

---

**AGENDA**

**Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization**

**Technical Advisory Committee**

---



**Date:** *Wednesday, March 14, 2018*

**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*

**Contact:** *Stephanie Thune, RVCOG: 541-423-1368*  
*RVMPO website: [www.rvmopo.org](http://www.rvmopo.org)*

<b>1</b>	<b>Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda</b>	<b>Mike Kuntz, Chair</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Review / Approve Minutes</b>	<b>Chair</b>
<i>Attachment</i>	<b>#1</b>   RVMPO TAC Draft Minutes 180214	
<b>3</b>	<b>Public Comment</b> Items not on the agenda   <i>Comments on agenda items allowed during discussion of each item</i>	<b>Chair</b>
<b>Action Items</b>		
<b>4</b>	<b>2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendment</b>	<b>Ryan MacLaren</b>
<i>Background</i>	The TAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the Policy Committee on the proposed TIP amendment. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing was advertised on March 3 in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.	
<i>Attachment</i>	<b>#2</b>   Memo: TIP Amendment	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation to Policy Committee.	

<b>Action Items (Continued)</b>		
<b>5</b>	<b>Project Substitution for the Nevada Street Bridge</b>	<b>Scott Fleury   Ryan MacLaren</b>
<i>Background</i>	Following Ashland City Council's decision not to proceed with the East Nevada Street project, Ashland staff is now submitting Washington Street Extension to Tolman Creek Road as a substitute project for the \$1.5 million dollar STBG grant awarded to the City of the East Nevada Street Bridge project as outlined in the RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds.	
<i>Attachment</i>	<p><b>#3</b>   <i>Materials Packet</i>: Memo, Scoring Criteria Table, Project Evaluation and CMAQ Benefits Analysis</p> <p><b>NOTE:</b> <i>The completed applications and supplemental materials for both the East Nevada Street (original) and Washington Street (proposed substitute) projects can be found online at the RVMPO website underneath the link to this agenda packet, or via these hyperlinks:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Application + Supplemental Materials   East Nevada Street Project</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Application   Washington Street Project</a></li> <li>• <a href="#">Supplemental Materials   Washington Street Project</a></li> </ul>	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation on project substitution to the Policy Committee.	
<b>6</b>	<b>RVMPO TAC Bylaws Update(s)</b>	<b>Karl Welzenbach</b>
<i>Background</i>	At its February 14 meeting, the TAC identified a desired wording change to Article II (b): change "Medford metropolitan area" to "metropolitan planning area." A review of the Bylaws to identify any other language/content changes is desired so that any/all change recommendations can be forwarded to the Policy Committee at one time.	
<i>Attachment</i>	<b>#4</b>   RVMPO TAC Bylaws	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation(s) to Policy Committee.	

<b>Presentations</b>		
<b>7</b>	<b>Proposed Project Streamlining</b>	<b>Karl Welzenbach</b>
<i>Background</i>	“Project Streamlining” has been a buzz-phrase for several years. This is a short presentation on an idea to undertake a planning level effort at project streamlining as the MPO develops/updates its Regional Transportation Plan.	
<i>Attachment</i>	None.	
<i>Action Requested</i>	No action required.	
<b>Discussion Items</b>		
<b>8</b>	<b>RVMPO UPWP   FY2018-2019</b>	<b>Karl Welzenbach</b>
<i>Background</i>	Each year the MPO is required to develop a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) for the upcoming Fiscal Year. The UPWP is a program budget for the MPO which identifies those planning initiatives and efforts to be undertaken in the upcoming fiscal year. Staff is seeking input on the distribution of planning funds across the proposed tasks as well as input on the tasks themselves.	
<i>Attachment</i>	None   Link to <a href="#">Draft RVMPO UPWP FY2018-2019</a> *Several copies of the draft document will be available for circulation at the meeting.	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Provide input/feedback for final draft.	
<b>9</b>	<b>Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan (RVATP)</b>	<b>Chair Kuntz</b>
<i>Background</i>	Jackson County plans to begin development of the Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan (RVATP) this spring. The project needs a TAC, which will likely be members of the RVMPO TAC. Should the RVATP TAC meetings be made a part of the RVMPO TAC meetings or made as a stand-alone meeting?	
<i>Attachment</i>	None.	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Discussion and recommendation for the scheduling of the RVATP TAC meetings.	
<b>10</b>	<b>Public Comment</b>	<b>Chair</b>

Regular Updates		
11	Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects	TAC Members
<i>Attachment</i>	#5   Tracking Spreadsheet for Currently Active RVMPO Projects	
12	<b>MPO Planning Update</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance Measures</li> <li>• CMAQ Funding</li> </ul>	Karl Welzenbach
13	<b>Other Business / Local Business</b> Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.	Chair
14	<b>Adjournment</b>	Chair

- The next RVMPO TAC meeting will be **Wednesday, April 11, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, March 27, at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, March 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 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  
February 14, 2018**



The following attended:

<b>Voting Members</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Alex Georgevitch	Medford	774-2114
Craig Anderson	Jackson County	774-6907
Dan Roberts	ODOT	774-6383
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	423-1362
Kyle Kearns	Medford	774-2380
Matt Samitore	Central Point	664-3321 x205
Mike Kuntz, <b>Chair</b>	Jackson County	774-6228
Mike Upston	Eagle Point	826-4212
Paige West	RVTD	608-2429
Ray DiPasquale	Phoenix	535-2226
Tom Humphrey	Central Point	423-1025
<b>Alternate Voting Members Present</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Charles Bennett	Jackson County	774-6115
<b>Staff</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Stephanie Thune	RVCOG	423-1368
<b>Interested Parties</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
James A. Herndon	RVMPO PAC	840-0741

Larry Martin	RVMPO PAC	664-3778
Mike Montero	Montero & Associates	944-4376

[RVMPO TAC February 14, 2018 Agenda Packet](#)

Full meeting recording: [170214 RVMPO TAC Meeting Audio](#)

Specific items are hyperlinked below.

**1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00 – 01:01**

1:49 | *Quorum*: Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD

**2. [Review / Approve Minutes](#) 01:02 – 02:16**

The Chair asked if there were any changes or additions to the minutes of the January 10 meeting.

**01:10 | Ian Horlacher moved to approve the January 10 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as presented. Tom Humphrey seconded.**

Chair Kuntz noted that the word “Chair” in Item 2 should be changed to “Vice Chair” as Vice Chair Sullivan presided at the January 10 meeting.

**02:04 | Ian Horlacher revised his motion to approve the January 10 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as amended. Tom Humphrey seconded.**

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

**3. Public Comment (*Item skipped*)**

***Action Items***

**4. [Election of RVMPO TAC Chair and Vice Chair](#) 02:17 – 07:12**

The RVMPO TAC Bylaws state: “*The officers of the committee shall be a chair and vice-chair to be elected at the February meeting. The officers shall hold office for a period of one year, beginning at the close of the February meeting.*”

The Chair opened the floor to RVMPO TAC Chair nominations.

**02:39 | Ian Horlacher moved to nominate and re-elect Mike Kuntz for the position of RVMPO TAC Chair for the term of February 2018 – February 2019. Tom Humphrey seconded.**

There were no other nominations.

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

The Chair opened the floor to RVMPO TAC Vice Chair nominations.

**03:23 | Mike Upston moved to nominate Alex Georgevitch for the position of RVMPO TAC Vice Chair for the term of February 2018 – February 2019. Tom Humphrey seconded.**

**04:08 | Alex Georgevitch moved to nominate Tom Humphrey for the position of RVMPO TAC Vice Chair for the term of February 2018 – February 2019. Mike Upston seconded.**

The Chair called for a vote on the motions with a show of hands in favor of each candidate.

*Alex Georgevitch was elected as the new RVMPO Vice Chair by carrying the majority of the vote.*

*(Mentioned at end of Item 5):* One recommendation concerning the Bylaws was made to take to the Policy Committee: In *Article II (b)*, change language of “Medford metropolitan area” to “metropolitan planning area.”

**5. 2017-2042 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and 2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Amendments 07:13 – 11:36**

Ryan MacLaren reported that the RVMPO RTP and TIP need to be amended to add the following two projects:

**A. RVMPO 5303 Funds (KN 21268)**

Description: “*Support transit planning through RTP & TIP.*”

**B. RVMPO Planning SFY2019 (KN 21268)**

Description: “*Planning and Research.*”

ODOT classifies Amendments A and B as just one project with the same Key Number, but for MPO purposes, they are split into two so that the 5303 (MPO soft match) and PL (ODOT hard match) funds can be shown separately in the RTP and TIP.

**02:34 | Ian Horlacher moved that the TAC Committee recommend approval to the Policy Committee of the proposed amendments to the 2017-2042 RTP and 2018-2021 TIP as presented. Alex Georgevitch seconded.**

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

**6. Central Point CP-5/6 Concept Plan Review 11:37 – 47:04**

Tom Humphrey explained that, since the last review by the TAC in January, changes have been made to some language in the Concept Plan in order to enhance clarity and identify specific findings in relation to the Performance Measures. One extended section of revised language can be referenced in the red text on page 34 of the agenda packet (page 19 of the Concept Plan) having to do with mixed use/pedestrian friendly areas.

The principle issues to be addressed in the Concept Plan are:

- a. Have the participating cities adequately addressed the percentages of land distribution that were agreed to? In the case of Central Point, these percentages equate to 76% residential, 4% commercial/employment-based and 20% open space/parks.
- b. Have the cities addressed whether they are meeting density commitments?

At the Concept Plan stage, the best that can be done is to assign educated estimates to anticipated land uses; traffic impact analyses are done when any particular segment of the Concept Plan reaches the UGB amendment phase.

The original Land Use Concept and Transportation Concept maps, which were included as pages 21 and 22 of the agenda packet (pages six and seven of the Concept Plan), went to the Central Point Planning Commission prior to the integration of CAC input; revised maps ([Land Use Concept](#) and [Transportation Concept](#)) have been created and Humphrey reviewed the adjusted boundary lines/designations for members, calling special attention to the “Area of Concern” notes in fine print below the Land Use Concept map. In terms of administering the specific citizen concerns listed, some items have standards in the Municipal Code to be followed, other items will need to be negotiated if/as issues with them arise. The major change made to the Transportation Concept map consisted of conceptualizing the Grant Road relocation all the way to the western side of the URA, creating a buffer with the agricultural land.

Humphrey along with Chair Kuntz explained that land/development can be located inside the City’s Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) and still be unincorporated, belonging to the county in terms of jurisdiction. If the resident/developer wishes to annex to the City, they can pursue that venue. The Concept Plan helps to guide land use decisions in cases such as these; a developer can present their plans, which can be compared to the desired conceptual use for that land to determine whether it would be a good fit as is, or whether fine-tuning or adjustments would need to be considered.

Humphrey will present the Concept Plan and comment letter to the RVMPO Policy Committee at their February 27 meeting. After successful collaboration with the MPO (culminating in the signing of the comment letter by the Policy Committee Chair), the Concept Plan will be presented to the Central Point City Council. Therefore, a request to recommend the signing of the Concept Plan comment letter by the Policy Committee Chair is sought today.

Craig Anderson expressed two lingering concerns of Jackson County Planning in relation to the Concept Plan:

- a) the county’s lack of ability to administer the (concept) plan; and
- b) the structure of the language in the County’s comprehensive plans in relation to that in the CP-5/6 Concept Plan’s regarding mixed-use/pedestrian friendly areas (i.e. having land zoned to allow for mixed use is not the same as demonstrating that mixed-use development will actually transpire on that land in the future).

In light of these concerns, Jackson County Planning is electing to abstain from voting on the Concept Plan at this time. Jackson County Planning will review the Concept Plan in the future if/when segments of it reach the UGB amendment stage.

**45:55 | Mike Upston moved that the TAC Committee recommend the signing of the comment letter related to the Central Point CP-5/6 Concept Plan by the RVMPO Policy Committee Chair. Alex Georgevitch seconded.**

There was no further discussion.

***The motion carried unanimously by voice vote, with the exception of Craig Anderson, Jackson County Planning, who abstained from voting for the reasons noted above.***



## **7. Safety Performance Measures 47:05 – 59:31**

Karl Welzenbach reported that calculations to develop a statewide VMT for ODOT's Safety Performance Measures remain unclear, but staff is recommending that the RVMPO adopt the state's figures nonetheless. The following considerations were noted:

- Developing separate measures for the MPO would be time-consuming and resource-heavy as no jurisdictions have means of collecting data for "all roads."
- Per Tables 3 and 4 provided in [Attachment 6](#) of the agenda packet, the RVMPO's fatality rate (.58) falls below the statewide target (.73), while the serious injury rate (4.54) is slightly higher than the statewide target (3.78) recommended in the measures.
- The nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries data is given as a number, not a rate. Consideration will have to be given to how to ensure decreasing numbers in that area even as bike/ped activity is being promoted region-/state-wide.
- The targets/measures apply to the entire MPO and would provide incentive to prioritize funding for safety-related projects throughout the MPO, particularly since, beginning May 22, 2018, the MPO must demonstrate to the state in every RTP and/or TIP amendment how it is meeting or working towards meeting the target measures.
- If, in the future, the MPO develops a more uniquely tailored set of measures for its area, it can choose at that time to opt out of the state's measures in favor of its own (with necessary documentation provided to the state).
- As yet, there are no penalties for not meeting the targets specified in the measures.

Welzenbach clarified that the only two Performance Measures of the seven listed (see "Background" information for Agenda Item 7) that will impact the MPO in terms of goal-setting/adoption are: Safety and CMAQ (CMAQ target measures will not be provided by the state until November). The state will not require the MPOs to report on the other five areas of concern.

**58:38 | Alex Georgevitch moved that the TAC Committee recommend adoption of the state's Safety Performance Measures to the Policy Committee. Ian Horlacher seconded.**

There was no further discussion.

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

## **8. RVMPO Dues | FY2018-2019 59:32 – 01:01:41**

Welzenbach reviewed highlights of information contained in [Attachment 7](#) of the agenda packet. Approval of the dues is an annual event; the dues allow the MPO to pursue activities/projects that are not eligible for federal funding. FY2018-2019 dues are slightly higher overall (\$591) than for FY2017-2018, and are based on a rate of \$.16 per capita in each jurisdiction. A small amount of positive carryover remains from last year's dues.

**01:00:46 | Tom Humphrey moved that the RVMPO TAC recommend approval of the FY2018-2019 RVMPO Dues to the Policy Committee. Alex Georgevitch seconded.**

There was no further discussion.

*The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.*

## ***Discussion Items***

### **9. RVMPO UPWP | FY2018-2019 01:01:42 – 01:08:50**

Welzenbach reported that ODOT will be reviewing the draft RVMPO Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) early this month; following their review, the draft document(s) will be posted on the RVMPO website, hopefully by Friday, February 23.

The UPWP is required for every MPO by the federal government and comprises the MPO's program budget, delineating how much planning money will be received, where it is coming from and how it will be spent. A summary of proposed spending was provided in [Attachment 8](#) of the agenda packet, though Welzenbach noted that the table included in the attachment was incorrect; the corrected table will be included in the draft UPWP document.

Of note:

- a. The approximate 20% increase in Program Management funds is due under-budgeting in that area last year.
- b. Line Item 2.5, "State and Federal Planning Coordination," will allow funds for participation in meetings/discussions related to the Performance Measures, which are being implemented this year and for other MPO expenses related to monitoring/justifying the pursuit of the measures' targets.

Suggestions/Inquiries:

- *Alex Georgevitch, Medford* | Questioned necessity of items 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 3.2.
  - Discussion revealed activity in each category over the past year and potentially necessary this year. It is possible that all funds in all categories may not be exhausted, but should remain in place to cover unexpected requests/work required.

Further input/suggestions are welcome and should be emailed to [kwelzenbach@rvcog.org](mailto:kwelzenbach@rvcog.org) prior to the March 14 TAC meeting, when the draft UPWP will be reviewed once more prior to returning as an action item for adoption in April.

### **10. Public Comment 01:08:51 – 01:08:58**

## ***Regular Updates***

### **11. Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects 01:08:59 – 01:17:51**

The spreadsheet of funded projects was reviewed; all jurisdictions present provided updates, which will be incorporated and made available for March's meeting. Welzenbach shared that this monthly roundtable for project status updates was looked upon favorably by state and federal representatives; MRMPO and RVMPO are the only two MPOs in the state who engage in this exercise.

### **12. MPO Planning Update 01:17:52 – 01:25:09**

- April 27 OMPOC meeting in Grants Pass at City Hall from 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.; local tour/speaker ideas are welcome.
- Change in CMAQ regulations may preclude CMAQ funds being used for projects incorporating bike lanes, with the new regulations stipulating that CMAQ funding be used for separate bike/ped facilities only. Georgevitch inquired whether including a three-foot buffer between the travel lane

and bike lane would allow the project to utilize CMAQ funds. Welzenbach said he will inquire about that possibility and will send a draft of the new CMAQ regulations to TAC members.

**13. Other Business / Local Business 01:25:10 – 01:28:09**

*Paige West, RVTID*

- Buses have recently had a new LECIP fare box system installed thanks to Enhance grant flexible funding received in 2015-16; fare enforcement and accuracy in revenue reporting are both expected to improve as a result.
- A small service enhancement is planned for April using revenue from property taxes and the \$.13 levy approved in 2016. The enhancement will increase frequency on Route 25, increase frequency on Route 10 on Saturdays, and also look into adding additional service in the Poplar Road/Royal Avenue area near Fred Meyer North. With these route enhancements, all of Medford except for Route 30 (E. Jackson to Jacksonville) will have 30-minute service.
- State funds will be used for Central Point routes/service.

**11. Adjournment 01:28:10 – 01:28:18**

3:17 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPO Policy Committee | February 27, 2018 | 2:00 p.m.

RVMPO TAC | March 14, 2018 | 1:30 p.m.

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: March 7, 2018  
 TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee  
 FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Senior Planner  
 SUBJECT: RTP/TIP Amendments

The TAC is being asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed TIP amendment described below and on the following pages. The Policy Committee will hold a public hearing at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 27, 2018 to consider adoption of the proposed TIP amendment. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing will be advertised on or before March 6<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. Adjust Project in TIP: I-5 over Crowson Road north and southbound bridges (KN21228)**

Description: Structural overlays.

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																
I-5 over Crowson Road north and southbound bridges (Ashland)	Structural overlays	n/a	Exempt - Table 2, Safety			Planning										
						Design					\$ -			\$ -		
						Land Purchase								\$ -		
				21228	FFY2018	Construction	\$ 855,676	FIX-IT	\$ 72,188	ODOT	\$ 927,864			\$ 927,864		
				21228	FFY2018	Construction	\$ 1,149,628	HB2017	\$ 96,987	ODOT	\$ 1,246,615			\$ 1,246,615		
						Other								\$ -		
					Total FFY18-21		\$ 2,005,304		\$ 169,175		\$ 2,174,479		\$ 2,174,479			



**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:** March 7, 2018  
**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Ryan MacLaren, Senior Planner  
**SUBJECT:** Evaluating Applications for RVMPO Discretionary Funds

---

This memo presents the staff evaluation of applications for RVMPO discretionary funds. Staff seeks the TAC's input on the project evaluations, as some criteria are subjective and open to staff interpretation. The goal of this agenda item is to gain general TAC consensus on the project scoring. Results of the staff review and scoring appears on the following pages. .

**Applicant Supplied Data**

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

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

	RVMPO Goal	2013-2034 RTP Goal	MPO Requirements (23 CFR, Part 450.306)	Evaluation Criteria	How Measured
1: <b>Mobility</b>		Plan for, develop and maintain a balanced multi-modal transportation system to address existing and future needs.	Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system, across and between modes for people and freight.	1. Safety or security issue addressed; Accident/injury reduction	Describe safety problem, and how project would reduce number and severity of crashes. <b>(If project demonstrates air quality benefit it will be evaluated for CMAQ.)</b>
				<b>2. Congestion relief/reduce delay</b>	<b>Level of Service improvement; idle time reduced. HDV may be calculated separately. (To qualify for CMAQ project must provide cost-effective congestion mitigation that provides an air quality benefit. If project adds capacity, it will not be considered for CMAQ.)</b>
		Optimize safety and security of the transportation system.	Increase security of the transportation system.	3. Promote connectivity (ex: more direct travel, network infill)	Describe connectivity feature. If project reduces VMT it could help the region meet greenhouse emission requirements.
				4. Population # served (ADT; pop/jobs w/in ½-mi)	Provide traffic count; estimate # jobs and population that will be served by this project. Objective is to show the number of people who will be served by the project. Staff will estimate population & employment using RVMPO model data. Numbers generated will be used to estimate VMT reduction and air quality benefit.
2: <b>Community Vitality &amp; Livability</b>	Continue to work toward more fully integrating transportation and land use planning.	Use transportation investments to foster compact, livable communities. Develop a plan that builds on the character of the community, is sensitive to the environment and enhances quality of life.	Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and planned growth and economic development.	1. Benefit to traditionally underserved populations (Low-Income, Minority, Seniors, Children, Limited English Proficiency)	Does the project invest in and/or provide benefit to an area identified in the Title VI and Environmental Justice Plan or the Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations; or meet a need identified in the Needs Assessment?
				2. Support Alternative Measure 2: improve transit accessibility	Is the project located along existing/planned transit route? Does the project promote or support an increase in housing along fixed route transit? Level of density w/in ¼ mile buffer of project area.
		Use transportation investments to foster economic opportunities.	Support economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.	3. Support Alternative Measure 5: Increase % housing in Activity Centers. Support Alternative Measure 6: Increase % employment in Activity Centers.	Is the project located in an Activity Center? Link to map <a href="#">here</a> . Does the project support, or is it part of, a high-density (at least 10-unites/acre for housing) area? Describe the relationship.
				4. Benefit to freight movement, commercial traffic	Describe the benefit to movement of commercial vehicles. <b>(If project reduces truck VMT or emissions – esp. pre 1986 trucks – project will be evaluated for CMAQ).</b>
3: <b>Transportation Options</b>	Increase integration and availability of transportation options.	Use incentives and other strategies to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.		<b>1. Encourage/support SOV reduction; Reduce auto dependence</b>	<b>Does the project reduce SOV use; what elements of project contribute?</b>
				<b>2. Support Alternative Measure 1: increase transit, bike, ped mode share</b>	<b>Describe how the project will increase use of alternative modes.</b>
				<b>3. Support Alternative Measure 3: increase bike facilities</b>	<b>Provide total length of bicycle facility, service to/within/between Activity Centers, and/or describe other improvement.</b>
				<b>4. Support Alternative Measure 4: increase sidewalks on collectors, arterials in Activity Centers</b>	<b>Provide total length of qualifying sidewalks/paths.</b>
4: <b>Resource Conservation</b>	Incorporate environmental and energy conservation into the RVMPO planning process.	Maximize efficient use of transportation infrastructure for all users and modes.	Promote efficient system management and operation.	1. Address/mitigate environmental impacts	Describe project's benefit to natural environment. Does project include conservation features (ex. permeable surface).
				<b>2. Air quality benefit, long term including NOX and VOC.</b>	<b>If there are air quality benefit in addition to responses provided to RED-TEXT criteria, describe. Emission reductions and cost/benefit analysis will be done based on responses provided to items in red. Numbers supplied or staff-generated for Mobility item 4 will be used in this analysis.</b>
				3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (CO) <sub>1</sub>	Does the project reduce reliance on travel by combustion vehicles, or shift to lower-carbon fuel? (It's anticipated that projects contributing to the Alternative Measures will reduce GHG emissions.)
	Encourage use of cost-effective emerging technologies to achieve regional transportation goals.	Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.	4. Use emerging/new technology	Describe technology to be incorporated into project.	
			5. Preserves existing transportation asset	How does the project extend the life of facility without the construction of new facilities? Does the project refurbish existing facility? <b>(If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.)</b>	
			6. Reduce VMT	Reduction formula based on project type	
			7. Improve system efficiency	Describe efficiency: Facility able to handle greater ADT without expansion; Improve other transportation function with smaller investment; reduced operational costs; other?	
			8. Lifespan	Useful life of investment. For roadway projects, uniform lifespan applies as determined by predominate material used: concrete = 30 yrs; asphalt = 20 yrs; bike lanes = 20 yrs	
			9. Other public, private funding sources (leverage)	List overmatch, other funds	

(1) Greenhouse gas emissions can be reduced by reducing congestion, increasing operational efficiency, supporting alternative modes reducing use of combustion vehicles, and shifting to lower-carbon fuels (<http://www.deq.state.or.us/aq/committees/lowcarbon.htm>).

RVMPPO Project Evaluation, 2019 - 2021

App #	Agency	Project Name/Description	Total Cost	Amount Requested	Functional Class	Criteria																												Total Score All Categories				
						Mobility					Community Vitality/Livability					Transportation Options					Resource Conservation																	
						Safety	Congest Reduct	Connectivity	# Served (1)	Total Mobility	Under-served Pop (2)	Housing @ Transit Routes (3)	Mixed Use	Freight (4)	Total Livability	SOV Reduct	Encourage Alt. Mode	Bike	Ped	Total Transpo Options	Mitigate Enviro Impacts	AQ Benefit (5)	GHG Reduct (6)	New Tech	Increase Facility Lifespan	VMT Reduction		Efficiency	Lifespan (years) (8)	Leverage (Federal Share)	Total Resource Conservtn							
			Pop: Emp: (1)																	Miles/Yr (7)	Grant \$/Mile																	
1	Ashland	E. Nevada Street Extension	\$5,489,000	\$1,961,600	Collector	0	2	3	Pop: Emp: (1)	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	10	1	2	2	0	0	1,684,238	\$ 1.16	0	20	35.7%	5	21						
2	Ashland	Washington Street Extension to Tolman Creek Road	\$1,590,000	\$1,500,000	Collector	2	2	3	Pop: Emp: (1)	7	1	1	2	2	6	2	2	3	3	10	2	0	1	0	0	202,575	\$ 7.40	2	20	94.3%	5	28						
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0											0	0						
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0												0	0					
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0													0	0				
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0														0	0			
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0															0	0		
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0																0	0	
									Pop: Emp: (1)	0					0					0																	0	0

0 = No identifiable link to criteria

1 = Low, Does little to fulfill criteria

2 = Medium, Contributes to criteria

3 = High, Strongly supports criteria

1. RVMPPO TAZ Data: Population, employment w/in 1/2-mile of improvement
2. Based on Transportation Needs Assessment for Traditionally Underserved Populations and Title VI & Env. Justice Plan 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
3. RVTD pop., employment from Land Use Conditions Summary, RVTD District Boundary Assessment, Spring 2011
4. Assumes one truck/day @ each station (21*365); Trucks stop for 10 hrs. rest
5. 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
6. 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 as follows: 1 = Addresses one of three category criteria 2 = Addresses two of three category criteria 3 = Addresses all three category criteria
7. 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*TripDistance)*365.
8. Per TAC agreement (Oct. 10, 2011) road project lifespan determined by material used. Predominately concrete project = 30 year; asphalt = 20 years; bicycle lanes=20 years; concrete sidewalk 30 years

Agency	Project Name/Description	Project Rank by Total Score	CMAQ \$ Total*	CMAQ Qualification								CMAQ Program Priority	
				CO (Medford UGB)				PM <sub>10</sub> (RVMPPO area)				Diesel Retrofit	Congestion Reduction
kg Reduct/yr	\$/kg	kg Reduct X Lifespan	\$/Reduct Lifespan	kg Reduct/yr	\$/kg	kg Reduct X Lifespan	\$/Reduct Lifespan						
Ashland	E. Nevada Street Extension	2	\$0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	2,097	\$ 935	41,940	n/a	No	Yes
Ashland	Washington Street Extension to Tolman Creek Road	1	\$0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	336	\$ 4,464	6,720	n/a	No	Yes



## CMAQ Project Analysis

Project Name: E. Nevada Street Extension  
 Applicant: City of Ashland  
 Date of Analysis: February 21, 2018

### Project Description

The E. Nevada St. extension project involves construction of a new 0.12 mile paved roadway, including a bridge, which links the existing terminus of E. Nevada St. and N. Mountain Ave., providing balance and mobility to the transportation system. Nevada St. is classified as an avenue in the City's Transportation System Plan. The project provides an additional route for local and regional multimodal east-west travel. The new project will include bicycle lanes, sidewalks, parkrow, providing connectivity to the Bear Creek Greenway and allow for a future transit route.

### Analysis

Implementation of this project will impact PM<sub>10</sub> emissions based on assuming a trip distance reduction and a mode shift. The analysis will examine reductions in PM<sub>10</sub>. PM<sub>10</sub> emission factors for paved roadways are derived from the RVMPO Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) for the 2017 – 2042 RTP.

#### *Assumptions used in this analysis:*

1. Volume (ADT) = 2,977 (based on 10/16/2013 TPAU analysis, predicted Peak Volume = 13% of ADT)
2. Trip Distance Reduction (miles) = 1.5 (estimated trip distance reduced: N. Mountain Avenue, E. Nevada Street to Siskiyou Boulevard)
3. Project Length (miles) = .12
4. Trip Length (miles) = 5.4 (average vehicle trip length in RVMPO)
5. Paved Road PM<sub>10</sub> Production Rate = 0.00117 kg/mile (RVMPO AQCD 2017-2042 RTP, Page 29, Table 14)
6. Days of use = 365

#### *PM<sub>10</sub> Analysis*

Daily Paved Road PM<sub>10</sub> Production = (Project Length\*0.00117\*ADT) = 0.4179 kg  
 VMT Reduction #1 = (ADT\*Trip Distance Reduction) = (2,977 x 1.5) = 4,465.5  
 VMT Reduction #2 = (ADT\*5% bike/ped mode shift reduction\*Trip Length) = 803.79  
 Daily PM<sub>10</sub> Reduction = ((VMT Reduction #1 + #2)\*0.00117 kg) = 6.1650 kg  
 Daily Benefit Reduction Less Production = (6.1650 kg - 0.4179 kg) = 5.7471 kg  
**PM<sub>10</sub> Annual Reduction = (5.7471 kg/day\*365 days) = 2,097.69 kg**





## CMAQ Project Analysis

Project Name: Washington Street Extension to Tolman Creek Road  
 Applicant: City of Ashland  
 Date of Analysis: February 21, 2018

### Project Description

This substitute project extends Washington Street from its current western terminus west of I-5 and south of Ashland Street directly west to connect with Tolman Creek Road. This project is consistent with the I-5/Ashland Street (Exit 14) IAMP Access Management Plan's Access Management Plan and Enhanced Local Street Network recommendations.

The proposed new street (Independent Way) will provide needed connectivity to this portion of the city and will have two-travel lanes, two parking lanes and sidewalks on each side buffered by landscaping. The project is currently at 60% design and the City will be submitting the Joint Permit Application to the Division of State Lands and Army Corps for approval of construction activities in Hamilton Creek for the fish friendly culvert crossing in January 2018.

### Analysis

Implementation of this project will impact PM<sub>10</sub> emissions based on assuming a trip distance reduction and a mode shift. The analysis will examine reductions in PM<sub>10</sub>. PM<sub>10</sub> emission factors for paved roadways are derived from the RVMPO Air Quality Conformity Determination (AQCD) for the 2017 – 2042 RTP.

#### *Assumptions used in this analysis:*

1. Volume (ADT) = 1,460 (based on estimated daily trips reduced on Tolman Creek Road, Washington Street, and Ashland Street between Washington Street and Tolman Creek Road)
2. Trip Distance Reduction (miles) = 0.4 (estimated trip distance reduced: Washington Street to Ashland Street to Tolman Creek Road)
3. Project Length (miles) = .13
4. Trip Length (miles) = 5.4 (average vehicle trip length in RVMPO)
5. Paved Road PM<sub>10</sub> Production Rate = 0.00117 kg/mile (RVMPO AQCD 2017-2042 RTP, Page 29, Table 14)
6. Days of use = 365

#### *PM<sub>10</sub> Analysis*

Daily Paved Road PM<sub>10</sub> Production = (Project Length\*0.00117\*ADT) = 0.2221 kg  
 VMT Reduction #1 = (ADT\*Trip Distance Reduction) = (1,460 x 0.4) = 584  
 VMT Reduction #2 = (ADT\*5% bike/ped mode shift reduction\*Trip Length) = 394.2  
 Daily PM<sub>10</sub> Reduction = ((VMT Reduction #1 + #2)\*0.00117 kg) = 1.1445 kg  
 Daily Benefit Reduction Less Production = (1.1445 kg – 0.2221 kg) = 0.9224 kg  
**PM<sub>10</sub> Annual Reduction = (0.9224 kg/day\*365 days) = 336.676 kg**

**BYLAWS**  
**ROGUE VALLEY COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (RVCOG)**  
**METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO)**  
**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

**Article I**

Name

This committee shall be known as the Technical Advisory Committee to the Metropolitan Planning Organization.

**Article II**

Purpose

This committee shall undertake for the MPO Policy Committee the technical activities necessary for the continuing, comprehensive and cooperative (3-C) transportation planning process described in the Unified Planning Work Program.

The committee shall conduct, under the direction of the MPO Policy Committee, the technical portions of the Rogue Valley Regional Transportation Plan, including, but not limited to the following activities.

- a. Annual preparation of the Unified Planning Work Program to address transportation issues in the Medford metropolitan area.
- b. Preparation of plans, programs and special studies to address transportation issues in the **Medford metropolitan planning area**.
- c. Work with the MPO to ensure public participation in the transportation planning process.
- d. Preparation of the Transportation Improvement Program at intervals of no less than biannually.

### Article III

#### Membership - Voting

##### Section 1. Membership of the Committee

The committee will be made up of representatives of the following jurisdictions and agencies:

City of Medford Public Works  
City of Medford Planning  
City of Central Point Public Works  
City of Central Point Planning  
City of Phoenix Public Works  
City of Phoenix Planning  
City of Jacksonville Public Works  
City of Jacksonville Planning  
City of Talent Public Works  
City of Talent Planning  
City of Ashland Public Works  
City of Ashland Planning  
City of Eagle Point Public Works  
City of Eagle Point Planning  
Jackson County Public Works  
Jackson County Planning  
Jackson County Urban Renewal Agency (White City)  
Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD) Planning (2 representatives)  
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Region III Planning Representative  
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) Rogue Valley Area Representative  
Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)  
Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)  
Federal Highway Administration (non-voting)

- b. Members may designate alternates to serve in their place.
- c. Designees may serve on a meeting-by-meeting basis or on a permanent basis.
- d. Designees serving on a permanent basis shall be afforded all the rights of a member, including the opportunity to serve as a committee officer.
- e. The committee shall have non-voting ex-officio members as appointed by the chair.
- f. The Federal Highway Administration Division Planning Engineer shall serve as a non-voting ex-officio member.

##### Section 2. Appointment and Tenure of Committee Membership

- a. Each jurisdiction with membership on the committee shall appoint its representatives. The MPO Policy Committee shall ratify all committee appointments.

- b. Members shall serve until they are replaced by their jurisdictions.

### Section 3. Voting Privileges

- a. Each member shall be entitled to one vote on all issues presented at regular and special meetings at which the jurisdiction is present.

## Article IV

### Meetings

#### Section 1. Regular Meetings

- a. The committee shall hold its regular meeting on the second (2<sup>nd</sup>) Wednesday of each month.

#### Section 2. Special Meetings

- a. Special meetings may be called by the chair, vice-chair or MPO transportation staff on two days notice.
- b. The person or persons calling such special meeting shall fix the time and place for holding of such meeting.

#### Section 3. Conduct of Meetings

- a. Official action may be taken by the committee when a quorum is present.
- b. A quorum shall exist when the majority of member jurisdictions are present. Member jurisdictions are one individual from each of the following: cities of Medford, Central Point, Phoenix, Jacksonville, Talent, Ashland, Eagle Point; Jackson County; Rogue Valley Transportation District; and ODOT Rogue Valley Area Office.
- c. The voting on all questions coming before the MPO Technical Advisory Committee shall be by vote. Any member may ask for "Super Majority" (two thirds of voting members plus one) roll call vote if consensus (unanimity) cannot be reached on an MPO decision item/issue. The ayes and nays shall be entered in the minutes of such meeting.
- d. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with Roberts' Rule of Order.

## Article V

### Officers and Duties

#### Section 1. Officers

- a. The officers of the committee shall be a chair and vice-chair to be elected at the February meeting.

## Section 2. Term of Office

- a. The officers shall hold office for a period of one year, beginning at the close of the February meeting.

## Section 3. Duties

- a. The chair shall preside at all meetings and is entitled to vote on all issues.
- b. The vice-chair shall perform all duties of the chair in the chair's absence.

## Section 4. Planning Program Manager

The RVCOG's Planning Program Manager shall be a non-voting, ex-officio member of the committee. The program manager shall be responsible for staff support of the committee, including minute taking and record keeping.

# Article VI

## Subcommittees

### Section 1. Subcommittees

- a. Subcommittees as needed shall be appointed by the chair.
- b. The members of subcommittees shall serve until the work of the subcommittees is completed, or until their successors have been elected or appointed.
- c. Subcommittees must have at least one member who is a member of the full committee.
- d. The chair and the Planning Program Manager shall serve as ex-officio members of all subcommittees.
- e. The committee, by a majority vote, may dissolve subcommittees or remove individual members with or without cause.

### Section 2. Subcommittee Meetings

- a. Meetings of each subcommittee may be called by its chair, by the chair of the TAC by any two subcommittee members or by MPO transportation staff on two days notice. A majority of the members of each subcommittee shall constitute a quorum, and an act of the majority of the quorum present at the meeting shall constitute the act of the subcommittee.

**Article VII****Amendments to Bylaws**

## Section 1.

- a. These bylaws may be amended or repealed or new bylaws may be adopted by a Super Majority vote of two-thirds plus one of the members of the committee present at any regular or special meeting called for that purpose. This also includes amending the bylaws to include new members. Written notice of proposed amendments shall be given to the membership of the committee at least thirty (30) days prior to the date of the meeting at which the bylaws are to be considered.

## Section 2.

- a. Amendments to the bylaws shall become effective upon approval by the MPO Policy Committee.

Approved by the MPO Policy Committee:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Quilty, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Feb. 23, 2010

Date

## Ongoing RVMPO<sup>2</sup>Projects 02-14-18

Agency	Project Name	TIP	Year Programmed (20XX)	Project Status (Phase / Status)		Comments Received
				P	S	
Ashland	E. Nevada Street Extension	15-18	16,17,18	PL		No report given.
				D		
				LP		
				UR		
				CN		
				OT		
Eagle Point	E. Main St./Stevens Rd. Improvements	15-18	16,17,18	PL	2	Identified the ROW that is needed to be purchased, looks to be about half of what was initially estimated. Project is expected to break ground this year.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Regional Active Transportation Plan	15-18	16	PL	1	Section committee reviewing RFP's this Friday (2/16/18) to select a consultant. Working to form a technical advisory committee and a citizen advisory committee this summer.
				D	0	
				LP	0	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Table Rock Rd.	15-18	16,18	PL	3	Contractor began working mostly night installing water and sewer just south of Airport Rd. Project expected to be completed by the end of October.
				D	3	
				LP	3	
				UR	3	
				CN	2	
				OT	0	
Medford	Foothill Rd. - Hillcrest to McAndrews	15-18	16,17	PL	3	Appraisals complete by April. ROW by late 2018.
				D	2	
				LP	2	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	

## Ongoing RVMPO<sup>2</sup>Projects 02-14-18

				OT	0	Bid December 2018. Start spring 2019
RVCOG	Hybrid Vehicle	15-18	16	OT	3	Complete.
RVTD	Valley Feeder Pilot Project	15-18	16	OT		No report given.
Ashland	Chip Seal	18-21	20	PL	2	No report given.
				D	1	
				LP	0	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	
Central Point	W. Pine St. Reconstruction - Glenn Way to Brandon Ave.	18-21	19,20	PL	1	Hoping before the end of third quarter on the IGA.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	1	
Eagle Point	S. Royal Ave. Improvements - Design & ROW	18-21	19	PL	1	Received some funding to begin design and planning.
				D	0	
				LP	0	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Foothill Rd. - Delta Waters to Dry Creek	18-21	19,20,21	PL	3	IGA is in the que. RFP has been started.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	



## Ongoing RVMPO<sup>2</sup>Projects 02-14-18

Jackson County / ODOT	Bear Creek GW - Hwy 140 Shared-Use Path	18-21	19	PL	3	Looking for construction in 2019.
				D	2	
				LP	2	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	
Phoenix	North Couplet Pedestrian Crossing	18-21	19	PL	2	Council is still evaluating lane configurations.
				D	1	
				LP	0	
				UR	1	
				CN	1	
				OT	0	

<u>Phase</u>	<u>Status</u>
PL= Planning	0 = N/A
D = Design	1 = Not Started
LP = Land Purchase	2 = In Process
UR = Utility Relocate	3 = Complete
CN = Construction	
OT = Other	