



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

**January 11, 2017**

*The following people were in attendance:*

**RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee**

***Voting Members in Attendance:***

|                             |                       |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Mike Kuntz, Chairman        | Jackson County        |
| Jon Sullivan, Vice Chairman | RVTD                  |
| Kelly Madding               | Jackson County        |
| Kyle Kearns                 | Medford               |
| Paige Townsend              | RVTD                  |
| Matt Samitore               | City of Central Point |
| Robert Miller               | Eagle Point           |
| Mike Upston                 | Eagle Point           |
| Ian Horlacher               | ODOT                  |
| Mike Faught                 | Ashland               |
| Carl Johnson                | Ashland               |
| Ray DiPasquale              | Phoenix               |
| Alex Georgevitch            | Medford               |
| Josh LeBombard              | DLCD                  |
| Tom Humphrey                | City of Central Point |

**Others**

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| John Vial    | Jackson County   |
| Mike Montero | Montero & Assoc. |

**RVCOG Staff**

Karl Welzenbach, Dan Moore, Andrea Napoli, Nicki Hart-Brinkley, Ryan MacLaren

**1. Call to Order / Introductions**

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

**2. Review/Approve Minutes**

The following edits were made to the previous meeting's minutes:

- The Phoenix 2036 population is expected to increase by 2,000.

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

**3. Public Comment - None.**

***Discussion Items:***

**4. Statewide Freight Plan**

Karl Welzenbach shared information on the Statewide Freight Plan. The Fix America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act includes additional requirements that the State of Oregon's Freight Plan must meet by December, 2017. Included in these requirements are the designation of Critical Rural and Critical Urban Freight Corridors. The Oregon Department of Transportation is seeking input from its statewide partners in defining both the Rural and Urban Critical Freight Corridors.

Dan Moore spoke about Medford's efforts on the process for designation of Critical Rural & Critical Urban Freight Corridors. Seventy seven (77) miles are allocated to the entire State. Additional agenda packet information included:

- Table 1: Corridor Eligibility Requirements (Rural & Urban)
- Considerations for MPO list development
- Figure 1: National and Oregon Freight Network Map
- Key Facts & Resources

**ODOT Planning Project Title VI Report – “The Oregon Freight Plan Amendment”**

- Project Overview & Process
- Data & Analysis
- Key Outcomes
- Outreach & Public Involvement Efforts
- FAST Act Freight Planning Requirements & OFP Approach

Oregon's state freight plan must be compliant with FAST Act planning requirements and approved by Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) Division Office by December 4, 2017. ODOT is leading the amendment process for the Oregon Freight Plan and will seek approval by the Oregon Transportation Commission of the final state freight plan document in November 2017

Ms. Hart-Brinkley shared maps depicting proposed local corridors tied to the I-5 National Freight Route, and gave details about the various corridors (land use) projects being proposed. Highway 140 is the designated State corridor for southern Oregon. Needed projects will be in the RTP, and maybe eligible for FAST funding. After additional discussion, members will respond to Dan Moore before Jan. 20<sup>th</sup> with their comments on this issue.

***Action Items:***

**5. Regional Plan/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment**

Ryan MacLaren said that the TAC was 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 were advertised on or before January 2nd in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.

**A. Amendment to RTP & TIP: OR 140/OR 238 Bridge & Culvert Rail Upgrades (KN 19961)**

Description: Bridge & Culvert Rail Upgrades project replaces railings on three bridges that do not meet modern safety standards to mitigate the potential for vehicles that strike the rails to depart the roadway. The bridges are located on OR 140 at mile post 7.75 (Little Butte Creek), OR 238 at MP35.44 (Jackson Creek) and OR 238 at MP 36.44 (Griffin Creek). Only the two bridges on OR 238 are within the RVMPO boundary. Staff will ask if the project name can be changed to reflect a more accurate description (not related to railroad infrastructure).

Project #: 961 FFY 2016 Design  
2017 Construction

State funds will be used.

|                          |              |                  |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Exempt - Table 2, Safety | Federal      | \$757,321        |
|                          | ODOT Match   | <u>\$ 86,678</u> |
|                          | <b>Total</b> | <b>\$844,000</b> |

**On a motion by Alex Georgevitch, seconded by Kelly Madding, Regional Plan/Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment (OR 140/OR 238 Bridge & Culvert Rail Upgrades) was recommended for approval by the Policy Committee. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.**

**6. Discretionary Funds Applications – Review Staff Evaluations**

Dan Moore presented the staff evaluation of applications for RVMPO discretionary funds. Staff was seeking the TAC’s input on the project evaluations, as some criteria are subjective and open to staff interpretation. Staff’s goal was to gain general TAC consensus on the project scoring. The projects and the amounts requested are listed in Table 1.

**TABLE 1: Applications for Discretionary Funds**

| Project Number | Agency        | Project Description                                  | Total STP Funds Available 2019-21<br><u>\$2,945,017</u><br>Total CMAQ Fund Request | Total CMAQ Funds Available 2019-21<br><u>\$3,241,281</u><br>Total STP Fund Request | Total Federal Funds Available 2019-21<br><u>\$6,195,298</u><br>Total Federal Funds Request (STP & CMAQ) |
|----------------|---------------|--|--|--|---|
| 1              | Ashland       | Chip Seal  |  | \$ 816,081   | \$816,081   |
| 2              | Central Point | W. Pine St. Reconstruction, Glenn Way to Brandon Ave | \$ 1,187,462   | \$ 1,517,385   | \$ 2,704,847  |
| 3              | Eagle Point   | Royal Ave Improvements, Design & ROW                 | \$ 532,000   |  | \$ 532,000  |
| 4              | JACO          | Expo Parking Lot Paving                              |  | \$ 559,873   | \$ 559,873  |
| 5              | JACO          | Foothill Rd. – Delta Waters to Dry Creek             | \$ 1,255,652   | \$ 1,255,652   | \$ 2,511,304  |
| 6              | JACO          | Bear Creek GW - Hwy 140 Shared - Use Path            |  | \$ 776,164   | \$ 776,164  |
| 7              | Medford       | Foothill Rd. - Cedar Links to                        | \$ 2,200,000   | \$ 1,240,000   | \$ 3,440,000  |

|    |         |  |                      |                      |                      |
|----|---------|--|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|    |         | Delta Waters                               |                      |                      |                      |
| 8  | Phoenix | North Couplet<br>Pedestrian Crossing       | \$ 73,000            |                      | \$ 73,000            |
| 9  | RVTD    | RVTD Bus<br>Replacement –<br>Diesel to CNG |                      | \$ 1,150,000         | \$ 1,150,000         |
| 10 | RVTD    | RVTD Trip<br>Reduction Program             |                      | \$ 120,000           | \$ 120,000           |
|    |         | <b>Total Funding\</b><br><b>Requests</b>   | <b>\$5,248,114</b>   | <b>\$7,435,155</b>   | <b>\$12,683,269</b>  |
|    |         | <b>Funding</b><br><b>Shortfall</b>         | <b>(\$2,294,097)</b> | <b>(\$4,193,874)</b> | <b>(\$6,487,971)</b> |

### Applicant Supplied Data

Staff relied on data supplied by each applicant to perform the evaluation. In cases where information was not supplied or was not clear, staff made assumptions based on the project description.

Karl Welzenbach explained that it is the TAC’s responsibility is to provide the Policy Committee with the best, objective information possible on the proposed projects. He also suggested that revisiting the criteria for subjectivity/objectivity might be warranted after the process is completed.

### Evaluation/Scoring Categories Included:

- Mobility
- Community Health/Vitality
- Transportation Options
- Resource Conservation

Staff’s presentation documents included a chart of Evaluation Measures – Goals & Project Funding Criteria for each category which delineated RVMPO Goals, 2013-34 RTP Goals, MPO Requirements (23 CFR, Part 450.306, Evaluation Criteria) and how each Criteria was measured.

### Other considerations included;

- RVMPO TAZ Data: Population, employment w/in 1/2-mile of improvement
- Criteria 2. Based on Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations and Title VI & Env. Justice Plan
- Strongly supports criteria
  - 1 = Minor population impact, investment located within Title VI & EJ Plan mapped population area
  - 2 = Moderate population impact, investment located within/along an Area of Concern (in Needs Assessment)
  - 3 = Significant population impact, project addresses identified need in Needs Assessment
- RVTD pop., employment from Land Use Conditions Summary, RVTD District Boundary Assessment, Spring 2011
- Assumes one truck/day @ each station (21\*365); Trucks stop for 10 hrs. rest
- Air Quality --Benefit considers: Emission reductions beyond those identified in CMAQ analysis; Cost effectiveness of air quality improvement
- (based on VMT reduction and population served); and Overall results of CMAQ analysis
- Greenhouse Gas Reduction -- Benefit considers: Support for efficient urban form (downtowns and activity centers, compact and mixed-use development, transportation

options); reduced combustion vehicle use; and shift to lower-carbon fuel. Scoring was as follows:

- 1 = Addresses one of three category criteria
- 2 = Addresses two of three category criteria
- 3 = Addresses all three category criteria
- VMT reduction per TPR allowance of 10% VMT reduction for adding sidewalks and bike facilities in Activity Centers; assumed 5% VMT reduction in all other locations. Annual VMT Reduction = daily VMT reduction (Less ADT\*Trip Distance)\*365.
- Per TAC agreement (Oct. 10, 2011) road project lifespan determined by material used. Predominately concrete project = 30 year; asphalt = 20

CMAQ Qualification included CO (Medford UGB) and PM<sub>10</sub> (RVMPO Area). CMAQ Program Priority covered Diesel Retrofit and Congestion Reduction.

Several members suggested that the group needed to choose a coherent method to reach a technical decision to pass along to the Policy Committee, where they would make the policy decisions. Based on a question from the Committee, Dan Moore said that time was of the essence in getting a recommendation to the Policy Committee. A longer decision process would not affect CMAQ funding. Air quality conformity is not an issue.

Prior to scoring the projects, questions and answers were exchanged among the Committee members on several projects how some of the scoring was done:

- JACO Bear Creek Greenway lack of ODOT funding?  
**Response: John Vial**
- Medford Foothills expansion from 3-5 lane design standard, ADTs and other local match funding (SDC, etc.) sources?  
**Response: Alex Georgevitch**
- JACO Foothills safety concerns (lane reductions)?  
Responder: Mike Kuntz and Alex Georgevitch  
Scoring rationales as related to bike/ped facilities  
**Response: John Vial**  
Crashes and project safety improvements on the expanded shoulders and left turn lanes (CMAQ/STBG \$\$\$ splits). The ROW will be a shared facility.  
**Response: Mike Kuntz**
- Phoenix The Couplet (a CMAQ project) may qualify for a fund exchange or STBG \$. Will improve pedestrian amenities in the downtown (Alternative Measure #7)  
**Response: Ray DiPasquale**

Medford's Foothills project (at five lanes) is not in the RTP, and would require an Air Quality Conformity analysis, as well as additional modeling. The RTP and TIP would have to be amended to add the additional lanes to the project.

The Ashland Project is not just a chip seal project and does provide multi-modal improvements. The TSP designates the ROWs as shared facilities with reduced speeds at 15 MPH.

The JACO Greenway Project doesn't require any emissions study.

Staff assumes that the RTP and TIP will be amended to include projects that are currently included

in local plans.

Foothills (Mc Andrews to Delta Waters) is not listed in Medford’s RTP as a five lane facility. It is in the TSP as a three lane facility. Maps indicate a five lane facility. The Comp Plan lists it as a five lane roadway. To modify it would be a minor TIP amendment, and the model would have to be changed. Conformity, modeling and associated costs are the predominant issues with a five lane project. NOTE: Foothills Road is designated as a Critical Freight Corridor.

Staff assumed that the applications were in conformity with local plans, and did not check them individually because plan compliance was asked for in the applications forms.

After a protracted discussion on possible ways to fit the Foothills project into the list, the Committee ended its discussion on Medford’s application with an informal consensus that the actual scoring/ranking should be done to see whether the project falls out of funding availability was not enough time to bring the project into conformity, and that it did not currently meet the technical analysis.

A question about a gap between the JACO and Medford’s projects arose, but it was pointed out that there are other gaps in the existing roadway system.

Staff scored/ranked the projects as follows:

| Ranked | Agency        | Project Description                                  |
|--------|---------------|--|
| 4      | Ashland       | Chip Seal  |
| 1      | Central Point | W. Pine St. Reconstruction, Glenn Way to Brandon Ave |
| 4      | Eagle Point   | Royal Ave Improvements, Design & ROW                 |
| 9      | JACO          | Expo Parking Lot Paving                              |
| 5      | JACO          | Foothill Rd. – Delta Waters to Dry Creek             |
| 3      | JACO          | Bear Creek GW - Hwy 140 Shared -Use Path             |
| 2      | Medford       | Foothill Rd. - Cedar Links to Delta Waters           |
| 6      | Phoenix       | Phoenix North Couplet Pedestrian Crossing            |
| 7      | RVTD          | RVTD Bus Replacement – Diesel to CNG                 |
| 8      | RVTD          | RVTD Trip Reduction Program                          |

Paige Townsend said that she did not agree with the staff perspective and scoring on the RVTD projects.

**On a motion by Paige Townsend, seconded by Ian Horlacher (for discussion purposes), it was recommended that the 2019-21 projects be forwarded to the Policy Committee for funding approval in the following order:**

- 1. Central Point (W. Pine Street),**
- 2. JACO (Foothills)**
- 3. Phoenix (North Couplet)**

- 4. Ashland (Chip Seal)**
- 5. Eagle Point (S Royal)**

**Discussion:**

There are funding shortages for several projects.

Alex Georgevitch reiterated the TACs responsibility to provide technical information to the policy Committee, and asked to articulate the technical scoring justifications. If the TAC needs more time to reach a consensus, rather than offer a technical recommendation, that information can be conveyed to the Policy Committee.

Only one of the highest cost projects can be funded, with some smaller projects being added to fill out the available funding. Documented improvements to mitigate safety issues were noted as deserving higher scores. John Vial expressed his concern leaving the JACO Greenway project (all CMAQ \$, and covered in the JACO TSP) off the list, and the future “regional trails” funding. ODOT’s “Enhanced” funding is no longer available.

Alex Georgevitch felt that the scoring should be tightened up, and that the remaining projects should be added below the “cut line”.

The Committee engaged in a lengthy conversation on shifting funding amounts around in various projects in order to allow for more projects to be funded.

Ryan MacLaren will make all the suggested changes to the spreadsheets.

The JACO Greenway project was added as #6 because the County will reduce their Foothills project by the amount needed for the Greenway.

**Paige Townsend withdrew her initial motion.**

**On a motion by Paige Townsend, the STBG and CMAQ projects 1-6 were recommended, as ranked and funded by the TAC, to the Policy Committee in the following order:**

- 1. Central Point (W. Pine Street),**
- 2. JACO (Foothills)**
- 3. Phoenix (North Couplet)**
- 4. Ashland (Chip Seal)**
- 5. Eagle Point (S Royal)**
- 6. JACO (Bear Creek Greenway Extension)**

**John Vial seconded the motion.**

**The motion passed with one nay (Ian Horlacher), and the rest ayes.**

**Further Discussion:**

Medford’s Foothill project is not eligible at this time. The vote on the remaining projects could be held off until more information is available on actual funding amounts. The CMAQ formula will not be changed until 2021.

Ray DiPasquale said Phoenix could probably find additional funding for the couplet project.

**On a motion by John Vail, seconded by Paige Townsend, if additional funds become available, Projects 1-6 will be made whole in the order in which they were prioritized in the previous motion**

**Discussion:**

Phoenix clarified that they could probably find safety funds to finance the north side of their couplet, and, if so, that they could drop their request for CMAQ funds. Paige Townsend asked about AQ conformity regulations for Medford’s Foothills project.

**The motion passed unanimously.**

The final four (4) projects will be ranked later, when more details are available.

Karl Welzenbach stated that he and staff are comfortable taking the TAC recommendations to the Policy Committee. Medford Planning will probably attend the Policy meeting to discuss its case.

The six (6), top ranked project costs were adjusted by the TAC and staff to reflect the following disbursements:

**2016 RVMPO Project Selection**

| Rank | Jurisdiction  | Project           | STBG Requested | CMAQ Requested | STBG Awarded | CMAQ Awarded | STBG Remaining | CMAQ Remaining |
|------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1    | Central Point | W. Pine           | \$1,187,462    | \$1,517,385    | \$1,187,462  | \$1,517,385  | \$1,766,555    | \$1,723,896    |
| 2    | JACO          | Foothill          | \$1,255,652    | \$1,255,652    | \$1,255,652  | \$755,652    | \$510,903      | \$968,244      |
| 3    | Phoenix       | North Couplet     | \$73,000       |                | \$73,000     |              | \$437,903      | \$968,244      |
| 4    | Ashland       | Chip Seal         |                | \$816,081      |              | \$468,244    | \$437,903      | \$500,000      |
| 5    | Eagle Point   | S Royal           | \$532,000      |                | \$437,903    |              |                | \$500,000      |
| 6    | JACO          | Hwy. 140 Greenway |                | \$776,164      |              | \$500,000    |                |                |
| 7    | Medford       | Foothill          | \$2,200,000    | \$1,240,000    |              |              |                |                |
| 7    | RVTD          | Buses             |                | \$1,150,000    |              |              |                |                |
| 7    | RVTD          | Trip Red. Program |                | \$120,000      |              |              |                |                |
| 7    | JACO          | EXPO Parking      |                | \$559,873      |              |              |                |                |
|      |               | <b>Total</b>      | \$5,248,114    | \$7,435,155    | \$2,954,017  | \$3,241,281  |                |                |
|      |               | <b>Available</b>  | \$2,954,017    | \$3,241,281    | \$2,954,017  | \$3,241,281  |                |                |
|      |               | <b>Balance</b>    | (\$2,294,097)  | (\$4,193,874)  |              |              |                |                |
|      |               |                   |                | (\$6,487,971)  |              |              |                |                |

**7. MPO Planning Update**

- Karl Welzenbach presented a CMAQ update. The Committee has been offered four (4) options, and they are trying to find a middle ground between formulaic distribution and



ODOT “running the show”. The RVMPO is the only region requiring conformity, and having two pollutants. The next meeting will be February 21<sup>st</sup>. The final recommendations are expected in September.

**8. Public Comment**

None received.

**9. Other Business / Local Business**

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

**Scheduled Meetings:**

- RVMPO TAC            Wed., Feb. 8, 2017            1:30 PM
- RVMPO Policy        Tues., Jan. 24, 2017        2:00 PM
- RVMPO PAC            Tues., Jan. 17, 2017        5:30 PM