
AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Technical Advisory Committee



Date: *Wednesday, April 11, 2018*

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 180314	
3	Public Comment Items not on the agenda <i>Comments on agenda items allowed during discussion of each item</i>	Chair
Action Items		
4	RTP and 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 March 29 in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#2 Memo: RTP/TIP Amendments	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation to Policy Committee.	

Action Items (Continued)		
5	RVMPO UPWP FY2018-2019	Karl Welzenbach
<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. This document has been presented to the RVMPO's TAC, Public Advisory Committee, and Policy Committee for review.	
<i>Attachment</i>	None Link to Draft RVMPO UPWP FY2018-2019 *Several copies of the draft document will be available for circulation at the meeting.	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation that the Policy Committee approve the 2018-19 UPWP.	
6	Project Substitution for the Nevada Street Bridge	Scott Fleury Ryan MacLaren
<i>Background</i>	At last month's TAC meeting, members provided comments regarding the proposed project substitution, had questions regarding its eligibility and funding amounts, and voiced concern about the IAMP. In light of the TAC's comments and inquiries, the City of Ashland has submitted a revised application for consideration and will report its finding pertaining to the project's eligibility.	
<i>Attachment</i>	<p>#3 Scoring Criteria Table and Project Evaluation (Revised, per March 14 TAC recommendations)</p> <p>NOTE: <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"> • Application + Supplemental Materials East Nevada Street Project • Application Washington Street Project • Supplemental Materials Washington Street Project 	
<i>Action Requested</i>	Forward recommendation on project substitution to the Policy Committee.	

Discussion Items		
7	Public Comment	Chair
Regular Updates		
8	Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects	TAC Members
<i>Attachment</i>	#4 Tracking Spreadsheet for Currently Active RVMPO Projects	
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, May 9, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next regularly scheduled RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, April 24, at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, May 15, 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
March 14, 2018**



The following attended:

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Alex Georgevitch	Medford	774-2114
Charles Bennett for Craig Anderson	Jackson County	774-6115
Jon Sullivan	RVTD	608-2448
Josh LeBombard	DLCD	414-7932
Karl Johnson	Ashland	488-5587
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 West	RVTD	608-2429
Ray DiPasquale	Phoenix	535-2226
Tom Humphrey	Central Point	423-1025
Alternate Voting Members Present	Organization	Phone Number
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Stephanie Thune	RVCOG	423-1368

Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
James A. Herndon	RVMPO PAC	840-0741
Mike Montero	Montero & Associates	944-4376
Scott Fleury	Ashland	488-5347
Spike Breon	Ashland	512-5844

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

Full meeting recording: [170314 RVMPO TAC Meeting Audio](#)

Specific items are hyperlinked below.

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00 – 01:09

1:34 | *Quorum*: Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, RVTD

2. [Review / Approve Minutes](#) 01:10 – 01:53

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

01:26 | Tom Humphrey moved to approve the February 14 RVMPO TAC meeting minutes as presented. Alex Georgevitch seconded.

There was no further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

3. Public Comment 01:54 – 02:04

Action Items

4. [2018-2021 Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\) Amendment](#) 02:05 – 03:51

Ryan MacLaren reported that the 2018-2021 RVMPO TIP needs to be amended to adjust the following project:

- I-5 over Crowson Road north and southbound bridges (KN21228)
Description: “*Structural overlays.*”

The construction cost for the project (a fix-it overlay is being added) has been increased by \$417,000, which triggers a full TIP amendment.

03:15 | Alex Georgevitch moved that the TAC Committee recommend approval to the Policy Committee of the proposed amendment to the 2018-2021 TIP as presented. Matt Samitore seconded.

There was no further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

5. Project Substitution for the Nevada Street Bridge 03:52 – 58:39

Scott Fleury gave a [PowerPoint presentation](#) detailing the proposed project substitution of *Washington Street Extension to Tolman Creek Road* for the canceled *East Nevada Street Extension* project.

Highlights:

- The proposed substitute is a high priority roadway project in Ashland’s TSP and includes infrastructure, underground utilities, sidewalk/multi-use path connections and a connection to cross Hamilton Creek with a fish-friendly culvert design. The connection would play a key role in future access to 67 acres of developable employment/commercial land, which comprises about 75% of such land remaining in Ashland.
 - The project began in 2012 at the culmination of Ashland’s TSP development, with the City knowing that ODOT and the IAMP for Exit 14 would eventually require a median and access management along Ashland Street, which would restrict left-hand turn movements out of Washington Street.
 - The right-of-way has already been purchased, so the project should be ready to bid Fall 2018 to Spring 2019.
 - The site master plan of the property owner from whom the right-of-way was purchased was approved in 2015 by the Planning Department and allows specific truck movements around the property owner’s facility to accommodate future development.
 - Sidewalk is designed for both sides of the project. The west side is fully connected; the east side, however, is only partially connected, since portions had to be eliminated from the midway point due to truck ingress/egress issues.
 - Riparian restoration will occur on Hamilton Creek due to the mitigation requirements for building in the restoration zone.
- Currently there is no direct funding allocated for the project; without MPO funds, Ashland would need to go the route of bonding/debt service. The total project budget estimate is \$1.59 million dollars, with the reallocation request from the original project at \$1.5 million.
 - *Clarification of budget/funding request from ensuing discussion:* The actual funding request will be 89.73% of approximately \$1.25 million, based on the following:
 - Total project cost is \$1.59 million, with \$339,000 already having been spent on 1) design (currently at 60%) and 2) the right-of-way purchase. However, because that \$339,000 was spent prior to an IGA/contract being in place for the project, it cannot count towards the City’s 10.27% local match requirement. Therefore, only roughly \$1.25 million of the total project cost remains eligible for funding with the 89.73% federal funds / 10.27% local match arrangement.
- The Transportation Planning Commission and Ashland City Council both support the project.

General inquiries/suggestions/concerns:

- **Is this project eligible for STBG funds given ODOT’s classification of the specified roadway? Ashland’s TSP identifies the roadway as a “planned neighborhood collector,” but it was speculated that the federal classification might be “local street.”*

Post meeting note: The federal classification is “urban collector,” making the proposed project eligible for STBG funding.

- **Analysis of the project’s direct correlation to the forecasted reduction of crashes should be provided to the TAC to assist in accurate scoring of the “safety” aspect of the project.*

- *Budget figure adjustments should be provided in light of the clarification above, specifying that Ashland is requesting funding for 89.73% of the remaining project cost of approximately \$1.25 million.
- *The date of the end of the three-year eligibility window from the initial project's programming date needs to be provided by staff to ensure that sufficient time exists for the proposed substitute project to be completed.
- Spike Breon, an Ashland citizen, wished to propose a Bicycle/Emergency Vehicle Bridge as an alternate to the East Nevada Street Bridge project. He was thanked for his interest, but informed that the MPO committees have no authority to recommend projects to the City of Ashland.

Scoring-related comments:

- The current assigned scores for “*Support Alt Meas. 1: Increase transit, bike, ped mode share*” and “*Support Alt Meas. 3: Increase bike facilities*” warrant further discussion, with general consensus supporting a reduction of the scores – possibly to “1” – in those areas.
- “*Efforts exceeding requirement to benefit natural environment*” scored as a “2” (higher than the original project's score of “1”) due to the mitigation efforts involved with the riparian restoration at Hamilton Creek.
- “*Reduce reliance on motor vehicle of single-occupant vehicle*” seems to be scored a bit high at “2.”

Action on this item was tabled pending clarification of the asterisked (*) items above.

6. RVMPO TAC Bylaws Update(s) 58:40 – 01:01:42

Between the TAC's February 14 and March 14 meetings, minor language and/or formatting changes were proposed to *Article II(a)* and *(b)*; *Article III, Section 1*; and *Article VI, Section 1(c)* of the TAC Bylaws. A [track changes document](#) was provided, specifying the revisions.

01:01:02 | Alex Georgevitch moved to approve the proposed revisions to the RVMPO TAC's Bylaws. Paige West seconded.

There was no further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Presentations

7. Proposed Project Streamlining 01:01:43 – 01:21:17

Karl Welzenbach [presented](#) an idea regarding GIS-based project streamlining for the MPO that could potentially be implemented at a planning level as the RVMPO develops/updates its Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The goal of the streamlining effort would be to pre-identify issues (e.g. through SHPO, DEQ and other agencies) with projects before they are submitted for MPO funding consideration. Welzenbach will be presenting the idea to all MPO committees over the coming month as well as to the OMPOC members in April to elicit feedback to inform next steps.

The following observations/concerns were noted:

- The Natural Resources department of RVMCOG provided a GIS platform like this previously, so coordinating with them is recommended to avoid redundancy and/or facilitate data-sharing (i.e. if project information has been retained/maintained to-date in the Natural Resources platform, that data could be pre-loaded into this separate MPO effort).

- Since each jurisdiction’s comprehensive plans already require research into potential SHPO, DEQ and other agency issues, and since much of the desired data from the agencies is already publicly available, concern was expressed that these agencies may balk at committing to entering their comments via this separate platform, especially at what would essentially be a “concept” or “pre-planning” phase of the projects.
- Even if the agencies entered initial data in the platform, the likelihood of them regularly reviewing/updating the comments as the projects progressed seems doubtful; finding some way to hold the agencies accountable to providing timely information would be necessary.
- If OSU hosts the platform, it is likely that ODOT would have to agree to pay.

As a result of the discussion, Welzenbach will research the existence of a similar platform through the Natural Resources department of RVCOG, and determine whether the information being sought from the agencies is already publicly available.

Discussion Items

8. RVMPO UPWP | FY2018-2019 01:21:18 – 01:25:04

Welzenbach reviewed highlights of minor changes to the categorization of line items contained in the [Draft RVMPO UPWP FY2018-2019](#). No changes in funding amounts were made since the previous TAC review of the draft UPWP at their February 14 meeting.

Any further comments should be emailed to kwelzenbach@rvcog.org prior to the TAC’s April 11 meeting. At that time, a recommendation for approval of the RVMPO UPWP FY2018-2019 to the Policy Committee will be sought as adoption of the document is required in April.

9. Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan (RVATP) 01:25:05 – 01:35:42

Chair Kuntz explained that, several years ago, Jackson County received an STBG grant through the RVMPO to prepare an Active Transportation Plan (ATP) for the RVMPO region, which will be referred to from now on as the Rogue Valley ATP (RVATP). Negotiations regarding the scope and fee of the project are now underway with Kittelson & Associates, Inc., the selected consultant. Ultimately, the RVATP will be adopted by the RVMPO Policy Committee to be referenced for the development of future Transportation System Plans (TSPs) and Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs).

The next step in the plan process is to assemble a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to provide input and expertise as the plan develops. It is anticipated that both committees will meet approximately quarterly (i.e. 4 – 5 times) with two-hour meetings over the forecasted project timeline of May/June 2018 through December 2019.

Discussion outcomes included:

- A new TAC will be assembled (not a direct subset of the RVMPO TAC) and will meet at a different time than the RVMPO TAC.
 - Chair Kuntz will prepare a memo to be forwarded by RVCOG staff to all RVMPO TAC members, requesting that the memo be circulated among the members of their jurisdictions whom they feel best qualified to serve on the RVATP TAC. The following participant recommendations were made:
 - *Medford* | Karl McNair
 - *RVTD* | Edem Gomez

- For the CAC, it is hoped that at least one member of each Rogue Valley community will participate. One member of the Jackson County Bicycle Committee has already volunteered and Chair Kuntz will seek additional volunteers from the RVMPO PAC as well as from the Jackson County Road Advisory Committee.
 - It is requested that RVMPO TAC members contact Chair Kuntz with contact information for the various committees in their communities that may have members interested in volunteering for the CAC.
 - It was recommended that certain target groups, e.g. ADA, also be approached in the search for CAC volunteers. Locally, the Handicap Awareness and Support League (HASL) may be able to provide one or more volunteers with an ADA focus.

10. Public Comment 01:35:43 – 01:35:51

Regular Updates

11. Updates on Currently Active RVMPO Projects 01:35:52 – 01:42:40

The spreadsheet of funded projects was reviewed; all jurisdictions present provided updates, which will be incorporated and made available for April's meeting.

12. MPO Planning Update 01:42:41 – 01:51:35

- Welzenbach will be recommending that the MPO simply adopt the state's target measures for the "Performance of the Interstate System and the Remainder of the NHS" and the "Freight Movement on the Interstate System" Performance Measures, which will need to be adopted in October 2018.
 - According to Welzenbach, the "level of travel time reliability" analysis used for the measures, which evaluates the reliability of given road segments, directly conflicts with the goals of the "Traffic Congestion" Performance Measure.
- The "On-road Mobile Source Emissions (through CMAQ)" Performance Measure will need to be adopted in October 2018. Since RVMPO CMAQ funding was cut in half, Welzenbach will be recommending that the MPO adopt only half of the state's target amounts.
 - An issue of note with this measure is that the MPO is being asked to set targets for it with no data available. Only one monitor exists in Medford, with no data collected since 2009.
 - Alex Georgevitch contributed that models are used; Welzenbach expressed doubt regarding the models' accuracy given the lack of access to any data the state uses to develop them.

13. Other Business / Local Business 01:51:36 – 01:51:41

14. Adjournment 01:51:42 – 01:51:50

3:26 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

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

RVMPO TAC | April 5, 2018 | 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: April 4, 2018
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 amendment (s) described below and on the following pages. The Policy Committee will hold a public hearing at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 24, 2018 to consider adoption of the proposed RTP/TIP amendments. The 21-day public comment period and public hearing will be advertised on or before April 2nd in the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. Information on the new project is enumerated, below:

A. Add New Project to RTP & TIP: Southern Oregon Seismic Triage (KN 21296)
 Description: Perform seismic upgrades on 17 bridges and 7 hillside slopes.

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	
Southern Oregon Seismic Triage	Perform seismic upgrades on 17 bridges and 7 hillside slopes.	511	Exempt - Table 2, Safety	21296	FFY2018	Design	\$ 2,243,250	HB2017	\$ 256,750	ODOT	\$ 2,500,000			\$ 2,500,000
				21296	FFY2018	Land Purchase	\$ 89,730	HB2017	\$ 10,270	ODOT	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000	
				21296	FFY2019	Utility Relocate	\$ 89,730	HB2017	\$ 10,270	ODOT	\$ 100,000		\$ 100,000	
				21296	FFY2020	Construction	\$ 28,982,790	HB2017	\$ 3,317,210	ODOT	\$ 32,300,000		\$ 32,300,000	
						Other								
				Total FFY18-21			\$ 31,405,500		\$ 3,594,500		\$ 35,000,000			\$ 35,000,000

RVMP0 Evaluation Measures – Goals and Project Funding Criteria

Attachment 3
(Agenda Item 6)
Items in red will be part of CMAQ funding evaluation unless specifically disqualified (adds capacity, maintains existing facility/service)

RVMP0 Goal	2013-2034 RTP Goal	MPO Requirements (23 CFR, Part 450.306)	Evaluation Criteria	How Measured
1. Mobility	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 2. Congestion relief/reduce delay 3. Promote connectivity (ex. more direct travel, network infill)	Describe safety problem, and how project would reduce number and severity of crashes. (If project demonstrates air quality benefit it will be evaluated for CMAQ.) Level of Service Improvement: (if 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.) Describe connectivity feature. If project reduces VMT, it could help the region meet greenhouse emission requirements.
	Optimize safety and security of the transportation system.	Increase accessibility and mobility Increase safety of the transportation system. Increase security of the transportation system.	4. Population # served (ADT, pop/jobs w/in 1/2-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. Start with estimate population & employment using RVMP0 model data. Numbers generated will be used to estimate VMT reduction and air quality benefit.
2. Community Vitality & Livability	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) 2. Support Alternative Measure 2: Improve transit accessibility 3. Support Alternative Measure 5: Increase % housing in Activity Centers Support Alternative Measure 6: Increase % employment in Activity Centers. 4. Benefit to freight movement, commercial traffic	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? 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 win 1/4 mile buffer of project area Is the project located in an Activity Center? Link to map here. Does the project support, or is it part of, a high-density (at least 10-units/acre for housing) area? Describe the relationship.
	Use transportation investments to foster economic opportunities.	Support economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.		Describe the benefit to movement of commercial vehicles. (If project reduces truck VMT or emissions – esp. pre 1985 trucks – project will be evaluated for CMAQ.) Does the project reduce SOV use; what elements of project contribute?
3. Transportation Options	Use incentives and other strategies to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.		1. Encourage/support SOV reduction; Reduce auto dependence 2. Support Alternative Measure 1: increase transit, bike, ped mode share 3. Support Alternative Measure 3: increase bike facilities 4. Support Alternative Measure 4: increase sidewalks on collectors, arterials in Activity Centers	Describe how the project will increase use of alternative modes. Provide total length of bicycle facility, service to/within between Activity Centers, and/or describe other improvement. Provide total length of qualifying sidewalks/paths.
	Increase integration and availability of transportation options.		1. Address/mitigate environmental impacts 2. Air quality benefit, long term including NOX and VOC. 3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (CO2) 4. Use emerging/new technology 5. Preserves existing transportation asset	Describe project's benefit to natural environment. Does project include conservation features (ex. permeable surface). 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. 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.) Describe technology to be incorporated into project. How does the project extend the life of facility without the construction of new facilities? Does the project refurbish existing facility? (If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.)
4. Resource Conservation	Encourage use of cost-effective emerging technologies to achieve regional transportation goals	Promote efficient use of transportation infrastructure for all users and modes.	6. Reduce VMT 7. Improve system efficiency 8. Lifespan 9. Other public, private funding sources (leverage)	Reduction formula based on project type Describe efficiency. Facility able to handle greater ADT without expansion; improve other transportation function with smaller investment, reduced operational costs; other? 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 List overmatch, other funds
	Incorporate environmental and energy conservation into the RVMP0 planning process	Emphasize the preservation of the existing transportation system.		How does the project extend the life of facility without the construction of new facilities? Does the project refurbish existing facility? (If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.) Reduction formula based on project type Describe efficiency. Facility able to handle greater ADT without expansion; improve other transportation function with smaller investment, reduced operational costs; other? 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 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/eac/committees/lowcarbon.htm>)



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 PM₁₀ emissions based on assuming a trip distance reduction and a mode shift. The analysis will examine reductions in PM₁₀. PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ Production Rate = 0.00117 kg/mile (RVMPO AQCD 2017-2042 RTP, Page 29, Table 14)
6. Days of use = 365

PM₁₀ Analysis

Daily Paved Road PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ 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
PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ emissions based on assuming a trip distance reduction and a mode shift. The analysis will examine reductions in PM₁₀. PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ Production Rate = 0.00117 kg/mile (RVMPO AQCD 2017-2042 RTP, Page 29, Table 14)
6. Days of use = 365

PM₁₀ Analysis

Daily Paved Road PM₁₀ 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 PM₁₀ 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
PM₁₀ Annual Reduction = (0.9224 kg/day*365 days) = 336.676 kg

Ongoing RVMPO¹Projects 03-14-18

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		Substitute project is being presented to the RVMPO for consideration.
				D		
				LP		
				UR		
				CN		
				OT		
Eagle Point	E. Main St./Stevens Rd. Improvements	15-18	16,17,18	PL	2	The Design Acceptance Package (preliminary plans and estimate) were completed August 2017 by OBEC Consultant Engineers. The joint DSJ/ACOE permit application was completed for the roadside ditches. Right of Way amendment was approved by DOJ. Design is continuing for Advance Plans date of March 2018. Advertising currently scheduled in 2018, pending right of way resolution.
				D	1	
				LP	1	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Rogue Valley Active Transportation Plan	15-18	16	PL	1	Negotiating scope and fee to get the project moving forward.
				D	0	
				LP	0	
				UR	0	
				CN	0	
				OT	0	
Jackson County	Table Rock Rd.	15-18	16,18	PL	3	Construction has begun, mostly at night. Medford water and RVSS are installing new facilities south of Airport.
				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 RVMPO¹Projects 03-14-18

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