
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Technical Advisory Committee



Date: *Wednesday, August 9, 2017*

Time: *1:30 p.m.*

Location: *Jefferson Conference Room
RVCOG, 155 N. 1st Street, Central Point
Transit: served by RVTD Route #40*

Contact: *Stephanie Thune, RVCOG: 541-423-1368
RVMPO website: www.rvmopo.org*

1	Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda	Mike Kuntz, Chair
2	Review / Approve Minutes	Chair
<i>Attachment</i>	#1 RVMPO TAC Draft Minutes 170712	
3	Public Comment Items not on the agenda <i>Comments on agenda items allowed during discussion of each item</i>	Chair
Action Items		
4	2017-2042 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment	Ryan MacLaren
<i>Background</i>	The TAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the proposed RTP/TIP amendment. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing was advertised on July 31st in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#2 Memo: RTP/TIP Amendment	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation to Policy Committee.	

5	Review “RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Transportation Funds” (last updated Jan. 24, 2012)	TAC Members
<i>Background</i>	At the June 14 RVMPO TAC meeting, it was decided that this policy should be reviewed with the aim of clarifying language related to items 3(ii) and 3(iii). The item was subsequently tabled from the July 12 to the August 9 RVMPO TAC meeting.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#3 RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Transportation Funds	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommended changes to the RVMPO Policy Committee for approval.	
Discussion Items		
6	STIP Presentation to Stakeholder Groups 2021-2024 STIP Development Process	Ian Horlacher
<i>Background</i>	An overview of the development process and timeline of the 2021-2024 STIP.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#4 2021-2024 STIP Presentation	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Information only.	
7	Public Comment	Chair
Regular Updates		
8	Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects	TAC Members
9	MPO Planning Update	Karl Welzenbach
10	Other Business / Local Business Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.	Chair
11	Adjournment	Chair

- The next RVMPO TAC meeting will be **Wednesday, September 13, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, August 22, at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.

- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, September 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 RVCOG, 541-664-6674. 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 MPO Technical Advisory Committee
July 12, 2017**



The following attended:

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Alex Georgevitch	Medford	774-2114
Charles Bennett for Ted Zuk	Jackson County	774-6907
Dan Roberts	ODOT	774-6383
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	423-1362
Josh LeBombard	DLCD	414-7932
Kyle Kearns	Medford	774-2380
Matt Samitore	Central Point	664-3321 x205
Mike Kuntz, Chair	Jackson County	774-6228
Mike Upston	Eagle Point	826-4212
Paige Townsend	RVTD	608-2429
Ray DiPasquale	Phoenix	535-2226
Tom Humphrey	Central Point	423-1025
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1361
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	423-1369
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Nikki Hart-Brinkley	RVCOG	423-1378
Stephanie Thune	RVCOG	423-1368

Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
Chris Bucher (via phone)	FHWA	503-316-2555
Jenna Marmon	ODOT	774-5925
Mike Montero	Montero & Associates	779-0771

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda

Chair Mike Kuntz called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. and introductions were made. A quorum was confirmed, with voting members or alternates from Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, and RVTD in attendance.

No changes to the agenda were required.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

The Chair asked if there were any changes or additions to the minutes of the June 14 meeting.

Item 5C: No change required (full excerpt below).

Tom Humphrey expressed his concern that, as the most regionally significant project presented during last month's presentation by Mike Faught, this summary was too brief and inquired as to others' sentiment. Consensus determined the description to suffice as written.

C. Project R25 | Construct Roadway and Bridge Improvements to Extend Washington Street to Tollman Creek Road

This project is the most regionally significant. It is identified in the IAMP as a singular access point and there is a projected need for a median on Oregon Route 66; a secondary local network would be created. Additionally, according to Faught's description, "This project already has a Council-approved agreement in place with the property owner. In addition, the City has already purchased the right-of-way and is developing construction plans and specifications along with obtaining all environmental permits for construction." Faught did note that the project would require – in addition to the re-allocated \$1.5 million from the East Nevada Street Bridge project – \$1.6 million dollars to complete.

Item 9, 1st bullet point: No change required (full excerpt below).

Alex Georgevitch requested clarification that the words "the removal" did, in fact, only refer to the series item behind which they were placed and that none of the other listed projects were being removed.

- Air quality modeling will be taking place for 1) the removal of the Phoenix RPS street network project, 2) the South Stage Road Overpass/Extension, 3) Foothill Road at Cedar Links/Delta Waters and 4) South Foothill Road. Results of the analyses will be shared with the TAC before modifications are made to the RTP.

On a motion by Tom Humphrey, seconded by Alex Georgevitch, the Committee recommended approval of the June 14 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as clarified.

There was no further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote, with Paige Townsend abstaining.

3. Public Comment

None voiced.

Presentation

4. Region 3 Active Transportation Liaison

Jenna Marmon delivered a PowerPoint presentation related to ODOT's Active Transportation Plan, and clarified her role as the plan's liaison, which includes planning and policy work, projects, maintenance, outreach/liasing, and serving as an internal and external resource.

Key points of the presentation included:

- Active Transportation (AT) = any self-propelled, human-powered mode of transportation. It also includes transit at backup for walking/biking, etc.
- AT shines necessary light on the questions of: 1) What is our vision for our elders, and 2) What is our vision for our kids?
- Benefits of AT include: increases in access to services and independence for those without driver's licenses; cost savings; increased health and well-being; and improved mental health.
- ODOT's AT goals include creating and/or enhancing: health; safety; efficiency; economic opportunity; livable communities; and the "roaming range" of people. In pursuit of these goals, ODOT is shifting gears from thinking "Highway" to thinking "Transportation" and is focusing on system solutions for moving people and moving freight.
- Aspects of HB 2017 that will benefit AT/transit if signed into law were also highlighted. Of particular note is the funding (\$10 million annually, effective 2018, rising to \$15 million annually in 2023 with no sunset) for Safe Routes to School infrastructure, with preference given to those routes falling within a one-mile radius of the school. The funds will apply to K-8 (40% match) and Title 1 (20% match) schools. Marmon is able to assist with resources and applications.
 - Mike Upston inquired as to the reasoning behind the sizeable match required for the Safe Routes to School funds; Marmon replied that it seems to simply be a statewide trend, referencing the hike in match requirements for ConnectOregon that occurred a couple of years ago.
 - Paige Townsend contributed that the Transportation Options Group of Oregon has submitted a letter to the HB 2017 Joint Committee. The letter recommends allowing the flexibility for a jurisdiction that is providing funding to support a local Safe Routes to School program to count that investment as part of their match. Rulemaking related to HB 2017 will determine whether this will ultimately be allowed or not. Marmon noted that the half-time Safe Routes to School Coordinator just hired by Jackson County could possibly provide leverage as rulemaking ensues.

In conclusion, Marmon listed several valuable AT resources, including a booklet entitled "Small Town and Rural Multimodal Networks," referred to as STAR, which can be downloaded here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/bicycle_pedestrian/publications/small_towns/.

Action Items

5. 2017-2042 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments

Ryan MacLaren reported that the state is requesting the amendment of the RVMPO RTP and TIP to include the following three projects:

A. RVTD-5310 Enhanced Mobility Small Urban (2017-19)

Description: “*Contracted service and mobility management.*”

Federal Funding: 5310 with RVTD match.

B. RVTD-5310 E&D Transit Capital STP Transfer (17-19)

Description: “*Contracted service.*”

Federal Funding: 5310 with RVTD match.

C. ORE Salt Pilot PH 2: Bridge Deck Testing & Sealing (KN 21076)

Description: “*Salt testing on bridge decks; design of sealing and overlay projects, and construction of protective systems.*”

Funding: STP Flex State Funds with ODOT match.

Notice of a public hearing and comment period regarding the amendment was published in the Medford Mail Tribune on Monday, July 3, when it was also posted on the RVMPO website. The 21-day public comment period will conclude on July 25, on which day the RVMPO Policy Committee will conduct a public hearing and vote on the item.

Regarding projects **A** and **B** above, Paige Townsend explained that the funding is for the 17-19 biennium and is primarily used for the para-transit (Valley Lift) ADA service, which is available throughout the RVTD service district. Other funding uses include a travel training program for the elderly and disabled populations, and a project with United Way to jointly staff a Mobility Manager position (previously Connie Wilkerson). Townsend requested that TAC members contact DeeAnne Everson if they are aware of anyone interested in/qualified for the position.

Regarding project **C**, MacLaren clarified that two bridges are involved, one in each MPO. The bridge in the RVMPO is located on I-5, north of Exit 35 where the highway goes over the railroad.

Alex Georgevitch moved that the TAC recommend approval of all three 2017-2042 RVMPO RTP and 2015-2018 RVMPO TIP amendments to the Policy Committee. Ian Horlacher seconded.

There was no further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

6. Alternative Measures: Draft Tech Memo 3

Andrea Napoli reported that staff has developed the initial results of the Alternative Measures 2015 Benchmark Analysis, which are presented in Tech Memo 3, the last of the tech memos in the project series. *Tech Memo 1: Methodologies* was reviewed by the TAC in December 2016, and *Tech Memo 2: Data Collection* was reviewed by the TAC in May 2017.

Comments, revision suggestions and/or concurrence is desired from the TAC today regarding the results reported for each measure so that *Draft Tech Memo 3: Analysis/Results* can be finalized. Once that is done, staff will begin preparing the Alternative Measures final report, in which recommendations for changes to the measures themselves can be included (Napoli indicated she is maintaining a cumulative list of TAC recommendations on the Tech Memo findings to-date and will add today's concerns, if any, to the list).

Due to a number of challenges related to the Alternative Measures' data collection/analysis process, which range from internal (e.g. different staff conducting the analyses in different periods) to external (e.g. changes to definitions, benchmarks, boundaries, etc.), Napoli included "Notes" and/or "Issues Identified" for each measure in the agenda packet materials, and will incorporate any additional concerns/insights offered by TAC members.

Comments/inquiries related to each measure follow:

Measure 1 | Transit and Bike/Pedestrian Mode Share

- *Josh LeBombard*: Inquired whether ridership numbers presented in Table 1.0 on Page 2 of the Tech Memo (e.g. bus-walk, bus/park & ride, etc.) seemed to be "normal" from TAC members' perspectives. Paige Townsend responded that daily ridership is approximately 4,500 and that table shows 3,800, so the numbers are reasonable, but noted that the table does not include figures for "just bus" (i.e. instances where individuals biked to the bus and/or were dropped off by someone at the stop).

Measure 2 | Percent Dwelling Units Within ¼-Mile Walk to 30-Minute Transit Service

- *Alex Georgevitch*: In the phrase "This just slightly exceeds the 2015 benchmark..." under "Findings and Conclusions" on page 3 (and anywhere else the phrase might occur throughout the memo), strike "just slightly," simply indicating whether the benchmark was met, not to what degree.
- *Josh LeBombard*: Inquired whether the data could be broken out by community (either city limit or UGB) – not for inclusion in the memo, but simply for informational purposes for the jurisdictions. Nikki Hart-Brinkley said that was possible and she would work on providing that information.
- *Tom Humphrey*: Suggested that moving transit stops could contribute to higher concentrations of dwelling units within the "¼-mile walk" criterion. Paige Townsend replied that strategic placement is definitely under consideration as the 2040 transit plan is developed; place-type maps and the Alternative Measures data are being reviewed to inform decision-making.

Measure 3 | Percentage of Collectors/Arterials with Bike Facilities

- *Alex Georgevitch*: Inquired why the north-side multi-use path (which substitutes for a bike lane) along McAndrews from Foothill onward was not included, since McAndrews is an arterial. Napoli responded that was dependent upon how Medford identified the path; if it had been identified as a bike lane, it would have been included. Collaboration is necessary going forward between staff and jurisdictions and the AT liaison to better identify and classify criteria governing "bicycle facilities."

NOTE: The following post-meeting clarification of McAndrews path classification from Nikki Hart-Brinkley was emailed to the TAC on July 18:

The McAndrews Bike Path was not included in the Bike Facilities analysis (as a percentage of arterials/collectors with bike facilities) because it is classified as a multi-use path in the Bike Facility shapefile from Jackson County GIS. The path begins at Chablis Terrace/Tamarack Dr. and ends at Brookdale Ave. The path follows E. McAndrews Rd closely (within a few feet in most areas) and is clearly intended to provide bicycle facilities for McAndrews. If included, It would add approximately 11,000 linear feet of bike facilities to the analysis which would not be quite enough to bump up the

percentage of arterials and collectors with bicycle facilities. It would remain at 28%. Note that the total linear feet of multi-use paths within the RVMPO was included as information-only in Tech Memo #3, and this section of multi-use path was included in that number.

- *Mike Kuntz*: Recommended making adjustments to the identification of bike facilities now – within this data set – so that it can contribute to the measurement and also be incorporated into the ongoing trend line for future measures.
- *Jenna Marmon/Mike Kuntz*: The development of the regional Active Transportation Plan (ATP) should be defining what the various methodologies are within the Rogue Valley for identifying/classifying bike facilities criteria.

Discussion digressed into concerns over the incomparability of data between benchmark periods due to ever-changing criteria, definitions, boundaries, etc. The seemingly mutually exclusive desires to both “lock in” procedures and methodologies while remaining flexible enough to accommodate the constantly changing state of data (accessibility and usability), boundaries, and new plans/systems (e.g. the Regional Active Transportation Plan) being put into effect, were debated at some length. With a comment to always keep the ultimate goals in mind – increasing facilities in order to give people options and finding a meaningful way to identify/quantify those increases – the side conversation was tabled by Chair Kuntz to the August 9 RVMPO TAC agenda under an item heading of “The How and Why of Alternative Measures.” Dan Moore noted that all jurisdictions are required to include the Alternative Measures in their TSP’s to demonstrate their compliance, so it will definitely behoove the group to work towards achieving more meaningful outcomes from the data.

Measure 4 | Percentage of Collectors/Arterials in Activity Centers with Sidewalks

No commentary outside of presented findings.

Measure 5 | Percentage of New Dwelling Units (DUs) in Activity Centers

- Napoli reiterated (from her comments made regarding Tech Memo 2 in May) that, in light of Measures 5 and 6 dealing with land use (i.e. zoning), over which the MPO has no authority, it may be worth considering having the cities handle them in the future.

Measure 6 | Percentage of New Employment in Activity Centers (ACs)

No commentary outside of presented findings.

Measure 7 | Alternative Transportation Funding

No commentary outside of presented findings.

7. Review “RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Transportation Funds (last updated Jan. 24, 2012)

This item was tabled to the August 9, 2017 RVMPO TAC meeting.

Discussion Items

8. Public Comment

None voiced.

Regular Updates

9. Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects

- **RVTD (Paige Townsend):** In response to a notation in the June 14 minutes that John Vial had requested a presentation by RVTD at the August 9 RVMPO TAC meeting regarding plans for utilizing the transit funding being made available by HB 2017 (if signed), Townsend stated that not too much information will be available by that time. She went on to provide the following update:
 - The Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) met on July 10. Their staff – the Rail and Public Transit Division (RPTD) – will be administering the payroll tax revenues for transit called for by HB 2017. RPTD does not foresee any payroll tax revenue being made available to RVTD prior to Fall 2018. In January 2019, RPTD will be increasing their staffing to review the Transit Development Plans (required for eligibility to receive payroll tax revenues) that will be being submitted by approximately 40 transit operations statewide.
 - RVTD has some service enhancements planned over the next year, with more to come once the extra funds become available (forecast to be approximately 3.5 million in the first year, and then \$4 million for the 2020-2021 biennium). As of now, there is not much facilities expansion being planned. Ultimately, with the payroll tax revenues, RVTD’s transit system will be twice the size in miles as it is now.
 - Short-list projects that would enhance district-wide connectivity and be well-received by the public include: circulator in Central Point; circulator in Ashland; an express route from Medford → Phoenix → Talent → Ashland; consideration for Sunday service; North-West Medford; and across town in Medford.
 - Karl Welzenbach recommended focusing on reducing headways on existing routes prior to expanding service to new areas. Townsend replied that the cost to RVTD would be similar – additional buses would need to be added in either scenario. However, RVTD is – at this point – focusing on addressing necessity (adding coverage where none exists) over convenience (shortening wait times on existing routes).
 - RVTD needs drivers; please refer if you know of qualified/interested candidates.
- **Eagle Point (Mike Upston):**
 - Linn Road: Bids for engineering services will be coming in. This is approximately a \$2 million project with Linn Road serving as the gateway into Eagle Point from Highway 62.
 - E. Main/Stevens Road: This is a major arterial with high truck traffic in a Safe Routes to School area that is unsafe at this time; the project will be moving forward in 2017-2018.
- **Jackson County (Chair Kuntz):**
 - Active Transportation Plan (ATP): The IGA is being executed for the ATP and the project is close to starting. An RFP to hire a consultant will be drafted within the next couple of months.
 - Table Rock Road: The project is finalizing with a mid-November bid date. The project was funded prior to Costco choosing its site, but nonetheless, Costco is making some interim road improvements as they build; some of these improvements (e.g. turn lane widening) will be incorporated into the project. Tom Humphrey reported that Costco has written a check to Medford to help address traffic impacts in particular locations on Table Rock and on Biddle at the airport, contributed \$377,000 towards Central Point’s Exit 33 off-ramp improvements, and paid \$1.6 million to Central Point for their building permit (funds from which can be used for improvements city-wide).
 - Karl Welzenbach inquired whether the new hangar construction at MillionAire would impact traffic on Table Rock if the building project signifies an increase in workforce. Tom Humphrey explained that the purpose of the construction was not to expand the company

itself, but rather to increase its hangar square footage to facilitate the servicing/maintenance of larger aircraft.

10. MPO Planning Update

ODOT'S NEW TRANSPORTATION MODEL

- ODOT is in the final phases of calibrating its new transportation model for the entire MRMPO and RVMPO area. The model will be activity-based rather than trip-based, and is meant to be more accurate in capturing all traffic modes, including transit and bike/ped. It will incorporate Local Street Networks (LSNs) and look at transit/bike/ped access in a slightly different way. The plan should be adopted in 2019, with the model put into effect in 2020.

CMAQ

- The final CMAQ cut for the RVMPO appears to be 55%. The OTC should be addressing the severity of the cut this month; there has been talk of a possible bridge fund to ease the transition to such a steep fund reduction.
- ODOT is looking to restrict the list of CMAQ eligible projects, but these restrictions will likely have minimal impact on the RVMPO, except for the fact that they will now be preferring that on-road bike/ped facilities be located in Activity Centers or downtowns (this would reduce the viability of the Foothill Road project in their eyes).
- Given that DEQ has so greatly reduced their data collection to inform CMAQ formula decision-making over the past 15-20 years, Welzenbach is asking for CMAQ fund eligibility to purchase sensors for data collection.

11. Other Business / Local Business

- *Jackson County*: The Jackson County Expo area will be best avoided from July 27 – 30 due to a huge concert event following the county fair. Upton Road between Wilson and 10th Street in Central Point will be restricted to one-way for north/east bound travelers. Mailers will be sent out shortly to update the affected populace.

12. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:32 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPO Policy Committee | July 25, 2017 | 2:00 p.m.

RVMPO TAC | August 9, 2017 | 1:30 p.m.



Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Regional Transportation Planning

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

DATE: August 9, 2017
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, August 22, 2017 to consider the **removal** of the proposed TIP and RTP amendment(s). The 21-day public comment period and public hearing will be advertised on or before July 31st in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. Information on the new project is enumerated, below:

A. **Remove Project from RTP & TIP: Region-wide Rumble Strips (KN 18880)**

Description: Region-wide rumble strips.

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	
ODOT														
Region Wide Rumble Strips	Install rumble strips	919	Exempt - Table 2, Safety			Planning								
				18880	2015	Design	\$ 68,243	HSIP	\$ 5,757	ODOT	\$ 74,000		\$ 74,000	
				18880	2016	Land Purchase	\$ 215,000	HSIP			\$ 215,000		\$ 215,000	
				18880	2017	Utility Relocate	\$ 1,750,000	HSIP			\$ 1,750,000		\$ 1,750,000	
				18880	2017	Construction	\$ 3,063,153	HSIP			\$ 3,063,153		\$ 3,063,153	
						Other					\$ -		\$ -	
		Total FFY15-18			\$ 5,096,396		\$ 5,757		\$ 5,102,153		\$ 5,102,153		\$ 5,102,153	

Jan. 24, 2012

RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds
(Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)

This Policy addresses the allocation of STP and CMAQ funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for surface transportation improvements. Projects receive federal funding through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for grant recipients is made by Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration through the funding obligation process, which occurs subsequent to publication in the MTIP.

1. RVMPO Policy Committee makes all final planning and programming decisions regarding STP and CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project, and must be spent on that project.
3. Funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
 - a. RVMPO member jurisdictions
 - i. When RVMPO grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - ii. When a jurisdiction determines it will not implement a project, it may offer a substitute project(s). Substitute project(s) will be evaluated according to current RVMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee will consider the evaluation of the substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:
 1. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
 2. Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.
 - iii. When a project cannot be implemented for reasons beyond the recipient jurisdiction's control (generally but not limited to when Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration finds an awarded project in-eligible) recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final determination to submit a substitute project for consideration. Substitute project will be scored according to current RVMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee will consider evaluation of substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:

1. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
 2. Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.
- b. Recipients that are not RVMPO members
- i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
4. Priority for available funds will be given to funded projects that need additional funding for completion.




2021-2024

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program





Transparency



Accessibility



Openness





2021-2024 STIP Schedule¹⁷

Program Allocation	Project Selection	Public Review And Approval
Summer-Fall 2017	Winter 2017-Fall 2019	Fall 2019-Summer 2020
Commission allocates funding among programs	Review STIP considerations	Develop draft STIP
	Develop preliminary project lists (150% lists)	Commission releases for public comment



Timeframe for Program Allocation¹⁸

July

August

September

October

November

Timeline
and
funding
framework

Non-
highway
and local
programs

Highway
conditions
and
funding
scenarios

Discuss
funding
scenarios
with stake-
holders

Approve
funding
scenario





How ODOT will engage stakeholders

Engage at
meetings

Regular e-mail
updates and
online OTC
materials

Actively seek
input to OTC

