#	**Source**	**Comment Summary**	**MRMPO Response**
1	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 4, page 1: Add Jacksonville Highway (OR-238) to the third paragraph.	Change made. Jacksonville Highway (OR-238) added.
2	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 4, page 2: Change "Williams Highway" to "Jacksonville Highway".	Change made. "Williams" changed to "Jacksonville".
3	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 5, page 2: Change "OR-199" to "US-199" in Table 5-1 and in text.	Change made. "OR" changed to "US".
4	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 5, page 2: Remove "Sams Valley Highway (OR 234)" from Table 5-1 and in text.	Change made. Sams Valley Highway removed.
5	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 5, page 2: Add Lincoln Road and Lower River Road to Table 5-2.	Change made. Lincoln Road and Lower River Road added.
6	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 5, page 7: Change "Williams Highway" to "Jacksonville Highway".	Change made. "Williams" changed to "Jacksonville".
7	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 5, page 33: Change "Ashland" to "Eugene" in the last paragraph on the page.	Change made. "Ashland" to "Eugene".
8	Michael Baker, ODOT	Chapter 10, page 4: MRMPO Civil Rights Plan's web link does not work.	Change made. Web link updated to correct address.
9	Peter Fish, Public	The bridge limits bus and emergency vehicles to the town.	Comment acknowledged. Others have expressed the same concern.
10	Peter Fish, Public	The main intersection in town at 2nd Ave. and Dardanelles St. is hazardous because of poor sight lines, and needs some kind of traffic control.	ODOT evaluating intersection.
11	Cassandra Rosa, Public	Introduce more renewable transportation infrastructure in the community. Create a broad spectrum communication of transportation, city planning sourced by a representative, up to date on plans and proposals to share and incorporate information across transportation service.	Public Involvement chapter seeks to enhance flow of information and opportunities for public comment.

Appendix A

Regulatory Framework

This Transportation Plan is intended to meet both federal and state requirements for regional transportation plans as described in the federal transportation act Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21), the U.S. Clean Air Act amendments of 1990, and Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). This chapter describes the federal and state rules, regulations, and policies that influence the content of this document.

A. Federal Regulation

According to the 23 CFR, §450.322:

(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. …. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO and then every four (4) years thereafter.

(b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every four years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every five years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The transportation plan (and any revisions) shall be approved by the MPO and submitted for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP);

(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data utilized in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:

(1) The projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;

(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities, and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan. In addition, the locally preferred alternative selected from an Alternatives Analysis under the FTA's Capital Investment Grant program (49 U.S.C. 5309 and 49 CFR part 611) needs to be adopted as part of the metropolitan transportation plan as a condition for funding under 49 U.S.C. 5309;

(3) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;

(4) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide; [Not Applicable to this Area];

(5) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system;

(6) …In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;

(7) A discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The discussion shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;

(8) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g);

(9) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, as appropriate; and

(10) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.

(i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall

contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).

(ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO, 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.

(iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified.

(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Starting December 11, 2007, 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).

(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.

(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP. [Not Applicable to this Area – the Grants Pass CO & PM_{10} Maintenance Areas do not have any TCMs].

(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may (but is not required to) include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (i.e. , by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:

(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or

(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.

(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should include a safety element that incorporates or summarizes the priorities, goals, countermeasures, or projects for the MPA contained in the Strategic Highway Safety Plan required under 23 U.S.C. 148, as well as (as appropriate) emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security (as appropriate) and safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

(i) The MPO shall provide citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public 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 §450.316(a).

(j) The metropolitan transportation plan shall be published or otherwise made readily available by the MPO for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

(k) A State or MPO shall not be required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(10) of this section.

(1) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93). During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.

B. Oregon's Transportation Planning Rule (TPR)

The Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) (OAR660-012) requires MPOs to develop a Transportation System Plan (TSP) for a coordinated network of transportation facilities and services of regional significance. The TSP is to provide for a safe, convenient and economic transportation system that reduces reliance on the automobile so that air pollution, traffic and other livability problems typically faced by urban areas might be avoided.

As a TSP, this document must address:

(1) A TSP shall establish a coordinated network of transportation facilities adequate to serve state, regional and local transportation needs.

(2) The TSP shall include the following elements:

(a) A determination of transportation needs as provided in OAR 660-012-0030;

(b) A road plan for a system of arterials and collectors and standards for the layout of local streets and other important non-collector street connections. Functional classifications of roads in regional and local TSP's shall be consistent with functional classifications of roads in state and regional TSP's and shall provide for continuity between adjacent jurisdictions. The standards for the layout of local streets shall provide for safe and convenient bike and pedestrian circulation necessary to carry out OAR 660-0120045(3)(b). New connections to arterials and state highways shall be consistent with designated access management categories. The intent of this requirement is to provide guidance on the spacing of future extensions and connections along existing and future streets which are needed to provide reasonably direct routes for bicycle and pedestrian travel. The standards for the layout of local streets shall address:

(A) Extensions of existing streets;

(B) Connections to existing or planned streets, including arterials and collectors; and

(C) Connections to neighborhood destinations.

(c) A public transportation plan which:

(A) Describes public transportation services for the transportation disadvantaged and identifies service inadequacies;

(B) Describes intercity bus and passenger rail service and identifies the location of terminals;

(C) For areas within an urban growth boundary which have public transit service, identifies existing and planned transit trunk routes, exclusive transit ways, terminals and major transfer stations, major transit stops, and park-and-ride stations. Designation of stop or station locations may allow for minor adjustments in the location of stops to provide for efficient transit or traffic operation or to provide convenient pedestrian access to adjacent or nearby uses.

(D) For areas within an urban area containing a population greater than 25,000 persons, not currently served by transit, evaluates the feasibility of developing a public transit system at buildout. Where a transit system is determined to be feasible, the plan shall meet the requirements of paragraph (2)(c)(C) of this rule.

(d) A bicycle and pedestrian plan for a network of bicycle and pedestrian routes throughout the planning area. The network and list of facility improvements shall be consistent with the requirements of ORS 366.514;

(e) An air, rail, water and pipeline transportation plan which identifies where public use airports, mainline and branch line railroads and railroad facilities, port facilities, and major regional pipelines and terminals are located or planned within the planning area. For airports, the planning area shall include all areas within airport imaginary surfaces and other areas covered by state or federal regulations;

(f) For areas within an urban area containing a population greater than 25,000 persons a plan for transportation system management and demand management;

(g) A parking plan in MPO areas as provided in OAR 660-012-0045(5) (c);

(h) Policies and land use regulations for implementing the TSP as provided in OAR 660-012-0045;

(i) For areas within an urban growth boundary containing a population greater than 2500 persons, a transportation financing program as provided in OAR 660-012-0040.

(3) Each element identified in subsections (2)(b)-(d) of this rule shall contain:

(a) An inventory and general assessment of existing and committed transportation facilities and services by function, type, capacity and condition:

(A) The transportation capacity analysis shall include information on:

(i) The capacities of existing and committed facilities;

(ii) The degree to which those capacities have been reached or surpassed on existing facilities.

APPENDIX B

MRMPO FINANCIAL FORECASTS & ASSUMPTIONS

City of Gold Hill

Table A-1 depicts the City of Gold Hill's estimated short, medium and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue (discussed later in this Appendix) accounting for 90% of all revenue. The City anticipates receiving $50,000 every three years from ODOT's Small City Allotment (SCA) program.

Table A-1

City of Gold Hill										
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses										
City Revenue Sources							**Non-Capital Expenses**			
Year	**System Dev Charges**	**Subtotals SDC**	**Street Utility Fee**	**Subtotals SUF**	**SCA**	**Subtotal Misc**	**Admin**	**Debt Service**	**Maint.**	**Subtotal Non Capital**
2015	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$41,285	
2016	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$42,317	
2017	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$43,375	**Short Range**
2018	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$44,459	
2019	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$45,571	
2020	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$50,000	**$150,000**	$0	$0	$46,710	**$263,718**
2021	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$47,878	
2022	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$49,075	
2023	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$50,302	
2024	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$51,559	
2025	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$52,848	**Medium Range**
2026	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$54,169	
2027	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$55,524	
2028	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$56,912	
2029	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$58,335	
2030	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$150,000**	$0	$0	$59,793	**$536,395**
2031	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$61,288	
2032	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$62,820	
2033	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$64,391	
2034	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$66,000	
2035	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$67,650	**Long Range**
2036	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$69,342	
2037	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$71,075	
2038	$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$72,852	
2039	$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$74,673	
2040	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$150,000**	$0	$0	$76,540	**$686,631**
Totals	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$450,000**	**$450,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,486,743**	**$1,486,743**
Assumptions	2.5% annual increase		2.5% annual increase				2.5% annual increase		2.5% annual increase	

Source: City of Gold Hill

City of Grants Pass

The City of Grants Pass owns and maintains a large segment of the regional roadway network in the MRMPO. Therefore, the city's revenues and expenses will reflect the size of the city's population and roadway network.

Table A-2

City of Grants Pass										
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses										
City Revenue Sources							Non-Capital Expenses			
Year	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Utility Fee	Subtotals SUF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2015	$0		$888,000		$20,500		$601,623	$0	$1,694,122	
2016	$100,000		$906,000		$20,500		$619,962	$0	$1,752,245	
2017	$250,000		$922,308		$20,500		$635,461	$0	$1,796,051	
2018	$254,500		$938,910		$20,500		$651,348	$0	$1,840,952	
2019	$259,081		$955,810		$20,500		$667,631	$0	$1,886,976	
2020	$263,744	**$1,127,325**	$973,014	**$5,584,042**	$20,500	**$123,000**	$684,322	$0	$1,934,151	**$14,764,844**
2021	$268,492		$990,529		$20,500		$701,430	$0	$1,982,504	
2022	$273,325		$1,008,358		$20,500		$718,966	$0	$2,032,067	
2023	$278,245		$1,026,509		$20,500		$736,940	$0	$2,082,869	
2024	$283,253		$1,044,986		$20,500		$755,363	$0	$2,134,940	
2025	$288,352		$1,063,796		$20,500		$774,248	$0	$2,188,314	
2026	$293,542		$1,082,944		$20,500		$793,604	$0	$2,243,022	
2027	$298,826		$1,102,437		$20,500		$813,444	$0	$2,299,097	
2028	$304,204		$1,122,281		$20,500		$833,780	$0	$2,356,575	
2029	$309,680		$1,142,482		$20,500		$854,624	$0	$2,415,489	
2030	$315,254	**$2,913,172**	$1,163,047	**$10,747,367**	$20,500	**$205,000**	$875,990	$0	$2,475,876	**$30,069,143**
2031	$320,929		$1,183,981		$20,500		$897,890	$0	$2,537,773	
2032	$326,706		$1,205,293		$20,500		$920,337	$0	$2,601,218	
2033	$332,586		$1,226,988		$20,500		$943,346	$0	$2,666,248	
2034	$338,573		$1,249,074		$20,500		$966,929	$0	$2,732,904	
2035	$344,667		$1,271,557		$20,500		$991,102	$0	$2,801,227	
2036	$350,871		$1,294,445		$20,500		$1,015,880	$0	$2,871,257	
2037	$357,187		$1,317,745		$20,500		$1,041,277	$0	$2,943,039	
2038	$363,616		$1,341,465		$20,500		$1,067,309	$0	$3,016,615	
2039	$370,161		$1,365,611		$20,500		$1,093,992	$0	$3,092,030	
2040	$376,824	**$3,482,121**	$1,390,192	**$12,846,354**	$20,500	**$205,000**	$1,121,341	$0	$3,169,331	**$38,491,045**
Totals	**$7,522,619**	**$7,522,619**	**$29,177,763**	**$29,177,763**	**$533,000**	**$533,000**	**$21,778,139**	**$0**	**$61,546,893**	**$83,325,032**
Assumptions	1.8% annual increase Based on Consumer Price Index - Urban (CPI-U)		1.8% annual increase Based on Consumer Price Index - Urban (CPI-U)				2.5% annual increase		2.5% annual increase	

Source: City of Grants Pass

Table A-2 above depicts the City of Grants Pass estimated short, medium and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue (discussed later in this chapter) accounting for more than two thirds of all revenue. The City's Street Utility Fee (SUF) is the next largest source of revenue for transportation operations and maintenance and administration.

City of Rogue River

Table A-3

City of Rogue River										
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses										
City Revenue Sources							Non-Capital Expenses			
Year	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Impact Fee	Subtotals SIF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2015	$10,000		$16,000		$89,000		$10,000	$89,000	$100,000	
2016	$10,250		$16,400		$139,000		$10,250	$89,000	$102,500	
2017	$10,506		$16,810		$89,000		$10,506	$89,000	$105,063	Short Range
2018	$10,769		$17,230		$89,000		$10,769	$89,000	$107,689	
2019	$11,038		$17,661		$139,000		$11,038	$89,000	$110,381	
2020	$11,314	**$63,877**	$18,103	**$102,204**	$89,000	**$634,000**	$11,314	$89,000	$113,141	**$1,236,651**
2021	$11,597		$18,555		$89,000		$11,597	$89,000	$115,969	
2022	$11,887		$19,019		$139,000		$11,887	$89,000	$118,869	
2023	$12,184		$19,494		$89,000		$12,184	$89,000	$121,840	
2024	$12,489		$19,982		$89,000		$12,489	$89,000	$124,886	
2025	$12,801		$20,481		$139,000		$12,801	$89,000	$128,008	Medium Range
2026	$13,121		$20,993		$89,000		$13,121	$89,000	$131,209	
2027	$13,449		$21,518		$89,000		$13,449	$89,000	$134,489	
2028	$13,785		$22,056		$139,000		$13,785	$89,000	$137,851	
2029	$14,130		$22,608		$89,000		$14,130	$89,000	$141,297	
2030	$14,483	**$129,925**	$23,173	**$207,880**	$89,000	**$1,040,000**	$14,483	$89,000	$144,830	**$2,319,174**
2031	$14,845		$23,752		$139,000		$14,845	$89,000	$148,451	
2032	$15,216		$24,346		$89,000		$15,216	$89,000	$152,162	
2033	$15,597		$24,955		$89,000		$15,597	$89,000	$155,966	
2034	$15,987		$25,578		$139,000		$15,987	$89,000	$159,865	
2035	$16,386		$26,218		$89,000		$16,386	$89,000	$163,862	Long Range
2036	$16,796		$26,873		$0		$16,796	$0	$167,958	
2037	$17,216		$27,545		$50,000		$17,216	$0	$172,157	
2038	$17,646		$28,234		$0		$17,646	$0	$176,461	
2039	$18,087		$28,940		$0		$18,087	$0	$180,873	
2040	$18,539	**$166,315**	$29,663	**$266,104**	$50,000	**$645,000**	$18,539	$0	$185,394	**$2,274,463**
Totals	**$360,117**	**$360,117**	**$576,187**	**$576,187**	**$2,319,000**	**$2,319,000**	**$360,117**	**$1,869,000**	**$3,601,171**	**$5,830,288**
Assumptions	2.5% annual increase		2.5% annual increase		Includes $89,000 per year from General Fund to 2025 and $50,000 every 3 years from SCA		2.5% annual increase		2.5% annual increase	

Source: City of Rogue River

Table A-3 above depicts the City of Rogue River's estimated short, medium and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue (discussed later in this chapter) accounting for more than 60% of all revenue. The City's local funds make up approximately 40% of revenue for debt service, maintenance and administration.

Table A-4 below depicts ODOT forecasts for total State Highway (SHF) revenues. ODOT forecasts steady growth in total SHF revenue through 2040, but the rate of growth (1.3%) is equal to the anticipated rate of inflation, resulting in a static annual funding amount as measured in constant 2015 dollars. SHF revenues have several major sources: Motor Vehicle Registration and title fees, driver license fees, motor vehicle fuel taxes and weight mile tax. Note that the forecast of SHF revenue is divided into two categories: "current law" reflects revenue from these sources according to rates in place prior to 2014, and "additional" revenue reflects increases in certain State taxes and fees that began to take effect in FYE 2014.

Table A-4: Projected State Highway Fund Revenues
State of Oregon, FYE 2015 to 2040 (millions)

	FYE	YOE $		
		"Current Law"	"Additional"	Total SHF Revenue
Short	2015	$ 1,073	$ 29	$ 1,103
	2016	$ 1,087	$ 50	$ 1,137
	2017	$ 1,101	$ 71	$ 1,172
	2018	$ 1,116	$ 93	$ 1,208
	2019	$ 1,130	$ 116	$ 1,246
	2020	$ 1,145	$ 140	$ 1,285
Medium	2021	$ 1,160	$ 165	$ 1,324
	2022	$ 1,175	$ 191	$ 1,365
	2023	$ 1,190	$ 218	$ 1,408
	2024	$ 1,206	$ 246	$ 1,451
	2025	$ 1,221	$ 275	$ 1,496
	2026	$ 1,237	$ 306	$ 1,543
	2027	$ 1,253	$ 337	$ 1,591
	2028	$ 1,270	$ 370	$ 1,640
	2029	$ 1,286	$ 405	$ 1,691
	2030	$ 1,303	$ 440	$ 1,743
Long	2031	$ 1,320	$ 478	$ 1,797
	2032	$ 1,337	$ 516	$ 1,853
	2033	$ 1,354	$ 556	$ 1,910
	2034	$ 1,372	$ 598	$ 1,970
	2035	$ 1,390	$ 641	$ 2,031
	2036	$ 1,408	$ 686	$ 2,094
	2037	$ 1,426	$ 732	$ 2,159
	2038	$ 1,445	$ 781	$ 2,225
	2039	$ 1,463	$ 831	$ 2,294
	2040	$ 1,482	$ 883	$ 2,366

Source: ODOT Long-Range Financial Assumptions for MPOs

Table A-5: Allocation of Projected State Highway Fund Revenues
State of Oregon, FYE 2015 to 2040 (millions)

	FYE	YOE $			
		State Share	County Share	City Share	Total
Short	2015	$ 653	$ 272	$ 177	$ 1,103
	2016	$ 672	$ 281	$ 184	$ 1,137
	2017	$ 691	$ 291	$ 190	$ 1,172
	2018	$ 710	$ 301	$ 197	$ 1,208
	2019	$ 730	$ 312	$ 204	$ 1,246
	2020	$ 751	$ 323	$ 211	$ 1,284
Medium	2021	$ 772	$ 334	$ 218	$ 1,324
	2022	$ 794	$ 345	$ 226	$ 1,365
	2023	$ 817	$ 357	$ 234	$ 1,408
	2024	$ 840	$ 369	$ 242	$ 1,451
	2025	$ 864	$ 382	$ 250	$ 1,496
	2026	$ 889	$ 395	$ 259	$ 1,543
	2027	$ 914	$ 409	$ 268	$ 1,590
	2028	$ 940	$ 422	$ 277	$ 1,640
	2029	$ 967	$ 437	$ 286	$ 1,691
	2030	$ 995	$ 452	$ 296	$ 1,743
Long	2031	$ 1,024	$ 467	$ 306	$ 1,797
	2032	$ 1,053	$ 483	$ 317	$ 1,853
	2033	$ 1,084	$ 499	$ 328	$ 1,910
	2034	$ 1,115	$ 516	$ 339	$ 1,969
	2035	$ 1,147	$ 533	$ 350	$ 2,031
	2036	$ 1,180	$ 551	$ 362	$ 2,093
	2037	$ 1,215	$ 569	$ 374	$ 2,158
	2038	$ 1,250	$ 588	$ 387	$ 2,225
	2039	$ 1,286	$ 608	$ 400	$ 2,294
	2040	$ 1,323	$ 628	$ 414	$ 2,365

Source: ODOT Long-Range Financial Assumptions for MPOs

SHF revenue is allocated to three jurisdiction levels: State, Counties, and Cities. Table A-5 reflects these allocations. Note that the "Additional" revenues allocate a higher share of SHF revenues to cities and counties than to the State, so that the amount of SHF revenue for cities and counties increases over time in constant 2015 dollars, while the State share of SHF revenue decreases.

Gold Hill, Grants Pass and Rogue River's share of SHF revenue for this financial plan were calculated by determining the percent of each of the cities' population to the statewide incorporated cities' total population. For Josephine and Jackson Counties, their share of SHF revenue was calculated by estimating the percent of rural population for each county within the MPO boundary compared to statewide population. Population figures are from Portland State University (PSU) Population Research Center's July 2013 certified population estimates.

Table A-6: MRMPO Population Estimates

Geography	Population
Oregon	3,919,020
Josephine County	82,815
Josephine County within MPO Area*	10,819
Jackson County	206,310
Jackson County within MPO Area**	1,596
Gold Hill	1,220
Grants Pass	34,855
Rogue River	2,145
MRMPO Total	50,635
Source: PSU July 2013	
* 13.06% of Josephine Co. Population within MPO (estimated)	
** 0.77% of Jackson Co. Population within MPO (estimated)	

.

Table A-6 above shows Portland State University's Population and Research Center's 2013 Oregon total population, Josephine & Jackson Counties' population and estimated population within the MRMPO Planning Area, and the population totals for Gold Hill, Grants Pass and Rogue River.

Table A-7: MRMPO Population to Oregon's Population

Geography	Population
Oregon	3,919,020
MRMPO	50,635
Ratio	1.3%

Table A-7 above depicts the MRMPO's ratio to Oregon's population. The MRMPO is 1.3% of Oregon's total population.

Table A-8: Ratio of Population of Cities within MRMPO to Population of Oregon Incorporated Cities

Geography	Population
Population of Oregon Cities	2,716,667
Population of MRMPO Cities	38,220
Ratio	1.4%

Table A-8 on Page 7 above shows MRMPO's ratio to Oregon's incorporated cities population. Gold Hill, Grants Pass and Rogue River make up 1.4% of Oregon's total incorporated city population.

Table A-9: MRMPO Population to Oregon's Population

MRMPO Jurisdictions	PSU 2013 Population of Incorporated Cities	MRMPO Jurisdiction % of Incorporated Cities and Counties Statewide Totals	MRMPO Jurisdiction % of MPO Population
Gold Hill	1,220	0.04%	2%
Grants Pass	34,855	1.28%	69%
Rogue River	2,145	0.08%	4%
Josephine County	10,819*	0.28%	21%
Jackson County	1,596*	0.04%	3%
***Includes rural county population within MPO boundary**			

Table A-9 above shows the estimated populations of each of the MRMPO member jurisdiction within the MPO area, percent totals of the jurisdictions compared to statewide and incorporated city total populations (these percentages are used to estimate State Highway Fund revenues), and the jurisdiction's percent of the MPO's population.

Table A-10: Ratio of ODOT Region 3 Population to Oregon's Population

Geography	Population
Oregon	3,919,020
Region 3	483,135
Ratio	12.3%

Table A-11: Ratio of MRMPO's Population to ODOT Region 3 Population

ODOT Region 3 Counties	Population
Coos	62,860
Curry	22,300
Douglas	108,850
Jackson	206,310
Josephine	82,815
Total	483,135
MRMPO	50,635
Ratio of MRMPO's Population to Region 3 Population	10.5%

Tables A-10 & A-11 show the ratios used to estimate ODOT Region 3's and the MRMPO's share of Oregon's non-modernization (Operations, Maintenance and Preservation) and modernization funding.

Table A-12 shows the estimated SHF revenue allocated to the MRMPO member jurisdictions from 2015 to 2040 using a 1.3% annual increase. FYE 2015, Gold Hill is forecast to receive approximately $80,000; Grants Pass $2.3 million; Rogue River $140,000; Josephine County $750,000 (within MPO boundary) and Jackson County $111,000 (within MPO boundary). Gold Hill's forecast to grows to nearly $186,000 in 2040; Grants Pass to $5.3 million; Rogue River to $327,000; Josephine County $1.7 million and Jackson County $ 256,000.

Table A-12: Allocation of Projected State Highway Fund Revenues to MRMPO Jurisdictions FYE 2015 to 2040

	Allocation to City of Grants Pass		Allocation to City of Rogue River		Allocation to City of Gold Hill		Allocation to Josephine County		Allocation to Jackson County	
	FYE	YOE $	FYE	YOE $	FYE	YOE $	FYE	YOE $	FYE	YOE $
Short	2015	$ 2,275,997	2015	$ 140,143	2015	$ 79,651	2015	$ 750,986	2015	$ 110,703
	2016	$ 2,356,517	2016	$ 145,101	2016	$ 82,469	2016	$ 777,190	2016	$ 114,566
	2017	$ 2,439,663	2017	$ 150,221	2017	$ 85,379	2017	$ 804,244	2017	$ 118,554
	2018	$ 2,525,518	2018	$ 155,507	2018	$ 88,383	2018	$ 832,175	2018	$ 122,671
	2019	$ 2,614,167	2019	$ 160,966	2019	$ 91,486	2019	$ 861,011	2019	$ 126,922
	2020	$ 2,705,698	2020	$ 166,602	2020	$ 94,689	2020	$ 890,780	2020	$ 131,310
Medium	2021	$ 2,800,204	2021	$ 172,421	2021	$ 97,996	2021	$ 921,513	2021	$ 135,840
	2022	$ 2,897,778	2022	$ 178,429	2022	$ 101,411	2022	$ 953,238	2022	$ 140,517
	2023	$ 2,998,516	2023	$ 184,632	2023	$ 104,936	2023	$ 985,988	2023	$ 145,345
	2024	$ 3,102,519	2024	$ 191,036	2024	$ 108,576	2024	$ 1,019,795	2024	$ 150,328
	2025	$ 3,209,890	2025	$ 197,647	2025	$ 112,334	2025	$ 1,054,692	2025	$ 155,473
	2026	$ 3,320,734	2026	$ 204,472	2026	$ 116,213	2026	$ 1,090,714	2026	$ 160,782
	2027	$ 3,435,163	2027	$ 211,518	2027	$ 120,217	2027	$ 1,127,895	2027	$ 166,263
	2028	$ 3,553,287	2028	$ 218,792	2028	$ 124,351	2028	$ 1,166,273	2028	$ 171,921
	2029	$ 3,675,225	2029	$ 226,300	2029	$ 128,619	2029	$ 1,205,885	2029	$ 177,760
	2030	$ 3,801,097	2030	$ 234,050	2030	$ 133,024	2030	$ 1,246,770	2030	$ 183,787
Long	2031	$ 3,931,025	2031	$ 242,051	2031	$ 137,571	2031	$ 1,288,968	2031	$ 190,007
	2032	$ 4,065,139	2032	$ 250,309	2032	$ 142,264	2032	$ 1,332,520	2032	$ 196,427
	2033	$ 4,203,569	2033	$ 258,832	2033	$ 147,109	2033	$ 1,377,469	2033	$ 203,053
	2034	$ 4,346,452	2034	$ 267,630	2034	$ 152,109	2034	$ 1,423,858	2034	$ 209,891
	2035	$ 4,493,928	2035	$ 276,711	2035	$ 157,270	2035	$ 1,471,734	2035	$ 216,949
	2036	$ 4,646,141	2036	$ 286,083	2036	$ 162,597	2036	$ 1,521,143	2036	$ 224,232
	2037	$ 4,803,240	2037	$ 295,757	2037	$ 168,095	2037	$ 1,572,132	2037	$ 231,749
	2038	$ 4,965,380	2038	$ 305,740	2038	$ 173,769	2038	$ 1,624,752	2038	$ 239,505
	2039	$ 5,132,718	2039	$ 316,044	2039	$ 179,625	2039	$ 1,679,053	2039	$ 247,510
	2040	$ 5,305,417	2040	$ 326,678	2040	$ 185,669	2040	$ 1,735,089	2040	$ 255,770

Source: ODOT Long-Range Financial Assumptions for MPOs & RVCOG Forecasting

Table A-13 includes the projected STP, CMAQ and Enhance-It revenues for 2015 to 2040. The estimates for STP and CMAQ are based on a 1.4% annual increase. Enhance-It funds are estimated at $1.6 million per year. Not all projects are eligible for Enhance-It funding. The selection process is competitive and ODOT notes that the criteria for projects may change.

Table A-13: MRMPO STP, CMAQ & Enhance-It Revenue - FYE 2015 to 2040

MRMPO STP, CMAQ & Enhance-It Revenue Projections								
2015 - 2040 RTP								
CMAQ ($ X 1,000)			STP ($ X 1,000)			Enhance-It ($ X 1,000)		
YEAR	Total CMAQ	Available	YEAR	Total STP	Available	YEAR	Total	Available
2015	$2,212		2015	$0		2015		
2016	$728		2016	$57		2016		
2017	$738	Short Range	2017	$0	Short Range	2017	Funds are Committed to 2018	Short Range
2018	$749		2018	$626		2018		
2019	$759		2019	$636		2019	$1,620	
2020	$770	**$5,956**	2020	$645	**$1,964**	2020	$1,620	**$3,240**
2021	$780		2021	$654		2021	$1,620	
2022	$791		2022	$663		2022	$1,620	
2023	$802		2023	$672		2023	$1,620	
2024	$814		2024	$682		2024	$1,620	
2025	$825	Medium Range	2025	$691	Medium Range	2025	$1,620	Medium Range
2026	$837		2026	$701		2026	$1,620	
2027	$848		2027	$711		2027	$1,620	
2028	$860		2028	$721		2028	$1,620	
2029	$872		2029	$731		2029	$1,620	
2030	$884	**$8,314**	2030	$741	**$6,967**	2030	$1,620	**$16,200**
2031	$897		2031	$751		2031	$1,620	
2032	$909		2032	$762		2032	$1,620	
2033	$922		2033	$773		2033	$1,620	
2034	$935		2034	$783		2034	$1,620	
2035	$948	Long Range	2035	$794	Long Range	2035	$1,620	Long Range
2036	$961		2036	$806		2036	$1,620	
2037	$975		2037	$817		2037	$1,620	
2038	$988		2038	$828		2038	$1,620	
2039	$1,002		2039	$840		2039	$1,620	
2040	$1,016	**$9,555**	2040	$852	**$8,006**	2040	$1,620	**$16,200**
	$23,825	**$23,825**		**$16,937**	**$16,937**		**$35,640**	**$35,640**
1.4% annual increase Only projects located within the Grants Pass CO & PM10 Maintenances are eligible for CMAQ funds.			1.4% annual increase STP funds can be used for projects within the entire MRMPO area.			$1.62M/year available for eligible projects in Jackson & Josephine Counties. Competitive project selection process through the RVACT. Some projects may not be eligible for funding. Criteria may change.		

Source: ODOT Long-Range Financial Assumptions for MPOs; ODOT Region 3

The State of Oregon is responsible for operations and maintenance of state highways. Table A-14 below shows the State forecast for these costs through FYE 2040. In total, the State forecasts $1.08 billion in annual operating costs in FYE 2015, with an annual growth rate of 3.1% per year.

Table A-14: Projected Annual Costs for ODOT Non-Modernization Highway Uses, FYE 2015 to 2040, Millions (YOE $)

FY 2013 LONG RANGE ESTIMATES OF ODOT HIGHWAY PRESERVATION, MAINTENANCE AND OTHER COSTS ($ Millions)										
Fiscal Year	Preservation	Maintenance	Safety	Traditional Operations	ITS	Bridge	Non-Mod. Debt S.	Central Services	Other	All Non-Mod Hwy Programs
	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)	(YOE $s)
2015	220	225	41	32	8	171	136	62	184	1,079
2016	226	232	42	33	8	177	136	64	190	1,109
2017	233	240	43	34	9	182	136	66	196	1,139
2018	241	247	45	35	9	188	136	68	202	1,170
2019	248	255	46	36	9	194	136	70	208	1,202
2020	256	263	47	37	9	200	136	72	214	1,235
2021	264	271	49	39	10	206	136	75	221	1,269
2022	272	279	50	40	10	212	136	77	228	1,304
2023	280	288	52	41	10	219	136	79	235	1,340
2024	289	297	54	42	11	226	136	82	242	1,378
2025	298	306	55	44	11	232	136	84	250	1,416
2026	307	315	57	45	11	240	136	87	257	1,456
2027	317	325	59	46	12	247	136	90	265	1,497
2028	327	335	60	48	12	255	136	92	274	1,539
2029	337	346	62	49	12	263	136	95	282	1,582
2030	347	356	64	51	13	271	131	98	291	1,622
2031	358	367	66	52	13	279	131	101	300	1,668
2032	369	379	68	54	13	288	131	104	309	1,716
2033	381	391	70	56	14	297	131	108	319	1,765
2034	392	403	73	57	14	306	131	111	329	1,815
2035	404	415	75	59	15	315	131	114	339	1,868
2036	417	428	77	61	15	325	30	118	349	1,821
2037	430	441	80	63	16	335	30	122	360	1,876
2038	443	455	82	65	16	346	30	125	371	1,934
2039	457	469	85	67	17	356	30	129	383	1,993
2040	471	484	87	69	17	368	30	133	395	2,054

Source: ODOT Long-Range Revenue Tables 2013. Summarized by RVCOG.

Table A-15 below shows the estimated amount of funding for ODOT Region 3 Operations, Maintenance and Preservation (OM&P) within the MRMPO area based on population ratios. OM&P estimates are based on population ratios; ODOT Region 3 = 12.3% of Oregon's population and MRMPO's population is 10.5% of Region 3's population. This methodology is also used by the Corvallis Area MPO (CAMPO).

Table A-15: Projected Annual Costs for ODOT Region 3 & MRMPO Non-Modernization Highway Uses, FYE 2015 to 2040 (YOE $)

Fiscal Year		All ODOT Non-Modernization Programs	Region 3 Share	MRMPO Share
Short	2015	$1,079,379,083	$132,763,627	$13,940,181
	2016	$1,108,620,735	$136,360,350	$14,317,837
	2017	$1,138,768,878	$140,068,572	$14,707,200
	2018	$1,169,851,613	$143,891,748	$15,108,634
	2019	$1,201,897,913	$147,833,443	$15,522,512
	2020	$1,234,937,648	$151,897,331	$15,949,220
Medium	2021	$1,269,001,615	$156,087,199	$16,389,156
	2022	$1,304,121,565	$160,406,953	$16,842,730
	2023	$1,340,330,234	$164,860,619	$17,310,365
	2024	$1,377,661,371	$169,452,349	$17,792,497
	2025	$1,416,149,773	$174,186,422	$18,289,574
	2026	$1,455,831,316	$179,067,252	$18,802,061
	2027	$1,496,742,987	$184,099,387	$19,330,436
	2028	$1,538,922,920	$189,287,519	$19,875,190
	2029	$1,582,410,430	$194,636,483	$20,436,831
	2030	$1,621,646,054	$199,462,465	$20,943,559
Long	2031	$1,667,871,581	$205,148,205	$21,540,561
	2032	$1,715,530,100	$211,010,202	$22,156,071
	2033	$1,764,666,034	$217,053,922	$22,790,662
	2034	$1,815,325,181	$223,284,997	$23,444,925
	2035	$1,867,554,761	$229,709,236	$24,119,470
	2036	$1,820,903,459	$223,971,125	$23,516,968
	2037	$1,876,421,466	$230,799,840	$24,233,983
	2038	$1,933,660,531	$237,840,245	$24,973,226
	2039	$1,992,674,008	$245,098,903	$25,735,385
	2040	$2,053,516,902	$252,582,579	$26,521,171

Source: ODOT Long-Range Revenue Tables 2013. Summarized by RVCOG.

Table A-16 below shows ODOT's projected revenues for modernization under ORS 366.507. In FYE 2015, 31% of State revenue for modernization is dedicated to pay debt service on previous bonds for transportation projects. These debt service payments continue through FYE 2028. In FYE 2015, ODOT forecasts $56.4 million in revenue for modernization projects net of debt service and federal match (i.e., revenue the ODOT can spend on new capital projects).

Table A-16: Projected Statewide Annual Revenue Available for Transportation Modernization Projects, ODOT, FYE 2015 to 2040, Millions (YOE $)

Fiscal Year	Statewide Funds Reserved for Highway Modernization Under ORS 366.507	ORS 366.507 Funds Reserved for Debt Service	ORS 366.507 Funds Net of Debt Service & Federal Match
2015	$82.6	25.2	56.4
2016	$83.7	25.2	57.5
2017	$84.8	25.2	58.5
2018	$85.9	25.2	59.6
2019	$87.0	25.2	60.7
2020	$88.1	25.2	54.4
2021	$89.3	25.2	63.0
2022	$90.4	25.2	64.1
2023	$91.6	25.2	65.3
2024	$92.8	25.2	66.5
2025	$94.0	25.2	67.6
2026	$95.2	25.2	59.9
2027	$96.4	25.2	70.1
2028	$97.7	12.6	83.9
2029	$99.0	0.0	97.8
2030	$100.3	0.0	99.0
2031	$101.6	0.0	100.3
2032	$102.9	0.0	90.9
2033	$104.2	0.0	102.9
2034	$105.6	0.0	104.3
2035	$106.9	0.0	105.6
2036	$108.3	0.0	107.0
2037	$109.7	0.0	108.4
2038	$111.2	0.0	96.9
2039	$112.6	0.0	111.2
2040	$114.1	0.0	112.7

Source: ODOT Long-Range Revenue Tables 2013. Summarized by RVCOG.

ODOT uses an agreed upon formula to allocate modernization revenues to each of the five ODOT regions across the state. The formula is based on population, vehicle miles traveled (VMT), ton miles traveled, vehicle registrations, and revenue estimates from the 1999-2001 biennium. The MRMPO is located in Region 3. Table A-17 below shows the ODOT calculation of Region 3's share of total ODOT revenue for modernization projects, resulting in Region 3 receiving 15.6% of the State's revenues.

Table A-17: ODOT Region 3 Share of State Revenue for Transportation Modernization

County	Population (2011)	Vehicle Miles Travelled (2011)	Ton Miles Travelled (2011)	Vehicle Registrations (2011)	Projected Revenue (FY 1999-2001)	Modernization Needs (1999)
Coos	62,960	277,635,754	1,221,567,568	74,540	$49,825,000	
Curry	22,335	114,100,278	404,787,891	29,849	$18,165,000	
Douglas	107,795	1,032,748,776	9,301,213,627	133,992	$144,523,000	
Jackson	203,950	884,841,906	5,057,214,273	225,579	$126,362,000	
Josephine	82,820	449,210,209	3,164,471,386	101,631	$62,470,000	
Region 3 Total	479,860	2,758,536,923	19,149,254,745	565,591	$401,345,000	
Statewide Total	3,857,625	19,426,126,596	109,029,809,309	4,062,873	$2,698,465,000	
Region 3 % of State	12.44%	14.20%	17.56%	13.92%	14.87%	15.6%

Source: ODOT Long-Range Revenue Tables 2013. Summarized by RVCOG.

There is no agreed upon formula for how Region 3 allocates ODOT revenue for modernization projects in different municipalities within the Region. Modernization funds for projects in Josephine and Jackson Counties are allocated through an application process facilitated by ODOT with recommendations for funding from the Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation (RVACT) made to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The Middle Rogue MPO has a voting member on the RVACT.

For the purposes of this analysis, the modernization funding revenue projections for the MRMPO are based on the most current (July 2014) Region 3 (12.3%) population ratio to the amount of statewide funding available for the planning period (2015 – 2040). These percentages are more conservative than the 15.6% estimate for Region 3 in Table A-17 above. Table A-18 below depicts the more conservative estimated modernization revenues for ODOT Region 3 and the MRMPO.

Table A-18: Projected Annual Allocation of Revenue to the MRMPO for Transportation Modernization Projects, FYE 2015 to 2040

Fiscal Year		ORS 336.507 Funds Net of Debt Service & Federal Match	Region 3 Share	MRMPO Share
Short	2015	$56,402,673	$6,937,529	$728,440.52
	2016	$57,462,510	$7,067,889	$742,128.32
	2017	$58,536,112	$7,199,942	$755,993.88
	2018	$59,623,656	$7,333,710	$770,039.51
	2019	$60,725,323	$7,469,215	$784,267.55
	2020	$54,419,235	$6,693,566	$702,824.42
Medium	2021	$62,971,766	$7,745,527	$813,280.36
	2022	$64,116,915	$7,886,381	$828,069.96
	2023	$65,276,936	$8,029,063	$843,051.62
	2024	$66,452,021	$8,173,599	$858,227.85
	2025	$67,642,367	$8,320,011	$873,601.17
	2026	$59,934,089	$7,371,893	$774,048.76
	2027	$70,069,636	$8,618,565	$904,949.35
	2028	$83,906,963	$10,320,556	$1,083,658.42
	2029	$97,760,358	$12,024,524	$1,262,575.03
	2030	$99,030,031	$12,180,694	$1,278,972.86
Long	2031	$100,316,193	$12,338,892	$1,295,583.64
	2032	$90,913,023	$11,182,302	$1,174,141.69
	2033	$102,938,842	$12,661,478	$1,329,455.15
	2034	$104,275,766	$12,825,919	$1,346,721.52
	2035	$105,630,053	$12,992,496	$1,364,212.13
	2036	$107,001,926	$13,161,237	$1,381,929.88
	2037	$108,391,616	$13,332,169	$1,399,877.72
	2038	$96,941,139	$11,923,760	$1,251,994.81
	2039	$111,225,371	$13,680,721	$1,436,475.67
	2040	$112,669,909	$13,858,399	$1,455,131.87

Source: ODOT Long-Range Revenue Tables 2013. Summarized by RVCOG.

Table A-19 shows the estimated revenue projection for Josephine Community Transit (JCT) for 2015 to 2040. Assumptions are included at the bottom of the chart.

Table A-19: JCT Revenue Projections, FYE 2015 to 2040

		Revenues										
	Year	5307	NEMT	5311	STF	Contract Services	EIP	Farebox	CMAQ	5309 Capital	5310	TOTALS
Short	2015	$500,000	$36,000	$77,000	$143,000	$210,000	$74,000	$162,000	$145,000	$280,000	$331,000	**$1,958,000**
	2016	$510,000	$36,720	$77,770	$147,433	$214,200	$75,110	$164,430	$147,000	$280,000	$331,000	**$1,983,663**
	2017	$520,200	$37,454	$78,548	$152,003	$218,484	$76,237	$166,896	$149,000	$280,000	$331,000	**$2,009,823**
	2018	$530,604	$38,203	$79,333	$156,716	$222,854		$169,400	$0	$280,000	$331,000	**$1,808,110**
	2019	$541,216	$38,968	$80,127	$161,574	$227,311		$171,941	$0	$280,000	$331,000	**$1,832,136**
	2020	$552,040	$39,747	$80,928	$166,582	$231,857		$174,520	$0	$280,000	$331,000	**$1,856,675**
Medium	2021	$563,081	$40,542	$81,737	$171,747	$236,494		$177,138	$0	$0	$0	**$1,270,739**
	2022	$574,343	$41,353	$82,554	$177,071	$241,224		$179,795	$0	$0	$0	**$1,296,340**
	2023	$585,830	$42,180	$83,380	$182,560	$246,048		$182,492	$0	$0	$0	**$1,322,490**
	2024	$597,546	$43,023	$84,214	$188,219	$250,969		$185,229	$0	$0	$0	**$1,349,201**
	2025	$609,497	$43,884	$85,056	$194,054	$255,989		$188,008	$0	$0	$0	**$1,376,487**
	2026	$621,687	$44,761	$85,906	$200,070	$261,109		$190,828	$0	$0	$0	**$1,404,361**
	2027	$634,121	$45,657	$86,766	$206,272	$266,331		$193,690	$0	$0	$0	**$1,432,836**
	2028	$646,803	$46,570	$87,633	$212,666	$271,657		$196,595	$0	$0	$0	**$1,461,926**
	2029	$659,739	$47,501	$88,510	$219,259	$277,091		$199,544	$0	$0	$0	**$1,491,644**
	2030	$672,934	$48,451	$89,395	$226,056	$282,632		$202,538	$0	$0	$0	**$1,522,006**
Long	2031	$686,393	$49,420	$90,289	$233,064	$288,285		$205,576	$0	$0	$0	**$1,553,026**
	2032	$700,121	$50,409	$91,191	$240,289	$294,051		$208,659	$0	$0	$0	**$1,584,720**
	2033	$714,123	$51,417	$92,103	$247,738	$299,932		$211,789	$0	$0	$0	**$1,617,102**
	2034	$728,406	$52,445	$93,024	$255,418	$305,930		$214,966	$0	$0	$0	**$1,650,189**
	2035	$742,974	$53,494	$93,955	$263,335	$312,049		$218,191	$0	$0	$0	**$1,683,997**
	2036	$757,833	$54,564	$94,894	$271,499	$318,290		$221,463	$0	$0	$0	**$1,718,543**
	2037	$772,990	$55,655	$95,843	$279,915	$324,656		$224,785	$0	$0	$0	**$1,753,845**
	2038	$788,450	$56,768	$96,802	$288,593	$331,149		$228,157	$0	$0	$0	**$1,789,918**
	2039	$804,219	$57,904	$97,770	$297,539	$337,772		$231,579	$0	$0	$0	**$1,826,782**
	2040	$820,303	$59,062	$98,747	$306,763	$344,527		$235,053	$0	$0	$0	**$1,864,455**
	Totals	**$16,835,453**	**$1,212,153**	**$2,273,474**	**$5,589,433**	**$7,070,890**	**$225,347**	**$5,105,263**	**$441,000**	**$1,680,000**	**$1,986,000**	**$42,419,012**
	Assumptions	2% annual increase	2% annual increase Non Emergency Medical Transportation	1% annual increase	3.1% annual increase	2% annual increase	1.5% annual increase Energy Incentive Program ends in 2017	1.5% annual increase	$441k in MRMPO CMAQ funds for RVCL Funds will sunset after 2017	ODOT long range financial projections	$331k annually	

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Table A-20 shows the estimated expenses for Josephine Community Transit (JCT) for 2015 to 2040. Assumptions are included at the bottom of the chart.

Table A-20: JCT Estimated Expenses, FYE 2015 to 2040

Expenses						
	Year	Ops	Maint	Admin	5309 Capital	TOTALS
Short	2015	$828,200	$326,800	$121,500	$75,000	**$1,351,500**
	2016	$844,764	$336,604	$124,538	$75,000	**$1,380,906**
	2017	$861,659	$346,702	$127,651	$75,000	**$1,411,012**
	2018	$878,892	$357,103	$130,842	$75,000	**$1,441,838**
	2019	$709,572	$367,816	$134,113	$75,000	**$1,286,502**
	2020	$723,764	$378,851	$137,466	$75,000	**$1,315,081**
Medium	2021	$738,239	$390,216	$140,903	$0	**$1,269,358**
	2022	$753,004	$401,923	$144,425	$0	**$1,299,352**
	2023	$768,064	$413,980	$148,036	$0	**$1,330,080**
	2024	$783,425	$426,400	$151,737	$0	**$1,361,562**
	2025	$799,094	$439,192	$155,530	$0	**$1,393,816**
	2026	$815,076	$452,368	$159,419	$0	**$1,426,862**
	2027	$831,377	$465,939	$163,404	$0	**$1,460,720**
	2028	$848,005	$479,917	$167,489	$0	**$1,495,411**
	2029	$864,965	$494,314	$171,676	$0	**$1,530,956**
	2030	$882,264	$509,144	$175,968	$0	**$1,567,376**
Long	2031	$899,909	$524,418	$180,367	$0	**$1,604,695**
	2032	$917,908	$540,151	$184,877	$0	**$1,642,935**
	2033	$936,266	$556,355	$189,499	$0	**$1,682,119**
	2034	$954,991	$573,046	$194,236	$0	**$1,722,273**
	2035	$974,091	$590,237	$199,092	$0	**$1,763,420**
	2036	$993,573	$607,944	$204,069	$0	**$1,805,586**
	2037	$1,013,444	$626,183	$209,171	$0	**$1,848,798**
	2038	$1,033,713	$644,968	$214,400	$0	**$1,893,081**
	2039	$1,054,387	$664,317	$219,760	$0	**$1,938,465**
	2040	$1,075,475	$684,247	$225,254	$0	**$1,984,976**
	Totals	**$22,784,123**	**$12,599,134**	**$4,375,423**	**$450,000**	**$40,208,680**
	Assumptions	2% annual increase	3% annual increase	2.5% annual increase	$150k annually to 2020	

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Table A-21 is a summary of revenues and expenses for JCT for 2015 to 2040. The analysis shows that transit revenues will exceed expenses through the planning horizon of 2040, based on carryover from the short range timeframe of the plan.

Table A-21: JCT Revenue & Expense Summary, FYE 2015 to 2040

JCT Revenue Summary					
Revenue Source	**Fund**	**Time Frame**			**Totals**
		Short	**Medium**	**Long**	
Federal	S5307	$3,154,060	$6,165,582	$7,515,810	**$16,835,453**
	NEMT	$227,092	$443,922	$541,138	**$1,212,153**
	5311	$473,705	$855,150	$944,618	**$2,273,474**
State	STF	$927,308	$1,977,973	$2,684,152	**$5,589,433**
	EIP	$225,347	$0	$0	**$225,347**
Local	Contract Services	$1,324,705	$2,589,545	$3,156,640	**$7,070,890**
	Farebox Returns	$1,009,187	$1,895,857	$2,200,219	**$5,105,263**
Other Federal	CMAQ	$441,000	$0	$0	**$441,000**
	5309 Capital	$1,680,000	$0	$0	**$1,680,000**
	5310	$1,986,000	$0	$0	**$1,986,000**
Totals		$11,448,405	$13,928,029	$17,042,578	**$42,419,012**
JCT Expense Summary					
Expenses		**Time Frame**			**Totals**
		Short	**Medium**	**Long**	
Operations		$4,846,852	$8,083,513	$9,853,757	**$22,784,123**
Maintenance		$2,113,876	$4,473,392	$6,011,865	**$12,599,134**
Administration		$776,110	$1,578,587	$2,020,725	**$4,375,423**
5309 Capital Grants		$450,000	$0	$0	**$450,000**
Sub-total		$8,186,838	$14,135,493	$17,886,348	$40,208,680
Balance		**$3,261,567**	**$3,054,103**	**$2,210,333**	**$2,210,333**

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Appendix C

COMMON TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACRONYMS AND TERMS

ACT:	Area Commission on Transportation
ADA:	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT:	Average Daily Traffic
AQMA:	Air Quality Maintenance Area
CAAA:	Clean Air Act Amendments
CBD:	Central Business District
CMAQ:	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality
CO:	Carbon Monoxide
DLCD:	Department of Land Conservation and Development
EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency
FFY:	Federal Fiscal Year: from October 1 to September 31.
FHWA:	Federal Highway Administration
FTA:	Federal Transit Administration
FTZ:	Foreign Trade Zone
FY:	Fiscal Year: (Oregon state fiscal year from July 1 to June 30)
GCP:	General Corridor Planning
GIS:	Geographic Information Systems
HOT:	High Occupancy Toll lane with extra charge for single occupants
HOV:	High Occupancy Vehicle lane for vehicles with more than one occupant
HPMS:	Highway Performance Monitoring System
I/M or I & M:	Inspection and Maintenance Program for emissions control
ISTEA:	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1991), replaced by **TEA-21**, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, expired in 2003
ITS:	Intelligent Transportation Systems
LOS:	Level of Service, a measure of traffic congestion from A (free-flow) to F (grid-lock)
LRT:	Light Rail Transit, self-propelled rail cars such as Portland's MAX
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century; 2013 transportation act.
MIS:	Major Investment Study
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO:	Metropolitan Planning Organization, a planning body in an urbanized area over 50,000 population which has responsibility for developing transportation plans for that area
MTIP:	Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (same as TIP)
NAAQS:	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NARC:	National Association of Regional Councils
NHS:	National Highway System
NPTS:	Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey
NTI:	National Transit Institute
OAR:	Oregon Administrative Rules

ODFW:	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
ODOT:	Oregon Department of Transportation
ORS:	Oregon Revised Statutes
OTC:	Oregon Transportation Commission, ODOT's governing body
OTP:	Oregon Transportation Plan
PC:	MPO Policy Committee
PL Funds:	Public Law 112, Federal Planning Funds
PM_{10}:	Particulate Matter of less than 10 Micrometers
$PM_{2.5}$:	Particulate Matter of less than 2.5 Micrometers
RTP:	Regional Transportation Plan
RVACT:	Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation
RVCOG:	Rogue Valley Council of Governments
RVIA:	Rogue Valley International Airport
RVTD:	Rogue Valley Transportation District
SAFETEA-LU	Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, the current 6-year surface transportation act, expired Sept. 2009
SIP:	State Implementation Plan
SOV:	Single Occupancy Vehicle
STA:	Special Transportation Area
STIP:	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
STP:	Surface Transportation Program
TAC:	MPO Technical Advisory Committee
TAZ:	Transportation Analysis Zones
TCM:	Traffic Control Measures
TDM:	Transportation Demand Management
TIP:	Transportation Improvement Program
TOD:	Transit Oriented Development
TPAU:	Transportation Planning Analysis Unit
TPR:	Transportation Planning Rule
TRADCO:	Transportation Advisory Committee
TSM:	Transportation Systems Management
TSP:	Transportation System Plan
UGB:	Urban Growth Boundary
UPWP:	Unified Planning Work Program
US DOT:	U.S. Department of Transportation
VMT:	Vehicle Miles of Travel

Appropriation - Legislation that allocates budgeted funds from general revenues to programs that have been previously authorized by other legislation. The amount of money appropriated may be less than the amount authorized.

Authorization - Federal legislation that creates the policy and structure of a program including formulas and guidelines for awarding funds. Authorizing legislation may set an upper limit on program spending or may be open ended. General revenue funds to be spent under an authorization must be appropriated by separate legislation.

Capital Costs - Non-recurring or infrequently recurring cost of long-term assets, such as land, buildings, vehicles, and stations.

Conformity Analysis - A determination made by the MPOs and the US DOT that transportation plans and programs in non-attainment areas meet the "purpose" of the SIP, which is to reduce pollutant emissions to meet air quality standards.

Emissions Budget - The part of the SIP that identifies the allowable emissions levels for certain pollutants emitted from mobile, stationary, and area sources. The emissions levels are used for meeting emission reduction milestones, attainment, or maintenance demonstration.

Emissions Inventory - A complete list of sources and amounts of pollutant emissions within a specific area and time interval (part of the SIP).

Exempt / Non-Exempt Projects - Transportation projects which will not change the operating characteristics of a roadway are exempt from the Transportation Improvement Program conformity analysis. Conformity analysis must be completed on projects that affect the distance, speed, or capacity of a roadway.

Federal-aid Highways - Those highways eligible for assistance under Title 23 of the United States Code, as amended, except those functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors.

Functional Classification - The grouping of streets and highways into classes, or systems according to the character of service that they are intended to provide, e.g., residential, collector, arterial, etc.

Key Number - Unique number assigned by ODOT to identify projects in the TIP/STIP.

Maintenance - Activities that preserve the function of the existing transportation system.

Maintenance Area - "Any geographical region of the United States that the EPA has designated (under Section 175A of the CAA) for a transportation related pollutant(s) for which a national ambient air quality standard exists." This designation is used after non-attainment areas reach attainment.

Mobile Sources - Mobile sources of air pollutants include motor vehicles, aircraft, seagoing vessels, and other transportation modes. The mobile source related pollutants of greatest concern are carbon monoxide (CO), transportation hydrocarbons (HC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM_{10}). Mobile sources are subject to a different set of regulations than are stationary and area sources of air pollutants.

Non-attainment Area - "Any geographic region of the United States that the EPA has designated as non-attainment for a transportation related pollutant(s) for which a national ambient air quality standard exists."

Regionally Significant – From OAR 340-252-0030 (39) "Regionally significant project" means a transportation project, other than an exempt project, that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs, such as access to and from the area outside the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves, and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum:
(a) All principal arterial highways;
(b) All fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel; and
(c) Any other facilities determined to be regionally significant through interagency consultation pursuant to OAR 340-252-0060.

3C - "Three C's" = continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative - This term refers to the requirements set forth in the Federal Highway Act of 1962 that transportation projects in urbanized areas be based on a "continuing, comprehensive transportation planning process carried out cooperatively by states and local communities." ISTEA's planning requirements broaden the framework for such a process to include consideration of important social, environmental and energy goals, and to involve the public in the process at several key decision making points.

Appendix D

PERFORMANCE BASED PLANNING

When Congress passed the 2012 transportation bill called MAP-21 and again within the subsequent bill the FAST Act in 2015, they included the requirement that performance based planning be implemented by both states and MPOs. To support this effort, FHWA and FTA spent several years developing the different regulations covering the primary areas of concern which are:

- Pavement condition on the Interstate System and on remainder of the National Highway System (NHS)
- Performance of the Interstate System and the remainder of the NHS
- Bridge condition on the NHS
- Fatalities and serious injuries—both number and rate per vehicle mile traveled—on all public roads
- Traffic congestion
- On-road mobile source emissions (through CMAQ)
- Freight movement on the Interstate System
- Transit System Reliability/State of Good Repair
- Transit Safety

The State has developed targets for the performance measures mandated by the federal transportation law. One can find these goals at the link below.

https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/PerformMang/Documents/FHWA%20Performance%20Management%20Area%20Targets.pdf

Metropolitan Planning Organizations have the option of either adopting the statewide goals or developing their own. The MRMPO and RVMPO intend to adopt the State's goals save one – on road mobile source emissions. This goal is pertinent to those organizations that receive Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. However, due to a recent redistribution of these funds and newly promulgated regulations on how those funds can be utilized, both the RVMPO and the MRMPO have seen significant reductions in both the amount of available CMAQ funds and how those funds may be used.

On the following page is a table showing all of the performance measures and their anticipated adoption dates.

Appendix D

Table i – Federal Performance Measures

Roadway Measures	First Target Due	
Safety - Final Rules as of May 27, 2016	**ODOT**	**MPOs**
- Serious Injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled	Aug-17	Feb-18
- Fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled		
- Number of Serious Injuries		
- Number of Fatalities		
- Number of Fatalities and Serious Injuries for non-motorized users		
Pavement and NHS Bridge Condition as of March 2017		
Pavement	May-18	Nov-18
- Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Good Condition		
- Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Poor Condition		
- Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good Condition		
- Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor Condition		
NHS Bridge		
- Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Good Condition		
- Percentage of NHS Bridges Classified as in Poor Condition		
Performance of National Highway System as of March 2017		
Travel Time Reliability	May-18	Nov-18
- Percent of the Person-Miles traveled on Interstate System that are reliable		
- Percent of the Person-Miles traveled on non-Interstate System that are reliable		
Freight Movement		
- Truck Travel Time Reliability Index		
Congestion and Air Quality Improvement Program		
- Annual hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay per Capita		
- Percent of non-SOV Travel		
- Total Emissons Reduction for All CMAQ funded projects		
Transit Measures		
System Reliability/State of Good Repair as of October 2016	Jan-17	Oct-18
- Major mechanical system failures		
- Other mechanical system failures		
Transit Safety - Final Rules TBD		
- Total number of reportable fatalities and rate per total unlinked passenger trips by mode	Pending	180 days after state target due
- Total number of reportable injuries and rate per total unlinked passenger trips by mode		
- Total number of reportable events and rate per total vehicle miles by mode		