



AGENDA

Middle Rogue Metropolitan Planning Organization
Citizens Advisory Committee

Date: Thursday, January 13, 2022

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Location: Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/87993671265?pwd=ZnFxcmF3VXVORWJ6VE1FemZ4cHVGOT09>

Meeting ID: 879 9367 1265

Passcode: 249176

Phone #: 253 215 8782

Contact: Office Specialist, RVMCOG: 541-423-1375

MRMPO website: www.mrmppo.org

1	Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda	Chair
2	Review / Approve Minutes	Chair
<i>Attachment</i>	#1 MRMPO CAC Draft Minutes 09/02/2021	
Discussion Items		
3	TIP Timeline	Karl Welzenbach
<i>Background</i>	It's that time of year again! The MRMPO needs to begin to develop the 2024-27 TIP. Towards that end staff is providing the timetable we need to follow to accomplish this goal	
<i>Attachment</i>	#2 TIP Development Timetable	
4	Application Process	Karl Welzenbach
<i>Background</i>	At the request of ODOT, the RVMPO undertook a review of their application and selection process and developed a series of policies intended to improve the process. MPO staff is sharing these with you to initiate a discussion on the MRMPO's process.	
<i>Attachment</i>	#3 RVMPO Policy on Project Applications and Selection	
5	Public Comment	

Regular Updates		
6	MPO Planning Update	Karl Welzenbach
7	Other Business / Member Comments Opportunity for MRMPO member jurisdictions to talk about transportation planning projects.	Chair
8	Adjournment	Chair

- The next MRMPO Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting will be **Thursday, February 10, 2022 at 2:00 p.m.** Online.
- The next MRMPO Policy Committee meeting will be **January 20, 2022 at 2:30 p.m.** Online.
- The next MRMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting will be **February 3, 2022 at 1:30 p.m.** Online.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, IF YOU NEED SPECIAL ASSISTANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT RVCOG, 541-664-6674. 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 MPO Technical Advisory Committee
And Citizens Advisory Committee
September 2, 2021

The following attended:

Voting Members for TAC	Organization	Phone Number
Ryan Nolan	Gold Hill	423-1382
Jason Canady	Grants Pass	450-6110
Wade Elliott, Chair	Grants Pass	450-6114
Michael Bollweg	Rogue River	660-0093
Mike Kuntz	Jackson County	774-6029
Niel Burgess	Josephine County	474-5460
Scott Chancey, Vice Chair	Josephine Co. Community Transit	474-5441
Justin Shoemaker	ODOT	774-6376
Ian Horlacher	ODOT	774-6399
Voting Members for CAC	Organization	Phone Number
Lesley Orr, Vice Chair	Active Transportation	
Judy Garrett	Grants Pass	659-9681
Stephen Haydon	Grants Pass	226-9044
David Leverenz	Mass Transit	917-453-8535
Staff	Organization	Phone Number
Karl Welzenbach	RVCOG	423-1360
Ryan MacLaren	RVCOG	423-1338
Kelsey Sharp	RVCOG	423-1375
Interested Parties	Organization	Phone Number
Pam VanArsdale	MRMPO Policy Committee	

[MRMPO TAC and CAC September 2, 2021 Agenda Packet](#)

Full meeting recording: [2021-09-02 MRMPO TAC and CAC Meeting Audio](#)

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Review Agenda 00:00–01:13

1:30 p.m. | *Quorum*: Gold Hill, Grants Pass, Rogue River, Jackson County, Josephine County, Josephine Co. Transit, ODOT

2. Review / Approve Minutes 01:13–02:44

01:47 | *Ian Horlacher moved to approve the August 5, 2021 MRMPO TAC and CAC joint meeting minutes as presented. Seconded by Jason Canady.*

No further discussion.

The motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

Action Items

3. Covid-19 Funding Discussion 02:44 – 46:15

During the previous discussion, an agreement was met that the funding is to be spend on transportation. The committees leaned towards giving a chunk of it to the cities of Gold Hill and Rogue River, anywhere from \$100-300 thousand.

05:09 | *Pam VanArsdale: Splitting the funds between the five jurisdictions is a great idea. There shouldn't be an approval process to spend, each jurisdiction knows what they need to have done and how to best spend the money.*

06:07 | *Michael Bollweg: Rogue River is very understaffed currently so getting some sort of presentation for the projects would be difficult. A follow-up on what the funding was used for after would be doable.*

07:00 | *Niel Burgess: Splitting five ways, due to the population differences, isn't equitable. Also, each jurisdiction should be allowed to spend it however they see fit, no presentation necessary.*

08:50 | *Scott Chancey: If it is being split, would that amount be too small to the larger jurisdictions to make much of a difference?*

Grants Pass specifically could put it towards multi-modal, sidewalk infills, or go to scheduled over-lays. Because it has no stings attached it could be useful. The counties could put it towards chip-seals.

09:35 | *Mike Kuntz: The smaller communities have a hard time coming up with projects and match, and then competing with the larger communities. Splitting this money evenly could be a way to help even things with the smaller communities. The Greenway is looking for ways to connect the greenway between Rogue River and Grants Pass, before long they will be looking for fundings for match. The MRMPO could take a piece of this funding and set it aside for greenway match. Something like \$300,000 for construction, then take the rest and split it between the other jurisdictions.*

14:35 | *Ian Horlacher: Because the smaller jurisdictions have hard time identifying projects and are outside of the CMAQ boundaries and don't get those funds, why not look at the Greenway, Rogue River, and Gold Hill taking advantage of the full Covid-19 funds. This could go to projects that need to be done for transportation, like Safe Route to School or sidewalk projects.*

22:19 | *Jason Canady: Should there be "guard rails" on the motion to ensure the funding is allocated to Greenway projects, and who would continue to hold the funding while it is being allocated?*

RVCOG currently has the funding in a Money market account. RVCOG will continue to hold the funding and give it out when a Greenway project comes. Perhaps in the motion it could be added that any Greenway funding that gets used for match would have to get approved by the Policy Committee.

24:05 | Scott Chancey: *Any funding being allocated to Gold Hill or Rogue River, will that be giving in check form with the promises it will be spend on transportation related projects? Also, there were two presentations at the last joint meeting, are those still being considered, or have they been discarded?*

The funding could be giving in check form, yes. And, for the ALERT Wildfire project, there were too many questions unanswered about the cost and a concern over annual fees. The GIS project was discussed, and most jurisdictions already pay for GIS. The consensus at the last joint meeting was this funding only goes to transportation, even though there are no official strings attached from the Federal government.

27:22 | Michael Bollweg: *Due to concerns the funding given to Rogue River and Gold Hill could go to non-transportation related projects, it would be reasonable to come back to give a short presentation on where the funding has gone. Perhaps before and after pictures.*

27:53 | Scott Chancey: *The cities could give a short presentation on what they are planning to do with the funds before instead of after.*

28:49 | Lesley Orr: *Regarding the Greenway, it would be best if it was understood this funding would more than likely go to building new sections between Rogue River and Grants Pass. This way these new areas could be used to be looked at by other sections that are having a harder time getting underway.*

30:28 | Jason Canady moved to recommend splitting the Covid-19 Relief Funds with 1/3 going to Rogue River, 1/3 going to Gold Hill, and 1/3 to be held in trust for the Greenway Foundation for the section between Rogue River and Grants Pass. Seconded by Ryan Nolan.

No further discussion.

Motioned passed unanimously by voice vote.

32:50 | Ian Horlacher moved to recommend the Greenway Foundation, Rogue River, and Gold Hill present a list of projects on how the funding will be spent prior to receiving funding.

Further discussion on adding stipulations to Greenway or not in the motion.

34:10 | Scott Chancey moved to recommend any of the recipients of the Covid-19 Relief funds come to MRMPO with the proposed projects before they are funded for approval. Seconded by Mike Kuntz.

Concern was raised with the word 'Approval.' An amendment of "approval for funding" was added to the motion.

Further discussion of where the sections of the Greenway project will be, as it stands, they are within the MRMPO boundary, and if the motion should be less limited with the Greenway Project.

Motioned passed unanimously by voice vote.

Discussion Items

4. Public Comment 46:15 – 46:15

No public present.

Regular Updates

5. MPO Planning Update 46:15 – 48:44

MPO Update provided by Karl regarding the various transportation bills, and the upcoming census.

6. Other Business / Local Business 48:44 – 52:00

Discussion on Gold Hill representation on the Policy Committee, and update from Grants Pass.

7. Adjournment

2:22 p.m.

Scheduled Meetings:

MRMPO Technical Advisory Committee | October 7, 2021 | 1:30 p.m.

MRMPO Citizens Advisory Committee | October 14, 2021 | 2:00 p.m.

MRMPO Policy Committee | September 16, 2021 | 2:30 p.m.

Schedule

Planned schedule and summary of actions listed below. For greater detail or more up-to-date information, please consult RVCOG staff.

January 31, 2022	Call for Projects
Mar-Apr, 2022	Application Workshop – Attendance mandatory for Applicants
May 27, 2022	Applications due by Close Of Business
Jun-Jul, 2022	TAC application review and project recommendations. <i>With TAC concurrence, applicants may submit minor changes to applications, or modifications suggested by the TAC, no later than noon on Friday July1, 2022</i>
Jul-Aug, 2022	Policy Committee Approval of projects selected for 24-27 TIP
August 2022	MRMPO initiates Air Quality Conformity Consultation with EPA, FHWA, FTA, ODOT, and DEQ
December 2022	Draft TIP and AQCD Provided to MPO Committees
January – February, 2023	Open Public Comment Period on 2024-27 TIP and AQCD
March 2023	Committee Recommendations and Policy Committee Action on 2024-27 TIP and AQCD
April 2023	MRMPO forwards documents to ODOT, FHWA, FTA, EPA, and DEQ
May-Jun, 2023	TIP Approved by Governor



Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization

Regional Transportation Planning

Ashland • Central Point • Eagle Point • Jacksonville • Medford • Phoenix • Talent • White City
Jackson County • Rogue Valley Transportation District • Oregon Department of Transportation

POLICY REGARDING PROJECT APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS AS ADOPTED BY THE RVMPO POLICY COMMITTEE – DECEMBER 28, 2021

Improvements to the Application -

- Include a check box in the application for jurisdictions to indicate whether or not they intend to pursue a simple fund exchange.
- Check box stating to the effect that, should fund exchange be denied, the jurisdiction intends to pursue the project under the federal delivery process and will provide the required local match.
- Include ODOT's Local Agency Technical Scope Sheets as an initial draft of anticipated expenses in the MPO's application form.
- If a jurisdiction is partnering with another jurisdiction or agency on a project the application must be signed by both partners or include a letter of support from the referred to partner

Improvements to the Process -

1. The MPO restricts all applications that will follow the federal delivery process (all CMAQ projects and those STBG projects that will not be fund exchanged) to a minimum project cost of \$1 million. Those applications that come in under the proposed minimum will be accepted but subject to additional scrutiny by the TAC.
2. Recommend that we allow jurisdictions to apply for just a planning phase with a suggested minimum of \$150,000 for such projects although projects under that minimum will be accepted but subject to additional scrutiny by the TAC.
3. Identify that there are three categories of projects: 1) simple STBG projects that could be fund exchanged and proceed apace; 2) larger more complicated and costly projects that will be required to follow ODOT procedures, and 3) planning phase projects
4. Recommend that the RVMPO hold a workshop subsequent to the call for projects to be hosted by the MPO staff but conducted by ODOT staff. This workshop is to review with the jurisdictions all of the requirements associated with the use of federal funds.
5. Recommend that the RVMPO make the aforementioned workshop mandatory – if a jurisdiction applies for funding but does not attend the workshop that application will not be considered.

While the Technical Advisory Committee believes that the recommendations contained above will help improve the entire project selection process from applications to recommendations, the TAC also affirms that they are responsible for developing the specific project recommendations for the Policy Committee to consider. As such, the TAC intends to be far more discerning and objective in their

analysis of project applications. Please note that this may result in the TAC not recommending certain projects to the Policy Committee if the members believe that the project contains fatal flaws that have not been addressed by the applicant.