



AGENDA
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee

Date: Wednesday, April 9, 2025

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Join In-Person

Location: Lewis Conference Room
RVCOG, 155 N 1st Street,
Central Point
Transit: Served by RVTB Route #40
Contact: RVCOG: 541-423-1375
Website: www.rvmopo.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 03/12/2025](#)

Action Items

3. 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan Chapters 4 and 7

Yazeed Alrashdi

Background: The TAC is being asked to review and provide any comments or recommendations on the following RTP Chapters. PLEASE NOTE: While SharePoint is being used, the formatting will be inconsistent. This will be fixed before final approval of the full document.

Chapter 4 – Planning Area Characteristics
Chapter 7 – Environmental Considerations

Link to Website: [Draft RTP Chapters](#)

Action Requested: *Review and recommendations*



Discussion Items

4. 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan Chapter 5

Yazeed Alrashdi

Background: The TAC is being asked to review and provide any comments on the following RTP Chapter. PLEASE NOTE: While SharePoint is being used, the formatting will be inconsistent. This will be fixed before final approval of the full document.

Chapter 5 – Regional Transportation System

Link to Website: [Draft RTP Chapters](#)

5. RTP Financial Constraint Concerns

Ryan MacLaren

Background: The RVMPO has received a letter from Mike Baker, of ODOT Region 3, requesting corrective actions of the RTP financial forecast and RTP project costs. The RVMPO staff has met with Federal Highway seeking guidance and will report on Federal Highway's response.

Attachment: [#2 Letter from Mike Baker](#)

6. Public Comment

Chair

Regular Updates

7. RVMPO Update

Ryan MacLaren

8. Other Business / Local Business

Chair

Opportunity for RVMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects

9. Adjournment

Chair

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPO TAC	May 14, 2025	1:30 p.m.
RVMPO PAC	April 15, 2025	5:30 p.m.
RVMPO Policy Meeting	April 22, 2025	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, March 12, 2025

Voting Members	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Johnson	Ashland PW	488-5587
Stephanie Powers	Central Point PL	423-1031
Matt Samitore, Vice-Chair	Central Point PW	664-3321 x205
Mike Upston	Eagle Point PW	826-4212
Alex Georgevitch, Chair	Medford PW	774-2114
Charles Bennett	Jackson County PL	774-6115
James Philp	Jackson County R&P	774-6236
Justin Shoemaker	ODOT	774-6376
Thomas Guevara	ODOT	608-2429
Paige West	RVTD	608-4249
Sean Eisma	RVTD	779-5821

Alternate Members	Organization	Phone Number
-------------------	--------------	--------------

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

Interested Parties	Organization
Mike Montero	RVMPO PAC
Eleanor Ponomareff	Talent

RVMPO TAC Minutes – Wednesday, March 12, 2025

[Agenda Packet](#)

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

1. Call to Order at 1:30 / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00 – 01:07

Quorum: 6 jurisdictions represented.

2. Review / Approve Minutes 01:07 – 02:14

- 01:26** Paige West moved to approve the February 12, 2025, RVMPO TAC Meeting Minutes with correction. Seconded by Mike Upston.
No further discussion.
Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.



SUMMARY MINUTES

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Technical Advisory Committee

Action Items

3. 2025-2026 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 02:14 – 19:40

18:38 Mike Upston moved to recommend approval of the 2025-2026 UPWP with discussed amendments. Seconded by Matt Samitore.
No further discussions.
Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

4. 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapter 4, 7, and 8 19:40 – End of First Recording

51:27 Mike Upston moved to continue this item for further review and discussion. Seconded by Charles Bennett.
No further discussions.
Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Items

5. Tier 2 Project List Beginning of Second Recording – 28:00

6. Public Comment 28:00 – 28:26

No comments received.

Regular Updates

7. MPO Planning Update 28:26 – 56:32

Due to technical difficulties, audio was cut disrupted at 42:23 and discussion was continued once audio was corrected.

Update provided by Ryan MacLaren regarding the cancellation of the Project Workshop for CMAQ applications.

8. Other Business / Local Business 56:32 – 57:52

Updates from Central Point and RVTD.

9. Adjournment

3:23 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings

RVMPO TAC	April 9, 2025	1:30 p.m.
RVMPO PAC	March 18, 2025	5:30 p.m.
RVMPO Policy Meeting	April 1, 2025	2:00 p.m.



Oregon

Tina Kotek, Governor

Department of Transportation

Region 3 Planning & Programming

3500 NW Stewart Parkway

Roseburg, OR 97470

Phone: (541) 957-3500

Fax: (541) 672-6148

March 31, 2025

Ryan MacLaren
Rogue Valley MPO
155 N. 1st Street
PO Box 3275
Central Point, OR 97502

RE: 2025-2050 Draft Regional Transportation Plan Financial Constraint

Dear Ryan,

Thank you for providing the project list and funding tables for projects in the Draft 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). We appreciate all the work that you and your agency put into developing such an important document. The RTP is an important tool to guide transportation investment and development in the Rogue Valley for the next 20+ years, ensuring a comprehensive and coordinated approach to meeting the region's transportation needs.

We were a bit surprised to see that the South Stage Overcrossing project was identified in the RTP as a financially constrained project. As a result, we decided to take a deeper dive into the RTP to review its financial constraint as it relates to both state and federal regulations for all projects.

As you know, ODOT completed a pre-NEPA planning document for a potential, future South Stage Overcrossing/Interchange in 2024 that identifies several alternatives. We noted that the overcrossing project identified in the RTP is currently shown at \$200 million. We also note that the two overcrossing alternatives in this study identify these potential solutions with associated costs on the low end ranging from \$162 million to \$213 million, and on the high end between \$211 to \$277 million dollars.

We undertook a review of all projects in the RTP Tier One fiscally constrained list and compared them to the metropolitan cities and county transportation system plans (TSP). We were able to locate most of the projects that were in the RTP within those documents. Those source TSPs include the 2016 Talent TSP, the 2012 Ashland TSP, the 2017/2019 Phoenix TSP, the 2008 Central Point TSP, the 2017 Medford TSP, the 2010 Eagle Point TSP, and the 2022 Jackson County TSP. Both the project and dollar amount in the RTP matched exactly with those TSPs.

Those project estimates are old and were developed generally between 3-17 years ago (with just a couple of exceptions that were adjusted from an email I sent earlier regarding project costs). Therefore, it does not appear that an inflationary factor was applied to project estimates consistent with the requirements under 23CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv)¹. Project costs must be inflated to the projected year of expenditure in the RTP.

¹ 23CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv): "Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s)."

The National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI) for highway construction projects has increased significantly since 2014. We as a State DOT, we have seen these increases, which in turn has limited our ability to deliver as many projects as possible. Here is a summary of the NHCCI inflation rate between 2014 and 2024.

- **2014-2019:** The average annual growth rate for this period was around 4.4%.
- **2020:** The growth rate dropped to 2.5%.
- **2021-2022:** Costs saw significant increases, with an average inflation rate of 8% in 2021 and 12% in 2022.
- **2023:** The NHCCI continued to rise, with the annualized rate reaching 9.6% in the first quarter of 2024, a 2.4% increase over the last quarter of 2023.
- **2024:** The NHCCI fell by 2.0% in the second quarter of 2024 from the first quarter of 2024 after reaching a new all-time high in the first quarter of 2024.

We do think it is unlikely that this rate of inflation will continue, however, due to inflation instability, a future rate is difficult to determine. FHWA has provided guidance² that using an annual inflation rate of 4% in the RTP is acceptable, unless a higher or lower number can be justified. Please note that inflation factors for revenue projections are normally different from inflation factors associated with actual construction costs.

Corrective Action 1: As required in 23CFR 450.324(f)(11)(iv), the 2025-2050 RTP shall develop a financial plan which includes revenue and cost estimates for projects based on year of expenditure dollars.

Federal regulations³ allow for MPOs to utilize cost-bands for large projects projected beyond the first ten-years, particularly where there is significant potential for uncertainty and risk. Future funding sources reasonably expected to be available shall be identified to carry out the upper band of the cost-band.

Cost bands are useful. Projects in the second 10-years of the Regional Transportation Plan might fall into this category, particularly larger projects. Risks and uncertainties may result from cost escalation (materials and labor), construction unknowns (unknown site conditions), uncertain environmental mitigation, unknown right-of-way needs, contractor risk and other causes. A cost band is a potential range of project costs that considers these and other risks and other potential uncertainties. A cost band can help convey the uncertainty of an estimate for a project and help educate other parties (such as the public and elected officials) who may not be intimately familiar with the project about cost variability. The use of cost bands in the second ten years of the RTP can help avoid misleading the public or others with a false sense of precision.

The South Stage Overcrossing would be one such project that would benefit from the use of a “cost-band.” The limited analysis and projected cost of each alternative varies widely, with significant more work to refine and select a project alternative. Because this is a major project, with significant unknowns, it is more appropriate for the MPO to use a “cost-band” in the RTP. This would show a cost of \$162 to \$277 million before inflation in 2024 dollars. The “cost-banded” project should utilize the higher number of \$277 million, then add inflation to the planned year of expenditure in the RTP.

Recommendation 1: As recommended by FHWA guidance, use a cost-band for the South Stage Overcrossing Project and identify available funding to support the highest level of the cost-band with inflation to the planned year of expenditure.

² <https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/planning/fscfctrntques.cfm>, #6, FHWA Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint for Transportation Plans and Programs Q & A, 2009

³ 23CFR 450.324(f)(11)(v): For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (*i.e.*, beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.

We reviewed the projected attribution of discretionary funds (CMAQ) toward projects in the RTP provided by your office, which identifies its use by jurisdiction and time range. As you know, the CMAQ program is funded by the federal government for the purpose of providing a source of flexible funding to states and local governments for transportation projects and programs that help meet the Clean Air Act requirements by reducing mobile source emissions in areas designated as nonattainment or maintenance areas for air quality standards.

The draft list of fiscally constrained projects identifies a future medium range project PHX-120 in the city of Phoenix which includes construction of a new 1.13-mile collector street to serve industrial/employment lands for \$9,500,000 (see Table 1 below). The medium range project list for the City of Phoenix includes four other projects with a total cost for all just over \$1.4 million. The revenue table we received from the MPO (see Table 2) indicates that \$9.5 million of MPO discretionary funds are available to the city for their medium range projects. Although CMAQ may be able to fund sidewalk/bike lane improvements, it is ineligible to fund most of the cost associated with construction for a new collector road as the draft RTP seems to indicate. Similar projects associated with CMAQ funds are included in Ashland and Talent. Please review the allocation of CMAQ funds to ensure that programmed projects meet the requirements and allocation of the funding source for all jurisdictions.

Table 1: Draft 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan, City of Phoenix Medium Range Project List

PHX-002	Rose St, Oak to 1st	Install sidewalks - length: .218 miles	Medium	\$346,500
PHX-003	Camp Baker Road, Hilsinger to Colver	new or improved sidewalks on both sides - length: .258 miles	Medium	\$445,000
PHX-004	Oak St. Rose to Main	Install sidewalks - length: .216 miles	Medium	\$363,000
PHX-006	Colver Rd., First St. to Southern UGB Boundary	Construct multi-use path on east side - length: .410 miles	Medium	\$250,000
PH6-120	UGB west of railroad between S. Stage Road and Houston Rd	New collector street and railroad crossing to serve industrial/employment lands - length: 1.13 miles	Medium	\$9,400,000

Table 2: Draft 2025-2050 Regional Transportation Plan Year of Expenditure – Discretionary Funds

Jurisdiction	Time Frame	Table 9.3.1 Year of Expenditure (YoE) X \$1,000									
		Federal Funds	State Gas Tax	Local			Total	Non-Capital Needs	Funds Available	Tier 1 RTP Project Costs	RVMPO Future Discretionary Funds
				SDC's	Fees	Other					
Ashland	short	\$4,600	\$11,705	\$990	\$10,673	\$1,026	\$28,994	\$17,590	\$11,403	\$7,752	
	medium		\$25,384	\$2,014	\$22,586	\$1,710	\$51,694	\$43,347	\$7,847	\$0	
	long		\$35,154	\$2,578	\$30,354	\$1,710	\$69,795	\$70,293	\$2	\$11,702	\$11,700
Central Point	short	\$3,200	\$10,728	\$300	\$5,100	\$5,000	\$24,328	\$5,647	\$18,681	\$4,899	
	medium		\$23,266	\$500	\$8,500	\$6,500	\$38,766	\$11,485	\$27,280	\$1,124	
	long		\$32,220	\$500	\$8,500	\$4,250	\$45,470	\$14,702	\$30,767	\$5,038	
Eagle Point	short		\$5,431	\$5,270	\$2,640	\$0	\$13,340	\$5,647	\$7,693	\$775	
	medium		\$11,777	\$10,719	\$5,812	\$0	\$28,308	\$11,485	\$16,822	\$8,000	
	long		\$16,310	\$13,721	\$8,198	\$0	\$38,228	\$14,702	\$23,526	\$20,925	
Jacksonville	short		\$1,744	\$83	\$984	\$0	\$2,811	\$2,217	\$595	\$0	
	medium		\$3,782	\$169	\$1,777	\$0	\$5,728	\$4,508	\$1,220	\$0	
	long		\$5,238	\$216	\$1,963	\$0	\$7,417	\$5,771	\$1,646	\$0	
Medford	short	\$60,150	\$49,580	\$11,179	\$48,471	\$4,471	\$173,851	\$90,080	\$83,771	\$27,925	
	medium		\$107,523	\$22,737	\$106,714	\$9,095	\$246,069	\$183,220	\$62,849	\$25,590	
	long		\$148,904	\$29,105	\$157,695	\$11,642	\$347,345	\$234,537	\$112,808	\$231,175	\$118,367
Phoenix	short		\$2,058	\$681	\$1,048	\$0	\$3,787	\$3,379	\$408	\$2,800	\$2,392
	medium		\$4,464	\$1,500	\$2,307	\$0	\$8,271	\$6,873	\$1,398	\$10,905	\$9,507
	long		\$6,181	\$2,116	\$3,255	\$0	\$11,552	\$8,798	\$2,754	\$770	
Talent	short		\$2,949	\$504	\$963	\$0	\$4,416	\$3,513	\$903	\$1,400	
	medium		\$6,396	\$1,110	\$2,120	\$0	\$9,626	\$7,146	\$2,480	\$5,040	\$2,560
	long		\$8,857	\$1,566	\$2,990	\$0	\$13,413	\$9,147	\$4,266	\$8,730	\$4,464
Jackson Co. (RVMPO Area)	short	\$28,500	\$57,698	\$3,000	\$3,600	\$1,700	\$94,498	\$22,894	\$71,604	\$17,500	
	medium		\$63,273	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$7,000	\$81,273	\$46,565	\$34,708	\$22,650	
	long		\$87,543	\$5,000	\$6,000	\$1,700	\$100,243	\$59,607	\$40,636	\$35,000	
Street System Totals		\$96,450	\$728,162	\$120,558	\$441,086	\$55,804	\$1,442,060	\$883,155	\$558,905	\$449,700	\$148,989
Total MPO Funds Available 2025-2050											\$151,483
Total MPO Funds Less Future MPO Funds Needed for Local Projects											\$2,494

Your email included a chain of emails between your staff and the city of Medford about applying \$20 million from a BUILD competitive grant, presumably to fund the South Stage Overcrossing. It is unclear if the source was used in the MPO revenue forecast, but the email leaves the impression it is included.

BUILD is a highly competitive federal grant that provides funding for surface transportation infrastructure projects with significant local or regional impact. Very few are given out in the State. If this fund source was used in your financial projections, please include additional information, assurances and actions the MPO is taking to ensure a future award.

Corrective Action 2: The MPO shall identify available and eligible revenue sources to ensure that the allocation of funds is consistent with eligibility requirements.

Corrective Action 3: The MPO shall provide clarity if a BUILD or other competitive federal grant is included as a revenue source in the RTP financial plan⁴ and if so, make findings on the actions and processes the MPO will undertake to assure receipt of those federal competitive grant(s).

As the RTP list of projects is currently drafted, we do not believe that it is fiscally constrained as required by federal regulations. We ask that you address the actions and recommendation above.

Once you have addressed these items, please forward a redlined version of the RTP constrained list to me as soon as is convenient along with any other associated findings or information.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 541-957-3658.

Sincerely,

Michael Baker /signed electronically 3/31/25

Michael Baker
ODOT Region 3 Planning and Development Manager

Cc: Erik Havig, ODOT, Statewide Planning Manager
Ashley Bryers – FHWA, Oregon Division
Jasmine Harris – FHWA, Oregon Division
Danielle Casey – FTA, Region 10
Tom Guevara – ODOT, Region 3 Planning
Natalie Lijenwall – ODOT, TPAU

⁴ 23CFR 450.324(11)(ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.