

AGENDA

Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

Date:	Thursday, January 7, 2016
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.mrmpo.org

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

Action Items:

3.	Regional Transp	portation Plan (RTP) Chapter 10 ReviewDan Moore
	Background:	The MRMPO TAC reviewed the revisions to Chapter 10 at the December meeting. Staff informed the TAC that the chapter is still undergoing agency review. The TAC requested that the agency comments be brought back to the TAC in January for review.
	Attachment:	#2 – RTP Draft Chapter 10, Agency comments (to be available at the meeting) RTP Environmental Maps (Maps posted at link below on website):
	Link to maps:	http://rvcog.org/ftp/2016_MRMPO/Attach2_Ch10_EnvMaps.pdf
Ac	tion Requested:	Make a recommendation to the Policy Committee.
4.	Regional Transp	portation Plan (RTP) Chapter 11 ReviewDan Moore
	Background:	The MRMPO TAC reviewed Chapter 11 <i>System Performance</i> at the December meeting. The TAC recommended revisions to the chapter. Staff will provide an overview of the revisions to the chapter. Revisions are highlighted.
	Attachment:	#3 – Revised RTP Draft Chapter 11
Ac	tion Requested:	Make a recommendation to the Policy Committee.

Discussion Items:

5.	Review of Dra Transportation	ft 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) / 2015-2040 Regional Plan (RTP) Projects					
	<i>Background:</i> The final draft of the 2015-18 TIP projects and the 2015-40 RTP projects are ready for the TAC to review before being included in the draft documents for adoption in March.						
	Attachment:	#4 – Draft 2015-18 TIP and 2015-40 RTP project lists.					
6.	MRMPO Updat	e Dan Moore					
7.	Public Comment*Chair						
	(Limited to one	comment per person, five minute maximum time limit)					
8.	. Other Business / Local BusinessChair						
	Opportunity for M	MRMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.					
9.	Adjournment	Chair					

• The next Middle Rogue MPO TAC meeting will be **Thursday**, **February 4**, 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 January 21, 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)

December 3, 2015

The following people were in attendance:

MRMPO Technical Advisory Committee

Voting Members in Attendance: Chuck DeJanvier John Krawczyk Mike Kuntz for John Vial Ian Horlacher Josh LeBombard Lora Glover Kelli Sparkman

Josephine County Rogue River Jackson County ODOT DLCD Grants Pass ODOT

Others Present: None

RVCOG Staff

Andrea Napoli, Sue Casavan

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda

The Vice Chairman, John Krawczyk, called the meeting to order at 1:35 PM. Members introduced themselves.

2. Review / Approve Minutes

The Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the November meeting minutes. Members noted there were typing errors in the chapter text. Staff will make corrections for the final document.

On a motion by Kelli Sparkman and seconded by Chuck DeJanvier, the Committee approved the minutes as presented noting that typing errors will be corrected in final documents. Mike Kuntz, Josh LeBombard, and Lora Glover abstained.

Action Items:

3. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapter 10 Revisions

Environmental Considerations

Andrea Napoli mentioned that the chapter was presented at the last TAC meeting and members wanted to review the changes before recommending approval.

<u>Review changes and Comments:</u> Page 9: MPO Staff confirmed consultation with the 3 tribes will be sufficient.

Page 10, Section A: Corrections in text of what is contained in the maps at the end of the chapter, no changes to the actual maps were needed.

John Krawczyk thought the 500 year floodplain could be removed, members agreed.

Lora Glover indicated that the term "floodplain" has been changed by FEMA, staff noted that the current verbiage will replace floodplain.

Page 11: Language changes, members asked to take out vernal pools from second paragraph

Page 12: Language added to include the principles of Environmental Justice and in Section C language was added about federal processes. Krawczyk suggested taking out "both" in first sentence of Section C.

Page 13: Removed references to vernal pools, there are none in MRMPO; green text moved from next page to delete repetition

Page 16: There was a request to add a section about the Wild and Scenic Rogue River and to note consideration of downstream impacts, new Section 6 added.

Section 7 confirms that MRMPO is part of the service area for ODOT mitigation banks located near Central Point.

Page 17-19: Format changes to text document

Page 20: Addressing impaired water resources, added 'high levels of bacteria' Table 10.1 spelled out CH = Critical Habitat

Page 22: The term biota changed to aquatic and terrestrial species, flow rates added, grammar correction in following paragraph.

Krawczyk recommended adding a column to Table 10.4 to identify 'Jurisdiction' next to Project Location.

Napoli noted that Greg Stabach from Natural Resources has sent the revised chapter off to coordinating agencies for review and comment before the next meeting.

Members agreed to bring back document back for approval in January after agency review and comment.

4. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Chapter 11 Review

Performance Measures

Napoli gave a brief introduction to the chapter. She presented a map of the model area and noted that it did not yet include Rogue River and Gold Hill. She added that the MPO border will be incorporated into the model area at the next RTP update.

She presented model results with future congestion.

Comments

Chuck DeJanvier asked if the 2014 improvements to Merlin Road were in the model for the 2040 congestion map. MPO staff will confirm project inclusion of the ODOT project.

Josh LeBombard suggested using the old UGB boundary for Grants Pass on the 2010 map, members agreed.

Mike Kuntz found the chapter title confusing and suggested changing to System Performance.

Lora Glover noted on the first page introduction (page 26) third paragraph 'all can be' is awkward, take out 'all'.

First paragraph under Grants Pass Model, rework the last sentence.

Page 28: Need narrative about the tables, more explanation.

Kelli Sparkman asked what the numbers in parenthesis for 1,2,3,4 mean and should they be taken out.

Demand Capacity Ratio numbers: bracket on left, parenthesis on right, make consistent. Put a dash (instead of comma) between the ratio range numbers.

Spell out VHT and explain what it means.

Remove the '10-40' from table or put full reference years 2010-2040.

Is demand capacity ratio the same as volume to capacity, VC is easier to understand, are they interchangeable if they are the same use VC as it is a more common term.

Page 29, Table 11.4-11.5: Explain how roads were selected, include in text description how/why selected.

Members suggested noting that higher congestion and higher ADT will carry more weight for improvement.

Lora Glover asked to change Dimmick Street to Highland and explained that just a very small piece is Dimmick (only Bridge Street to A Street).

Mike Kuntz made a motion to bring document with changes back to the committee in January. Seconded by Chuck DeJanvier. Committee unanimously agreed to bring back chapter with revisions for review.

5. MRMPO Planning Update -

Napoli reported that TPAU had done a model run for Vehicles Miles Travelled (VMT) for the Grants Pass Model Area. It was determined that MRMPO meets the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) 5% reduction in VMT over the planning horizon timeframe. No need to establish Alternative Measures.

6. **Public Comment -** None received

7. Other Business / Local Business - None received.

8. Adjournment -

The meeting was adjourned at 2:20 PM.

Chapter 10 – Environmental Considerations

The Environmental Considerations Chapter includes a discussion of potential environmental impacts, avoidance and mitigation activities at the policy and strategy level rather than from a project-specific level. This analysis is a specific requirement of the Moving Ahead for Progress for the 21st Century (MAP-21), signed into law in 2012.

This discussion was developed in consultation with federal, state and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies, as shown on Table 10.1.

Table 10.1

Agency
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)
Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL)
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW)
Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
Oregon Department of Land and Conservation (DLCD)
Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
U.S. Department of Commerce, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)

Environmental mitigation activities are defined in MAP-21 as strategies, policies, programs, actions and activities that over time will serve to minimize or compensate for the impacts to or disruption of elements of the human and natural environment associated with the implementation of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

MAP-21 requires that metropolitan planning organizations, as part of the consultation process, discuss 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 plan. These activities should also be developed in consultation with Federal, State and tribal wildlife, land management and regulatory agencies (23 U.S.C. 134(i)(2)(D)).

To fulfill this requirement, a comparison of projects in the RTP to historic and environmentallysensitive areas was conducted to determine the environmental impacts and potential mitigation activities that could be implemented in areas where a project intersects a resource area.

MAP-21 requires a discussion of potential mitigation activities for each environmental resource affected by the RTP. These activities will be considered if the project, at the time of implementation, would produce any effect on the environment.

This RTP includes non-federally-funded regionally significant projects for air quality purposes and projects that receive federal funds. Some environmental laws and regulations are applicable regardless of the funding source. This chapter will outline the applicability of those laws and regulations as related to expected funding.

A. Inventory and Mapping

The MRMPO inventoried historic and natural resources within the MPO planning boundary. The work was coordinated with the appropriate federal, state, tribal, wildlife, land management and regulatory agencies.

The MRMPO collaborated with consultation partners to identify and obtain the most current, complete and accurate data possible from which to develop the inventory in this chapter.

This framework consists of a library of Geographical Information Systems (GIS) shape files (data layers); and a set of maps highlighting ecologically important areas, linkages within and outside of the valley, and conflicts with planned transportation projects or existing transportation structures (e.g., culverts).

Data was incorporated into GIS to create the maps that illustrate important environmental areas. Inventory and resource data are included in the discussion sections of this chapter; all maps appear in numerical order at the end of the chapter.

Environmental Considerations Maps 10-1 through 10-8 depict information pertaining to: Prime Agricultural Soils, Viticulture Areas, Vineyards, and Orchards Wetlands and Special Flood Hazard Area Fish Passage Barriers, Salmonid Habitat, and Water Quality (TMDL) Limited Streams Conservation Opportunity Areas, Wildlife Sensitivity, and Wildlife Linkages Wildlife Movements Wildlife Collision Hotspots Historic Places RTP Projects Intersecting Selected Environmental or Historic Areas

Details about selected maps appear below, with more in depth discussion of issues surrounding environmental features in the sections that follow. Map pages begin on page 10-17.



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

Prime Agricultural Soils, Viticulture Areas, Vineyards, and Orchards Map 10-1 -- RTP projects that are located on agricultural soils (irrigated soils classes 1-4). This soil information is derived from U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) soils data, which categorize soils into eight capability classes. Viticulture areas represent the areas that meet the criteria for High Value farmland within the Viticultural Area per ORS 195. Vineyard information for both counties is provided by Greg Jones, Professor of Environmental Science and Policy, Southern Oregon University.

Wetlands and Special Flood Hazard Area, Map 10-2 – illustrates RTP projects that intersect the National Wetlands Inventory, Grants Pass Local Wetlands Inventory, and FEMA's Special Flood Hazard Area (100 year floodplain).

Fish Passage Barriers, Salmonid Habitat, and TMDL (Water Quality Limited) Streams, Map 10-3 – Identifies fish passage barriers (primarily culverts and dams) and illustrates RTP projects that intersect with Salmonid habitat (Coho salmon, Chinook Salmon, and Steelhead) and TMDL approved streams (water quality limited streams). Streams for which management plans (Total Maximum Daily Load action plans) have been approved are shown.

Conservation Opportunity Areas, Wildlife Sensitivity, and Wildlife Linkages, Map 10-4 – Identifies ODFW's priority areas for conservation actions that directly benefit wildlife and habitats (conservation opportunity areas), wildlife sensitivity data, and key movement areas for wildlife (linkages).

Wildlife Movements, Map 10-5 – illustrates RTP projects that overlap with ODFW wildlife movement data, which are key movement areas for wildlife, emphasizing areas that cross paved roads.

Wildlife Collision Hotspots Map 10-6 –illustrates RTP Projects that overlap with high frequency wildlife carcass incidents (from Oregon Department of Transportation dispatch records of carcass reports). Includes only records of deer and elk.

Historic Places, Map 10-7 – The National Parks Service National Register of Historic Places mapped with the RTP projects.



B. Environmental Justice

Environmental Justice encompasses three fundamental principles:

- 1. Avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations
- 2. Ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process
- 3. Prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay of these protections for minority and low-income populations.

These principles work to identify and appropriately address disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority and low-income populations.

Environmental Justice stems from Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Executive Order 12898 of 1994. The latter, Executive Order 12898, states that federal agencies incorporate achieving Environmental Justice into their missions.

MRMPO maintains a separate civil rights plan: http://**MRMPO**.org/files/Environ-Justice-Plan-FinalDoc-10-23-2010.pdf

One of the Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization's Environmental Justice goals is to achieve equal protection from environmental and health hazards and equal access to decision-making for all citizens of the MRMPO area in an effort to promote quality of life.

Environmental Justice principles are addressed through policy, as well as through actions by the **MRMPO** to promote equality. Through constant and consistent assessment the **MRMPO** will work to assure Environmental Justice.

C. Environmental Considerations in Planning

It is appropriate to begin considering the environmental consequences of any policy, project, and/or program that addresses transportation deficiencies. However, such consideration is not expected to be at the same level of detail as may be required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It is important to note that a NEPA process is required for any transportation project having a federal nexus. A project has a federal nexus if it involves federal funding, a federal permit or approval, use of federal lands, or a federal program.



1. Early Consideration of Environmental Consequences

A common principle of environmental laws and regulations is a stepped process that focuses on:

- Avoiding impacts to resources;
- Minimizing those impacts that are unavoidable, and
- If impacts are not avoidable, mitigating for those impacts.

If these processes can be considered at a regional level, projects may be able to advance through required environmental processes more quickly than projects whose impacts must be evaluated and considered independently.

2. Use of Environmental Information

Environmental information is typically collected and analyzed in the transportation planning process. The **MRMPO** maintains a GIS library of environmental data that can be used to identify and document potentially affected environmental resources. This information can then be used to identify opportunities to avoid or minimize environmental impacts of any alternative transportation solutions being considered, modify alternatives being considered, or potentially eliminate alternatives with unacceptable or greater environmental consequences.

Maps 10-1 through 10-8 were created by overlaying the planned transportation projects with environmental data including wetlands, floodplains, fish (salmonid) habitat, wildlife critical habitats, and ecologically sensitive areas.

Documentation – Environmental information and/or analyses used in the planning process, and environmental impact avoidance or minimization actions taken, should be thoroughly documented. This will allow information to be used again, or incorporated as evidence of mitigation, resulting in effective and expedited environmental review.

3. Evaluation of Impacts

The evaluation of the impacts a roadway project has on natural areas and historic resources shall take into account (23 CFR Part 777.7):

- a. The importance of the impacted wetlands and natural habitats. Evaluation shall consider:
 - Wetland and natural habitat functional capacity
 - Relative importance of these functions to the total wetland or natural habitat resource of the area
 - Other factors such as uniqueness, aesthetics, or cultural values; and
 - Input from the appropriate resource management agencies through interagency coordination.
- b. The extent of roadway impacts on the wetlands and natural habitats



c. Actions necessary to comply with the Clean Water Act, Section 404; the Endangered Species Act of 1973; and other relevant Federal statutes. The short and long-term effects of the project on wetland or natural habitat functional capacity.

4. Avoidance, Minimization, Mitigation

The MRMPO, utilizing GIS, species accounts, soil types and other relevant data, seeks to avoid or minimize environmental impacts. Where impacts cannot be avoided, efforts will be made to ensure appropriate mitigation. Additionally, the MRMPO works with other agencies to provide greater benefits to the environment regionally. Additional discussion of avoidance, minimization and mitigation appears in subsequent sections addressing specific resources.

The Rogue Valley Council of Governments has a Natural Resource Department that coordinates and facilitates resource projects within the region. Subsequently, this internal knowledge of natural resources, combined with regional collaboration, will lead to improved avoidance measures and natural resource mitigation activities.

Mitigation is the attempt to offset potential adverse effects of human activity on the environment. Mitigation is the last step of the avoidance and minimization process. The National Environmental Policy Act regulations define mitigation (40 CFR 1508.20) as follows:

- 1. Avoiding adverse impacts by not taking an action.
- 2. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree of action.
- 3. Rectifying by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
- 4. Reducing or eliminating impacts over time through preservation and maintenance activities.
- 5. Compensating for an impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments. In most mitigation agreements, more of a resource or habitat must be provided than was originally present. Ratios greater than 1:1 are required in part to compensate for unrealized losses and the inability of technology to completely restore the natural environment.

5. Wetlands and Natural Habitats

The MRMPO encourages progressive approaches to wetlands and natural habitat mitigation. These approaches include the development of conservation and mitigation banking agreements or the purchase of intact natural areas. Conservation and mitigation banks differ to some degree. Mitigation bank could refer to mitigation of any habitat, although they are typically referring to wetland mitigation per federal guidance for Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources, Federal Register / Volume 73, Number 70, Thursday, April 10, 2008 / Rules and Regulations, Army Corps of Engineers (COR), 33 CFR Parts 325 & 332, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 40 CFR Part 230.

Whereas conservation banks are oriented toward endangered, threatened and other at-risk species; habitats are selected and managed based upon the needs of those specific species. Roadway projects are linear, often resulting in many small, incremental impacts. Subsequently, on-site mitigation sometimes results in isolated wetlands and natural habitat that might not provide benefits commensurate with costs and time required to establish wetland and natural habitat functions.



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

Wetland or habitat banks have the ability to provide more wetland or habitat values and benefits per acre; consequently, the increased habitat benefits result in greater benefits to fauna, and often result in increased biodiversity. It is noteworthy that the mitigation area needs to receive sufficient management to ensure their functions will be sustained in perpetuity. In some cases it may be mutually beneficial, both in preserving the environment and creating an effective transportation system, to preserve the same or similar habitats in relatively close proximity to the habitats being impacted. The MRMPO recognizes that the Rogue Valley provides valuable habitat along the Pacific flyway, one of four flyways nationwide. Therefore, the MRMPO will strive to lessen impacts to habitats upon which species are dependent.

Additionally, efforts will be made to establish and maintain regional collaboration, both in identifying potential mitigation areas and ensuring their management in perpetuity.

Reducing Impacts – There are a number of actions that can be taken to minimize the impact of roadway projects on wetlands or natural habitats (23 CFR Part 777.9).

- Avoidance and minimization of impacts to wetlands or natural habitats through realignment and special design, construction features, or other measures.
- Compensatory mitigation alternatives, either inside or outside of the right-of-way. This includes, but is not limited to, such measures as on-site mitigation, when that alternative is determined to be the preferred approach by the appropriate regulatory agency; improvement of existing degraded or historic wetlands or natural habitats through restoration or enhancement on or off site; creation of new wetlands; and under certain circumstances, preservation of existing wetlands or natural habitats on or off site. Restoration of wetlands is generally preferable to enhancement or creation of new wetlands.
- Improvements to existing wetlands or natural habitats. Such activities may include, but are not limited to, construction or modification of water level control structures or ditches, establishment of natural vegetation, re-contouring of a site, installation or removal of irrigation, drainage, or other water distribution systems, integrated pest management, installation of fencing, monitoring, and other measures to protect, enhance, or restore the wetland or natural habitat character of a site.

6. Rogue Wild and Scenic River Designation

The Rogue Wild and Scenic River is best known for its outstanding natural scenery, fishing, whitewater boating, and wildlife and cultural resources. Eighty-four miles of the Rogue River was designated wild and scenic by Congress in 1968, under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, to preserve its outstanding qualities. The Applegate River (7 miles west of Grants Pass, Oregon) is the east boundary and Lobster Creek (11 mile east of Gold Beach, Oregon) is the west boundary.

The area gets over half a million visitors, annually. Recreation opportunities include: boating, fishing, guided motorized tour boat trips, guided whitewater fishing and float trips, camping, hiking, swimming, picnicking, wildlife viewing, and sun bathing.



Although the Wild and Scenic section is not within the MRMPO Boundary, consideration of downstream impacts of projects is recommended.

7. Mitigation Banks

The MRMPO encourages the use of mitigation banks, or other habitat preservation measures, to offset habitat impacts. Banks will be approved in accordance with the Federal Guidance for Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources, Federal Register / Volume 73, Number 70, Thursday, April 10, 2008 / Rules and Regulations, Army Corps of Engineers (COR), 33 CFR Parts 325 & 332, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), 40 CFR Part 230, or other agreement between appropriate agencies. Where feasible, the MPO will attempt to collectively conserve habitat areas that provide greater environmental benefits.

Mitigation Bank Areas in the MRMPO

MAP-21 requires MPOs to provide a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry out these activities. This section of the chapter provides an overview of the potential areas to carry out mitigation activities.

There are no existing or proposed mitigation bank areas in the MRMPO area.

The MRMPO area is part of the service area for the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) operated Vernal Pool Mitigation/Conservation Bank (Bank) near Central Point, used for ODOT projects.

ODOT began an extensive search for prospective vernal pool complex bank sites in 2005. Several prospective sites were viewed in the field by staff from ODOT, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL), the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

The Bank is located near the intersection of Newland and Truax Roads, in White City, Jackson County, Oregon. Originally the Bank consisted of the two parcels that comprise 80.23 acres and located west of and directly adjacent to the Nature Conservancy's Whetstone Savanna Preserve (a registered Oregon Natural Heritage Resource) and are of similar character. In 2014, ODOT completed the purchase of four additional parcels (106 acres) adjacent and to the west and north of the original Bank parcels to serve as Individual Permittee Responsible Mitigation for ODOT's Highway 62: Interstate 5 to Dutton Road Project.

The adjacent preserve's acreage is approximately 106 acres of which roughly 13 acres is high functioning. The remaining 100 plus acres will be enhanced and restored to high functioning habitat. In 2014, approximately 14 acres of the property was restored, with additional phases of restoration slated for 2015 through 2017. Cumulatively, upon completion of restoration activities, approximately 196 acres of contiguous high functioning vernal pool complex will be protected and under management to sustain wetland functions and values



8. Wildlife Habitat

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) follows a conservation strategy that focuses on habitat restoration and maintenance to address the needs of game and nongame species.



The strategy highlights specific actions that can conserve Oregon's fish and wildlife when the chances of success are greatest before they become sensitive or endangered.

The strategy provides information about species and habitats in every region in Oregon and the issues affecting their present and future health. This information is included in the RTP for the purpose of:

- Landowners and land managers who want to improve conditions for at-risk wildlife;
- Agencies and organizations interested in making conservation investments more effective and efficient; and
- Oregonians who want a better understanding of the conservation issues of concern in their area.

The link below offers more information on the ODFW Conservation Strategy for Oregon: <u>http://www.dfw.state.or.us/conservationstrategy/contents.asp</u>

Conservation Strategy for Oregon – Klamath Mountains Ecoregion

The **MRMPO** is situated within the Klamath Mountains ecoregion which covers much of southwestern Oregon, including the Umpqua Mountains, Siskiyou Mountains and interior valleys and foothills between these and the Cascade Range. Several popular and scenic rivers run through the ecoregion, including: the Umpqua, Rogue, Illinois, and Applegate.

Within the ecoregion, there are wide ranges in elevation, topography, geology, and climate. The elevation ranges from about 600 to more than 7400 feet, from steep mountains and canyons to gentle foothills and flat valley bottoms. This variation along with the varied marine influence support a climate that ranges from the lush, rainy western portion of the ecoregion to the dry, warmer interior valleys and cold, snowy mountains.



The Klamath Mountains ecoregion boasts a high rate of species diversity, including many species found only locally. In fact, the Klamath-Siskiyou region was included in the World Wildlife Fund's assessment of the 200 locations most important for species diversity world-wide.

The region is particularly rich in plant species, including many pockets of endemic communities and some of the most diverse plant communities in the world. For example, there are more kinds of cone-bearing trees found in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion than anywhere else in North America. In all, there are about 4,000 native plants in Oregon, and about half of these are found in the Klamath Mountains ecoregion.

The ecoregion is noted as an Area of Global Botanical Significance (one of only seven in North America) and world "Centre of Plant Diversity" by the World Conservation Union. The ecoregion boasts many unique invertebrates, although many of these are not as well studied as their plant counterparts.

While the Klamath Mountains ecoregion is ecologically unique, it embodies many of the conservation issues facing other parts of Oregon. For example, increasing population growth and development in rural residential and urban communities strain resources, particularly in the southern and eastern portions of the ecoregion. The Klamath Mountains is the second fastest-growing ecoregion in Oregon (the Willamette Valley is experiencing the fastest rate of expansion). Much of the population growth is concentrated in valleys along the Interstate 5 corridor. Demands for choice building sites often coincide with good quality habitat.

Land use conversion and urbanization, loss of habitat connectivity and invasive species are limiting factors identified by the Strategy for this ecoregion. Appropriate transportation planning as well as project design and implementation can be a valuable tool in addressing these factors.

Recent indicators suggest that water quality and riparian condition in the ecoregion may be improving. Much of this change could be attributed to local collaborative conservation efforts via watershed councils and other groups. For more information on the Klamath Mountains Ecoregion and possible actions recommended to restore habitats identified in this ecoregion click on the link below:

http://www.dfw.state.or.us/conservationstrategy/document_pdf/b-eco_km.pdf

Habitat Conservation Opportunities

As defined in the Conservation Strategy, Conservation Opportunity Areas (COAs) are landscapes where broad fish and wildlife conservation goals would be best met. COAs were developed to guide voluntary, non-regulatory actions. There are no COAs located within the **MRMPO** planning area.

9. Barriers to Wildlife Movement

Barriers to fish and wildlife movement are a key conservation issue for the **MRMPO**. Roads, dams and other structures act as barriers to the movement of fish and wildlife. These barriers reduce total habitat, create challenges to animal dispersal and reproduction and make wildlife more vulnerable to injury and death.



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

ODFW is working with the Oregon Department of Transportation, county transportation departments, and other partners to identify and reduce fish passage barriers and areas where wildlife mortality on highways occurs. ODFW's fish passage rules can be found here: <u>http://www.dfw.state.or.us/fish/passage/</u> (OAR Chapter 635 Division 412).

ODFW notes that stream crossing designs must meet fish passage criteria in order to provide fish passage for Oregon's native migratory fish species. Barriers to migration are a big challenge to recovery for the fish species in the Rogue Basin. In the MRMPO area numerous tributaries have significant barriers near their confluence with the Rogue River. Restoration of native fish populations will lag if fish are not able to utilize the habitat available in the watershed, including urban stream areas.

During a project near a stream, it may be possible to utilize equipment and personnel to do smaller scale restoration projects on the nearby waterbody, such as adding some minor retrofits to improve fish passage. This can be scoped with ODFW pre-project.

ODOT is a cooperator on the Oregon Wildlife Movement Strategy, an interagency partnership to inventory and prioritize wildlife movement barriers on the state highway system. ODOT's Geo-Environmental Section is developing a Wildlife Collision Prevention Plan that addresses Federal Highway Administration and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife concerns for animal-vehicle collisions on the state highway system.

The effects of roads on wildlife can be mitigated through the design and construction of underpasses and overcrossings. For more information on wildlife and roads, click on the links below:

http://www.wildlifeandroads.org/decisionguide/

http://www.defenders.org/programs_and_policy/habitat_conservation/habitat_and_highways/ind ex.php

10. Addressing Impaired Water Resources

This portion of the Rogue Valley, like many regions in the United States, has experienced development and modification of the natural landscape. Subsequently, modifications of the natural landscape have led to water resource impacts. Surface waters and associated vegetation have been altered, leaving bodies of water with impairments, such as increased temperatures, decreased dissolved oxygen levels, high levels of bacteria, and other concerns.

As a result of combined impairments to water bodies across the nation, the Clean Water Act was established. The Act includes a system for identifying and working to repair impaired water bodies. The system for identifying impaired water bodies is known as the 303(d) list and requires states to identify impaired waters within their state. The list identifies both the body of water and what impairments it has. The states are then required to prioritize their impaired water bodies and develop action plans, known as total maximum daily loads (TMDLs), to improve water quality of the listed systems.



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

TMDLs for the streams within the **MRMPO** (Rogue River Basin) have been approved that meet the requirements of Section 303(d) of the Federal 1972 Clear Water Act. Map 10.3 illustrates TMDL water bodies and fish passage barriers; the Rogue River is TMDL listed for bacteria (E. coli and Temperature). Table 10.2 lists TMDL stream segments within the **MRMPO** along with their identified impairments. See Table 10.1 for a list of fish, wildlife and plant species including their status at the local, state or federal levels.

Species common name	Species scientific name	Status	Critical Habitat (CH)
Birds			
Northern Spotted Owl	Strix occidentalis caurina	Т	Y
Fish			
Coho salmon	Oncorhynchus kisutch	Т	Y
Flowers			
Gentner's Fritillary	Fritillaria gentneri	Е	Ν
Mammals			
Gray Wolf	Canis lupus	Е	Ν
Fisher	Martes pennanti	рТ	Ν

Table 10.1

Table	1	0	.2
		~	

Stream/River	Pollutant(s)
	pH, mercury, flow modification, dissolved oxygen, and
Applegate River	temperature
Birdseye Creek	temperature
Cheney Creek	dissolved oxygen
Evans Creek	bacteria and biological criteria
Galls Creek	temperature
Jackson Creek (Applegate)	dissolved oxygen
Jones Creek	E. coli and dissolved oxygen
Jumpoff Joe Creek	temperature
Kane Creek	biological criteria
Quartz Creek	temperature
Rogue River	ph, dissolved oxygen, bacteria, and temperature



11. Stormwater Monitoring and Management

Stormwater is the flow of water created by impermeable surfaces, such as roads, highways, bridges, sidewalks and parking lots. There are additional forms of development that contribute to stormwater runoff, such as commercial and residential buildings. Ultimately, the combinations of these impervious surfaces prevent water from infiltrating and percolating through the soils and into the groundwater (groundwater recharge). Consequently, water that used to be available through groundwater, as well as seeps, which may be needed by streams and other surface waters during the summer months may no longer be available. Therefore, a variety of interrelated impacts can occur.

A consequence of decreasing groundwater is a decrease in the amount of water available to surface waters, such as through seeps or springs. Typically during the warmer months when water levels are lower, seeps may be needed to augment stream flows in order to prevent surface waters (e.g., streams) from becoming shallow and warmer. Surface waters that do not receive appropriate inflow from seeps or springs may not properly function. Subsequently, the lower volumes of surface water lead to temperature increases which result in changes to aquatic and terrestrial species.

Impervious surfaces also lead to increased flows during months with high precipitation. Precipitation runs off and flows downhill (path of least resistance), and ends up in a receiving water body. It is noteworthy that increased runoff causes increased flow rates (seasonal peaks) which in turn cause scour and erosion, often resulting in modifications to the shape of the stream channel. For example, months with a lot of rain create peak flows in stream systems from the increased water being conveyed to them as a result of an increase in impervious surfaces. Consequently, stream channels can scour and banks can erode resulting in the channel being altered and subsequent changes to habitats and composition of species.

As stormwater runoff flows over ground surfaces, it can pick up debris, chemicals, dirt, and other pollutants and flow into a storm sewer system or directly to a lake, stream, river, wetland, or coastal water. Anything that enters a storm drain untreated is discharged into the water bodies. Pollutants commonly found in stormwater include nutrients (nitrogen and phosphorus), oil, bacteria, fertilizers, and metals (e.g., copper, lead, and zinc from automobile brake pads).

Impacts to habitats and the wildlife can result from roads and other impervious surfaces. Erosion and scour that changes a stream channel will modify flow, vegetation and temperature, and subsequently favor species adapted to the newly created conditions. In addition, pollutants draining from roads and parking lots can contribute to impaired water quality and degraded wildlife habitat. Therefore, care in the design of the transportation system is important. Stormwater discharge is regulated under the Clean Water Act, Section 402.

12. Historic and Archeological Considerations

Protection of historic and archeological resources must be considered as part of the decisionmaking process for transportation projects.

Numerous laws and regulations call for preservation and/or enhancement of cultural resources. These include the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966, the Federal-Aid Highway



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

Act of 1968, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, the Archeological Resource Protection Act of 1979 and the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987. In addition, regulations by the Council on Environmental Quality (40 CFR, Part 1500-1508) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) (36 CFR, Part 800) have been promulgated to assure that effects on historic properties are considered in the development of federal undertakings. Historic properties are any historic district, site, building, structure or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places.

Transportation officials are required to make a good faith effort to identify historic properties that may be affected by a transportation project. A discussion of the effects on historic properties must be included in the environmental documentation. This discussion is to be commensurate with the importance of the historic properties as well as the magnitude of the project's impacts on those properties.

The primary provisions related to historic preservation for transportation projects are Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the DOT Act. These provisions are applicable to actions that require federal approval or are undertaken with federal funds.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) as amended through 2000 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and afford the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) a reasonable opportunity to comment on the undertaking. The historic preservation review and consultation process mandated by Section 106 is outlined in regulations issued by ACHP. Revised regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800), became effective January 10, 2001 and were further amended in August 2004.

Federal agencies are responsible for initiating Section 106 review, most of which takes place between the agency and state and tribal officials. Appointed by the governor, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) coordinates the state's historic preservation program and consults with agencies during Section 106 review. Agencies also consult with officials of federally recognized Indian tribes when tribal lands or historic properties of significance to such tribes are involved. Some tribes have officially designated Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs), who function as a SHPO on tribal lands, while others designate representatives to consult with agencies as needed.

At this time, none of the Tribes in the Region have a THPO. The MPO will consult with the Confederated Tribes of Grande Ronde; Confederated Tribes of Siletz; and Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians for each Regional Transportation Plan update. The appropriate Tribe to consult will be determined based upon historic and current information provided.

According to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, Section 106 review and consultation requires federal agencies to do the following:

• Determine if Section 106 of the NHPA applies to a given project and, if so, initiate consultation;



Middle Rogue Regional Transportation Plan

- Gather information to decide which properties in the project area are listed in or eligible for the National Register Historic Places;
- Determine how historic properties might be affected;
- Explore alternatives to avoid or reduce harm to historic properties; and
- Reach agreement with the SHPO/THPO (and the ACHP in some cases) on measures to resolve any adverse effects to historic properties.

Another protection to park and wildlife areas is provided by Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966. This environmental regulation applies to projects that receive Department of Transportation (FHWA or FTA) funds. Section 4(f) (recodified in 49 USC 303, but still known as Section 4(f)) includes provisions prohibiting federal transportation agencies from using land from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or any land from an historic site of national, state, or local significance unless:

- There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land, and
- The action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from use.

In assessing the environmental effects of an action through the National Environmental Policy Act process, FHWA includes an evaluation of the use of land protected under Section 4(f). The environmental regulations for applying Section 4(f) to transportation project development can be found at 23 CFR 771.135. For other detailed guidance on applying the requirements of Section 4(f), the FHWA wrote the Section 4(f) Policy Paper, which discusses such topics as the history of Section 4(f), alternatives analysis, mitigation, and how Section 4(f) relates to other statutes and regulations which protect the same types of resources, including Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

In order for FHWA field offices to make key determinations on projects having minor impacts or a net benefit on areas protected by Section 4(f), the agency issued several Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Statements. Section 4(f) is considered by the preservation community to be one of the most effective tools in the protection of historic properties. But its stringent standards and interpretations by various court rulings have had the transportation community seeking revisions to provide more flexibility in implementing the law.

13. RTP Projects and Environmental Features

Table 10.4 below lists 2016-2040 projects that intersect with a resource identified in this chapter. The projects are identified with RTP project number, location, and timing (reflected in the color of the text), and the corresponding environmental resource or feature.

The environmental and historic resources and concerns addressed in the chapter and listed in the tables below are: National Historic Districts, wetlands listed in Local Wetlands Inventories and/or National Wetlands Inventory; Special Flood Hazard Area; and fish habitat (Coho, and Steelhead habitat). Projects are mapped with environmental features beginning on Page 15.



RTP Project Number	Project Location	Jurisdiction	Wetlands	Special Flood Hazard Area	Wildlife Movement	National Historic District	Steelhead	Coho Salmon (Threatened)
201	Allen Cr Rd-W Harbeck to Denton Rd	Grants Pass	Х					
202	G Street-Lincoln Rd to Leonard St	Grants Pass	Х			Х		
203	Fruitdale Dr-Parkdale to Overland	Grants Pass	Х	Х			Х	Х
204	G St-Leonard to 3rd St	Grants Pass	Х	Х		Х	Х	
205	Fruitdale Dr-Overland to RR Hwy 99	Grants Pass	Х	Х			Х	Х
206	Vine St-Highland to Hawthorne Ave	ODOT	Х					
209	Leonard Rd- Willow Ln to school	ODOT	Х					
212	Foothill: City Limits-Ament Rd	Rogue River	Х				Х	Х
213	Hillcrest: 9th to 10th Street	Grants Pass	Х					
216	Cloverlawn Dr:Eastview-Hamilton Ln	Grants Pass	Х				Х	
217	Highland Av:S line sect 6 to NW UGB	Grants Pass	Х					
218	Leonard Rd:Dowell to Willow Ln	Grants Pass	Х					
220	E Park St:Clara to Hamilton	Grants Pass		Х				
222	Hamilton Ln:Park St-RR Hwy	Grants Pass		Х				
223	W Park St:Ringuette to Pansy Ln	Grants Pass	Х	Х			Х	
227	Hamilton Ln:Overland Dr-Cloverlawn	Grants Pass	Х	Х			Х	Х
228	E Park St: Gold River Ln-Clara Av	Grants Pass		Х				
230	Portola Dr: 450ft west of Gladiola	Grants Pass		Х				
231	Portola Dr: Gladiola to Shannon Ln	Grants Pass		Х				
232	Shannon Ln: Portola-N RR ROW	Grants Pass	Х	Х				
402	Monument Dr: Merlin Rd-Timber Ln	Grants Pass	Х	Х			Х	Х
500	US199-Bridge, 6th St (Cavemen)	Grants Pass	Х				Х	X
501	I-5: N Grants Pass-Evans Creek	Rogue River	Х	X	X		Х	X
601	E. Main Street Bridge	Josephine County	Х	X			Х	
602	Main Street	Grants Pass			Х			

Green Short range projects.

Blue Medium range projects.

Red Long term projects.



Chapter 11 – System Performance

Performance measures in this chapter are forecasts of future travel conditions—specifically traffic congestion. The forecasts are estimates produced by the Grants Pass travel demand model. The model, computer software that performs a series of calculations, is based on information the MRMPO obtained about future population and employment.

Estimates of the numbers of people, jobs and their locations within the region are critical to the model. Also, the transportation network itself is represented in the model.

The current system, including numbers of lanes, locations of intersections, signals, turn lanes and lane widths can be significant to traffic flow and road capacity. Future conditions for all of these factors are estimated in consultation with local, state and federal agencies and governments, and are incorporated into the model for specific future years.

Grants Pass Model

The model used for the RTP is the Grants Pass Oregon Small Urban Model (OSUM). The Grants Pass model was developed to address the need for a travel demand forecasting tool that could be used for a variety of purposes including; transportation system planning, subarea transportation studies, the analysis of the transportation system impacts of large-scale development proposals, and the evaluation of the effects of large-scale transportation projects.

The MRMPO will use the OSUM Grants Pass model through the first RTP (spring 2016), and then start building a new model before the second RTP that will cover the larger MRMPO boundary. The model itself, the information and running the software, is a cooperative project between MRMPO and ODOT's

Transportation Planning and Analysis Unit (TPAU).

"Estimates of the numbers of people, jobs and their locations within the region are critical to the model."

The model provides answers on a regional level for a variety of analyses.

Beyond the generalized, region-scale outputs that are reported in this chapter, the Grants Pass model is the foundation for more detailed analyses that jurisdictions, developers and project managers conduct to estimate fine-grained conditions such as:

- How much traffic will be generated by a particular development, what road will be affected and to what extent?
- How much traffic can be accommodated at a particular location and what happens to traffic conditions if a lane is added, or access points changed?
- How large does a facility such as a freeway interchange have to be in terms of number of lanes and their length to accommodate future anticipated traffic?



In developing the 2015-2040 RTP, the model was asked to provide answers to some basic questions about performance of the transportation system in future years, given the plan's forecasts for growth. Results are described in the following sections.

Future Congestion

Generally, travel demand modeling shows that the region can expect congestion to increase. Table 11.1 below shows that in 2010, there were five (5) congested lane miles. By 2040, the number of congested lane miles increases to twenty-two (22), which is 3% of the total lane miles in model area.

Table 11.1

Grants Pass RTP ₂₀₁₀₋₂₀₄₀ Percentage of Congested Lane-Miles* P.M. Peak Hour								
SCENARIOS	SCENARIOS Reference No-Build No-Build No-RTP RTP							
MEASURED	MEASURED 2010 2015 2020 2040 2040							
Total Lane Miles643NANA643648								
Congested Lane Miles5NANA2422								
% of Congested Lane Miles	1%	NA	NA	4%	3%			
* Congestion defined as	s model links wit	h demand/ca	pacity ratio ≥	0.90				

Planned roadway capacity projects alone are not expected to keep pace with the region's anticipated growth. Through 2040, this plan anticipates an expansion of the regional transportation system of 5 lane miles.

Meanwhile, population is expected to increase by nearly 28 percent (from about 68,973 to 89,004), and employment by 45 percent (from 20,765 jobs to 30,030). These modeled estimates are based on existing local plans and coordination with the City of Grants Pass.

As Table 11.1 shows, with implementation of the 2040 RTP the amount of congested roadways will increase from about 5 lane miles today to 22 lane miles in 2040. If no improvements were made to roads (none of the RTP projects implemented), congested lane miles would increase to 24 by 2040.

Traffic ebbs and flows given the time of day. Locally, most roads at most times of the day are – and will continue to be – fairly clear and free-flowing. To look at congestion, the times of highest, or peak, travel are isolated. Traffic counts are taken continuously over multiple days, show that the peak hour in most cases is late afternoon to very early evening – the evening commute hours. Because of this travel pattern, many transportation demand management programs seek to offer travel alternatives so that fewer motorists are driving at the peak hours.



Table	11.2

Grants Pass RTP ₂₀₁₀₋₂₀₄₀ Other Evalaution Measures									
SCENARIOS	SCENARIOS Reference No-Build No-Build No-RTP RTP-Build								
MEASURED	2010	2015	2020	2040	2040				
P.M. Peak Hour Mean	8 06	NI/A	NI/A	8 07	8 96				
Travel Time	0.90	IVA		0.97	0.90				
P.M. Peak Hour VMT	116,751	N/A	N/A	155,731	155,613				
P.M. Peak Hour VHT*	P.M. Peak Hour VHT* 2,535 N/A N/A 3,577 3,572								
Daily Transit Mode	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A				
Split	11// \	1.1/1			1.4/1.				

*VHT - vehicle hours traveled is a function of both travel time and total volume.

Table 11.2 shows that in 2010, the P.M. peak hour mean travel time was 8.96 minutes, and in 2040 the travel time is the same even though VMT increased by 33% between 2010 & 2040. VHT is the number of hours that vehicles spend in the traffic during the peak hour. In terms of VHT, Table 11.2 shows that in 2040 without the RTP the VHT will increase by 1,042 hours from the base year, but with the RTP the VHT will increase by 1,037 hours from the base year. In other words, there are 5 VHT reductions during the PM peak hour in the 2040 RTP Scenario.

Performance Comparison

Table 11.3 shows the year 2040 forecast volume-to-capacity ratios for freeways, principal arterials, minor arterials and collectors within the Grants Pass area per lane mile. The 72 miles of freeways within the MRMPO area in 2040 show little congestion (V/C of 0 - 0.59). Whereas, the 83 miles of principal arterials in the MRMPO area in 2040 show increased congestion ranging from 0 - 0.59 to 9.99.

2040 RTP ₂₀₁₀₋₂₀₄₀ Peak Lane Miles							
Volume/Capacity Ratio Range	Freeway	Principal Arterial	Minor Arterial	Collector			
0 - 0.59	71.72	48.05	72.84	342.56			
0.59 - 0.69	0.00	5.75	2.52	4.05			
0.69 - 0.79	0.00	6.13	1.23	3.67			
0.79 - 0.89	0.00	6.47	1.84	0.93			
0.89 - 0.99	0.00	5.24	1.22	0.71			
0.99 - 9.99	0.00	11.82	1.48	0.98			
TOTAL	71.72	83.46	81.13	352.90			

Table 11.3

Congested Roads

Travel conditions on several key roads were examined with the model. The analysis includes selected principal and minor arterial roadways identified by staff as key travel routes within the



model area. Results on Table 11.4 and 11.5 show estimated base year 2010 and future conditions. Travel conditions expressed are peak hour conditions, which are calculated to be typical conditions a motorist is likely to encounter at the late afternoon-early evening hours – the time of the greatest amount of travel in the MRMPO region.

	2010 Reference Peak Lane Mile Percentages														
Demand/Capacity Ratio Range	Rogue River Hwy (OR99)	Redwood Hwy (OR199)	Jacksonville Hwy (OR238)	Highland Ave	Redwood Ave	G St	A St	Allen Creek Rd	Bridge St	E St	F St	M St	Parkdale Drive		
0 - 0.59	76%	70%	92%	100%	70%	69%	98%	100%	82%	100%	100%	85%	37%		
0.59 - 0.69	16%	2%	4%	0%	3%	0%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%	24%		
0.69 - 0.79	2%	15%	2%	0%	11%	18%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%		
0.79 - 0.89	2%	9%	2%	0%	6%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%		
0.89 - 0.99	0%	2%	0%	0%	5%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%		
0.99 - 9.99	4%	2%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	12%	5%		
No Congestion	94%	87%	98%	100%	84%	87%	100%	100%	87%	100%	100%	88%	66%		
Congestion	2%	11%	2%	0%	12%	12%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%		
High Congestion	4%	2%	0%	0%	4%	0%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	12%	5%		
Total Lane Miles	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		

Table 11.4

Table 11.5

2040 RTP ₁₀₄₀ Peak Lane Mile Percentages														
Demand/Capacity Ratio Range	Rogue River Hwy (OR99)	Redwood Hwy (OR199)	Jacksonville Hwy (OR238)	Highland Ave	Redwood Ave	G St	A St	Allen Creek Rd	Bridge St	E St	F St	M St	Parkdale Drive	
0 - 0.59	61%	60%	82%	100%	66%	69%	93%	100%	76%	100%	100%	85%	0%	
0.59 - 0.69	8%	3%	8%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	7%	0%	0%	0%	16%	
0.69 - 0.79	14%	1%	4%	0%	8%	13%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
0.79 - 0.89	9%	8%	1%	0%	8%	14%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%	21%	
0.89 - 0.99	2%	8%	3%	0%	8%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	
0.99 - 9.99	6%	20%	2%	0%	9%	1%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	12%	55%	
No Congestion	83%	64%	94%	100%	75%	81%	98%	100%	82%	100%	100%	85%	16%	
Congestion	11%	16%	4%	0%	16%	18%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	3%	29%	
High Congestion	6%	20%	2%	0%	9%	1%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	12%	55%	
Total Lane Miles	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	

The numbers in the columns in these two tables are the percentages of lane miles on a particular road that are at the volume/capacity ratio ranges indicated in the first column. Congestion is expressed as a ratio of travel demand, or number of vehicle trips to roadway capacity for accommodating vehicles. High congestion indicates too many vehicles attempting to travel on the segment of road, causing delay. The estimates report peak hour travel - travel at certain hours in the day, generally mid-afternoon in the Grants Pass area. (Peak hour varies from region to region, dependent on conditions such as shift changes and school hours.) Congestion on the roads shown on these tables can lead to delays on intersecting roads as well. The model data can be used to identify highly traveled and congested roadways, which can be prioritized for funding through the MRMPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) project selection processes.

Congestions Maps

Maps below indicate locations where the MRMPO travel demand model estimates potential for congestion in future years.

Years shown are 2010 and 2040. By viewing the maps in succession, it's possible to see how, where and when congested conditions are likely to expand.



Rather than showing with absolute certainty future congested conditions, these maps indicate the locations most vulnerable to traffic pressures. The futures shown here are far from certain because MRMPO jurisdictions are in agreement that additional funds will need to be indentified for projects not yet in the plan. Beyond that, there are projects being planned, but are not included in this analysis because RTP projects must be financially constrained, as described in Chapter 8 Financial Plan.















MRMPO 2015-2018 TIP Updated December 17, 2015

		RTP													
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal	Phase		Federa	1	Federal Requ	ired Match	Total Fed+Req	Other		Total All Sources
		Number			rear			\$	Source	\$	Source	Watch	\$	Source	
Gold Hill															
						Planning									<u></u>
						Design									-
						Land Purchase									
No Projects						Utility Relocate									
, í						Construction									
						Other									
							\$	-		\$ -		\$-			-
Subtotal Gold Hi	Il Projects						\$	-		\$		\$ -	\$-		-
		RTP													
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal	Phase		Federa	1	Federal Requ	ired Match	Total Fed+Req	Other		Total All Sources
		Number			rear			\$	Source	\$	Source	- Watch	\$	Source	1 .
Grants Pass						•									
				18235	EEY2013	Design	\$	202 790	STP-FLX	\$ 23.21(\$ 226,000			\$ 226,000
			Evenent (Table 2)	18235	FFY2013	Design	\$	492 618	CMAQ (1400)	\$ 56.382	Grants Pass	\$ 549,000		+	\$ 549,000
	Allen Creek Rd. From W.		Other Planning	18235	FFY2017	Land Purchase	\$	628,110	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 71.890) Grants Pass	\$ 700.000		+	\$ 700.000
Allen Creek Road	Harbeck to Denton will be	201	and Technical	18235	FFY2017	Utility Relocate	\$	134,595	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 15.405	5 Grants Pass	\$ 150.000		<u> </u>	\$ 150,000
Improvements	Upgraded to City Arterial	201	Studies (in PM ₁₀	18235	FFY2018	Construction	\$	649.645	STP	\$ 74.355	5 ODOT	\$ 724,000		<u> </u>	\$ 724.000
	Standards		Maintenance Area)	18235	FFY2018	Construction	\$	1,504,772	CMAQ (L400)	\$ 172,228	3 Grants Pass	\$ 1,677,000	\$ 394,000	Grants Pass	\$ 2,071,000
					Total FEY15-18		\$	3 612 530		\$ 413.470)	\$ 4 026 000	\$ 394,000		\$ 4420,000
Subtotal Grants	Pass Projects						¢	2 612 520		¢ 413,470		¢ 4,026,000	\$ 304,000		\$ 4,420,000
Subiolal Granis I		DTD					Ψ	5,012,550		Fodoral Pog	irod Match	\$ 4,020,000	φ 334,000 Othor		\$ 4,420,000
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Kev #	Federal Fiscal	Phase		reuera				Total Fed+Req	Other		Total All Sources
i roject Name		Number		ncy "	Year	1 11450		\$	Source	\$	Source	Match	s	Source	
Jackson County								·							
						Planning			Ī			\$-		1	
						Design									
						Land Purchase								<u> </u>	
No Proiects						Utility Relocate								<u> </u>	
· · · , · · · ·						Construction						\$-			\$ -
						Other						\$ -			
							\$	-		\$-		\$-	C		-
Subtotal Jackson	n County Projects						\$	_		\$ -		\$ -	0		-
		RTP			Federal Field		Ť	Federa		Federal Requ	ired Match	Total Fade Day	Other		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal	Phase						Iotal Fed+Req Match			Total All Sources
		Number			i cai			\$	Source	\$	Source	Match	\$	Source	<u> </u>
Josephine Count	ty	-		•			-								
				-		Planning						\$-			
				19186	FFY2014	Design	\$	8,000	FLAP			\$ 8,000			
Galice Rd #2401:			Exempt (Table 2)			Land Purchase						\$ -			
Chip Seal (MP 0.0-	Chip Seal and related prep	403	Safety, pavement			Utility Relocate						\$ -		+	
15.4)	work, guardrair updates		resurfacing		FFY 2015	Construction	\$	931.000	FLAP			\$ 931.000		<u> </u>	
						Other	•	,				\$ -		<u> </u>	
					Total FEY12-15		\$	939 000		\$ -		\$ 939,000	\$ -		\$ 939.000
Subtotal Joseph	ine County Projects						\$	-		\$ -		\$	\$ -		\$ 939.000
Custotal Cocopin							÷			Ŷ		+	+	<u> </u>	÷ 000,000
		RTP			Federal Fiscal			Federa	I	Federal Requ	ired Match	Total Fed+Reg	Other		
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Year	Phase						Match			Total All Sources
		Number						\$	Source	\$	Source		\$	Source	
Josephine Comp	nunity Transit Projects								500,00	· · · · ·	Jouroo				
oosephine contin						Planning						¢			T
					1	Design	+			1	-	ψ -	+	ł	
						Land Purchase				1	1	+	+	 	+
Josephine County -	Rural Operations	700	Exempt (Table 2)			Litility Relocate				1	1	1		+	+
5311 (FY15)		100	Transit			Construction								<u> </u>	+
	1	I	I		_ _	COnstruction	_							<u> </u>	

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)

MRMPO 2015-2018 TIP Updated December 17, 2015

	1	1	i i	47704	550045	Others	A 74	007 57		1		^	100 511					
				17761	FF2015	Otner	\$ 74	,887 FT	IA 5311	\$58,654	<u>+</u>	۵ ۵	133,541	*		<u> </u>		100 544
					10tal FFY15-18		\$ 74	,887		\$ 58,654		\$	133,541	\$	-	L	\$	133,541
		1						_										
						Planning						\$	-			 		
						Design										<u> </u>		
JCT - 5307 Transit	Transit Operating	701	Exempt (Table 2)			Litility Relocate										<u> </u>	+	
Operations (FY15)	Assistance	701	Transit													<u> </u>		
				18605	FFY2015	Other	\$ 716	518 FT	FA 5307	\$716.51	3	\$	1 433 036			<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
					Total FEY15-18		\$ 716	518		\$ 716 518		\$	1 433 036	\$			\$	1 433 036
				1			1 • • • •	,0.0		• • • • • • •		· ·	.,,	+		<u> </u>	1 *	.,,
						Planning		- T				¢	-					
						Design						φ	-			<u> </u>	+	
						Land Purchase										<u> </u>		
JCT - 5309	Capital Purchase -	702	Exempt (Table 2)			Utility Relocate										<u> </u>	-	
	Replacement Vehicle		Transit			Construction											-	
				19461	FFY2016	Other	\$ 120	,000 FT	FA 5309	\$30,000)	\$	150,000					
					Total FFY16-18		\$ 120	,000		\$ 30,000		\$	150,000	\$			\$	150,000
		1					, .	,		,,		· ·	,	•			<u> </u>	
					1	Planning						\$	-					
						Design						Ψ				<u> </u>	-	
						Land Purchase											-	
Commuter Service	Transit service between	703	Exempt (Table 2)			Utility Relocate												
	Grants Pass and Medford		Transit			Construction						\$	-					
				19168	FFY2015	Other	\$ 448	,584 CN	MAQ (L400)	\$ 51,342		\$	499,926					
					Total FFY12-15		\$ 448	,584		\$ 51,342		\$	499,926		0		\$	499,926
						Planning						\$	-					
						Design												
5310 E&D Transit			Exampt (Table 2)			Land Purchase												
Capital STP	Purchase Service	723	Transit			Utility Relocate										L		
Transfer						Construction						\$	-					
				18364	FFY2016	Other	\$ 273	,475 L24	240	\$ 31,300		\$	304,775			<u> </u>		
					Total FFY12-16		\$ 273	,475		\$ 31,300		\$	304,775		0		\$	304,775
Subtotal Middle	Rogue MPO Transit Proj	ects					\$ 1,633,	464		\$ 887,815		\$	2,521,279	\$	-		\$	2,521,279
		RTP			Endoral Fiscal		Fe	ederal		Federal Requ	red Match	То	tal Fod Bog		Other			
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Year	Phase							Match				Tota	I All Sources
		Number					\$		Source	\$	Source			\$		Source		
ODOT	-				-	-					-							
						Planning				4		\$	-				───	
			Exempt (Table 2)		FFY2014	Design	\$ 349	,947		\$ 40,053		\$	390,000				<u> </u>	
OR99: Rogue River	Seismic, deck overlay,		Safety, pavement	18569	FFY2015	Land Purchase	\$ 9	,870	NHPP	\$ 1,130		\$	11,000		l			
(6th St, Caveman)	joints, bearings, concrete	500	resurfacing (in	18569	FFY2015	Utility Relocate	\$ 4	,487	NHPP	\$ 514		\$	5,001					
Bridge Rehab	repairs, br#01418		PM ₁₀ Maintenance	18569	FFY2017	Construction	\$ 3,982	,216		\$ 455,783		\$	4,437,999					
			Area)			Other						\$	-					
					Total FFY15-18		\$ 4,346	,520		\$ 497,480		\$	4,844,000	\$	-		\$	4,844,000
						Planning						\$	-					
			Exampt (Table 2)	18875	FFY2016	Design	\$ 412	,000				\$	412,000					
			Safety, pavement	18875	FFY2016	Land Purchase	\$ 5	000				\$	5 000					
I-5: N. Grants Pass	 Grid/Inlay	501	resurfacing (in	18875	FFY2016	Utility Relocate	\$ 5	.000			1	\$	5 000			<u> </u>	+	
Evans Greek Paving			PM ₁₀ Maintenance	18875	FFY2018	Construction	\$ 7.634	,000				\$	7.634.000			<u> </u>	†	
			Area)			Construction				\$		\$	-			<u> </u>	1	
					Total FFY15-18		\$ 8.056	,000		\$ -		\$	8.056.000				\$	8.056.000
										· ·			3,223,000					
						Planning						\$	-				T	
-				5												·		

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)

MRMPO 2015-2018 TIP Updated December 17, 2015

			Example (Table 0)	17477	FFY2015	Design	\$ 138.330	HSIP	\$ 11,670		\$ 150.000				
	Reconfig Intersection		Exempt (Table 3)	17/77	EEV2017	Land Burchaso	¢ 25.822	State	¢ 2.178		\$ 28,000				
I-5 Exit 58 6th &	Reconfig & Lengthen SB	502	Channelization	17477	FFY2018	Utility Relocate	\$ 23,822 \$ 9,222	State	\$ 2,178		\$ 28,000 \$ 10,000				
worgan	Offramp		Project (in PM ₁₀	17477	FFY2018	Construction	\$ 1.209.926	HSIP	\$ 102,074		\$ 1.312.000				
			Maintenance Area)			Other	· · · · · · ·				\$ -				
					Total FFY15-18		\$ 1,383,300		\$ 116,700		\$ 1,500,000			\$	1,500,000
						Planning					\$ -				
leakeen end				19564	FFY 2016	Design	\$ 64,328	STP FLEX	\$ 7,363	ODOT	\$ 71,691				
Josephine Sign and	Enhanced Curve Signeage,		Exempt (Table 2)		FFY2017	Utility Relocation	\$ 922	HSIP	\$ 78	ODOT	\$- \$1000				
Delineation	Pavement Markings, and	503	Safety	10564	EEV2018	Construction	¢ 580.077		\$ 67 423		\$ 656 500				
Upgrades	Alighment Deimeation			19504	1112018	Construction	φ 309,077	SIFILLA	¢ 01,120	0001	\$ 050,500				
						Other					\$ -			^	700 404
					10tal FF 115-16		\$ 054,327	<u> </u>	\$ 74,004		ə 729,191			φ	729,191
						Planning		[1		\$-				
					FFY2012	Design	\$ 269,190	L240	\$ 30,810		\$ 300,000				
FFO-I5: Exit 61	Right Turn Lane on Merlin		Exempt (Table 3)		FFY2014	Land Purchase	\$ 85,244	ACP0	\$ 9,756		\$ 95,000				
(Louse Creek)	WB, Signals Placed on	504	Intersection				\$-		\$-		\$-				
Interchange	on Merlin-I-5		Channelization Project	16062	FFY2015	Construction	\$ 1,929,195	STP	\$ 220,805	ODOT	\$ 2,150,000				
					FFY2015	Other	\$ 4,487	L240	\$ 513		\$ 5,000				
					Total FFY15-18		\$ 2,288,116		\$ 261,884		\$ 2,550,000			\$	2,550,000
Subtotal ODOT P	Projects						\$ 16,728,263		\$ 950,928		\$ 17,679,191	\$-		\$	17,679,191
		ото					Federa		Federal Requir	ed Match		Other			
		RIP			Federal Fiscal						Total Fed+Reg				
Project Name	Project Description	Project	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase	¢	Source	e	Source	Total Fed+Req Match	c	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name	Project Description	Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase	\$	Source	\$	Source	Total Fed+Req Match	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River	Project Description	RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning	\$	Source	\$	Source	Total Fed+Req Match	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River	Project Description	RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design	\$	Source	\$	Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River	Project Description	Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase	\$	Source	\$	Source	S - \$ - \$ -	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects	Project Description	NIP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate	\$	Source	\$	Source	S - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects	Project Description	Number Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction	\$	Source	\$	Source	S - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$	Source	То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects	Project Description	Number Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$	Source	\$	Source	S - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$	Source		tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects	Project Description	NA	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$ \$ 	Source	\$ 	Source	S - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$ 	Source	то 	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R	Project Description	NA	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$ 	Source	\$ 	Source	S - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$ 	Source	\$ \$	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R	Project Description	NA NA	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$ 	Source	\$ Federal Requir	Source ed Match	Total Fed+Req Match \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$	Source	\$ \$	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name	Project Description River Projects Project Description	NA NA RTP Project NUMber	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$ 	Source	\$ \$ \$ \$ Federal Requir	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ 000	Source	то 	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name Rogue Valley Cou	Project Description Project Description River Projects Project Description Uncil of Governments	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other	\$ 	Source Source	\$ Federal Requir	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ -	\$ 0 	Source	то \$ \$ То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name Rogue Valley Cou	Project Description River Projects Project Description uncil of Governments	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Phase Phase Planning	\$ 	Source	\$ Federal Requir	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ 0 Other \$	Source	то \$ \$ То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue F Project Name Rogue Valley Cou	Project Description River Projects Project Description uncil of Governments	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Other Planning Planning Design Land Purchase	\$ 	Source	\$ Federal Requir	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - * Total Fed+Req Match *	\$ 0 Other \$	Source	то \$ \$ То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name Rogue Valley Cou	Project Description	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Control of the second status Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year Image: Second state	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Other Planning Planning Design Land Purchase Construction	\$ 	Source	\$ Federal Requir \$ 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ Other \$	Source	То \$ \$ То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name Rogue Valley Cou No Projects	Project Description River Projects Project Description uncil of Governments	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year Image: Second state	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Phase Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Construction Other	\$ 	Source Source Source	\$ Federal Requir \$ 	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ Total Fed+Req Match \$ - * * *	\$ O O O ther \$	Source	То \$ \$ То	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Project Name Rogue Valley Cou No Projects	Project Description River Projects Project Description ancil of Governments	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year Image: Second S	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Planning Planning Design Land Purchase Construction Other	\$ 	Source	\$	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ 0 Other \$	Source	5 5 5 7 70	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue F Project Name Rogue Valley Cou No Projects Subtotal RVCOG	Project Description River Projects Project Description Incil of Governments Projects	NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Air Quality Status Air Quality Status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year Image: State Stat	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Planning Planning Design Land Purchase Construction Other	\$ 	Source	\$	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -<	\$ 0	Source	To 5 5 5 7 70	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Rogue Valley Cou No Projects Subtotal RVCOG	Project Description	RTP Project Number NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Constraint of the second status Image: Consecond status Image:	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Planning Planning Design Land Purchase Construction Other Other Other	\$ 	Source	\$	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ O O ther \$ 	Source	To \$ \$ To \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	tal All Sources
Project Name Rogue River No Projects Subtotal Rogue R Rogue Valley Cou No Projects Subtotal RVCOG	Project Description	RTP Project NA NA RTP Project Number	Air Quality Status Image: Contract of the second status	Key #	Federal Fiscal Year Federal Fiscal Federal Fiscal Year	Phase Planning Design Land Purchase Utility Relocate Construction Other Planning Planning Planning Design Land Purchase Construction Other Other	\$ 	Source Source Source Source Source Source	\$	Source ed Match Source	Total Fed+Req Match \$ -	\$ O	Source	To	tal All Sources

PROJECT						Sh	ort Range Fundin	g Sources (2015 -	2020)				Project Located
NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	CMAQ	STP	Enhance-It		Transit Funds	State ODOT	Cost by Phase	Conformity Status	in CO or PM10 Maintenance
		Fu	nds Availat	ole - Short Range	\$5,955,357	\$1,963,904	\$0	Local	\$5,031,971	\$33,211,382			Area?
Gold Hill								\$0					
0	No Short Range Projects	No Short Range Projects	Short	\$0									
		She	ort Range T	otal							\$0		
Grants Pas	s		1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				\$6,987,083					
200	Transit Enhancements - Sidewalk Construction	Install 4 miles of sidewalks, replace missing/non-conforming sidewalks, Install stop sign/amenities (funds obligated prior to MPO designation)	Short	\$1,914,740	\$1,714,740	\$0	\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$0	\$1,914,740	Exempt	NA
201	Allen Creek Rd. Improvements	Allen Creek Rd. from W. Harbeck to Denton will be upgraded to City Arterial standards (CMAQ & STP funds awarded prior to MPO designation).	Short	\$4,420,000	\$2,760,095	\$950,000		\$709,905	\$0	\$0	\$4,420,000	Exempt	PM ₁₀
202	G Street: Lincoln Road to Leonard Street	Full reconstruction of arterial to include TWLTL, bike lanes, sidewalks, parking one side.	Short	\$1,124,643	\$504,571	\$325,000	\$0	\$295,072	\$0	\$0	\$1,124,643	Exempt	PM ₁₀
203	Fruitdale Drive: Parkdale Drive to Overland Drive	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, bike lanes, sidewalk, parking one side.	Short	\$3,213,256	\$618,607	\$324,059	\$0	\$2,270,590	\$0	\$0	\$3,213,256	Exempt	PM ₁₀
204	G Street: Leonard Road to 3rd Street	Stripe for TWLTL	Short	\$903,013	\$0	\$810,274	\$0	\$92,739	\$0	\$0	\$903,013	Exempt	PM ₁₀
205	Fruitdale Drive: Overland Drive to Rogue River Hwy	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, bike lanes, sidewalk, parking one side.	Short	\$4,498,558	\$504,571	\$316,571	\$0	\$3,677,416	\$0	\$0	\$4,498,558	Exempt	PM ₁₀
		Sho	ort Range T	otal	\$1,627,749	\$1,775,904	\$0	\$6,335,817	\$0	\$0	\$9,739,470		
		Fu	nds Remair	ning	\$4,327,608	\$188,000	\$0	\$651,266	\$0	\$0			
Jackson Co	ounty							\$47,000					
300	Rogue River Greenway: N. River Road Section	PE (design) and Right-of-way (ROW) Phase	Short	\$450,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,000	\$0	\$403,000	\$450,000	Exempt	NA
		She	ort Range T	otal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$47,000	\$0	\$403,000	\$450,000		
		Fu	nds Remair	ning	\$4,327,608	\$188,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Josephine	County					<u>.</u>							
403	Galice Rd #2401: Chip seal (MP 0.0 - 15.4)	Chip seal and related prep work; guardrail updates	Short	\$939,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$939,000	Exempt	NA
		She	ort Range T	otal	\$4,327,608	\$188,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$939,000		
ODOT						<u>.</u>		\$0					
500	US199: Rogue River (6th St. Cavemen)	Bridge repair. Seismic, deck overlay, joints, bearings, concrete repairs, br#01418	Short	\$4,844,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,844,000	\$4,844,000	Exempt	PM ₁₀
501	I-5: N. Grants Pass - Evans Creek Paving	Paving. Grid/Inlay.	Short	\$8,056,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$8,056,000	\$8,056,000	Exempt	PM ₁₀
502	I-5: Exit 58 6th & Morgan	Reconfig intersection, reconfig & lengthen SB Offramp	Short	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Exempt	PM ₁₀
503	Jackson & Josephine Sign & Delineation Upgrades	Enhanced curve signage, pavement markings, & alignment delineation.	Short	\$729,191	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$729,191	\$729,191	Exempt	NA
504	FFO-I5: Exit 61 (Louse Creek)	Signals Placed on Merlin NB, Left Turn Lane on Merlin VB,	Short	\$17,679,191	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,679,191	\$17,679,191	Exempt	NA
		She	ort Range T	otal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0		\$32,808,382	\$32,808,382		
Rogue Rive	er					<u>.</u>		\$432,000					
601	E. Main Street Bridge	Bridge replacement at Wards Creek, widen or replace to arterial standard.	Short	\$570,000	\$0	\$188,000	\$0	\$382,000	\$0	\$0	\$570,000	Exempt	NA
		She	ort Range T	otal	\$0	\$188,000	\$0	\$382,000	\$0	\$0	\$570,000		
-		Fu	nds Remair	ning	\$4,327,608	\$0	\$0	\$50,000	\$0				
Josephine	Community Transit	1	1	,	F								
700	Josephine County - 5311	Rural Operations	Short	\$133,541		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$133,541	\$0	\$133,541	Exempt	NA
701	JCT - 5307 Transit Operations	I ransit Operating Assistance	Short	\$1,433,036		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,433,036	\$0	\$1,433,036	Exempt	NA
702	JC1 - 5309	Capital Purchase - Replacement Venicle	Short	\$560,000	¢440 E04	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$560,000	\$0	\$560,000	Exempt	NA
703	Vohiele Replacement 2016	Capital Burghase - Replacement Vehicle	Short	\$499,926	\$446,364	\$U \$0	\$U \$0	\$0 \$0	\$350,000	\$U \$0	\$499,929	Exempt	NA NA
704	Vehicle Replacement - 2017	Capital Furchase - Replacement Vehicle	Short	\$350,000		م و 02	ው ወ	ው ምር	\$350,000	<u> </u>	\$350,000	Exempt	NA
706	Vahiele Bonlacoment 2019		Short	\$350,000		¢0 ¢0	φ0 ¢0	\$0 \$0	\$350,000	φ0 ¢0	\$350,000	Exempt	ΝΔ
700	Vehicle Replacement - 2010	Capital Furchase - Replacement Vehicle	Short	\$350,000		φ0 ¢0	\$0 ¢0	\$0 \$0	\$350,000	φ0 Φ0	\$350,000	Exempt	ΝΔ
708	Vehicle Replacement - 2020	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Short	\$350,000		\$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$350,000	\$0 \$0	\$350,000	Exempt	NA
723	5310 E & D Transit Capital STP Transfer	Purchase service	Short	\$350,000		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$304 775	\$0	\$304 775	Exempt	NA
2		Sh	ort Range T	otal	\$448 584	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,232,697	\$0	\$4.681.281	pt	
		Fu	nds Remain	ning	\$3.879.024	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$799.274	\$0	+ 1,50 1,201		
	•							Total	Short Range R	FP (2015 - 2020)	\$49,188,133		

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)

PROJECT		DESCRIPTION	TIMING	T200		Med	lium Range Fundi	ng Sources (2021	- 2030)				Project Located
NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	0031	CMAQ	STP	Enhance-It		Transit Funds	State ODOT	Cost by Phase	Conformity Status	In CO or PM10 Maintenance
		Fund	s Available	- Medium Range	\$12,193,563	\$6,967,068	\$16,200,000	LUCai	\$7,918,604	\$0			Area?
Gold Hill													
0	No Medium Range Projects	No Medium Range Projects	Medium										
		Medi	ium Range	Total	\$0								
Grants Pass	3		1					\$17,242,076					
206	Vine Street: Highland Ave to Hawthorne Ave	Full reconstruction of arterial to include bike lanes and sidewalks.	Medium	\$2,448,182	\$1,000,000	\$576,658	\$0	\$871,524	\$0	\$0	\$2,448,182	Exempt	PM ₁₀
207	Willow Lane: Redwood Hwy to Redwood Ave	Full reconstruction of arterial to include bike lanes and sidewalks. Provide 60-ft ROW.	Medium	\$1,756,580	\$500,000	\$413,755	\$0	\$842,825	\$0	\$0	\$1,756,580	Exempt	PM ₁₀
208	Fruitdale Drive: Jacksonville Hwy to Parkdale Drive	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, bike lanes and sidewalk.	Medium	\$2,570,604	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$1,570,604	\$0	\$0	\$2,570,604	Exempt	PM ₁₀
209	Leonard Road: Willow Lane to Redwood School (UGB)	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, blke lanes and sidewalk.	Medium	\$3,213,256	\$1,000,000	\$500,000	\$0	\$1,713,256	\$0	\$0	\$3,213,256	Exempt	PM ₁₀
210	West Harbeck Road: Grandview Ave to Williams Hwy	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, bike lanes and sidewalk.	Medium	\$2,399,232	\$1,000,000	\$824,629	\$0	\$574,603	\$0	\$0	\$2,399,232	Exempt	PM ₁₀
211	Dimmick Street: C Street to Railroad Crossing	Full reconstruction of arterial with TWLTL	Medium	\$324,493	\$210,920	\$76,433	\$0	\$37,140	\$0	\$0	\$324,493	Exempt	PM ₁₀
212	Foothill Blvd: City Limits to Ament Road	Full reconstruction of collector. 42° wide, blke lanes, no parking and sidewalks.	Medium	\$1,799,430	\$1,169,630	\$350,000	\$0	\$279,800	\$0	\$0	\$1,799,430	Exempt	PM ₁₀
213	Hillcrest Drive: Ninth Street to Tenth Street	Full reconstruction of collector to include bike lanes, sidewalks, no parking.	Medium	\$1,214,615	\$789,500	\$286,097	\$0	\$139,018	\$0	\$0	\$1,214,615	Exempt	PM ₁₀
214	Hillcrest Drive: Tenth Street to Beacon Drive	Full reconstruction of collector to include bike lanes, sidewalks, no parking.	Medium	\$1,124,643	\$731,016	\$264,905	\$0	\$128,720	\$0	\$0	\$1,124,641	Exempt	PM ₁₀
216	Cloverlawn Drive: Eastview Place to Hamilton Lane	Full reconstruction of collector to provide bike lanes and sidewalks. Provide 60-ft ROW.	Medium	\$4,284,341	\$1,559,501	\$500,000	\$0	\$2,224,840	\$0	\$0	\$4,284,341	Exempt	PM ₁₀
217	Highland Ave: South Line Section 6 to N.W. UGB	Full reconstruction of arterial. 40' wide, bike lanes and sidewalk.	Medium	\$3,643,844	\$1,093,153	\$650,000	\$0	\$1,900,691	\$0	\$0	\$3,643,844	Exempt	PM ₁₀
218	Leonard Road: Dowell Road to Willow Lane	Full reconstruction of local collector. 36' wide and sidewalks.	Medium	\$3,213,256	\$1,243,458	\$656,190	\$0	\$1,313,608	\$0	\$0	\$3,213,256	Exempt	PM ₁₀
219	Scoville Road: Greenfield Road to Scenic Drive	Full reconstruction of collector to include bike lanes and sidewalks.	Medium	\$376,642	\$244,817	\$88,716	\$0	\$43,108	\$0	\$0	\$376,642	Exempt	PM ₁₀
220	East Park Street: Clara Ave to Hamilton Lane	Full reconstruction local collector. 36' wide and sidewalk.	Medium	\$1,259,600	\$818,740	\$296,693	\$0	\$144,167	\$0	\$0	\$1,259,600	Exempt	PM ₁₀
		Medi	ium Range	Total	\$11,860,736	\$5,984,076	\$0	\$11,783,904	\$0	\$0	\$29,628,718		
laskson Co	unty	Fur	nds Remain	ning	\$332,827	\$982,992	\$0	\$5,458,172	\$0	\$0			
	No Medium Range Projects	No Medium Range Projects	Medium					Ф О					ΝΔ
0		Median Hange Hojeeta	ium Range	Total							\$0		
Josephine C	County		<u></u>					\$112.508					
401	Bike/Ped	Monument Drive: North Valley High School to Hugo Road - Install bike lanes	Medium	\$1,095,500	\$0	\$982,992	\$0	\$112,508	\$0	\$0	\$1,095,500	Exempt	NA
		Medi	ium Range	Total	\$0	\$982,992	\$0	\$112,508	\$0	\$0	\$1,095,500		
		Fur	nds Remain	ning	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Oregon Dep	t. of Transportation							\$0					
0	No Medium Range Projects	No Medium Range Projects	Medium										NA
Reque Diver		Medi	ium Range	lotal							\$0		
	No Medium Pange Projects	No Medium Pange Projects	Medium										ΝΔ
0		Median Range Frojecta	ium Range	Total							\$0		
Josephine C	Community Transit		j-						\$8,717,878				
709	Vehicle Replacement - 2021	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
710	Vehicle Replacement - 2022	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
711	Vehicle Replacement - 2023	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
712	Vehicle Replacement - 2024	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
713	Venicle Replacement - 2025	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
715	Vehicle Replacement - 2027	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
716	Vehicle Replacement - 2028	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0 \$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
717	Vehicle Replacement - 2029	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA
718	Vehicle Replacement - 2030	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Medium	\$380,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$380,000		\$380,000	Exempt	NA

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)

2015 - 2040 MRMPO RTP Project List

		Med	lium Range [·]	Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$3.800.000		\$3.800.000		
		Fu	nds Remain	ing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,917,878	\$0	+-,,		
								Total M	edium Range R	TP (2021 - 2030)	\$34,524,218		
BRO JECT						L	ong Range Fundin	g Sources (2031 -	2040)				Project Located
NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST							Cost by Phase	Conformity	in CO or PM10
					CMAQ	STP	Enhance-It	Local	Transit Funds	State ODOT	·····	Status	Maintenance
		Fu	inds Availab	le - Short Range	\$9,887,827	\$8,006,000	\$16,200,000		\$10,767,085	\$0			Alcu.
Gold Hill	L	1											
0	No Long Range Projects	No Long Range Projects	Long										NA
Cronto Dec		Lo	ng Range To	otal				* 22.000.011			\$0		
Grants Pas	S	Full reconstruction of collector, 42' wide, bike lange and						\$29,393,611					
221	Scenic Drive, West: Granite Hill Road to Scoville Road	sidewalk.	Long	\$1,313,619	\$394,086	\$262,724	\$0	\$656,810	\$0	\$0	\$1,313,619	Exempt	PM ₁₀
222	Hamilton Lane: Park Street, East to Rogue River Hwy	Full reconstruction local collector to include sidewalks.	Long	\$269,941	\$80,982	\$53,988	\$0	\$134,971	\$0	\$0	\$269,941	Exempt	PM ₁₀
223	West Park Street: Rignuette Street to Pansy Lane	Construct/reconstruction to local collector. 36' wide, bike lanes,	Lona	\$3.045.712	\$913,714	\$609,142	\$0	\$1,522,856	\$0	\$0	\$3.045.712	Non-Exempt	PM ₁₀
	······································	no parking and sidewalks.		+=,= :=	+ ,	····		+ - , ,			+-,		10
224	Nebraska Ave: McCarter Drive to S. Union Ave	sidewalk.	Long	\$325,631	\$97,689	\$65,126	\$0	\$162,816	\$0	\$0	\$325,631	Exempt	PM ₁₀
225	Beacon Drive: Madrone to Hillcrest	Full reconstruction of collector. Bike lanes and sidewalk.	Long	\$3,868,774	\$1,160,632	\$773,755	\$0	\$1,934,387	\$0	\$0	\$3,868,774	Exempt	NA
226	Pansy Lane: Redwood Ave to North End	Full reconstruction of local collector. 36' wide and sidewalk.	Long	\$428,435	\$128,531	\$85,687	\$0	\$214,218	\$0	\$0	\$428,435	Exempt	PM ₁₀
227	Hamilton Lane: Overland Drive to Cloverlawn Drive	Full reconstruction local collector to include sidewalks.	Long	\$5,128,375	\$1,538,513	\$1,635,333	\$0	\$1,954,529	\$0	\$0	\$5,128,375	Exempt	NA
228	East Park Street: Gold River Lane to Clara Ave	Full reconstruction local collector to include sidewalks.	Long	\$1,079,657	\$323,897	\$215,931	\$0	\$539,829	\$0	\$0	\$1,079,657	Exempt	PM ₁₀
229	Havilland Drive: Grandview Ave to Highline Canal	Full reconstruction local collector to include sidewalks.	Long	\$1,456,676	\$437,003	\$291,335	\$0	\$728,338	\$0	\$0	\$1,456,676	Exempt	PM ₁₀
230	Portola Drive: 450-Feet West of Gladiola Ave	Full reconstruction of local collector. 36' wide and sidewalk.	Long	\$382,175	\$114,653	\$76,435	\$0	\$191,088	\$0	\$0	\$382,175	Exempt	PM ₁₀
231	Portola Drive: Gladiola Ave to Shannon Lane	Full reconstruction of local collector. 36' wide and sidewalk.	Long	\$885,396	\$265,619	\$177,079	\$0	\$442,698	\$0	\$0	\$885,396	Exempt	PM ₁₀
232	Shannon Lane: Portola Drive to North Railroad (ROW)	Full reconstruction of local collector. 36' wide and sidewalk.	Long	\$636,957	\$191,087	\$127,391	\$0	\$318,479	\$0	\$0	\$636,957	Exempt	PM ₁₀
		Lo	ng Range To	otal	\$5,646,405	\$4,373,928	\$0	\$8,801,016	\$0	\$0	\$18,821,348		
Jackson Co		Fu	nds Remain	ing	\$4,241,422	\$3,632,072	\$0	\$20,592,595	\$0	\$0			
	No Long Rango Projects	No Long Pango Projecto	Long					۵U					ΝΑ
0			LONG	ong Pange Total							0.9		INA .
Josephine	County			Long Range Total				\$335.638			ψυ		
402	Monument Drive: Merlin Road to Timber Lane	Install left turn lanes at intersections	Lona	\$2.932.500	\$0	\$2,596,862	\$0	\$335.638	\$0	\$0	\$2,932,500		NA
		Lo	ng Range To	otal	\$0	\$2,596,862	\$0	\$335,638	\$0	\$0	\$2,932,500		
		Fu	nds Remain	ing	\$0	\$1,035,210	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0			
Oregon De	ot. of Transportation							\$0					
0	No Long Range Projects	No Long Range Projects	Long										NA
		Lo	ng Range To	otal	\$0						\$0		
Rogue Rive	r							\$1,528,790					
602	Main Street	Realign Main Street so that E. Main and W. Main align at the Pine Street intersection	Long	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$1,035,210	\$0	\$464,790	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000	Exempt	NA
002			ng Range Te	otal	\$0	\$1 035 210	\$0	\$464 790	\$0	\$0	\$1,500,000		
			nds Remain	ing	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1.064.000	\$0	\$0	\$1,000,000		
Josephine	Community Transit							, , ,	\$14,567,085				
719	Vehicle Replacement - 2031	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Long	\$410,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$0	\$410,000	Exempt	NA
720	Vehicle Replacement - 2032	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Long	\$410,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$0	\$410,000	Exempt	NA
721	Vehicle Replacement - 2033	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Long	\$410,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$0	\$410,000	Exempt	NA
722	Vehicle Replacement - 2034	Capital Purchase - Replacement Vehicle	Long	\$410,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$410,000	\$0	\$410,000	Exempt	NA
		Lo	ng Range To	otal	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,640,000	\$0	\$1,640,000		
		Fu	nds Remain	ling	\$4,241,422	\$0	\$0	\$0 	\$12,927,085	\$0 FD (2024 - 2240)	\$0		
								Iota	Long Range R	18 (2031 - 2040)	\$24,893,848	2015 2040	¢400.000.400
											Total KTP (2015 - 2040)	\$108,606,199
		MRMPO 20	15 - 2(040 RTP 1	Fier 2 Pr	oject Lis	st						
						•							
BROJECT												Conformitu	Project Located

MRMPO 2015 -	2040 RTP Tier	2 Project List
--------------	---------------	----------------

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)

NUMBER	LOCATION	DESCRIPTION	TIMING	COST	MRMPO 20	015 - 2040 RTP Tie	r 2 Project List - Un	nfunded Needs		Cost by Phase	Status	Maintenance Area?
Jackson Co	punty											
	Tier 2 Projects - Unfunded Needs											
300	N. River Road, Twin Bridges Rd: Rock Point	Add bicycle/pedestrian path	Tier 2	\$ 3,000,000						\$ 3,000,000		NA
	East Evans Creek Rd: Rogue River - Pleasant Cr.	Upgrade to rural major collector	Tier 2	\$ 3,890,000						\$ 3,890,000		NA
	Old Stage Road, Blackwell Road: Winterbrook Lane	Improve to rural two-lane with shoulder bikeways	Tier 2	\$ 2,500,000						\$ 2,500,000		NA
	N. River Road: Rogue River - Gold Hill	Upgrade to collector	Tier 2	\$ 4,750,000						\$ 4,750,000		NA
									Total	\$ 14,140,000		
Josephine (County											
-	Tier 2 Projects - Unfunded Needs											
	Dowell Road at Wolf Lane	Improve intersection	Tier 2	\$1,000,000						\$1,000,000		NA
	Cloverlawn Drive (MP .5 - 3.6)	Widen shoulders to min. 4-feet, resurface, improve intersection with Summit Loop Road	Tier 2	\$2,500,000						\$2,500,000		NA
	Rogue River Loop Highway / Lower River Road	Widen shoulders	Tier 2	\$17,037,500						\$17,037,500		NA
									Total	\$20,537,500		
Rogue Rive	r											
	Tier 2 Projects - Unfunded Needs											
	Rogue River	Provide multi-use pathway along both sides of the river. Create a multi-use pathway loop at N side of river connecting to a bike lane/path at N. River Road. Connect City pathways with a regional system.	Tier 2	per design						per design		NA
	Evans Creek	Provide a pathway following Pine St. and E. Evans Creek Rd. to the High School.	Tier 2	per design						per design		NA
	Various Arterials and Collectors	Provide access improvements, such as curbs.	Tier 2	per design						per design		NA
	Wards Creek	Provide pathway along Wards Creek.	Tier 2	per design						per design		NA
									Total	NA		
								Tota	Tier 2 Projects	\$ 34,677,500		

Attachment #4 (Agenda Item 5)