



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 23, 2025
To: RVMPO Policy Committee (PC)
From: Dan Moore, Senior Planner
Subject: RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Funding

THE HISTORY OF AND CURRENT POLICY REGARDING AWARDS OF DISCRETIONARY FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION FUNDS

The original policy regarding awards of discretionary funding was approved by the RVMPO Policy Committee on July 22, 2008. The intent of the policy was to allow jurisdictions the option of submitting a substitute project if their original project was deemed ineligible for CMAQ funding. The policy was revised on July 18, 2011, January 24, 2012, September 26, 2017 and July 23, 2024. See Appendix A for more information.

THE WEST PINE PROJECT

Original Application Description: West Pine Street is currently a two lane minor arterial with no bike lanes, no sidewalks and steep drainage canals on either side of the street. Existing conditions also reflect a lack of access control and the need for the construction of a continuous center left turn lane. Proposed improvements include widening West Pine Street between Glenn Way and Brandon Ave to include sidewalks on both sides of the street, curb and gutter on both sides, bike lanes on both sides, two paved travel lanes and one continuous left turn lane. Drainage will also be installed/upgraded.

Award: \$1,187,462 STBG funds and \$1,985,629 CMAQ funds.

Rescoped Project Status: As a cost-savings measure, the project was rescoped to eliminate the landscaping. All other aspects of the project remain the same.

Request for Additional Funding: Central Point made its first formal request for additional funds for the W. Pine project through a letter presented to the MPO Policy Committee on May 23, 2025 requesting \$7 Million dollars, but due to the receipt of the letter only 2 business days before the MPO meeting the request was not included on the business agenda. See Appendix B to review request letter.

THE TABLE ROCK PROJECTS

There are two Table Rock Road projects.

One is Medford's Table Rock Rd Merriman to I-5 (PE & ROW) project which was awarded \$1,106,888 in CMAQ funds and included in the 2024-27 TIP to complete preliminary engineering (PE) and start the right-of-way (ROW) process.

Original Application Description: Table Rock Rd is an existing Minor Arterial roadway with one lane each direction and 5' shoulders in an urbanizing area with a mix of medium and high density housing, single-family housing, a church, and the Jackson County Humane Society along this major north-south corridor. It also provides access to Howard Elementary school to the west as well as shopping, jobs, recreation, and access to transit both north and south. The segments north of I-5 and south of Merriman Rd are fully improved with travel lanes, bike lanes, and sidewalks.

The other is the current application for funding the construction phase for \$17,766,540.

Request for Additional Funding: Medford made an informal request for additional funding for Table Rock Rd (PE and ROW phase project) at the June 2025 TAC meeting. The formal request letter can be viewed in Appendix B.

October 2021 Covid-19 Relief Funds

On October 2021, the RVMPO Policy Committee approved the COVID-19 Relief Funding allocations depicted in the table below. The committee also approved the City of Ashland's proposal for returning \$468,244 in CMAQ funds from the Chip Seal project in exchange for COVID-19 funds. The returned CMAQ funds were reallocated to the City of Central Point's West Pine Street project

<u>COVID-19 Relief Allocation</u>	<u>\$ 2,515,367</u>
<u>Talent</u>	<u>\$ 250,000</u>
<u>Phoenix</u>	<u>\$ 250,000</u>
<u>Jacksonville</u>	<u>\$ 250,000</u>
<u>Eagle Point</u>	<u>\$ 250,000</u>
Ashland Chip Seal	\$ 250,000
Ashland Chip Seal (Additional)	\$ 150,000
NearMap (RVCOG)	\$ 75,000
Total Allocated	\$ 1,475,000
Remaining funds to be used in the next project selection cycle.	\$ 1,040,367

PRIOR SOLICITATION ROUNDS

2016 RVMPO Project Selection - Policy approved 1-24-17									
Rank			Requested		Awarded		Remaining Funds		
			STBG	CMAQ	STBG	CMAQ	STBG	CMAQ	
1	Central Point	W. Pine	\$ 1,187,462	\$ 1,517,385	\$ 1,187,462	\$ 1,517,385	\$ 1,766,555	\$ 1,723,896	
2	Jackson Co.	Foothill	\$ 1,255,652	\$ 1,255,652	\$ 1,255,652	\$ 755,652	\$ 510,903	\$ 968,244	
3	Phoenix	North Couplet	\$ 73,000	\$ -	\$ 73,000	\$ -	\$ 437,903	\$ 968,244	
4	Ashland	Ashland Chip Seal	\$ -	\$ 816,081	\$ -	\$ 468,244	\$ 437,903	\$ 500,000	
5	Eagle Point	S Royal	\$ 532,000	\$ -	\$ 437,903	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	
6	Jackson Co.	140 Greenway	\$ -	\$ 776,164		\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ -	
7	Medford	Foothill	\$ 2,200,000	\$ 1,240,000			\$ -	\$ -	
7	RVTD	Buses	\$ -	\$ 1,150,000			\$ -	\$ -	
7	RVTD	Trip Red. Prog.	\$ -	\$ 120,000			\$ -	\$ -	
7	Jackson Co.	Expo Parking	\$ -	\$ 559,873			\$ -	\$ -	
		Total	\$ 5,248,114	\$ 7,435,155	\$ 2,954,017	\$ 3,241,281			
		Available	\$ 2,954,017	\$ 3,241,281	\$ 2,954,017	\$ 3,241,281			
		Balance	\$ (2,294,097)	\$ (4,193,874)	\$ -	\$ -			
			\$ (6,487,971)		\$ -				
On a motion by John Vail, seconded by Paige Townsend, if additional funds become available, Projects 1-6 will be made whole in the order in which they were prioritized in the previous motion									

RVMPD Discretionary Funding 2022-2024


	2022	2023	2024	Total
CMAQ	\$ 1,365,412	\$ 1,268,258	\$ 1,296,805	\$ 3,930,475
STBG	\$ 1,448,772	\$ 1,496,045	\$ 1,544,358	\$ 4,489,175
Total	\$ 2,816,206	\$ 2,764,303	\$ 2,841,163	\$ 8,419,650

Jackson County		CMAQ	STBG
	Clay	\$ 2,294,806	\$ 2,241,008
	Crews	\$ 473,652	\$ -
	Expo	\$ 643,913	\$ -
	Total	\$ 3,412,371	\$ 2,241,008

Medford		CMAQ	STBG
	Stevens	\$ -	\$ 2,107,167
	Alley	\$ 319,723	\$ -
	Total	\$ 319,723	\$ 2,107,167

RVMPD		CMAQ	STBG
	Travel Survey \$47k for 3 years		\$ 141,000
	Total	\$ -	\$ 141,000

	Requested	Available	Remaining
CMAQ Total	\$ 3,732,094	\$ 3,930,475	\$ 198,381
STBG Total	\$ 4,489,175	\$ 4,489,175	\$ -
Total	\$ 8,221,269	\$ 8,419,650	\$ 198,381

<div> Rogue Valley MPO Federal Funding Allocations by Year 2025-2027</div>																		
Jurisdiction	Project Name	Total STBG Awarded	Total CMAQ Awarded	Total COVID Awarded	Total Awarded	2021-2024	2025				2026				2027			
						STBG	STBG		CMAQ		STBG		CMAQ		STBG		CMAQ	
						\$2,107,167	Available	\$1,989,293	Available	\$4,626,435	Available	\$2,035,710	Available	\$1,126,435	Available	\$2,035,710	Available	\$1,126,435
						Awarded	Awarded	Remaining	Awarded	Remaining	Awarded	Remaining	Awarded	Remaining	Awarded	Remaining	Awarded	Remaining
Ashland	Clay St.	\$ 100,000	\$ 1,826,248	0	\$ 1,926,248	0		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Central Point	10th Street: Bike and Ped	\$ 3,953,638	\$ 44,402	0	\$ 3,998,040	0		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Jackson County	Foothill Rd. Delta to Stevens	\$ 2,529,230	0	\$ 1,094,623	\$ 3,623,853	\$ 2,107,167		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Medford	Delta Waters Rd.	0	\$ 1,794,600	0	\$ 1,794,600	0		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Medford	Table Rock Rd.	\$ 1,585,012	\$ 1,106,888	0	\$ 2,691,900	0		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Medford	Stevens	0	\$ 2,107,167	0	\$ 2,107,167	0		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435
Total Awarded:		\$ 8,167,880	\$ 6,879,305	\$ 1,094,623	\$ 16,141,808	0	\$ -	\$ 1,989,293	\$ -	\$ 4,626,435	\$ -	\$ 2,035,710	\$ -	\$ 1,126,435	\$ -	\$ 2,035,710	\$ -	\$ 1,126,435
Funds Remaining:					0	\$ 2,107,167		\$ 1,989,293		\$ 4,626,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435		\$ 2,035,710		\$ 1,126,435

STBG Rollover Funds

In 2024, the RVMPO had a balance of \$3,304,783 in STGB funds that needed to be obligated by December 2024. On June 25, 2024, the RVMPO Policy Committee approved the allocations in the table below. The table also shows the amount of CMAQ funds returned to the RVMPO.

2024 STBG Carryover Funds			Returned CMAQ Funds
Jurisdiction	Project	Allocations	
Medford	Delta Waters: Waterford Ct. to Colonial Ave	\$1,909,150	\$1,794,600
Central Point	10th St Bike & Ped Improvements	\$1,395,633	\$3,900,000
Total		\$3,304,783	\$5,694,600

CURRENT SOLICITATION

	Key #	Project Status	Agency	Project Description	Phase	CMAQ Fund Request
1	21017	CARRIED OVER	Central Point ²	West Pine Street Reconstruction	PE, ROW, CONS	\$7,000,000
2	23303	CARRIED OVER	Medford ²	Table Rock Road - Merriman to I-5	PE, ROW	\$1,884,330
3	-	NEW	Medford	Table Rock Road - Merriman to I-5	CONS	\$17,766,540
4	-	NEW	Medford	Main & Highland Intersection Improvement	PE, ROW, CONS	\$2,243,250
5	-	NEW	ODOT	OR99: Matt Loop - Garfield	PE	\$500,000.00
6	-	NEW	RVTD ⁴	Transit Operations	-	\$4,000,000
7	21197	NEW	Talent	OR99: Creel to Bear Creek Greenway Connector	ROW, CONS	\$773,900.00

Total CMAQ Funds Available 2027-2030 ¹	\$ 10,064,862
Total Additional Funding Requests ²	\$ 8,884,330
Total Net CMAQ Funding Available ³	\$ 1,180,532
Total New Projects Funding Requests	\$ 25,283,690
Total Funding Requests	\$ 34,168,020
Funding Shortfall	\$ (24,103,158)

¹ Includes 2027 carryover funds

² These projects request additional CMAQ funding under the underfunded projects policy. They **ARE NOT** competing for this round of funding.

³ (Total CMAQ Funds - Total Additional Funding)

⁴ RVTD proposes to exchange \$3,098,720 in 2026 to 2030 gas tax funds for \$4M in CMAQ funds. RVTD estimates the gas tax multiplier effect is 1.29% which makes the exchange worth \$3,997,348

RVMPO 2027 CMAQ Carryover Funds	
Medford: Delta Waters: Waterford Ct. to Colonial Ave	\$ 1,794,600
Central Point: 10th St Bike & Pedestrian Improvements	\$ 3,900,000
ODOT CMAQ Program: 2027 CMAQ Fund Balance	\$ 928,473
Total	\$ 6,623,073

THE JUNE TAC WORKSHOP

The RVMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) held a 2027-2030 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funding workshop at their June 11, 2025 meeting where RVMPO jurisdictions applying for CMAQ funding presented their projects.

The TAC discussed Central Point's and Medford's request for additional funding based on the Policy Committee's policy regarding awards of discretionary funding. The TAC had several questions regarding how to interpret the policy. The TAC made a motion seeking Policy Committee direction. The motion is paraphrased for clarification.

1. Existing projects are 100% funded regardless of the funding source and date of approval. If not, then,
2. Fund existing projects with carryover CMAQ funds and use remaining funds for new TIP projects.

In summary, the TAC concluded that direction is needed from the Policy Committee on how they interpret the policy.

- Is the total amount of TIP funding for the 4-year cycle including carryover funds available to previously awarded underfunded existing projects seeking additional funding?
- Are only carryover funds available for previously awarded underfunded existing projects seeking additional funding?
- Is the intent of the funding policy to make previously awarded underfunded existing projects whole without limitation? Limitations, some of which were discussed, could include:
 1. limits on the time period a previously awarded project may seek additional funding.
 2. Limits on the amount carried over from the solicitation period awarding the project.
 3. Limits on the amount of additional funds that may be requested, i.e., limited to the inflation rate or any deficit after additional funding sources may be reasonably available.

Policy Committee Action Items

The questions raised by the TAC entail resolution of these questions:

1. Determine the intent and scope of the policy in the context of a jurisdiction's invocation of paragraph 6's direction to provided priority for "available" funds to "funded projects" that need additional funding for completion.

2. Reply to the TAC's questions regarding the funding policy - whether the roll-over CMAQ funds from prior solicitations – \$5 million (or \$6.5 million) – may be allocated to funded projects needing additional funding and/or whether the current solicitation funds may also be allocated to funded projects – for a total of \$10 million.

POTENTIAL MOTIONS

Question 1

To deem the “available funds” policy inapplicable due to [examples - [option: vagueness] [option: forfeiture as it relates to projects awarded prior to the last solicitation round] [option: internal inconsistency where federal rules change the applicable criteria generally]] [option: the policy having not been applied/considered in relation to separate actions substituting discretionary funds for Covid and roll-over STBG funds over two solicitation rounds]

To deem the “available funds” policy to including only the funds made available (carry overed) from the particular solicitation round and to be available only for the underfunded or unfunded projects of that solicitation round.

To deem the “available funds” policy to include all Carryover funds from the previous solicitation rounds and to be available for the underfunded or unfunded projects of all prior solicitation rounds.

To deem the “available funds” policy to include all Carryover and current unawarded solicitation round funds and to be available for the underfunded and unfunded projects of all prior solicitation rounds.

Question 2

- A. I move to direct the TAC to consider the W. Pine and Table Rock project requests as an unprioritized equal application in the current solicitation (which includes all funds).
- B. I move to direct the jurisdictions to seek applications for prior unfunded projects by July 10, 2025 and direct the TAC to make funding recommendations considering all prior underfunded and unfunded projects [option: as unprioritized equal applications in the current solicitation (including all funds)] [option: for the available funds in amount of the “Carryover funds.”]
- C. I move to direct the TAC to consider the current solicitation to exclude the relevant separate solicitation round Carryover amounts and to make recommendations for each roll-over amount as available to the underfunded [and/or unfunded projects sought by letter application due July 10] of that solicitation round.
 - a. For example – make recommendations regarding CMAQ rollover funds in the amount of \$5,694,600 (“2025-27 Solicitation round rollover”) to the 2025-27 solicitation round underfunded projects; and regarding CMAQ rollover funds in the amount of \$928,473 (“[? date] Solicitation round rollover”) to the [? same date] solicitation round underfunded projects, etc.

- D. I move to direct the TAC to consider the current solicitation to exclude \$8,884,330, and to recommend awarding the remaining \$1,180,532 for the current TIP solicitation cycle and further move to award Central Point 7 Million for the W. Pine project and \$1,884,330 to Medford for the Table Rock Road project and direct the
- E. I move to direct the TAC to consider the current solicitation to exclude the \$6,479,442 in Carryover CMAQ funds and to recommend awarding the remaining \$ _____ for the current TIP solicitation cycle and further move to [option: award the Central Point W. Pine Project (x%) and the Medford Table Rock Road Project (x%) of the \$6,479,442 in Carryover CMAQ funds] [option: direct Medford and Central Point to make a separate presentation to the MPO at the July meeting at which time the Policy Committee will determine how much, if any of the Carryover funds it will award to the projects and determine how the Policy Committee will award any remaining Carryover funds.
- F. I move to direct the TAC to consider the current solicitation to exclude \$1,884,330 in Carryover CMAQ funds and to recommend awarding the remaining \$ 4,595,112 in Carryover funds and \$3,585,420 in 2028, 2029 & 2030 TIP cycle funding (total amount of funding available for 2027-2030 TIP cycle would be \$8,180,532) and further move to award the Medford Table Rock Road Project \$1,884,330 in Carryover CMAQ funds. which will leave
- G. I move to direct the TAC to consider the current solicitation to exclude \$ 6,479,422 in Carryover CMAQ funds and to recommend awarding the remaining \$3,585,420 for the 2028, 2029 & 2030 TIP cycle funding and further move to award the Central Point W. Pine Project \$6,479,442 in Carryover CMAQ funds..

Appendices

Appendix A

History of Awards of Discretionary Funding Policies



**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*

July 22, 2008

RVMPO Policy Regarding CMAQ Grant Awards

1. RVMPO Policy Committee makes all final decisions regarding CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project and must be spent on that project.
3. CMAQ funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
 - a. RVMPO member jurisdictions
 - i. When by the jurisdiction's own action, funds not used, either in whole or in part (jurisdiction cancels project, un-spent balance accrues, etc.) unused grant funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - ii. When the Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration find an awarded project in-eligible, recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final federal decision to submit a substitute project for consideration. Substitute project will be scored according to RVMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee may fund the substitute project if members agree that its evaluation scores are similar to, or better than, the scores for the denied project. Funds not awarded to a substitute project in the manner described will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - b. Recipients that are not RVMPO members
 - i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
4. Priority for available funds will be given to CMAQ-funded projects that need additional funding for completion.



**Rogue Valley
Metropolitan Planning Organization**

Regional Transportation Planning

Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation

DATE: July 18, 2011
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Vicki Guarino
SUBJECT: RVMPO Discretionary Funds Process and Policy Questions

The Policy Committee is responsible for awarding about \$3.8 million in federal funds annually to transportation projects. With the next round of grant awards coming this fall, this memo is intended to provide an update of work undertaken to improve and update the RVMPO's discretionary funds grant process and present two policy issues for committee action.

Background

Funds come to the RVMPO region from two sources: Surface Transportation Program (local share through agreement among ODOT, League of Oregon Cities and Association of Oregon Counties), \$1.2 million; and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, \$2.6 million. These discretionary funds are awarded to projects well ahead of the year they are available, consistent with federal and state planning requirements for MPOs. This means we are preparing to solicit project applications for 2014 and 2015 funds.

Grant Process Update

To respond to changing conditions and ensure RVMPO is putting these funds to the best possible use, we have been working through a nearly year-long process of reviewing and updating all discretionary funding procedures. We have updated both the application form and the project evaluation matrix. Project applications will continue to be evaluated according to how well they contribute to RVMPO transportation goals – both organizational goals adopted in 2009 and the Regional Transportation Plan goals – as well as federal objectives. Under the updated format, however, each goal is clearly identified in the application and evaluation process. This work was initiated in response to requests from member jurisdictions and to be consistent with the RVMPO goal to “*Strategically use RVMPO funding to pursue RVMPO goals.*” All goals and corresponding evaluation criteria are shown on Table 1: Goals and Project Funding Criteria. The criteria are linked to the project scoring sheet, shown as Table 2 in this memo. (Large format versions of both tables will be available at the meeting.) Table 2 is a mock-up of how preliminary staff evaluations would occur.

The grant application packet is appended to this memo for informational purposes. It will be released for use by jurisdictions by the end of the month.

Policy Questions for Committee Action

Two policy questions arose from the discretionary fund process review: setting applicant guidelines; and a policy revision to clarify the intent of Policy Committee funding decisions.

RVMPO is staffed by Rogue Valley Council of Governments • 155 N. First St. • P O Box 3275 • Central Point OR 97502 • 664-6674

- **Policy Question 1: Establishing Applicant or Sponsorship Guidelines**

Proposed Policy: All applicants for discretionary funds must be RVMPO members. Members may sponsor applications of non-member organizations, public and private. All funds will go to the sponsoring jurisdiction except in cases where the Rogue Valley Council of Governments has agreed to be the recipient. Non-member recipient projects will be funded by contract with the member jurisdiction, or RVCOG. RVCOG contracting costs will be reimbursed by the recipient.

Discussion: RVMPO has accepted (and funded) projects submitted directly from private business (Rogue Disposal) and non-profits (Cascade Sierra). The TAC and staff recommend adoption of a new requirement that all non-RVMPO member applications be sponsored by an RVMPO member. This would be consistent with the practice at other MPOs that fund private and non-member projects. The change would provide a higher level of accountability and understanding of the projects, and would streamline any eventual funding process. Funds for such projects must be awarded to a qualifying government agency. Currently, RVCOG has been the recipient for the RVMPO's private projects, contracting with the project recipient for project delivery. Under the proposed policy, the RVMPO jurisdiction would submit the application, and support the application through the Policy Committee decision. If the project is funded, the jurisdiction could ask RVCOG to take over contracting responsibility. RVCOG's project management costs would be determined prior to taking on the project.

- **Policy Question 2: Project Funding Decisions**

Proposed Policy: To extend to all funding sources the current policy regarding CMAQ funds, and formalizing the Policy Committee's authority to make funding decisions. The policy establishes a process for instances when a project funded by the Policy Committee cannot be implemented. Current policy appears below with amendments highlighted. The Policy Committee could adopt this policy as presented.

Discussion: The original policy regarding RVMPO discretionary funds identified CMAQ funds, but through an oversight failed to specify STP funds. The TAC reviewed the proposed policy amendments and recommend adoption.

RVMPO Policy regarding use of discretionary funds, with proposed amendments, below:

July 22, 2008 July 26, 2011

RVMPO Policy Regarding CMAQ Grant Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds
(Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)

This Policy addresses the allocation of STP and CMAQ funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for surface transportation improvements. Projects receive federal funding through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for grant recipients 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 STP and CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project, and must be spent on that project.
3. ~~CMAQ-F~~unds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
 - a. RVMPO member jurisdictions
 - i. When by the jurisdiction's own action, funds are not used, either in whole or in part (jurisdiction cancels project, un-spent balance accrues, etc.) unused grant funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - ii. When Federal Highway Administration or Federal Transit Administration find an awarded project in-eligible, recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final federal decision to submit a substitute project for consideration. Substitute project will be scored according to RVMPO evaluation criteria. The Policy Committee may fund the substitute project if members agree that its evaluation scores are similar to, or better than, the scores for the denied project. Funds not award to a substitute project in the manner described will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - b. Recipients that are not RVMPO members
 - i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
4. Priority for available funds will be given to ~~CMAQ~~-funded projects that need additional funding for completion.

Commitment to Schedule

Although it is understandable that circumstances can arise to force policy makers to shift course in unplanned ways, staff and the TAC are asking the RVMPO to commit to keeping the grant-award schedule as outlined on pages 2 and 3 of the application packet. The schedule was developed to allow us to be consistent with the state's schedule for adopting the 2012-2015 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, complete our Air Quality Conformity Determination, allow jurisdictions time to develop applications, and provide time for advisory committees to evaluate applications. Last-minute changes can adversely impact jurisdiction staff schedules and RVMPO's ability to complete required regional, state and federal coordination.

On the following pages are: Table 1: Goals and Project Funding Criteria; and Table 2: Project Scoring sheet.

Also attached is the grant application packet to be published at the end of the month.



**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: Jan. 18, 2012
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Vicki Guarino
SUBJECT: Policy Regarding Use of Discretionary Funds

This memo results from discussion by the Policy Committee and Technical Advisory Council in late fall regarding the RVMPO's policy on the use and re-allocation of RVMPO discretionary funds (Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program and Surface Transportation Program). We've had instances where jurisdictions have seen their needs and funding conditions change over the span of years between the RVMPO funding decision and project implementation. Concerns have been raised that the existing RVMPO policy doesn't recognize changing circumstances and reduces the ability of jurisdictions – and the region – to respond.

The purpose of having a policy regarding these funds is to provide everyone with an understanding of expectations. When funds are awarded they are awarded to a project, not to a jurisdiction. The Policy Committee is not permitted to award funds by jurisdiction; that is considered sub-allocation. Funds must be allocated based on a process that fulfills federal requirements and local expectations. Any re-allocation of unused funds also must be made by the Policy Committee, meeting the same standards as the original decision. The policy sets out a process by which re-allocation can occur, recognizing that a jurisdiction's priorities can change.

Draft revised policy as recommended to the Policy Committee by the TAC and PAC is attached.



**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

~~Jan. 24, 2012~~ July 26, 2011

RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds
(Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)

This Policy addresses the allocation of STP and CMAQ funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for surface transportation improvements. Projects receive federal funding through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for grant recipients 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 STP and CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project, and must be spent on that project.
3. Funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
 - a. RVMPO member jurisdictions

- i. ~~When by the jurisdiction's own action, RVMPO grant funds are not fully expended, used, either in whole or in part (jurisdiction cancels project, unspent balance accrues, etc.) unused grant funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.~~
 - ii. ~~When a jurisdiction determines it will not implement a project, it may offer a substitute project(s). Substitute project(s) will be evaluated according to current RVMPO evaluation criteria. 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.~~
 - iii. ~~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 -federal decision- to submit a substitute project for consideration. Substitute project will be scored according to current RVMPO evaluation criteria. 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:~~

RVMPO is staffed by Rogue Valley Council of Governments • 155 N. First St. • P O Box 3275 • Central Point OR 97502 • 664-6674

1. Funds should be awarded to the substitute project; or
 2. Funds should go back to the region for re-allocation.
- ~~b. The Policy Committee may fund the substitute project if members agree that its evaluation scores are similar to, or better than, the scores for the denied project. Funds not award to a substitute project in the manner described will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.~~
- ~~e.b.~~ Recipients that are not RVMPO members
- i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
4. Priority for available funds will be given to funded projects that need additional funding for completion.



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 26, 2017

RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds (Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program)

This Policy addresses the allocation of STP and CMAQ funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for surface transportation improvements. Projects receive federal funding through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for grant recipients 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 STP and CMAQ program awards.
2. All awards are specific to a project and must be spent on that project.
3. Funds that are not used on the project for which they were allocated will be addressed as follows:
 - a. RVMPO member jurisdictions
 - i. When RVMPO grant funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
 - ii. 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.
 - iii. 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.
- b. Recipients that are not RVMPO members
- i. All funds not used as described at the time of the award will go back to the RVMPO region for re-allocation.
4. Priority for available funds will be given to funded projects that need additional funding for completion.
5. 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*

July 23, 2024

RVMPO Policy Regarding Awards of Discretionary Federal Transportation Funds (Surface Transportation Block Grant and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program) and/or State Gas Tax Funds passed through the MPO hereafter collectively called “funds”.¹

This Policy addresses the allocation of funds awarded to the RVMPO planning area for projects. Projects receive funds through the RVMPO by way of listing in the current RVMPO Transportation Improvement Program. Final approval for federal transportation funds 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, then no further action is required.
 - For recipients of federal transportation 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 funds are not fully expended, unused funds go back to the RVMPO for re- allocation according to the relevant allocation policy.
4. Should a jurisdiction which is a recipient of state gas tax funds fail to begin a funded 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), as determined by the Policy Committee, the recipient jurisdiction will have 90 days from the date of final determination of the Policy

¹ At the time this policy was amended in July 2024, ORS 367.095(4)(b), directed the substitution of STBG funds with state gas tax funds to pass through the MPOs.

Committee to submit a substitute project for consideration. To facilitate the Policy Committee's decision on whether the failure to implement was for reasons beyond the control of the jurisdiction, the jurisdiction should submit a report advocating its position to the TAC and the TAC may issue a response or otherwise make a recommendation for the Policy Committee. Those reports/comments and minutes of TAC proceedings shall be forwarded to the Policy Committee for its determination. If the Policy Committee determines the failure was beyond the jurisdiction's control, the TAC shall consider the jurisdiction's substitute project and make a recommendation to the Policy Committee by scoring both the currently programmed and the substitute project according to current RVMPO evaluation process against all submitted projects during that funding round. The recommendation shall be based upon the evaluation of substitute project, particularly its performance relative to the original project, and other information the committee agrees is appropriate. After receiving the TAC's recommendation, 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.

Appendix B

CMAQ Funding Requests

From: [Matt Samitore](#)
To: [Ryan McLaren *QDOT](#)
Cc: [Yazeed Alrashdi](#); ksharp@rvcoq.org; [Michael Quilty](#)
Subject: Copy of West Pine Funding and Costs.xlsx
Date: Friday, May 16, 2025 11:55:08 AM
Attachments: [Copy of West Pine Funding and Costs.xlsx](#)

Ryan,

I am writing to formally request an additional **\$7 million in CMAQ funding** for the West Pine Reconstruction Project in Central Point. This project is vital for the safety of our community, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists along a heavily utilized corridor.

Since the original grant in 2015, the cost of the West Pine Reconstruction Project has significantly increased due to various factors, including inflation and rising material costs, time delays and COVID. The initial CMAQ grant of \$4,500,000 is no longer sufficient to cover the scope of work necessary to address the pressing safety concerns on West Pine.

The core purpose of this grant was to dramatically improve bike and pedestrian safety on a corridor that serves five school bus stops and the second-largest housing authority apartments in Central Point. This area experiences incredibly heavy pedestrian traffic, including numerous children traveling to and from school and bus stops. Tragically, since 2015, three children in Central Point have been hit while waiting to board the bus. These incidents underscore the urgent need for comprehensive improvements to ensure the safety of our most vulnerable residents.

We understand the importance of regional collaboration and are committed to being team players to ensure that critical infrastructure projects across the Rogue Valley can be completed. We are actively seeking solutions and partnerships to maximize the impact of every dollar.

However, if the full \$7 million in additional funding is not feasible, we respectfully request as much as possible to improve as much of the corridor as possible. While this would necessitate scaling back portions of the project, it would allow us to prioritize the most critical safety enhancements and still significantly impact this dangerous corridor. We believe any additional funding will be crucial in preventing further tragedies.

We ask the Policy Committee to address this funding immediately, as any project scope change will take additional time to get approved.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this urgent request. We are available to discuss this matter further and provide any additional information you may require.

Sincerely,

Matt Samitore

Assistant City Manager/Parks & Public Works Director, City of Central Point



**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 18, 2025
TO: Policy Committee
FROM: Jeffrey Stump, Associate Transportation Planner
SUBJECT: RE: Factual Questions: Projects Requesting CMAQ Funding

Project Information

Applicant: City of Central Point
Project: West Pine Reconstruction
Project Key Number: 21017

Policy Committee Questions

***1. Policy Committee Chair Eleanor Ponomareff, received via email
Tuesday 5/27/2025***

Matt Samitore response, received via email Thursday 5/29/2025, shown in red below.

How has the project changed (in terms of scope, costs)?

- What was the original scope of the project, vs now?

The project hasn't changed. The only change was reducing the cost, so we have eliminated the landscape row. It is now a Curb, gutter, and sidewalk.

- What portion of the project was eligible for CMAQ, vs now?

Dan (Roberts – ODOT) can clarify, but it is 100% eligible.

What progress has been made?

- What was the timeline proposed with the original project submission/approval

The project got delayed because of the Twin Creeks Rail Crossing project. If you don't know about that project, the city hired TYLIN through ODOT's approved engineering firms. A week before bid, TYLIN closed all their Oregon offices and every person except for one was fired. The plans were all wrong, and it took ODOT and the City 2 years longer than usual to

finish the project. In 2022, we rescoped W. Pine Street. In 2023, we signed the IGA with ODOT so that they could do the PE on this project.

- Was the project "begun" according to the definition. (If an IGA with ODOT defines beginning the project, is the IGA still in effect?)

Preliminary Engineering started in 2024, they are currently working on the Environmental. Approximately 250k has been spent so far.

- What portion of the CMAQ funds have been used, and when?

See answer above.

- What progress has been made on the project?

See answer above.

Other funding sources?

- What other sources of funding have been applied for, and/or will be applied for; please include the amounts applied for and whether they were received?

Other than local match, no other funds are currently available. We are applying for Safe Routes to School for some of the project, but the grant cycle doesn't open until this fall.

Policy Committee Questions

2. Steve Lambert, received via email Friday 5/30/2025

Per our discussion at the Policy Committee this week, I would like to know answers to the following questions to better inform me of the status of any projects that are currently not fully funded and may be requesting additional CMAQ funds.

Matt Samitore response, received via email Friday 5/30/2025, shown in red.

Justin Shoemaker response, received via email Friday 5/30/2025, shown in blue.

Please add these comments to existing City responses. Dan can attend the TAC and Policy meeting to discuss the project progression in detail. ODOT has also provided the PCR to the MPO and City. The PCR has some of the information that was requested here.

1. Date original grant was awarded

Originally awarded in 2015, we asked for it to be in the 2018 start year for budgeting purposes.

2. Date an IGA with ODOT was fully executed, if any delays why?

Yes, the City had a significant issue with the Twin Creeks Rail Crossing. When the project went to be bid for construction, TYLIN, Inc. (one of the engineers on ODOT's approved list) closed all of their Oregon offices. The plans were inaccurate and almost every design sheet had to be redone. A project that was supposed to be a 1.5-year construction project lasted nearly 3 years. Additionally, the City sued TYLIN with ODOT to recover some of the funds spent. We could not start the W. Pine Project until that was done, which it finalized in late 2020. In 2022, we rescope the project with ODOT and in 2023, an IGA was signed.

In addition to the City comment provided. The Application was not scoped by ODOT for Federal delivery. There was not enough funding to Design or R/W for even ODOT to design/deliver the project let alone consultant delivery as these projects are supposed to be set up for. ODOT does not enter an IGA or start a procurement process until STIP and ODOT cost estimate align. We required by PCR that the City move funding from the construction phase to match out minimum estimates for PE and R/W. The construction phase had to be backfilled with Local funding to meet STIP requirements. This allows the local to start the design when looking for additional fund for the construction phase

3. Have there been any significant changes in the scope of work? If so, why?

No, the project has been simplified. We have eliminated the landscape rows, and they are now curb, gutter, sidewalk, grind, and inlay. The city has also done all the water work for the pre-project.

In ODOT opinion yes – this was originally proposed as a continuous 3 lane section. As this was laid out to fit AASHTO standards it would have created significant R/W Takes, including a lot of person property (sheds, carports, etc.). Project was adjusted for minimized R/W impacts, and to stay within the R/W estimate.

4. What are the other currently obligated funding sources?

The only source is CMAQ. The project has used approximately 250k of the 1.5 million for PE.

The only source is CMAQ, and local match, *** Construction phase will have Local overmatch - due to required STIP adjustment to move project forward.

5. Have all other sources of funding been fully utilized? Is there any capacity to add other funding?

We are applying for Safe Routes to School in the fall of 2025.

6. Has work on the project already begun? If so, what has been completed to date?

An IGA was signed in 2023 for ODOT to do the design in-house, and ODOT will need to inform us of the percentage of projects designed. As stated earlier, we have signed an IGA and PE is underway. Approximately 250k has been spent.

Yes – PE is fully obligated – we are pre-DAP – Survey Complete, 2D set, 3D modeled, API locked, and NEPA beginning (in heavy negotiations with regulators). This is about 20%. – We are looking late 2027 Bid date.

7. Is ODOT delivering all aspects of the project, or are contractors (ie. is this ODOT design and inspected, or subcontractors)?

This is currently inhouse ODOT full service delivery, depending if we have reduction to ODOT staffing – we may need to acquire consultant inspection / QA/QC depending on our resources in 2028.

8. What is ODOT doing to control costs, including their project delivery costs?

ODOT uses value engineering processes and is efficient in delivering the requirements of FHWA projects. <https://www.oregon.gov/odot/Engineering/Pages/Manuals.aspx>

9. What is driving the rise in cost? I am looking for specifics, not just “inflation.” If rising costs match inflation rates per the National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI), then fine, but if increasing costs are in excess of the NHCCI, I would like to know what is driving those increases.

As stated above in #2 – Scoping of this project has been extremely underestimated. MPO applications were not using updated cost data. MPO applications use generalized bid items and have had high usage of Lump Sum estimation that did/do not meet real world delivery. R/W cost has been drastically overlooked by all local agencies in the past application processes. Under scoped projects have been a discussion at the MPO for years – Examples of projects that come to mind with similar issues (scoping) of delivery cost vs application: Foothills / Clay Street / Crews Road / Ashland Chip seal.

10. Has the jurisdiction looked at any other alternatives, such as reducing project scope to achieve similar results if possible?

If need be and allowed, we could do a half street improvement from Griffin Creek to Bandon on the South side of the street, eliminating a large portion of sidewalk and curb and gutter. In 2021 this was scoped for a price of 6.2 million, best estimates are that it'd be 7.5-8 million.

Reduction in project will require new CMAQ application and eligibility review. Project will need to use updated tool and calculators for Program and FHWA assessment. CMAQ minimum requirement will still have to be met.



June 13, 2025

Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization
Via Email Only

TABLE ROCK ROAD – PROJECT CHANGE REQUEST

To the TAC and Policy Committee,

The City of Medford would like to request an additional \$1,884,330 in CMAQ funding for the Design and Right-of-Way phases of the Table Rock Road project. These phases of the project were awarded \$2,691,900 in 2022. Since then inflation and additional project scoping has shown an expected increase in the cost to complete the work. The total cost of these two phases of the project were estimated at \$3,000,000 in 2022. They are now estimated at \$5,100,000.

The scope of the project has not changed. The cost increase is simply a result of updating the estimate to apply for construction dollars. We have seen the costs of design and construction increase dramatically over the last three years.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Karl H. MacNair'.

Karl H. MacNair, PE
Transportation Manager

From: [Kelsey Sharp](#)
Subject: Additional Information on Medford's Table Rock Road Project
Date: Monday, June 23, 2025 3:33:42 PM

Hello all,

Below please find questions and answers for the Medford's Table Rock Road Project. The answers to the questions are in **Purple from Karl MacNair**.

Questions via Chairperson Ponomareff

How has the project changed (in terms of scope, costs)? **The primary scope change since 2022 is the identification of two pieces of property for storm water treatment.**

- What was the original scope of the project, vs now? **The scope is to build the City's standard Minor Arterial cross-section (3-lanes, separated bike lanes, sidewalks, streetlights, storm drain, etc.) from approximately 300' north of Merriman Road to approximately 350' south of the south abutment of the bridge over I-5.**
- What portion of the project was eligible for CMAQ, vs now? **We are still waiting on that determination from ODOT.**

What progress has been made?

- What was the timeline proposed with the original project submission/approval? **PE and ROW to be completed in the 2024-2027 STIP cycle.**
- Was the project "begun" according to the definition? (If an IGA with ODOT defines beginning the project, is the IGA still in effect?) **Not yet.**
- What portion of the CMAQ funds have been used, and when? **None.**
- What progress has been made on the project? **The City completed additional preliminary design work in preparation for this year's applications but no milestones have been reached.**

Other funding sources?

- What other sources of funding have been applied for, and/or will be applied for; please include the amounts applied for and whether they were received? **Medford applied for \$2,000,000 in All Roads Traffic Safety (ARTS) funding in 2023. ARTS funding was not awarded. Medford was just notified in June about ARTS.**

Questions via Steve Lambert

1. Date original grant was awarded **2022**
2. Date an IGA with ODOT was fully executed, if any delays why? **Not yet executed**
3. Have there been any significant changes in the scope of work? If so, why? **No significant scope changes.**
4. What are the other currently obligated funding sources? **None.**
5. Have all other sources of funding been fully utilized? Is there any capacity to add other funding? **No money has been spent to date on this project.**
6. Has work on the project already begun? If so, what has been completed to date? **The City completed additional preliminary design work in preparation for this year's applications but no milestones have been reached.**
7. Is ODOT delivering all aspects of the project, or are contractors (ie. is this ODOT design and inspected, or subcontractors)? **The City anticipates delivering the project as a certified agency with in-house design and hiring consultants for specialty design as needed.**
8. What is ODOT doing to control costs, including their project delivery costs? **Not applicable. ODOT has not been involved in the scoping effort to date.**
9. What is driving the rise in cost? I am looking for specifics, not just "inflation." If rising costs match inflation rates per the National Highway Construction Cost Index (NHCCI), then fine, but if increasing costs are in excess of the NHCCI, I would like to know what is driving those increases. **The primary scope change since 2022 is the identification of two pieces of property for storm water treatment. These are responsible for a good portion of the \$500k increase in ROW. The rest is due to increases in property values. The construction cost increases are primarily due to inflation. The estimate was updated to reflect state average bid pricing for 2024.**
10. Has the jurisdiction looked at any other alternatives, such as reducing project scope to achieve similar results if possible? **Building the whole project at once is the most cost-effective way to construct it. There are not really any logical end points to shorten the project. It could be built as a half street, but that will leave the need for the other half while increasing the overall cost of the project with two mobilizations and additional time (and inflation) before the 2nd half is built.**

Hope to see you in the RVMPO Policy Committee meeting tomorrow!

Thank you,

Kelsey Sharp

Planning Dept. - Office Specialist III
She/They
Rogue Valley Council of Governments
155 N. First St | PO Box 3275
Central Point, OR 97502
Direct Line : (541) 423-1375
Fax : (541) 664-7927
Ksharp@rvcog.org
[RVCOG](#) | [RVMPQ](#) | [MRMPQ](#) | [RVACT](#)