



|   |   |                        |
|---|---|------------------------|
| <b>5</b>                                | <b>Ashland Chip-Seal Project</b>  | <b>Karl Welzenbach</b> |
| <i>Background</i>                       | This project was originally programmed in the 2018-21 with CMAQ funds. It is anticipated that the number of roads to be covered in chip-seal will be dramatically reduced should the project move forward. The city of Ashland has requested that the CMAQ funds be withdrawn and the difference made up with the COVID relief funds recently allocated to the MPO. |                        |
| <i>Attachment</i>                       | #5   <a href="#">Letter for the City of Ashland</a>   |                        |
| <i>Action Requested</i>                 | Recommendation to the Policy Committee  |                        |
| <b>6</b>                                | <b>Improvements to Project Selection Process</b>  | <b>Karl Welzenbach</b> |
| <i>Background</i>                       | For the past two TAC meetings we have had some excellent discussions regarding the selection process itself, the application format, as well as project cost estimates. I believe we still have a few more issues to nail down including what will be the makeup of the workshop to be held after the next call for projects.                                       |                        |
| <i>Attachment</i>                       | #6   <a href="#">Memo</a>   |                        |
| <i>Action Requested</i>                 | Further discussion and recommendations for the Policy Committee   |                        |
| <b>Regular Updates   Standing Items</b> |   |                        |
| <b>7</b>                                | <b>MPO Planning Update</b>  | <b>Karl Welzenbach</b> |
| <b>8</b>                                | <b>Other Business</b>   | <b>Chair</b>           |
| <b>9</b>                                | <b>Next Meeting</b><br><i>The next PAC meeting is scheduled for September 8, 2021 at 5:30 p.m. at RVCOG.</i>  | <b>Chair</b>           |
| <b>10</b>                               | <b>Adjournment</b>  | <b>Chair</b>           |

- [The next RVMPO PAC meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 8, 2021, at 5:30 p.m. in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.](#)
- The next RVMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Tuesday, August 24, 2021 at 2:00 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.
- The next RVMPO TAC meeting will be **Wednesday, September 8, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.** in the Jefferson Conference Room, RVCOG, Central Point.



**Summary Minutes**  
**Rogue Valley MPO Public Advisory Council**  
*July 20, 2021*

The following attended:

| Involvement Area   | Appointee                  | Phone Number |
|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------|
| Ashland            | Mary Wooding               | 482-1066     |
| Central Point      | Jennifer Boardman          | 630-0387     |
| Central Point      | Larry Martin               | 664-3778     |
| Eagle Point        | Mike Stanek                | 821-1804     |
| Jacksonville       | Ron Holthusen              | 944-5040     |
| Non-voting Members | Appointee                  | Phone Number |
|                    |                            |              |
| Special Interest   | Appointee                  | Phone Number |
| Freight Industry   | Mike Montero, <b>Chair</b> | 779-0771     |
| Public Health      | Michael Polich             | 608-3802     |
| Senior             | Robin Lee                  | 773-7185     |
| Staff              |                            |              |
| RVCOG              | Karl Welzenbach            | 423-1360     |
| RVCOG              | Rayn MacLaren              | 423-1338     |
| RVCOG              | Kelsey Sharp               | 423-1375     |
| Interested Party   |                            |              |
|                    |                            |              |

RVMPO PAC Agenda Packet: [July 20, 2021](#)

Meeting Recordings: [07/20/2021](#)

1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda 00:00 – 01:42

5:30 p.m.

**2. Review / Approve Minutes 01:42 – 02:15**

02:01 | *Mary Wooding motioned to approve the June 15, 2021 meeting minutes as presented. Seconded by Ron Holthusen.*

*No further discussion.*

*Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.*

**3. Public Comment 02:15 – 02:22**

*No Comments*

***Action Items***

**4. Amendment to the 2021-2024 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) 02:22 – 16:49**

13:30 | *Mary Wooding motioned to recommend approval of the OR-99 Glennwood-Coleman Creek Amendment to the 2021-2024 TIP. Seconded by Robin Lee.*

*Further discussion on OR-99 I-5 to Scenic Ave.*

*Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.*

15:57 | *Jennifer Boardman motioned to recommend approval of the OR-99 I-5 to Scenic Ave Amendment to the 2021-2024 TIP. Seconded by Mike Stanek.*

*No further discussion.*

*Motion passed with 7 yes and 1 abstain.*

***Discussion Items***

**5. Improvements to Project Selection Process 16:49 – 45:17**

A memo of this discussion and the Technical Advisory Committee’s discussion will be sent out at a later date.

***Regular Updates***

**6. MPO Planning Update 45:58 – 01:01:20**

*Provided by Karl. Updates on the Covid-19 funding and the joint PAC and TAC meeting in September., and the upcoming OMPOC meeting.*

**7. Other Business 01:01:20 – 01:05:22**

**8. Next Meeting:** *The next PAC meeting is July 20, 2021 at 5:30 p.m.*

**9. Meeting Adjourned**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b><u>Scheduled Meetings:</u></b></p> <p>RVMPO PAC   Tuesday, August 17, 2021 @ 5:30 pm</p> <p>RVMPO TAC   Wednesday, August 11, 2020 @ 1:30 p.m.</p> <p>RVMPO Policy Committee   Tuesday, July 27, 2020 @ 2:00 p.m.</p> |
|---|

## ODOT-FTA-FHWA Amendment Matrix

### REVISED MATRIX

Program & Funding Services staff met with FHWA and FTA to revise the amendment matrix. Here are the major changes to the [ODOT-FTA-FHWA amendment matrix](#):

1. Clarifications in the text;
2. **Cancelling** a project is now an **administrative** amendment (used to be a full amendment);
3. The mile point was modified from a + or - **.25 change** to a **1 mile increase** in the project location (*see examples below*); and
4. The dollar amount threshold is increasing to match the OTC approval matrix. Any changes that meet the following criteria are considered a full amendment (otherwise the project change is an administrative amendment/adjustment):
  - Projects under **\$1M** – increase/decrease over 50%
  - Projects **\$1M to \$5M** – increase/decrease over 30%
  - Projects **\$5M** and over – increase/decrease over 20%

### MILE POINT AMENDMENTS

Due to Federal requirements, obligated work must be within the project’s mile point limits. STIP Coordinators enter an amendment to update project data in the STIP/FP system. Once the amendment is entered, the review and approval process is next.

The ODOT-FTA-FHWA amendment matrix lists which amendments require FTA-FHWA approval and which amendments ODOT has delegated authority to approve. If ODOT approves the amendment, it is called an **administrative** amendment. If FTA-FHWA also approves the amendment, it is called a **full** amendment. The main difference between the two amendment types is the amount of time for approval. A “full amendment” will likely take longer due to the public review period and FTA-FHWA review/approval. Whereas an “administrative amendment” only requires ODOT review/approval.

### EXAMPLES – Mile point changes:

*While it is Program & Funding Services’ responsibility to determine if the amendment is full or administrative, the following examples portray the types of amendments for mile point changes.*

| Project | Original Mile Points | Revised Mile Points          | Amendment Type | Comments  |
|---------|----------------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|
| A       | 0.25 – 1.00          | 0.5 – 0.75                   | None           | Revised mile points still within the original range do not require an amendment.  |
| B       | Intersection @ 1.00  | Add 4 legs at .25 miles each | None           | FHWA clarified that the legs are expected as part of an intersection project, so as long as the mile point was the centerpoint of the intersection, it does not warrant an amendment. |
| C       | 1.00 – 2.00          | 1.25 – 2.99                  | Administrative | Change from 2.00 to 2.99 is less than 1 mile.   |
| D       | 2.00 – 3.00          | 5.00 – 6.00                  | Full           | Change is greater than 1 mile. FTA-FHWA approval is necessary.  |
| E       | 4.00 – 5.00          | 4.25 – 6.25                  | Full           | Change from 5.00 to 6.25 is greater than 1 mile.  |
| F       | Bridge on Hwy X      | Bridge on Hwy Y              | Full           | FHWA approval is necessary.   |

Please contact the applicable [STIP Coordinator](#) for any questions.

## ODOT-FTA-FHWA AMENDMENT MATRIX

| FULL AMENDMENTS                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1                                    | Adding or cancelling a federally funded, and regionally significant project to the STIP and state funded projects which will potentially be federalized   |
| 2                                    | Major change in project scope. Major scope change includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change in project termini - greater than .25 mile in any direction</li> <li>• Changes to the approved environmental footprint</li> <li>• Impacts to AQ conformity</li> <li>• Adding capacity per FHWA Standards</li> <li>• Adding or deleting worktype</li> </ul>  |
| 3                                    | Changes in Fiscal Constraint by the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FHWA project cost increase/decrease: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects under \$500K – increase/decrease over 50%</li> <li>- Projects \$500K to \$1M – increase/decrease over 30%</li> <li>- Projects \$1M and over – increase/decrease over 20%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All FTA project changes – increase/decrease over 30%</li> </ul> |
| 4                                    | Adding an emergency relief permanent repair project that involves substantial change in function and location.  |
| ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS |   |
| 1                                    | Advancing or Slipping an approved project/phase within the current STIP (If slipping outside current STIP, see Full Amendments #2)  |
| 2                                    | Adding or deleting any phase (except CN) of an approved project below Full Amendment #3   |
| 3                                    | Combining two or more approved projects into one or splitting an approved project into two or more, or splitting part of an approved project to a new one.  |
| 4                                    | Splitting a new project out of an approved program-specific pool of funds (but not reserves for future projects) or adding funds to an existing project from a bucket or reserve if the project was selected through a specific process (i.e. ARTS, Local Bridge...)  |
| 5                                    | Minor technical corrections to make the printed STIP consistent with prior approvals, such as typos or missing data.  |
| 6                                    | Changing name of project due to change in scope, combining or splitting of projects, or to better conform to naming convention. (For major change in scope, see Full Amendments #2)   |
| 7                                    | Adding a temporary emergency repair and relief project that does not involve substantial change in function and location.   |

### **Amendment Definition**

An amendment is a change to project information and costs. For financial changes, this applies to unobligated phases or phases which have been obligated and have additional financial change within the same federal fiscal year

### **Public Comment Notes**

For public comment, project updates need to be provided at a public meeting. Requirements are the project needs to be listed as part of the agenda and allow for the public to comment on the changes.

If project covers is in multiple ACT's, then project needs to be presented to both

## ODOT-FTA-FHWA AMENDMENT MATRIX

| FULL AMENDMENTS                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1                                    | Adding a federally funded, regionally significant, or state/locally funded projects which will potentially be federalized. If project does not meet this criteria, see Administrative #1. For WFL or planning projects, see Administrative #7 & #8.  |
| 2                                    | Major change in total project scope. Major scope change may include changes like: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in project location greater than 1 mile</li> <li>• Project modifications that result in NEPA re-evaluation</li> <li>• Change affects air quality conformity</li> <li>• Adding capacity per FHWA Standards</li> <li>• Adding or deleting worktype in the STIP/FP</li> </ul>   |
| 3                                    | Changes in Fiscal Constraint by the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For FHWA funded projects - total project cost increase/decrease (all phases, any type of funding increase): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Projects under \$1M – increase/decrease over 50%</li> <li>- Projects \$1M to \$5M – increase/decrease over 30%</li> <li>- Projects \$5M and over – increase/decrease over 20%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• All FTA project changes – increase/decrease over 30%</li> </ul> |
| 4                                    | Adding an emergency relief permanent repair project that involves substantial change in function and location. **See note below for temporary emergency repair projects.   |
| ADMINISTRATIVE/TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS |  |
| 1                                    | Any project changes that do not meet the STIP amendment criteria in the Full Amendments section above.   |
| 2                                    | Advancing or Slipping an approved project/phase within the current STIP (If slipping outside current STIP, project must be canceled in the current STIP).  |
| 3                                    | Adding or canceling any phase of an approved project. See Full Amendment #3 for fiscal constraint thresholds.  |
| 4                                    | Combining two or more approved projects into one or splitting an approved project into two or more, or splitting part of an approved project to a new one.   |
| 5                                    | Splitting a new project out of an approved program-specific pool of funds (but not reserves for future projects) or adding funds to an existing project from a bucket or reserve if the project was selected through a specific process (i.e. ARTS, Local Bridge...).  |
| 6                                    | Minor technical corrections to make the printed STIP consistent with prior approvals, such as typos or missing data.   |
| 7                                    | Changing name of project due to change in scope, combining or splitting of projects, or to better conform to naming convention. (For major change in scope, see Full Amendments #2)  |
| 8                                    | Adding or modifying metropolitan planning projects (UPWP) funded under 23 U.S.C. 104(d) and 49 CFR 5305(d) or State Planning and Research (SPR) projects funded under 23 U.S.C. 505 and 49 U.S.C. 5303(e) or Surface Transportation Program funds.   |
| 9                                    | Adding a WFL project.  |

\*\*Temporary emergency repair (ER) projects are not added to the STIP.

**Amendment Definition:** An amendment is a change to project information and costs. For financial changes, this applies to unobligated phases or phases which have been obligated and have additional financial change within the same federal fiscal year.

**Public Comment Notes:** For public comment, project updates need to be provided at a public meeting. Requirements are the project needs to be listed as part of the agenda and allow for the public to comment on the changes. If project covers is in multiple ACTs, then project needs to be presented to both.

# CITY OF ASHLAND

July 21, 2021

Karl D. Welzenbach  
Planning and Program Manager  
Rogue Valley Council of Governments  
155 N. First St | PO Box 3275  
Central Point, OR 97502

RE: COVID Relief Funding

Dear Karl,

The City of Ashland would like to seek approval of a proposal in that the City returns the current CMAQ distribution of \$468,244 for the Ashland Chip Seal Project (Key# 21016, RTP #166) and in return the City would ask for distribution of \$420,000 in COVID Relief Funding and take over and manage the chip seal project to completion. This proposal will assist a currently underfunded CMAQ project that can take advantage of the \$468,244 to help and expand the chip seal project to complete more streets as originally intended.

While working through the CMAQ Chip Seal project process with ODOT, we are both realizing the project is not panning out as we hoped. The cost/benefit with respect to the engineering and construction phases is skewed because of Federal requirements associated with the CMAQ program. Currently, preliminary engineering is projected to be approximately \$350,00 of the \$561,648 project total, leaving only \$210,000 for construction. Without the requirements tied to the CMAQ funding the City feels that all of the \$420,000 could be used on construction alone. After including the original City share, we are hoping to complete at least double the number of streets of what it appears would be able to be finished if it were to remain a CMAQ project. Completing this project is a priority for the City and meets the goals of the region through particulate reduction.

The City has discussed this proposal with ODOT, and they are in complete support of the proposal. In addition, it will free ODOT staff of their obligations of the local agency assistance requirement for the Chip Seal project and will provide more timely resources to other locally delivered federal aid projects managed by ODOT.

The City would welcome your feedback on this proposal and would appreciate hearing what our next steps should be in this process.

Sincerely,



Scott Fleury, PE  
Public Works Director







**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: August 2, 2021  
TO: TAC, PAC, Policy Committee  
FROM: Karl Welzenbach, Planning Program Director  
SUBJECT: Ongoing Discussion Regarding Cost Estimates and Project Application Process

---

This memo is an attempt to capture the intent and direction of the conversation had by the TAC regarding how best to address the apparent shortfalls in cost estimation for project applications. After listening to the recording of the meeting and recognizing that a lot of interesting topics and areas of discussion were raised and/or addressed I thought it best to provide a brief summary of the tentative agreements that had been reached by the group as a whole.

I would urge all of the members of the TAC to take some time to listen in on the recording (note the discussion of interest begins at around 7:24 in the recording). The recording had to be broken up into two parts and the links to both segments are included below:

Part 1 - [https://rvmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/07\\_14\\_21-RVMPO-TAC-Audio-pt.1.mp3](https://rvmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/07_14_21-RVMPO-TAC-Audio-pt.1.mp3)

Part 2 - [https://rvmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/07\\_14\\_21-RVMPO-TAC-Audio-pt.-2.mp3](https://rvmpo.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/07_14_21-RVMPO-TAC-Audio-pt.-2.mp3)

Again, I haven't tried to provide a verbatim transcript nor highlight all of the conversation. Rather I've attempted to describe the understandings that seem to have been reached at the most recent meeting of the TAC regarding how to improve our project cost estimation/project selection process.

The approach taken during this second discussion was a more pragmatic one attempting to answer such questions as:

- What is the goal here? Are we trying to be punitive or become more successful with our selected projects?
- What are the key issues that commonly result in under-estimated project costs?
- Should we revisit the idea of setting minimum dollar amount thresholds for CMAQ funded projects?
- Is there additional information that should be requested on the project application form?
- What steps should the TAC take to improve the process?

After much discussion the general consensus seemed to fall into two categories: improvements to the application form itself and improvements to the process. The following recommendations are what I heard the TAC come to consensus on:

Recommendations:

1. Include a check box in the application for jurisdictions to indicate whether or not they intend to pursue a simple fund exchange.
2. Restrict application for CMAQ funding to projects that cost in excess of \$1 million
3. Hold a workshop subsequent to the call for projects to be hosted by the MPO staff but conducted by ODOT staff to review with the jurisdictions all of the requirements associated with the use of federal funds.
4. Make the aforementioned workshop mandatory – if a jurisdiction applies for funding but does not attend the workshop that application will be thrown out.
5. Include ODOT's prospectus (or a portion of it) in the MPO's application form.
6. Identify two categories of projects: a) simple projects that could be fund exchanged and proceed apace; b) larger more complicated and costly projects
7. Allow jurisdictions to apply for just a planning phase
8. Onus is on the Technical Advisory Committee to undertake a more critical review of each application.