



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 2nd 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 13th meeting. Based on the discussion, revisions were made to several of the tables and text included the July 6th 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:

Revenue Sources	Type
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 13th 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>
	CMAQ	STBG	Enhance			
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>
Totals	\$63,045	\$38,830	\$45,942	\$19,440	\$104,212	\$41,168

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

- The new Program Manager will assume 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 the Policy Committee letter and offer verbal testimony on the CMAQ changes.
- 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. He Policy Committee’s letter, as well as offering verbal testimony.

8. Public Comment

None received.

9. Other Business / Local Business

- Kelli Sparkman explained that the Nevada Street Bridge (Ashland) project is 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. 26th. 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