

**AGENDA**

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



*Date:* Wednesday, September 14, 2016  
*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. Regional Plan / Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments..... 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 September 7<sup>th</sup> in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.
    - ***RVTD-5339 Bus & Facilities Program-Small Urban (15-17)***
    - ***RVTD-5310 FTA Enhanced Mobility Program (2016)***
  - Attachment:* #2 – Memo, RTP/TIP Amendments
  - Action Requested:* Forward recommendation to Policy Committee.
  
- 5. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Amendments ..... Dan Moore**
  - Background:* The UPWP budget needs to be amended to reflect changes in the amounts of FHWA and FTA 5303 funds allocated to the RVMPO.
  - Attachments:* #3 – Memo
  - Action Requested:* Forward recommendation to the Policy Committee.

## 6. Air Quality Conformity Consultation.....Dan Moore

*Background:* RVMPO is starting interagency consultation on procedures for conforming the 2042 RTP and the 2018-2021 TIP. The Oregon Conformity Rule identifies the TAC as being the region's standing committee for consultation purposes.

*Attachments:* #4 – Pre-Analysis Consensus Plan for Transportation Conformity (attached separately); RTP, TIP & AQCD Timeline

*Action Requested:* Review and comment on analysis plan.

## 7. RVMPO Discretionary Funding Project Solicitation..... Dan Moore

*Background:* The TAC decided to delay the 2019-2021 RVMPO discretionary fund project solicitation until fall 2016 when a decision by ODOT on future CMAQ funding allocations was expected. ODOT has revised the timeline on how to allocate CMAQ funding and how to include all nine eligible areas. The process is expected to take 9 – 12 months. A final decision on CMAQ allocations may be as far off as September – October 2017. Based on the new timeline for a decision on future CMAQ funding allocations, the TAC may want to reconsider moving forward with the project solicitation process to be a part of the 2018-21 TIP (to be adopted in March 2017).

*Attachments:* #5 – Memo from ODOT to OTC

*Action Requested:* Provide direction on whether or not to proceed with project solicitation process.

## 8. ODOT Fund Exchange Process..... Dan Moore

*Background:* ODOT has developed a process for RVMPO jurisdictions and RVCOG to follow for STBG fund exchange projects. The process is outlined in the attached memo.

*Attachments:* #6 – Memo

*Action Requested:* None. Information item.

## 9. 2017 – 2042 RTP Place Type Maps..... Dan Moore

*Background:* The TAC may recall that Place Types, originally introduced to the RVMPO during the Strategic Assessment process, are used to quantify neighborhood characteristics by the role that they play in the region, proximity to destinations, and availability of various travel options. MPO staff will present Place Type maps, developed by ODOT, of the base (2017) and horizon year (2042) land use assumptions (by TAZ) for the 2042 RTP.

The following links provide Place Type maps described above:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/ORPlaceTypes.aspx?ptv=RVMPO-2017>

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/ORPlaceTypes.aspx?ptv=RVMPO-2042>

The following links provide more information on Place Types.

[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/Pages/scenario\\_planning.aspx#s3](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/Pages/scenario_planning.aspx#s3)

[http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ORPlaceTypes/PlaceType\\_Flyer.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ORPlaceTypes/PlaceType_Flyer.pdf)

*Attachments:* #7 – Memo

*Action Requested:* None. Discussion item.

- 10. MPO Planning Update** ..... **Dan Moore**
- 11. Public Comment**..... **Chair**
- 12. Other Business / Local Business** ..... **Chair**  
 Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.
- 13. Adjournment** ..... **Chair**

- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO TAC Committee meeting: Wednesday, October 12, at 1:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting is scheduled for September 27, at 2:00 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 20, 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*

**August 10, 2016**

*The following people were in attendance:*

### **RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee**

*Voting Members in Attendance:*

John Vial for Mike Kuntz	Jackson County
Alex Georgevitch	City of Medford
Jon Sullivan, Vice Chairman	RVTD
Kelly Madding	Jackson County
John Adam	Medford
Paige Townsend	RVTD
Tom Humphrey	City of Central Point
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Matt Samitore	City of Central
Mike Upston	

### **Others**

Mike Montero

### **RVCOG Staff**

Dan Moore (by phone), Ryan MacLaren

### **1. Call to Order / Introductions**

The Vice Chairman called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. Those present introduced themselves.

### **2. Review/Approve Minutes**

**On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Mike Upston, the minutes of the previous meeting were approved as corrected by unanimous voice vote.**

### **3. Public Comment**

No public comment was forthcoming.

### **Action Items:**

### **4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Transportation Program (TIP) Amendments**

The TAC was asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed RTP/TIP amendments. The Policy Committee will hold a public hearing at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 23, 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 August 2<sup>nd</sup> in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.

**A. Amendment to RTP & TIP: RVTD Mass Transit Program 15-17 (KN19915)**

Description: Category A Vehicle Replacement. Total = \$475,000 State Funding. No MPO funding.

**On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by John Vial, the amendment to the RTP & TIP: RVTD Mass Transit Program 15-17 (KN19915) was unanimously recommended for Policy Committee for approval.**

**B. Add New Project to RTP & TIP: Region-Wide Rumble Strips (KN 18880)**

Description: Install edge line rumble strips, center line rumble strips, and center line recessed pavement markers to a number of highway segments within the Region (tables were included for exact mile markers). Only a small segment of center line recessed pavement markers fall within the RVMPO boundary (an included map depicted general location). Total = \$5,102,000. State funding, with ODOT match. 2015-17 implementation.

The costs for the project were questioned by the Committee members. It was explained that the numbers are for the region wide project, not just within the 30 miles of MPO boundaries. John Vial explained that this was purely procedural matter. The Committee asked to be assured that the Policy Committee understood the MPO's portion of the total project, and what the regions would be getting in return.

**On a motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the amendment to RTP & TIP: Region-Wide Rumble Strips (KN 18880), with the provision that Staff clearly explains the MPO's specific per mile costs, as well as the Policy Committee's role in the decision.**

Alex Georgevitch and Mike Upston commented that the TAC needed to have the specific technical information related to implementation within the MPO boundaries in order to proceed. Alex Georgevitch added that this was more of a procedural routine (rather than technical), and had been done before by the TAC.

**On a revised motion by Mike Upston, seconded by Tom Humphrey, the amendment to the RTP & TIP: Region-Wide Rumble Strips (KN 18880) was recommended for Policy Committee approval. The motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.**

**5. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2017-2042 Financial Forecasts**

Dan Moore (by phone) explained that the TAC reviewed the draft financial forecasts for the 2017–2042 RTP included in the memo dated July 6, 2016 during their July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. Based on the discussion, revisions were made to several of the tables and text included the July 6<sup>th</sup> draft memo. Some of the revisions were in track changes and some were highlighted in yellow.

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

The TAC was asked to review and recommend approval of Tables 1 through 9 and to be discuss the proposed financial summary included in Table 3, the revenue and expenditure assumptions described in Table 5, and RVTD's financial information in Tables 6 - 9.

Street system revenues identified in the financial forecast included:

<b>Revenue Sources</b>	<b>Type</b>
Federal	STBG
CMAQ	
State (ODOT)	Highway Fund (Gas Tax)
Enhance & Fix-It	
Maintenance, Operations, Safety & Preservation	
Local Jurisdictions	Street Utility Fees (SUF) System Development Charges (SDC) Other (Urban Renewal, developer fees, etc)

Mr. Moore explained the figures and changes in each of the Tables

- Table 1 – Highway Funds – State portion, including more than just gas tax (Registrations fees, etc.)
- Table 2 – Highway Funds Distribution – estimated State revenues (predominantly gas taxes) for each jurisdiction.  
Note: The table uses the estimated population within the RVMPO to estimate what Jackson County would receive for that portion of the MPO. This is the only place this figure appears in the tables. The point was made that it was difficult to understand a more than doubling of the population in such a short period of time.
- Table 3 – RVMPO Revenue Summary 2013-38 – based on additional forecast review/updates by the various jurisdictions. Assumptions are listed at the bottom of the Table. Mr. Moore explained that Jackson County provides a revenue estimate on what they would spend (in the RVMPO area) for short, medium and long range projects.
- Table 4 – Discretionary Funds - CMAQ remain the same. STBG funds: When the RVMPO is becomes a TMA (2030 estimate), STBG funds will essentially double. “Enhance It” funds were projected at 50% at the previous figures.
- Table 5 – Revenue & Expenditure Assumptions (based on ODOT estimates) – updated to reflect current funding.
- Table 6 – RVTD Revenue Assumptions – revenue assumptions went up based on STBG funding increases.
- Table 7 – RVTD Expenditure Assumptions
- Table 8 - RVTD Revenue & Expenditure Summaries - Shortfalls in Medium and Long Range categories were clarified.
- Table 9 – RVTD Revenue & Expenditure Assumptions

**On a motion by John Adam, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the TAC unanimously recommended Policy Committee approval of the Financial Forecasts, by voice vote.**

## **6. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2017-2042 Project Lists**

Dan Moore explained that the TAC reviewed the draft short, medium and long range projects to be included in the 2017–2042 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) at their July 13<sup>th</sup> meeting. After review, it was determined that the projects proposed by the MPO jurisdictions exceeded the financial capacity of the MPO. The TAC recommended that jurisdictions revise their project lists and financial forecasts (if necessary) to help the project list meet financial constraint. The revised draft project lists are attached to this memo. Also attached was a draft Tier 2 project list. The RTP, like

the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), includes projects that meet federal guidelines, specifically: regionally significant (generally adding travel lanes) and federally funded. Any project that adds system capacity (other than local street expansion) must be included for air quality conformity. The project list in the RTP must also be financially-constrained; meaning that funding to build the projects is reasonably expected to be available at the time of construction. The RVMPO typically uses discretionary Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, in addition to local funds, to supplement short, medium and long range RTP projects in order to demonstrate financial constraint. Estimated ODOT Enhance funds for the RVMPO area are also used in the discretionary funding formula. The TAC recommended that the MPO only plan on receiving one half of the Enhance funds for future MPO projects. This seems realistic in that not all of the Enhance funds for Region 3 will go to MPO projects. Table 1 reflects the changes in the Enhance funds. Federal planning requirements limit RTP projects to those which full funding has been identified. The anticipated funding must be reasonable and based on the RTP's approved financial forecast. After revisions were made to the MPO member project lists and financial forecasts, there is adequate MPO discretionary funding (STBG, CMAQ & Enhance) to supplement the funds needed for the short, medium and long range projects (through 2042). Table 1 depicts the breakdown of discretionary funding.

**Table 1 – Discretionary Funding Needs (\$ x 1,000)**

<u>Discretionary Funding Needs</u>	<u>Discretionary S</u>				<u>Total</u>	<u>Balance</u>
	<u>CMAQ</u>	<u>STBG</u>	<u>Enhance</u>			
Short Range Street System Need	\$2502	\$3,995	\$3,054	\$2,430	\$9,479	\$6,977
Medium Range Street System Need	\$28330	\$13,350	\$11,491	\$7,290	\$32,131	\$3,801
<u>Long Range Street System Need</u>	<u>\$32,213</u>	<u>\$21,485</u>	<u>\$31,397</u>	<u>\$9,720</u>	<u>\$62,603</u>	<u>\$30.390</u>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$63,045</b>	<b>\$38,830</b>	<b>\$45,942</b>	<b>\$19,440</b>	<b>\$104,212</b>	<b>\$41,168</b>

RTP timeframes in Table 1 under the “Potential Funding” column. The second column under “Discretionary Funding Needs,” shows the amount of funding needed to fully-fund proposed RTP projects for the short, medium and long range timeframes. The last column shows the balances for each timeframe after applying the potential funding for each timeframe. There are balances of \$7 million in the short range, \$3.8 million in the medium and \$30 million in the long range timeframes.

After the jurisdictions revised their project lists and financial forecasts, all the draft project lists are now financially-constrained. In other words, the MPO can reasonably expect to receive the funding needed to construct the projects in the 2017-42 RTP. There is one project on the Tier 2 list. The Tier 2 lists projects that are needed, but not funded (or need some legislative action such as a comprehensive plan amendment). Once funding is identified, the RVMPO may list them in the RTP projects list. Tier 2 projects cannot be relied upon for metropolitan planning purposes. They are not considered to be planned projects in the RTP. However, they can be analyzed and listing these projects in Tier 2 serves to identify unmet needs.

Mr. Moore went over the figures for various jurisdictions, identifying where discretionary funds would need to be requested. Already approved federal funds are included in the totals. Projects not having adequate local funding will not be in the TIP unless the Policy Committee approves awarding

CMAQ and STP funds to Phoenix and Jackson County. John Adam suggested red highlighting for the Discretionary Funds column.

Foothill Blvd. improvements need to be added to the list because it will not be completed by 2018. Alex Georgevitch and Andrea Napoli will check on this issue.

Discretionary Funds for Short/Medium Range Projects were not assigned to any particular jurisdiction so the column will be renamed to MPO Funds Needed. Balance will remain the same for carryover to Medium/Long Range. Alex Georgevitch asked that it be footnoted that Medford has current, unreflected needs because their TSP has not been adopted.

**On a motion by Paige Townsend, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the TAC unanimously recommended Policy Committee approval of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) 2017-2042 Project Lists, by voice vote.**

Staff assured the Committee that all the projects will be mapped for the Air Quality Conformity process.

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

- Carl Rosenbach will be assuming the Program Manager position when his family finds housing in the Medford area. NO start date has been determined, but is expected to be in the next several months.
- The TPAU Model is 90% complete.
- The Air Quality Conformity Determination for the RTP update and new TIP will follow the Model completion.
- Staff will provide an emailed TIP project list for review/updates of phasing and costs( through 2021) by MPO jurisdictions. New projects included will have to be financially constrained without the use of MPO discretionary funds.
- The Strategic Assessment will have a “scenario” section on the website. The TAC will be asked for their in September.
- OTC will meet in K. Falls to discuss CMAQ funding changes. The MPO will be represented by Mike Quilty, and he will present
- There will be a new process whereby ODOT is requiring MPO approval (via letter) for fund exchange projects. Affected jurisdictions will have to enter into an agreement with the RVCOG for invoicing/reporting to ODOT through RVCOG finance channels. The jurisdictions will then be paid by the RVCOG. This was viewed by the Committee as a very convoluted an onerous issue, and more questions will be forthcoming from Kelli Sparkman, ODOT, to “higher ups” for clarification.

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

None received.

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

- Kelli Sparkman explained that the Nevada Street Bridge (Ashland) project was not eligible for fund exchange. This has been explained to the project opposition. The project has been in Ashland’s TSP for approximately fifteen years.
- RVTD Route #10 is being increased to 20 minute intervals, ending at 5:00 pm. The RCC schedule will start on Sept. 26<sup>th</sup>. The last run will be returning to downtown Medford at 6:30 pm.



**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

**Scheduled Meetings:**

- RVMPO TAC Wed., Sept. 14, 2016 1:30 PM
- RVMPO Policy Tues., Sept. 27, 2016 2:00 PM
- RVMPO PAC Tues., Sept. 20, 2016 5:30 PM

DRAFT



**Rogue Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Regional Transportation Planning**

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

DATE: September 7, 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, September 27, 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 September 7<sup>th</sup> 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: RVTD-5339 Bus & Facilities Program-Small Urban (15-17) KN 19954**

Description: Bus replacement for small urban public transit service.

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	
<b>Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)</b>														
RVTD-5339 Bus & Facilities Program-Small Urban (15-17)		1082	Exempt (Table 2)	19954	FFY2016	Other	\$ 852,435	F160	\$ 97,565	State	\$ 950,000			\$ 950,000

**B. Add New Project to RTP & TIP: RVTD-5310 FTA Enhanced Mobility Program (2016)**

Description: Mobility management purchase service.

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	
<b>Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD)</b>														
RVTD-5310 FTA Enhanced Mobility Program (2016)		1083	Exempt (Table 2)	19580	FFY2016	Other	\$ 401,786	F160	\$ 50,223	State	\$ 452,009	\$50,223	RVTD	\$ 502,232



**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

September 7, 2016

**To:** RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager  
**Subject:** FY 2016 – 2017 UPWP Amendments

The purpose of this memo is to provide the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) with information on proposed budget amendments to the 2016-2017 Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization (RVMPO), Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) budget. The UPWP budget needs to be amended to reflect changes in the amounts of FHWA and FTA 5303 planning funds allocated to the MPO.

FHWA planning funds for the RVMPO need to be reduced \$43,537 from \$465,431 to \$421,894. FTA 5303 planning funds need to be reduced \$850 from \$84,588 to \$83,738. Combined, FTA 5303 and FHWA fund reductions for the RVMPO total \$44,387. The reason for the reductions in funding is that ODOT revised the funding estimates without notifying the RVMPO until after the UPWP was adopted and the IGA sent for signature. The RVMPO was inadvertently left off of a February 2016 email notification from ODOT that went out to the Oregon MPOs with the changes to MPO funding allocations.

A total of \$44,387 needs to be deducted from some of the current UPWP work tasks to balance the budget. Below is a list of proposed deductions. In order to accommodate the reductions, some staff hours were reallocated to other projects (i.e., RVTD Transit Plan, Rogue River TSP and Gold Hill LSNP). Most UPWP tasks have contingency funds built into the budget that can be used, if necessary, on the task budgets below that are being reduced. There is approximately \$27,000 in contingency funds available. The original and revised budget sheets are attached to this memo. The proposed deductions will not affect the MPO's ability to complete the work tasks identified for reductions. If the MPO had the correct funding amounts to begin with, the work task budgets below would have been proposed for the FY2017 UPWP.

**Proposed UPWP Amendments**

1. Under Task 2.0 Short Range Planning, Subtask 2.1 TIP Activities; deduct \$8,537 in FHWA planning funds.

**Subtask 2.1 Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP); Annual Projects Listing**

**Work Task Budget: ~~\$92,787~~ \$82,250**  
**FHWA MPO Planning Funds ~~\$82,371~~ \$73,834**  
**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds, \$8,000**  
**RVMPO Dues, \$1,500**  
**In-Kind Match, \$916**

2. Under Task 2.0 Short Range Planning, Subtask 2.2 Air Quality Conformity; deduct \$6,000 in FHWA Planning funds.

**Subtask 2.2** *Air Quality Conformity/SIP Implementation*

**Work Task Budget:** ~~\$29,687~~ \$23,687  
**FHWA MPO Planning Funds,** ~~\$23,000~~ \$17,000  
**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds,** \$6,000  
**RVMPO Dues,** \$0  
**In-Kind Match,** \$687

3. Under Task 2.0 Short Range Planning, Subtask 2.3 Local Jurisdiction Technical Assistance; deduct \$2,000 in FHWA planning funds.

**Subtask 2.3** *Local Jurisdiction Technical Assistance (state Transportation System Plan/Other)*

**Work Task Budget:** ~~\$5,229~~ \$3,229  
**- FHWA MPO Planning Funds,** ~~\$3,000~~ \$1,000  
**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds,** \$2,000  
**In-Kind Match,** \$229

4. Under Task 3.0 Long Range Planning, Subtask 3.2 RTP Implementation/Safety, Regional Problem Solving integration; deduct \$2,000 in FHWA planning funds.

**Subtask 3.2** *2013 – 2038 RTP Implementation/Safety, Regional Problem Solving Integration*

**Work Task Budget:** ~~\$14,416~~ \$12,416  
**FHWA MPO Planning Funds,** ~~\$4,000~~ \$2,000  
**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds,** \$8,000  
**MPO Dues,** \$1,500  
**In-Kind Match,** \$916

5. Under Task 3.0 Long Range Planning, Subtask 3.3 RTP Update; deduct \$20,000 in FHWA planning funds and \$850 in FTA 5303 planning funds.

**Subtask 3.3** *2017-2042 RTP Development and Adoption*

**Work Task Budget:** ~~\$142,251~~ \$121,304  
**FHWA MPO Planning Funds,** ~~\$82,060~~ \$62,060  
**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds,** ~~\$16,267~~ \$15,417  
**RVMPO Dues,** \$1,494  
**In-Kind Match,** ~~\$1,862~~ \$1,765  
**Region 3 Planning Funds,** \$40,568

6. Under Task 4.0 Data Development, Subtask 4.1 Research & Analysis Program; deduct \$5,000 in FHWA planning funds.

**Subtask 4.1 *Research and Analysis Program; Travel Demand Model Support & Development***

**Work Task Budget: ~~\$35,167~~ \$30,167**

**FHWA MPO Planning Funds, ~~\$25,000~~ \$20,000**

**FTA 5303 Metropolitan Planning Funds, \$5,333**

**RVMPO Dues, \$4,224**

**In-Kind Match, \$610**

Table 1 – Revised FY17 UPWP Budget

RVMPO FY 2017 UPWP BUDGET						
Transportation Planning Funds by Source and Activity						
	FHWA MPO Planning Funds (1)	FTA 5303 (2)	In-Kind Match (2)	MPO Dues (3)	Region 3 Planning Funds (4)	Total Budget (5)
<b>Work Tasks</b>						
<b>1. Program Management</b>						
1.1 Office & Personnel Mgmt: Fiscal & Grant Admin.	\$120,000	\$10,988	\$1,257.6	\$12,500	\$0	\$144,746
1.2 UPWP Development & UPWP Progress	\$12,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$250	\$0	\$13,364
1.3 Public Education and Involvement Program	\$19,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$250	\$0	\$20,364
1.4 Interagency & Jurisdictional Coordination	\$18,000	\$3,000	\$343.4	\$750	\$0	\$22,093
1.5 Grant Writing	\$3,000	\$0	\$0.0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000
Totals	\$172,000	\$15,988	\$1,830	\$13,750	\$0	\$203,568
<b>2. Short Range Planning</b>						
2.1 TIP Activities	\$73,834	\$8,000	\$915.6	\$1,500	\$0	\$84,250
2.2 Air Quality Conformity	\$17,000	\$6,000	\$686.7	\$0	\$0	\$23,687
2.3 Local Jurisdiction Technical Assistance	\$1,000	\$2,000	\$228.9	\$0	\$0	\$3,229
2.4 STP & CMAQ Project Funds Management	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$572.3	\$750	\$0	\$16,322
Totals	\$101,834	\$21,000	\$2,404	\$2,250	\$0	\$127,488
<b>3. Long Range Planning</b>						
3.1 ITS Operations & Implementation Plan Coordination	\$10,000	\$7,000	\$801.2	\$250	\$0	\$18,051
3.2 RTP Implementation/Safety, Regional Problem Solving Integration	\$2,000	\$8,000	\$915.6	\$1,500	\$0	\$12,416
3.3 2017 - 2042 RTP Update	\$62,060	\$15,417	\$1,764.5	\$1,494	\$40,568	\$121,304
Totals	\$74,060	\$30,417	\$3,481	\$3,244	\$40,568	\$151,770
<b>4. Data Development</b>						
4.1 Research & Analysis Program	\$20,000	\$5,333	\$610.4	\$4,224	\$0	\$30,167
4.2 Data collection/analysis for Title 6 & EJ	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$4,347	\$0	\$8,461
Totals	\$23,000	\$6,333	\$725	\$8,571	\$0	\$38,629
<b>5. Transit</b>						
5.1 Transit Master Plan	\$51,000	\$10,000	\$1,144.5	\$0	\$0	\$62,145
Totals	\$51,000	\$10,000	\$1,145	\$0	\$0	\$62,145
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$421,894</b>	<b>\$83,738</b>	<b>\$9,584</b>	<b>\$27,815</b>	<b>\$40,568</b>	<b>\$583,599</b>

(1) FHWA MPO Planning funds are allocated to the RVMPO by formula and consist of 89.73% federal funds and 10.27% state match. Federal Share: \$263,378; Oregon Match: \$30,145, and FY 2015 Carryover PL: \$115,187 and match: \$13,184 for a Total of \$421,894 for FY 2017.

(2) FTA Section 5303 funds are provided for metropolitan planning activities. Total 2017 allocation consists of 89.73% federal (\$83,738) and a required 10.27% local share (\$9,584) provided by RVMPO member in-kind contributions (meetings & technical document reviews).

(3) MPO annual dues are paid by MPO member jurisdictions: Ashland, Talent, Jacksonville, Eagle Point, Medford, Central Point, Phoenix, Jackson County.

4) ODOT Region 3 Planning funds to complete Alternative Measures update and 2015 benchmark analysis.

5) RVCOG acting on behalf of the the RVMPO will apply for and otherwise obtain these funds. RVCOG will carry out the tasks described in this UPWP.

**Note: The revenues contained in the UPWP represent the best estimates of expected funding and planning priorities at this time. These priorities and funding levels may change over time. Actual ODOT funding commitments are finalized through specific IGAs. The identified dollar amounts may include subcontracted activities.**

Table 2 – Adopted FY17 UPWP Budget

RVMPO FY 2017 UPWP BUDGET						
Transportation Planning Funds by Source and Activity						
	FHWA MPO Planning Funds (1)	FTA 5303 (2)	In-Kind Match (2)	MPO Dues (3)	Region 3 Planning Funds (4)	Total Budget (5)
<b>Work Tasks</b>						
<b>1. Program Management</b>						
1.1 Office & Personnel Mgmt: Fiscal & Grant Admin.	\$120,000	\$10,988	\$1,257.6	\$12,500	\$0	\$144,746
1.2 UPWP Development & UPWP Progress	\$12,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$250	\$0	\$13,364
1.3 Public Education and Involvement Program	\$19,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$250	\$0	\$20,364
1.4 Interagency & Jurisdictional Coordination	\$18,000	\$3,000	\$343.4	\$750	\$0	\$22,093
1.5 Grant Writing	\$3,000	\$0	\$0.0	\$0	\$0	\$3,000
Totals	\$172,000	\$15,988	\$1,830	\$13,750	\$0	\$203,568
<b>2. Short Range Planning</b>						
2.1 TIP Activities	\$82,371	\$8,000	\$915.6	\$1,500	\$0	\$92,787
2.2 Air Quality Conformity	\$23,000	\$6,000	\$686.7	\$0	\$0	\$29,687
2.3 Local Jurisdiction Technical Assistance	\$3,000	\$2,000	\$228.9	\$0	\$0	\$5,229
2.4 STP & CMAQ Project Funds Management	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$572.3	\$750	\$0	\$16,322
Totals	\$118,371	\$21,000	\$2,404	\$2,250	\$0	\$144,025
<b>3. Long Range Planning</b>						
3.1 ITS Operations & Implementation Plan Coordination	\$10,000	\$7,000	\$801.2	\$250	\$0	\$18,051
3.2 RTP Implementation/Safety, Regional Problem Solving Integration	\$4,000	\$8,000	\$915.6	\$1,500	\$0	\$14,416
3.3 2017 - 2042 RTP Update	\$82,060	\$16,267	\$1,861.8	\$1,494	\$40,568	\$142,251
Totals	\$96,060	\$31,267	\$3,579	\$3,244	\$40,568	\$174,718
<b>4. Data Development</b>						
4.1 Research & Analysis Program	\$25,000	\$5,333	\$610.4	\$4,224	\$0	\$35,167
4.2 Data collection/analysis for Title 6 & EJ	\$3,000	\$1,000	\$114.5	\$4,347	\$0	\$8,461
Totals	\$28,000	\$6,333	\$725	\$8,571	\$0	\$43,629
<b>5. Transit</b>						
5.1 Transit Master Plan	\$51,000	\$10,000	\$1,144.5	\$0	\$0	\$62,145
Totals	\$51,000	\$10,000	\$1,145	\$0	\$0	\$62,145
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$465,431</b>	<b>\$84,588</b>	<b>\$9,681</b>	<b>\$27,815</b>	<b>\$40,568</b>	<b>\$628,083</b>

(1) FHWA MPO Planning funds are allocated to the RVMPO by formula and consist of 89.73% federal funds and 10.27% state match. Federal Share: \$263,378; Oregon Match: \$30,145, and FY 2015 Carryover PL: \$115,187 and match: \$13,184 for a Total of \$421,894 for FY 2017.

(2) FTA Section 5303 funds are provided for metropolitan planning activities. Total 2017 allocation consists of 89.73% federal (\$83,738) and a required 10.27% local share (\$9,584) provided by RVMPO member in-kind contributions (meetings & technical document reviews).

(3) MPO annual dues are paid by MPO member jurisdictions: Ashland, Talent, Jacksonville, Eagle Point, Medford, Central Point, Phoenix, Jackson County.

4) ODOT Region 3 Planning funds to complete Alternative Measures update and 2015 benchmark analysis.

5) RVCOG acting on behalf of the the RVMPO will apply for and otherwise obtain these funds. RVCOG will carry out the tasks described in this UPWP.

**Note: The revenues contained in the UPWP represent the best estimates of expected funding and planning priorities at this time. These priorities and funding levels may change over time. Actual ODOT funding commitments are finalized through specific IGAs. The identified dollar amounts may include subcontracted activities.**





**DATE:** August 4, 2016

**TO:** Oregon Transportation Commission

*[Original signature on file]*

**FROM:** Matthew L. Garrett  
Director

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

**Requested Action:**

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

**Background:**

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

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

Oregon Transportation Commission  
August 4, 2016  
Page 2

**New Considerations:**

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

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

**Next Steps:**

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

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

**Attachments:**

- Attachment 1 – CMAQ letters from local governments

**Copies (w/attachments) to:**

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



**Rogue Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

---

**Regional Transportation Planning**

---

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

---

**DATE:** September 7, 2016  
**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager  
**SUBJECT:** Fund Exchange Process

---

At the last TAC meeting, staff discussed potential changes to ODOT's fund exchange process. The TAC was concerned and confused with what was being proposed. Kelli Sparkman, ODOT agreed to discuss these issues with staff within ODOT around how the STP fund exchange process should work when STP funds are allocated through MPOs to local jurisdictions. Based on Kelli's discussions with ODOT staff, all have agreed that the following process should be used:

1. STBG funds are allocated to local jurisdictions through the MPO selection process. If only STBG funds are allocated and it is expected that they will be fund exchanged, these projects DO NOT get added to the STIP. These projects are captured by the MPO staff internally and shown on the MTIP under a single line item.
2. When the local jurisdiction is ready to move forward with their project, they ensure a project prospectus is completed and sent to the MPO.
3. The MPO forwards along the project prospectus and issues a letter to ODOT (Jeanette Denn, ODOT Region 3 at this time) indicating their approval of the funds and requesting the fund exchange through their allotment for the project and amount on behalf of the jurisdiction.
4. ODOT moves forward with creating an agreement between the local jurisdiction and ODOT for the project using the fund exchange template.
5. The local jurisdiction completes the project and submits invoices to ODOT for reimbursement.



**Rogue Valley  
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Regional Transportation Planning**

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

**DATE:** September 8, 2016  
**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Planning Program Manager  
**SUBJECT:** 2017-42 RTP Place Type Maps

ODOT and DLCD have created a land use classification system to better understand the transportation impacts of land use patterns and enable local jurisdictions to make more informed policy decisions. The following links provide Place Type maps of the base (2017) and horizon year (2042) land use assumptions (by TAZ) to be used in the RVMPO RTP, including the travel modeling efforts which will estimate the impact of RTP transportation and land use policies.

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/ORPlaceTypes.aspx?ptv=RVMPO-2017>  
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/ORPlaceTypes.aspx?ptv=RVMPO-2042>

Place Types, originally introduced to RVMPO during the Strategic Assessment process, are used to quantify neighborhood characteristics by the role that they play in the region, proximity to destinations, and availability of various travel options. These neighborhood characteristics influence the transportation choices individuals make, which ultimately affect the overall amount of vehicle travel in the region.

Through comparing the existing built environment characteristics with the expected future environment with the aid of visualization tools, decision makers are able to better understand how changes to infrastructure and land use might influence demographics, individual choices, and travel behavior. The following links provide more information on Place Types.

Place type website: [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/Pages/scenario\\_planning.aspx#s3](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/OSTI/Pages/scenario_planning.aspx#s3)  
 \*and/or\* Place Type flyer: [http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ORPlaceTypes/PlaceType\\_Flyer.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/ORPlaceTypes/PlaceType_Flyer.pdf)