

# ***RVACT*** *Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation*

155 N. 1st Street • P.O. Box 3275 • Central Point, Oregon 97502 • 541-664-6674  
FAX 541- 664-7927

**To:** Members, Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

**From:** Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Re:** Summary of March 11, 2008, RVACT Meeting, Josephine County Courthouse,  
Room 157, Grants Pass, OR

**Date:** March 11, 2008

**Members and Alternates in Attendance:** Arthur Anderson and Paul Mather, ODOT; John Morrison and Paula Brown, Ashland; John Vial, Jackson County; Rob Brandes, Josephine County; Bob Lewis, Phoenix; Al Densmore, Medford; Tim Cummings, Grants Pass; Betty Wheeler, Talent; Alan DeBoer, Reeve Hennion, Jeff Hunter, Stacy Kellenbeck, John Watt, James Lowe, Craig Stone and Mike Montero private sector representatives from Jackson and Josephine Counties

**Members Absent:** Butte Falls, Cave Junction, Central Point, Eagle Point, Jacksonville, Gold Hill, MPO Policy, Rogue River, RVTD, Shady Cove and private sector representative Richard Smith

**Staff:** Gary Leaming, ODOT; Pat Foley, RVCOG

**Other:** Matthew Garrett, Doug Tindall, Mike Baker, Jerry Marmon, Jane Randleman, Lisa Cortes and Allie Cyr ODOT; Representative Ron Maurer; Shayne Maxwell, Rogue River Greenway; Alex Georgevich, Medford; and Andrew Margeson

**1. Roll Call**  
Jeff Hunter

Roll was taken. A quorum was present.

**2. Approval of Minutes**  
Jeff Hunter

Jeff asked if there were any changes to the January 8, 2008 RVACT minutes. Corrections: Add Tim Cummings to attendees. Delete Frank Bosshardt, replace with Rob Brandes. Change Stacy to Stacey. The minutes were approved with changes.

### 3. Public Input

Jeff Hunter

Jeff invited members of the public to make comments.

Andrew Margeson: In regard to Williams Hwy from New Hope Rd to beyond Espy Rd (Grants Pass UGB); Andrew and his neighbors have put hundreds of hours into an effort to address this problem area. This section of the highway is in terrible condition and extremely dangerous. The core problem is that Williams Hwy goes from five lanes (four traffic lanes plus a center turn lane at New Hope Rd) down to two lanes with bike lanes that are well below ODOT's standards and no sidewalks. The four lane section of the highway south Union Ave has an AADT of 20,700 (2006 data). South of New Hope Rd (two lanes) the AADT drops to 11,300. If this figure is compared to other roads in the area, this is an extremely high traffic area. At mile post 2.85 it drops to 8,300. The speed limit is 45 mph with more than 3/4<sup>th</sup> of the cars exceeding the speed limit according to an ODOT spot traffic study. Site distances are limited. There is a lot of heavy truck traffic. At mile post 2 the city has acquired land for a public park. This is one mile from an elementary school. It is too dangerous to walk or ride a bicycle on Williams Hwy. What is to be done: the city of Grants Pass submitted a proposal for the 2002 cycle which would increase this section to four or five lanes. The proposal narrowly missed the cut because the cost of acquiring right of way was very high. Unfortunately the proposal was dropped. Andrew is an economist and understands there is a cost benefit analysis but feels something needs to be done. He suggested that creative engineers find things short of just extending the five lanes the full distance because, at this point so much development has occurred, and that is impractical on a cost benefit basis. As each new development is added there has been a hodge-podge of third lanes created. He said that since a lot of the highway has three lanes already, increasing it to three lanes throughout, doing something about the site distances and creating bike lanes that meet Oregon standards would be an enormous step forward. This would allow for safer access and egress from the highway and improve through traffic which would make this a safer area. He strongly encouraged the RVACT to approve this effort that is going to be proposed by the city today. In closing he stated that since he has lived in the area is a common occurrence for the road to be closed for serious traffic accidents. Recently a young mother was killed in a traffic accident. He asked if we are doing all that we can to see that the problem is minimized by addressing dangerous situations on state highways.

Matthew Garrett, Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation: He wants the RVACT to know how important what they do is for his department and his commission. He thanked the RVACT members for their dedication and commitment. He has always looked to RVACT and the Mid-Williamette Valley ACT as proto-types. The ACTs came into being roughly a decade ago. RVACT has been the model and set the bar in the way you engage the transportation debate. It has gone through tough times. You were there during the drought in the 1990's. You were there informing the discussions whether it was OTIA or Connect Oregon. I am blessed with some of the best and brightest in ODOT whether it's Mr. Mather, Mr. Anderson or formerly Mr. Vial. You are represented well from an ODOT standpoint. The collective wisdom that you bring to this debate is extremely important to us. I know you are folks that could invest your time in a lot of different things. My commission appreciates that. My commission is going to engage the ACTs differently in the future than they have in the past. As we ride circuit we are going to carve out time to sit down and have discussions with the Area Commissions on Transportation in order for you to be able to ask us basic questions above and beyond the chartering process. That is kind of a formal check the box type of thing. This will be a sit down

where you ask the questions: How can we address some of the needs and significant issues that are percolating through your region? What can we do as a commission to enhance the relationship with the Area Commissions on Transportation? We are about a decade old in this experiment, a very successful experiment. It always demands that we pause and reflect on what we do and can we do it better. This will be the tone of the discussion that is going to come forward from my commission. I think we are at a hinge moment in the transportation debate. As we move toward that 2009 legislative session we have a very heavy job in terms of identifying the appropriate solutions to address some of the challenges that we face in transportation. Even under the best of circumstances a transportation funding package is difficult. We will have to serve many masters as we move to 2009. I know you will be there. You have been there in the past and your leadership has certainly helped in previous efforts. We are challenged at the federal level. Some folks were back in Washington D.C. and we understand that is a very challenging time as we move toward the big reauthorization conversation at the federal level. At a time when the Highway Trust Fund is in the negative, the expenditures far outweigh the revenue; we have somewhat of a perfect storm and how we navigate this storm will depend on the collective wisdom of you and your ACT brethren across the state. I look forward to engaging in the discussion as we move toward 2009.

Shayne Maxwell: Shayne said the Rogue River Greenway and Recreational Corridor Project is rolling along nicely. They are bringing together all of the jurisdictions and agencies. Contrary to recent events they do love fishermen and everybody that has a recreational itinerary. Regarding the Hwy 140 project; ODOT is planning a Hwy 140 Extension Project at Blackwell and Kirtland Roads in Central Point. There are two proposals on the table both of which come up short in funding. One proposal has an at-grade crossing over the rail road tracks and the other proposal has an elevated-crossing. The Rogue River Greenway is concerned that without an elevated-crossing bikes and pedestrians would not have a facility. With an elevated-crossing bikes and pedestrians would have a facility underneath the over-crossing. This would provide a connection that would keep the project Rogue River Greenway Project going. One of the biggest connections for the Rogue River Greenway Project is to the Bear Creek Greenway. This is the whole point of this regional project. An at-grade crossing creates a truck highway that bikes and pedestrians would have a hard time getting through. A bike-pedestrian bridge would cost between \$1.5M - \$2M. With the at-grade crossing ODOT is short \$851,000; above-grade the project is short \$2,654,000 which takes into consideration \$750,000 from the railroad and \$1M from TE funds. The challenge is, do we do this inexpensively or do we come up with more funds and do it right for the long term. Shayne feels that we need to take the time to figure out a way to do this with an elevated-crossing which will benefit all modes of transportation.

#### **4. Elect Jackson County RVACT Chair**

Jeff Hunter

The term of the Jackson County RVACT Chair is up shortly. Jeff Hunter asked if there were any motions for nominees for the JACO Chair position. Craig Stone made a motion that Mike Montero be selected as the JACO Chair position. Stacey Kellenbeck seconded the motion. Mike was unanimously elected.

#### **5. Plus Up Project Presentations**

Jayne Randleman, Laurel Samson, Betty Wheeler, Bob Lewis, Alex Georgevich  
Art Anderson reminded the RVACT that there was a discussion on the need to set our compass for the next legislative session. All of the jurisdictions were asked to submit applications for

Plus Up Projects. The purpose today is to look at and discuss these projects, not to make a decision.

Jayne Randleman presented the following projects:

**1. I-5 to Kirtland/Blackwell Road Improvements**

- Phase 1 will begin where the Hwy 140 Freight Extension ends on Blackwell Rd and proceed about one mile west and end at the Seven Oaks Interchange (Exit 35)
- Phase 2 consists of building new frontage roads that will extend north and south of the existing Blackwell Rd
- The project proposes to widen existing highway shoulders to 8 feet throughout project, add frontage roads on both sides of the highway from the interchange to about a half mile west, ending at a signal on Blackwell Rd.
- Cost: \$9.3M Match: Local match is a possibility

• Project is phaseable

**2. Highway 238 – Unit 2**

- Since the Unit 1 project, this roadway is now a state highway, and, as a result has higher traffic volumes. Improvements are from Bybee Corner to Ross Lane
- Improvements include:
  - a. the intersection of Hanley and Rossanley Roads
  - b. two bridges over Griffin and Jackson Creeks
  - c. relocation of major utility poles
  - d. realignment of Jackson Creek to allow for highway widening
- Cost: \$14M Match: \$0

**3. Highway 62: Mall/Target Access**

- Rogue Valley Mall access will move east about 200 feet
- Existing Target/Red Lobster access will be closed and on-site circulation will be modified to use a single, signalized intersection
- Single right turn lane will be modified to a double turn lane from westbound Hwy 62 to northbound Hwy 99
- Median modified, new paving and striping of new travel lanes
- Cost: \$4.8M Match: \$725,000 to \$2M

**4. OR 99 at South Valley View Dr**

- Reconstruction and realign Valley View Rd, construct a new bridge over Bear Creek, realign and add signals at Lowe Rd with Eagle Mill Rd
- Realign Valley View with OR 99 northwest of present location
- Provides for bike/pedestrian connectivity
- Cost: \$10.2M Match: \$0
- Other: Current configuration has a poor service level, congestion and a high perceived crash rate. The improvements will increase LOS, relieve congestion and improve safety on the corridor.

**5. I-5 – Exit 35 Interchange Improvements, Unit 2**

- Widen and improve vertical alignment over I-5
- Realign Willow Springs Rd with Eric Ave on Hwy 99. Reconstruction of southbound off ramp to create two separate off ramps
- Realignment of Blackwell Rd to achieve quarter mile spacing from ramps
- Cost: \$14M Match: \$0

- Other: The area will ultimately be incorporated into the city of Central Point for development. This project should enhance longevity and usability of the interchange when development occurs.
- 6. I-5 Truck Climbing Lanes (MP 66.3 – 71.4)**
  - Construct a third travel lane on the ascending portions of Sexton Pass north of Grants Pass to accommodate climbing trucks. This would allow the shoulder to be used as originally intended – for disabled or emergency vehicles.
  - Cost: \$17.5M Match: \$0
  - Other: \$2M in the STIP
- 7. Highway 238: Jacksonville to Ruch**
  - Widen the existing highway shoulders 8 feet through the two lane corridor, add a left turn lane at Cady Rd, and two passing lanes, one eastbound and one westbound
  - Cost: \$12.3M Match: \$0
  - Other: Phaseable
- 8. Highway 62: Linn Road to OR 234**
  - Construct a 3 lane rural section – 2 travel lanes with island style median with left turn lanes and widen shoulders/bike lanes
  - Project will address access control between Crystal and Rolling Hills
  - Cost: \$15.5M Match: \$0
  - Other: The area has a perceived high accident rate, poor access management and substandard shoulders and bike lanes.
- 9. OR 140: Agate Rd and Leigh Way/Agate Rd and Ave G**
  - These former Jackson County roads are proposed to be an extension of OR 140, Lake of the Woods Highway, as a future truck route to I-5
    - a. Unit 1 modifies the intersection of Kirtland and Blackwell Rds as a free-flowing highway
    - b. Unit 2 will modify the traffic movements at two intersections
    - c. Will modify to provide free-flowing condition at Leigh Way and Agate Rd
    - d. And at Leigh Way to Ave G
  - Cost: \$7.3M Match: \$0
  - Other: This corridor has been shown to reduce Hwy 62 traffic by 2,500 ADT or 8 to 10% of the current traffic load.

Bob Lewis, Phoenix Public Works Director, presented the following project:

**10. I-5 Fern Valley Interchange**

- Project replaces the I-5 interchange and realigns and improves connections to Hwy 99 and N. Phoenix Rd
  - a. Project reduces congestion and improves operations
  - b. Replace bridge over Bear Creek
- Cost: \$57M Match: \$6.8M
- Other: Project is phaseable – with construction of east/west side connections. Draft Environmental Assessment due for release in April-May 2008. Total funding request \$18,300,000
- Bob gave a breakdown of costs:
  - \$3.8M engineering
  - \$11.5M right-of-way acquisition
  - \$3M utility relocation
  - \$38.7M construction



both sides of the highway. This would serve the area south of New Hope Rd which is within the Grants Pass Urban Growth Boundary

- Cost:                 \$12.4M                                 Match:                 \$400,000
- Other:
  - a. Access – this highway currently has a few segments of sidewalks but primarily pedestrians and bicyclists must share a very narrow shoulder. The project will install sidewalks and bike lanes the entire length.
  - b. Accidents - In 2007, 23 accidents, one fatality, six roll-over accidents.
  - c. Highway used by trucks.
  - d. Used as an alternate route from Jacksonville to Grants Pass
  - e. Need to keep speed limits down

Questions/Comments:

Bob Lewis: He asked if the city, on the completion of this project, is going to take over jurisdiction of this area. Laurel answered; no this is a district level highway.

Mike Montero: Mr. Quilty just returned from an American Association of MPOs meeting and this particular type of orientation for district level highways is something that they are looking at nationally because the capacity is basically the equivalent and it does all of the things that you talked about. Apparently what you are proposing is cutting edge stuff. You might want to contact Mike Quilty so he can get you in touch with the folks that did the design stuff.

Rob Brandes, Josephine County Public Works Director, presented the following project:

**14. I-5: Exit 61 Interchange Improvements**

- Identification and construction of a preferred alternative to improve the intersection of I-5 northbound on/off ramps – Merlin Galice Road. Per policy 6-G of the TSP, either a traffic signal or bulb-out would provide satisfactory conditions through 2025.
- Construction of a bulb-out would involve acquisition of additional land to accommodate the relocation of the Highland Ave/Merlin Galice Rd further to the east.
- Project evaluation should also include the provision for the possible future rebuilding of the I-5 northbound off-ramp to provide a loop off-ramp.
  - Cost:                 \$5.2M                                 Match:                 None shown however Paradise Ranch Development Group has acknowledged a portion of the responsibility that they would add to this issue. The county is looking at options.
- Other:
  - a. Problems include stacking issues onto the highway.
  - b. There is increased growth in area which includes Paradise Ranch.

Questions/Comments:

Mike Montero: If this project were to be submitted for consideration in the STIP, are there land use issues. One of the STIP criteria is the project's readiness and one of the many things is whether or not you need a reason's goal exception if it is in Ag-land. Is that something that you are going to have to deal with? Rob responded, not that I am aware of.

Jim Lowe: The bridges in this area are being replaced this year under OTIA. It is too bad that OTIA wasn't used, such as it was at the Fern Valley Interchange. He saw some MSE walls going in so hopefully the line site will be better than it is now. OTIA is going in this spring.

Art Anderson said we have negotiated with the Paradise Ranch group. In the interim they are going to coordinate around those bridge replacements. They are going to put in two signals; one at the off-ramp and one at Highland Drive. They are going to put in a right-turn refuge on Monument Drive. Also they are looking at some sort of collection from the houses that are being built in their development that will be used as a seed to help build this project.

The following two projects were not included on the PowerPoint presentation.

Alex Georgevich, City of Medford, presented the following project:

**15. Foothill Rd Improvements - Hillcrest and Delta Waters**

- Will improve Foothill Rd from a narrow, curvy two-lane county road to a five-lane urban arterial
- Four signals planned but only when warranted
- Foothill Rd has become the natural bypass to I-5 and Hwy 62 heading to or from White City/Eagle Point and south Medford Phoenix
- Cost:               \$22M               Match: \$2M
- Other:
  - a. Project will provide bicycle/pedestrian facilities
  - b. Improvements along this corridor will help protect the existing system as well as reduce impacts at South Medford Interchange
  - c. City match of 10% and up (\$1M to \$4M for the first phase of the project or the entire project depending on what happens with the PP&L substations)

Questions/Comments:

Tim Cummings: Is Foothill or Hillcrest a state highway? Alex responded, currently Foothill Road is a county facility and it will be a city major arterial facility.

Paula Brown, Ashland Public Works Director

**16. North Main St Hersey-Wimer St Improvements**

- Improve safety and traffic flow by realigning the current offset intersection to a standard four-way intersection with signals
- Current intersection has high left turn crash history
- Poor site distance
- Cost:               \$1.485M               Match:               \$300,000
- Other: Project can be phased for realignment and signals

Art Anderson said that Mike Baker is going to score these projects like Modernization projects have been done in the past when we went through STIP updates. We will use that as a general reference for scoring at the next meeting. In the meantime we will mail you a copy of the electronic version of these projects. The idea for the next meeting is to try and draw the line somewhere in terms of funding because we are looking at a number that is not hard and set as we do not know what will come out of the next legislative session. We will be putting the projects in some sort of order above the cut line taking into account the equity issue between Jackson and Josephine counties. This will be our job at the next meeting so that we can get something to Doug Tindall and staff to take forward to the legislative session.

Tim Cummings: He asked if we can have the information regarding vehicle trips, crash data and other criteria used for the safety portion of this. Are we going to be provided with any other additional information? Mike Baker said that we will provide you a summary on how it meets the general classification, one of which is safety. There is a point spread that is provided based on total number of accidents and the cost ratios that comes out of that, compares accidents to the cost of the project. Tim said he is not sure of what the criteria is that is used to judge the projects. As long as I have that I will be good.

John Vial: A lot of the projects that we are seeing for the first time. I am assuming that there is a dialog that can occur with the locals now regarding potential match. Art said that is a good point because a match is one of the criteria that are used for scoring. There needs to be an ongoing dialog. Match is always a good seller whenever you are trying to get a project moving.

John Vial: He is curious as to why South Stage wasn't included as a project. South Stage overcrossing/interchange has been a frequent topic of discussion. Art Anderson said he did not think that it was on our horizon.

James Lowe: We basically have a total of \$150M worth of projects submitted. As we go through the summary each one has pluses and minuses. To get down to \$50M is quite a trim. We definitely have our work cut out for us.

Mike Montero: One refinement that we are likely to see as we go forward is that the different modal committees are now taking a stronger role in giving their recommendations. It will provide a different set of lenses that we are able to look at. If the freight community says that the climbing lanes on Mt. Sexton are the most important, they will be able to give us a better informed look at that. There is a movement throughout the state and the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee is entertaining the notion of having an economic benefit analysis done for all of the projects that they look at. It isn't just the typical make an investment, you will get the cost of congestion relieve. There was a big study done in Portland where they monetized the kinds of improvements in a place like the Sexton Pass. They scored pretty well when you look at them in that way. We are going to have a lot of different tools to use in the future but maybe not by the next meeting.

Art Anderson: The passing lane project has \$2M in seed money that was collected within the Region for operational issues. We have \$1M from MOD. For a \$17M project for both directions, if you divide it in half you are talking around \$9M each way.

## **Connect Oregon Presentation**

Mike Baker

ODOT received two applications for Connect Oregon projects from the region that were deemed viable, one from this area and one from the Southwest ACT area.

The next step in the process is to review these applications on a regional basis and then send them to Salem for overall prioritization. We are guaranteed \$10M in this region. Both of these projects combined total less than that. Assuming that we agree to move these projects on I don't see any issue with funding. We do need to follow the process which is to have a regional review. We are proposing that we select one representative from the Rogue Valley to meet with one representative from the SW ACT. This meeting could be via telephone.

The project submitted from the Rogue Valley is at the Medford International Airport and is for an additional building, parking and taxi lanes to consolidate the express cargo facilities. This project expands some of the cargo capabilities of the Medford International Airport. They have applied for \$4.7M. The other application is for a new control tower at the North Bend SW Regional Airport. They have applied for \$700,000.

Questions/Comments:

Craig Stone: Asked if the RVACT is being asked to make a recommendation. Mike said that is a good idea so that the person representing the RVACT knows that they have that support.

Alan DeBoer: He asked what happens to the extra money. Can we convert it to other uses? Mike said the extra money goes to the State. \$10M was divided up between the five regions and there was \$50M statewide. Now there will be about \$55M statewide.

Mike was asked where the rail road is in all of this. He responded that they chose not to apply for funding. They do have a Connect Oregon I grant that was used to partially construct facilities. The remainder of their funds is frozen pending further discussions.

Mike Montero said that the firm that he is associated with was retained by David Evans and Associates to do the economic forecast analysis for the project. His understanding is that the rules with regard to the ACT and the rules for Connect Oregon may be different. He thinks that it is important for purposes of this discussion if there is any issue that would weaken the application he probably shouldn't represent the ACT.

Mike asked for a volunteer to represent the RVACT in this process.

Jeff Hunter said this would be something that he would be interested in doing.

Mike Montero made a motion that Jeff Hunter represents the RVACT for the Connect Oregon II process. John Vial seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

Mike Baker asked the RVACT to make a recommendation on the projects. Craig Stone made a motion that the RVACT support the Multi-Modal Express Air Cargo Extension project. Stacy Kellenbeck seconded the motion. The motion was approved.

## **7. 30/70 Equity Split**

Mike Baker

*Handouts: 1) Regional Modernization Equity Splits, 2010-2013 STIP, 2) RVACT All Projects (1992-2011) and 3) Resolution between Jackson and Josephine Counties*

Mike Baker started by saying that in 2002 the RVACT passed an amendment to the By Laws which said that as we move forward over a ten year period we would look for equity in projects that are recommended to the Oregon Transportation Commission and this would be reviewed every five years.

Using the chart shown below Mike reviewed the equity breakouts starting with data from pre-resolution through 2008-2011.

<b>RVACT All Projects (1992 - 2011)</b>		
All Projects (1992 - 2011)	Josephine	\$204,521,000
All Projects (1992 - 2011)	Jackson	\$501,474,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$705,995,000</b>
<b>Overall Project Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>29%</b>
<b>Overall Project Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>71%</b>
Note: These totals do not include earmarks or local match. Totals do include recently recommended modernization reductions.		
<b>STIP UPDATE 2000-2003 (RVACT Pre-Resolution)</b>		
Modernization only (2000-2003 STIP)	Josephine	\$325,000
Modernization only (2000-2003 STIP)	Jackson	\$2,284,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$2,609,000</b>
<b>2002-2003 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>12%</b>
<b>2002-2003 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>88%</b>
<b>STIP UPDATE 2002-2005 (RVACT Pre-Resolution)</b>		
Modernization only (2002-2005 STIP)	Josephine	\$500,000
Modernization only (2002-2005 STIP)	Jackson	\$15,000,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$15,500,000</b>
<b>2004-2005 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>2004-2005 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>97%</b>
<b>RVACT EQUITY RESOLUTION APPROVED 2002 DURING 2004-2007 STIP UPDATE</b>		
<b>STIP UPDATE 2004-2007 (RVACT Post-Resolution)</b>		
Modernization only (2004-2007 STIP)	Josephine	\$3,546,000
Modernization only (2004-2007 STIP)	Jackson	\$10,516,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$14,062,000</b>
<b>2006-2007 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>2006-2007 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>75%</b>
<b>STIP UPDATE 2006-2009 (RVACT Post-Resolution)</b>		
Modernization only (2006-2009 STIP)	Josephine	\$5,710,000
Modernization only (2006-2009 STIP)	Jackson	\$7,100,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$12,810,000</b>
<b>2008-2009 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>2008-2009 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>STIP UPDATE 2008-2011 (RVACT Post-Resolution)</b>		
Modernization only (2008-2011 STIP)	Josephine	\$5,100,000
Modernization only (2008-2011 STIP)	Jackson	\$8,900,000
<b>Total: Jackson/Josephine</b>		<b>\$14,000,000</b>
<b>2010-2011 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>36%</b>
<b>2010-2011 MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>64%</b>
<b>TOTAL STIP MODERNIZATION (RVACT 2004-07 through 2008-11)</b>		
<b>Total Dollars (without reductions)</b>		<b>\$40,872,000</b>
<b>Avg MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Avg MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>65%</b>
<b>Total Dollars (with reductions)</b>		<b>\$34,372,000</b>
<b>Avg MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Josephine</b>	<b>23%</b>
<b>Avg MOD Equity Split</b>	<b>Jackson</b>	<b>77%</b>

For 2010-13 the modernization formula still indicates a 70:30 split between Jackson and Josephine Counties.

Using the graph shown below Mike reviewed the data that is used to determine the equity split.

**REGIONAL MODERNIZATION EQUITY SPLITS, 2010-2013 STIP**

County	Region	Population (2006) (1)	Vehicle Miles Travelled 2006 (2)	Ton Miles Travelled (2006) (2)	Vehicle Registrations (2006) (3)	Projected Revenue (FY 1999-2001)(4)	MOD Needs (5)	Regional Average
Jackson	3	198,615	959,000,000	5,159,625,546	231,268	\$126,362,000		
<b>Jackson Total</b>		<b>198,615</b>	<b>959,000,000</b>	<b>5,159,625,546</b>	<b>231,268</b>	<b>\$126,362,000</b>		
<b>% of RVACT</b>		<b>71.00%</b>	<b>65.60%</b>	<b>62.28%</b>	<b>68.30%</b>	<b>66.92%</b>	<b>91.0%</b>	<b>70.85%</b>
Josephine	3	81,125	502,900,000	3,125,212,428	107,352	\$62,470,000		
<b>Josephine Total</b>		<b>81,125</b>	<b>502,900,000</b>	<b>3,125,212,428</b>	<b>107,352</b>	<b>\$62,470,000</b>		
<b>% of RVACT</b>		<b>29.00%</b>	<b>34.40%</b>	<b>37.72%</b>	<b>31.70%</b>	<b>33.08%</b>	<b>9.0%</b>	<b>29.15%</b>
<b>RVACT Total</b>		<b>279,740</b>	<b>1,461,900,000</b>	<b>8,284,837,974</b>	<b>338,620</b>	<b>188,832,000</b>		

(1) 2006 Oregon Population Report, Population Research Center, Portland State University

(2) Transportation Systems Monitoring Unit, Transportation Data Section, Oregon Department of Transportation

(3) Driver and Motor Vehicle Services Branch, Oregon Department of Transportation

(4) State and Federal Highway Revenues and Expenditures by County and Region, August 1999, Policy Section, Oregon Department of Transportation

(5) From Region Needs list. Based on projects in TSPs, Facility Plans, and previous project scoping efforts. 2008

**Questions/Comments:**

Laurel Samson: She has one concern about limiting this to the resolution because I was here during those early years and the comment that Josephine County always got the money when 88% to 97% went to Jackson County was the worry that we have to do it that way because if you get a big project that comes through and there was no question that we were going to stick with some, although there was no specific resolution at that point there was certainly an expectation on everybody's part that it would go back and forth and some years Josephine County would get more. I don't think that it is quite fair to then draw this line and say oh well those early years now don't count. I would like to see what that number looks like if we go back to the beginning of RVACT, looking at the Modernization projects because those are the ones that this body has control over. Maintenance is not a RVACT decision and looking at that with the cuts included that weren't included last time. I think then that we are still way behind. I think that it is unfair to put an arbitrary line in there and say we'll just ignore those; those were a gift to Jackson County in those early years. Mike responded said that the reason he did that is that he said the over-all as that was how we originally established it. The actual resolution calls for looking forward ten years. This report is based on that. Laurel said that she understands that but certainly if you look back at the minutes the discussion at those times in those early ones when the money went to Medford or to Jackson County was that it had to be done that way because those were big projects that needed a lot of money and our turn would come. This says oh we will skip our turn and those comments didn't make anything. I think it is just as important to look, and I don't see that number on here. What would that number be if we looked at the beginning of RVACT to now with the cuts that had to be made in the last couple of months to the one project where it looks like we did real well in those two years but actually a good portion of that money was taken back. I think that if you look at that number that would be one and if we had that one close to 30% that would then start to feel like we are equal partners.

Andrew Margeson: As an economist and a citizen, another concern is that it is pretty apparent that as you drive around the region that one result of this split has been that projects in Josephine and Jackson County were lower than if the cost ratio had been preferred to projects in Josephine County with higher benefit cost ratios. That is why you see the kind of reconstruction of Highway 238 in Jackson County that you do not see in Josephine County. Compare this road where I live to what has been done in the Jacksonville area and you will see what I am talking about.

Mike Montero: I understand where Laurel is coming from and I also understand the comment the gentleman from New Hope made. His comment frankly echoed what we are hearing a lot in other places around the state. That is there really hasn't been historically an analysis to determine what the cost benefit ratio is. We have never done it before. There are other bodies and committees that are starting to do it now. That is one way to look at it. The other thing that I would mention is that when this group was chartered many years ago the intent was to have a two county commitment to make the best recommendations to improve the state system that we could. That was the job. There are unique characteristics between the two regions that cause some of this to occur. At the end of the day project selection has to be done not just on a county distribution formula but just which ones do the best for the system. What we got saddled with in Jackson County was the residue of a decision made back in the 50's and that was to put the interstate system right through the middle of the valley. You guys, whether you knew it or not, the biggest gift that you folks got from the interstate system was that they bypassed your community. You don't have the ongoing kinds of problems to try and mitigate going forward. Is that fair? No it is not fair but it is the circumstances and so I think that was why the resolution that was done in 2002 was to set as a goal, and I think that this body is committed to that. Notwithstanding the very regrettable decision that we had to make at the last meeting to defer funding for Hwy 199 but I think it has long been the commitment of this body that we would look for projects that met the criteria so that we could maintain the equity and do we have catch up to do, you bet. I think that is something that we have to be mindful about what is our charge and then look for those good projects and I think there are a whole bunch of them that I saw presented on the Plus Up list, probably more than we can fund that will provide this body with an opportunity to do that. I think it is important to keep a holistic perspective of what this ACT's commitment is to the OTC.

James Lowe: With that said, I am going through the numbers and I know that it is only modernization but the South Medford Interchange, Highway 62, the north interchange and Exit 35, are those not modernization projects? Where are those big numbers? Mike said that some of those projects had OTIA funds, earmarks, bridge funds and different types of other funds. We are talking about the pieces this body has made decisions on.

Paula Brown: Except that we often predicate our decisions based on other funding. Yes I understand what you are saying but I am not sure it is absolutely the true picture. Paul Mather responded you can calculate these numbers nine different ways. We chose to follow what were the decisions that this body made and the splits for this time. If you want us to do a different combination of those splits, we can do whatever you want.

Stacey Kellenbeck: Just to make sure I am looking at this right, then the bottom box has the total dollars with reductions but then actually the STIP update 2008-2011 just above that should actually have a separate box that says with reductions and that percentage split would be 0%/100%. Response: Yes.

Mike Montero: I think that Paula's comment is spot on as well for another reason. What has occurred over the ten/twelve years that we have been in existence is the whole formula for how we prioritize projects did shift because in those lean years where there was just simply wasn't money what we started doing, there was almost a cultural change in this organization to say okay how can we leverage dollars to get projects that otherwise couldn't be built done. That is when we started looking at earmarks and it added in the effects like OTIA III or bridge replacement funds and the like and so what has happened is that different regions have had greater success in leveraging those different funds. If you are a small community there probably is that feeling that we are being out bid and we don't have an even playing field because we don't have the resources to do that that other areas did. I am thinking about a decision that Betty correct me if I am wrong, back when the STIP criteria was updated and it said now it is a requirement that you have some match and the city of Talent didn't have the money for the match. I think what this body did was accept some commitment to doing maintenance on landscaping as meeting their match. There has been a precedent of this organization to try and level the playing field where you could. That might be an area that the entire ACT process might want to collaborate more closely is trying to identify those different leveraging pieces and then to work more closely like we do with our MPO. That is a suggestion to try and help because they don't all have the same skill sets and the same understanding of the different pots of money.

Stacey Kellenbeck: Would it be possible to get the number that Laurel was asking for, the RVACT, all projects from the very beginning, MOD projects only. Mike said we can do that. Paul said that the resolution says that we look at the numbers every two years. We are short on doing that. We are doing it now but we are late. It is probably something that we want to put more firmly into our process in order to keep this equity question in front of us so that it is consistent with the resolution. Also there are a number of different ways you can cut the numbers. We also have to land on what is the standard way we want to look at this. We presented it one way and it may or may not be the way you want to see it.

## **8. Oregon Transportation Commission/Legislative Updates**

Paul Mather

Paul reported that Stuart Foster's replacement on the OTC is David Lohman. He attended his first OTC meeting in February. We will invite him to a future RVACT meeting.

## **9. Agenda Build/Next Meeting**

Jeff Hunter, Art Anderson

Rogue River Greenway Project Update

Equity discussion – do we want to make changes in the way we look at information

MOD Plus Up decisions

Representative Ron Maurer said that he is watching two counties fight a little bit and they are still smiling. That is very important. I want to emphasize that you need to stay together and make this work. No matter how many numbers you put together you are going to find that it is not ever going to be quite equal. Part of the reason I came today was that I knew about the vote from before and I thought that there would be some ramifications to that. I appreciate the work you are doing on the list. I just did my voter's pamphlet statement where I state my top priority is transportation funding for the 2009 session. There are huge issues out there that we need to tackle and dollars are the only way we are going to do it.