Appendix A

Regulatory Framework

This Transportation Plan is intended to meet federal requirements for regional transportation plans as described in the Code of Federal Regulations and the U.S. Clean Air Act amendments of 1990. This appendix describes the federal rules, regulations, and policies that influence the content of this document.

A. Federal Regulation

According to the 23 CFR, §450.324:

(a) The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include the development of a transportation plan addressing no less than a 20-year planning horizon as of the effective date. In formulating the transportation plan, the MPO shall consider factors described in § 450.306 as the factors relate to a minimum 20-year forecast period. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be the date of a conformity determination issued by the FHWA and the FTA. In attainment areas, the effective date of the transportation plan shall be its date of adoption by the MPO.

(b) The transportation plan shall include both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that provide for the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system (including accessible pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities) to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand.

(c) The MPO shall review and update the transportation plan at least every 4 years in air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas and at least every 5 years in attainment areas to confirm the transportation plan's validity and consistency with current and forecasted transportation and land use conditions and trends and to extend the forecast period to at least a 20-year planning horizon. In addition, the MPO may revise the transportation plan at any time using the procedures in this section without a requirement to extend the horizon year. The MPO shall approve the transportation plan (and any revisions) and submit it for information purposes to the Governor. Copies of any updated or revised transportation plans must be provided to the FHWA and the FTA.

(d) In metropolitan areas that are in nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide, the MPO shall coordinate the development of the metropolitan transportation plan with the process for developing transportation control measures (TCMs) in a State Implementation Plan (SIP).

(e) The MPO, the State(s), and the public transportation operator(s) shall validate data used in preparing other existing modal plans for providing input to the transportation plan. In updating the transportation plan, the MPO shall base the update on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity. The MPO shall approve transportation plan contents and supporting analyses produced by a transportation plan update.

(f) The metropolitan transportation plan shall, at a minimum, include:

(1) The current and projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the transportation plan;

(2) Existing and proposed transportation facilities (including major roadways, public transportation facilities, intercity bus facilities, multimodal and intermodal facilities, nonmotorized transportation facilities (e.g., pedestrian walkways and bicycle facilities), and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions over the period of the transportation plan.

(3) A description of the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system in accordance with § 450.306(d).

(4) A system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets described in § 450.306(d), including—

(i) Progress achieved by the metropolitan planning organization in meeting the performance targets in comparison with system performance recorded in previous reports, including baseline data; and

(ii) For metropolitan planning organizations that voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios, an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets.

(5) Operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods;

(6) Consideration of the results of the congestion management process in TMAs that meet the requirements of this subpart, including the identification of SOV projects that result from a congestion management process in TMAs that are nonattainment for ozone or carbon monoxide.

(7) Assessment of capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure, provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs, and reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters. The metropolitan transportation plan may consider projects and strategies that address areas or corridors where current or projected congestion threatens the efficient functioning of key elements of the metropolitan area's transportation system.

(8) Transportation and transit enhancement activities, including consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated, and including transportation alternatives, as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a), and associated transit improvements, as described in 49 U.S.C. 5302(a), as appropriate;

(9) Design concept and design scope descriptions of all existing and proposed transportation facilities in sufficient detail, regardless of funding source, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for conformity determinations under the EPA's transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). In all areas (regardless of air quality designation), all proposed improvements shall be described in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates;

(10) A discussion of 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 metropolitan transportation plan. The discussion may focus on policies, programs, or strategies, rather than at the project level. The MPO shall develop the discussion in consultation with applicable Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies. The MPO may establish reasonable timeframes for performing this consultation;

(11) A financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented.

> (i) For purposes of transportation system operations and maintenance, the financial plan shall contain system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources that are reasonably expected to be available to adequately operate and maintain the Federal-aid highways (as defined by 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5)) and public transportation (as defined by title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53).
>
> (ii) For the purpose of developing the metropolitan transportation plan, the MPO(s), public transportation operator(s), and State shall cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support metropolitan transportation plan implementation, as required under § 450.314(a). All necessary financial resources from public and private sources that are reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the transportation plan shall be identified.
>
> (iii) The financial plan shall include recommendations on any additional financing strategies to fund projects and programs included in the metropolitan transportation plan. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. The financial plan may include an assessment of the appropriateness of innovative finance techniques (for example, tolling, pricing, bonding, public private partnerships, or other strategies) as revenue sources for projects in the plan.

(iv) In developing the financial plan, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C., title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 or with other Federal funds; State assistance; local sources; and private participation. Revenue and cost estimates that support the metropolitan transportation plan must use an inflation rate(s) to reflect "year of expenditure dollars," based on reasonable financial principles and information, developed cooperatively by the MPO, State(s), and public transportation operator(s).

(v) For the outer years of the metropolitan transportation plan (*i.e.*, beyond the first 10 years), the financial plan may reflect aggregate cost ranges/cost bands, as long as the future funding source(s) is reasonably expected to be available to support the projected cost ranges/cost bands.

(vi) For nonattainment and maintenance areas, the financial plan shall address the specific financial strategies required to ensure the implementation of TCMs in the applicable SIP.

(vii) For illustrative purposes, the financial plan may include additional projects that would be included in the adopted transportation plan if additional resources beyond those identified in the financial plan were to become available.

(viii) In cases that the FHWA and the FTA find a metropolitan transportation plan to be fiscally constrained and a revenue source is subsequently removed or substantially reduced (*i.e.*, by legislative or administrative actions), the FHWA and the FTA will not withdraw the original determination of fiscal constraint; however, in such cases, the FHWA and the FTA will not act on an updated or amended metropolitan transportation plan that does not reflect the changed revenue situation.

(12) Pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g).

(g) The MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate:

(1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or

(2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available.

(h) The metropolitan transportation plan should integrate the priorities, goals, countermeasures, strategies, or projects for the metropolitan planning area contained in the HSIP, including the SHSP required under 23 U.S.C. 148, the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan required

under 49 U.S.C. 5329(d), or an Interim Agency Safety Plan in accordance with 49 CFR part 659, as in effect until completion of the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan, and may incorporate or reference applicable emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security, as appropriate, to safeguard the personal security of all motorized and non-motorized users.

(i) An MPO may, while fitting the needs and complexity of its community, voluntarily elect to develop multiple scenarios for consideration as part of the development of the metropolitan transportation plan.

(1) An MPO that chooses to develop multiple scenarios under this paragraph (i) is encouraged to consider:

(i) Potential regional investment strategies for the planning horizon;

(ii) Assumed distribution of population and employment;

(iii) A scenario that, to the maximum extent practicable, maintains baseline conditions for the performance areas identified in § 450.306(d) and measures established under 23 CFR part 490;

(iv) A scenario that improves the baseline conditions for as many of the performance measures identified in § 450.306(d) as possible;

(v) Revenue constrained scenarios based on the total revenues expected to be available over the forecast period of the plan; and

(vi) Estimated costs and potential revenues available to support each scenario.

(2) In addition to the performance areas identified in 23 U.S.C. 150(c), 49 U.S.C. 5326(c), and 5329(d), and the measures established under 23 CFR part 490, MPOs may evaluate scenarios developed under this paragraph using locally developed measures.

(j) The MPO shall provide individuals, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, such as carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cashout program, shuttle program, or telework program), representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan using the participation plan developed under § 450.316(a).

(k) The MPO shall publish or otherwise make readily available the metropolitan transportation plan for public review, including (to the maximum extent practicable) in electronically accessible formats and means, such as the World Wide Web.

(l) A State or MPO is not required to select any project from the illustrative list of additional projects included in the financial plan under paragraph (f)(11) of this section.

(m) In nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related pollutants, the MPO, as well as the FHWA and the FTA, must make a conformity determination on any updated or amended transportation plan in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the EPA transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). A 12-month conformity lapse grace period will be implemented when an area misses an applicable deadline, in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the transportation conformity regulations (40 CFR part 93, subpart A). At the end of this 12-month grace period, the existing conformity determination will lapse. During a conformity lapse, MPOs can prepare an interim metropolitan transportation plan as a basis for advancing projects that are eligible to proceed under a conformity lapse. An interim metropolitan transportation plan consisting of eligible projects from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP may proceed immediately without revisiting the requirements of this section, subject to interagency consultation defined in 40 CFR part 93, subpart A. An interim metropolitan transportation plan containing eligible projects that are not from, or consistent with, the most recent conforming transportation plan and TIP must meet all the requirements of this section.

Appendix B

Performance Based Planning

A. Performance Measures

The MRMPO adopted targets in February 2018 for the Safety performance measures (discussed below) and accepted the Transit Asset Management performance measures established by JCT (discussed below).

To be reported on annually as required for state DOTs and MPOs:

1. Fatalities
2. Fatality Rate (Fatalities/100M Vehicle Miles Traveled)
3. Serious Injuries
4. Serious Injury Rate (Serious Injuries/100M Vehicle Miles Traveled)
5. Nonmotorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries

Note that more detailed information on ODOT performance measures and targets is provided in the 2016 Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan.

B. Safety

MPOs can use the state established targets or establish targets specifically for the planning area for performance measures listed above. The MRMPO is currently using ODOT's established targets, which are based on an S-curve forecast trend using five-year averages to achieve the vision of zero fatalities and life-changing injuries by 2035. The targets are applicable to all public roads in the MPO and must be reported annually. For reference, Table 1 below identifies each target baseline and five-year average target for the five performance measures out to 2015-2019 for the entire state of Oregon.

Table 1 - Statewide Safety Targets

Safety					
Base Period	Fatalities (People)	Fatality Rate (People per 100 Million VMT)	Serious Injuries (People)	Serious Injury Rate (People per 100 Million VMT)	Non-motorized Fatalities and Serious Injuries (People)
2021 Baseline reported Crashes (2014-2018)	448	1.48	1,739	5.03	257
2022 First Year Reported Crashes (2015-2019)	444	1.46	1,722	4.98	254
The federal performance areas and targets addressing safety are contained in the Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan.					

How projects in the TIP help achieve Safety Targets

The safety of all users on our transportation system has always been a high priority for MRMPO and the local jurisdictions, especially vulnerable users. One of the goals of the MRMPO 2024-2049 Regional Transportation Systems Plan (RTSP) is to have a regional transportation system plan that is designed with the safety of all users in mind. The scoring criteria used to prioritize projects that are considered for MRMPO funding directly links the goals of the RTSP with the selection of projects.

Almost every project in the TIP has a safety element. Projects that more directly benefit the safety of the transportation system include:

- HSIP projects – HSIP projects are specifically selected to improve the safety of the roadway. Projects include buffered bike lanes, road diet, enhanced pedestrian crossings, signal improvements, curve warning signs, rumble strips, turn lanes, and other proven safety measures.
- Urban Upgrade Projects - Projects that add bike lanes and sidewalks along the roadway reduce the need for non-motorists to walk or bike in the roadway, along narrow shoulders, or in the ditch. Separating the vulnerable users from motor vehicles provides a safer environment, reducing the chances of dying or being seriously injured.
- Intersection Improvements – Projects that add, or replace, traffic signals and/or add turn lanes reduce the potential for serious crashes. Most crashes occur at intersections.

C. Pavement and Bridge Condition

ODOT established statewide targets for each of the six pavement and National Highway System (NHS) bridge condition performance measures and reports progress every four years. The MRMPO has adopted the state's targets for this measure.

D. Performance of the National Highway System (NHS)

ODOT established statewide targets for each of the six performance measures evaluating the system performance of the NHS and reports on progress every four years. These include travel time reliability, freight movement, Congestion and Air Quality Program (CMAQ). For the CMAQ measures, only the total emissions reduction for all CMAQ funded project measure is required for MPOs with more than 200,000 people during the first reporting period (January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2021). The MRMPO is unaffected by this measure.

Table 2 Federal Performance Measures

FAST ACT (FHWA) Performance Measures		2022 Performance Baseline	2023 (2 Year) Performance Target	2025 (4 Year) Performance Target
Pavement Condition				
1. Percentage of pavements of Interstate System in Good condition		57.7%	50.0%	50.0%
2. Percentage of pavements of the Interstate System in Poor condition		0.2%	0.5%	0.5%
3. Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Good condition		33.5%	30.0%	30.0%
4. Percentage of pavements of the non-Interstate NHS in Poor condition		2.9%	5.0%	5.0%
Bridge Condition				
5. Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Good condition		13.%%	11.4%	10.0%
6. Percentage of NHS bridges classified as in Poor condition		1.8%	2.4%	3.0%
National Highway System Performance				
7. Percent of the person-miles traveled on the Interstate that are reliable (Interstate Travel Time Reliability measure)		78%	78%	78%
8. Percent of person-miles traveled on the non-Interstate NHS that are reliable (Non-Interstate Travel Time Reliability measure)		78%	78%	78%
Freight Movement on Interstate System				
9. Truck Travel Time Reliability (TTTR) Index (Freight Reliability measure)		1.45	1.45	1.45
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality - Traffic Congestion				
ODOT and CLMPO	**10.** Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita	3.6 hours	8.5 hours	9 hours
	11. Percent of Non-SOV Travel	30.2%	33.0%	35.0%
ODOT and SKATS	**10.** Annual Hours of Peak Hour Excessive Delay (PHED) Per Capita	7 hours	7 hours	7 hours
	11. Percent of Non-SOV Travel	24%	23.2%	22.7%
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality - On-Road Mobile Source Emissions				
12. Total Emissions Reduction; 2-year and 4-year cumulative reported emission reductions, for all projects funded by CMAQ funds, of each criteria pollutant and applicable precursors (PM2.5, PM10, CO, VOC, and NOx) under the CMAQ program for which the area is designated nonattainment or maintenance		**Baseline**	**2 Year** Kg/Day:	**4 Year** Kg/Day:
	VOC	N/A	N/A	N/A
	CO	92.25	46.13	92.25
	NOx	0	0	0
	PM10	1115.03	557.51	1115.03
	PM2.5	0	0	0

*FHWA Performance Areas and Measures are contained in the Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) Appendix D
~ Adopted May 17, 2018 (Original 2006 OTP is currently under Revision)

The Oregon Highway Plan addresses the FHWA performance management requirements for National Highway Performance, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality, and National Freight Movement. The performance based planning process and performance targets contained in this amendment are for ODOT's federal reporting requirements only. The requirements and targets addressed in this amendment are not applicable to the Transportation Planning Rule for consistency in regional and local transportation system plans. The federal performance areas and targets regarding public transportation are contained in the Oregon Transit Asset Management Plan, and will be referenced in the Oregon Public Transportation Plan.

E. Transit Asset Management (TAM)

In 2012, MAP-21 mandated FTA to develop a rule establishing a strategic and systematic process of operating, maintaining, and improving public capital assets effectively through their entire life cycle. The FTA Final Rule for Transit Asset Management (49 USC 625) established four performance measures for transit districts.

1) Rolling Stock: The percentage of revenue vehicles (by type) that exceed the useful life benchmark (ULB).
2) Equipment: The percentage of non-revenue service vehicles (by type) that exceed the ULB.
3) Facilities: The percentage of facilities (by group) that are rated less than 3.0 on the Transit Economic Requirements Model (TERM) Scale.
4) Infrastructure: The percentage of track segments (by mode) that have performance restrictions. Track segments are measured to the nearest 0.01 of a mile. (JCT does not operate a track system; therefore, this measure does not apply.)

JCT is designated as a Tier II transit agency and relies on the Oregon Public Transit Tier II Transit Asset Management Plan to meet the federal TAM target requirements. The MRMPO supports the Josephine Community Transit (JCT) Tier II TAM targets.

How projects in the TIP help achieve JCT TAM Targets

The MRMPO is committed to supporting the transit system in the area. Historically, MRMPO's federal funds have been used to help purchase approximately one bus per year as well as promote greater accessibility. For efficiency purposes, the funds for several years and sources have been combined for one larger purchase once every several years.

Table 3 on the following page shows Tier II transit agency TAM targets.

Table 3 Tier II TAM Plan Performance Targets

Tier II Group TAM Plan Performance Targets

Asset Type	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
Equipment - Automobiles	40%	40%	40%	25%	12%	8%
Equipment - Truck and other Rubber Tire Vehicles			40%	45%	44%	45%
Rolling Stock - Articulated Bus					30%	20%
Rolling Stock - Over the Road Bus	20%	20%			75%	78%
Rolling Stock - Bus	40%	40%	20%	25%	20%	25%
Rolling Stock - Cutaway	40%	40%	50%	40%	32%	38%
Rolling Stock - Van	40%	40%	45%	41%	45%	40%
Rolling Stock - Minivan	40%	40%	45%	41%	32%	34%
Rolling Stock - SUV	40%	40%	40%	23%	38%	31%
Rolling Stock - Automobile	40%	40%	45%	63%	50%	50%
Facilities - Passenger / Parking Facilities	10%	10%	50%	0%	0%	0%
Facilities - Administrative / Maintenance Facilities	10%	10%	20%	3%	1.5%	1.5%

Appendix C

Tier 2 Project List

Additional projects identified as necessary and important by all jurisdictions, called Tier 2 projects, are presented in Table C-1 on the following page. Please note, no funding has been identified for Tier 2 projects.

Table C- 1

Tier 2 RTP Projects				
PROJECT NUMBER	**LOCATION**	**DESCRIPTION**	**TIMING**	**COST**
Gold Hill				
0	No Teir 2 Projects		Teir 2	
			Teir 2 Total	**$0**
Grants Pass				
GP-006	Fruitdale Drive: Parkdale Drive to Cloverlawn Drive	Full reconstruction of collector. 42' wide, bike lanes and sidewalk.	Teir 2	$2,209,800
NEW	Fourth Bridge and Approaches	Full Construction of bridge approaches and the bridge connecting Lincoln Road to Allen Creek Road	Teir 2	$40,000,000
			Teir 2 Total	**$42,209,800**
Jackson County				
NEW	East Evans Creek Road: Rogue River City Limits to Rogue River High School	Widen to 3-lane urban major collector	Teir 2	$4,500,000
NEW	Foothill Boulevard: Rogue River City Limits to Rogue River UGB	Widen to 3-lane urban major collector	Teir 2	$3,000,000
NEW	Foothill Boulevard: Rogue River UGB to Josephine County Line	Install 6-foot shoulders consistent with rural major collector	Teir 2	$12,400,000
			Teir 2 Total	**$19,900,000**
Josephine County				
0	No Teir 2 Projects		Teir 2	
			Teir 2 Total	**$0**
Rogue River				
0	No Teir 2 Projects		Teir 2	
			Teir 2 Total	**$0**
			Teir 2 RTP Total	**$62,109,800**

Appendix D

COMMON TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ACRONYMS AND TERMS

ACT:	Area Commission on Transportation
ADA:	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADT:	Average Daily Traffic
AQMA:	Air Quality Maintenance Area
CAAA:	Clean Air Act Amendments
CBD:	Central Business District
CMAQ:	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality
CO:	Carbon Monoxide
DLCD:	Department of Land Conservation and Development
EPA:	Environmental Protection Agency
FFY:	Federal Fiscal Year: from October 1 to September 31.
FHWA:	Federal Highway Administration
FTA:	Federal Transit Administration
FTZ:	Foreign Trade Zone
FY:	Fiscal Year: (Oregon state fiscal year from July 1 to June 30)
GCP:	General Corridor Planning
GIS:	Geographic Information Systems
HOT:	High Occupancy Toll lane with extra charge for single occupants
HOV:	High Occupancy Vehicle lane for vehicles with more than one occupant
HPMS:	Highway Performance Monitoring System
I/M or I & M:	Inspection and Maintenance Program for emissions control
ISTEA:	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (1991), replaced by **TEA-21**, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, expired in 2003
ITS:	Intelligent Transportation Systems
LOS:	Level of Service, a measure of traffic congestion from A (free-flow) to F (grid-lock)
LRT:	Light Rail Transit, self-propelled rail cars such as Portland's MAX
MAP-21	Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century; 2013 transportation act.
MIS:	Major Investment Study
MOU:	Memorandum of Understanding
MPO:	Metropolitan Planning Organization, a planning body in an urbanized area over 50,000 population which has responsibility for developing transportation plans for that area
MTIP:	Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (same as TIP)
NAAQS:	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NARC:	National Association of Regional Councils
NHS:	National Highway System
NPTS:	Nationwide Personal Transportation Survey
NTI:	National Transit Institute

OAR:	Oregon Administrative Rules
ODFW:	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
ODOT:	Oregon Department of Transportation
ORS:	Oregon Revised Statutes
OTC:	Oregon Transportation Commission, ODOT's governing body
OTP:	Oregon Transportation Plan
PC:	MPO Policy Committee
PL Funds:	Public Law 112, Federal Planning Funds
PM_{10}:	Particulate Matter of less than 10 Micrometers
$PM_{2.5}$:	Particulate Matter of less than 2.5 Micrometers
RTP:	Regional Transportation Plan
RVACT:	Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation
RVCOG:	Rogue Valley Council of Governments
RVIA:	Rogue Valley International Airport
RVTD:	Rogue Valley Transportation District
SAFETEA-LU	Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, the current 6-year surface transportation act, expired Sept. 2009
SIP:	State Implementation Plan
SOV:	Single Occupancy Vehicle
STA:	Special Transportation Area
STIP:	Statewide Transportation Improvement Program
STP:	Surface Transportation Program
TAC:	MPO Technical Advisory Committee
TAZ:	Transportation Analysis Zones
TCM:	Traffic Control Measures
TDM:	Transportation Demand Management
TIP:	Transportation Improvement Program
TOD:	Transit Oriented Development
TPAU:	Transportation Planning Analysis Unit
TPR:	Transportation Planning Rule
TRADCO:	Transportation Advisory Committee
TSM:	Transportation Systems Management
TSP:	Transportation System Plan
UGB:	Urban Growth Boundary
UPWP:	Unified Planning Work Program
US DOT:	U.S. Department of Transportation
VMT:	Vehicle Miles of Travel

Appropriation - Legislation that allocates budgeted funds from general revenues to programs that have been previously authorized by other legislation. The amount of money appropriated may be less than the amount authorized.

Authorization - Federal legislation that creates the policy and structure of a program including formulas and guidelines for awarding funds. Authorizing legislation may set an upper limit on program spending or may be open ended. General revenue funds to be spent under an authorization must be appropriated by separate legislation.

Capital Costs - Non-recurring or infrequently recurring cost of long-term assets, such as land, buildings, vehicles, and stations.

Conformity Analysis - A determination made by the MPOs and the US DOT that transportation plans and programs in non-attainment areas meet the "purpose" of the SIP, which is to reduce pollutant emissions to meet air quality standards.

Emissions Budget - The part of the SIP that identifies the allowable emissions levels for certain pollutants emitted from mobile, stationary, and area sources. The emissions levels are used for meeting emission reduction milestones, attainment, or maintenance demonstration.

Emissions Inventory - A complete list of sources and amounts of pollutant emissions within a specific area and time interval (part of the SIP).

Exempt / Non-Exempt Projects - Transportation projects which will not change the operating characteristics of a roadway are exempt from the Transportation Improvement Program conformity analysis. Conformity analysis must be completed on projects that affect the distance, speed, or capacity of a roadway.

Federal-aid Highways - Those highways eligible for assistance under Title 23 of the United States Code, as amended, except those functionally classified as local or rural minor collectors.

Functional Classification - The grouping of streets and highways into classes, or systems according to the character of service that they are intended to provide, e.g., residential, collector, arterial, etc.

Key Number - Unique number assigned by ODOT to identify projects in the TIP/STIP.

Maintenance - Activities that preserve the function of the existing transportation system.

Maintenance Area - "Any geographical region of the United States that the EPA has designated (under Section 175A of the CAA) for a transportation related pollutant(s) for which a national ambient air quality standard exists." This designation is used after non-attainment areas reach attainment.

Mobile Sources - Mobile sources of air pollutants include motor vehicles, aircraft, seagoing vessels, and other transportation modes. The mobile source related pollutants of greatest concern are carbon monoxide (CO), transportation hydrocarbons (HC), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM_{10}). Mobile sources are subject to a different set of regulations than are stationary and area sources of air pollutants.

Non-attainment Area - "Any geographic region of the United States that the EPA has designated as non-attainment for a transportation related pollutant(s) for which a national ambient air quality standard exists."

Regionally Significant – From OAR 340-252-0030 (39) "Regionally significant project" means a transportation project, other than an exempt project, that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs, such as access to and from the area outside the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves, and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum:
(a) All principal arterial highways;
(b) All fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel; and
(c) Any other facilities determined to be regionally significant through interagency consultation pursuant to OAR 340-252-0060.

3C - "Three C's" = continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative - This term refers to the requirements set forth in the Federal Highway Act of 1962 that transportation projects in urbanized areas be based on a "continuing, comprehensive transportation planning process carried out cooperatively by states and local communities." ISTEA's planning requirements broaden the framework for such a process to include consideration of important social, environmental and energy goals, and to involve the public in the process at several key decision making points.

APPENDIX E

MRMPO FINANCIAL FORECASTS & ASSUMPTIONS

City of Gold Hill

Table B-1 depicts the City of Gold Hill's estimated short, medium, and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue (discussed later in this Appendix) accounting for 90% of all revenue. The city anticipates receiving $50,000 every three years from ODOT's Small City Allotment (SCA) program. A 2% annual "year of expenditure" (YOE) or inflation factor is used to estimate future maintenance and operations costs.

Table B-1

City of Gold Hill														
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses ($ x 1,000)														
City Revenue Sources											Non-Capital Expenses			
					Local									
Year	Federl	Subtotal Federl	State	Subtotal State	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Utility Fee	Subtotals SUF	SCA	Subtotal SCA	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2024	$0		$105,239		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$51,559	
2025	$0		$106,593		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$52,590	
2026	$0		$107,416		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$53,905	
2027	$0		$107,676		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$55,253	
2028	$0	$0	$107,324	$534,248	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	$0	$56,634	**$269,941**
2029	$0		$107,403		$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$58,050	
2030	$0		$106,866		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$59,501	
2031	$0		$106,332		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$60,988	
2032	$0		$105,800		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$62,513	
2033	$0		$105,271		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$64,076	
2034	$0		$104,745		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$65,678	
2035	$0		$104,221		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$67,320	
2036	$0		$103,700		$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$69,003	
2037	$0		$103,181		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$70,728	
2038	$0	$0	$102,665	$1,050,184	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$100,000**	$0	$0	$72,496	**$650,353**
2039	$0		$102,152		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$74,309	
2040	$0		$101,641		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$76,166	
2041	$0		$101,133		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$78,070	
2042	$0		$100,627		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$80,022	
2043	$0		$100,124		$0		$0		$50,000		$0	$0	$82,023	
2044	$0		$99,624		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$84,073	
2045	$0		$99,126		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$86,175	
2046	$0		$98,630		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$88,330	
2047	$0		$98,137		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$90,538	
2048	$0		$97,646		$0		$0		$0		$0	$0	$92,801	
2049	$0	$0	$97,158	$1,095,998	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$50,000**	$0	$0	$95,121	**$927,628**
Totals	**$0**		**$2,680,430**		**$0**		**$0**		**$150,000**		**$0**	**$0**	**$1,847,922**	**$1,847,922**
Assumptions			0.5% annual decrease "YOE"		2% annual increase "YOE"		2% annual increase "YOE"		"YOE" refers to Year of Expenditure or inflation factor		2% annual increase "YOE"		2% annual increase "YOE"	

Source: City of Gold Hill

City of Grants Pass

The City of Grants Pass owns and maintains a large segment of the regional roadway network in the MRMPO. Therefore, the city's revenues and expenses will reflect the size of the city's population and roadway network. A 2.5% annual "year of expenditure" (YOE) or inflation factor is used to estimate future maintenance and operations costs.

Table B-2

City of Grants Pass													
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses ($ x 1,000)													
City Revenue Sources										Non-Capital Expenses			
				Local									
Year	Federal	State "Gas Tax Share"	Subtotal State	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Utility Fee	Subtotals SUF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2024		$2,900,000		$200,000		$1,225,000		$30,000		$600,000	$0	$1,475,000	
2025		$2,827,500		$205,000		$1,255,625		$30,000		$615,000	$0	$1,504,500	
2026		$2,756,813		$210,125		$1,287,016		$30,000		$630,375	$0	$1,542,113	
2027		$2,687,892		$215,378		$1,319,191		$30,000		$646,134	$0	$1,580,665	
2028		$2,620,695	**$13,792,900**	$220,763	**$1,051,266**	$1,352,171	**$6,439,002**	$30,000	**$150,000**	$662,288	$0	$1,620,182	**$10,876,257**
2029		$2,555,178		$226,282		$1,385,975		$30,000		$678,845	$0	$1,660,686	
2030		$2,491,298		$231,939		$1,420,624		$30,000		$695,816	$0	$1,702,204	
2031		$2,429,016		$237,737		$1,456,140		$30,000		$713,211	$0	$1,744,759	
2032		$2,368,290		$243,681		$1,492,544		$30,000		$731,042	$0	$1,788,378	
2033		$2,309,083		$249,773		$1,529,857		$30,000		$749,318	$0	$1,833,087	
2034		$2,251,356		$256,017		$1,568,104		$30,000		$768,051	$0	$1,878,914	
2035		$2,195,072		$262,417		$1,607,306		$30,000		$787,252	$0	$1,925,887	
2036		$2,140,195		$268,978		$1,647,489		$30,000		$806,933	$0	$1,974,034	
2037		$2,086,690		$275,702		$1,688,676		$30,000		$827,107	$0	$2,023,385	
2038		$2,034,523	**$22,860,701**	$282,595	**$2,535,120**	$1,730,893	**$15,527,608**	$30,000	**$300,000**	$847,784	$0	$2,073,970	**$26,210,664**
2039		$1,983,660		$289,660		$1,774,165		$30,000		$868,979	$0	$2,125,819	
2040		$1,934,068		$296,901		$1,818,519		$30,000		$890,703	$0	$2,178,965	
2041		$1,885,717		$304,324		$1,863,982		$30,000		$912,971	$0	$2,233,439	
2042		$1,838,574		$311,932		$1,910,582		$30,000		$935,795	$0	$2,289,275	
2043		$1,792,610		$319,730		$1,958,346		$30,000		$959,190	$0	$2,346,507	
2044		$1,747,794		$327,723		$2,007,305		$30,000		$983,170	$0	$2,405,169	
2045		$1,704,099		$335,916		$2,057,488		$30,000		$1,007,749	$0	$2,465,298	
2046		$1,661,497		$344,314		$2,108,925		$30,000		$1,032,943	$0	$2,526,931	
2047		$1,619,960		$352,922		$2,161,648		$30,000		$1,058,766	$0	$2,590,104	
2048		$1,579,461		$361,745		$2,215,689		$30,000		$1,085,236	$0	$2,654,857	
2049		$1,539,974	**$19,287,413**	$370,789	**$3,615,956**	$2,271,082	**$22,147,732**	$30,000	**$330,000**	$1,112,366	$0	$2,721,228	**$37,385,460**
Totals		**$55,941,014**	**$55,941,014**	**$7,202,342**	**$7,202,342**	**$44,114,342**	**$44,114,342**	**$780,000**	**$780,000**	**$21,607,025**	**$0**	**$52,865,356**	**$74,472,381**
Assumptions		2.5% annual decrease "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		"YOE" refers to Year of Expenditure or inflation factor		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5 % annual increase "YOE"	

Source: City of Grants Pass

Table B-2 above depicts the City of Grants Pass estimated short, medium and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue accounting for more than two thirds of all revenue. The City's Street Utility Fee (SUF) is the next largest source of revenue for transportation operations and maintenance and administration.

City of Rogue River

Table B-3 depicts the City of Rogue River's estimated short, medium and long-range local revenues and non-capital expenses. City revenue resources for transportation operations and maintenance primarily come from allocations of State Highway Fund (SHF) revenue accounting for more than 60% of all revenue. The City's local funds make up approximately 40% of revenue for debt service, maintenance, and administration.

Table B-3

Rogue River															
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses ($ x 1,000)															
City Revenue Sources												Non-Capital Expenses			
					Local										
Year	Federal	Subtotal Federal	State	Subtotal State	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Impact Fee	Subtotals SUF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc		Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2024	$ -		$ 171,753.00		$8,060		$18,900		$89,000			$164,703	$89,000	$190,650	
2025	$ -		$ 170,894.24		$8,262		$19,373		$89,000			$168,821	$89,000	$194,463	
2026	$ -		$ 170,039.76		$8,468		$19,857		$89,000			$173,041	$89,000	$199,325	
2027	$ -		$ 169,189.57		$8,680		$20,353		$339,000			$177,367	$89,000	$204,308	
2028	$ -	$ -	$ 168,343.62	$ 850,220.18	$8,897	**$42,366**	$20,862	**$99,345**	$89,000	**$695,000**		$181,801	$89,000	$209,415	**$2,308,894**
2029	$ -		$ 167,501.90		$9,119		$21,384		$89,000			$186,346	$89,000	$214,651	
2030	$ -		$ 166,664.39		$9,347		$21,918		$89,000			$191,005	$89,000	$220,017	
2031	$ -		$ 165,831.07		$9,581		$22,466		$339,000			$195,780	$89,000	$225,517	
2032	$ -		$ 165,001.91		$9,820		$23,028		$89,000			$200,675	$89,000	$231,155	
2033	$ -		$ 164,176.90		$10,066		$23,604		$89,000			$205,691	$89,000	$236,934	
2034	$ -		$ 163,356.02		$10,317		$24,194		$89,000			$210,834	$89,000	$242,858	
2035	$ -		$ 162,539.24		$10,575		$24,798		$339,000			$216,105	$89,000	$248,929	
2036	$ -		$ 161,726.54		$10,840		$25,418					$221,507	$0	$255,152	
2037	$ -		$ 160,917.91		$11,111		$26,054					$227,045	$0	$261,531	
2038	$ -	$ -	$ 160,113.32	$ 1,637,829.20	$11,389	**$102,165**	$26,705	**$239,569**		**$1,123,000**		$232,721	$0	$268,069	**$5,115,524**
2039	$ -		$ 159,312.75		$11,673		$27,373		$250,000			$238,539	$0	$274,771	
2040	$ -		$ 158,516.19		$11,965		$28,057					$244,503	$0	$281,640	
2041	$ -		$ 157,723.61		$12,264		$28,759					$250,615	$0	$288,681	
2042	$ -		$ 156,934.99		$12,571		$29,478					$256,880	$0	$295,898	
2043	$ -		$ 156,150.32		$12,885		$30,214		$250,000			$263,302	$0	$303,296	
2044	$ -		$ 155,369.56		$13,207		$30,970					$269,885	$0	$310,878	
2045	$ -		$ 154,592.72		$13,537		$31,744					$276,632	$0	$318,650	
2046	$ -		$ 153,819.75		$13,876		$32,538					$283,548	$0	$326,617	
2047	$ -		$ 153,050.65		$14,223		$33,351		$250,000			$290,637	$0	$334,782	
2048	$ -		$ 152,285.40		$14,578		$34,185					$297,903	$0	$343,151	
2049	$ -	$ -	$ 151,523.97	$ 1,709,279.92	$14,943	**$134,050**	$35,040	**$314,335**		**$750,000**		$305,350	$0	$351,730	**$6,407,890**
Totals	**$ -**		$ 4,197,329.30		**$290,254**	**$278,581**	**$680,621**	**$653,248**	$2,568,000	**$2,568,000**		**$5,931,236**	**$1,068,000**	**$6,833,071**	**$13,832,308**
sumptions			.5% annual gas tax decrease "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		Includes $89,000 per year from General Fund to 2025 and $250,000 every four years from SCA			2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"	

Source: City of Rogue River

Jackson County

Jackson County owns and maintains a portion of the regional roadway network in the MRMPO. Therefore, the county's revenues and expenses shown in Table B-4 reflects the portion of the county's population and roadway network within the MRMPO planning area. A 2.5% annual "year of expenditure" (YOE) or inflation factor is used to estimate future maintenance and operations costs.

Table B-4

Jackson County														
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses ($ x 1,000)														
County Revenue Sources											Non-Capital Expenses			
					Local									
Year	Federal	Subtotal Federal	State	Subtotal State	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Utility Fee	Subtotals SUF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2024	$1,076		$22,395		$809		$0		$3,718		$2,914	$29	$6,443	
2025	$1,103		$22,955		$829		$0		$3,811		$2,987	$29	$6,572	
2026	$1,131		$23,529		$850		$0		$3,906		$3,062	$0	$6,737	
2027	$1,159		$24,117		$871		$0		$4,004		$3,138	$0	$6,905	
2028	$1,188	**$5,658**	$24,720	**$117,716**	$893	**$4,252**	$0	**$0**	$4,104	**$19,541**	$3,217	$0	$7,078	**$49,111**
2029	$1,218		$25,338		$915		$0		$4,206		$3,297	$0	$7,255	
2030	$1,248		$25,971		$938		$0		$4,311		$3,380	$0	$7,436	
2031	$1,279		$26,621		$962		$0		$4,419		$3,464	$0	$7,622	
2032	$1,311		$27,286		$986		$0		$4,530		$3,551	$0	$7,812	
2033	$1,344		$27,968		$1,010		$0		$4,643		$3,640	$0	$8,008	
2034	$1,378		$28,668		$1,036		$0		$4,759		$3,731	$0	$8,208	
2035	$1,412		$29,384		$1,061		$0		$4,878		$3,824	$0	$8,413	
2036	$1,448		$30,119		$1,088		$0		$5,000		$3,919	$0	$8,623	
2037	$1,484		$30,872		$1,115		$0		$5,125		$4,017	$0	$8,839	
2038	$1,521	**$13,644**	$31,644	**$283,870**	$1,143	**$10,254**	$0	**$0**	$5,253	**$47,124**	$4,118	$0	$9,060	**$118,216**
2039	$1,559		$32,435		$1,172		$0		$5,384		$4,221	$0	$9,286	
2040	$1,598		$33,246		$1,201		$0		$5,519		$4,326	$0	$9,519	
2041	$1,638		$34,077		$1,231		$0		$5,657		$4,434	$0	$9,757	
2042	$1,679		$34,929		$1,262		$0		$5,798		$4,545	$0	$10,000	
2043	$1,721		$35,802		$1,293		$0		$5,943		$4,659	$0	$10,250	
2044	$1,764		$36,697		$1,326		$0		$6,092		$4,775	$0	$10,507	
2045	$1,808		$37,614		$1,359		$0		$6,244		$4,895	$0	$10,769	
2046	$1,853		$38,555		$1,393		$0		$6,400		$5,017	$0	$11,039	
2047	$1,899		$39,518		$1,427		$0		$6,560		$5,143	$0	$11,315	
2048	$1,947		$40,506		$1,463		$0		$6,724		$5,271	$0	$11,597	
2049	$1,996	**$19,461**	$41,519	**$404,897**	$1,500	**$14,626**	$0	**$0**	$6,892	**$67,215**	$5,403	$0	$11,887	**$168,617**
Totals	**$38,762**		**$806,483**		**$29,132**	**$29,132**	**$0**	**$0**	**$133,880**	**$133,880**	**$104,949**	**$58**	**$230,937**	**$335,944**
Assumptions	2.5% annual inc. "YOE"		2.5% annual incr "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual incr "YOE"		2.5% annual increase "YOE"		2.5% annual incr "YOE"	

Source: Jackson County

Josephine County

Josephine County owns and maintains a portion of the regional roadway network in the MRMPO. Therefore, the county's revenues and expenses shown in Table B-5 reflects the portion of the county's population and roadway network within the MRMPO planning area. A 2.5% annual "year of expenditure" (YOE) or inflation factor is used to estimate future maintenance and operations costs.

Table B-5

Jpsephine County														
Street System Local Revenues and Non-Capital Expenses ($ x 1,000)														
City Revenue Sources											Non-Capital Expenses			
Year	Federl	Subtotal Federl	State	Subtotal State	System Dev Charges	Subtotals SDC	Street Utility Fee	Subtotals SUF	Misc.	Subtotal Misc	Admin	Debt Service	Maint.	Subtotal Non Capital
2024	$0		$ 9,841,241		$0		$0		$0		$603,580	$0	$9,544,000	
2025	$0		$ 10,133,959		$0		$0		$0		$615,652	$0	$9,734,880	
2026	$0		$ 10,193,047		$0		$0		$0		$627,965	$0	$9,929,578	
2027	$0		$ 10,195,899		$0		$0		$0		$640,524	$0	$10,128,169	
2028	$0	**$0**	$ 10,501,776	**$ 50,865,922**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$653,334	$0	$10,330,733	**$52,808,414**
2029	$0		$ 10,816,829		$0		$0		$0		$666,401	$0	$10,537,347	
2030	$0		$ 11,141,334		$0		$0		$0		$679,729	$0	$10,748,094	
2031	$0		$ 11,475,574		$0		$0		$0		$693,324	$0	$10,963,056	
2032	$0		$ 11,819,841		$0		$0		$0		$707,190	$0	$11,182,317	
2033	$0		$ 12,174,437		$0		$0		$0		$721,334	$0	$11,405,963	
2034	$0		$ 12,539,670		$0		$0		$0		$735,761	$0	$11,634,083	
2035	$0		$ 12,915,860		$0		$0		$0		$750,476	$0	$11,866,764	
2036	$0		$ 13,303,336		$0		$0		$0		$765,485	$0	$12,104,100	
2037	$0		$ 13,702,436		$0		$0		$0		$780,795	$0	$12,346,182	
2038	$0	**$0**	$ 14,113,509	**$124,002,825**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$796,411	$0	$12,593,105	**$122,677,918**
2039	$0		$ 14,536,914		$0		$0		$0		$812,339	$0	$12,844,967	
2040	$0		$ 14,973,021		$0		$0		$0		$828,586	$0	$13,101,867	
2041	$0		$ 15,422,212		$0		$0		$0		$845,158	$0	$13,363,904	
2042	$0		$ 15,884,878		$0		$0		$0		$862,061	$0	$13,631,182	
2043	$0		$ 16,361,425		$0		$0		$0		$879,302	$0	$13,903,806	
2044	$0		$ 16,852,268		$0		$0		$0		$896,888	$0	$14,181,882	
2045	$0		$ 17,357,836		$0		$0		$0		$914,826	$0	$14,465,520	
2046	$0		$ 17,878,571		$0		$0		$0		$933,122	$0	$14,754,830	
2047	$0		$ 18,414,928		$0		$0		$0		$951,785	$0	$15,049,927	
2048	$0		$ 18,967,376		$0		$0		$0		$970,821	$0	$15,350,925	
2049	$0	**$0**	$ 19,536,397	**$186,185,824**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$0	**$0**	$990,237	$0	$15,657,944	**$166,191,878**
Totals			**$ 361,054,572**		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	$0	**$0**	**$20,323,085**	**$0**	**$321,355,124**	**$341,678,209**
Assumptions			3% annual increase "YOE"		% annual increase		% annual increase				2% annual increase "YOE"		2% annual increase "YOE"	

Source: Josephine County

Table B-6 shows the estimated revenue projection for Josephine Community Transit (JCT) for 2024 to 2049. Assumptions are included at the bottom of the chart.

Table B-6: JCT Revenue Projections, FYE 2024 to 2049

		Revenues							
	Year	5307 (FTA)	STIF	FTA (ODOT)	Grants Pass	Contract Services	Farebox	5309 Capital	TOTALS
Short	2024	$ 1,073,500	$ 1,378,995	$ 661,854	$ 137,500	$ 62,000	$ 98,500	$ 628,000	$ 4,040,349
	2025	$ 1,100,338	$ 1,413,470	$ 678,400	$ 140,938	$ 63,550	$ 100,963	$ 628,000	$ 4,125,658
	2026	$ 1,127,846	$ 1,448,807	$ 695,360	$ 144,461	$ 65,139	$ 103,487	$ 628,000	$ 4,213,099
	2027	$ 1,156,042	$ 1,485,027	$ 712,744	$ 148,072	$ 66,767	$ 106,074	$ 673,000	$ 4,347,727
	2028	$ 1,184,943	$ 1,522,152	$ 730,563	$ 151,774	$ 68,436	$ 108,726	$ 673,000	$ 4,439,595
Medium	2029	$ 1,214,567	$ 1,560,206	$ 748,827	$ 155,569	$ 70,147	$ 111,444	$ 727,000	$ 4,587,760
	2030	$ 1,244,931	$ 1,599,211	$ 767,548	$ 159,458	$ 71,901	$ 114,230	$ 727,000	$ 4,684,279
	2031	$ 1,276,054	$ 1,639,192	$ 786,736	$ 163,444	$ 73,699	$ 117,086	$ 727,000	$ 4,783,211
	2032	$ 1,307,956	$ 1,680,172	$ 806,405	$ 167,530	$ 75,541	$ 120,013	$ 727,000	$ 4,884,616
	2033	$ 1,340,654	$ 1,722,176	$ 826,565	$ 171,719	$ 77,430	$ 123,013	$ 727,000	$ 4,988,556
	2034	$ 1,374,171	$ 1,765,230	$ 847,229	$ 176,012	$ 79,365	$ 126,088	$ 727,000	$ 5,095,095
	2035	$ 1,408,525	$ 1,809,361	$ 868,410	$ 180,412	$ 81,349	$ 129,241	$ 750,000	$ 5,227,298
	2036	$ 1,443,738	$ 1,854,595	$ 890,120	$ 184,922	$ 83,383	$ 132,472	$ 750,000	$ 5,339,230
	2037	$ 1,479,832	$ 1,900,960	$ 912,373	$ 189,545	$ 85,468	$ 135,783	$ 750,000	$ 5,453,961
	2038	$ 1,516,827	$ 1,948,484	$ 935,182	$ 194,284	$ 87,604	$ 139,178	$ 750,000	$ 5,571,560
	2039	$ 1,554,748	$ 1,997,196	$ 958,562	$ 199,141	$ 89,794	$ 142,657	$ 772,000	$ 5,714,099
Long	2040	$ 1,593,617	$ 2,047,126	$ 982,526	$ 204,120	$ 92,039	$ 146,224	$ 772,000	$ 5,837,651
	2041	$ 1,633,457	$ 2,098,304	$ 1,007,089	$ 209,223	$ 94,340	$ 149,879	$ 772,000	$ 5,964,293
	2042	$ 1,674,294	$ 2,150,762	$ 1,032,266	$ 214,453	$ 96,699	$ 153,626	$ 772,000	$ 6,094,100
	2043	$ 1,716,151	$ 2,204,531	$ 1,058,073	$ 219,814	$ 99,116	$ 157,467	$ 772,000	$ 6,227,152
	2044	$ 1,759,055	$ 2,259,644	$ 1,084,525	$ 225,310	$ 101,594	$ 161,404	$ 772,000	$ 6,363,531
	2045	$ 1,803,031	$ 2,316,135	$ 1,111,638	$ 230,943	$ 104,134	$ 165,439	$ 772,000	$ 6,503,319
	2046	$ 1,848,107	$ 2,374,038	$ 1,139,429	$ 236,716	$ 106,737	$ 169,575	$ 772,000	$ 6,646,602
	2047	$ 1,894,310	$ 2,433,389	$ 1,167,915	$ 242,634	$ 109,406	$ 173,814	$ 772,000	$ 6,793,467
	2048	$ 1,941,667	$ 2,494,224	$ 1,197,113	$ 248,700	$ 112,141	$ 178,160	$ 772,000	$ 6,944,004
	2049	$ 1,990,209	$ 2,556,580	$ 1,227,040	$ 254,917	$ 114,945	$ 182,613	$ 772,000	$ 7,098,304
	Totals	**$38,658,569**	**$49,659,965**	**$23,834,493**	**$ 4,951,610**	**$2,232,726**	**$3,547,153**	**$ 19,084,000**	**$141,968,516**
	Assum	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	% annual increase "YOE"	

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Table B-7 shows the estimated expenses for Josephine Community Transit (JCT) for 2024 to 2049. Assumptions are included at the bottom of the chart.

Table B-7: JCT Estimated Expenses, FYE 2024 to 2049

Expenses						
	Year	Ops	Maint	Admin	5309 Capital	TOTALS
Short	2024	$ 2,144,833	$ 567,000	$ 626,967	$ 700,000	$ 4,038,800
	2025	$ 2,198,454	$ 581,175	$ 642,641	$ 700,000	$ 4,122,270
	2026	$ 2,253,415	$ 595,704	$ 658,707	$ 700,000	$ 4,207,827
	2027	$ 2,309,751	$ 610,597	$ 675,175	$ 750,000	$ 4,345,522
	2028	$ 2,367,494	$ 625,862	$ 692,054	$ 750,000	$ 4,435,410
Medium	2029	$ 2,426,682	$ 641,508	$ 709,356	$ 750,000	$ 4,527,546
	2030	$ 2,487,349	$ 657,546	$ 727,090	$ 810,000	$ 4,681,984
	2031	$ 2,549,532	$ 673,985	$ 745,267	$ 810,000	$ 4,778,784
	2032	$ 2,613,271	$ 690,834	$ 763,898	$ 810,000	$ 4,878,004
	2033	$ 2,678,603	$ 708,105	$ 782,996	$ 810,000	$ 4,979,704
	2034	$ 2,745,568	$ 725,808	$ 802,571	$ 810,000	$ 5,083,946
	2035	$ 2,814,207	$ 743,953	$ 822,635	$ 835,000	$ 5,215,795
	2036	$ 2,884,562	$ 762,552	$ 843,201	$ 835,000	$ 5,325,315
	2037	$ 2,956,676	$ 781,616	$ 864,281	$ 835,000	$ 5,437,573
	2038	$ 3,030,593	$ 801,156	$ 885,888	$ 835,000	$ 5,552,637
	2039	$ 3,106,358	$ 821,185	$ 908,035	$ 860,000	$ 5,695,578
Long	2040	$ 3,184,017	$ 841,715	$ 930,736	$ 860,000	$ 5,816,467
	2041	$ 3,263,617	$ 862,758	$ 954,004	$ 860,000	$ 5,940,379
	2042	$ 3,345,207	$ 884,326	$ 977,855	$ 860,000	$ 6,067,389
	2043	$ 3,428,838	$ 906,435	$ 1,002,301	$ 860,000	$ 6,197,573
	2044	$ 3,514,559	$ 929,096	$ 1,027,358	$ 860,000	$ 6,331,013
	2045	$ 3,602,423	$ 952,323	$ 1,053,042	$ 860,000	$ 6,467,788
	2046	$ 3,692,483	$ 976,131	$ 1,079,368	$ 860,000	$ 6,607,983
	2047	$ 3,784,795	$ 1,000,534	$ 1,106,353	$ 860,000	$ 6,751,682
	2048	$ 3,879,415	$ 1,025,548	$ 1,134,011	$ 860,000	$ 6,898,974
	2049	$ 3,976,400	$ 1,051,186	$ 1,162,362	$ 860,000	$ 7,049,949
	Totals	**$ 77,239,100**	**$20,418,638**	**$ 22,578,153**	**$ 21,200,000**	**$ 141,435,891**
	Assum	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	2.5% annual increase "YOE"	% annual increase "YOE"	

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Table B-8 is a summary of revenues and expenses for JCT for 2024 to 2049. The analysis shows that transit revenues will exceed expenses through the planning horizon of 2049, based on carryover from the short-range timeframe of the plan.

Table B-8: JCT Revenue & Expense Summary, FYE 2024 to 2049

JCT Revenue Summary					
Revenue Source	**Fund**	**Time Frame**			**Totals**
		Short	**Medium**	**Long**	
Federal	S5307	$ 5,642,669	$ 15,162,003	$ 17,853,897	**$ 38,658,569**
	NEMT	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**
	5311	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**
State	STIF	$ 7,248,451	$ 19,476,782	$ 22,934,732	**$ 49,659,965**
	FTA (ODOT)	$ 3,478,922	$ 9,347,957	$ 11,007,614	**$ 23,834,493**
Local	Contract Services	$ 325,892	$ 875,682	$ 1,031,152	**$ 2,232,726**
	Farebox Returns	$ 517,748	$ 1,391,204	$ 1,638,201	**$ 3,547,153**
	Grants Pass	$ 722,745	$ 1,942,036	$ 2,286,829	**$ 4,951,610**
Other Federal	CMAQ	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**
	5309 Capital	$ 3,230,000	$ 8,134,000	$ 7,720,000	**$ 19,084,000**
	5310	$ -	$ -	$ -	**$ -**
Totals		$ 21,166,427	$ 56,329,663	$ 64,472,425	**$ 141,968,516**

JCT Expense Summary				
Expenses	**Time Frame**			**Totals**
	Short	**Medium**	**Long**	
Operations	$ 11,273,947	$ 30,293,399	$ 35,671,754	**$ 77,239,100**
Maintenance	$ 2,980,338	$ 8,008,249	$ 9,430,051	**$ 20,418,638**
Administration	$ 3,295,545	$ 8,855,217	$ 10,427,391	**$ 22,578,153**
5309 Capital Grants	$ 3,600,000	$ 9,000,000	$ 8,600,000	**$ 21,200,000**
Sub-total	$ 21,149,830	$ 56,156,865	$ 64,129,196	$ 141,435,891
Net Balance	**$ 16,598**	**$ 189,396**	**$ 532,625**	**$ 532,625**

Source: Josephine Community Transit; RVCOG forecasting

Appendix F

2021 Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)

Each fiscal year during the development of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP), the MPO reviews the current USDOT Planning Emphasis Areas to identify topics to address in the work program.

Tackling the Climate Crisis – Transition to a Clean Energy, Resilient Future

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) divisions and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) regional offices should work with State departments of transportation (State DOT), metropolitan planning organizations (MPO), and providers of public transportation to ensure that our transportation plans and infrastructure investments help achieve the national greenhouse gas reduction goals of 50-52 percent below 2005 levels by 2030, and net-zero emissions by 2050, and increase resilience to extreme weather events and other disasters resulting from the increasing effects of climate change. Field offices should encourage State DOTs and MPOs to use the transportation planning process to accelerate the transition toward electric and other alternative fueled vehicles, plan for a sustainable infrastructure system that works for all users, and undertake actions to prepare for and adapt to the impacts of climate change. Appropriate Unified Planning Work Program work tasks could include identifying the barriers to and opportunities for deployment of fueling and charging infrastructure; evaluating opportunities to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips and increasing access to public transportation, shift to lower emission modes of transportation ; and identifying transportation system vulnerabilities to climate change impacts and evaluating potential solutions. We encourage you to visit FHWA's Sustainable Transportation or FTA's Transit and Sustainability Webpages for more information.

(See EO 14008 on "Tackling the Climate Crisis at Home and Abroad," EO 13990 on "Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis." EO 14030 on "Climate-Related Financial Risk," See also FHWA Order 5520 "Transportation System Preparedness and Resilience to Extreme Weather Events," FTA's "Hazard Mitigation Cost Effectiveness Tool," FTA's "Emergency Relief Manual," and "TCRP Document 70: Improving the Resilience of Transit Systems Threatened by Natural Disasters")

Equity and Justice40 in Transportation Planning

FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should work with State DOTs, MPOs, and providers of public transportation to advance racial equity and support for underserved and disadvantaged communities. This will help ensure public involvement in the planning process and that plans and strategies reflect various perspectives, concerns, and priorities from impacted areas. We encourage the use of strategies that:

1) improve infrastructure for non-motorized travel, public transportation access, and increased public transportation service in underserved communities;
2) plan for the safety of all road users, particularly those on arterials, through infrastructure improvements and advanced speed management;

3) reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel and associated air pollution in communities near high-volume corridors;
4) offer reduced public transportation fares as appropriate;
5) target demand-response service towards communities with higher concentrations of older adults and those with poor access to essential services; and
6) consider equitable and sustainable practices while developing transit-oriented development including affordable housing strategies and consideration of environmental justice populations.

Executive Order 13985 ***(Advancing Racial Equity and Support for Underserved Communities)*** defines the term "equity" as the consistent and systematic fair, just, and impartial treatment of all individuals, including individuals who belong to underserved communities that have been denied such treatment, such as Black, Latino, and Indigenous and Native American persons, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and other persons of color; members of religious minorities; lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ+) persons; persons with disabilities; persons who live in rural areas; and persons otherwise adversely affected by persistent poverty or inequality. The term "underserved communities" refers to populations sharing a particular characteristic, as well as geographic communities, that have been systematically denied a full opportunity to participate in aspects of economic, social, and civic life, as exemplified by the list in the preceding definition of "equity." In addition, Executive Order 14008 and M-21-28 provides a whole-of-government approach to advancing environmental justice by stating that 40 percent of Federal investments flow to disadvantaged communities. FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should work with State DOTs, MPOs, and providers of public transportation to review current and new metropolitan transportation plans to advance Federal investments to disadvantaged communities.

To accomplish both initiatives, our joint planning processes should support State and MPO goals for economic opportunity in disadvantaged communities that have been historically marginalized and overburdened by pollution and underinvestment in housing, transportation, water and wastewater infrastructure, recreation, and health care.

Complete Streets

FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should work with State DOTs, MPOs and providers of public transportation to review current policies, rules, and procedures to determine their impact on safety for all road users. This effort should work to include provisions for safety in future transportation infrastructure, particularly those outside automobiles.

A complete street is safe, and feels safe, for everyone using the street. FHWA and FTA seek to help Federal aid recipients plan, develop, and operate streets and networks that prioritize safety, comfort, and access to destinations for people who use the street network, including pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, micro-mobility users, freight delivery services, and motorists. The goal is to provide an equitable and safe transportation network for travelers of all ages and abilities, including those from marginalized communities facing historic disinvestment. This vision is not achieved through a one-size-fits-all solution – each complete street is unique and developed to best serve its community context and its primary role in the network.

Per the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's 2019 data, 62 percent of the motor vehicle crashes that resulted in pedestrian fatalities took place on arterials. Arterials tend to be designed for vehicle movement rather than mobility for non-motorized users and often lack convenient and safe crossing opportunities. They can function as barriers to a safe travel network for road users outside of vehicles.

To be considered complete, these roads should include safe pedestrian facilities, safe transit stops (if present), and safe crossing opportunities on an interval necessary for accessing destinations. A safe and complete network for bicycles can also be achieved through a safe and comfortable bicycle facility located on the roadway, adjacent to the road, or on a nearby parallel corridor. Jurisdictions will be encouraged to prioritize safety improvements and speed management on arterials that are essential to creating complete travel networks for those without access to single-occupancy vehicles.

Public Involvement

Early, effective, and continuous public involvement brings diverse viewpoints into the decision making process. FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should encourage MPOs, State DOTs, and providers of public transportation to increase meaningful public involvement in transportation planning by integrating Virtual Public Involvement (VPI) tools into the overall public involvement approach while ensuring continued public participation by individuals without access to computers and mobile devices. The use of VPI broadens the reach of information to the public and makes participation more convenient and affordable to greater numbers of people. Virtual tools provide increased transparency and access to transportation planning activities and decision making processes. Many virtual tools also provide information in visual and interactive formats that enhance public and stakeholder understanding of proposed plans, programs, and projects. Increasing participation earlier in the process can reduce project delays and lower staff time and costs. More information on VPI is available here.

Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)/U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) Coordination

FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should encourage MPOs and State DOTs to coordinate with representatives from DOD in the transportation planning and project programming process on infrastructure and connectivity needs for STRAHNET routes and other public roads that connect to DOD facilities. According to the Declaration of Policy in 23 U.S.C. 101(b)(1), it is in the national interest to accelerate construction of the Federal-aid highway system, including the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, because many of the highways (or portions of the highways) are inadequate to meet the needs of national and civil defense. The DOD's facilities include military bases, ports, and depots. The road networks that provide access and connections to these facilities are essential to national security. The 64,200-mile STRAHNET system consists of public highways that provide access, continuity, and emergency transportation of personnel and equipment in times of peace and war. It includes the entire 48,482 miles of the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways and 14,000 miles of other non-Interstate public highways on the National Highway System. The STRAHNET also contains approximately 1,800 miles of

connector routes linking more than 200 military installations and ports to the primary highway system. The DOD's facilities are also often major employers in a region, generating substantial volumes of commuter and freight traffic on the transportation network and around entry points to the military facilities. Stakeholders are encouraged to review the STRAHNET maps and recent Power Project Platform (PPP) studies. These can be a useful resource in the State and MPO areas covered by these route analyses.

Federal Land Management Agency (FLMA) Coordination

FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should encourage MPOs and State DOTs to coordinate with FLMAs in the transportation planning and project programming process on infrastructure and connectivity needs related to access routes and other public roads and transportation services that connect to Federal lands. Through joint coordination, the State DOTs, MPOs, Tribal Governments, FLMAs, and local agencies should focus on integration of their transportation planning activities and develop cross-cutting State and MPO long range transportation plans, programs, and corridor studies, as well as the Office of Federal Lands

Highway's developed transportation plans and programs. Agencies should explore opportunities to leverage transportation funding to support access and transportation needs of FLMAs before transportation projects are programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). Each State must consider the concerns of FLMAs that have jurisdiction over land within the boundaries of the State (23 CFR 450.208(a)(3)). MPOs must appropriately involve FLMAs in the development of the metropolitan transportation plan and the TIP (23 CFR 450.316(d)). Additionally, the Tribal Transportation Program, Federal Lands Transportation Program, and the Federal Lands Access Program TIPs must be included in the STIP, directly or by reference, after FHWA approval in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 201(c) (23 CFR 450.218(e)).

Planning and Environment Linkages (PEL)

FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should encourage State DOTs, MPOs and Public Transportation Agencies to implement PEL as part of the transportation planning and environmental review processes. The use of PEL is a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision making that considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process, and uses the information, analysis, and products developed during planning to inform the environmental review process. PEL leads to interagency relationship building among planning, resource, and regulatory agencies in the early stages of planning to inform and improve project delivery timeframes, including minimizing duplication and creating one cohesive flow of information. This results in transportation programs and projects that serve the community's transportation needs more effectively while avoiding and minimizing the impacts on human and natural resources. More information on PEL is available here.

Data in Transportation Planning

To address the emerging topic areas of data sharing, needs, and analytics, FHWA Division and FTA regional offices should encourage State DOTs, MPOs, and providers of public transportation to incorporate data sharing and consideration into the transportation planning process, because data assets have value across multiple programs. Data sharing principles and data management can be used for a variety of issues, such as freight, bike and pedestrian planning, equity analyses, managing curb space, performance management, travel time reliability, connected and autonomous vehicles, mobility services, and safety. Developing and advancing data sharing principles allows for efficient use of resources and improved policy and decision making at the State, MPO, regional, and local levels for all parties.

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

Federal Transit Administration

Office of the Administrator

1200 New Jersey Ave., SE
Washington, D.C. 20590

December 30, 2021

Attention: FHWA Division Administrators
FTA Regional Administrators

Subject: 2021 Planning Emphasis Areas for use in the development of Metropolitan and Statewide Planning and Research Work programs.

With continued focus on transportation planning the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Offices of Planning are jointly issuing updated Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs). The PEAs are areas that FHWA and FTA field offices should emphasize when meeting with the metropolitan planning organizations, State departments of transportation, Public Transportation Agencies, and Federal Land Management Agency counterparts to identify and develop tasks associated with the Unified Planning Work Program and the Statewide Planning and Research Program. We recognize the variability of work program development and update cycles, so we encourage field offices to incorporate these PEAs as programs are updated.

Please note that this letter is intended only to provide clarity regarding existing requirements. It is not binding and does not have the force and effect of law. All relevant statutes and regulations still apply.

Sincerely,

Nuria Fernandez
Administrator
Federal Transit Administration

Stephanie Pollack
Deputy Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

Enclosure

Appendix G

End of Transportation Conformity Requirements Following 20 years of Maintenance for the Grants Pass PM_{10} Maintenance Area

Attached below is the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) letter documenting the end of transportation conformity requirement for Grants Pass PM10 area, which has reached attainment.

REGION 10
SEATTLE, WA 98101

January 24, 2024

Mr. Karl Welzenbach
Planning Program Director
Rogue Valley Council of Governments/Middle Rogue MPO
155 North 1st Street
Central Point, Oregon 97502

Re: End of Transportation Conformity Requirements Following 20 years of Maintenance for the Grants Pass PM_{10} Maintenance Area

Dear Mr. Welzenbach:

Our records indicate that the Grants Pass PM_{10} area has reached the end of the 20-year maintenance period for the PM_{10} National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS). Congratulations on reaching this milestone which is the culmination of efforts to reduce PM_{10} in the Grants Pass area to healthy levels and maintain those levels for more than 20 years. The purpose of this letter is to provide information regarding transportation conformity requirements for a maintenance area that has achieved 20 years of maintenance.

Once the total of 20 years of maintenance has been achieved, the requirements for a transportation conformity determination as provided in CAA section 176(c) and 40 CFR part 93 no longer apply to the maintenance area unless the applicable implementation plan specifies otherwise. *See* 40 CFR 93.102(b)(4).

Additional information regarding the end of 20 years of maintenance is also presented in our Office of Transportation and Air Quality's guidance document titled "Transportation Conformity Guidance for Areas Reaching the End of the Maintenance Period; EPA-420-B-14-093, October 2014." available at http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyPDF.cgi/P100KPP0.PDF?Dockey=P100KPP0.PDF.

The EPA approved the first 10-year maintenance plan on October 27, 2003 (68 FR 61111) with an effective date of December 26, 2003. We approved the second 10-year Limited Maintenance Plan on July 30, 2015 (80 FR 45431) with an effective date of September 28, 2015. The Grants Pass PM_{10} maintenance period spanned from December 26, 2003, through December 26, 2023. Therefore, as of December 27, 2023, Rogue Valley Council of Governments/Middle Rogue MPO is no longer required to address the transportation conformity requirements of 40 CFR part 93 for PM_{10}. As such, a conformity

determination is no longer required for the Rogue Valley Council of Governments/Middle Rogue MPO Regional Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program.

Finally, we note that the other provisions of the second 10-year maintenance plan continue to remain in effect and all measures and requirements contained in the plan must be complied with until the state submits, and the EPA approves, a revision to the State Implementation Plan consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of CAA section 110(l) and CAA section 193, if applicable. Furthermore, the maintenance requirement in CAA section 110(a)(1) remains in place for all areas, including attainment areas.

If there are any questions regarding transportation conformity or the Grants Pass PM_{10} maintenance plan, please have your staff contact Tess Bloom, of my staff, at (206) 553-6362 or bloom.tess@epa.gov.

Sincerely,

KRISHNASWAMY VISWANATHAN

Digitally signed by KRISHNASWAMY VISWANATHAN
Date: 2024.01.24 12:46:24 -08'00'

Krishna Viswanathan
Director
Air and Radiation Division

cc: Ms. Ashley Bryers
Federal Highway Administration

Ms. Jasmine Harris
Federal Highway Administration

Mr. Ned Conroy
Federal Transit Administration

Ms. Natalie Liljenwall
Oregon Department of Transportation

Mr. Jeffrey Stocum
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Mr. Michael Orman
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

Ms. Ann Marie Alfrey
Mr. Rogue Valley Council of Governments

Mr. Ryan MacLaren
Rogue Valley Metropolitan Planning Organization