



AGENDA
Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Date: Thursday, May 1, 2014
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Location: Courtyard Conference Room, Grants Pass City Hall, 101 NW 'A' Street,
Grants Pass, Oregon
Phone : Sue Casavan, RVCOG, 541-423-1360
MRMPO website : www.mrmppo.org

- 1. Call to Order/Introductions/Review AgendaMichael Black, Chair**
- 2. Review/Approve Minutes (Attachment #1)Chair**

Action Item:

- 3. Discretionary Funding Project Status.....Dan Moore/Andrea Napoli**

Background: At their April 17th meeting, the Policy Committee tentatively approved six (6) of the thirteen (13) TAC's recommended discretionary funded projects that had construction funds identified in the project budget. Staff will present possible funding scenarios for the remaining seven (7) projects.

Attachments: #2 (a,b,c,d) - Spreadsheets, Letter from ODOT

Action Requested: Recommend funding scenarios for remaining projects to the Policy Committee

Discussion Item:

- 4. TAC Review of Staff Documents Prior to MPO Policy Committee Submittal Chuck DeJanvier**

Background: This is a proposal from a TAC member to have the TAC review materials prepared by MPO staff prior to submittal to the Policy Committee.

Action Requested: Discussion and Direction from TAC

5. **MRMPO Planning Update**..... **Jonathan David**
6. **Public Comment***.....**Chair**
(Limited to one comment per person, five minute maximum time limit)
7. **Other Business / Local Business****Chair**
Opportunity for MRMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.
8. **Adjournment****Chair**

- The next Middle Rogue MPO TAC meeting will be **Thursday, June 5, at 1:30 p.m. in the Courtyard Conference Room at Grants Pass City Hall.**
- The next Middle Rogue MPO Policy Committee meeting will be **Thursday, May 15, 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 SUE CASAVAN, 541-423-1360. 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 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

April 3, 2014

The following people were in attendance:

MRMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance:

Chuck DeJanvier	Josephine County
Ian Horlacher	ODOT
John Krawczyk	Rogue River
John Vial	Jackson County
Josh LeBombard	DLCD
Lora Glover for Michael Black	Grants Pass
Kelli Sparkman	ODOT
Rick Hohnbaum	Gold Hill

Others Present:

None.

RVCOG Staff

Jonathan David, Dan Moore, Dick Converse, Sue Casavan

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda

John Vial called the meeting to order at 1:30 PM.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

Vial asked if there were any changes or additions to the March meeting minutes. Rick Hohnbaum pointed out minor corrections to MPO staff before meeting.

On a motion by Rick Hohnbaum and seconded by Kelli Sparkman, the Committee approved the minutes as corrected. Ian Horlacher abstained.

3. MRMPO Draft Public Participation Plan

Dick Converse presented the draft document and said the main purpose of the plan was to provide a forum for the public to comment and that the MPO respond to their comments. He did some census evaluation to determine the extent of outreach that will be needed and noted that the MRMPO falls below the threshold for minorities. He suggested the target group for MRMPO should probably be the elderly and poverty as far as threshold and percentages.

Members briefly discussed different outreach options. Members felt due to the geography of the

MRMPO and distance between jurisdictions that a committee might not be as valuable as other outreach methods at this time.

Dan Moore informed members that a committee is not mandated at the federal level and it will be up to the Policy Committee in the end to decide what type of MPO representation they will want.

Josh LeBombard suggested making advertising for the meetings more interesting to the average person, highlight specific important events.

Members briefly discussed various outreach methods and directed staff to present a list of options for discussion at the next meeting.

4. Draft Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) 2014-2015

Jonathan David presented the work program document.

Chuck DeJanvier noted that on Page 'ii' there were two different organizational formats for the TAC and the Policy Committees.

David informed the committee that MPO staff is beginning to look at the air quality requirements and hoping that a Limited Maintenance Plan (LMP) will be approved by the regulating agencies. He briefly discussed work for a land use model update.

On a motion by Ian Horlacher and seconded by John Krawczyk the committee unanimously forwarded recommendation for approval of the UPWP 2014-2015 to the Policy Committee.

5. Long-Range Funding Projections

John Vial noted that the issue was raised at the last Policy Committee meeting.

Dan Moore added that the Policy Committee was concerned how money spent for planning a project would prompt timing for funding of construction of the project in the future and asked to see other possible funding sources. He presented a spreadsheet with a 2013-2040 funding forecast. Additional funding of Enhance/Fix-it funds and gas tax revenues were included. He explained that the MPO could not commit funds to a project and the jurisdiction would need to apply and/or commit the funds. John Vial and Chuck DeJanvier mentioned that gas tax funds were being used for maintenance in both counties. Members also expressed concern of including the state funds as they are competitive and not guaranteed.

Kelli Sparkman gave a brief explanation of time spans and how obligated funds would work. She suggested that picking one or two priorities and funding the whole project might be beneficial focusing on the CMAQ and STP funds that are allotted to MRMPO. Jurisdictions will be committed to using funds to the completion of the project and should consider the possibility of other projects rising in priority with the completion of the RTP.

Vial indicated that the gas tax is not available for project funding and the state funds are competitive and cannot be depended on. The MPO should focus on the CMAQ and STP funds and can the projects be funded from those two sources.

Members felt Grants Pass and Josephine County needed to first feel comfortable with the obligated funding and long term commitment and other members will support the decision. Jonathan David noted that the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) will be developed before the 2018 funds are available and changes could be made. Moore added that 2018 funds could be used for funding construction.

On a motion by Chuck DeJanvier and seconded by Rick Hohnbaum the committee unanimously forwarded recommendation to the Policy Committee to approve the MPO project plan as listed and based on funding tables there is adequate CMAQ and STP funds to fully fund construction.

Jonathan David briefly discussed the importance of communication and sharing technical information from the MPO meetings between TAC members and Policy Committee members.

6. MRMPO Bylaws Revision Discussion

Jonathan David asked members to review the bylaws and consider adding language to include voting by email. There was question if this process would comply with public meeting laws. Members support drafting language in the bylaws that support the process. There was some question and discussion that an email vote might not be appropriate for a new item that was not discussed at a meeting.

7. MPO Planning Update

Jonathan David mentioned that a cost benefit analysis for the RVCOG Hybrid Vehicle will be brought to the Policy Committee at the April meeting.

8. Public Comment

None received.

9. Other Business / Local Business -

Ian Horlacher said the Transportation Growth Management (TGM) grants are in and jurisdictions will need to apply for the funds.

10. Adjournment -

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40 p.m.

Project #	Agency	Project Name	Total Cost												Other Funds
				FFY 2014		FFY 2015		FFY 2016		FFY 2017		FFY 2018		Local Funds	
				STP	CMAQ	STP	CMAQ	STP	CMAQ	STP	CMAQ	STP	CMAQ		
1	Grants Pass	Alt Fuel Facility Plan	\$ 112,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 12,000	\$ -
2	Grants Pass	Bike/Ped Improvments	\$ 558,923	\$ -	\$ 418,971	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 139,952	\$ -
3	Grants Pass	Fruitdale Drive	\$10,074,058	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 836,655	\$ -	\$ 738,154	\$ 333,547	\$ 748,488	\$ 6,917,214	\$ -
4	Grants Pass	Lincoln Road	\$ 475,288			\$ 100,288								\$ 375,000	\$ -
6	Grants Pass	Redwood Ave Phase 2	\$ 3,579,043	\$ 579,043										\$ 3,000,000	
7	Grants Pass	Redwood Ave Phase 3	\$ 1,320,000	\$ -		\$ 500,000								\$ 700,000	\$ 120,000
8	Grants Pass	Transit Hub Study	\$ 55,135		\$ 50,000									\$ 5,135	\$ -
9	JCT	Commuter Service	\$ 499,927		\$ 448,584									\$ 51,343	\$ -
10	Josephine County	G Street	\$ 149,000										\$ 133,000	\$ 16,000	\$ -
11	Josephine County	Highland Ave	\$ 186,000										\$ 166,000	\$ 20,000	\$ -
12	Josephine County	Merlin Road Sidewalk	\$ 812,000					\$ 102,000		\$ 617,214				\$ 92,786	\$ -
13	Josephine County	Hillcrest Multi-Street Improvements	\$ 1,714,665				\$ -						\$ -	\$ 1,484,665	\$ 230,000
14	RVCOG	Hybrid Vehicle	\$ 12,957	\$ 12,957	\$ -	\$ -								\$ -	\$ -
	Total Funding Requests			\$ 592,000	\$ 917,555	\$ 600,288	\$ 100,000	\$ 602,000	\$ 836,655	\$ 617,214	\$ 738,154	\$ 632,547	\$ 2,233,153		
	Funding Available			\$ 592,000	\$ 1,943,000	\$ 600,288	\$ 1,743,357	\$ 608,692	\$ 2,371,320	\$ 623,906	\$ 2,272,819	\$ 632,547	\$ 2,283,153		
	Fund Balances (incl. carry-overs)			\$0	\$1,025,445	\$0	\$1,643,357	\$6,692	\$1,534,665	\$6,692	\$1,534,665	\$0	\$50,000		
				Redwood Ph2 STP reduced by \$12,957						Merlin STP reduced by \$9,786		Fruitdale STP reduced by ~47%	Hillcrest CMAQ reduced by ~69%	Merlin to add \$9,786 from 2017 STP reduction	

MRMPO Discretionary Funding Requests
Total All Years

Agency	Project Description	(1) ODOT CMAQ Program Manager Eligibility Determination	Total STP Funds Available 2014-18	Total CMAQ Funds Available 2014-18	Total Federal Funds Available 2014-18	(2) Local & Other Funds	(3) Total Cost	(4) Construction Funds Identified in Project (part of total project cost)	(5) Estimated Construction Funds Needed to Complete Project (\$500/linear foot for roads)	(6) Local Match @ 10.27%	(7) Total Future Construction Funds Needed for Highlighted Projects
			\$ 3,044,049	\$ 4,875,517	\$ 7,919,566						
			Total STP Fund Request	Total CMAQ Fund Request	Total Federal Funds Request (STP & CMAQ)						
Grants Pass	Alt Fuel Facility Plan*	Yes	\$ -	\$ 100,000	\$100,000	\$ 10,500	\$ 110,500	\$ -	\$ 1,345,950	\$ 154,050	\$ 1,500,000
Grants Pass	Bike/Ped Improvments	Yes	\$ -	\$ 418,971	\$418,971	\$ 139,952	\$ 558,923	\$ 434,903	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grants Pass	Fruitdale Drive	Yes	\$ 833,547	\$ 2,323,297	\$3,156,844	\$ 6,917,214	\$ 10,074,058	\$ 1,182,035	\$ 5,937,626	\$ 679,588	\$ 6,617,214
Grants Pass	Lincoln Road	NA - STP	\$ 100,288	\$ -	\$100,288	\$ 375,000	\$ 475,288	\$ 425,288	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grants Pass	Redwood Ave Phase 2	NA - STP	\$ 579,043	\$ -	\$579,043	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,579,043	\$ 3,579,043	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grants Pass	Redwood Ave Phase 3**	NA - STP	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$500,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ 1,100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Grants Pass	Transit Hub Study	Yes	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$50,000	\$ 5,135	\$ 55,135	\$ -	\$ 897,300	\$ 102,700	\$ 1,000,000
JCT	Commuter Service	Yes	\$ -	\$ 448,584	\$448,584	\$ 51,343	\$ 499,927	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Josephine County	G Street	NA - STP	\$ 133,000	\$ -	\$133,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 149,000	\$ -	\$ 740,273	\$ 84,728	\$ 825,000
Josephine County	Highland Ave	NA - STP	\$ 166,000	\$ -	\$166,000	\$ 20,000	\$ 186,000	\$ -	\$ 1,615,140	\$ 184,860	\$ 1,800,000
Josephine County	Merlin Road Sidewalk	NA - STP	\$ 719,214	\$ -	\$719,214	\$ 92,786	\$ 812,000	\$ 699,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Josephine County	Hillcrest Multi-Street	Yes	\$ -	\$ 1,484,665	\$1,484,665	\$ 230,000	\$ 1,714,665	\$ -	\$ 3,230,280	\$ 369,720	\$ 3,600,000
RVCOG	Hybrid Vehicle	NA - STP	\$ 12,957	\$ -	\$12,957	\$ -	\$ 12,957	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Total Funding Requests			\$ 3,044,049	\$ 4,825,517	\$ 7,869,566	\$11,677,930	\$ 19,547,496	\$ 7,420,269	\$ 13,766,569	\$ 1,575,645	\$ 15,342,214
Funding Difference			\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000						

*The likely design would either be a CNG Station, an LPG Station, or both. A fast fill CNG Station would likely cost between \$1.2 million and \$1.5 million, based on some stations built by Avista in other parts of Oregon and the northwest. A LPG station would likely be in the \$200,000 to \$300,000 range and perhaps slightly less.

** Grants Pass is currently evaluating Redwood Ave Phase 3 to determine if the scope of the project needs to change. Costs may increase as a result.

- (1) Eligibility determined by ODOT's CMAQ Program Manager (2-18-14). Awaiting FHWA's concurrence
- (2) Applicant's local funding contribution to the project. Grants Pass Fruitdale project included \$6,617,214 in future STP/CMAQ funds as local funds towards the project. This amount is not counted as available for the project.
- (3) Total estimated cost of each project, including STP, CMAQ and local/other funds
- (4) Construction funds identified in the project budget (part of the total project cost)
- (5) Estimated construction costs for projects without construction cost identified in the project budget. Based on estimated \$500 per linear/foot construction cost. Fruitdale estimated \$6,617,214 construction costs are from project budget.
- (6) Estimated local match for construction @ 10.27%
- (7) Total future construction funding needed for highlighted projects

TABLE 1: Projects Tentatively Approved by MRMPO Policy Committee, April 17, 2014								
Agency	Project Description	ODOT CMAQ Program Manager Eligibility Determination <small>*awaiting final FHWA/FTA determ.</small>	Total STP Funds Available 2014-18	Total CMAQ Funds Available 2014-18	Total Federal Funds Available 2014-18	Local & Other Funds	Total Est. Cost	Construction Funds Identified in Project (part of total project cost)
			\$ 3,044,049	\$ 4,875,517	\$ 7,919,566			
			Total STP Fund Request	Total CMAQ Fund Request	Total Federal Funds Request (STP & CMAQ)			
Grants Pass	Bike/Ped Improvments	Yes*	\$ -	\$ 418,971	\$ 418,971	\$ 139,952	\$ 558,923	\$ 434,903
Grants Pass	Lincoln Road	NA - STP	\$ 100,288	\$ -	\$ 100,288	\$ 375,000	\$ 475,288	\$ 425,288
Grants Pass	Redwood Ave Phase 2	NA - STP	\$ 579,043	\$ -	\$ 579,043	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,579,043	\$ 3,579,043
JCT	Commuter Service	Yes*	\$ -	\$ 448,584	\$ 448,584	\$ 51,343	\$ 499,927	\$ -
Josephine County	Merlin Road Sidewalk	NA - STP	\$ 719,214	\$ -	\$ 719,214	\$ 92,786	\$ 812,000	\$ 699,000
RVCOG	Hybrid Vehicle (1)	NA - STP	\$ 16,000	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ -	\$ 16,000	\$ -
Total Funding Requests			\$ 1,414,545	\$ 867,555	\$ 2,282,100	\$ 3,659,081	\$ 5,941,181	\$ 5,138,234
Funds Remaining			\$ 1,629,504	\$ 4,007,962	\$ 5,637,466			

(1) NTE: \$16,000

TABLE 2: Remaining Projects Funding Scenarios, Staff Suggestion, April 24, 2014								
Agency	Project Description	ODOT CMAQ Program Manager Eligibility Determination <small>*awaiting final FHWA/FTA determ.</small>	Total STP Funds Remaining 2014-18	Total CMAQ Funds Remaining 2014-18	Total Federal Funds Remaining 2014-18	Local & Other Funds	Total Est. Cost	Est. Total Future Construction Funds Needed
			\$ 1,629,504	\$ 4,007,962	\$ 5,637,466			
			Total STP Fund Request	Total CMAQ Fund Request	Total Federal Funds Request (STP & CMAQ)			
Grants Pass	Alt Fuel Facility	Yes*	\$ 107,000		\$ 107,000	\$ 12,000	\$ 119,000	\$ 1,500,000
Grants Pass	Transit Hub Study	Yes*	\$ 53,500		\$ 53,500	\$ 5,135	\$ 58,635	\$ 1,000,000
Josephine County	G street	will be needed		\$ 958,000	\$ 958,000	\$ 16,000	\$ 974,000	\$ 825,000
Josephine County	Highland Ave	will be needed		\$ 1,966,000	\$ 1,966,000	\$ 186,000	\$ 2,152,000	\$ 1,800,000
Total Funding Requests			\$ 160,500	\$ 2,924,000	\$ 3,084,500			
Funds Remaining			\$ 1,469,004	\$ 1,083,962	\$ 2,552,966			

Move to STP, Fund Exchange @ 107%, match not required

Move to STP, Fund Exchange @ 107%, match not required

Move PE and Const. to CMAQ(\$133k+\$825k=\$958k)

Move PE and Const. to CMAQ(\$166k+\$1.8M=\$1.966M)

TABLE 3: Remaining Projects, Pending Future TAC Discussion								
Agency	Project Description	ODOT CMAQ Program Manager Eligibility Determination <small>*awaiting final FHWA determ.</small>	Total STP Funds Remaining 2014-18	Total CMAQ Funds Remaining 2014-18	Total Federal Funds Remaining 2014-18	Local & Other Funds (1)	Total Est. Cost	Est. Total Future Construction Funds Needed
			\$ 1,469,004	\$ 1,083,962	\$ 2,552,966			
			Total STP Fund Request	Total CMAQ Fund Request	Total Federal Funds Request (STP & CMAQ)			
Grants Pass	Fruitdale	Yes*	\$ 833,547	\$ 2,323,297	\$ 3,156,844	\$ 6,917,214	\$ 10,074,058	\$ 6,617,214
Grants Pass	Redwood Phase 3	NA - STP	\$ 500,000	\$ -	\$ 500,000	\$ 820,000	\$ 1,320,000	\$ -
Josephine County	Hillcrest Multi-Street	Yes		\$ 1,484,665	\$ 1,484,665	\$ 230,000	\$ 1,714,665	\$ 3,600,000
Total Funding Requests			\$ 1,333,547	\$ 3,807,962	\$ 5,141,509			
Funds Remaining			\$ 135,457	\$ (2,724,000)	\$ (2,588,543)			

(1) Grants Pass Fruitdale project included \$6,617,214 in future STP/CMAQ funds as local funds towards the project. This amount is not counted as available for the project.

Undergoing review/revision by DEA



Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

Department of Transportation
Planning & Programming Section
3500 NW Stewart Parkway
Roseburg, OR 97470
Phone: (541) 957-3500
Fax: (541) 672-6148

April 16, 2014

Jonathon David
MRMPO
P.O. Box 3275
Central Point, OR 97502

RE: 2014 CMAQ and STP Applications

Dear Jonathon,

The work that the MRMPO has done in soliciting projects for federal STP and CMAQ funding is appreciated. It is recognized that this is a new process and that a lot of questions may arise in light of federal regulations attached to these funding types. Upon reviewing the materials provided to and through the MRMPO, the following observations and suggestions are offered.

In general, it is noted that many of the Josephine County projects (G Street, Highland Avenue, Hillcrest), and the City of Grants Pass Fruitdale Drive project are partially funded. An estimated dollar amount for construction was not identified on most of these projects, with one project identifying a cost for a significantly sized 'Other' phase. Two projects, "Alt Fuel Facility Plan" and "Transit Hub Study" appear to be planning studies, albeit with limited engineering input.

The two planning studies are proposing to use CMAQ funding, a source not eligible for that activity. Preliminary Engineering is an eligible activity, but must be fully funded, meaning at the end of the phase the design must be complete and ready to go to bid. Alternately, planning studies may use STP funds. If the intent is to do preliminary engineering, please consider reviewing the costs as they appear to be extremely low for a federal aid project. Also, it would be helpful to know the anticipated construction costs for both of these projects and the financing plan for ensuring they will be constructed within the federal timeline.

The Fruitdale Drive project identifies a preliminary engineering cost of around \$1.4 million, but a construction cost of only \$1.5 million. This project also identifies an 'Other' phase totaling \$6.6 million, which is understood to be the cost associated with the construction of future phases. Some clarity would be helpful around what the \$1.4 million figure will be used to accomplish (design of all phases?) as well as the defined "phases" of the entire project. Based on the information given, the City of Grants Pass appears to be obligating themselves to \$6.9 million for this project. If so, the City should be commended for stepping up in such a large way.

The G Street and Highland projects indicate only PE costs in the application and the Hillcrest project indicates PE and ROW phases. In order to make a well-informed decision, it would be helpful to understand the estimated construction costs for these projects And the financing plan for ensuring they will be constructed within the federal timeline.

It is also noted that some of the costs of these projects were derived from the city TSP (a 20-year old document). Even though costs were "escalated" to current year dollars, the projects did not seem to account for inflation to the years of obligation. It should be stressed that the agreements developed for these types of projects require the local jurisdiction to cover all costs in excess of the awarded amount, unless the MRMPO

approves additional funds. Cost increases are a normal part of business due to many unforeseen factors. Given that all funds are proposed to be allocated, are the local jurisdictions aware that they will be obligated to fully deliver the project, even if that means using their own funds? Has any thought been given to not funding the PE projects and holding money back for potential cost overruns?

While any of these projects can be supported, there is great concern that sufficient funding is not available to support many projects through construction. Federal regulations require a project to obligate construction funds within 10 years of obligating the PE phase, with the risk of having to pay back the PE dollars, should this not occur.

In conclusion, the projects that are only partially funded are of great concern to ODOT with the fear that the MRMPO may be embarking upon a journey that will not serve the needs of the public and will bring harm to the MRMPO. In order to ensure a successful program for this funding cycle, please consider re-visiting the list of projects presented and possibly committing to a smaller number of projects that can be fully funded through construction or implementation. This will offer more certainty to the MRMPO for this funding cycle and greater flexibility for future funding cycles. This will also offer more efficiency in the sense that commitments will be well thought out, allowing staff to concentrate on developing and completing the selected projects in a manner that is typical, rather than starting and stopping at certain points along the way due to lack of funds or other uncertainties.

Sincerely,



Michael Baker
ODOT Region 3 Planning and Programming Manager

Cc: Art Anderson, Area Manager