

AGENDA

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization Technical Advisory Committee



Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021

Time: 1:30 p.m.

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

Contact: Office Specialist, RVCOG: 541-423-1375
RVMPO website: www.rvmppo.org

1	Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda	Chair
Consent Agenda		
2	Review / Approve Minutes	Chair
Attachment	#1 RVMPO TAC Meeting Draft Minutes 06/09/2021	
Action Items		
3	Amendments to the 2021–2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	Ryan MacLaren
Background	<p>The TAC is being asked to review the adoption of amendments to the 2021–2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include the following project(s):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• OR99 Glennwood-Colman Creek• OR99: I-5 to Scenic Ave <p>The 21-day public comment period and public hearing was advertised on or before Tuesday, July 1, 2021, in the <i>Medford Mail Tribune</i>, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.</p>	
Attachment	#4 TIP Amendments #5 Additional Information for both projects	
Action Requested	Recommendation of approval to the Policy Committee.	
Discussion Items		

4	Improvements to Project Selection Process	Karl Welzenbach
<i>Background</i>	For the past two TIP cycles this MPO has selected/approved projects that have become problematic for both ODOT and the MPO. This is primarily due to cost estimates that have fallen short of actual project costs.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#6 Memo	
5	Public Comment	Chair
Regular Updates		
6	RVMPPO Planning Update	Karl Welzenbach
7	Other Business / Local Business Opportunity for RVMPPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.	Chair
8	Adjournment	Chair

- The next RVMPPO TAC meeting will be **Wednesday, August 11, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, July 27, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPPO PAC meeting is scheduled for **Tuesday, July 20, 2021, 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
June 9, 2021**



The following attended:

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Johnson	Ashland PW	488-5587
Stephanie Holtey	Central Point PL	
Mike Upston	Eagle Point PL	826-4212
Matt Brinkley	Medford PL	774-2381
Alex Georgevitch, Chair	Medford PW	774-2114
Eric Swanson	Phoenix PL	580-7900
Charles Bennett	Jackson County PL	774-6115
Mike Kuntz	Jackson County R&P	774-6228
Justin Shoemaker	ODOT	774-6376
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	774-6399
Paige West	RVTD PL	608-2429
Josh LeBombard	DLCD (Quorum)	414-7932
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Kelsey Sharp	RVCOG	423-1375
Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
Mike Baker	ODOT	
Tonia Moro	RVTD	
Michael Montero	PAC	

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00–02:09

1:32 p.m. | *Quorum:* Ashland, Central Point, Eagle Point, Phoenix, Medford, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD.

2. Review / Approve Minutes 02:09–03:30

02:31 | *Mike Kuntz moved to approve the May 12, 2021 RVMPO TAC Meeting Minutes as presented. Seconded by Mike Upston.*

No further discussion.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Presentations

3. 24-27 STIP Highway Program 03:30 – 15:51

13:25 | *Question from Karl Welzenbach: When ODOT makes the lists, do they have cost estimate as well?*

Yes, some have been scoped and have estimates from that, and some have planning level estimates.

14:04 | *Question from Karl Welzenbach: Once the scoping is finished and cost estimates are complete, what percentage still show cost overruns or delays? Or is there an estimate of all the projects in district 3 of ODOT have cost overruns?*

This information can be found but is not readily available right now. That would depend on the complexity of the projects. The cost of oil had increased which has raised the cost of projects. Things like this can increase project costs outside of ODOT's control.

Action Items

4. Amendments to the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 15:51 – 22:10

21:00 | *Ian Horlacher moved to recommend approval of the amendments to 2021-2024 TIP. Seconded by Justin Shoemaker.*

No further discussion.

Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Items

5. Improvements to Project Selection Process 22:10 – 01:29:24

There is a need for an improvement in the way projects are selected and how cost estimates are created. It is understood that there are some problems outside of control (price of oil, building materials, etc.) that will change the estimates. However, for many projects this was not the case. The goal of this discussion is to come up with a better method to estimate costs or come up with a

recommendation for a policy that may mitigate some of the less-than accurate estimates. There are a few recommendations for how this can be done: 1. RVMPO works with ODOT and uses their pricing lists. 2. A policy recommendation to the Policy Committee of “Should the MPO approve the project, any cost over is the responsibility of the jurisdiction.”

25:25 | Mike Kuntz: *A big concern is if this policy is passed, then the smaller agencies will not get a chance to use project funds because they cannot afford it. I think there is room to craft a policy close to this and to be better with beginning estimates. Also, there is some disagreement with the beginning estimates being very low. Often, there is an under-estimation of various engineering, permitting, or right-of-way costs. There will be delays in the project process that are out of the jurisdictions control. Perhaps a crafting of a policy about future funding would be appropriate, but not as “harsh” as proposed.*

28:19 | Karl Welzenbach: *Another restriction this MPO is facing is, other than Medford, there is no agency that is certified in design. This means ODOT must do much of the work. Another approach could be to work with ODOT and see how many projects they can reasonably take on and work from there.*

29:01 | Alex Georgevitch: *It is ODOT’s responsibility to manage the Federal Funds they receive. If the MPO has enough funds to build more projects than ODOT can take on, the MPO should not have to hold back and not use the funds. We should not focus on bigger projects that use more funding just to cut down the number of projects because that will be a detriment to the smaller jurisdictions that need the smaller projects.*

There was a brief discussion before the meeting on if the cost goes over the cost estimate than the jurisdiction is responsible for the extra. One concern with this is some jurisdictions do not have complete control over the design process. I am for the jurisdictions being some-what responsible for overrun costs. There have been discussions in the past with concerns of projects running over and the jurisdiction being told if they move forward, they will be responsible for it. However, it does not seem that has been enforced.

Perhaps a policy could include any left over or unallocated funds could go to projects that have come up short in ways that are out of the jurisdictions control.

34:40 | Mike Baker: *The local agency bridge committee uses a very full scoping process that is more in-depth. This process adds around a year, if we were to use something similar it may add four to six months. The time may be worth the more accurate cost estimates.*

36:43 | Karl Welzenbach: *In other MPO’s, there is a pre-scoping arrangement. Jurisdictions did not apply for projects, they applied for an analysis of the project. There are STBG funds set aside with three engineering firms that come up with a cost estimate after analyzing the whole project.*

38:40 | Justin Shoemaker: *The bridge committee in Region 1 would use consultants instead of regional staff. The bridge program uses an equation to get the 150% list. This would be difficult for this MPO.*

41:48 | Alex Georgevitch: *A concern is still that there is only one company certified to scope. It does not seem fair to have the same company to scope and do the work.*

ODOT is re-soliciting contracts. There are currently two companies that have potential to be certified.

45:14 | Alex Georgevitch: *The options presented so far: 1. Suggest to the Policy Committee a policy that any overrun costs are the responsibility of the jurisdiction. 2. Work with ODOT to identify how many projects they can undertake for the MPO.*

51:12 | Karl Welzenbach: *This will exclude Transit for RVTD. It is assumed if they need something like a bus, they will know how much that will cost.*

52:48 | Paige West: *There is the possibility that if we hire out to do estimations there will still be overruns. This does not seem to fix the problem.*

It may not fix the problem, but it may reduce the number of times it arises and the amount of the overrun.

55:44 | Alex Georgevitch: *There will always be a situation where costs will overrun. The discussion of “If we spend the money on scoping and there is still overrun, who is responsible of it” needs to be expanded on.*

One possibility could be if it scoped, and the MPO has agreed to fund the project, the MPO will provide the funds. After that project is funded the MPO will go forward with other projects.

59:37 | Charles Bennet: *One more option could be improving the way each jurisdiction does their scoping, instead of setting aside money for consultants when they only have the information we give them and can only be so accurate.*

01:00:29 | Justin Shoemaker: *In the past, the biggest pieces that have been off are PE and Right-of-Way by large amounts. Construction has been fairly accurate. Jurisdictions are not estimating high enough for the paperwork for the federal.*

01:07:25 | Paige West: *If one part of the project is under funded, is it possible to borrow money from other phases?*

Technically no. Sometimes you can justify with a new estimate for why one part of the project was over funded and why it should be moved. This would require a full amendment of the STIP/TIP.

01:13:45 | Karl Welzenbach: *A memo will be sent out with summaries of the discussion held today with pros and cons of each suggestion.*

01:19:10 | Justin Shoemaker: *The IGA’s say that any overrun costs are the responsibility of the local agency.*

The MPO could also consider adding a “Scoping phase.” Select a project and put funds towards scoping and get a more accurate estimate.

01:24:48 | Paige West: *The option to fund a project until it is finished has a concern with the scoring we use for the projects. There is a cost-based metric used that would potentially not be used. Also, if there are several projects in the planning phase, then one or two projects get funded for the construction phase will have to be started over. There should be consideration with how many projects can be in the planning phase and how we can keep projects moving.*

6. Public Comment 01:29:24 – 01:29:52

No Comments.

Regular Updates

7. MPO Planning Update 01:29:52 – 01:31:28

Provided by Karl Welzenbach regarding the ODOT and FHWA Covid funding.

8. Other Business / Local Business 01:31:28–01:34:59

Updates provided by Jackson County, RVTB and Medford.

9. Adjournment

3:08 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPOTAC | July 14, 2021 | 1:30 p.m.

RVMPOTAC Policy Committee | June 22, 2021 | 2:00 p.m.

RVMPOTAC PAC | June 15, 2021 | 5:30 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: July 2, 2021
TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Senior Planner
SUBJECT: TIP Amendments

The TAC is being asked to make recommendations to the Policy Committee on the proposed TIP amendments described below and on the following pages. The Policy Committee will hold a public hearing at 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 27, 2021 to consider adoption of the proposed TIP amendments. A press release for the 21-day public comment period and public hearing was sent on or before July 2nd to the Medford Tribune, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. Information on the projects is enumerated, below:

A. Adjust Project in TIP: *OR99: Glenwood – Coleman Creek (KN 22384)*

Description: Increase the project estimate by \$12.5M and add a Construction phase, moving funds from project keys 21351 and 21721, adding Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) program funds, and adding \$8M in Fix-It funds, Add OTH Phase, Slip UR to FF22.

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														
OR99: Glenwood - Coleman Creek	Widen road to add sidewalk, bike lane. Update ADA and Pedestrian crossings and transit locations to improve safety.	n/a	Exempt (40 CFR § 93.126 Table 2) - Safety			Planning								\$ -
				22384	2021	Design	\$ 897,300	Fix-It R3	\$ 102,700	ODOT	\$ 1,000,000			\$ 1,000,000
				22384	2021	Land Purchase	\$ 5,832,450	Fix-It R3	\$ 667,550	ODOT	\$ 6,500,000			\$ 6,500,000
				22384	2021	Utility Relocate	\$ 1,525,410	Fix-It R3	\$ 174,590	ODOT	\$ 1,700,000			\$ 1,700,000
				22384	2024	Construction	\$ 897,300	Fix-It R3	\$ 102,700	ODOT	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 4,500,000	ODOT	\$ 5,500,000
				22384	2022	Other	\$ 269,190	Fix-It R3	\$ 30,810	ODOT	\$ 300,000			\$ 300,000
					Total FFY21-24			\$ 9,421,650		\$ 1,078,350		\$ 10,500,000	\$ 4,500,000	

B. Adjust Project in TIP: *OR99: I-5 to Scenic Ave (KN 20185)*

Description: Increase Construction estimate by \$909,000 from Region Savings.

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														
OR99:I-5 to Scenic Ave	Convert 4-Lane Roadway to 3-Lane Roadway with Center Turn Lane, Add Traffic Signal	926	Carried over from 2018-21 conforming TIP. Exempt (40 CFR § 93.126 Table 2)			Planning								\$ -
				20185	2018	Design	\$ 373,000	HSIP			\$ 373,000			\$ 373,000
				20185	2021	Land Purchase	\$ 10,144	HSP	\$ 856	ODOT	\$ 11,000			\$ 11,000
				20185	2022	Utility Relocate	\$ 92,220	HSP	\$ 7,780	ODOT	\$ 100,000			\$ 100,000
				20185	2022	Construction	\$ 3,926,652	HSP	\$ 260,348	ODOT	\$ 4,187,000			\$ 4,187,000
						Other					\$ -			\$ -
					Total FFY21-24		\$ 4,402,016		\$ 268,984		\$ 4,671,000	\$ -		\$ 4,671,000

Status: **Approved**

CMR Transaction

Request Date: 2/24/2021 CMR Number: 22384-P1 Project Lead (TPM/RE-CP): Shoemaker, Justin

Project Name: OR99: Coleman Creek - Glenwood

KN: 22384 Region: 3 Area: Rogue Valley Project Delivery Phase: Project Initiation

Funding Program 1: FIX-IT REGION 3 Program 2: OTHER Program 3: FIX-IT SW SWIP BIKPE

Program 4: FIX-IT SW BIKE/PED Program 5: Program 6:

STIP Amendment: Full Approval Authority: ODOT Director MPO Amendment: ☒ Yes ☐ NoIGA Amendment: ☐ Yes ☒ No A & E Contract Amendment: ☐ Yes ☒ No Reset Baseline Project: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Change 1: Elective Reason 1: 302 Additional budget added

Change 2: Reason 2:

Change 3: Reason 3:

Current Scope: Project will upgrade the road from the north terminus of Coleman Creek culvert to Glenwood Road. It consists of widening the road for sidewalks and bike lanes, building three improved pedestrian crossings and rebuilding six bus stops.

Describe Scope Change: N/A

Justification for Scope Change: N/A

Describe the Risk of not Approving the Scope Change: N/A

	Current Dates	Proposed Dates		Current Dates	Proposed Dates
PE EA Open - 008	2/5/2021		PS&E Submittal - 551	10/16/2023	
PDT Kick-off - 018			Bid Opening - 560	12/14/2023	
Project Initiation Phase Complete - 050			Forecasted 1st Note 735		
DAP Phase Complete - 325	8/16/2021		Forecasted 2nd Note 790		
ROW EA Open - 470	9/15/2021		Forecasted 3rd Note 796		

Describe Schedule Change: This is the initial schedule for planning purposes, which may be slightly adjusted after the completion of the project initiation phase and the zero CMR.

Justification for Schedule Change: N/A

Describe the Risk of not Approving the Schedule Change: N/A

	Phase Total Estimated Cost	Requested Budget	Change
Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0
Preliminary Engineering	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0
Right of Way	\$1,000,000	\$6,500,000	\$5,500,000

Status: **Approved**

CMR Transaction

Request Date: 2/24/2021 CMR Number: 22384-P1 Project Lead (TPM/RE-CP): Shoemaker, Justin

Project Name: OR99: Coleman Creek - Glenwood

KN: 22384 Region: 3 Area: Rogue Valley Project Delivery Phase: Project Initiation

Utility Relocation	\$500,000	\$1,700,000	\$1,200,000
Construction	\$0	\$5,500,000	\$5,500,000
Other	\$0	\$300,000	\$300,000
Total:	\$2,500,000	\$15,000,000	\$12,500,000

Describe Budget Change (Break down the change by Funding Program): Current project was approved by the ODOT Director to start the PE and UT phases (\$2.5M) in anticipation of the OTC's approval of COVID-19 relief funding for the ROW, CN and OT phases (\$1M of the \$2.5M was subsequently administratively amended into the ROW phase after receiving advance acquisition approval from FHWA). The OTC approved \$8M at their Mar 11, 2021 meeting for the project. This request also adds additional funding from STIF (\$1M), SRTS (\$2.1M) and SWIP (\$1.4M) to fully fund all phases of the project for \$15M.

Justification for Budget Change: All phases of the project need to be fully funded. This action will combine previously approved Region 3 funding of \$1M for PE, \$1M for ROW and \$500K for UT work, along with OTC approved funding of \$5.5M for ROW, \$1.2M for UT, \$1M for CN and \$300K for OT. An additional \$4.5M of SRTS (\$2.1M), SWIP (\$1.4M) and STIF (\$1M) will fully fund the CN phase.

Describe the Risk of not Approving the Budget Change: We will not be able to proceed with a fully funded STIP project.

	<u>Signatures</u>	<u>Dates</u>		<u>Signatures</u>	<u>Dates</u>
Funding Program Manager:	Marmon, Jennifer	3/23/2021	Additional Signator:	Baker, Michael	3/24/2021
STIP Coordinator:	Birch, Naomi	3/23/2021	Additional Signator:		
Area Manager:	Anderson, Art	2/24/2021	Additional Signator:		
Project Sponsor:	Anderson, Art	2/24/2021	Additional Signator:		
Tech Center Manager:	Thompson, Mark	3/25/2021	Additional Signator:		
Region Manager:	Neavoll, Darrin	3/25/2021	Additional Signator:		
Additional Signator:	Griffin, Jeremiah	3/16/2021	Additional Signator:		

Status: **Approved**

CMR Transaction

Request Date: 6/2/2021 CMR Number: 20185-01 Project Lead (TPM/RE-CP): Oberlander, Elijah
Project Name: OR99: I-5 to Scenic Ave.
KN: 20185 Region: 3 Area: Rogue Valley Project Delivery Phase: DAP

Funding Program 1: FIX-IT REGION 3 Program 2: LOCAL Program 3:
Program 4: Program 5: Program 6:
STIP Amendment: Admin Approval Authority: None MPO Amendment: ☒ Yes ☐ No
IGA Amendment: ☐ Yes ☒ No A & E Contract Amendment: ☐ Yes ☒ No Reset Baseline Project: ☐ Yes ☒ No

Change 1: Avoidable Reason 1: 302 Additional budget added
Change 2: Reason 2:
Change 3: Reason 3:

Current Scope: Convert the current four lane roadway to a three lane roadway with a continuous two-way left turn lane on OR 99 from MP 0.42 to MP 1.64, install a traffic signal at OR 99/Scenic Avenue intersection.

Describe Scope Change: No Scope Change

Justification for Scope Change: N/A

Describe the Risk of not Approving the Scope Change: N/A

	Current Dates	Proposed Dates		Current Dates	Proposed Dates
PE EA Open - 008	2/12/2019	2/12/2019	PS&E Submittal - 551	7/25/2022	7/25/2022
PDT Kick-off - 018	6/10/2020	6/10/2020	Bid Opening - 560	9/14/2022	9/14/2022
Project Initiation Phase Complete - 050	12/16/2020	12/16/2020	Forecasted 1st Note 735	11/18/2022	11/18/2022
DAP Phase Complete - 325	6/28/2021	6/28/2021	Forecasted 2nd Note 790	9/8/2023	9/8/2023
ROW EA Open - 470	6/28/2021	6/28/2021	Forecasted 3rd Note 796	6/27/2024	6/27/2024

Describe Schedule Change: No Schedule Change

Justification for Schedule Change: N/A

Describe the Risk of not Approving the Schedule Change: N/A

	Phase Total Estimated Cost	Requested Budget	Change
Planning	\$0	\$0	\$0
Preliminary Engineering	\$373,000	\$373,000	\$0
Right of Way	\$11,000	\$11,000	\$0

Status: **Approved**

CMR Transaction

Request Date: 6/2/2021 CMR Number: 20185-01 Project Lead (TPM/RE-CP): Oberlander, Elijah

Project Name: OR99: I-5 to Scenic Ave.

KN: 20185 Region: 3 Area: Rogue Valley Project Delivery Phase: DAP

Utility Relocation	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$0
Construction	\$3,278,000	\$4,187,000	\$909,000
Other	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total:	\$3,762,000	\$4,671,000	\$909,000

Describe Budget Change
(Break down the change by
Funding Program): Adding \$909,000 to the CN PhaseJustification for Budget
Change: DAP Estimate exceeds programmed fundsDescribe the Risk of not
Approving the Budget
Change: The project will not be able to pass the DAP milestone.

	<u>Signatures</u>	<u>Dates</u>		<u>Signatures</u>	<u>Dates</u>
Funding Program Manager:	Carpenter, Jered	6/9/2021	Additional Signator:		
STIP Coordinator:	Birch, Naomi	6/4/2021	Additional Signator:		
Area Manager:	Anderson, Art	6/4/2021	Additional Signator:		
Project Sponsor:	Griffin, Jeremiah	6/3/2021	Additional Signator:		
Tech Center Manager:	Thompson, Mark	6/9/2021	Additional Signator:		
Region Manager:	Neavoll, Darrin	6/9/2021	Additional Signator:		
Additional Signator:			Additional Signator:		



**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: June 17, 2021
TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Karl Welzenbach, Planning Program Manager
SUBJECT: Discussion Regarding Improvements to Project Cost Estimates

At its May meeting, the Policy Committee of the RVMPO directed the TAC to review the current project selection process and criteria with an eye towards improving the cost estimates of projects submitted and approved for the TIP cycle. The discussion at the TAC was quite in depth and quite lively. I want to thank all of the participants especially ODOT's representatives. They provided a good deal of information and insight into ODOT's process for implementing projects once they have been programmed as well as pertinent information on other related approaches.

The discussion begins around minute 22 of the recording. Here is a link to the recording:

https://rvmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/DRAFT-06_09_21-RVMPO-TAC-Audio.mp3

POLICY OPTIONS DISCUSSED:

1. Once projects are selected and approved for the TIP by the policy committee any ensuing cost overruns are the sole responsibility of the sponsoring jurisdiction
2. Work with ODOT to identify how many projects that they feel they can undertake for the MPO over the course of the next TIP
3. Set Aside funding for scoping of project proposals rather than actual project applications
 - a) Adopt Policy stating, with the improved scoping process, a project would remain on the MPOs TIP list until fully funded
4. Do nothing

DISCUSSIONS/PROS AND CONS

Option 1 – Once projects are selected and approved for the TIP by the policy committee any ensuing cost overruns are the sole responsibility of the sponsoring jurisdiction

Pros:

- Would put the onus on the sponsoring jurisdiction and hopefully encourage better scoping of project prior to submitting application for consideration

Cons:

- Concern about negative impact on smaller communities. The thinking was that they were already stretched to apply for the project originally and any additional financial demands would probably result in them withdrawing the project
- Cost overruns are sometimes due to existential circumstances beyond the control of the sponsoring jurisdiction (e.g., increased prices of steel, concrete, or oil)

- Suggestion to “soften the blow” by allowing the sponsoring jurisdiction to come back to the MPO to request more funds

Option 2 – Work with ODOT to identify how many projects that they feel they can undertake for the MPO over the course of the next TIP

Pros:

- Since ODOT would be responsible for delivering the projects anyway, this would allow them to have some control over project costs and cost overruns

Cons:

- Disagreement with proposal since it is ODOT’s responsibility to program projects and manage the federal fund program for the region (including those projects programmed by the MPOs)
- Disagreed with giving the DOT de facto power over the size of the MPOs program for each cycle
- Here again, if MPO coordinates with ODOT and decides on fewer, larger projects this would unduly impact the opportunity for smaller communities since they typically apply for smaller projects

Option 3 - Set Aside funding for scoping of project proposals (would mean setting aside \$100K - \$200K to scope projects applied for by jurisdictions). Scope projects more fully before programming (much like the state’s bridge committee). Jurisdictions would apply to have projects scoped and not the actual projects themselves.

Pros:

- Would benefit the smaller communities by allowing them to have access to a more accurate scoping mechanism
- Would, hopefully, benefit the sponsoring jurisdiction, ODOT, and the MPO by improving project delivery and reducing most cost overruns

Cons:

- Would require the MPO to set aside \$100K - \$200K from each TIP cycle to pay engineering consulting firms for scoping of project proposals
- Might require additional work from ODOT and MPO staff to ensure better coordination with STIP and project bidding cycle
- Might prove difficult to hire engineering consulting firms for scoping process (apparently that would preclude the same firms from bidding on the actual project itself)

Side notes for Option 3 – to ensure stability of projects this option might require an additional policy to “fully fund the selected projects until those projects are complete”. This could require programming funds from the subsequent cycle into existing, yet unfinished, projects.

Option 4 – Do nothing

This option was rejected by the committee.