



AGENDA

Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization

Policy Committee

Date: Thursday, January 26, 2017

Time: 2:30 p.m.

Location: Courtyard Conference Room, Grants Pass City Hall, 101 NW 'A' Street, Grants Pass, Oregon

Phone : Andrea Napoli, RVCOG, 541-423-1369
MRMPO website : www.mrmppo.org

1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review AgendaChair

2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1)Chair

Action Items:

3. Continued RTP/TIP Amendment Request.....Karl Welzenbach

Background: At the December 2016 TAC meeting, the TAC approved a motion to continue the proposed RTP/TIP amendments: Transfer Jurisdiction of OR 260: Lower River Road to Josephine County. The amendment request has since been withdrawn by ODOT.

Attachment: None.

Action Requested: Approve/Deny original request prior to deletion by ODOT to be consistent with Robert's Rules of Order.

Discussion Items:

4. Statewide Freight Plan Dan Moore

Background: The Fix America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act includes additional requirements that the State of Oregon's Freight Plan must meet by December of 2017. Included in these requirements are the designation of Critical Rural and Critical Urban Freight Corridors. The Oregon Department of Transportation is seeking input from its statewide partners in defining both the Rural and Urban Critical Freight Corridors.

- Attachment:* #2 – Designation Fact Sheet for MPOs,
 #3 – Oregon Freight Plan Amendment Overview
 #4 – Proposed Critical Urban Freight Corridors

Map Link – <http://rvcog.maps.arcgis.com/apps/PublicInformation/index.html?appid=ef703bc59ec34ddf8511e3d6d2126354>

5. Public Comment*Chair

(Limited to one comment per person, five minute maximum time limit)

6. Planning Update.....Karl Welzenbach

- CMAQ Update
- Letter to the Land Conservation and Development Commission (Attachment #5)

7. Other Business / Local BusinessChair

Opportunity for MRMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.

9. AdjournmentChair

- The next MRMPO TAC meeting will be **Thursday, February 2, at 1:30 p.m.** in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.
- The next MRMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Thursday, February 16th, at 2:30 p.m.** in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT ANDREA NAPOLI, 541-423-1369. REASONABLE ADVANCE NOTICE OF THE NEED FOR ACCOMMODATION PRIOR TO THE MEETING (48 HOURS ADVANCE NOTICE IS PREFERABLE) WILL ENABLE US TO MAKE REASONABLE ARRANGEMENTS TO ENSURE ACCESSIBILITY TO THIS MEETING.



SUMMARY MINUTES

Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization Policy Committee

December 15, 2017

The following attended:

Member	Organization	Phone Number
Darin Fowler, Chairman	Grants Pass	600-3696
Colleen Roberts	Jackson County	646-2878
Pam Van Arsdale, Vice Chairman	Rogue River	660-4414
Rob Brandes	Josephine County	474-5460
Art Anderson for Mike Baker	ODOT	
Others		
Leslie Orr	GP Bike/Ped.	
Beverly Layer	Medford	
Staff		
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	
Andrea Napoli	RVCOG	

1. Call to Order / Introductions/ Review Agenda

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. The Committee did self introductions, and congratulated Pam Van Arsdale on her election as Rogue River mayor. Art Anderson brought a copies of the 2017 ODOT Transportation Funding package to share with the Committee and address under Local Business on the agenda.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

The Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the previous meeting minutes.

On a motion by Pam Van Arsdale, seconded by Colleen Roberts, the minutes were approved as presented. Art Anderson abstained.

Action Item(s):**3. Greenhouse Gas Target Discussion & Direction**

Karl Welzenbach shared that the Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reduction has been meeting for almost a year and has come up with some basic statements towards recommendations to the Land Conservation and Development Commission.

Summary of Discussions and Recommendations from Green House Gas Advisory Committee

On November 4th, the greenhouse gas advisory committee met to begin finalizing recommendations to bring back to the Commission. The agenda for this meeting included (1) a discussions of policy approaches for increasing transportation choices and (2) a discussion of Green House Gas reduction targets. **Please note:** Included in the discussion of reduction targets was the issue of whether or not to include the newly formed MPOs (Middle Rogue and Albany) in the mix. I will address this towards the end of this memo.

- (1) The overall policy approach was to let MPOs focus on the RTP and the accompanying federal requirements and allow each region a choice for coordination. This could mean that the goal is set by the members of the MPO and there could be an exclusion for smaller cities (population 2500 and below) for meeting these goals. The effort would be to try to look towards those things that local governments, rather than MPOs, control – land use, zoning, development, etc.
- (2) Green House Gas Targets – LCDC staff provided three options to consider when developing GHG targets for communities within MPO areas: (1) establish one target for every area; (2) establish one target for the Portland Metro area and another target for everyone else; (3) establish individual targets for each area. After a great deal of discussion the committee settled on to two versions of the second option – one target for Metro and one for everyone else. These two options are:

Option 5.2.3 Year	Portland Metro Area	Other MPO Areas
By 2040	26%	13%
By 2050	37%	26%
Option 5.2.4 Year	Portland Metro Area	Other MPO Areas
By 2040	25%	20%
By 2050	35%	30%

Whether or Not to Include the New MPOs in Target Rules

Although the data indicates that there is “an insignificant effect on the targets by including [or excluding] the two Metropolitan Areas” LCDC staff recommends inclusion. Mr. Darin Fowler, Chairman of the Middle Rogue MPO, took exception to this recommendation and wanted both the TAC and the Policy Committee to discuss this issue. The TAC did not come to a conclusion on this matter, and deferred to the Policy Committee on this matter. Chairman Fowler spoke about his interaction with the GHG Advisory Committee, and the fact that the MPO didn’t have any work to do. The process is voluntary. In the proposed TPR, 13 of the 24 involved cities can opt out, but Grants Pass cannot. Rogue River is small enough to opt out. Pam Van Arsdale expressed her opinion that the entire MPO should be considered, rather than individual jurisdictions. There was concern that the process would become mandatory at some point, and that it is not a “one size fits all” issue, with each geographic area

throughout the state having its unique attributes. Meeting the intent voluntarily may be of future benefit if the process becomes mandatory.

There is recognition that the MPO is limited in its role, with the individual jurisdictions ultimately having their own land use authority. All LCDC staff is asking for is some level of cooperation, and will pay for the associated costs. Frustration was expressed about being as to know what would be relevant in 20 years, and DLCD's place in the GHG process. The TRP is a DLCD document. ODOT uses it as a reference. Future technology advancements cannot be used in the calculations because it is anticipated that they will occur on their own.

The members discussed the predominantly rural nature of the southern Oregon region, and the inherent difficulties of implementing a viable transit system to serve the outermost areas of the MPO. Mr. Welzenbach said that the state had to deal with the problem on a statewide basis, thereby calling for some innovative solutions in order to serve everyone. The benefit beginning the process early, while it can be paid for by others was brought up. Robert Brandes said that his opposition stemmed from things being to "open ended" at this time. Pam Van Arsdale pointed out the whole GHG issue was much more global than a single state's handling of the situation. Several jurisdictions have also implemented pollution mitigation measures that fall outside the transportation parameters.

The Committee reached a consensus to have Mr. Welzenbach draft a Letter of Non-Support on behalf of the MRMPO in order to Commission that it is the opinion of the Policy Committee that the current approach being considered is too open ended and the anticipated benefits are too uncertain, too economically and/or socially infeasible for a small community given the current range of options (parking fees, ridesharing programs, enhanced transit operations, increased land use densities). The Policy Committee believes that it would be wiser for the smaller communities to revisit this issue at a later date once the benefits and efficacy of the proposed remedies and policies are better understood and quantified.

MOTION(S):

On a motion by Pam Van Arsdale, seconded by Colleen Roberts, Karl Welzenbach was directed to write the Letter of Non-Support, as discussed, on behalf of the MPO. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Item(s):

4. Project Applications, CMAQ Funding Balance, CMAQ Advisory Committee

In August 2016, ODOT informed the Oregon Air Quality Maintenance Areas (including the RVMPO and MRMPO) that both Salem and Eugene are now Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) eligible areas, which will require an update to the current funding allocation formula that was last approved back in 2006 with the passage of SAFETEA-LU. Table 1 below includes an estimate prepared by ODOT, based on population, of what the allocations could look like when Salem and Eugene are added. The table also includes the differences in funding with and without Salem/Eugene and the percent reduction.

Table 1 - Oregon CMAQ Funding - FAST Act Annual Amounts

	Without Salem/ Eugene	% Share	With Salem/Eugene	% share	\$ Difference	% Reduction
Metro	\$14,086,017	79.1%	\$10,561,701	59.3%	-\$3,524,316	25%
Medford	\$2,465,053	13.8%	\$1,307,833	7.3%	-\$1,157,220	47%
Grants Pass	\$704,300	4.0%	\$532,341	3.0%	-\$171,959	24%
Klamath Falls	\$352,150	2.0%	\$427,221	2.4%	\$75,071	-21%

Eugene	\$0	0%	\$2,263,636	12.7%	\$2263,636	
Salem	\$0	0%	\$2,514,788	14.1%	\$2,514,788	
Lakeview	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,0000	0.4%	\$0	0%
Oakridge	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,0000	0.4%	\$0	0%
La Grand	\$65,000	0.4%	\$65,0000	0.4%	\$0	0%
	\$17,802,520	100%	\$17,802,520	100%		

*Distribution based on population, which closely matches 2006 CMAQ allocation formula

ODOT recognizes that the timing of this presents some challenges for the MPO Maintenance Areas developing Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). ODOT recommends taking a conservative approach as the MPOs go through the CMAQ project solicitation/selection process. The RVMPO is using the annual estimate of \$1,307,833 (Table 1 with Salem/Eugene column) for their 2018-21 TIP development.

ODOT hired a public involvement consultant, Jeanne Lawson, to conduct some preliminary interviews with a select number of eligible CMAQ entities. ODOT felt it was important to have a neutral, non-ODOT person conduct these conversations. On October 31st, the RVCOG Executive Director, Planning Program Manager and MPO Coordinator participated in an interview with Ms. Lawson to talk about how the MPO is currently distributing CMAQ funds, the opportunities and barriers to our method, impacts on planned investments, and what kind of approach should be used to distribute the funds. Ms. Lawson will provide a summary of the interviews in the near future.

Currently, ODOT is in the process of forming a Program Advisory Committee (PAC) Committee to develop program recommendations for (CMAQ) funds. Mike Quilty, RVMPO Policy Committee Chair, is serving on the CMAQ PAC. Mr. Darin Fowler has been contacted to represent the Middle Rogue MPO. The first meeting is likely to be held on December 16th in Salem.

Mr. Welzenbach shared that the application deadline for CMAQ/STP project funding has been extended for Grants Pass projects. He commented that the significant funding carry over would make it difficult to justify asking for more funding if no project applications are made. Therefore, the MRMPO TAC will now be making application for several projects. Other possible funding redistributions were also discussed, including a three year hold harmless for existing members as related to the inclusion of Eugene and Salem in the process. PL funds will be impacted too. The MRMPO is affected by the redistribution of PL funding, losing \$3,000. The current approach to adjust the totals is formulaic. Next year, the RVMPO is the only one that has to do conformity, and the MRMPO and RVMPO are the only MPOs in the state having to deal with two (2) pollutants. At the end of everything, the MRMPO will get an additional \$17,000.

5. MRMPO Planning Update

- The MRMPO is the only MPO in the state to reduce VMT over twenty years, but LCDC still asked to see one year benchmarks that have been reached.
- OMPOC has sent out legislation initiatives for transit funding (operational and local matches), active transportation bike/ped, and healthy air quality (additional state dollars). There are six additional items on the back page of the document. Copies of the initiatives will be provided for the Committee by staff. The RVMPO is against the “pay as you go” collection plan. The MRMPO membership also objected to this method, citing several other options to generate appropriate revenues.

6. Public Comment

None received.

7. Other Business/Local Business

- New MPO liaisons will be appointed in February. There will be a combination of old and new appointments
- Art Anderson shared ODOT's financial requests based on needs that have been established in various categories, through analysis, that are being presented to the OTC for their consideration. If agreed upon by OTC, the report will then go onto the legislature to move forward in devising a bill. Mr. Anderson went over the categorical figures in two scenarios with the Committee, and said that he would provide copies to the members in the next few days. Investment Scenario #1, at \$600 million, is viewed as more of a "maintenance" scenario. Investment Scenario #2 is over a billion dollars, and would allow for a variety of transportation improvements/programs. The figures are reflective of a reasonable "asks", and it is anticipated that Scenario #1 will be the preferred scenario. Oregon is ranked last in the US in terms of the cost operating/maintaining a car for a year. If the state gas tax was raised, it would generate a significant increase in revenues. The same would also be true at a federal level. The Governor's transportation audit was also discussed.
- Details of the recent southern Oregon (Seismic) Triage, allowing for escape routes from the region in the event of an earthquake were shared with the Committee. Based upon interest expressed by the Committee members, Mr. Anderson said he would bring the triage presentation to the MPO at their next meeting. (Note: due to scheduling conflicts this presentation has been moved to February.)

8. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Meeting Schedule:

MRMPO TAC	Thursday, Jan. 5, 2017 @ 1:30 pm
MRMPO Policy	Thursday, Jan. 19, 2017 @ 2:30 pm

Designating Critical Rural and Critical Urban Freight Corridors

Critical Rural Freight Corridors (CRFC) and Critical Urban Freight Corridors (CUFC) provide important connections to the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). States and MPOs designate corridors to add mileage to the National Highway Freight Network and strategically direct federal resources towards improved system performance and efficient freight movement. Adding mileage for CRFCs and CUFCs to the state’s NHFN allows expanded use of National Highway Freight Program formula funds and FASTLANE Grant Program funds for eligible projects that support the national highway and multimodal freight system goals.

ODOT considered two approaches to conduct system definition and critical freight corridor designation. One approach would identify segments of the broader multimodal freight network for designation. The preferred approach focuses strategically on qualifying segments in which improvement projects in need of federal funding are being developed or are anticipated in the next five to twenty years. This effort will not impact current roadway designations, such as freight routes from the Oregon Highway Plan and strategic corridors from the Oregon Freight Plan. Table 1 below lists the eligibility requirements to designate corridors.

Table 1: Eligibility Requirements

Critical Rural Freight Corridors	Critical Urban Freight Corridors
<p>Must be a public road within the borders of the state and <i>not in an urbanized area</i></p> <p>Meet one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rural principal arterial roadway with minimum 25% of annual average daily traffic (measured in passenger vehicle equivalent units) from trucks (FHWA vehicle class 8-13) (A) 2. Provides access to energy exploration, development, installation, or production areas (B) 3. Connects the PHFS or the Interstate System to facilities that handle more than 50k TEUs per year or 500k tons per year of bulk commodities (C) 4. Provides access to grain elevators, agricultural, mining, forestry, or intermodal facilities (D) 5. Connects to an international port of entry (E) 6. Provides access to significant air, rail, water, or other freight facilities in the state (F) 7. Determined by the State to be vital to improving the efficient movement of freight of importance to the economy of the State (G) <p>FHWA encourages states to consider first and last mile connector routes from high-volume freight corridors to key rural freight facilities, such as manufacturing centers, agricultural processing centers, farms, intermodal and military facilities</p> <p>State may designate Critical Rural Freight Corridors</p>	<p>Must be a public road <i>in an urbanized area</i></p> <p>Meet one or more of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Connects an intermodal facility to the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS), the Interstate System, or an intermodal freight facility (H) 2. Located within a corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement (I) 3. Serves a major freight generator, logistic center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land (J) 4. Important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the MPO or the State (K) <p>FHWA encourages States, when making CUFC designations, to consider first or last mile connector routes from high-volume freight corridors to freight-intensive land and key urban freight facilities, including ports, rail terminals, and other industrial-zoned land</p> <p>Note: <i>MPOs in urbanized areas with population of 500,000 or more may designate Critical Urban Freight Corridors in coordination with the State. In urbanized areas with population under 500,000, the State, in consultation with MPOs, may designate CUFCs.</i></p>

FHWA code for each eligibility item is noted in parentheses and bold italics

Designating Critical Rural and Critical Urban Freight Corridors

According to FAST Act requirements, the State is responsible for designating Critical Urban Freight Corridors, in coordination with MPOs, for urbanized areas with population under 500,000. MPOs may designate CUFCs, in coordination with the State, in urbanized areas with population 500,000 or more.

ODOT is facilitating a discussion with MPOs in Oregon to identify candidates for CUFC designations. The discussion will take place on January 13, 2017 during the regularly scheduled MPO Transit Districts meeting. MPO directors are expected to attend and are invited to bring planning staff or additional MPO staff as desired. To prepare for the discussion, ODOT requests each MPO to develop a refined list of locations or road segments within your metropolitan planning area as candidates for CUFC designation.

Please consider the following as you develop your list:

- ⇒ Use the eligibility requirements for CUFCs listed in Table 1
- ⇒ Develop location/segment list noting the road name, mile points, segment length, and applicable FHWA code(s) to indicate applicable criteria for each facility
- ⇒ Describe each location/segment's importance to freight mobility
- ⇒ Consider anticipated need for improvements on the eligible road network in your metropolitan planning area
- ⇒ Focus on portions of corridors that provide critical links or road segments where an improvement project is being developed rather than an entire highway corridor

In addition, the State is responsible for designating Critical Rural Freight Corridors and miles to be added to the National Multimodal Freight Network in Oregon. ODOT is developing a working group to discuss designation candidates in the winter and spring of 2017. The working group will include representatives of freight transportation modes, shippers and carriers, and jurisdictions involved in rural and regional freight transportation system planning.



Figure 1: Illustration of National Highway Freight Network (blue) and Oregon Highway Plan Freight Routes (red)

Key Facts and Resources

USDOT allotted the following additional mileage for Oregon freight corridor designations:

- ⇒ 155 miles for Critical Rural Freight Corridors
- ⇒ 77 miles for Critical Urban Freight Corridors

FHWA Guidance on Designations:

www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/crfc/sec_1116_gdnce.htm

Oregon Freight Plan:

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ofp.aspx

For more information on Critical Urban Freight Corridors and Critical Rural Freight Corridors, or for information on the Oregon Freight Plan amendment work currently underway, please contact the ODOT Freight Planning Unit.

Contacts

Scott Turnoy, Freight Planning Program Manager
Scott.turnoy@odot.state.or.us
 503-986-3703

Erik Havig, Planning Section Manager
Erik.M.HAVIG@odot.state.or.us
 503-986-4127

ODOT Planning Project Title VI Report

OREGON FREIGHT PLAN AMENDMENT



DATA AND ANALYSIS

Freight transportation facilities with mobility issues are currently being inventoried and prioritized into tiers. This effort includes collection of truck travel data, National Performance Management Research Data Set, Average Annual Daily Traffic, and analysis of highway delay areas, intermodal connectors, and non-highway needs identified by aviation, marine, and rail representatives.

PROJECT OVERVIEW AND PROCESS

The Oregon Freight Plan (OFP) must meet new federal requirements for the state to obligate federal formula freight funding beyond December 4, 2017. The requirements and ODOT's approach for meeting them are detailed in the attached document, *FAST Act Freight Planning Requirements and OFP Approach*. While several of the requirements are addressed by the 2011 OFP and other statewide policy plans, ODOT's OFP amendment process will address the remaining requirements, including a tiered statewide inventory of freight transportation facilities with mobility needs; additional urban and rural facilities designated as critical freight corridors; a five-year investment plan listing priority projects; and performance measures. A contract has been established for project management and facilitation services to help ODOT meet the tight timeline to complete the amendment and assist with stakeholder engagement.



KEY OUTCOMES

An amended Oregon Freight Plan, approved by the Oregon Transportation Commission and certified by Federal Highway Administration, which enables the state to continue obligating federal formula freight funding. This effort sets the foundation for freight transportation system investments to be included in the 2018-2021 STIP, as well as for future statewide freight planning.

OUTREACH AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT EFFORTS

Outreach to the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee, Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Area Commissions on Transportation are components of the outreach and stakeholder engagement plan for this project. In addition, a working group consisting of freight transportation modal, industry, and rural jurisdiction representatives will provide input on Critical Rural Freight Corridor designations.



Website: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ofp.aspx
For more Information, Please Contact:
Scott Turnoy, 503-986-3703 scott.turnoy@odot.state.or.us
Erik Havig, 503-986-4127 erik.m.havig@odot.state.or.us

Oregon’s state freight plan must be compliant with FAST Act planning requirements and approved by Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) Division Office by December 4, 2017. ODOT is leading the amendment process for the Oregon Freight Plan and will seek approval by the Oregon Transportation Commission of the final state freight plan document in November 2017. For quick reference, ODOT has organized the FAST Act freight planning requirements and ODOT’s corresponding approach to meet each requirement in Table 1 below.

Table 1: State Freight Plan Requirements and Approach

FAST Act State Freight Planning Requirements	ODOT Approach	Schedule
1. Identification of significant freight system <i>trends, needs, and issues</i> with respect to the state	The 2011 OFP contains information on trends, needs, and issues - develop spreadsheet that refers to relevant sections of the 2011 OFP for FHWA review	Winter 2017
2. Description of freight <i>policies, strategies, and performance measures</i> that will guide State’s freight-related transportation investment decisions	The 2011 OFP and other policy plans contain policies and strategies, but performance measures will either reflect federal measures or short list of measures linked to investment opportunities	Winter 2017 PMs by Spring 2017
3. Listing of: a) multimodal <i>critical rural freight facilities and corridors</i> designated within the state, b) <i>critical rural and urban freight corridors</i> designated within the state	Urban mileage will be designated in consultation with MPOs, rural mileage and additional multimodal mileage will be designated in consultation with working group of modal, freight transportation industry, and rural jurisdiction representatives ODOT GIS Unit will develop proposed designation maps	Revised maps by Spring 2017 Final memo by Summer 2017
4. Description of how the plan will improve the ability of the state to <i>meet the national multimodal freight policy goals and the national highway freight program goals</i>	Provide a crosswalk table that demonstrates correlation between the national goals and existing statewide plan policies, strategies, and the new freight investment plan	Spring 2017
5. Description of how <i>innovative technologies and operational strategies</i> including freight intelligent transportation systems, that improve the safety and efficiency of freight movement were considered	Refer to relevant sections of 2011 OFP and other policy plans for policies and strategies	Winter 2017
6. Description of improvements that may be required to <i>reduce or impede the deterioration of roadways</i> due to projected wear from travel by heavy vehicles	Refer to relevant sections of 2011 OFP, the OHP, and the OTP state of good repair policies	Winter 2017

FAST Act State Freight Planning Requirements	ODOT Approach	Schedule
<p>7. Inventory of facilities with freight mobility issues, such as bottlenecks, within the state, and for those facilities that are state owned or operated, a description of the strategies the state is employing to address those freight mobility issues</p>	<p>Inventory of needs will include tiered list of Freight Highway Bottlenecks (Delay Areas), Intermodal Connectors, and non-highway facilities with freight mobility issues</p> <p>Refer to existing plans for strategies to address issues</p>	<p>Winter/Spring 2017</p>
<p>8. Consideration of any significant congestion or <i>delay caused by freight movements</i> and any strategies to mitigate that congestion or delay</p>	<p>Discuss with ODOT Regions, ODOT Rail Division, and Oregon Freight Advisory Committee (OFAC) related to passing lanes, truck climbing lanes, and rail-highway at grade crossings that have delays</p>	<p>Winter 2017</p>
<p>9. Freight investment plan that includes a list of priority projects and describes how freight formula funds would be invested and matched</p>	<p>The inventory of facilities with freight mobility issues will inform the list of priority projects in the investment plan</p> <p>ODOT will develop a proposal, working with region staff for project scoping and cost information, including freight formula funds and matching fund sources for each project</p> <p>Investment plan proposal shared with ACTs and OFAC for feedback</p>	<p>Summer 2017</p>
<p>10. Consult with the state freight advisory committee</p>	<p>Prepare an OFAC consultation section of the update outlining all points and steps in which OFAC provided input and guided the amendment process.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Inventory of facilities (bottlenecks, intermodal connectors, non-highway system needs) ✓ Investment strategy ✓ Performance measures ✓ Delay caused by freight movements ✓ Draft plan amendment review 	<p>Winter 2017</p> <p>Spring 2017</p> <p>Summer 2017</p>

Contact

Scott Turnoy
Freight Planning Program Manager
scott.turnoy@odot.state.or.us
503-986-3703

Erik Havig
Planning Section Manager
erik.m.havig@odot.state.or.us
503-986-4127

**Middle Rogue MPO
Proposed Critical Urban Freight Corridors
January 19, 2017**

Route Name	Start Point	End Point	Length (Miles)	FHWA Code (List all that apply)	Description of Importance Other Comments
SE M St.	Milbank St.	Hwy 199	.29	H, I, J, K	Freight corridor serving industrial/commercial areas with connection to I-5
Hwy 199	MPO boundary	MPO boundary	9.24	H, I, J, K	Freight corridor serving industrial/commercial areas with connection to I-5
Hwy 238	MPO boundary	MPO boundary	5.91	H, I, J, K	Freight corridor serving industrial/commercial areas with connection to I-5
Hwy 99	MPO boundary	MPO boundary	20.4	H, I, J, K	Freight corridor serving industrial/commercial areas with connection to I-5

Eligibility Requirements for Designating Critical Urban Freight Corridors within an MPO

Must be a public road *in an urbanized area*

Meet one or more of the following:

1. Connects an intermodal facility to the Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS), the Interstate System, or an intermodal freight facility (**H**)
2. Located within a corridor of a route on the PHFS and provides an alternative highway option important to goods movement (**I**)
3. Serves a major freight generator, logistic center, or manufacturing and warehouse industrial land (**J**)
4. Important to the movement of freight within the region, as determined by the MPO or the State (**K**)

FHWA encourages States, when making CUFC designations, to consider first or last mile connector routes from high-volume freight corridors to freight intensive land and key urban freight facilities, including ports, rail terminals, and other industrial-zoned land

Note: MPOs in urbanized areas with population of 500,000 or more may designate Critical Urban Freight Corridors in coordination with the State. In urbanized areas with population under 500,000, the State, in consultation with MPOs, may designate CUFCs.



**Middle Rogue
Metropolitan Planning Organization**
Regional Transportation Planning

Gold Hill • Grants Pass • Rogue River • Jackson County • Josephine County • Oregon Department of Transportation

December 20, 2016

Mr. Greg Macpherson
Chairman,
Land Conservation and Development Commission
635 Capital St., N.E., Suite 150
Salem, OR 97301-2540

RE: Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reduction Targets

Dear Mr. Macpherson:

Over the past year the staff of the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) has been working closely with and providing support to an Advisory Committee on Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Greenhouse Gas Reductions. Their charter was to provide the Commission on Land Conservation and Development with recommendations regarding the role of local governments and MPOs in developing transportation alternatives (including recommendations concerning the existing Transportation Planning Rules) and setting targets for greenhouse gas reductions.

While the Policy Committee of the Middle Rogue MPO applauds the effort and the professionalism of the DLCD staff, we are concerned with the final recommendations regarding the inclusion of the two smallest MPOs, the Albany MPO and the Middle Rogue MPO, in the Greenhouse Gas target reductions being recommended to the Commission.

In their Technical Memo #2 (and referred to in staff's Target Policy Memo for the November 4, 2016 meeting) DLCD staff stated that inclusion of the two smallest MPOs have "... an insignificant effect on the targets ..." Thus, the logic holds that excluding the two smallest MPOs would also have an insignificant effect on the targets.

It is the opinion of the Policy Committee that the current approach being considered is too open ended and the anticipated benefits are too uncertain, too economically and/or socially infeasible for a small community given the current range of options (parking fees, ridesharing programs, enhanced transit operations, increased land use densities). The Policy Committee believes that it would be wiser for the smaller communities to revisit this issue at a later date once the benefits and efficacy of the proposed remedies and policies are better understood and quantified.

On behalf of the Middle Rogue MPO Policy Committee,

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Darin Fowler".

Mr. Darin Fowler, Chairman
MRMPO