn higher rating)

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

For CMAQ Funding: Describe how the project is CMAQ eligible. For partial CMAQ funding, note which eligible elements of the project are seeking CMAQ funding. (Eligibility Guidelines: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/cmaq.cfm>)

3. PROJECT EVALUATION CRITERIA - Complete as applicable to project

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

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

3.a) MOBILITY

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

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

Crash Data / History:

Describe Safety Problem and How Project will Address it.

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

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

Promote Connectivity: Roadway Bike/Ped Transit Anticipate VMT Reduction

Describe connectivity feature(s); How project completes network. Explain anticipated VMT Reduction (if checked)

Population Served: Applicant-Provided ADT _____ or Transit Boarding _____

RVMPO staff will estimate number of people served by project (population and employment) using RVMPO travel demand model data (TAZ data).

3.b) COMMUNITY VITALITY & LIVABILITY

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

Will project improve handicapped access?

Project Improves Transit Accessibility	Yes	Identify route (or planned route), describe improvement
Project Supports Increased Housing and/or Employment in an Activity Center (click for map)	Yes	Project is located in an Activity Center: Yes No Project supports/is part of a high-density (at least 10 du/acre) area: Yes No Identify or Describe Area:
Benefits Freight Movement <i>Check appropriate:</i> Reduce Truck VMT Reduce Truck Idle Other (explain at right)	<i>Provide as appropriate:</i> • Truck VMT/yr _____ • Truck ADT _____ • Truck Idle Hrs/yr _____ • Anticipated Truck VMT Reduction/yr _____ • Anticipated Truck Idle Reduction/yr _____ Additional Information: <i>(If project reduces truck VMT or emissions, project may be evaluated for CMAQ funds. Light-duty vehicle reductions should be entered in 3a –Mobility, above.)</i>	

3.c) TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS

Project Reduces Dependence on Motor Vehicles or Single-Occupant Vehicles	Yes	Explain:
Project Supports Increased Transit, Bike, Pedestrian Mode Share	Yes	Explain:
Project Is or Includes Bicycle Facility	Yes	Describe Improvement: Total Length: _____
Project Is or Includes Bicycle Facility w/ Service to/within/between Activity Center(s)	Yes	Explain:
Project Is or Includes a Sidewalk/Path	Yes	Describe Improvement: Total length: _____
Project Is or Includes a Sidewalk on Collector/Arterial in Activity Center, or Path in Activity Center	Yes	Explain:

3.d) RESOURCE CONSERVATION

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

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

Diesel Vehicle Project (check one)

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

Project Description:

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

Greenhouse Gas Emission Reductions (CO₂) Yes

(Generally, project that reduces travel by combustion vehicle)

Explain:

Emerging Technology Yes

(Describe technology to be incorporated)

Explain:

System Preservation Yes

Pavement Preservation Yes

(How project extends the life of existing facility)

Explain:

VMT Reduction: (Explain how project will reduce travel)

Estimate VMT Reduction _____ miles/yr.

System Efficiency

Yes

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

Explain:

Project Lifespan _____ yrs.

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

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

4. ADDITIONAL PROJECT INFORMATION Optional; Information not submitted elsewhere

From: [LYNDE McGregor * Mac](#)
To: [LEYBOLD Ted](#); [JAFFE Mike](#); [THOMPSON Paul E](#); [MOORE Dan](#); [ERAUT Michelle](#); [HARRIS Jasmine](#); [BAKER John J](#); [BROUWER Travis](#); [BOHARD Jerri L](#); [FLOWERS Jeffrey A](#); [FISHER Patricia R](#) * [ODOT](#); [EDGAR Deanna D](#); [LIJENWALL Natalie](#)
Cc: [HAVIG Erik M](#); [BROOKS Kelly S](#); [NELL Lisa D](#); [BAKER John J](#); [PENNINGER Teresa B](#); [PFEIFFER Amy L](#); [WINDSHEIMER Rian M](#); [CHICKERING Sonny P](#); [READING Frank H](#); [BRYANT Robert W](#); [GROVE Monte](#); [HANSEN Norman C](#) * [Butch](#); [SIPP Craig A](#); [THOMPSON Rodney](#) * [Rod](#); [WEAVER Darlene](#); [HAUPT Susan](#); [John Vial](#) (VialJN@jacksoncounty.org); [MAHER John D](#); [KEASEY Ted W](#); [BARRY Michael P](#); [PARLETTE Katie M](#); [SPARKMAN Kelli](#); [HUESTIS John](#); [HUNAIDI Sam H](#); [GRISHAM Nicholas](#) * [Cole](#); [SANDVIG Amanda L](#); [JACOBSEN Kelly A](#); [DADE Flower E](#); [OLSON Marybeth W](#); [MATHER Paul R](#)
Subject: CMAQ Funding Allocation Update
Date: Tuesday, April 19, 2016 2:36:04 PM

All-

As some of you may have heard, FHWA recently confirmed for us that both Salem and Eugene are now CMAQ eligible areas. This will require an update to the current funding allocation formula that was last approved back in 2006 with the passage of SAFETEA-LU. There are several issues with the current formula and the ability to reproduce it, as well as other challenges and opportunities that have been brought up over the years. It is our intent to bring our key stakeholders (i.e. CMAQ eligible areas and others) together to discuss options for best utilizing CMAQ funds and make a recommendation to the OTC for consideration/approval this Fall. More details will be coming out soon about the schedule of events and meeting invites.

I recognize that the timing of this presents some challenges, especially to those of you working on your MTIP development. Knowing that the work of this group and the decision of the OTC will change the current allocation (simply by adding Salem and Eugene), I would strongly recommend taking a conservative approach as you do your project solicitation/selection efforts.

With the passage of the FAST Act, CMAQ funds in Oregon did see an increase. With the inability to fully use the existing allocation formula (due to lack of some specific air quality data), we can use population as a very close proxy for the formula. Below is an example of what the allocations could look like, when Salem and Eugene are added. While I don't believe this will be the final recommendation going to the OTC this fall, this does give you a sense of what the impact to your area could be.

Many of you are experts in this area and I welcome the discussions we are going to have over the coming months. I ask for your patience as we work through this process and your participation and partnership.

Any questions or concerns about the process or timing, please let me know.

I've cc'd a number of people that I know are interested about this topic. Please forward this message to anyone I may have missed.

-Mac

Oregon CMAQ Funding - FAST Act Annual Amounts

	without Salem/Eugene	with Salem/Eugene
--	-------------------------	----------------------

Metro	\$14,086,017	\$10,561,701
Medford	\$2,465,053	\$1,307,833
Grants Pass	\$704,300	\$532,341
Klamath Falls	\$352,150	\$427,221
Eugene	\$0	\$2,263,636
Salem	\$0	\$2,514,788
Lakeview	\$65,000	\$65,000
Oakridge	\$65,000	\$65,000
LaGrande	\$65,000	\$65,000
	\$17,802,520	\$17,802,520

*Distribution based on population, which
closely matches 2006 CMAQ allocation
formula

Butch, Ted K., Mike B....can you share this message with your local agency contacts, and also share their contact info with me, please.

McGregor “Mac” Lynde

ODOT-Active Transportation Section Manager

555 13th St NE

Salem, OR 97301

Office: 503-986-3880



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: May 4, 2016
TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: RVMPO CMAQ Funding – Allocation Shortfalls

ODOT recently updated the RVMPO CMAQ-funded project balance spreadsheet and it shows that the RVMPO will have a deficit of approximately \$682,000 by FY 2018. I am working with ODOT to identify the reason for this deficit. It appears that the RVMPO did not receive anticipated allotments of CMAQ funds (see Table 1). Table 1 below lists, by year, the amounts of CMAQ funds programmed by the RVMPO and then allocated to local projects approved by the Policy Committee.

Also included is Table 2 that lists RVMPO CMAQ allocations from the 15-18 STIP. There are no entries for FYs 2016, 2017 & 2018. Table 2 shows that less funds were allocated to the RVMPO than shown on Table 1 for FYs 14 & 15. I asked ODOT to verify the CMAQ allocations for the RVMPO for FYs 16, 17 & 18. ODOT's guidance at this point is to go ahead with the programmed CMAQ projects through 2018 and reduce the 2019, 2020 and 2021 CMAQ allocations by \$682,216.

Table 1	
FFY	Programmed in RVMPO 2012-15 and 15 -18 TIPs
2013	\$2,317,498
2014	\$2,188,000
2015	\$2,451,000
2016	\$2,544,783
2017	\$2,580,412
2018	\$2,616,538

Table 2				
FFY	Key #	Programmed in RVMPO 2012-15 TIP	Programmed in 2015-18 STIP CMAQ	From 2013-38 RTP RVMPO Financial Plan
2013	16853	\$2,317,498		
2014	18296	\$2,188,000	\$52,713	
2015	18297	\$2,451,000	\$2,058,329	
2016	NA		\$0	\$2,544,783
2017	NA		\$0	\$2,580,412
2018	NA		\$0	\$2,616,538

CMAQ Funding For RVMPO - 3-31-16

Key Number	Jurisdiction	Project	MPO Approved Amount for CMAQ	Amount Already Obligated Thru 3/31/16	Amount Left to Obligate Thru FFY 2018	Comments	Obligation Planned for FFY 2016	Obligation Planned for FFY 2017	Obligation Planned for FFY 2018
15257	Ashland	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 91,200.00	\$ 26,263.97	\$ -	Closed Out			
15694	Ashland	Plaza Av. Paving	\$ 797,700.00	\$ 438,632.32	\$ -	Closed Out			
17249	Ashland	Walker Avenue: Ashland to East Main	\$ 666,694.00	\$ 666,694.00	\$ -				
18250	Ashland	Hersey Street Sidewalk: N Main to Oak	\$ 531,000.00	\$ 120,238.20	\$ 410,761.80		\$ 18,842.80	\$ 391,919.00	
15253	Central Point	Hazel St: E of 10th St.	\$ 332,001.00	\$ 276,172.34	\$ -	Closed Out			
15695	Central Point/Tint	Central Point and Talent Parking Lot Imp.	\$ 1,044,403.00	\$ 1,043,065.15	\$ 1,337.85	Ready for Close Out	\$ 1,337.85		
17666	Central Point	Hybrid Vehicle Purchases	\$ 83,140.00	\$ 51,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17667	Central Point	Street Sweeper	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 172,947.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17252	Central Point	Snowy Butte & Chickory Lane Paving	\$ 509,267.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
16092	Central Point	Propane Vehicle Conversions	\$ 196,294.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
17401	Central Point	Freeman Road	\$ 1,341,000.00	\$ 1,341,000.00	\$ -				
17734	Eagle Point	Mattie Brown Park Parking Lot Paving	\$ 175,622.00	\$ 165,860.91	\$ -	Closed Out			
19230	Eagle Point	Stevens Rd: East Main St to Palima Dr	\$ 1,332,497.00	\$ 208,564.37	\$ 1,123,932.63			\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,113,932.63
15252	Jackson County	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 86,141.00	\$ 32,195.12	\$ -	Closed Out			
15254	Jackson County	East Pine St: I-5 to Peninger Rd	\$ 646,056.00	\$ 646,146.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
15667	Jackson County	Street Sweeper	\$ 152,541.00	\$ 150,532.66	\$ -	Closed Out			
15702	Jackson County	Peachey - Walker to Hillview	\$ 807,570.00	\$ 768,098.89	\$ -	Closed Out			
16089	Jackson County	MPO Alternative Energy-Emission Red	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 87,500.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
18974	Jackson County	Table Rock Rd: I-5 Crossing to Biddle	\$ 3,498,900.00	\$ 940,572.32	\$ 2,558,327.68		\$ 153,976.88	\$ 2,404,350.80	
15251	Jacksonville	Elm & M St. Paving	\$ 648,558.00	\$ 397,141.64	\$ -	Closed Out			
15696	Jacksonville	Street Sweeper	\$ 152,541.00	\$ 143,099.42	\$ -	Closed Out			
13553	Medford	Mace Rd. Sidewalks	\$ 585,744.00	\$ 585,744.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
13356	Medford	W. Medford Alleys	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 452,933.73	\$ -	Closed Out			
13357	Medford	Oak St- McAndrews to Taft	\$ 481,001.00	\$ 428,346.14	\$ -	Closed Out			
15250	Medford	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 78,870.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
15691	Medford	Street Sweeper	\$ 223,920.00	\$ 223,919.42	\$ -	Closed Out			
15692	Medford	Jackson St. & Stevens St Alleys	\$ 1,183,538.00	\$ 1,199,221.24	\$ (15,683.24)		\$ (15,683.24)		
15693	Medford	Alternative Fueling Station	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
15233	Medford	Barnett Bike/Ped Bridge	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 450,042.16	\$ -	Closed Out			
17240	Medford	Garfield Ave: Columbus to Peach	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17241	Medford	Adaptive Signal Timing	\$ 278,870.00	\$ 278,870.00	\$ -	Ready for Close Out			
16091	Medford	Springbrook Delta Waters Realignment	\$ 548,650.00	\$ 543,116.83	\$ -	Closed Out			
17388	Medford	Lozier Lane Improvements	\$ 5,001,912.00	\$ 1,732,119.82	\$ 3,269,792.18		\$ 3,269,792.18		
19231	Medford	Foothill Rd: Hillcrest to McAndrews	\$ 3,000,000.00	\$ 165,103.20	\$ 2,834,896.80		\$ 193,816.80	\$ 2,641,080.00	
15497	RVCOG	TDM	\$ 41,823.00	\$ 40,280.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
16290	RVCOG	Cascade Sierra Solutions	\$ 314,055.00	\$ 289,948.32	\$ -	Closed Out			
17254	RVCOG	Clean Air Campaign	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 55,000.00	\$ -				
16090	RVCOG	School Bus Fleet Diesel Retrofit	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
13554/17263	RVTD	Passenger Information	\$ 923,322.00	\$ 923,322.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
15246	RVTD	Diesel Bus Replacement	\$ 940,370.00	\$ 940,370.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
15666	RVTD	On-board Diagnostic	\$ 98,703.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
17168	RVTD	Expanded Transit Service	\$ 1,081,756.00	\$ 1,081,756.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
19378	RVTD	Valley Feeder Pilot Project	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 100,000.00		
		Total Planned for Projects Thru FFY 2018			\$ 10,283,365.70	Total Planned	\$ 3,722,083.27	\$ 5,447,349.80	\$ 1,113,932.63
						Total Available	\$ 4,671,043.67	\$ 3,414,013.40	\$ 431,716.60
		Balance as of 3/31/16 from Financial Plan			\$ 893,542.39				
		Estimated Obligation Amount Already Accounted for in Financial Plan			\$ 3,777,501.28				
		Expected Allocation for FFY 2017			\$ 2,465,053.00				
		Expected Allocation for FFY 2018			\$ 2,465,053.00				
		Total Available			\$ 9,601,149.67				
				Balance	\$ (682,216.03)		\$ 948,960.40	\$ (2,033,336.40)	\$ (682,216.03)

CMAQ Funding For RVMPO - 3-31-16 with Cuts

Key Number	Jurisdiction	Project	MPO Approved Amount for CMAQ	Amount Already Obligated Thru 3/31/16	Amount Left to Obligate Thru FFY 2018	Comments	Obligation Planned for FFY 2016	Obligation Planned for FFY 2017	Obligation Planned for FFY 2018
15257	Ashland	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 91,200.00	\$ 26,263.97	\$ -	Closed Out			
15694	Ashland	Plaza Av. Paving	\$ 797,700.00	\$ 438,632.32	\$ -	Closed Out			
17249	Ashland	Walker Avenue: Ashland to East Main	\$ 666,694.00	\$ 666,694.00	\$ -				
18250	Ashland	Hersey Street Sidewalk: N Main to Oak	\$ 531,000.00	\$ 120,238.20	\$ 410,761.80		\$ 18,842.80	\$ 391,919.00	
15253	Central Point	Hazel St: E of 10th St.	\$ 332,001.00	\$ 276,172.34	\$ -	Closed Out			
15695	Central Point/Tint	Central Point and Talent Parking Lot Imp.	\$ 1,044,403.00	\$ 1,043,065.15	\$ 1,337.85	Ready for Close Out	\$ 1,337.85		
17666	Central Point	Hybrid Vehicle Purchases	\$ 83,140.00	\$ 51,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17667	Central Point	Street Sweeper	\$ 175,000.00	\$ 172,947.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17252	Central Point	Snowy Butte & Chickory Lane Paving	\$ 509,267.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
16092	Central Point	Propane Vehicle Conversions	\$ 196,294.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
17401	Central Point	Freeman Road	\$ 1,341,000.00	\$ 1,341,000.00	\$ -				
17734	Eagle Point	Mattie Brown Park Parking Lot Paving	\$ 175,622.00	\$ 165,860.91	\$ -	Closed Out			
19230	Eagle Point	Stevens Rd: East Main St to Palima Dr	\$ 1,332,497.00	\$ 208,564.37	\$ 1,123,932.63			\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,113,932.63
15252	Jackson County	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 86,141.00	\$ 32,195.12	\$ -	Closed Out			
15254	Jackson County	East Pine St: I-5 to Peninger Rd	\$ 646,056.00	\$ 646,146.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
15667	Jackson County	Street Sweeper	\$ 152,541.00	\$ 150,532.66	\$ -	Closed Out			
15702	Jackson County	Peachey - Walker to Hillview	\$ 807,570.00	\$ 768,098.89	\$ -	Closed Out			
16089	Jackson County	MPO Alternative Energy-Emission Red	\$ 100,000.00	\$ 87,500.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
18974	Jackson County	Table Rock Rd: I-5 Crossing to Biddle	\$ 3,498,900.00	\$ 940,572.32	\$ 2,558,327.68		\$ 153,976.88	\$ 2,404,350.80	
15251	Jacksonville	Elm & M St. Paving	\$ 648,558.00	\$ 397,141.64	\$ -	Closed Out			
15696	Jacksonville	Street Sweeper	\$ 152,541.00	\$ 143,099.42	\$ -	Closed Out			
13553	Medford	Mace Rd. Sidewalks	\$ 585,744.00	\$ 585,744.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
13356	Medford	W. Medford Alleys	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 452,933.73	\$ -	Closed Out			
13357	Medford	Oak St- McAndrews to Taft	\$ 481,001.00	\$ 428,346.14	\$ -	Closed Out			
15250	Medford	Diesel Retrofit	\$ 78,870.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
15691	Medford	Street Sweeper	\$ 223,920.00	\$ 223,919.42	\$ -	Closed Out			
15692	Medford	Jackson St. & Stevens St Alleys	\$ 1,183,538.00	\$ 1,199,221.24	\$ (15,683.24)		\$ (15,683.24)		
15693	Medford	Alternative Fueling Station	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
15233	Medford	Barnett Bike/Ped Bridge	\$ 500,000.00	\$ 450,042.16	\$ -	Closed Out			
17240	Medford	Garfield Ave: Columbus to Peach	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ 1,500,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
17241	Medford	Adaptive Signal Timing	\$ 278,870.00	\$ 278,870.00	\$ -	Ready for Close Out			
16091	Medford	Springbrook Delta Waters Realignment	\$ 548,650.00	\$ 543,116.83	\$ -	Closed Out			
17388	Medford	Lozier Lane Improvements	\$ 5,001,912.00	\$ 1,732,119.82	\$ 3,269,792.18		\$ 3,269,792.18		
19231	Medford	Foothill Rd: Hillcrest to McAndrews	\$ 3,000,000.00	\$ 165,103.20	\$ 2,834,896.80		\$ 193,816.80	\$ 2,641,080.00	
15497	RVCOG	TDM	\$ 41,823.00	\$ 40,280.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
16290	RVCOG	Cascade Sierra Solutions	\$ 314,055.00	\$ 289,948.32	\$ -	Closed Out			
17254	RVCOG	Clean Air Campaign	\$ 55,000.00	\$ 55,000.00	\$ -				
16090	RVCOG	School Bus Fleet Diesel Retrofit	\$ 40,000.00	\$ 40,000.00	\$ -	Closed Out			
13554/17263	RVTD	Passenger Information	\$ 923,322.00	\$ 923,322.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
15246	RVTD	Diesel Bus Replacement	\$ 940,370.00	\$ 940,370.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
15666	RVTD	On-board Diagnostic	\$ 98,703.00	\$ -	\$ -	Project Cancelled			
17168	RVTD	Expanded Transit Service	\$ 1,081,756.00	\$ 1,081,756.00	\$ -	Transferred to FTA			
19378	RVTD	Valley Feeder Pilot Project	\$ 100,000.00	\$ -	\$ 100,000.00		\$ 100,000.00		
		Total Planned for Projects Thru FFY 2018		\$ 10,283,365.70		Total Planned	\$ 3,722,083.27	\$ 5,447,349.80	\$ 1,113,932.63
						Total Available	\$ 4,671,043.67	\$ 2,256,793.40	\$ (1,882,723.40)
		Balance as of 3/31/16 from Financial Plan		\$ 893,542.39					
		Estimated Obligation Amount Already Accounted for in Financial Plan		\$ 3,777,501.28					
		Expected Allocation for FFY 2017		\$ 1,307,833.00					
		Expected Allocation for FFY 2018		\$ 1,307,833.00					
		Total Available		\$ 7,286,709.67					
				Balance	\$ (2,996,656.03)		\$ 948,960.40	\$ (3,190,556.40)	\$ (2,996,656.03)