



**Date: Tuesday, June 25, 2024**

**Time: 2:00 p.m.**

**Join In-Person**

**Location:** Lewis Conference Room  
 RVCOG, 155 N 1<sup>st</sup> Street,  
 Central Point

**Transit:** Served by RVTD Route #40

**Contact:** RVCOG: 541-423-1375

**Website:** [www.rvmpo.org](http://www.rvmpo.org)

**Or via Zoom**

**Meeting ID:** 846 2782 3341

**Phone #:** +1 346 248 7799

**Zoom Link:**  
<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84627823341>

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 Policy Meeting Draft Minutes 05/25/2024](#)

**Public Hearing**

*Chair will read the public hearing procedures*

**3. Amendment to the 2024-27 TIP**

**Ryan MacLaren**

**Background:** The Policy Committee 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:* **Consideration and approval of the TIP Amendments**



## Action Items

### 4. Rollover Funds

Ryan MacLaren

- Background:** The RVMPO has lapsing funds totaling \$3,304,813 that will have to be obligated by December 2024.  
During the June 12, 2024, TAC meeting, it was unanimously voted to recommend to the Policy Committee \$1,909,150 to go to Medford's Delta Waters project.  
On June 18<sup>th</sup>, the TAC had a special meeting. During that meeting it was unanimously voted to recommend to the Policy Committee the rest of the rollover funds, \$1,395,633, go to Central Point's North 10<sup>th</sup> Street project. This would allow Central Point to de-federalize the project and return CMAQ funds.  
Two other cities sent proposals that are attached below as well.
- Attachments:** [#3 Central Point's Proposal](#)  
[#4 Ashland's Proposal](#)  
[#5 Medford's Proposal](#)
- Action Requested:** *Consideration and approval of the TAC recommendations*
- 

### 5. Policy on Project Substitution

Ryan MacLaren

- Background:** The TAC has spent several months updating the Policy on Project Substitutions.
- Attachment:** [#6 Updated Policy "Clean version"](#)  
[#7 Redline Version of Policy](#)
- Action Requested:** *Approval of Policy on Project Substitutions*
- 

## Discussion Items

### 6. 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.*
- Attachment/Link:** [#8 PPP Memo](#)  
[Draft PPP](#)  
[Redline Version of Draft PPP](#)



**7. Update on Projects in the 2024-2027 Funding Cycle**

**Ryan MacLaren**

Background: As requested during the last Policy Committee meeting, this is to update how the funding of selected projects look now that the switch from STBG to Gas Tax funds has happened.

Attachment: [#9 Status on Projects Funded in the 2024 – 2027 Cycle memo](#)

---

**8. Public Comment**

**Chair**

**Regular Updates**

**9. RVMPO Update**

**Ryan MacLaren**

**10. Other Business / Local Business**

**Chair**

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects

---

**11. Adjournment**

**Chair**

Scheduled Meetings		
RVMPO TAC	July 10, 2024	1:30 p.m.
RVMPO PAC	July 16, 2024	5:30 p.m.
RVMPO Policy Meeting	July 23, 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**  
 Policy Committee

**Date: Tuesday, May 28, 2024**

<b>Voting Members</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Tonya Graham	Ashland	488-6002
Donna Bowen	Jacksonville	899-1231
Tim D’Alessandro	Medford	944-3530
Terry Baker	Phoenix	535-1955
Eleanor Ponomareff	Talent	535-1566
Colleen Roberts	Jackson County	774-6117
Jerry Marmon, Chair	ODOT	774-6353
Tonia Moro	RVTD	973-2063

<b>Alternate Members</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Scott Fleury	Ashland	
Steve Lambert	Jackson County	
Mike Baker	ODOT	
Paige West	RVTD	

<b>Staff</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone Number</b>
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Kelsey Sharp	RVCOG	423-1375
Dan Moore	RVCOG	423-1393

<b>Interested Parties</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Zac Moody	Phoenix
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
Thomas Guevara	ODOT
Ashley Bryer	FHWA
Mike Montero	RVMPO PAC

**RVMPO Policy Minutes – Tuesday, May 28, 2024**

[Agenda Packet](#)

[Meeting Audio](#)

**1. Call to Order at 2:00 p.m. / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00 – 02:00**

Quorum: Central Point, Medford, Talent, Jackson County, ODOT, RVTD



**2. Review / Approve Minutes 02:00 – 02:42**

- 02:29** Colleen Roberts moved to approve the April 23, 2024, RVMPO Policy Committee Meeting Minutes as presented. Seconded by Eleanor Ponomareff.  
 No further discussion.  
 Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**Action Items**

**3. Ride the Rogue 02:42 – 05:10**

- 04:33** Tonia Moro moved to approve the RVMPO Sponsoring Ride the Rogue on a Gold Level Sponsor for \$2,500. Seconded by Eleanor Ponomareff  
 No further discussion.  
 Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

**4. Subcommittee for RVTD Funding Allocation 05:10 – 13:14**

- 12:15** Chair Jerry Marmon established the Subcommittee with discussed members.

**Discussion Items**

**5. RTP Goals and Policies 13:14 – 24:30**

**6. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Performance Measures 24:30 – 29:40**

**7. Public Comment 29:40 – 29:57**

*No comments received.*

**Regular Updates**

**8. MPO Planning Update 29:57 – 46:18**

*Provided by Ryan MacLaren regarding the upcoming Regional Transportation Plan update, the modeling for the RTP, Tribal contact update, and an update from the League of Oregon Cities.*

**9. Other Business / Local Business 46:18– 49:14**

*Updates from Jackson County, Ashland, and ODOT.*

**10. Adjournment**

2:49p.m.

Scheduled Meetings		
RVMPO TAC	May 8, 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 20, 2024  
 TO: RVMPO Policy Committee  
 FROM: Ryan MacLaren, Planning Program Director  
 SUBJECT: TIP Amendments

The Policy Committee is being asked to consider approval of the following amendment(s) to the 2024-2027 Transportation Improvement Program.

A press release for the 21-day public comment period and public hearing was sent on or before June 3<sup>rd</sup> to the Rogue Valley Times and information is currently available on the RVMPO website. The RVMPO TAC and PAC have recommended approval of the amendment(s) listed. 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	
<b>RVTD</b>														
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		5307	\$ 4,611,364		\$ 4,611,364	Local	\$ 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	
<b>ODOT</b>														
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					\$ -		\$ -	
						<b>Total FFY 24-27</b>			\$ 560,813		\$ 64,187		\$ 625,000	\$ -

**From:** [Matt Samitore](#)  
**To:** [rmaclaren@rvcog.org](mailto:rmaclaren@rvcog.org)  
**Cc:** [SHOEMAKER Justin D](#)  
**Subject:** STBG Funds  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 18, 2024 2:00:44 PM

---

Ryan,

The City of Central Point would like to request the rollover of 1.4 million in STBG funds for North 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The City would like to use the STBG dollars awarded with the N. 10<sup>th</sup> grant and fund exchange, which will total approximately 1.9 million dollars. The City will continue to match an additional \$500k for the project, making it an approximately 2.4 million dollar project. The City would then de-federalize the project with construction in 2025 or 2026, depending on when the gas tax dollars would be available. The City would give back the 3.9 million in CMAQ funds in exchange.

We will have an engineer's updated estimate by the end of the week and work with you and Justin to get the necessary paperwork to complete this request.

Sincerely,

Matt Samitore  
Assistant City Manager/Parks and Public Works Director  
City of Central Point  
(541)423-1017

---

This electronic communication, including any attached documents, may contain confidential and/or legally privileged information that is intended only for use by the recipient(s) named above. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the communication and any attachments. Emails are generally public records and therefore subject to public disclosure unless exempt from disclosure under Oregon Public Records Law.

## Disclaimer

The information contained in this communication from the sender is confidential. It is intended solely for use by the recipient and others authorized to receive it. If you are not the recipient, you are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, distribution or taking action in relation of the contents of this information is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful.

This email has been scanned for viruses and malware, and may have been automatically archived by **Mimecast Ltd**, an innovator in Software as a Service (SaaS) for business. Providing a **safer** and **more useful** place for your human generated data. Specializing in; Security, archiving and compliance. To find out more [Click Here](#).



# Memorandum

---

DATE: June 17, 2024  
TO: Ryan MacLaren, RVCOG  
FROM: Karl Johnson, City of Ashland  
RE: **Proposal for 2024 Rollover Funds**

After the June 12<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting there is currently \$1,395,663 of STBG “Rollover Funds” left that needs to be obligated by December 31, 2024.

The City of Ashland would offer obligating our currently programed PE funding with the expiring STBG “Rollover funds” for the Clay Street Project. The City of Ashland can obligate PE in the first part of the federal fiscal year of 2025. The remaining non-expiring STBG/CMAQ funds are then requested to be added into the construction phase of the Clay Street Project. This project has a significant deficit in its overall project budget and these funds would go to help reduce that deficit. Our project is close to wrapping up the ODOT IGA process and will be able move into the Preliminary Engineering phase in the very near future.

The City of Ashland would add, that if the City of Central Point is prepared to move forward with Fund Exchanging their 10<sup>th</sup> Street Project, we feel that their project would benefit greatly and could move forward at a faster rate than our Clay Street Project. Ashland would support that the \$1,395,663 “Rollover Funds” go to that project, and the returned CMAQ funds from both the Central Point and Medford projects be distributed towards the two currently underfunded CMAQ projects (Clay Street and West Pine) at a later date. This request would fall in line with the MPO’s policy of funding the underfunded projects already under development.

## Proposal for 2024 rollover funds:

Currently there is \$3,304,813 in STBG “Rollover Funds” that needs to be obligated by December 31, 2024. Given the very short timeframe, the only way to successfully use these funds are to swap them for funds already in a programmed project.

Medford proposes that the ***Delta Waters: Waterford Ct. to Colonial Ave. Project, Key #23302*** swap the currently programmed CMAQ funds for the rollover funds as well as provide some additional dollars as the project is currently underfunded. The Delta Waters project currently has \$1,794,600 in federal CMAQ programmed. Medford requests \$1,794,600 in STBG rollover funds and would then return \$1,794,600 in CMAQ funds back to the MPO to be programmed in future years. This request is contingent on being able to fund exchange the STBG funds with the state.

Of the remaining STBG funds, Medford would like to request additional funding for the Stevens Street project that we previously fund exchanged. It is anticipated that the project will have a \$1,500,000 deficit due to significant inflation since the project budget was originally put together. We have already completed the survey and have begun preliminary design.

Summary:

### **Rollover Funds**

Total	\$3,304,813
Delta Waters Request	(\$1,909,150)
Remainder	\$1,395,663

### **Returned to MPO**

Delta Waters CMAQ	\$1,794,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$1,794,600</b>

Additional Request if funds are available:

### **Rollover Funds**

Stevens Street Request	up to \$1,395,663
Remainder	\$0



# **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

June 25, 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”.**

This Policy addresses the allocation of funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for projects. Projects receive federal funding through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO 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 TIP.

1. RVMPO Policy Committee makes all final planning and programming decisions regarding program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project and must be spent on that project.
  - a. When jurisdictions are awarded funds, they will have up to 24 months to begin the project. “Begin the project” is defined as follows:
    - For recipients of state gas tax funds “begin the project” is defined as commencing Preliminary Engineering (PE), unless a direct allocation is provided, than no further action is required.
    - 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.
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 against all submitted projects during that funding round. 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 RVMPO 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.



## **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





**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 20, 2024  
**TO:** RVMPO Policy Committee  
**FROM:** Dan Moore, Senior Transportation Planner  
**SUBJECT:** RVMPO 2024 Public Participation Plan Update

---

The purpose of this memo is to provide some background information on the update of the update of the RVMPO's 2024 Public Participation Plan.

The PPP is a core MPO document which is updated every 5 years. It was originally adopted in 2007 and updated in:

- 2014, 2018 & 2022
- The 2024 PPP will be the 5<sup>th</sup> Edition

The PPP describes methods, strategies and desired outcomes for public participation which includes:

- Goals and objectives
- The Public's role in MPO decision-making
- Public participation tools
- How the MPO implements and evaluates public participation.
- Appendices A through I

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) reviewed and commented on the draft plan based on federal transportation planning guidelines (PPP Checklist below). The Plan was updated based on FHWA's comments including adding **Policy 13** (Page 7) that incorporates "Equity" measures to benefit underserved populations.

The 45-day public review for the PPP began on Friday, June 7<sup>th</sup>. Below is the schedule for review and adoption of the PPP:

- TAC Review/Comment – June 12<sup>th</sup>
- PAC Review/Comment – June 18<sup>th</sup>
- Policy Committee Review/Comment – June 25<sup>th</sup>
- TAC recommendation to Policy Committee for approval - July 10<sup>th</sup>
- PAC recommendation to Policy Committee for approval - July 16<sup>th</sup>
- Policy Committee approval - July 23<sup>rd</sup>

# PPP Review Checklist

MPO:	MRMPO & RVMPO		
FHWA/FTA Reviewer:	Ashley	Comments Submitted to MPO:	3/11/24
Public Comment Period:		Adoption Date:	Planned for 6/20/24 & 7/23/24

## 23 CFR 450.316 Interested parties, participation, and consultation

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316(a)</a>	1) The MPO shall develop the participation plan in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies, and desired outcomes for i-ix	Were interested parties consulted in the development of this PPP?	25	<b>No, I made a comment</b>
		Did the MPO follow the PPP procedures in the development of this PPP?	18	<b>Yes.</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(i)	(i) Providing adequate public notice of public participation activities and time for public review and comment at key decision points, including a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;	Does the PPP show the public comment period for each planning document?	19	<b>Yes! Nice table that has the full public comment. I asked for the amendment public comment period to be added.</b>
		Does the PPP show the steps that are to be taken for each document during the development	17+	<b>No table, but listing of how each document is created is provided. I asked about adding a table.</b>

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
		phase?		
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(ii)	(ii) Providing timely notice and reasonable access to information about transportation issues and processes;	Does the MPO provide timely notices to meetings and public comment opportunities?	6	<b>Yes! Six days for meetings</b>  <b>Page 19 has a table for planning products.</b>
		Does the MPO provide reasonable access to information? Where is it posted online?	12	<b>I asked for the committee urls to be added on page 12.</b>
			15	<b>They mentioned the website is used to post all minutes and report drafts.</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(iii)	(iii) Employing visualization techniques to describe metropolitan transportation plans and TIPs;	Does the MPO use graphics and other visualization techniques to describe MTPs and TIPs?	15	<b>Yes!</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(iv)	(iv) Making public information (technical information and meeting notices) available in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web;	Are documents posted online?	15	<b>Yes. I asked for the urls to be added to each of the 6 planning products on page 17</b>
		Are meeting notices posted online?	6	<b>yes. 6 days prior.</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(v)	(v) Holding any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times;	Does the PPP discuss holding meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times?	<b>1 and 16</b>	<b>Yes</b>  Police 2 of goal 4 also – page 8

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vi)	(vi) Demonstrating explicit consideration and response to public input received during the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP;	Does the PPP say how the MPO will consider public input during the development of the MTP and TIP?	8	The MRMPO staff and committees will consider public input, which may result in revisions to draft plans and programs, as an integral part of the planning process. Every attempt will be made to respond to public comments in a timely manner.
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(vii)	(vii) Seeking out and considering the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment and other services;	How does the MPO plan to engage the traditionally underserved?	15	<b>Mentions it, but doesn't say how. I made a comment about tabling.</b>
		Did the MPO collect and use data during its EJ/Title VI activities to identify and reach out to underserved groups?		<b>Added as a comment on page 15</b>
		Did the MPO make the public participation/ involvement activities accessible to all members of the public and stakeholders?	8 and 9	<b>Talked about accessible locations and where traditionally underserved communities can reach.</b>

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
		How diverse were outreach activities and approaches?	25	Added as a comment suggesting a survey be utilized to gather input that would be more diverse than only discussing at TAC, CAC, and PC.
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(viii)	(viii) Providing an additional opportunity for public comment, if the final metropolitan transportation plan or TIP differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment by the MPO and raises new material issues that interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts;	Does the PPP state that if the final MTP or TIP differs significantly from the version made available for public comment they will provide an opportunity for public comment?	9	<b>Policy 3: In instances when a final version of a Regional Transportation Plan or Transportation Improvement Program differs significantly from the draft version that was subject to public review, another opportunity for public comment will be provided.</b>
		How many comments were received?	34	Not obtained yet but have the table ready for them.
		Did the agency document, consider, and respond to comments on the development of the PPP?	34 18	Not obtained yet but have the table ready for them.  States comments will be responded to and included in the final document.
		Were the public	18	Not yet but says will be

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
		comment responses disseminated to the public?		<b>included in the final document.</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(ix)	(ix) Coordinating with the statewide transportation planning public involvement and consultation processes under <a href="#">subpart B of this part</a> ; and  <a href="#">23 CFR 450.316(b)</a>  The MPO should consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities.	Was the PPP developed in consultation with other entities that are impacted by transportation in the MPA?	<b>25</b>	<b>Suggested doing a survey to gain their input.</b>
		Does the PPP state how the MPO will consult with other agencies within the MPA?	<b>No 17</b>	<b>I added a comment asking for each of the 6 core documents to have a section about how interested parties are involved.</b>
<a href="https://www.congress.gov/117/plaws/publ58/PLAW-117publ58.pdf#page=89">https://www.congress.gov/117/plaws/publ58/PLAW-117publ58.pdf#page=89</a>	Does the MPO detail how they will consult with low-income housing organizations?		<b>8</b>	<b>Added as a comment</b>
23 CFR 450.316(a)(1)(x)	(x) Periodically reviewing the effectiveness of the procedures and strategies contained in the participation plan to ensure a full and open participation process.	Does the PPP have performance measures?	<b>19</b>	<b>Not explicitly. I asked for 1 or 2 to be explicitly tracked.</b>
		How often are the performance measures to be		<b>I added this as a comment.</b>

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
		updated?		
		Were past PPP performance measures evaluated for effectiveness? What changed to improve the PPP process?		<b>Added as a comment on page 19</b>
		How often will the PPP be updated?	<b>18</b>	<b>Said periodic. I asked for X years.</b>
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316</a> (a)(3) 45 Day public comment period on the PPP	A minimum public comment period of 45 calendar days shall be provided before the initial or revised participation plan is adopted by the MPO. Copies of the approved participation plan shall be provided to the FHWA and the FTA for informational purposes and shall be posted on the World Wide Web, to the maximum extent practicable.	Was the PPP approved through a 45-day public comment period?	<b>2</b>	<b>Yes, it will be.</b>
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316</a> (b) Consultation with planning officials	In developing the MTP, the MPO <b>should</b> consult with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities within the MPA that are affected by transportation (including State and local planned growth, economic development, tourism, natural disaster risk reduction, environmental protection, airport operations, or freight movements) or coordinate its planning process (to the maximum extent practicable) with such planning activities.	Does the PPP state how the MPO will consult or coordinate its planning process, with agencies and officials responsible for other planning activities in the MPA that are	<b>17</b>	<b>Added as a comment on page 17</b>

CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316</a> (c) Tribal Consultation	When the MPA includes Indian Tribal lands, the MPO <b>shall</b> appropriately involve the Indian Tribal government(s) in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.	affected by transportation?  Or is this in a different document?		
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316</a> (d) Consultation with Federal land management agencies	When the MPA includes Federal public lands, the MPO <b>shall</b> appropriately involve the Federal land management agencies in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP.			
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.316</a> (e) Document processes	(e) MPOs shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process(es) that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies, as defined in <a href="#">paragraphs (b), (c), and (d)</a> of this section, which may be included in the agreement(s) developed under <a href="#">§ 450.314</a> .			
<a href="#">23 CFR 450.324</a> (j) Public comment, consistent with the participation plan	The MPO <b>shall</b> provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public			



CFR	CFR Language	Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
			Page	Comments/Notes
	transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under <a href="#">§ 450.316(a)</a> .			
<a href="#">2021 Planning Emphasis Areas</a>	Public Involvement	Did this plan include Virtual Public Involvement (VPI) tools?	16	Virtual open houses.

\*Does not include 23 CFR 450.340 (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f) in the table because they are not pertinent.

## Questions

Questions to Consider	FHWA Comments/Notes	
	Page	Comments/Notes
How is the PPP going to be implemented for the UPWP, MTP, TIP, etc.?	17	Listed for each of the 6 core documents.
How is equity considered in the PPP? (This isn't a requirement, but a FHWA initiative.)	TOC	Added as a comment asking for this.

## Resources to Share:

- [Promising Practices for Meaningful Public Involvement in Transportation Decision-Making](#)
- [Reference Tool - Public Involvement - Planning - FHWA \(dot.gov\)](#)

RMPO has fact sheets policy 4. RMPO has more Goal 1 policies.

**From:** [Bryers, Ashley \(FHWA\)](#)  
**To:** [dmoore@rvco.org](#)  
**Cc:** [Ryan MacLaren](#)  
**Subject:** RE: MRMPO Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan  
**Date:** Monday, March 11, 2024 4:24:17 PM  
**Attachments:** [fhwa021.org](#)  
[MRMPO 2024 Public Participation Plan Draft ADB Comments-2024-03-11.docx](#)  
[MRMPO PPP FHWA Checklist.docx](#)

Hi Dan,

I provided comments on the MRMPO PPP. The same comments apply to the RVMPPO PPP. Overall great job! I really appreciate that you already had several of the elements that were necessary.

Also attached is the PPP FHWA checklist so you can see what I used to review the plan.

My one additional comment for the RVMPPO PPP is below.

#### A. Consistency with Federal Requirements

Adopted in January 2007, the RVMPPO's previous Public Participation Plan was created to comply with the public involvement requirements outlined in the prior transportation authorization bill, the Moving Ahead for Progress-21 Act (MAP-21). Today, the current transportation authorization act, Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA), signed into law in November of 2021, incorporates performance goals, measures, and targets



Please let me know if you'd like to chat about my comments.

Thank you,  
Ashley

--  
**Ashley Bryers, AICP**, Planning Program Manager, she | her | hers  
FHWA | Oregon Division | 503-316-2556 | [ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)

---

**From:** Bryers, Ashley (FHWA)  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 12:54 PM  
**To:** Dan Moore <[dmoore@rvco.org](mailto:dmoore@rvco.org)>  
**Cc:** Ryan MacLaren <[rmaclaren@rvco.org](mailto:rmaclaren@rvco.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: MRMPO Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan

Will do!

Thank you,  
Ashley

--  
**Ashley Bryers, AICP**, Planning Program Manager, she | her | hers  
FHWA | Oregon Division | 503-316-2556 | [ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)

---

**From:** Dan Moore <[dmoore@rvco.org](mailto:dmoore@rvco.org)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 11:50 AM  
**To:** Bryers, Ashley (FHWA) <[ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)>  
**Cc:** Ryan MacLaren <[rmaclaren@rvco.org](mailto:rmaclaren@rvco.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: MRMPO Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ashley – Please disregard the previous draft plans I sent you. I noticed that the draft copies of the MRMPO and RVMPPO Public Participation Plans that I sent you do not have a section for tribal consultation. I added that section (E) under Public Role in Decision Making in both plans. Sorry for the confusion. Let me know if you have any questions or need more information. Thanks.

Dan

---

**From:** Bryers, Ashley (FHWA) <[ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 11, 2024 8:25 AM  
**To:** dmoore@rvco.org <[dmoore@rvco.org](mailto:dmoore@rvco.org)>  
**Cc:** Ryan MacLaren <[rmaclaren@rvco.org](mailto:rmaclaren@rvco.org)>  
**Subject:** RE: MRMPO Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan

Thank you, Dan.

This is to confirm I received both MRMPO's and RVMPPO's PPPs. I will get you comments.

Have a great day!

Thank you,  
Ashley

--  
**Ashley Bryers, AICP**, Planning Program Manager, she | her | hers  
FHWA | Oregon Division | 503-316-2556 | [ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)

---

**From:** Dan Moore <[dmoore@rvco.org](mailto:dmoore@rvco.org)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 7, 2024 7:58 AM  
**To:** Bryers, Ashley (FHWA) <[ashley.bryers@dot.gov](mailto:ashley.bryers@dot.gov)>  
**Cc:** Ryan MacLaren <[rmaclaren@rvco.org](mailto:rmaclaren@rvco.org)>  
**Subject:** MRMPO Draft 2024 Public Participation Plan

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the Department of Transportation (DOT). Do not click on links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know

the content is safe.

Ashley,

Attached is a copy of the draft 2024 MRMPO Public Participation Plan for your review and comment. The public hearing for adoption is scheduled for Thursday, June 20, 2024 with the MRMPO Policy Committee. Let me know if you have any questions or need more information. Thanks.

Dan

Dan Moore | Senior Transportation Planner  
Rogue Valley Council of Governments  
155 N. 1<sup>st</sup> Street  
P.O. Box 3275  
Central Point, OR 97502  
541-423-1393  
541-324-1166 (cell)  
[www.rvcog.org](http://www.rvcog.org) | [www.rmpo.org](http://www.rmpo.org) | [www.mrmpo.org](http://www.mrmpo.org)



**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.

<b>Table 1</b>				
<b>Federal Funded STBG (Pre Gas Tax)</b>				
	<b>2025</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2027</b>	
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.

<b>Table 2</b>				
<b>Gas Tax Allocation</b>				
	<b>2025</b>	<b>2026</b>	<b>2027</b>	
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.

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

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

<b>Table 4</b>			
<b>Funds returned from Medford</b>	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.

<b>Table 5</b>			
	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