



Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2024

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Join In-Person

Location: Lewis Conference Room
 RVCOG, 155 N 1st Street,
 Central Point

Transit: Served by RVTD Route #40

Contact: RVCOG: 541-423-1375

Website: www.rvmppo.org

Or via Zoom

Meeting ID: 876 0096 3358

Phone #: +1 253 215 8782

Zoom Link:
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87600963358>

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT RVCOG, 541-664-6674. 48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE IS PREFERABLE, AND WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda

Chair

Consent Agenda

2. Review / Approve Minutes

Chair

Attachment: [#1 RVMPO TAC Meeting Draft Minutes 05/08/2024](#)

Action Items

3. Amendment to the 2024-27 TIP

Ryan MacLaren

Background: The TAC is being asked to review of amendments to the 2024–2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to include the following project(s):

- Adjust Project in TIP: *RVTD-Transit operations (5307) FY2024 (KN22685)*
- Add Project to TIP: *Alternatives design for a connecting facility to connect Hwy 99 to the Bear Creek shared-use path. (KN 21197)*

The 21-day public comment period and public hearing was advertised on or before Monday, June 3, 2024 in the *Rogue Valley Times*, and information is currently available on the RVMPO website.

Attachment: [#2 TIP Amendments](#)

Action Requested: *Recommendation of Approval*

4. Policy on Project Substitution

Ryan MacLaren

Background: Several suggestions were made at the last meeting and staff attempted to incorporate those suggestions into a revised policy. Attached is the revised document which includes all modifications to the original.



Attachment: [#3 Updated Policy](#)

Action Requested: *Deliberation and possible recommendations*

5. Project Selection Criteria, Gas Tax Distribution, and Project Funding Status **Ryan MacLaren**

Background: With the changes in the type of funding that will now be used (state gas tax revenues), staff suggest that the TAC review and modify the current project selection criteria. Previously, this MPO has pursued projects that meet the goals of the MPO as well as the federal requirements for their eligibility. For state gas tax funds, the federal requirements no longer apply.

[#4 Current Evaluation Criteria](#)

Attachments: [#5 Status on Projects Funded in the 2024 – 2027 Cycle Memo](#)
[#6 Allocation of Gas Tax by Population](#)

Action Requested: *Deliberation and possible recommendations*

6. Rollover Funds **Ryan MacLaren**

Background: The RVMPO has lapsing funds total of \$3,304,813 that will have to be obligated by December 2024.

Action Requested: *Deliberation and possible recommendations*

Discussion Items

7. Greenhouse Gas Performance Measure **Ryan MacLaren**

Background: Update on the status of the Federal GHG Performance Measure (PM) that the RVMPO anticipated adopting this year to comply with USDOT Performance Measures requirements.

Attachment: [#7 TAC Memo](#)

8. Public Participation Plan **Dan Moore**

Background: The policies and practices described in the Public Participation Plan recognize the need for robust public involvement at all stages of regional transportation planning. The plan is intended to encourage, facilitate, and follow through on public comments, concerns, and suggestions by establishing procedures for providing full public access to information and decisions, timely public notices, and early and continuing public involvement in plan development.

Link: [Draft PPP](#)

9. Public Comment **Chair**

Regular Updates

10. RVMPO Update **Ryan MacLaren**



AGENDA
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

11. Other Business / Local Business

Chair

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects

12. Adjournment

Chair

Scheduled Meetings		
RVMPO TAC	July 10, 2024	1:30 p.m.
RVMPO PAC	June 18, 2024	5:30 p.m.
RVMPO Policy Meeting	June 25, 2024	2:00 p.m.

All meetings are available in-person and online via Zoom unless otherwise noted.



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
 Technical Advisory Committee

Date: Wednesday, May 8, 2024

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Matt Samitore	Central Point PW	664-3321 x205
Mike Upston	Eagle Point PL	826-4212
Alex Georgevitch, Chair	Medford PW	774-2114
Zac Moody	Phoenix PL	535-2050
Charles Bennett	Jackson County PL	774-6115
Justin Shoemaker	ODOT	774-6376
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	774-6399
Paige West	RVTD	608-4249
Sean Eisma	RVTD	779-5821

Alternate Members	Organization	Phone Number
Colton Minton	Jackson County	

Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Kelsey Sharp	RVCOG	423-1375
Yazeed Alrashdi	RVCOG	423-1378
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1393

Interested Parties	Organization
Tonia Moro	RVTD
Steve Lambert	Jackson County
Mike Montero	PAC
Eleanor Ponomareff	Talent

RVMPO TAC Minutes – Wednesday, May 8, 2024

[Agenda Packet](#)

[Meeting Audio Part 1 & Part 2](#)

1. Call to Order at 1:30 / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00 – 00:53

Quorum: Central Point, Eagle Point, Medford, Phoenix, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD

2. Review / Approve Minutes 00:53 – 01:36

- 01:00** Ian Horlacher moved to approve the April 10, 2024, RVMPO TAC Meeting Minutes as presented. Seconded by Charles Bennett.
 No further discussion.
 Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.



Action Items

3. RTP Goals and Policies 02:02 – 39:13

- 05:20** Comment from Ian Horlacher: *Goal 7-5 could be re-worded to be more consistent with the rest. Instead of "Consult with" add "Coordinate and support with."*
- 12:42** Questions from Paige West: *Are the Performance Indicators being tracked by the MPO? Will the TAC be presented with this data?*
This has not been done in the past.
- 25:04** Mike Upston moved to recommend approval of the RTP Goals and Policies as presented. Seconded by Ian Horlacher.
Friendly amendment proposed by Ian Horlacher to add the suggested changes to Goal 7-5. Seconded by Mike Upston.
Comment by Zac Moody.
Friendly amendment passed unanimously by voice vote.
Comments from Paige West: *Add 'Potential' in front of 'Performance Indicators' to provide clarity.*
Friendly amendment proposed by Paige West to add 'Potential' in front of 'Performance Indicators.' Seconded by Zac Moody.
Comment by Charles Bennett.
Friendly amendment passed by voice vote with 2 against.
Motion passed by voice vote 3 against.

4. Policy on Project Substitution 39:13 – End of first recording

- 40:18** Questions from Jackson County: *What is the exact amount of Gas Tax being discussed? As this document is currently written, it seems like an unfair scoring process for the project being substituted. The substitution should be scored against all projects.*
The exact numbers can be brought next meeting. So far, all discussion has been using round numbers. The Policy Committee has directed the TAC and a Subcommittee to discuss pros and cons of multiple ways to allocate future funds, and future allocation of funds to RVTD.
- 1:12:30** Ian Horlacher moved to table the item until next RVMPO TAC meeting and re-open the document online for further comment. Seconded by Colton Minton.
No further discussions.
Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

5. Project Selection Criteria and Gas Tax Distribution Beginning of second recording – 39:20

- 38:45** Ian Horlacher moved to table the item until next RVMPO TAC meeting. Seconded by Colton Minton.



SUMMARY MINUTES
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

No further discussions.
Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Items

6. Greenhouse Gas Performance Measure

Item will be brought next meeting for discussion.

7. Ride the Rogue

Item will be brought next meeting for discussion.

8. Public Comment 39:20 – 43:55

Comments provided by Eleanor Ponomareff.

Regular Updates

9. MPO Planning Update 43:55 – 44:50

Update provided by Dan Moore regarding Staffing Updates, and RTP update.

10. Other Business / Local Business 44:50 – 49:27

Updates from ODOT and Jackson County.

11. Adjournment

3:34 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings		
RVMPO TAC	June 6, 2024	1:30 p.m.
RVMPO PAC	May 21, 2024	5:30 p.m.
RVMPO Policy Meeting	May 28, 2024	2:00 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: June 3, 2024
 TO: RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee
 FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Planning Program Director
 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 Wednesday, June 25, 2024 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 June 3rd to the Rogue Valley Times and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. Information on the projects is enumerated, below:

A. Adjust Project in TIP: RVTD-Transit operations (5307) FY2024 (KN22685)

Description: Increase award in TIP/STIP.

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	
RVTD														
RVTD-Transit operations (5307) FY2024	Funding for transit operating expenses to promote the use of alternative forms of transportation.	n/a	Exempt (40 CFR § 93.126 Table 2) - Mass Transit			Planning					\$ -			\$ -
						Design				\$ -			\$ -	
						Land Purchase				\$ -			\$ -	
						Utility Relocate				\$ -			\$ -	
						Construction				\$ -			\$ -	
				22685	2024	Other	\$ 4,611,364	5307	\$ 4,611,364	Local	\$ 9,222,728		\$ 9,222,728	
	Total FFY24-27		\$ 4,611,364		\$ 4,611,364		\$ 9,222,728	\$ -	\$ 9,222,728					

B. Add Project to TIP: *Alternatives design for a connecting facility to connect Hwy 99 to the Bear Creek shared-use path. (KN 21197)*

Description: Connecting Hwy 99 to the shared multi-use path.

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															
Alternatives design for a connecting facility to connect Hwy 99 to the Bear Creek shared-use path.	Connecting Hwy 99 to the shared multi-use path	n/a	Exempt (40 CFR § 93.126 Table 2) - Bike Ped	21197	2024	Planning	\$ 560,813	STBG IJA	\$ 64,187	ODOT	\$ 625,000			\$ 625,000	
						Design					\$ -			\$ -	
						Land Purchase						\$ -			\$ -
						Utility Relocate						\$ -			\$ -
						Construction						\$ -			\$ -
						Other						\$ -			\$ -
						Total FFY24-27				\$ 560,813		\$ 64,187		\$ 625,000	\$ -



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

~~September-June 264, 2017~~2024

RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds ~~(Surface Transportation Block Grant and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)~~ and State Gas Tax Funds hereafter called “funds”.

~~(Surface Transportation Program Block Grant and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)~~

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

1. RVMPO Policy Committee makes all final planning and programming decisions regarding ~~STBGP and CMAQ~~ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project and must be spent on that project.
- ~~2. When jurisdictions are awarded state gas tax funds, they will have up to 24 months to begin a project. Any jurisdiction that has not begun a significant part of the project for which the funds are awarded after 24 months may not request a substitution and must return the funds that had been programmed.~~
- ~~3. Funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:~~
- ~~4.~~
 - a. ~~When jurisdictions are awarded state gas tax funds, or CMAQ funds they will have up to 24 months to begin the project. “Begin the project is defined as follows: RVMPO member jurisdictions~~
 - For recipients of state gas tax funds “begin a project” is defined as commencing Preliminary Engineering (PE)
 - For recipients of federal funds (CMAQ or STBG) “begin a project” is defined as having signed an Inter-governmental Agreement (IGA) with the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) for surface transportation projects or having signed a contract with a consulting firm, contractor, and/or manufacturer for transit projects.
3. ~~When federal grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO for re-allocation.~~
 - a. ~~When a jurisdiction determines it will not implement a project, it may offer a substitute project(s). Both the currently programmed and its substitute project(s) will be evaluated according to current RVMPO evaluation process. The Policy Committee will consider the~~

evaluation of the substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:

- Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
- Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.

4. Should a jurisdiction which is a recipient of state gas tax funds fail to begin a project within 24 months of authorization by the RVMPO, then it is incumbent upon that jurisdiction to refund the funds in full, back to the RVMPO. Failure to do so will result in that jurisdiction being ineligible for project funding application through the RVMPO process until such times as the full amount of funds are reimbursed.

5. When a project cannot be implemented for reasons beyond the recipient jurisdiction's control (generally but not limited to when Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration finds an awarded project in-eligible) recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final determination to submit a substitute project for consideration. Both the currently programmed and its substitute project will be scored according to current RVMPO evaluation process. The Policy Committee will consider evaluation of substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:

- a. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
- b. Funds should go back to the MPO for re-allocation.
- c. For recipients that are not RVMPO members, all federal funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO for re-allocation.

6. Priority for available funds will be given to funded projects that need additional funding for completion. Should funding still be available and if all programmed projects have been fully funded, then prioritization may be given to those projects that were submitted through the application process but were not selected for funding.

~~b. They will have up to 24 months to begin a project. Any jurisdiction that has not begun a significant part of the project for which the funds are awarded after 24 months may not request a substitution and must return the funds that had been programmed to the RVMPO. When RVMPO grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.~~

- ~~• And a project is completed and RVMPO grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation. When a jurisdiction determines it will not implement a project, it may offer a substitute project(s). Both the currently programmed and its substitute project(s) will be evaluated according to current RVMPO evaluation process. The Policy Committee will consider the evaluation of the substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy Committee will decide whether:~~

- ~~(1) Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or~~
- ~~(2) Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.~~

- ~~• When a project cannot be implemented for reasons beyond the recipient jurisdiction's control (generally but not limited to when Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration finds an awarded project in-eligible) recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final determination to submit a substitute project for~~

~~consideration. Both the currently programmed and its substitute project will be scored according to current RVMPO evaluation process. The Policy Committee will consider evaluation of substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. The Policy~~

Committee will decide whether:

- (1) ~~Funds should be awarded to the substitute project, or~~
- (2) ~~Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.~~

e. ~~Recipients that are not RVMPO members~~

- ~~All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.~~

~~— Funds that are returned per section 3a. Shall be utilized as follows:~~

- 5. ~~Priority for available funds will be given to currently funded projects that need additional funding for completion at the discretion of the Policy Committee.~~
- 6. ~~Should funding still be available and if all programmed projects have been fully funded then prioritization may be given to those projects that were submitted through the application process but were not selected for funding.~~

Formatted

RVMPO Evaluation Measures – Goals and Project Funding Criteria

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

As discussed at Feb 28 meeting subcommittee meetings

	RVMPO Goal	2021-2045 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	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.)
				2. Congestion relief/reduce delay	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.)
		Optimize safety and security of the transportation system.	Increase accessibility and mobility.	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.
			Increase safety 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. Staff will estimate population & employment using RVMPO model data. Numbers generated will be used to estimate VMT reduction and air quality benefit.
2: Community Vitality & Livability	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	Does the project promote alternate modes of transportation and/or promote transit improvements on or near an existing/planned transit route?
		Use transportation investments to foster economic opportunities.	Support economic vitality especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity and efficiency.	Support Alternative Measures 5 and 6: Is project in or near an Activity Center	Is the project located in an Activity Center?. Assign point based on proximity to an Activity Center.
				3. Benefit to freight movement, commercial traffic	Describe the benefit to movement of commercial vehicles. (If project reduces truck VMT or emissions – esp. pre 1986 trucks – project will be evaluated for CMAQ.)
3: Transportation Options	Increase integration and availability of transportation options.	Use incentives and other strategies to reduce reliance on single-occupant vehicles.		1. Encourage/support SOV reduction; Reduce auto dependence	Does the project reduce SOV use; what elements of project contribute?
				2. Support Alternative Measure 1: Is the project included in RVMPO Active Transportation Plan?	Assigns points depending on whether project is an identified route in the RVATP, with special consideration to whether it is identified as a Regional or Connector route and meets the RVATP aspirational LTS thresholds.
				3. Support Alternative Measure 3: increase bike facilities	Provide total length of bicycle facility, service to/within/between Activity Centers, and/or describe other improvement.
				4. Support Alternative Measure 4: increase sidewalks on collectors, arterials in Activity Centers	Provide total length of qualifying sidewalks/paths.
4: Resource Conservation	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).
				2. Air quality benefit, long term including NOX and VOC.	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.
				3. Reduce greenhouse gas emissions (CO) ₁	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? (If facility is transit, bike or pedestrian it will be considered for CMAQ evaluation.)
				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/air/committees/lowcarbon.htm>).



**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 3, 2024
TO: Technical Advisory Committee
FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Planning Program Director
SUBJECT: Status on Projects Funded in the 2024 – 2027 Cycle

The purpose of this memo is to explain how the funding of selected projects looks like now that we have switch from STBG to State Gas Tax funds.

Table 1 illustrates the programed amount of STBG dollars for the 24-27 projects.

Table 1				
Federal Funded STBG (Pre Gas Tax)				
	2025	2026	2027	
STBG Pre RVTD	\$ 2,689,293	\$ 2,735,710	\$ 2,735,710	
After RVTD	\$ 1,989,293	\$ 2,035,710	\$ 2,035,710	

Table 2 illustrates what the MPO actually received in State Gas Tax funds.

Table 2				
Gas Tax Allocation				
	2025	2026	2027	
GAS TAX PRE	\$ 2,177,849	\$ 2,177,849	\$ 2,177,849	
After RVTD	\$ 1,477,849	\$ 1,477,849	\$ 1,477,849	

Table 3 illustrates the deficit from switching to the Gas Tax.

Table 3					
Deficit from Gas Tax					
	2025	2026	2027		
Diff between STBG and Gas Tax	\$ (511,444)	\$ (557,861)	\$ (557,861)	Total	\$ (1,627,166)

Table 4 illustrates the funds being returned to the MPO from the City of Medford projects.

Table 4			
Funds returned from Medford	STBG	\$	1,498,418
(Stevens Street & A-48 Alley)	CMAQ	\$	928,473
	Total	\$	2,426,891

Table 5 illustrates the deficit from the switch being made whole from the returned funds.

Table 5			
	Deficit STBG	\$	(1,627,166)
	Returned STBG	\$	1,498,418
	Total	\$	(128,748)
	CMAQ Surplus Available	\$	928,473
	Replaced Gas Tax for CMAQ	\$	(128,748)
	CMAQ Remaining	\$	799,725

No Carve Out for RVTD

Jurisdiction	Population	% of total population	Funding	
			Distribution by %	of pop
Ashland	21,457	11%	\$	242,115
Central Point	19,666	10%	\$	221,906
Eagle Point	9,955	5%	\$	112,329
Jacksonville	3,197	2%	\$	36,074
Medford	90,887	47%	\$	1,025,544
Phoenix	3,773	2%	\$	42,573
Talent	5,228	3%	\$	58,991
Jackson County	<u>38,845</u>	20%	\$	438,316
	<u>193,008</u>			

**MPO's Annual
Allocation of
State Gas Tax**

\$ 2,177,849

With Carve Out for RVTD

Jurisdiction	Population	% of total population	Funding	
			Distribution by %	of pop
Ashland	21,457	11%	\$	164,295
Central Point	19,666	10%	\$	150,581
Eagle Point	9,955	5%	\$	76,225
Jacksonville	3,197	2%	\$	24,479
Medford	90,887	47%	\$	695,916
Phoenix	3,773	2%	\$	28,890
Talent	5,228	3%	\$	40,030
Jackson County	<u>38,845</u>	20%	\$	297,433
	<u>193,008</u>			

**MPO's Annual
Allocation of
State Gas Tax**

\$ 1,477,849



**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: May 1, 2024
TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Planning Program Director
SUBJECT: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Performance Measure

The purpose of the memo is to update the TAC on the status of the Federal GHG Performance Measure (PM) that the RVMPO anticipated adopting this year to comply with USDOT Performance Measures requirements.

Two separate federal court rulings and a senate vote have effectively halted the Federal GHG Performance Measure under CFR 490 (federal performance measures). ODOT has already reported and set a state target and is no longer pursuing voluntary reporting for MPOs for this cycle.

Again, there is no federal requirement for MPOs to report or set a GHG PM target. However, ODOT supports a national GHG measure and will report the statewide and MPO fuels-based GHG measure annually on their website. ODOT's GHG performance measure report would only be for state and local purposes, not through the Federal PM system that applies to MPOs.

For your information, below is a list of the MPO's current performance measures adopted in 2018. The MPO adopted ODOT's targets for each of the performance measures, which are reported on every 4 to 5 years. <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/performmang/pages/index.aspx>

- Safety performance measures (Fatalities and serious injuries—both number and rate per vehicle mile traveled--on all public roads)
- Transit Asset Management (TAM) established by RVTD.
- Pavement condition on the Interstate System and on remainder of the National Highway System (NHS)
- Performance of the Interstate System and the remainder of the NHS
- Bridge condition on the NHS
- Traffic congestion
- On-road mobile source emissions (through CMAQ)
- Freight movement on the Interstate System