



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