

Orientation Manual



RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

| | |
|--|----|
| Oregon Transportation Commission..... | 5 |
| ODOT Transportation Regions Map..... | 9 |
| Region 3 Map..... | 10 |
| What is an Area Commission on Transportation..... | 11 |
| Oregon Area Commissions on Transportation Map..... | 13 |
| OTC Policy on Formation and Operation of ACTs..... | 15 |
| Quick Reference: Oregon Public Meetings Law..... | 37 |
| Common Terms and Acronyms..... | 53 |
| Internet Links..... | 75 |

Chapter 2: RVACT

| | |
|---------------------------------|----|
| RVACT Bylaws Presentation..... | 77 |
| RVACT Bylaws..... | 87 |
| Membership List (May 2013)..... | 91 |

Chapter 3: STIP Project Selection

| | |
|--|-----|
| STIP Primer..... | 97 |
| Introduction to the Enhance-it/Fix-it Process..... | 113 |
| 2015-18 Enhance Timeline..... | 129 |
| 2015-18 STIP Timeline..... | 130 |
| 2015-18 STIP Funding Allocations..... | 131 |
| 2015-18 STIP Funding Process Presentation..... | 133 |
| 2015-18 RVACT 150% Project Packet for OTC..... | 149 |

Oregon Transportation Commission

What is the Oregon Transportation Commission?

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) establishes state transportation policy. The commission also guides the planning, development and management of a statewide integrated transportation network that provides efficient access, is safe, and enhances Oregon's economy and livability. The commission meets monthly to oversee Department of Transportation activities relating to highways, public transportation, rail, transportation safety, motor carrier transportation, and drivers and motor vehicles.

The governor appoints five commissioners, ensuring that different geographic regions of the state are represented. One member must live east of the Cascade Range; no more than three can belong to one political party.

For more information: Visit the OTC website.

Oregon Transportation Commission Members

Pat Egan, Chair

Pat Egan is VP, Customer and Community Affairs for Pacific Power. Egan is an attorney and has served as Legislative Director and Transportation Policy Adviser to Gov. Kitzhaber and as Chief of Staff to Gov. Kulongoski. Egan was also State Affairs Manager at the Port of Portland. He serves on the boards of the NW Energy Efficiency Alliance, the Pacific NW Utilities Conference Committee, the Oregon Sports Authority and the Oregon State University Alumni Association. Mr. Egan earned a law degree from the Willamette University College of Law and holds a bachelor's of science degree from Oregon State University.



Commission Chair Pat Egan

Commission term:

12/1/2011 to 6/30/2012; 7/1/2012 to 6/30/2016

David Lohman

Dave Lohman is an attorney in southwest Oregon. He began practicing law in 1981. Mr. Lohman holds an undergraduate degree in English from Yale and a law degree from the University of Michigan. He has held senior management positions at the Port of Portland and the Oregon Economic Development Department. Mr. Lohman served on the congressional staff of U.S. Congressman John Dellenback and the professional staff of the U.S. Senate Appropriations Committee.

Commission term:
2/18/2008 to 6/30/2013



David Lohman

Mary Olson

Mary Olson is the president of Norris, Olson & Associates in Portland and the former vice-president for the Port of Portland Commission. She is a member of the Finance Committee for Northwest Electrical Light and Power Association, and the corporate co-chairperson of U.S. Bancorp United Way Campaign. Ms. Olson holds a bachelors degree from Oregon State University and attended the Northwest School of Banking.

Commission term:
3/1/2010 to 6/30/2012; 7/1/2012 to 6/30/2016



Mary Olson

Mark Frohnmayer

Mark Frohnmayer graduated from UC Berkeley in 1996 with a degree in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science. After 11 years in the computer games industry and a successful exit from his first startup, GarageGames, Mr. Frohnmayer has turned his entrepreneurial energy towards sustainable business development in Oregon. He founded Arcimoto in October 2007 to bring quality, affordable, sustainable vehicles to the public. Mr. Frohnmayer served on the Oregon governor's Alternate Fuel Vehicle Infrastructure Working Group in 2009 and was peer selected as one of the Pacific Northwest's clean technology Pivotal Leaders. He is currently serving on the Oregon Transportation Commission and the Oregon Passenger Rail Leadership Council, which was recently appointed by Oregon Gov. Kitzhaber to guide the Oregon Passenger Rail Environmental Impact Statement Project.

Commission term:
6/20/2011 to 6/30/2013



Mark Frohnmayer

Tammy Baney

Tammy Baney is in her second term as a Deschutes County Commissioner. She also serves as the elected President of the Association of Oregon Counties. Baney has an extensive background in public service and community advocacy, working with groups such as CASA (Court Appointed Special Advocate for children), Habitat for Humanity, Commission on Children and Families, Family Law Advisory Council, Family Access Network and has been a foster parent for years. Baney has been appointed by Governor Kitzhaber to various leadership teams to assist with policy creation for both early childhood learning and healthcare reform efforts. Baney was appointed by Governor Kulongoski to the Oregon Housing Council in 2010 and also serves on the Road User Fee Task Force for the OTC. She is a champion for integrating community health reform into transportation planning. Baney is the proud mom of Addy and her three grown foster daughters Lindsy, Ashley, and Alesha.



Tammy Baney



Commission term:
7/1/2011 to 6/30/2015

OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION REGION MAP



LEGEND

- REGION OFFICE
- STATE HIGHWAY
- 100** STATE HIGHWAY NUMBER
- COUNTY BOUNDARY
- REGION NUMBER
- ROUTE SHIELDS**
- INTERSTATE
- U.S.
- OREGON



Area Commissions on Transportation

What is an ACT?

Area Commissions on Transportation are advisory bodies chartered by the Oregon Transportation Commission. In 1996, the OTC authorized regionally based transportation advisory commissions known as Area Commissions on Transportation or ACTs in order to expand opportunities for local citizen involvement in ODOT's decision making.


ACT members are volunteers and represent local government, businesses and non-profits, the transportation industry and communities at-large. ACTs serve the Oregon Transportation Commission in much the same way the local planning commissions serve cities and counties in Oregon. Most major geographical areas in Oregon are covered by an Area Commission on Transportation. Currently, there are 11 ACTs in Oregon.

ACTs address all aspects of transportation (surface, marine, air, and transportation safety) with primary focus on the state transportation system. ACTs consider regional and local transportation issues if they affect the state system. They work with other local organizations dealing with transportation-related issues.

ACTs play a key advisory role in the development of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which schedules funded transportation projects. ACTs establish a public process for area project selection priorities. Through that process and following adopted project eligibility criteria, they prioritize and recommend projects in their area to be included in the STIP.

ACTs are represented on the STIP Stakeholder Committee that is charged with developing the project eligibility criteria for the STIP.

Oregon's Area Commissions on Transportation



POLICY ON FORMATION AND OPERATION OF AREA COMMISSIONS ON TRANSPORTATION (ACTs)

INTRODUCTION

The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) established the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) to improve communication and interaction between the OTC and local stakeholders who share a transportation focused community of interest. That dialogue will include the OTC, local officials, legislators, the business community and appropriate stakeholders and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

By increasing stakeholder commitment and understanding of transportation programs, funding and issues, the OTC expects to:

- Broaden opportunities for advising the OTC on policy issues
- Improve project recommendations and coordination at the local level
- Broaden the Regional transportation perspective
- Increase stakeholder support for and commitment to projects
- Control project costs
- Support timely completion of projects
- Meet expectations for quality projects
- Facilitate private sector capital investments
- Maximize ODOT's capacity to deliver projects
- Improve Oregon's economy by addressing transportation challenges

The OTC adopted *Policy on Formation and Operation of Area Commissions on Transportation*¹ to provide answers to common questions about the purpose, formation and function of ACTs and to encourage a reasonable degree of consistency statewide in their role and operation.² The document is intended to provide statewide consistency for the ACTs while balancing local needs for flexibility and uniqueness. Each ACT will adopt Operating Agreements to further define its operating procedures. Topics addressed include the following:

- I. Mission
- II. Roles and Responsibilities
- III. Authority
- IV. ACT Structure and Membership
- V. Operations of the ACT
- VI. Basis for Decision Making
- VII. Coordination

As the need arises, the OTC may review this document and update as appropriate.

¹ This statement assumes future adoption of this document by the OTC

² See Attachment B.

The OTC will give significant weight to recommendations from the ACTs that follow the procedures described in this document. The ACT, however, is an advisory body to the OTC, and the OTC is the final decision-maker. Geographic areas that do not have an ACT or MPO must adhere to the same standards of accountability as ACTs and demonstrate to the OTC that recommendations were developed in accordance with ACT obligations. Prior to starting the process to prioritize project recommendations, the appropriate ODOT Region and the non-ACT geographic area will reach consensus on the process for determining compliance with this policy. This process could utilize previously adopted documents as appropriate.

In order to clarify the document, a glossary was prepared which defines the terms Region, Regional, Area, Transportation System and a series of verbs used throughout the document. The verbs convey varying levels of action or responsibility and include the following: must, shall, will, should, and may. See Attachment D, Glossary of Terms, for further definition and usage examples.

POLICY ON FORMATION AND OPERATION OF AREA COMMISSIONS ON TRANSPORTATION (ACTs)

I. MISSION

The mission of the ACTs is to provide a forum for the discussion and coordination of current and future transportation issues and to make recommendations to the OTC. An ACT plays a key advisory role in the development of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The ACTs shall recommend priorities for state transportation infrastructure and capital investments based on state and local transportation plans related to the geographic boundary of the ACT.

II. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

ACTs have a primary role of making recommendations to the OTC regarding project selection for projects of local or Regional significance. ACTs may also be requested to provide input to the OTC on projects of statewide importance and on statewide policy issues.

A. Primary Role of the ACTs

At a minimum, ACTs shall perform the following:

- Provide a forum to advance the public's awareness and understanding among transportation stakeholders of transportation issues.
- Establish a public process that is consistent with state and federal laws, regulations and policies.
- Provide recommendations to the OTC regarding program funding allocations for the STIP, balancing local, Regional and statewide perspectives³.
- Prioritize Area Modernization project recommendations for the Development STIP and Construction STIP based on state and local transportation plans related to the Area.
- Make recommendations to ODOT regarding special funding opportunities and programs.
- Communicate and coordinate Regional priorities with other organizations, including the following:
 - Other ODOT Regions and ACTs
 - Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
 - Community Solutions Team (CST)
 - Regional Partnerships and Regional Investment Boards
 - ODOT advisory committees

³ Techniques ACTs may use to achieve statewide perspective include: interacting with other ACTs, hosting forums on statewide issues such as access management and highway segment designations, and having the ODOT Director or OTC liaison attend and participate in ACT meetings. By using criteria established by the OTC and adherence to those standards, ACTs achieve a statewide vantage point.

- As applicable, consider all modes and aspects of the Transportation System in formulating recommendations, taking into account the provision of elements and connections between air, marine, rail, highway, trucking, transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 - The Transportation System includes the following modes and aspects:
 - Air, marine, rail (freight and passenger)
 - Highway (trucks, buses, cars)
 - Transit
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian
- Provide documentation to the OTC of the public process and resulting recommendations forwarded by the ACT including alternatives for solutions and outcomes of decisions.
- Provide a report to the Oregon Transportation Commission at least once every two years.

B. Optional Activities of the ACTs

In addition to the above, ACTs may choose to provide advice on activities such as:

- ODOT corridor plans or local transportation system plans (TSPs) that contain projects of Regional significance (for example, a new highway bypass).
- Review projects and policies for other STIP funding programs and categories that have advisory committees or processes in place and advise ODOT on any special circumstances or opportunities that apply. These programs include Preservation, Safety, Bridge, Operations, Public Transportation, Freight, Rail, Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Enhancement, Scenic Byways, Federal Lands Highways, and Fish Culverts.
- Advise the OTC on state and Regional policies affecting the Area's Transportation System, including proposed ODOT policies & their implementation.
- Input into prioritization of long-range planning projects (especially refinement plans) in the ODOT Region planning work programs.
- Establishment and monitoring of benchmarks for Regional transportation improvements.
- Other transportation related policy or funding issues relevant to a particular ACT that would benefit from the coordinated committee discussion afforded by the ACT structure.

See Attachment C for a flowchart showing ACT involvement in the typical process elements for the STIP.

C. Role of OTC

Success of the ACT is linked to communication with the OTC. The OTC role includes:

- Designating one OTC member as the liaison to the ACT.
- Encouraging the OTC liaison to attend ACT meetings.
- Providing financial support in an amount sufficient to meet OTC expectations.
- Facilitating communication between the OTC and the ODOT representative to the ACT.
- Describing expectations and providing adequate lead time when requesting input from the ACT.

- Providing training opportunities for the ACTs to enhance understanding of statewide programs and issues.
- Giving significant weight to recommendations from ACTs that follow procedures and requirements described in this document.
- Providing feedback to the ACTs regarding decisions that were made based on the ACT recommendations.
- Conducting a biennial review of the ACT Charter and Operating Agreements.

D. Role of ODOT Staff

ODOT staff provides a key role in the successful operation of the ACT. ODOT shall assign a senior manager with good communication skills as its voting representative to the ACT. The ODOT representative shall:

- Serve as a communication liaison between the ACT, ODOT Region, and ODOT Director's Office.
- Bring a statewide perspective to discussions of local transportation issues.
- Coordinate timely preparation of agenda items for action by the ACT.
- Provide technical and policy information in a timely manner to assist the ACT in carrying out its roles and responsibilities.
- Provide information on project status.
- Coordinate presentations and education regarding state and federal programs and priorities.
- Advise the ACT of ODOT views during program and project discussions.
- Provide staff support as agreed upon (Section V. B.).
- Advise on technical or policy issues relating to transportation safety, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, passenger rail and freight, trucking, public transportation, scenic byways, motor carriers and state/local government relationships.

III. AUTHORITY

ORS 184.610 to 184.666 gives the Oregon Transportation Commission the authority to establish the policies for the operation of the Oregon Department of Transportation and for the administration of programs related to transportation. The Area Commissions on Transportation are advisory bodies chartered under authority of the Oregon Transportation Commission. The OTC may charter an ACT when it demonstrates, and as long as it maintains, a structure consistent with the requirements contained in this document. The OTC retains oversight and final decision making authority to assure efficient management of the state Transportation System. ACTs provide valuable input and recommendations to that process.

An ACT is a voluntary association of government and non-government transportation stakeholders and has no legal regulatory, policy or administrative authority. The ACT process and resulting recommendations shall comply with relevant laws, regulations and policies. As an advisory body to the OTC with authority to make recommendations on policy or administration, ACTs meet the definition of a "Governing Body" and fall under the requirements of the Public Meetings Law. ORS 192.610 to 192.690. An ACT's members shall comply with the requirements of Oregon Government Standards and Practices laws concerning conflict of interest.

ACTs should apply a statewide perspective to address the Transportation System with primary focus on the state Transportation System (Glossary, Attachment D). ACTs may also consider Regional and local transportation issues. Multi-ACT collaboration may be requested to facilitate consideration of issues that have a broader geographic scope than any one ACT. The needs of urban and rural areas may be different and discussions may include ACT representatives from more than one ODOT Region to help focus discussions on corridor or system needs.

IV. ACT STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP

A. Geographic Coverage

Because the ACTs (and, where applicable, the MPOs) are primary advisors to the OTC with regard to transportation policies and programs which effect them, the OTC strongly encourages coverage of the State with respect to ACT or MPO representation.

The OTC recognizes that there is strength in member familiarity with Regional issues, and thus, expects that an ACT will encompass an area that geographically represents all its interests. The rationale for ACT boundaries should be consistent with a “geographical community of interest” regarding the state Transportation System and coordinated with existing Regional inter-governmental relationships. Shared interest might include a similarity of population, economy, land use, infrastructure needs, contiguous boundaries, commute shed, political and programmatic interests, and collaborative opportunities. The geographic boundaries of an ACT or MPO may change over time and if this occurs, an amendment to the boundaries will be negotiated and agreed upon by the affected parties, and a formal request for change will be submitted in writing to the OTC for approval. Each ACT will develop an Operating Agreement (Section V. A.) and this agreement will articulate the rationale for its specific boundaries.

B. Membership

When establishing the voting⁴ membership, an ACT needs to consider all modes and aspects of the Transportation System. An ACT will have a voting membership which is reflective of its population and interest groups and will be broadly representative of those impacted by ACT recommendations. At a minimum, ACT representation will include at least 50% elected officials from the Area. Representation shall include City, County, and MPO officials within the ACT boundaries. Tribal Governments, Port officials, and Transit officials⁵ shall also be invited to participate as voting members and will count toward the requirement of at least 50% elected officials. The remainder of the representation should be from interested stakeholders which may represent, but are not limited to: freight, trucking, bicycle, pedestrian, public transportation system, public interest advocacy groups, environmental, land use, local citizens, business, education, public safety providers, non-profit organizations, etc. ODOT will be a voting member on each ACT. Members should be carefully selected so that transportation recommendations are coordinated with other local and Regional community development activities, creating consensus within the Area on transportation issues and priorities. The ACT will determine the total number and selection of ACT members.

⁴ Voting may be by consensus or majority, as defined in the individual ACT Operating Agreement (Section V. A.).

⁵ In some geographic areas, Port and Transit officials are appointed, not elected.

In addition to the official membership, each ACT should include appropriate ex officio members and give full consideration to their comments and recommendations. Ex officio members may include:

- Oregon Transportation Commissioners, state legislators, and local congressional aides
- Community Solutions Team
- State and federal agencies such as US Forest Service, BLM, Fish and Wildlife, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Land Conservation and Development, Department of Aviation
- City and county road district or department
- Regional groups that have an interest in transportation issues such as housing advocates, Regional Partnerships and Regional Investment Boards, law enforcement agencies, etc.

The ACT should encourage participation of adjacent ACTs and consider inviting representatives as ex officio members. Adjoining ACTs should be included on all mailing lists and be invited to attend all ACT meetings.

As an ACT experiences membership turnover, it should review representation to ensure continued balance of all groups the committee represents. When providing reports to the OTC, ACTS will be asked to describe how they have met the membership guidance. If circumstances within the ACT (e.g., small population and large geographic area) prevent the ACT from meeting the minimum membership requirements, the ACT may develop an alternate proposal for approval by the OTC during its biennial review.

C. Technical Advisory Committee

Although not required, the ACT may establish a technical advisory committee to assist during project or policy discussions. The TAC may be a standing committee to the ACT or formed on an ad-hoc basis as needed. The ACT will determine membership of the TAC and its role will be defined in the Operating Agreement.

V. OPERATIONS OF THE ACT

A. ACT Operating Agreements

ACT operating agreements must clarify the roles and processes between members, agencies, ODOT and the OTC. They are intended to specify how members will be selected and define membership beyond that required in this document, including the total number and the voting status of each member. Operating agreements shall provide for a wide solicitation for non-elected membership, and specify the solicitation process used. In addition, Operating Agreements shall specify when, where and how meetings will be conducted, officers and terms of office, whether or not alternates will be allowed, the public involvement processes which the ACT will use, number of members required to constitute a quorum, decision making process (for example, consensus or majority vote), and whether technical advisory committees will be used and how they will be constituted.

Some ACTs may choose to have an executive/steering committee and if so, the Operating Agreement will describe the committee's authority and how it meets the requirements of this document, particularly in regard to membership and public involvement. The Operating

Agreement will articulate how the executive/steering committee will communicate with the full ACT.

The Operating Agreements shall clarify that ACTs are advisory bodies that make recommendations to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

B. Staffing and Financial Support

An ACT must be staffed either by ODOT or an organization with which ODOT could contract administrative services. The ACT and ODOT will jointly agree on how the ACT will be staffed. ODOT will provide planning staff assistance to the ACT and financial support for administration of the ACT in an amount sufficient to meet OTC expectations. Where it makes financial and logistical sense, the management and technical support services of an MPO and an ACT may be combined to increase consistency, cost-efficiency, and coordination.

C. Public Involvement

As an advisory body that has authority to make recommendations to the OTC on policy or administration, an ACT must comply with the requirements of Oregon's Public Meetings Law found at ORS 192.610 to 192.690. The policy underlying the law is to ensure an open governmental decision making process and so facilitate the public's awareness "of the deliberations and decisions of governing bodies and the information upon which such decisions were made." (ORS 192.620.)

The Public Involvement section gives more detail than other portions of this document. Attachment A provides the minimum and preferred public involvement requirements for different types of ACT meetings. The ACT may use Attachment A as a template to incorporate into its bylaws. The goal is to achieve statewide consistency through an open, understandable process that meets state and federal public involvement policies, while continuing to recognize Regional differences in issues and priorities. In its biennial report to the OTC, the ACT will describe how it meets the minimum requirements. The ACTs must follow all relevant federal laws, regulations and policies for public involvement, including Title VI and Environmental Justice requirements, and all applicable ODOT policies.

For ACTs to fulfill their advisory role in prioritizing transportation problems and solutions and recommending projects, the ACTs must involve the public and stakeholders in their decision making processes. As the ACTs consider local, Regional and statewide transportation issues, it is important that they use the appropriate level of public involvement and/or public information. To comply with federal Environmental Justice requirements, the public involvement process needs to identify a strategy for engaging minority and low income populations in transportation decision making. Meeting materials and facilities shall be accessible to those with disabilities pursuant to ADA standards.

The responsibility for developing agendas, distributing materials, taking minutes, website maintenance and other duties related to ACT public involvement shall be covered in the joint agreement identified in Section V. B, Staffing and Financial Support.

VI. BASIS FOR DECISION MAKING

The ACT shall function as an advisory body to the OTC, which has final decision authority. The ACT process and resulting recommendations shall comply with relevant laws, regulations and policies. When ACTs are considering recommendations relative to the STIP, their recommendations must comply with the policies and standards adopted by the OTC. When ACTs are providing recommendations on policy, they have greater latitude in formulating their response.

Recommendations shall be based on local, state, and federal adopted transportation plans, policies and procedures including, but not limited to:

- Oregon Transportation Plan and supporting mode plans (e.g., Oregon Highway Plan and Oregon Public Transportation Plan)
- Oregon Public Meetings Law, ORS 192.610 to 192.690 (See State of Oregon, Department of Justice, *Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual*)
- State corridor and facility plans
- Transportation Planning Rule, OAR 660-012
- Transportation system plans
- MPO regional transportation plans
- Federal transportation planning regulations
- Local government plans, regulations, and ordinances
- Project selection criteria and prioritization factors approved by the OTC, including Oregon Transportation Management System data
- State Agency Coordination Program, OAR 731-15
- Additional criteria established by the OTC
- Oregon Government Standards and Practices, ORS Chapter 244
(See *Oregon Government Standards and Practices Laws, a Guide for Public Officials*, by the Oregon Government Standards and Practices Commission)

ACTs may use additional criteria to select and rank projects provided the criteria do not conflict with any criteria established by the OTC⁶. If an ACT chooses to use additional criteria, they must inform those developing project proposals about the criteria. ACTs shall apply Regional and statewide perspectives to their considerations, refining recommendations after consultation with any affected metropolitan planning organization.

Recommendations to the OTC shall be documented and forwarded to the OTC with the factors used to develop the recommendation, including any additional criteria used by the ACT in forming its recommendation. Documentation developed by a member whose recommendations were not incorporated into the final ACT recommendations will be forwarded to the OTC with other materials documenting ACT recommendations. Recommendations to the OTC will be made in accordance with the approved STIP Development Timeline (on the Web at: <http://www.odot.state.or.us/stip/>).

⁶ See footnote 3.

ODOT has established special committees and processes to apply Oregon Transportation Management System information for the identification, prioritization and development of bridge replacement/rehabilitation and pavement preservation projects. If the ACT reviews Bridge or Preservation projects based on OTC approved criteria, the role of the ACT shall be to review the recommended lists of projects and to provide information to ODOT regarding any special circumstances within the Area that may apply to the prioritized list. Due to the highly technical nature of the bridge project selection, prioritization is primarily the responsibility of the technical staff utilizing the Bridge Management System. For preservation projects, the list from the Pavement Management System is enhanced by ACT knowledge/ information that helps meet state and local objectives (e.g., leverage funding sources, bundle with other projects, coordinate with local projects).

Federal regulations require MPOs to select transportation projects within the MPO boundaries from a limited pool of projects identified in the MPO's financially constrained regional plan. Selection of other projects within the MPO boundary requires coordination with the MPO and amendment of the MPO plan and TIP prior to adding them to the STIP. Outside MPO boundaries, ACTs may draw from a larger pool of projects found in local transportation system plans, which are not necessarily financially constrained.

VII. COORDINATION

Because of the fundamental importance placed on recommendations by the ACTs, coordination shall be a primary obligation and ACTs are expected to meet a high standard in this area. To ensure that recommendations have been reviewed for local, Regional and statewide issues and perspectives, ACTs should communicate with others that may have knowledge or interest in the Area. Working with a broad representation of stakeholder groups should also help provide a balance between local/Regional priorities and statewide priorities. ACT coordination should include, but not be limited to the following groups:

- Oregon Transportation Commission
- Other ACTs within and across ODOT Regions
- ODOT Advisory Committees
- Community Solutions Team
- Regional Partnerships and Regional Investment Boards
- Tribal Governments
- MPOs
- Local Governments, Transit and Port Districts
- Stakeholder groups (e.g., environmental, business, state and federal agencies with land holdings within the ACT boundary)

It is recommended that the ACT develop a diagram or flowchart showing the numerous relationships within the ACT. The diagram should be available at each meeting of the ACT.

A. Oregon Transportation Commission

ACTs will provide a report to the OTC at least once every two years. The report will provide an opportunity for the Commission to review the ACT charter, operating agreements and proposed work program. If modifications are required to comply with new or updated OTC direction (e.g.,

revising processes to conform to the revised “Policy on Formation and Operation of Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT)”, changes will be incorporated at that time. An ACT or the OTC may initiate additional communication on an as-needed basis.

ACTs will forward their recommendations and supporting information to the OTC for consideration. The OTC will provide feedback to the ACTs regarding actions taken.

B. ACTs Within and Across ODOT Regions

ACTs will coordinate with other ACTs, as needed for recommendations to the OTC that may have a Regional impact (e.g., priorities along a specific highway corridor). To facilitate regular communications, adjacent ACTs should be included on the ACT mailing lists and invited to all ACT meetings. Meeting agendas and minutes should be provided to adjacent ACTs. The ACT should consider adjacent ACT representatives for inclusion as ex officio members.

C. ODOT Advisory Committees

ACTs are encouraged to keep ODOT’s specialized standing committees (e.g., Local Officials Advisory Committee, Rail, Freight, Public Transportation, Bicycle/Pedestrian, Transportation Enhancement, Scenic Byways and the Tri-Agency Committee for the Forest Highway Program) informed and to seek their comment on major policies and programs under consideration. Representatives should be included on the ACT mailing lists and invited to all ACT meetings. The committees have a mutual obligation to provide information to the ACTs regarding processes, technical data, and recommendations specific to the program.

D. Community Solutions Team

Since 1995, five state agency directors, serving as the Governor's Community Solutions Team (CST), have been actively engaged in developing an integrated and collaborative approach to community development. ACTs are encouraged to use the multi agency resources of the Regional Community Solutions Teams (RCST) early in the project review process to raise and resolve issues as appropriate. RCST may also help identify opportunities to leverage funds. The standing agencies of the CST include:

- Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)
- Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS)
- Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD)
- Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)
- Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ).

Representatives of the RCST should be included on the ACT mailing lists and invited to all ACT meetings

E. Regional Partnerships and Regional Investment Boards

Regional Partnerships and Regional Investment Boards are composed of local partners in two or more counties and the cities, ports, and tribes within those counties who agree to work together to provide a forum for coordination of economic and community development planning and investments so that strategies and processes for economic and community development are leveraged to the greatest extent possible to meet agreed upon priority issues, challenges and goals.

Representatives of Regional Partnerships or Regional Investment Boards should be included on the ACT mailing lists and invited to all ACT meetings. ACTs are encouraged to either be one and the same with a Regional Partnership or be organized to work effectively with and contribute to the work of a Regional Partnership.

F. Tribal Governments

OTC recognizes that Tribal Governments represent sovereign nations. ACT recommendations will consider the needs of the Tribal Governments, as well as coordination with the tribal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and other projects being developed by the Tribal Governments. To provide this coordination and understanding, a tribal representative shall be invited as a voting member of the ACT, as applicable.

G. MPOs

While the ACTs provide valuable advice on project priorities and other policy issues, the MPO is responsible for carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning process within urbanized areas in cooperation with the State and transit operators (23 CFR 450.312). MPOs develop a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) that approves all projects that are regionally significant or that include federal funds, by year and by phase within the MPO planning areas. Before FHWA and FTA can approve Federal transportation funding for projects or activities within urbanized areas, they must be consistent with the MPO's regional transportation plan (RTP) and TIP.

The MPO must have a continuing, cooperative and comprehensive transportation planning process that results in plans and programs that consider all transportation modes and supports metropolitan community development and social goals. These plans and programs shall lead to the development and operation of an integrated intermodal transportation system that facilitates the efficient, economic movement of people and goods. (23 CFR 450.312).

ACTs and MPOs should coordinate their efforts to assure a better decision making process which results in better coordination of projects. The form of coordination should be different depending upon where MPO and ACT boundaries fall. When ACT and MPO boundaries overlap, a higher level of clearly defined coordination is needed and it is important that ACT activities fully coordinate with the MPO planning process. The MPO and ACT should jointly agree on a process for maintaining consistency between ACT recommendations and the MPO Plan and TIP, where this occurs. An MPO representative shall be included as a voting member on the ACT if within the same geographic area as an ACT.

For ACTs that are near or adjacent to an MPO, a sufficient level of coordination can be achieved by simply communicating the priorities of each group. This might be done through ex officio membership on committees or some other mutually agreeable, less formal method.

H. Local Governments, Transit and Port Districts

Transportation recommendations will be coordinated with other local and Regional community development activities. ACT representation shall include port and transit officials from the Area. ACT representatives of these groups are responsible for providing regular updates to their respective organizations on actions and recommendations being considered by the ACTs.

I. Stakeholder Groups

While it may be impractical to include representatives from every stakeholder group on the ACT, the ACT needs to make a concerted effort to hear the concerns and recommendations of stakeholders prior to making decisions regarding recommendations to the OTC. The ACT will provide easy access to technical materials and supporting documentation considered by the ACT during its decision making process and shall consider and respond to public input received during the planning and program development process. (Section V. C. and Attachment A).

Attachment A Public Involvement

ACT meetings will comply with the requirements of the Oregon Public Meetings Law, ORS 192.610 to 192.690. “Meeting” means the convening of a governing body of a public body for which a quorum is required to make a decision or deliberate toward a decision on any matter.” ORS 192.610(5). Meetings include information-gathering sessions, working lunches and electronic meetings. All ACT meetings will be open to public attendance and any member of the public may attend any meeting of the ACT.

A. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS FOR REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETINGS

The ACT will conduct all meetings in accordance with the following minimum requirements and will strive to meet the preferred standards. The regular meeting requirements will be supplemented with the methods found in Table 1 if the meeting falls into the following additional categories:

- Developing project priorities for Draft STIP using approved criteria.
- Draft STIP public hearing.
- Special meetings.
- Electronic meetings.

Meeting Notice

- Advance notice to interested persons and stakeholder groups on ACT mailing list and to news media which have requested notice.
- Notices must include time, place, agenda (principal subjects) and name of person and telephone number (including TTY number) at the public body to contact to make a request for an interpreter for the hearing impaired or for other communication aids.
- A good faith effort must be made to provide an interpreter for hearing-impaired persons on receipt of proper notice. ORS 192.630(5).

Meeting Materials

- For decision items, distribute information to everyone in attendance at the meeting.
- Provide time on the agenda for general public comment.

Meeting Schedule

- If regularly scheduled meetings are not possible, the minimum standard is to provide extra public notification by following the Preferred method of meeting notification.

Meeting Location

- Meets accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- No meeting may be held in buildings where discrimination (race, sex, age, national origin, color, creed, disability) is practiced. ORS 192.630(3).
- Generally held within the geographic boundaries of the ACT’s jurisdiction. Training sessions may be held anywhere.
- Contains adequate seating and facilities to encourage attendance by the general public.

Meeting Minutes--Minutes shall be prepared for all ACT meetings. Minutes must include at least:

- Members present.
- All motions, proposals and resolutions proposed, and their disposition.
- Results of all votes/decisions. Secret ballots prohibited.
- Substance of all discussion.
- Reference to all documents discussed (confidentiality of records exempt from disclosure may be protected).
- After each ACT meeting the ACT shall prepare and distribute the minutes prior to the next ACT meeting.
- As appropriate to the Area, meeting minutes should be provided in languages other than English.⁷
- Minutes must be preserved for a reasonable time.

B. PREFERRED STANDARD FOR REGULAR MEETINGS

In addition to the minimum requirements, the preferred standard for regular meetings includes:

Meeting Notice

- One week advance notice.
- Notices posted at local public institutions (city hall, library, community center, etc.).
- Notice posted on ACT website, along with links to meeting agendas, past meeting minutes, technical materials and documentation.

Meeting Materials

- Provide an advance agenda one week prior to the meeting, either on the ACT website or through the mail.
- For decision items, provide technical materials and supporting documentation one week prior to the ACT meeting. Materials can be distributed through the ACT website and/or through the mail.
- Provide copies of all correspondence received prior to the meeting to ACT members and the public attending the meeting.

Meeting Schedule

- Regular schedule (e.g., meetings at 1:00 p.m. on the last Thursday of each month).

Meeting Location

- Easily accessible by public transportation.

Meeting Minutes--

- Post minutes from the meeting on the ACT website.

⁷ A Governor's task force is currently working on methodology for meeting the federal requirements for Limited English Proficiency. Public involvement at the ACTs will need to comply with the guidance developed.

C. EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

The responsibilities of the ACT do not include work permitted in an executive session (ORS 192.660).

D. CONTROL OF MEETINGS

- The presiding officer has inherent authority to keep order at meetings—can “reasonably” regulate the use of cameras and tape recorders.
- No smoking is permitted at any meeting of the ACT.

E. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Roles and responsibilities of parties engaged in public involvement activities on behalf of ACT will be designated in the joint agreement identified in Section V.B, Staffing and Financial support.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT

The public shall be provided opportunities to speak to the merits of proposals before the ACT and to forward their own proposals. Public comment may be taken at any time during the ACT meeting. Copies of all correspondence received prior to the meeting should be available for ACT members and the public at the meeting. The ACT public involvement process shall demonstrate explicit consideration and response to public input during the planning and program development process.

| Type of Meeting | Meeting Notice | | Meeting Materials | | Meeting Schedule | | Meeting Location | |
|--|---|---|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|--|---|
| | Minimum | Preferred | Minimum | Preferred | Minimum | Preferred | Minimum | Preferred |
| Developing Project Priorities for Draft STIP Using Approved Criteria | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings Plus -Paid Advertising | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings plus -In establishing outreach activities for specific projects or topics consider locations that would be frequented by that community (e.g., social service organizations, schools). |
| Draft STIP Public Hearing | -Same as Regular Meetings plus -Paid Advertising | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | Same as Developing Project Priorities for Draft STIP Using Approved Criteria |
| Special Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings plus -Minimum 24 hours Notice | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings | -Same as Regular Meetings |
| Electronic Requirements apply to all meetings by electronic means (e.g., personal computers). | -Same as Minimum for meeting type listed above. All procedural and formal requirements apply (minutes, notices, etc.). ORS 192.670. | - Same as Preferred for appropriate meeting type listed above | -Same as Regular Meetings | Same as Regular Meetings plus -Room with “listening” device | -Same as Regular Meetings |

Attachment B

How An Act Is Established and Biennial Report Structure

In establishing an ACT, local elected officials and staff work together with the ODOT Region Manager and the OTC member representing the Area to develop a proposal for the formation of an Area Commission on Transportation (ACT). The proposal should address the key questions listed below. The proposal is circulated among local jurisdictions for comment, revision and eventually expressions of support. The State Community Solutions Team reviews the proposal for coordination with the Regional Partnership Initiative. The Oregon Transportation Commission reviews the proposal. Once the Commission accepts the proposal, it adopts a resolution providing a provisional charter for the Area Commission on Transportation. The ACT selects its members and begins to function as an official advisory body to the Oregon Transportation Commission.

The Biennial Report should follow a similar process in addressing the questions below and should be reviewed by the ACT membership before submitting to the OTC.


Key Questions to be addressed in an ACT Proposal

The Oregon Transportation Commission expects that for an ACT to be effective it will represent the political environment of the Area. Therefore, each ACT may look and function somewhat differently than another. However, each proposal or biennial report for an ACT should address at least the following questions:

1. What is the rationale for the geographic boundaries of the proposed ACT? If the boundaries are being modified, why?
2. What are the proposed voting and ex officio membership categories and how do they ensure coordination with existing Regional public agencies?
3. Is the membership broadly representative of local elected officials and inclusive of other key stakeholders and interests (see Section IV, Subsection B., Membership)? If key representation is not included, explain the justification.
4. How would/does the ACT coordinate with adjacent ACTs and/or MPOs and involve state legislators?
5. What is the proposed work program of the ACT?
6. How will/does the ACT meet the minimum public involvement standards as shown in Attachment A of this document?
7. Who would/does help guide the work program and agendas of the ACT? Indicate the general operational structure.
8. How would/does the ACT secure technical assistance on transportation issues?

9. What key work efforts will be /have been addressed by the ACT?
10. Who would/does provide support staff to the ACT?
11. What will be/is the decision making process used by the ACT?

**ATTACHMENT C: ACT PARTICIPATION
TYPICAL PROCESS ELEMENTS
STATEWIDE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**



* Bicycle/Pedestrian, Highway, Public Transportation, Rail Freight, Rail Passenger, Transportation Safety Action, Aviation
 ** MPO TIPS must be included in ODOT's STIP without modification. To ensure state priorities are considered, ODOT must be involved in the local planning project selection process.

Bold Text = Primary Role for ACTs

Italicized Text = Optional Role for ACTs

Black Text = Not covered for Formation and Operation of ACTs document

Attachment D

Glossary of Terms

Area—When capitalized, describes the geographic area of the Area Commission on Transportation.

Region—When capitalized, describes the Oregon Department of Transportation geographic regions.

Regional—When capitalized, includes considerations of other communities, regional movements and patterns of transportation.

Transportation System—When capitalized, includes the following modes and aspects:

- Air, marine, rail (freight and passenger)
- Highway (trucks, buses, cars)
- Transit
- Bicycle/Pedestrian

To consider all modes and aspects of the Transportation System in formulating recommendations, ACTs would take into account the provision of elements and connections between air, marine, rail, highway, trucking, transit, bike and pedestrian facilities.

Verbs:

Obligation—This category of terms shows the ACTs' responsibility to ensure the outcome to the OTC. The terms that fall within this category include:

- Must
- Shall
- Will

Encouraged—This category of terms provides the ACTs some flexibility with their responsibilities to the OTC. The terms that fall within this category include:

- Should

Permitted—This is the most flexible category of terms. It allows the ACTs to decide whether or not to engage in evaluation of the particular situation. Terms that fall within this category include:

- May

Protecting the public's right to know

A QUICK REFERENCE GUIDE TO OREGON'S PUBLIC MEETINGS LAW

For local and state officials, members
of Oregon boards and commissions, citizens,
and non-profit groups

This guide is published as a public service by
Open Oregon: a Freedom of information Coalition
and the Oregon Attorney General's office.



A Time Saving Reference

This guide is brought to you free of charge as a joint project between Open Oregon: A Freedom of Information Coalition and Oregon Attorney General Hardy Myers. Funding for this booklet came from the National Freedom of Information Coalition through a grant from the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation.

How to Use This Guide

This summary is intended as a quick reference to the Oregon Public Meetings Law. The entire law may be found in Oregon Revised Statutes 192.610 to 192.690. Additional information may be obtained by sending an e-mail request to info@open-oregon.com or visiting www.open-oregon.com

For a comprehensive analysis of the law, refer to the latest edition of the Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual, available for a nominal fee by calling (503) 378-2992 or writing to Department of Justice, Administrative Services, 1162 Court Street NE, Salem, Oregon 97301-4096.

What is Open Oregon?

Open Oregon: A Freedom of Information Coalition is a non-profit educational and charitable organization with a single purpose: to assist and educate the general public, students, educators, public officials, media and legal professional to understand and exercise:

- Their rights to open government.
- Their rights and responsibilities under the Oregon public meetings and records laws.
- Their rights under the federal Freedom of Information Act.

Open Oregon is a 501(c)(3) non-profit corporation.

The Spirit of Oregon's Public Meetings Law

The Value of Openness

Understanding the letter of the Public Meetings Law is critical. Equally important is understanding and committing to the spirit of that law. Public bodies should approach the law with openness in mind. Open meetings help citizens understand decisions and build trust in government. It is better to comply with the spirit of the law and keep deliberations open.

“Government accountability depends on an open and accessible process.”

•

Hardy Myers

Oregon Attorney General

“Public bodies must conduct business in public - it’s really that simple.”

•

Bill Bradbury

Oregon Secretary of State
Honorary Co-Chair, Open Oregon

“Oregon needs to protect its tradition of openness.”

•

Dave Frohnmayer

President, University of Oregon
Honorary Co-Chair, Open Oregon

Oregon's Public Meetings Law

“Open government” or “sunshine” laws originally were enacted nationwide in the early 1970s because of growing public unhappiness with government secrecy. As a result, every state and the District of Columbia enacted laws requiring government to conduct its business openly, rather than behind closed doors.

Open government laws benefit both government and the public. Citizens gain by having access to the process of deliberation - enabling them to view their government at work and to influence its deliberations. Government officials gain credibility by permitting citizens to observe their information-gathering and decision-making processes. Such understanding leads to greater trust in government by its citizens. Conversely, officials who attempt to keep their deliberations hidden from public scrutiny create cynicism, erode public trust and discourage involvement.

Policy

Oregon's Public Meetings Law was enacted in 1973 to make sure that all meetings of governing bodies covered by the law are open to the public. This includes meetings called just to gather information for subsequent decisions or recommendations.

The law also requires that the public be given notice of the time and place of meetings and that meetings be accessible to everyone, including persons with disabilities.

The Public Meetings Law guarantees the public the right to view government meetings, but not necessarily to speak at them. Governing bodies set their own rules for citizen participation and public comment.

Who is covered?

Because questions often arise about what groups must comply with the public-meetings law, it is useful to look at the definitions in the law. The law says that any “governing body” of a “public body” is required to comply. It offers these definitions:

- A **“public body”** is any state, regional, or local governmental board, department, commission, council, bureau, committee, subcommittee, or advisory group created by the state constitution, statute, administrative rule, order, intergovernmental agreement, bylaw or other official act.
- A **“governing body”** is two or more members of a public body who have the authority to make decisions for or recommendations to a public body on policy or administration. A group without power of decision is a governing body when authorized to make recommendations to a public body, but not when the recommendations go to individual public officials.

Example

- *A school board must meet in public.*
- *So must most advisory committees that the school board creates, such as a budget committee.*
- *But if the school board chair asks several business leaders to meet with him to discuss future building needs, that meeting may be held in private.*

Private bodies, such as non-profit corporations, do not have to comply with the public-meetings law, even if they receive public funds, contract with governmental bodies or perform public services.

Example

- *A school district contracts with Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Oregon to provide health insurance for district employees. The BlueCross BlueShield board of directors is not required to meet in public.*

Public agencies contracting with private bodies may require a private body to comply with the law for pertinent meetings. Federal agencies are not subject to Oregon’s Public Meetings Law.

What is a Public Meeting?

A public meeting is the convening of any governing body for which a quorum is required to make or deliberate toward a decision on any matter, or to gather information. Decisions must be made in public, and secret ballots are prohibited. Quorum requirements may vary among governing bodies.

Example

- *A county commission's goal-setting retreat is a public meeting if a quorum is present and they discuss official business.*
- *A training session for the commissioners is not a public meeting, unless a quorum is present and the commissioners discuss official business.*
- *A staff meeting absent a quorum of commissioners, whether called by a single commissioner or a non-elected official, is not a public meeting.*

Meetings accomplished by telephone conference calls or other electronic means are public meetings. The governing body must provide public notice, as well as a location where the public may listen to or observe the meeting.

Governing bodies must hold their meetings within the geographic boundaries of their jurisdiction. However, a governing body may meet elsewhere if there is an actual emergency requiring immediate action or to hold a training session, when no deliberation toward a decision is involved.

Example

- *A library board is free to rotate meetings at different libraries in its district, but it may not meet outside its district.*

Federal and state law requires that meetings be held in places accessible to individuals with mobility and other impairments.

What is Exempt from the Law?

On-site inspections, staff meetings and gatherings of associations to which a public body or its members belong are not considered public meetings. Chance social gatherings are not considered meetings as long as no official business is discussed.

Example

- *Three out of five city councilors inspect a new landfill site. Their inspection does not constitute a public meeting, unless they deliberate toward a decision on a city matter.*
- *Later, the three city councilors attend a League of Oregon Cities conference. Again, this is not a public meeting, unless the councilors discuss official city business.*
- *That evening, the three councilors chat during a concert intermission. As long as they talk about the music, this is not a public meeting. But if they stray into discussion of official city business, then it is.*

Also exempt from the Public Meetings Law are:

- Meetings of state or local lawyers assistance committees.
- Meetings of medical peer review committees.
- Meetings of multidisciplinary teams reviewing child abuse and neglect fatalities.
- Judicial proceedings. However, see Oregon Constitution, Section 10.
- Review by the Workers' Compensation Board and the Employment Appeals Board of hearings on contested cases.
- Meetings of the Energy Facility Siting Council when it reviews and approves security programs.
- The Oregon Health and Science University regarding presidential selection process, sensitive business matters, or meetings of faculty or staff committees.
- Mediation by the agricultural mediation service program.

For some entities, the deliberation process alone is exempt, although information-gathering and decision-making must be public. This applies to the State Board of Parole, the Psychiatric Security Review Board, and state agencies conducting hearings on contested cases under the Administrative Procedures Act.

Notice of Meetings

Governing bodies must give notice of the time, place and agenda for any regular, special or emergency meeting.

Public notice must be reasonably calculated to give actual notice to interested persons and media who have asked in writing to be notified of meetings and general notice to the public at large.

Governing bodies wishing to provide adequate notice should strive to provide as much notice as possible to ensure that those wishing to attend have ample opportunity – a week to 10 days for example.

At least 24-hour notice to members of the governing body, the public and media is required for any special meeting, unless the meeting is considered an emergency meeting. Appropriate notice is required for emergency meetings and should include phone calls to media and other interested parties. Notice for emergency meetings must also cite the emergency.

A meeting notice must include a list of the principal subjects to be considered at the meeting. This list should be specific enough to permit citizens to recognize matters of interest. However, discussion of subjects not on the agenda is allowed at the meeting.

Example

The State Board of Higher Education plans to discuss building new college campus in Burns. An agenda item that says "Discussion of public works" would be too general. Instead, the agenda should say something like "Discussion of proposed Burns campus."

Executive Sessions

Governing bodies are allowed to exclude the public - but generally not the media - from the discussion of certain subjects. These meetings are called executive sessions.

Executive sessions may be called during any regular, special or emergency meeting. A governing body may set a meeting solely to hold an executive session as long as it gives appropriate public notice. Notice requirements for executive sessions are the same as for regular, special or emergency meetings. However, labor negotiations conducted in executive sessions are not subject to public notice requirements.

Notice of an executive session must cite the specific law that authorizes the executive session. This authorization also must be announced before going into the executive session.

Governing bodies may formally specify that the media not disclose information that is the subject of the executive session. Governing bodies should not discuss topics apart from those legally justifying the executive session. Media representatives may report discussions that stray from legitimate executive session topics and are not required to inform the governing body when they intend to do so.

No final action may be taken in executive session. Decisions must be made in public session. If a governing body expects to meet publicly to make a final decision immediately after an executive session, it should try to announce the time of that open session to the public before the executive session begins.

Example

• City councilors meet in executive session to discuss the city manager's performance. A local reporter attends. During the meeting, the councilors discuss whether the city should put a bond measure on the next ballot. The reporter may write a story on the council's bond-measure discussion, because that discussion was not allowed under the executive session rules. The reporter may not write about the city manager's performance.

Executive Sessions Criteria

Executive sessions are allowed only for very limited purposes. Those include:

- 1. To consider the initial employment of a public officer**, employee or staff member, but not to fill a vacancy in an elected office, or on public committees, commissions or advisory groups. These sessions are allowed only if the position has been advertised, standardized procedures for hiring have been publicly adopted, and the public has had an opportunity for input on the process. Executive sessions are not allowed to consider general employment policies.
- 2. To consider dismissal**, discipline, complaints or charges against a public official, employee, official, staff or individual agent, unless that person requests a public hearing.
- 3. To review and evaluate the job performance** of a chief executive officer, or other officer or staff member, unless that person requests an open hearing. Such evaluation must be pursuant to standards, criteria and policy directives publicly adopted by the governing body following an opportunity for public comment. The executive session may not be used for the general evaluation of agency goals, objectives, programs or operations, or to issue any directive to personnel on the same.
- 4. To deliberate with persons designated to conduct labor negotiations.** The media may be excluded from these sessions.
- 5. To conduct labor negotiations** if both sides request that negotiations be in executive session. Public notice is not required for such meetings.
- 6. To consider records** that are exempt by law from public disclosure.
- 7. To consult with counsel** concerning litigation filed or likely to be filed against the public body. Members of the media that are a party to that litigation, or represent a media entity that is a party, may be excluded.
- 8. To consult with persons designated to negotiate** real property transactions.

9. To discuss matters of trade when the governing body is in competition with other states or nations.

10. To negotiate with a private person or business regarding public investments.

11. To discuss matters of medical competency and other matters pertaining to licensed hospitals.

12. To consider information obtained by a health professional regulatory board or State Landscape Architect Board as part of an investigation of licensee or applicant conduct.

13. To discuss information relating to the security of: a nuclear power plant; transportation of radioactive materials; generation, storage or conveyance of electricity, gas hazardous substances, petroleum, sewage or water; and telecommunications and data transmission.

Media at Executive Sessions

Media representatives must be allowed to attend executive sessions, with three exceptions. Media may be excluded from:

- Strategy discussions with labor negotiators.
- Meetings to consider expulsion of a student or to discuss students' confidential medical records.
- Meetings to consult with counsel concerning litigation to which the media or media representative is a party.

A governing body may require that specific information not be reported by the media. This should be done by declaration of the presiding officer or vote. In the absence of this directive, the executive session may be reported. Any discussion of topics apart from those legally justifying the executive session may be reported by the media.

The media also is free to report on information gathered independently from executive session, even though the information may be the subject of an executive session.

Example

• A reporter attends the executive session on the city council's discussion of the city manager's performance. Afterwards the reporter asks a councilor what she thinks of the city manager's performance. She shares her criticism. The reporter may use that interview to develop a story, even though the reporter first heard the information at the executive session.

Minutes

Written, sound, video or digital recording of minutes are required for all meetings.

The meetings law says minutes must be made available within a "reasonable time" after each meeting, but does not specify the time. Generally, this time frame should not exceed three weeks. Minutes must be preserved for a "reasonable time." This is generally interpreted to be at least one year. Minutes of many governing bodies are subject to records retention rules and schedules established by the State Archivist.

Minutes must indicate:

- Members present
- All motions, proposals, resolutions, orders, ordinances and measures proposed and their disposition.
- The result of all votes by name of each member (except for public bodies consisting of more than 25 members). No secret ballots are allowed.
- The substance of discussion on any matter.
- A reference to any document discussed at the meeting.

Minutes are not required to be a verbatim transcript and the meeting does not have to be tape recorded unless so specified by law. Minutes are public record and may not be withheld from

the public merely because they will not be approved until the next meeting. Minutes of executive sessions are exempt from disclosure under the Oregon Public Records Law. Governing bodies are allowed to charge fees to recover their actual cost for duplicating minutes, tapes and records. A person with a disability may not be charged additional costs for providing records in larger print.

Enforcement

County district attorneys or the Oregon Attorney General's Office may be able to answer questions about possible public meetings law violations, although neither has any formal enforcement role and both are statutorily prohibited from providing legal advice to private citizens.

Any person affected by a governing body's decision may file a lawsuit in circuit court to require compliance with or prevent violations of the Public Meetings Law. The lawsuit must be filed within 60 days following the date the decision becomes public record.

The court may void a governing body's decision if the governing body intentionally or willfully violated the Public Meetings Law, even if the governing body has reinstated the decision in a public vote. The court also may award reasonable legal fees to a plaintiff who brings suit under the Public Meetings Law.

Complaints of executive session violations may be directed to the Oregon Government Ethics Commission, 3218 Pringle Road SE, Suite 220, Salem OR, 97302-1544; 503-378-5105, for review, investigation and possible imposition of civil penalties.

Members of a governing body may be liable for attorney and court costs both as individuals or as members of a group if found in willful violation of the Public Meetings Law.

For additional copies of this guide or information about Open Oregon, contact:

Open Oregon: A Freedom of information Coalition
PO Box 172, Portland, Oregon 97207-0172
info@open-oregon.com
www.open-oregon.com

Additional resources:

- **Oregon Attorney General's Public Records and Meetings Manual**, available by calling 503-378-2992 or writing to Department of Justice, 1162 Court Street NE, Salem, OR 97301-4096; www.doj.state.or.us/oregonians/pubs.shtml
- **Oregon Revised Statutes 192.610 to 162.690**, the Oregon Public Meetings Law, available in most libraries and on the internet at www.leg.state.or.us.
- **Oregon Newspaper Publishers Association**, 503-624-6397. Offers legal advice to member newspapers and general information about public records and meetings requirements; www.orenews.com
- **League of Oregon Cities**, 1201 Court St. NE, Salem, OR 97301. 503-588-6550; www.orcities.org
- **Association of Oregon Counties**, 1201 Court St. NE, Salem, OR 97301. 503-585-8351; www.aocweb.org
- **Oregon School Boards Association**, 1201 Court St. NE, Salem, OR 97301. 503-588-2800; www.osba.org
- **Special Districts Association of Oregon**, PO Box 12613, Salem, OR 97301-0613, 503-371-8667; www.sdao.com

Open Oregon Board of Directors

Honorary co-chairs:

- Dave Frohnmayer,
President, University of Oregon
- Bill Bradbury, Oregon Secretary of State

Directors:

- Bryan Brumley, President, Bureau Chief,
The Associated Press
- Lisa Phipps, Vice President, Mayor,
Rockaway Beach
- Kenneth Lewis, Treasurer,
Portland Attorney
- Judson Randall, Secretary,
Adviser, Student Publications,
Portland State University
- Diana Banning, Portland City Archivist
- Duane Bosworth, Attorney,
Davis Wright Tremaine

- Therese Bottomly,
Managing Editor, The Oregonian
- Nick Budnick,
Society of Professional Journalists
- Tim Doran, Editor,
The Bulletin, Bend, Oregon
- Cindy Gibbon, Multnomah County Library
- Tim Gleason, Dean, University of
Oregon School of Journalism
- Mary Beth Herkert,
Oregon State Archivist
- Laurie Hieb, Executive Director, Oregon
Newspaper Publishers Association
- Gail Holmes, League of Women Voters
- Phil Keisling, Former Oregon Secretary
of State, Pro DX
- Kevin Neely, C&E Systems
- Norman Turrill, League of Women Voters

November 2007



A Freedom of Information Coalition

P.O. Box 172

Portland, Oregon 97207-0172



Protecting the public's right to know

Glossary and Acronyms

This is divided into a [GLOSSARY](#) and an [ACRONYM](#) section.

GLOSSARY

A

Access Control The limitation of the right and use of access either by law or agreement. The control can be a complete restriction of access or a limitation of access to a specific location.

[OAR 734-051-0040\(1\)](#) defines Access Control as “. . . no right of access exists between a property abutting the highway and the highway. The right of access may have been acquired by the department or eliminated by law.”

Access rights may be eliminated by acquisition, including:

- Purchase;
- Donation;
- Condemnation; or
- Law.

Access Management

Improves the safety and efficiency of traffic operations while enhancing accessibility to and mobility of the transportation system. Access management measures include managing:

- The location, spacing and type of physical connections to streets, roads and highways from public roads and private driveways.
- Grade-separated interchange areas for safe and efficient operation.
- The type and placement of medians and the location of median openings.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/ACCESSMGT/Pages/index.aspx>

Acquisition Elimination of the right of access. (See Access Control.)

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO)

The American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials advocates transportation-related policies and provides technical services to support states in their efforts to efficiently and safely move people and goods. This national organization serves transportation groups, state departments of transportation, and Congress by:

- Promoting transportation agendas.
- Testifying and advocating on behalf of highway and transportation agencies.

- Establishing transportation standards.

See: <http://www.transportation.org>

American Public Works Association (APWA) The American Public Works Association is an international educational and professional association of public agencies, private sector companies, and individuals dedicated to providing high quality public works goods and services. This organization supports utility companies and local governments that operate utilities.

See: <http://www.apwa.net/>

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is a federal civil rights law that prohibits discrimination against people with disabilities in everyday activities, such as buying an item at the store, going to the movies, enjoying a meal at a local restaurant, exercising at the health club, or having the car serviced at a local garage.

To meet the goals of the ADA, the law established requirements for businesses of all sizes. These requirements went into effect on January 26, 1992. Businesses that serve the public must modify policies and practices that discriminate against people with disabilities; comply with accessible design standards when constructing or altering facilities; remove barriers in existing facilities where readily achievable; and provide auxiliary aids and services when needed to ensure effective communication with people who have hearing, vision, or speech impairments. All businesses, even those that do not serve the public, must comply with accessible design standards when constructing or altering facilities.

See ADA's website at: <http://www.ada.gov/> and ODOT Civil Rights Section at: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CS/CIVILRIGHTS/Pages/index.aspx>

Approach (or approach road)

A public or private roadway, or driveway connection:

- Between the outside edge of the shoulder or curb line and the right of way line of the highway.
- Intended to provide vehicular access to and from said highway and the adjoining property.

Area Part of an ODOT region, with each region consisting of two or more areas. Area borders are county lines to be consistent with county governments. There are 12 areas.

Area Commission on Transportation (ACT) Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT) are advisory bodies chartered by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). ACTs address all aspects of transportation (surface, marine, air, and transportation safety) with primary focus on the state transportation system. ACTs consider regional and local transportation issues if they affect the state system. They work with other local organizations dealing with transportation-related issues.

ACTs play a key advisory role in the development of the [Statewide Transportation Improvement Program](#), which schedules funded transportation projects. ACTs establish a public process for area project selection priorities for the STIP. Through that process and following adopted project eligibility criteria, they prioritize transportation problems and solutions and recommend projects in their area to be included in the STIP.

See: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml

Arterial A class of roads serving major traffic movements (high-speed, high volume) for travel between major points. See definition for Functional Classification.

Average daily traffic (ADT) The average number of vehicles passing a certain point each day on a highway, road or street.

B

Bicycle and Pedestrian Program The Oregon Pedestrian and Bicycle Program provides direction to ODOT in establishing pedestrian and bicycle facilities on state highways. They also provide support to local governments, governmental and non-governmental organizations and private citizens, in planning, designing and constructing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

See the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Program:
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BIKEPED>

Bridge A structure spanning and providing passage over a river, chasm road or the like. A structure including supports erected over a depression or an obstruction, such as water, highway, or railway, and having a track or passageway for carrying traffic or other moving loads, and having an opening measured along the center of the roadway of 6 feet or more between undercopings of abutments or spring lines of arches, or extreme ends of openings for multiple boxes; it may also include multiple pipes, where the clear distance between openings is less than half of the smaller contiguous opening.
See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BRIDGE/>

C

Capacity Maximum volume of traffic that the roadway section is able to carry on a sustained basis.

Certification Program The ODOT Certification Program is a local program administered by ODOT's Local Government Section that enables local agencies (e.g. cities and counties) to retain more approval authority and control at the local level when developing FHWA funded, non-National Highway System (NHS) transportation projects.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/LGS/Pages/Certification.aspx>

Civil Rights

See ODOT Civil Rights Section at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CS/CIVILRIGHTS>

Classifications of Highways

The Department's designation of state highways into four categories:

- Interstate.
- Statewide.
- Regional.
- District.

See "Functional Classifications."

See: Oregon Highway Plan at

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

Construction Engineering Inspection, testing and reporting activities performed by ODOT or the project sponsor (or its consultant) during the construction phase activities after a contractor has been selected to build a project, and are not part of the project development process.

Context Sensitive Design (CSD) A decision-making process that seeks flexibility in the application of design standards in order to incorporate or respond to surrounding natural or built site conditions without compromising safety.

Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) A collaborative, interdisciplinary approach that involves all stakeholders to develop a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and preserves scenic, aesthetic, historic and environmental resources, while maintaining safety and mobility. CSS is an approach that considers the total context within which a transportation improvement project will exist.

Context Sensitive and Sustainable Solutions (CS₃) The concept of merging the principles of context sensitive design, context sensitive solutions and sustainability to create a framework for decision-making and problem-solving throughout the lifecycle of a project.

Corridor A designated length of highway and the towns and features in its vicinity.

Crossings (railroad)

Intersections between railroad tracks and a road, which can be:

- At-grade (at the same level).
- Grade-separated, where the road uses either a tunnel or a bridge to avoid crossing the railroad tracks.

D

District Part of an ODOT region designated for maintenance purposes; however, not all district boundaries correlate to region boundaries. There are 14 districts.

See ODOT Maintenance District Map on ODOT's website:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDATA/gis/docs/statemaps/districtmaintmap.pdf>

E

Environmental Assessment (EA) A report documenting the potential environmental effects of a proposed project. A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is issued after a Revised EA.

Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) A report documenting specific environmental impacts of a proposed project. A Record of Decision is issued after a Final Environmental Impact Statement.

F

Facility Plan A facility plan may address issues for one transportation mode, such as pipeline, aviation, rail, or bike/ped; or it may address issues for multiple modes, such as, a highway corridor plan, a downtown plan, or Special Transportation Area (STA) management plan that include components for access management, public transit, traffic safety, and/or bike/ped improvements. Facility plans consider specific geographic issues and affect the application of specific Statewide Planning Goals and, therefore, contain land use decisions. The State Agency Coordination Rule (OAR 731-015-0015) defines "facility plan" in a similar light, "a plan for a transportation facility such as a highway corridor or airport master plan."

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) The federal agency that provides oversight to state departments of transportation and approves statewide transportation improvement programs (STIPs).

See: <http://www.dot.gov/>

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) A statement certifying that a proposed project has no substantial impact on the natural or social environment.

Functional Classification Functional classification is the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of service they are intended to provide. Basic to this process is the recognition that individual

roads and streets do not serve travel independently in any major way. Rather, most travel involves movement through a network of roads. It becomes necessary then to determine how this travel can be channelized within the network in a logical and efficient manner. Functional classification defines the nature of this channelization process by defining the part that any particular road or street should play in serving the flow of trips through a highway network.

G

Global Positioning System (GPS) A computer and satellite system that locates the latitude and longitude of a permanent or portable beacon unit.

Grade-separated Where a tunnel or bridge is used to separate two roadways, or a road and something else, such as railroad tracks.

H

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) A federal program that develops safety improvement projects to reduce the risk, number and severity of crashes on public roads and transportation facilities.

High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes (HOV-Lanes) Exclusive road or traffic lane limited to buses, vanpools, carpools, and emergency vehicles. (American Public Transit Association Transit Fact Book APTA1)

Highway Is any road, street, parkway, or freeway/expressway that includes rights-of-way, bridges, railroad-highway crossings, tunnels, drainage structures, signs, guardrail, and protective structures in connection with highways. The highway further includes that portion of any interstate or international bridge or tunnel and the approaches thereto (23 U.S.C. 101a). (FHWA2)

Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP) Established under 23 U.S.C., Section 144, to enable the several states to replace and rehabilitate highway bridges when it is determined that the bridge is unsafe because of structural deficiencies, physical deterioration, or functional obsolescence.

See: ODOT – Bridge Engineering/ Local Agency Bridge Projects
http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/BRIDGE/Pages/local_agency

Highway Designations

Subcategories that are policy specific and have importance for certain areas and users; such as:

- Special Transportation Areas.
- Urban Business Areas.

See: The Oregon Highway Plan at
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/index.aspx>

Highway Mobility Standards Policy

Establishes standards for mobility that are reasonable and consistent with the directions of other Highway Plan policies, which:

- Establish higher mobility standards for interstate highways, freight routes and other state highways than for regional or district highways.
- Establish lower mobility standards for Special Transportation Areas (STAs) and more highly developed urban areas than less developed areas and rural areas.
- Establish the lowest mobility standards for regional and district highways in STAs where traffic congestion will be allowed to reach levels where peak hour traffic flow is highly unstable and traffic queues form on a regular basis.

See: Statewide Traffic Mobility at:
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/MCT/Pages/mobility.aspx>

I

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

ITS uses technology to improve the movement of people and goods, with the objective of improving safety and reducing congestion and delays over the existing transportation infrastructure. The five components of ITS are:

- Advanced Public Transportation Systems.
- Advanced Transportation Management Systems.
- Advanced Traveler Information Systems.
- Advanced Vehicle Control Systems.
- Commercial Vehicle Operations.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/ITS/Pages/index.aspx>

Interchange A system of interconnecting roadways and structures in conjunction with one or more grade separations that provides for the movement of traffic between two or more roadways on different levels.

Inter-governmental Agreement (IGA) An agreement between two or more governments designating financial and labor obligations for a project.

Intermodal A facility, system or plan that connects two or more modes of transportation.

Intermodal Facilities

Facilities that allow passenger and/or freight connections between modes of transportation. Examples include:

- Airports.

- Bus stations.
- Ports.
- Rail stations.
- Intermodal yards.

Intersection The area where two or more roadways join or cross at the same elevation.

L

Lane miles The product of distance (in miles) times the number of lanes for motorized vehicles.

Let (for bidding)

To:

Release and advertise a project for bidding by contractors.

- Receive bids.
- Select a successful bidder.
- Award the contract.

M

Management Systems

Computer programs that organize and prioritize information about transportation facilities such as roads, bridges and intersections so that staff may objectively know which facilities are in the greatest need of repair, including:

- Maintenance Management System.
- Bridge Management System.
- Pavement Management System.
- Congestion Management System.

See:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TDATA/Pages/otms/OTMS_Standards_Guidelines.aspx

MAP-21, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century An act signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012. Funding surface transportation programs at over \$105 billion for fiscal years (FY) 2013 and 2014, MAP-21 is the first long-term highway authorization enacted since 2005.

Metropolitan planning organization (MPO)

A planning body in an urbanized area of over 50,000 that has responsibility for developing transportation plans for that area. Designated MPOs include:

- Corvallis Area.
- Bend.
- Eugene/Springfield.
- Portland Metro.
- Rogue Valley (Medford Area).
- Salem/Keizer.
- Middle Rogue (Grants Pass Area).

Mitigate To incorporate planned features that compensate for impacts created by road construction, such as:

- The creation of new wetlands.
- Enhancement of existing wetlands to compensate for destruction of the existing wetlands.
- Mitigation also can relate to safety and efficiency of the highway, such as:
- Making a driveway or road connection safer while simultaneously keeping through traffic moving by using right-turn lanes to remove turning traffic from the traffic stream.
- Using medians to limit left-turn movements.

Mobility Standards Maximum volume to capacity ratios for two-hour, peak-hour operating conditions through a 20-year horizon for state highway sections.

See: The Oregon Highway Plan at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

Mobility Targets Measures that provide a tool to identify transportation needs and solutions and better balance state and local community needs and objectives. Mobility targets are used in three distinct ways:

- **Transportation System Planning:** Mobility targets identify state highway mobility performance expectations and provide a measure by which the existing and future performance of the highway system can be evaluated. Plan development may necessitate adopting methodologies and targets that deviate from adopted mobility targets in order to balance regional and local performance expectations.
- **Plan Amendments and Development Review:** Mobility targets are used to review amendments to comprehensive plans and land use regulations pursuant to the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) to assess if the proposed changes are consistent with the planned function, capacity and performance standards of state highway facilities.
- **Operations:** Mobility targets assist in making traffic operations decisions such as managing access and traffic control systems to maintain acceptable highway performance.

See: The Oregon Highway Plan at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

Mode

A type of transportation such as vehicle, train, or plane.

Modernization Project Projects that make improvements to accommodate existing traffic or projected growth, with the primary goal of adding capacity. These projects typically involve the construction of new transportation facilities.

N

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

An act passed in 1969 that established national environmental policy and goals for the protection, maintenance and enhancement of the environment. NEPA requires federal and state agencies:

- To examine the environmental consequences of major proposed actions, such as building a new transportation facility.
- To conduct a decision-making process that incorporates public input.

See: <http://epa.gov/compliance/nepa/>

New Road A public road or road segment on new alignment, not a realignment of an existing road or road segment.

Noise Barrier A mound or wall of earth, concrete wall or other barrier used to deflect traffic noise.

See:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/GEOENVIRONMENTAL/Pages/air_noise.aspx

O

Operations Projects

Projects that increase the efficiency and safety of the highway system, such as:

- Traffic signals.
- Permanent signs.
- Variable message signs.
- Slow-moving vehicle turnouts.

Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) Rules written by Oregon government agencies to

clarify or augment adopted Oregon Revised Statutes. OARs are laws secondary to statute.

See: <http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/pages/rules/index.html> -or-
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/CS/RULES/Pages/index.aspx>

Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT)

Oregon's state transportation department.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Pages>

Oregon Highway Plan (OHP)

The policy document for state highways, adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission, which:

- Sets long-range policies and investment strategies.
- Identifies highway system needs.
- Establishes goals for mobility standards.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS)

The laws passed by the Legislature that govern the State of Oregon.

See: <http://www.leg.state.or.us/>

Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)

ODOT's governing body, with five members appointed by the Governor.

See: http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/Pages/otc_main.aspx

Oregon Transportation Investment Act (OTIA) Transportation funding acts passed by the 2001 and 2003 Legislatures. OTIA I and II represent \$500 million in bonded revenue. OTIA III represents an additional \$2.5 billion in bonded revenue.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/OTIA/Pages/Index.aspx>

Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP)

The policy document covering all transportation modes, adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission, which:

- Describes policies.
- Presents multimodal system needs.
- Establishes goals for minimum levels of service.
- Presents actions to achieve the established goals.

The plan is for a 20-year period, with six-year updates.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/otp.aspx>

Overlay

An asphalt surface or cover placed over an existing surface.

P

Pavement Asphalt or Portland cement concrete placed for vehicular use on highway, road and street traveled ways, shoulders, auxiliary lanes and parking areas.

Pavement Markings Painted or applied lines of legends placed on a roadway surface for regulating, guiding or warning traffic.

Pavement Management System (PMS) A set of tools that can assist decision-makers in finding cost-effective strategies for providing, evaluating and maintaining pavements in a serviceable condition at the lowest lifecycle cost.

See:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/CONSTRUCTION/Pages/pavement_management_sys.aspx

Peak Hour

- For urban areas, “peak hour” usually means the highest one-hour volume observed on the roadway during a typical or average week.
- In rural areas, generally “peak hour” refers to the 30th highest hourly traffic volume typically observed over the course of a year.

Plans Drawings that show the location, type, dimensions and details of the work to be done under a construction contract.

Policy A direction for ODOT officially adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission.

Preliminary Engineering (PE) Includes all project activities before a construction contractor has been selected to build a transportation project.

Preservation Projects Projects that add useful life to the road without increasing capacity such as rebuilding, rehabilitating or extending the service life of existing facilities, primarily by paving.

Project Authorization The estimated cost of the project and consists of the Contractor’s original bid amount, anticipated items, contingencies and construction engineering.

R

Ramp A section of roadway that connects a mainline roadway to a crossroad, typically

where the mainline and crossroad are grade separated. The ramp is generally measured to the ramp intersection, or to the end of a free-flow ramp terminal merge lane taper.

Ramp Meter

A traffic signal positioned at a highway on-ramp that:

- Stops incoming traffic.
- Indicates when one or two vehicles may enter the roadway. A ramp meter is typically used to prevent congestion from merging vehicles during peak traffic times.

Realignment

Rebuilding an existing roadway on a new alignment where:

- The new centerline shifts outside the existing right of way.
- The existing road surface is either:
 - Removed.
 - Maintained as an access road.
 - Maintained as a connection between the realigned roadway and a road that intersects the original alignment.

Region

A geographic management area of ODOT; there are five regions.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT> Click on “Highway Regions” or on any of the five regions listed.

Rehabilitate

To repair a transportation facility:

- To its original condition.
- So that the facility can be safely used.

Right of Way

The highway property and property rights owned or controlled by ODOT, which may include:

- The paved roadway surface.
- Shoulder area.
- Ditches and other drainage facilities.
- Sidewalks in the border area between the ditches or curbs.

See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/PROPMGT>

Riprap

A foundation or sustaining wall of stones or chunks of concrete thrown together without order. A layer of similar material on an embankment slope used to prevent erosion.

Roundabout

A form of intersection design and control which:

- Accommodates traffic flow in one direction around a central island.
- Operates with yield control at the entry points.
- Gives priority to vehicles within the roundabout (circulating flow).

See:

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/hwy/engservices/Pages/roundabout_home.aspx

S

Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU)

Transportation funding law passed by Congress in August 2005 that supersedes TEA-21. See: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/index.htm>

Safety Projects

Projects that address dangerous highway locations and corridors by using actions including:

- Passing lanes.
- Wider shoulders.
- Illumination.
- Rumble strips.
- Striping.
- Access management actions.
- Highway-rail grade crossing improvements or closures.

Scenic Byway A designation given to a roadway by the state or federal government due to special cultural or geographic features.

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) A federally required and regularly updated state program of transportation projects. In Oregon the STIP covers four years and is updated every two years. See:

<http://www.oregon.gov/odot/td/stip/Pages/default.aspx>

Safety Investment Program (SIP) A program of the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that provides separate funding to address safety issues on preservation projects.

Safety Priority Index System (SPIS) A method developed by ODOT for identifying potential safety problems on state highways. SPIS is a tool used to identify accident history in 0.10 mile or variable length segments on state highways. SPIS scores are developed based upon crash frequency, severity, and rate. A prioritized list is created for each region (the top 10 percent of statewide SPIS sites) and is provided to regions annually for analysis and possible corrective action.

T

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) The operation and coordination of various transportation programs to provide the most efficient and effective use of existing transportation services and facilities. TDM is one category of traffic system management actions.

Transportation System Management (TSM) a planning tool that increases the efficiency of the transportation system by using technology to minimize the effects of vehicle congestion. TSM can involve equipment, such as signals and communications equipment, and technology to monitor traffic and make adjustments to traffic operations on a real-time basis when more vehicles are using the road than can pass through without causing congestion. TSM can also involve improvements to the street and highway network such as lane modifications and parking configuration.

Transportation System Plan (TSP) A plan outlining transportation strategies and future projects for a specific geographic region (primarily a city or a county). As defined by State Land Use Planning Goal 12, implemented through the transportation planning rule. See: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/plans.aspx>

U

Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) The area surrounding an incorporated city or metropolitan area [see: MPO (Metropolitan Planning Organization)] into which the city may legally expand its city limits.

V

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Miles traveled per vehicle multiplied by the total number of vehicles.

Volume to Capacity Ratio (V/C) The peak hour traffic volume (vehicles/hour) on a highway section divided by the maximum volume that highway section can handle. See: The Oregon Highway Plan at <http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

ACRONYMS

3-C – Continuing, Comprehensive & Cooperative Planning Process

3R – Resurfacing, restoring, and rehabilitating

AAA – American Automobile Association

AASHTO – American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials

ACT – Area Commission on Transportation

ADA – Americans with Disabilities Act

ADT – Average Daily Traffic (or Average Daily trips)

AMP – Access Management Plan

AMPO – Association of Metropolitan Planning Organizations

APA – American Planning Association

APTA – American Public Transportation Association

AQCD – Air Quality Conformity Determination

ARBA – American Road Builders' Association

ARMA – American Road Makers' Association

ARTBA – American Road & Transportation Builders' Association

BMCS – Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety

BMP – Best Management Practice

BMS – Bridge Management System

BRT – Bus Rapid Transit

BTS – Bureau of Transportation Statistics

CAA(A) – Clean Air Act (Amendments)

CAC – Citizen Advisory Committee

CFR – Code of Federal Regulations

CIP – Capital Improvement Program

CMAQ – Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program

CMP – Congestion Management Plan (Process)

CMS – Congestion Management System

COG – Council of Governments

DEIS – Draft Environment Impact Statement

DEQ – Department of Environmental Quality

DLCD – Department of Land Conservation and Development

DOT – Department of Transportation

EEO – Equal Employment Opportunity

EIS – Environmental Impact Statement

EJ – Environmental Justice

EMME/2 – Equilibre Multimodal Multimodal Equilibrium
(Transportation Model)

EPA – Environmental Protection Agency

FAA – Federal Aviation Administration

FAP – Federal-Aid primary

FAS – Federal-Aid secondary

FAU – Federal-Aid urban

FEIS – Final Environmental Impact Statement

FHWA – Federal Highway Administration

FRA – Federal Railroad Administration

FTA – Federal Transit Administration

(F)FY – (Federal) Fiscal Year

GIS – Geographic Information Systems

GPS – Global Positioning Systems

HCM – Highway Capacity Manual

HOV – High Occupancy Vehicle

HPMS – Highway Performance Monitoring Systems

HRB – Highway Research Board

HSR – High Speed Rail

I/M – Inspection and Maintenance

IAMP – Interchange Area Management Plan

ICC – Interstate Commerce Commission

IHS – Interstate Highway System

IM – Interstate Maintenance

ISTEA – Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991

ITS – Intelligent Transportation Systems

IVHS – Intelligent Vehicle Highway Systems

JARC – Job Access and Reverse Commute

LCDC – Land Conservation and Development Commission

LOS – Level of Service (Traffic flow rating)

LRT – Light Rail Transit

LRTP – Long Range Transportation Plan

LUAM – Land Use Allocation Model

MAP-21 – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century

MIS – Major Investment Study

MOA – Memorandum of Agreement

MOBILE6 – An emissions model, being replaced by MOVES

MOU – Memorandum of Understanding

MOVES – Motor Vehicle Emission Simulator

MPC – Metropolitan Policy Committee

MPO – Metropolitan Planning Organization

MSA – Metropolitan Statistical Area

MTP – Metropolitan Transportation Plan

MTIP – Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program

MUTCD – Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices

NAA – Non-Attainment Area

NAAQS – National Ambient Air Quality Standards

NEPA – National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

NHS – National Highway System

NHTSA – National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

NOX – Nitrogen Oxides

O&M – Operations and Maintenance

ODOT – Oregon Department of Transportation

OHP – Oregon Highway Plan

OM&P – Operations, Maintenance and Preservation

OMPOC – Oregon MPO Consortium

ORFS – Oregon Roads Finance Committee

OTC – Oregon Transportation Commission

OTIA – Oregon Transportation Investment Act

OTP – Oregon Transportation Plan

OTREC – Oregon Transportation Research and Education Consortium

PCR – Pavement Condition Rating

PE – Preliminary Engineering

PPP – Public Participation Plan

PS&E – Plans, Specifications, and Estimates

RFP – Request for Proposal

ROW – Right of Way

RR – Railroad

RTP – Regional Transportation Plan

SAFETEA-LU – Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users

SDC – System Development Charge

SHTF – State Highway Trust Fund

SIB – State Infrastructure Bank

SIP – State Implementation Plan

SOV – Single Occupancy Vehicle

SPR – State Planning and Research funds

STA – Special Transportation Area

STIP – State Transportation Improvement Program

 C-STIP – Construction STIP

 D-STIP – Development STIP

STP – Surface Transportation Program (-U – - Urban)

STPP – Surface Transportation Policy Project

TAC – Technical Advisory Committee

TAZ – Traffic Analysis Zone

TCM – Transportation Control Measure

TDM – Transportation Demand Management

TDP – Transit Development Program

TEA-21 – Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century

TIFIA – Transportation Infrastructure Finance & Innovation Act (1998)

TIP – Transportation Improvement Program, either MTIP or STIP

TMA – Transportation Management Area

TMSF – Transportation Management System Fee

TO – Transportation Options

TOD – Transit Oriented Development

TOAC – Transportation Options Advisory Committee

TPAU – Transportation Planning Analysis Unit

TPC – Transportation Planning Committee

TPR – Transportation Planning Rule

TRB – Transportation Research Board

TSI – Transportation System Improvements

TSM – Transportation System Management

TSP – Transportation System Plan

TUF – Transportation Utility Fee

UBA – Urban Business Area

UGB – Urban Growth Boundary

UMTA – Urban Mass Transportation Administration

UPWP – Unified Planning Work Program

V/C – Volume to Capacity

VMT – Vehicle Miles Traveled

VOCs – Volatile Organic Compounds

VPD – Vehicles Per Day

Internet Links

Area Commissions on Transportation

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/pages/act_main.aspx

Connect Oregon

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/connector.aspx>

ODOT Mapping

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/Pages/maps.aspx>

ODOT Region 3

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/REGION3/>

Oregon Aviation Plan

http://www.oregon.gov/aviation/Pages/docs/system_plan/2007_oregon_system_plan_details.aspx

Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/bikepedplan.aspx>

Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ofac.aspx>

Oregon Freight Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ofp.aspx>

Oregon Highway Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/ohp.aspx>

Oregon Public Transportation Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Plans/OPTP.pdf>

Oregon Rail Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/Pages/RailPlan.aspx>

Oregon Transportation Plan

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/pages/otp.aspx>

Oregon Transportation Safety Action Plan

http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TS/docs/tsap_0806.pdf

Statewide Transportation Improvement Program

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/STIP/pages/default.aspx>

Transportation Planning Online Database

<https://zigzag.odot.state.or.us/>



RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Rogue Valley ACT Overview

May 2013





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Rogue Valley ACT Purpose

“The Rogue Valley ACT is an advisory commission to the Oregon Transportation Commission representing the Rogue Valley area of Oregon (Jackson and Josephine Counties). RVACT was formed to strengthen the state/local partnership in transportation planning, programming and development.”





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Rogue Valley ACT Mission

“Provide a forum for communication, learning and understanding transportation issues;

Provide recommendations to the OTC regarding program funding allocations for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP);

Prioritize state transportation infrastructure and capital investments

Make recommendations to ODOT regarding special funding opportunities and Programs; and

Communicate and coordinate regional priorities with other organizations,





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Membership Structure

- **Designated:** Cities, Counties, MPOs, ODOT, RVTD, CORP, Rogue Valley Airport - *(21 members)*
- **Other Stakeholders:** Trucking, Bike/Pedestrian, Jackson Co. Private Sector (3), Josephine Co. Private Sector (3) - *(8 members)*
- **Alternates:** Jackson Co. Private Sector (3),
Josephine Co. Private Sector (3)
Alternates are selected in the same manner as the Primary member.
- **Ex-Officio Members**





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Membership

Attendance

- Expectation to attend all meetings
- Other Stakeholder members are removed automatically if 3 meetings in a calendar year are missed without excusal.
- If members fail to attend 3 consecutive meetings, position is deemed vacant for purposes of a quorum.





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Operation

Decision Making

- Quorum is 50% of current voting membership total.
- Decision by Consensus – Defined as ‘all voting members present can live with decision’
- Majority Vote of quorum present
- Anyone can call for a 2/3 majority vote.

Officers

- 2 Chairs - 1 from each County - 2-year terms
- Jackson County elected odd-years, Josephine even years





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Work Plan

- Commission Education
- Advisory and Coordination Activities
 - Review and comment on the STIP
 - Prioritize Enhance funding applications
 - Provide recommendations to ODOT re: special funding opportunities and programs
 - Provide recommendations to ODOT re: priorities for state infrastructure and capital investments
- Commission Governance
- Public Involvement





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Public Involvement

- As an advisory body that has authority to make recommendations to the OTC on policy or administration, an ACT must comply with the requirements of Oregon's Public Meetings Law found at ORS 192.610 to 192.690.
- The policy underlying the law is to ensure an open governmental decision making process and so facilitate the public's awareness "of the deliberations and decisions of governing bodies and the information upon which such decisions were made." (ORS 192.620.)





RVACT

Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation

Amendments to Bylaws

- Bylaws require 30-days notice to all members.
- Requires 2/3 majority vote of all RVACT members.



RVACT Bylaws

Adopted November 2012

PURPOSE

The Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation (RVACT) is an advisory committee to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) representing the Rogue Valley area of Oregon (Jackson and Josephine Counties). RVACT was formed to strengthen the state/local partnership in transportation planning, programming and development.

AUTHORITY

ORS 184.610 to 184.666 gives the Oregon Transportation Commission the authority to establish the policies for the operation of the Oregon Department of Transportation and for the administration of programs related to transportation. The Area Commissions on Transportation are advisory bodies chartered under authority of the Oregon Transportation Commission. The OTC retains oversight and final decision-making authority to assure efficient management of the state transportation system. ACTs provide valuable input and recommendations to that process.

An ACT is a voluntary association of government and non-government transportation stakeholders and has no legal regulatory, policy or administrative authority. The ACT process and resulting recommendations shall comply with relevant laws, regulations and policies. As an advisory body to the OTC with authority to make recommendations on policy or administration, ACTs meet the definition of a “Governing Body” and fall under the requirements of the Public Meetings Law, ORS 192.610 to 192.690. An ACT's members shall comply with the requirements of Oregon Government Standards and Practices laws concerning conflict of interest.

MISSION

The primary mission of the RVACT is to advise the Oregon Transportation Commission on state and regional policies affecting the Rogue Valley area's transportation system. In order to effectively accomplish the mission, the RVACT will do the following:

- Provide a forum for communication, learning and understanding transportation issues as they affect the Rogue Valley's economic opportunities and livability;
- Provide recommendations to the OTC regarding program funding allocations for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and special funding opportunities and programs, balancing local, regional, and statewide perspectives;
- Prioritize state transportation infrastructure and capital investments through the STIP that supports transportation plans related to the Rogue Valley area.
- Make recommendations to ODOT regarding special funding opportunities and programs;
- Communicate and coordinate regional priorities with other organizations;
- Provide documentation to the OTC of the public process and resulting recommendations forwarded by the ACT including alternatives for solutions and outcomes of decisions;

Relationship to Decision Making Bodies and Community Interest

The Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation (RVACT) is an advisory body to the OTC that is the policy making body that oversees ODOT activities. RVACT's purpose is to gain consensus and support throughout the Rogue Valley area and make recommendations to the OTC on regional transportation project priorities.

MEMBERSHIP

Membership will be comprised of up to 29 voting members, determined as follows:

Designated

1. **Jackson & Josephine Counties and Cities:** The governing bodies of Jackson and Josephine Counties and the incorporated cities within the Area (Ashland, Butte Falls, Cave Junction, Central Point, Eagle Point, Gold Hill, Grants Pass, Jacksonville, Medford, Phoenix, Rogue River, Shady Cove, Talent) (15 members)
2. **ODOT:** The ODOT Rogue Valley Area manager is a voting member (1 member)
3. **Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs):** Rogue Valley and Middle Rogue (2 members)
4. **Rogue Valley Transportation District (RVTD):** (1 member)
5. **Rogue Valley International Airport (Medford Airport):** (1 member)
6. **Central Oregon and Pacific Railroad (CORP):** (1 member)

All Designated Representatives are invited to designate a primary and an alternate.

Other Stakeholders

1. Trucking (1 member);
2. Bicyclists and Pedestrians (1 member);
3. Jackson County private sector (3 members); and
4. Josephine County private sector (3 members).

Ex-officio: The RVACT may appoint ex officio membership (non-voting) from the following categories:

- Oregon Transportation Commissioners, state legislators, and local congressional aides
- Regional Solutions Team (RST)
- State and federal agencies such as US Forest Service, BLM, Fish and Wildlife, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Land Conservation and Development, Department of Aviation
- City and county road district or departments
- Regional groups that have an interest in transportation issues such as housing advocates, regional partnerships and regional investment boards, law enforcement agencies.

Ex-officio members will be nominated and elected by the RVACT.

ALTERNATES

Alternates will be selected in the same manner as the primary member.

Designated Members: The primary member or an alternate may vote. If neither is in attendance, then another may vote by written authority.

Other Stakeholders: Up to three Other Stakeholders, three from each county, shall be designated as first through third alternate for each county, based on date of appointment, with the most senior alternate being the first alternate and so on. In the absence of a voting member(s) at an RVACT meeting, alternate members from that county may vote in the following manner: If one member is absent, the first alternate would vote; if two are absent, first and second alternates would vote, respectively, up to all three alternates voting in the absence of all three members.

Trucking and Bicyclists and Pedestrians primary members or an alternates is authorized to vote on RVACT.

SELECTION PROCESS

Designated Members: The governing bodies shall appoint a member and alternate

Other Stakeholders: RVACT will advertise vacancies in the appropriate County. Trucking and Bicycle and Pedestrian members will be advertised in both counties. Interested members shall submit an application for consideration. RVACT shall appoint members based on the application.

Other Stakeholder members would be selected, to the greatest extent practical, to represent a diversity of interests. Members should be appointed to balance other members of RVACT and provide a greater diversity of interests and geographic areas.

The Co-Chair from each county is empowered to create a screening committee to review Other Stakeholder applications for their respective county and may together form a joint screening committee to review Trucking and Bicyclists and Pedestrians membership applications as the need arises. Recommendations from the screening committee will be made to all RVACT members at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

ATTENDANCE

Designated Members: members may replace their own voting member, but shall inform the ACT in writing. It is expected that the primary voting member will attend consistently and not regularly substitute his or her alternate.

Other Stakeholders: Should a member have to resign mid-term or is removed due to absences, an alternate may continue to serve in the capacity of the member until a new member is selected.

Members missing 3 meetings in a calendar year without excusal by the ACT chair will automatically be removed from RVACT membership. After 3 excusals, excusals shall be allowed only for unusual circumstances and will require majority consent of the RVACT members in attendance.

If a member fails to participate in three consecutive meetings, or to send an alternate, the member's position is deemed vacant, until such time as someone in that position participates (again) in a meeting.

RVACT may replace a repeatedly absent member.

RVACT meetings will be presided over by a chair. Co-Chairs, one each from Jackson and Josephine counties, will be nominated from and elected by the members. Both Co-Chairs will be nominated from and elected by the members for a two-year term starting January of each (even-Josephine/odd- Jackson) numbered year.

DECISIONS

A quorum for decision-making purposes will be 50% of the membership plus one member. Vacant positions shall not count when determining the number of voting members required for a quorum or the number of votes needed to make a decision.

RVACT will strive for complete consensus when making decisions. When consensus cannot be arrived at, decisions will be made by a majority of members in attendance. Any member of the RVACT can call for a decision to be made by a 2/3 majority of the members present.

All action items must be known in advance and jurisdictions will be provided time to have issues brought before their individual councils. Planning commissions and community groups may be involved in the process for some decisions.

MEETINGS

Meetings will be held on the second Tuesday of every other month from 9:00 a.m. to 12 noon and rotated, as determined by the RVACT, between locations in Jackson and Josephine Counties. Meeting field trips may be made a part of the regular meeting to allow greater community input on local issues and priorities. Special out-of-cycle RVACT meetings may be called by an RVACT chair with 10 days advance notice. Meetings will be open to the public and minutes and agendas will be distributed in advance. RVCOG and ODOT will staff the meetings. The public will be invited to participate in the process and there will be a standing agenda item for public input with a five-minute limit per person. All meetings will be advertised in advance.

RVACT may form any subcommittee on the basis of need. Subcommittees will form and/or disband per ongoing needs of RVACT.

A Super ACT made up of the RVACT and the Southwest ACT may be formed to make regional recommendations to the OTC. The RVACT may select members for participation in the Super ACT meetings as needed.

AMENDMENTS

The bylaws may be amended as necessary, after giving not less than 30 days notice to all members of RVACT, by a 2/3 majority vote of all RVACT members. (19 votes)

RVACT Membership List 2013

Last Update March 2013

| Jurisdiction | Member | E-mail | Phone | Address |
|----------------------|---------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| Ashland | | | | |
| Primary Rep | John Stromberg, Mayor | john@council.ashland.or.us | 541-552-2104 | 252 Ridge Road Ashland, OR 97520 |
| Alternate Rep | Mike Faught, PW Dir. | faughtm@ashland.or.us | 541-552-2411 | 51 Winburn Way Ashland, OR 97520 |
| Butte Falls | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Vacant | bfcityhall@gmail.com | 541-865-3262 | P.O. Box 268 Butte Falls, OR 97522 |
| Alternate Rep | Vacant | | | |
| Cave Junction | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Roy Hewson, Citizen | maryroyhewson@gmail.com | 541-592-6802 | P.O. Box 34 Cave Junction, OR 97523 |
| Alternate Rep | Ryan Nolan, City Recorder | cityofcj@cavenet.com | 541-592-4529 | P.O. Box 1396 Cave Junction, OR 97523 |
| Central Point | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Hank Williams, Mayor | hankw@centralpointoregon.gov | 541-664-1947 | 140 S. 3 rd Street Central Point, OR 97502 |
| Alternate Rep | Tom Humphrey, CD Dir. | Tom.humphrey@centralpointoregon.gov | 541-664-3321 ext. 230 | 140 S. 3 rd Street Central Point, OR 97502 |
| Eagle Point | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Ruth Jenks, Councilor | ruthjenks@cityofeaglepoint.org | 541-941-8537 | |
| Alternate Rep | Robert Miller, PW Dir | robertmiller@cityofeaglepoint.org | 541-826-4212 ext. 105 | P. O. Box 779 Eagle Point, OR 97524 |

| Gold Hill | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------------|--|
| Primary Rep | Christina Stanley, Councilor | | 541-855-1501 | 455 N. 6 th Ave Gold Hill, OR 97525 |
| Alternate Rep | Rick Hohnbaum, City Mgr | citymgr@ci.goldhill.or.us | 541-855-1525 | P. O. Box 308 Gold Hill, OR 97525 |
| Grants Pass | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Dan DeYoung, City Councilor | declassics@hotmail.com | 541-660-0342 | 1373 NW Prospect Grants Pass, OR 97516 |
| Alternate Rep | Michael Black, Director of Parks and Community Dev. | mblack@grantspassoregon.gov | 541-450-6060 | 101 NW A Street Grants Pass, OR 97526 |
| Jacksonville | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Jim Lewis, City Councilor | Captjim1109@gmail.com | 541-899-7023 | P.O. Box 7 Jacksonville, OR 97530 |
| Alternate Rep | Vacant | | | |
| Jackson County | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Vacant | | | |
| Alternate Rep | John Vial, Parks & Road Dir. | vialjn@jacksoncounty.org | 541-774-6238 | 200 Antelope Rd White City, OR 97503 |
| Josephine County | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Simon Hare, Commissioner | share@co.josephine.or.us | 541-474-5221 | 500 NW 6 th Street Grants Pass, OR 97528 |
| Alternate Rep | Rob Brandes, PW Director | rbrandes@co.josephine.or.us | 541-474-5460 | 201 River Heights Way Grants Pass, OR 97527 |
| Medford | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Al Densmore, Councilor | al@opfa.com | 541-772-1116 | 2736 Inverness Drive Medford, OR 97504 |
| Alternate Rep | Cory Crebbin, PW Director | Cory.crebbin@cityofmedford.org | 541-774-2100 | 411 W. 8 th St. modular Bldg Medford, OR 97501 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|
| Phoenix | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Vacant | | | |
| Alternate Rep | Joe Strahl, Public Works | jstrahl@rh2.com | 541-665-5233 | 60 N. 4 th St Central Point, OR 97502 |
| Rogue River | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Pam VanArsdale, Mayor | pamvan@charter.net | 541-660-4414 | P.O. Box 1137 Rogue River, OR 97537 |
| Alternate Rep | John, Krawczyk, PW Director | jkrawczyk@ci.rogue-river.or.us | 541-582-4401 ext. 103 | P.O. Box 1137 Rogue River, OR 97537 |
| Shady Cove | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Ron Holthusen, Mayor | holthusenr@embarqmail.com | 541-944-5040 | P. O. Box 768 Shady Cove, OR 97539 |
| Alternate Rep | Jim Ulrich, Councilor | Uboat2000@yahoo.com | 541-878-2225 | 343 Rene Drive Shady Cove OR 97539 |
| Talent | | | | |
| Primary Rep | William Cecil, Mayor | wcecil@charter.net | 541-535-5863 | 271 Autumn Drive Talent, OR 97540 |
| Alternate Rep | Joan Dean, Councilor | Councilor3@cityoftalent.org | 541-535-7289 | P.O. Box 445 Talent, OR 97540 |
| Rail | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Patrick Kerr, Rail America | Patrick.kerr@railamerica.com | 541-525-2087 | 4462 Calumet Way Eugene, OR 97404 |
| Alternate Rep | John Bullion, RA Alternate | John.Bullion@railamerica.com | 541-957-2504 Ext. 204 | 2 E McAndrews Rd Medford, OR 97501 |
| MRMPO | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Vacant | | | |
| Alternate Rep | Vacant | | | |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------|--|
| RVMPO | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Mike Quilty, RVMPO | michaelquilty@q.com | 541-621-4852 | 942 Forest Glen Drive Central Point, OR 97502 |
| Alternate Rep | Vicki Guarino, RVMPO Alternate | vguarino@rvcog.org | 541-423-1338 | P.O. Box 3275 Central Point, OR 97502 |
| ODOT | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Art Anderson, Area Manager | Arthur.h.anderson@odot.state.or.us | 541-774-6353 | 100 Antelope Rd White City, OR 97503 |
| Alternate Rep | Jerry Marmon, Operations | Jerry.marmon@odot.state.or.us | 541-774-6376 | 100 Antelope Rd White City, OR 97503 |
| RVI Airport | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Bern Case, Airport Director | casebe@jacksoncounty.org | 541-776-7222 | 1000 Terminal Loop Pkwy Medford, OR 97504 |
| Alternate Rep | Robert Russell, Oper. Mgr | russellro@jacksoncounty.org | 541-776-7222 | 1000 Terminal Loop Pkwy Medford, OR 97504 |
| RVTD | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Wade Six, Board Member | | | |
| Alternate Rep | Joel Marks, Board Member | Jmarks5678@gmail.com | 541-608-2429 | 5678 Cherry Lane Medford, OR 97504 |
| Alternate Rep | Paige Townsend, RVTD | p.townsend@rvtd.org | 541-608-2429 | 3200 Crater Lake Ave. Medford, OR 97501 |
| Trucking | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Mark Gibson | tllmark@mindspring.com | 541-488-2755 | 1623 Edgevale Ave. Medford, OR 97504 |
| Alternate Rep | Donald Stone | Dons97520@jeffnet.org | 541-488-6970 | 395 Kearney St. Ashland, OR 97520 |
| Bicyclists-Pedestrian | | | | |
| Primary Rep | William Landis | lb150yrs@yahoo.com | 541-660-2134 | P.O. Box 5483 Central Point, OR 97502 |
| Alternate Rep | Stephen Haydon | mandshaydon@gmail.com | 541-226-9044 | 1835 SE Lela Lane |

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| | | | | Grants Pass, OR 97526 |
| Jackson County Private Sector Representatives & Alternates | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Craig Stone | Craig@CSAplanning.net | 541-779-0569 | 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Suite 101 Medford, OR 97504 |
| Primary Rep | Mike Montero | mike@montero-associates.com Montero_Associates@q.com | 541-779-0771 541-944-4375 cell | 4497 Brownridge Terrace, Suite 202 Medford, OR 97504 |
| Primary Rep | Earl Wood | No email | 541-840-2497 | P.O. Box 451 Eagle Point, OR 97524 |
| Alternate #1 | John Watt | John@jwatt.com | 541-779-0036 | P.O. Box 4661 Medford, OR 97501 |
| Alternate #2 | Alan DeBoer | awdb@aol.com | 541-944-1600 | 2260 Morada Lane Ashland, OR 97520 |
| Alternate #3 | Rob Wallace | rob@delriovineyards.com | 541-840-8953 | P. O. Box 906 Gold Hill, OR 97525 |
| Josephine County Private Sector Representatives & Alternates | | | | |
| Primary Rep | Justin Gerlitz | justing@zcsengineering.com | 541-479-3865 | 550 SW 6 th St., Ste. C Grants Pass, OR 97526 |
| Primary Rep | Robert McCraley | bobandannettemc@msn.com | 541-955-8003 | 2461 Coach Drive Grants Pass, OR 97527 |
| Primary Rep | Stan Wolfe | Stanwolfe11@gmail.com | 541-441-8421 | 295 Wildrose Lane Grants Pass, OR 97527 |
| Alternate #1 | Larry Ford | Glad2bhome33@yahoo.com | 541-476-7258 | 136 Ferry Road Grants Pass, OR 97526 |
| Alternate #2 | James Lowe | JLowe@grantspass.k12.or.us | 541-660-5035 | 3130 Leonard Road Grants Pass, OR 97527 |
| Alternate #3 | Vacant | | | |

OREGON'S

S TATEWIDE

T RANSPORTATION

I MPROVEMENT

P ROGRAM

A Citizen's Primer



*Oregon
Department
of Transportation*

What is the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)?


- The Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is the funding and scheduling document for major road, highway, and transit projects in Oregon. It lists projects for the next four years.
- The STIP is important because federal and state money cannot be spent on projects unless they are listed in the STIP. It's the law! Every state adopts its own STIP.
- Projects are listed in the STIP based on where they are located and which program is paying for them.
- The STIP is not a plan; it is a budget document that is used to schedule and fund projects. The projects listed in the STIP typically come from local- and/or state-approved plans.
- The STIP covers a four-year period, but projects in year four are included for information—funding is not obligated to them.

You can learn more at the STIP web site. See the STIP *Users' Guide* or view the adopted STIP at: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/STIP.



When does the state prepare the STIP?

- It takes about 2½ years to prepare the STIP. The work begins in odd-numbered years. The STIP Clock below shows when the process starts and finishes. There also is a flow chart on pages 8-9 that shows the process steps.
- In odd-numbered years, there is a time when ODOT is working on three different STIP cycles; however, there is only one approved STIP in effect at any time.
- The STIP is adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) in odd-numbered years, usually in August.



Who participates in the STIP process?

- While Oregon's STIP is adopted by the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC), many groups are involved in the process.
- The following list shows some of the agencies and interest groups involved with the STIP process:
 - Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs)
 - Cities and counties
 - Federal agencies
 - Freight Advisory Committee (FAC)
 - Indian tribal governments
 - Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)
 - ODOT program advisory groups
 - Transit districts, port districts
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are planning agencies that prepare and adopt transportation plans for large cities. Oregon's MPOs include: Bend, Central Lane, Corvallis, Portland Metro, Rogue Valley, and Salem/Keizer.
- Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) advise the OTC about transportation issues. Most highway regions have several ACTs and each ACT covers several counties. For information about the ACT where you live, go to:
www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml .



How can citizens participate effectively in the STIP?

- Getting involved *before* a project makes its way into the STIP is the most effective way to influence a project.
- STIP projects are chosen from adopted plans, so the most important way to affect the STIP is to get involved with the transportation planning for your community. Local plans that are used to prepare the STIP include:
 - City and county transportation system plans (TSPs)
 - Regional transportation plans for metropolitan areas (RTPs)
 - Transit agency plans
 - Tribal government transportation improvement plans (TIPs)
 - ODOT facility plans
- Major highway projects are selected from local transportation plans and are prioritized by each of Oregon's five highway regions. To learn about highway planning projects in your region, go to: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/resourcelinks.shtml .
- The process for selecting new construction projects in metropolitan areas is a cooperative process between the MPO and ODOT. Citizens in large urban areas should contact their MPO about their process. Go to www.oregon.gov/ODOT/TD/TP/resourcelinks.shtml for a listing of MPOs and other transportation planning agencies.


How is the STIP document organized?

- The STIP is organized in four sections. The Introduction explains how ODOT prepares the STIP. It also describes the programs that pay for the projects listed in the STIP.
- The “Construction STIP” (C-STIP) lists all approved construction and transit projects. The C-STIP is organized by highway region, and then by county. A map showing the state’s highway regions is on the back cover of this brochure.
- A third section includes the “Development STIP” (D-STIP), which lists multi-year planning and engineering projects. This section also lists projects of statewide significance and federal “earmarks” approved by Congress. Earmarks are for special projects and the money may only be spent on that project. Projects in the D-STIP are not yet approved for construction; they are still getting ready for construction.
- The last section of the STIP lists adopted criteria that affect some programs. For example, there are criteria for selecting Bridge, Pavement Preservation, and Modernization projects.
- Programs such as Pavement Preservation, Safety, Modernization, and Bicycle/Pedestrian are the building blocks for the STIP. The STIP process is all about deciding which projects to approve and which program(s) should pay for them.




What programs are funded through the STIP and how much money is involved?

- The pie chart below shows the main ODOT programs and how much money will flow through them during the current STIP cycle.



STIP DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

GOALS AND FUNDING



ODOT managers evaluate system goals and needs


Highway Finance Office determines available funding

ODOT recommends funding levels

STIP participants review and comment on recommendations

OTC approves program funding levels

PROJECT SELECTION



Regions and ACTs identify and scope potential projects


Regions prepare draft list of programs, projects and funding

ODOT Advisory Committees and MPOs comment on the draft STIP

ODOT staff and ACTs use systems and criteria to select projects and forward recommendations to the OTC

Draft STIP available for public review

DRAFT STIP/ PUBLIC REVIEW



Public review of draft STIP

Regions and ACTs review public input and may modify the draft STIP


Air quality modeling and conformity reviewed for affected areas

Fiscally constrained analysis to ensure STIP projects stay within available funds

TIPs added into final STIP

ODOT advisory committees and other stakeholders review final STIP

STIP APPROVAL



OTC approves final STIP

Governor approves MPO TIPs

Final STIP submitted to federal funding agencies*

FHWA/
FTA approve final STIP

* Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

Federal Transit Administration (FTA)

Where does ODOT find the projects listed in the STIP?

Projects listed in the STIP come primarily from two sources: **local transportation plans** or **program data and management systems**.

Local transportation plans contribute projects to the STIP, especially Modernization projects. OTC criteria and policies influence the selection of projects from local plans. Plans may include:

| PLAN TYPE | PREPARED BY | CONTENTS |
|---|--|---|
| Transportation System Plan | Cities and counties; ODOT participates | 20 year plan—part of local land use plans |
| Regional Transportation Plan | Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) | 20 year plan—lists needs and funding sources |
| Land Management Agency Transportation Plans | Federal agencies, tribal governments, state agencies | Long-term plans that identify needs |
| Refinement Plans/ Facility Plans | ODOT, MPOs, local governments | Concept designs for specific locations |
| Transit Agency Strategic Plans | Transit districts and agencies | Long-term plans for transit services |
| Special studies and reports | ODOT | Special reports like the <i>Bridge Options Report</i> or <i>I-5 Conditions Report</i> |



Program data and management systems are used to monitor conditions on state highways and help managers prioritize needs. The following table lists some of the important management systems and databases for the state’s highway system. For some programs, the OTC adopts criteria that are used along with the management system to decide which projects to select. The Pavement Preservation and Bridge programs use OTC adopted criteria to help select projects.

| PROGRAM DATA AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM | RESPONSIBLE DIVISION | USED FOR |
|---|--|---|
| Bridge Management System | Highway – Bridge | Repair and replacement |
| Congestion Management System | Transportation Development – Planning Analysis | Identify and monitor congested areas |
| Pavement Management System | Highway – Preservation | Highway resurfacing |
| Safety Management System | Highway – Traffic Safety | Crash-prone areas |
| Culverts/Fish Passage database | Highway – Hydrologist/ Fish Biologist | Replace culverts and improve fish habitat |
| Signs, Signals, Illumination database | Highway – Region Traffic/ Operations | Asset replacement and improvements |
| Slides and Rockfalls database | Highway – Geologist/ Region Traffic Manager | Preventive measures and repairs |

What programs are in the STIP?

Listed below are some of ODOT's major programs. Some programs include several funding sources that are managed separately.

| PROGRAM NAME | USED FOR |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Modernization | Building/expanding roads and highways |
| Public Transportation Programs | Multiple programs for capital purchases and operations |
| Pavement Preservation | Resurfacing state highways |
| State and Local Bridge | Building/repairing bridges |
| Highway Safety | Improvements to reduce crashes and make highways safer |
| Bicycle/Pedestrian | Improvements for these users |
| Transportation Enhancement | Projects that improve the appearance and function of the transportation system |
| Operations | Multiple programs that affect highway operations (signals, rockfalls, signs, lighting) |

There are other programs funded through the STIP. For more information, go to the STIP web site and browse through the Program Descriptions chapter of the STIP *Users' Guide* at:

www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/STIP.



Where does the STIP fit into the project development and construction process?

The STIP is one of the last steps in the project approval process. The sequence for most transportation improvement projects is as follows:

PLANNING PHASE – Projects are identified in one or more of the following types of plans/systems:

| SOURCE DOCUMENT | PREPARED BY |
|---|---|
| Transportation system plans | Local government |
| Facility plans | ODOT |
| Regional transportation plans | MPOs |
| Tribal government plans | Tribal governments, e.g., Klamath, Umatilla, Warm Springs |
| Federal agency plans | Federal agencies, e.g., BLM, U.S. Forest Service |
| Oregon Transportation Management System | ODOT |

STIP FUNDING/SCHEDULING PHASE – Projects are selected from plans and approved in the STIP.

PROJECT DELIVERY PHASE – State highway projects are assigned to a project team in the region where the project is located for design and construction. To learn more about how projects get built, go to www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/OPD/PDguidebook.shtml.

How would a typical project approval process work?

The example below outlines the typical approval process for a Modernization program project (i.e., a project that adds capacity, like highway widening or new interchanges).

| MODERNIZATION PROGRAM PROJECT APPROVAL PROCESS |
|---|
| Project identified in local, state, or regional transportation plan. |
| Project refinement plan prepared using combined state/local funding. |
| Project environmental impact study prepared; sometimes this is funded through the D-STIP. |
| Project recommended to be in the STIP by the ACT and approved by the OTC (approval may require several attempts). |
| After STIP approval, a project team designs the project and manages the construction process (for state system projects). |

The approval process for projects funded through other STIP programs is similar to the steps shown for a Modernization project.

Some programs, such as Bicycle/Pedestrian and Transportation Enhancement, have special application procedures. Other programs have their own advisory committees that review projects before they go into the STIP (e.g., Bike/Ped Advisory Committee, Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee).

For more information about the project approval process, see the STIP *Users' Guide* at: www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HWY/STIP.



Participation Tips

To effectively advocate for a project, proponents must know how far along the path to completion the project is. Here are some examples.

| PROJECT STATUS | PROCESS STEP |
|---|--|
| <p>Our town has congestion problems but we're not sure how to fix them.</p> <p>The bridge doesn't seem to be meeting current traffic needs.</p> | <p>Local city or county Transportation System Plan or Highway Corridor Study (20-year plans)</p> |
| <p>Fixing the highway is in the local plan but the solution is not clear.</p> <p>We need an environmental study for a major project.</p> | <p>Development STIP (construction 4+ years away)</p> |
| <p>The engineering design is complete and the local match is approved.</p> <p>The city is scheduling future utility work.</p> | <p>Construction STIP (construction within 4 years)</p> |
| <p>The project is funded, but how will it affect my property?</p> | <p>Project Delivery (project design and right-of-way issues)</p> |


Contacts

ODOT Highway Region:
www.oregon.gov/ODOT/HighwayRegions.shtml

Area Commissions on Transportation:
www.oregon.gov/ODOT/COMM/act_main.shtml

Local government contacts:
www.bluebook.state.or.us/local/cities/cities.htm

ODOT HIGHWAY REGIONS



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
355 Capitol Street NE, Salem, OR 97301
888-275-6368
www.oregon.gov/ODOT

Introduction to *Enhance* and *Fix-It* for the 2015-2018 STIP

September 24, 2012

1.0 Overview

The purpose of this paper is to provide the following information:

- Explain the rationale for the change in process
- Explain what types of projects are in the *Enhance* and *Fix-It* categories
- The framework in which the ACTs and MPOs should select the recommended projects to be funded in the *Enhance* category
- Outline the sequence of steps in the development of the 2015-2018 STIP

The expectation of the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) is to identify and fund the best multimodal transportation project solution to address a problem. As the agency develops the 2015-2018 STIP, we have an opportunity to move toward an improved process that allows maximum flexibility in the use of limited funds. The Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) needs the ability to apply the available funds in the broadest way possible.

The Oregon Transportation Plan and the supporting modal plan policies identify the need to maintain and preserve the existing transportation assets. With limited funds it is not possible to maintain the existing system, yet some expansion to develop a fully multimodal system is necessary. This process will provide an opportunity for the Oregon Transportation Commission to provide policy direction to balance maintenance and enhancement of the State of Oregon's multimodal transportation system.

The OTC and ODOT are changing how the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is developed. The STIP will no longer be developed as a collection of programs tied to specific pools of funding dedicated to specific transportation modes or specialty programs. Beginning in the summer of 2012, the STIP will be divided into two broad categories: *Fix-It* and *Enhance*.

The primary objective of this change is to enable ODOT to take care of the existing transportation assets while still providing a measure of funding to enhance the state and local transportation system in a truly multimodal way.

There are a number of issues driving the need for this change. Perhaps most important, when revenue for transportation system maintenance and improvement is limited and declining, it is important that transportation investments effectively address a wide range of issues, from safety, mobility, and accessibility to economic development, sustainability, energy, health, and community livability. In short, we need to identify the most effective projects based on community and state values, rather than those that fit best into prescribed programs. The new STIP development process also aligns with

Definitions:

Enhance: Activities that enhance, expand, or improve the transportation system

Fix-It: Activities that fix or preserve the transportation system

ODOT's internal effort to "right-size" the agency and reorganize along functional lines (rather than modal or program lines) to adapt to continuing financial constraints.

At the core of this new approach is a single application process for all projects that will be funded under the **Enhance** side of the STIP. The OTC will select **Enhance** projects based on recommendations developed by local governments, public agencies and citizen representatives through a process conducted by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), where applicable, and the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACT). The **Fix-It** portion of this process will be discussed in Section 1.6 below.

The purpose of this guidance document is to provide some perspective and considerations for reviewers to use when evaluating and prioritizing **Enhance** project applications. Project activities that are eligible for **Enhance** category funds include:

- Bicycle and/or Pedestrian facilities on or off the highway right-of-way
- Development STIP (D-STIP) projects (development work for projects that will not be ready for construction or implementation within the four years of the STIP)
- Modernization (projects that add capacity to the system, in accordance with ORS 366.507)
- Most projects previously eligible for Transportation Enhancement funds
- Projects eligible for Flex Funds (the Flexible Funds program funded Bicycle, Pedestrian, Transit and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects, plans, programs, and services)
- Protective Right-of-Way purchases
- Public Transportation¹ (capital projects only, not operations)
- Safe Routes to School (infrastructure projects)
- Scenic Byways (construction projects)
- Transportation Alternatives (new with MAP-21, the federal transportation authorization)
- Transportation Demand Management

Because of the wide diversity of project applications that the department expects to receive, we do not advise a formal scoring process. This STIP development process will ultimately be subjective and largely driven by matching identified problems with cost-effective solutions that reflect local values and concerns. However, there are some practical sideboards that we can establish to help guide the decision-making process. The remainder of this document will provide those policy-based and practical parameters.

We note that these guidelines are not intended to be definitive or inclusive of all possible considerations. Other considerations of local or regional importance may be factored into any selection recommendation process. The only real requirements within the selection recommendation process are that the projects legitimately address at least one of the benefit areas included in the application (to address multiple areas generally

¹ Public transportation capital projects are eligible for Enhance funds. It is important to note, however, that the funds from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) are not included in the Enhance funds. Those dollars remain separate and are solely for public transportation projects.

makes for a stronger application) and whatever logic and rationale is used to make the decisions is clearly and thoroughly documented.

The OTC has also provided significant guidance over the last year about what will constitute a successful project as funding becomes more limited, and projects become more difficult to implement. As has been the case for many years, the OTC continues to put a strong emphasis on preserving the existing transportation system first. This is evidenced by the funding split between the **Fix-It** portion of the proposed new STIP (76 percent) and the **Enhance** portion (24 percent).

In addition, this process applies primarily to projects that will be ready for construction or implementation in 2016 to 2018, because projects for 2015 are largely already selected. Because the STIP is updated every two years, there will be an opportunity to review the later projects in the STIP and to improve on the STIP selection process for the next STIP update cycle.

Note also that all legal obligations to develop the STIP, including any minimum expenditures, will continue to be honored in this STIP and all later STIPs. This includes any federal requirements that may change with updates to federal law, including the 2012 MAP-21 transportation authorization legislation, and any successor legislation. ODOT will try to mirror changes in law in the STIP process, where appropriate. For example, MAP-21 places Transportation Enhancement, Recreational Trails, and Safe Routes to School, that were formerly separate programs, under one “Transportation Alternatives” (TA) program. Similarly, in Oregon’s process, the types of projects allowed under the new TA program are eligible to apply for funding under **Enhance**.

1.1 The Oregon Transportation Plan

The Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP) set the stage for ODOT’s transition to a more multimodal agency with multiple goals and policy objectives when it was adopted in 2006. Demonstrating how a project will meet or advance the OTP goals and objectives will be an asset to any **Enhance** application and will ultimately strengthen its chances of implementation.

The OTP Goals

1. Mobility and Accessibility
2. Management of the System
3. Economic Vitality
4. Sustainability
5. Safety and Security
6. Funding the Transportation System
7. Coordination, Communication and Cooperation

Embedded in these policies and actions are a set of priorities to be considered after maintaining and preserving the system. This includes recognizing some key priorities embedded both in the OTP and in OTC discussions: enhancing economic development opportunities; supporting compact mixed use development, integrating multimodal systems; maintaining the safety of the system and making strategic investments that contribute measurable benefits to the efficiency of the system. The direction of the OTC

and the policy framework of the Oregon Transportation Plan are augmented by the governor's direction that provides more specific guidance.

1.2 Governor's Direction

One excellent source of guidance to determine which project applications represent the best high-value, multimodal project opportunities comes from the office of Governor John Kitzhaber. The governor laid out a variety of principles about how to make transportation system investments and how to conduct the investment decision-making process.

On August 24, 2011, the governor met with the OTC and talked about his direction and expectations. The governor laid out six principles he wants brought to the fore in transportation decision making. Those six principles are:

1. Have the right group of people at the table at the beginning of the process to define the problem and solution together
2. Determine who is best positioned to manage/own facilities
3. Create programs that invest in the transportation system AND meet a multitude of community objectives
4. Move us closer to a sustainable, safe, lower carbon, multi-modal system
5. Maximize benefit for the least cost under limited resources
6. Move us closer to a transportation funding mechanism for the future

Additionally, the governor stressed that to support sustainable communities, state agencies shall seek to help enable and encourage local communities to achieve the following objectives:

- Resilient local economies that provide a diversity of economic opportunities for all citizens
- Workers supported by lifelong education to ensure a globally competitive workforce
- An independent and productive citizenry
- Youth supported by strong families and communities
- Downtowns and main street communities that are active and vital
- Development that wisely and efficiently uses infrastructure investments and natural resources
- Affordable housing available for citizens in community centers
- Healthy urban and rural watersheds, including habitats for fish and wildlife
- Clean and sufficient water for all uses
- Efficient use and reuse of resources and minimization of harmful emissions to the environment

Project applications that demonstrate alignment with these various directives and principles will ultimately have an improved chance of being chosen for implementation.

The following bullet points summarize his key themes that provide not only guidance in the selection of projects, but also for other transportation issues that the Commission often addresses.

- Maximize and leverage investments by looking for:
 - projects with the potential to be both effective and efficient
 - projects that involve multiple funding sources
 - projects that are complementary to other projects or community development activities and offer the chance for the whole to be greater than the sum of the parts
- Investments must achieve multiple objectives
- Conduct proactive asset management (strategically take care of what we already have)
- Move toward a more multimodal transportation system by maximizing funding flexibility and consider a wider range of community issues and benefits
- As funding decreases, and projects become increasingly difficult to implement we need to transition and transform the way we work—to look for new ways of doing business
- Use Regional Solution Centers to reduce bureaucratic barriers and help identify opportunities to partner and leverage projects
- Look for projects that result in GHG emissions reductions
- Continue to develop a Rapid Passenger Rail Plan
- Implement least cost planning principles
- Incorporate practical design principles from planning to project development
- Weigh all the values we have – including energy, job creation and health – in final design

1.3 Legislative Direction

This new approach will also be responsive, at appropriate points in the process, to various legislative actions. Examples of prior legislation that apply to the STIP are listed below (from Oregon Revised Statutes).

ORS 184.621. The Oregon Legislature included ten considerations for use in developing STIP criteria in the Jobs and Transportation Act (JTA). The ten considerations directly relate to categories of benefits included in the application. Also, nine of the ten categories listed below have been selected by the STIP Stakeholder Committee for analysis in Oregon’s least cost planning process (Mosaic) and, in turn, relate closely to the goals and policies of the OTP. All these parallels ensure that the STIP **Enhance** process reflects the goals and policies of the OTP, the priorities of the STIP Stakeholder Committee, and the legislature’s STIP considerations. Specific language from the JTA:

“The Oregon Transportation Commission shall work with stakeholders to review and update the criteria used to select projects within the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. When revising the project selection criteria the commission shall consider whether the project:

(1) Improves the state highway system or major access routes to the state highway system on the local road system to relieve congestion by expanding capacity,

enhancing operations or otherwise improving travel times within high-congestion corridors.

(2) Enhances the safety of the traveling public by decreasing traffic crash rates, promoting the efficient movement of people and goods and preserving the public investment in the transportation system.

(3) Increases the operational effectiveness and reliability of the existing system by using technological innovation, providing linkages to other existing components of the transportation system and relieving congestion.

(4) Is capable of being implemented to reduce the need for additional highway projects.

(5) Improves the condition, connectivity and capacity of freight-reliant infrastructure serving the state.

(6) Supports improvements necessary for this state's economic growth and competitiveness, accessibility to industries and economic development.

(7) Provides the greatest benefit in relation to project costs.

(8) Fosters livable communities by demonstrating that the investment does not undermine sustainable urban development.

(9) Enhances the value of transportation projects through designs and development that reflect environmental stewardship and community sensitivity.

(10) Is consistent with the state's greenhouse gas emissions reduction goals and reduces this state's dependence on foreign oil."

ORS 184.611. This statute addresses prioritization of freight mobility projects and reads "(1) As used in this section, "freight mobility project" means a project that supports the safe, reliable and efficient movement of goods between and among local, national and international markets. (2) The Legislative Assembly finds that investment in freight mobility projects will yield a return on the state's investment in terms of improved economic opportunity and safety. (3) In developing the STIP, the Department of Transportation shall give priority to freight mobility projects that: (a) Are located on identified freight routes of statewide or regional significance; (b) Remove identified barriers to the safe, reliable and efficient movement of goods; and (c) Facilitate public and private investment that creates or sustains jobs."

ORS 366.507. This statute addresses Modernization program funding, conditions and criteria.

ORS 366.514. This statute addresses the use of state highway funds for footpaths and bicycle trails. It includes the requirement that "The amount expended by the department or by a city or county as required or permitted by this section shall never in any one fiscal year be less than one percent of the total amount of the funds received from the highway fund." and related definitions and exemptions.

1.4 OTC Perspective

In the past year the OTC has studied the existing funding and institutional realities facing ODOT and Oregon transportation system development, future challenges, and how other DOTs addressed financial limitations and achieved improved partnerships with transportation stakeholders and jurisdictions. The OTC Workshop in October 2011 highlighted several key points including:

- Funds are not keeping up with expenditures

- All modes are underfunded
- The transportation system will deteriorate from its current condition, both physically and operationally
- New strategies are being implemented to maximize our investments
- The organization is being reduced in size and services to match projected funding levels

The OTC has also reviewed the role of Area Commissions and identified that ACTs are underutilized, given the experience and commitment of the ACT members.

1.5 OTC Priorities

The OTC commissioners identified the following thematic priorities during the October 2011 workshop:

- The need to achieve a truly multimodal system
- Work to integrate health into transportation discussions
- Improve transportation system efficiency by implementing technology solutions
- Look for ways to be innovative in project funding, packaging, and implementation
- Continue developing and seeking approval for sustainable funding mechanisms
- Look for creative ways to resolve intergovernmental transportation system problems cooperatively

In November 2011, the OTC invited the chairs of the Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) and other advisory committees to participate in presentations focused on some of the challenges that Oregon faces. A key theme was that now, more than ever, we need to engage transportation stakeholders to identify issues and to develop creative and sustainable multimodal transportation system solutions.

The presentations were followed by a roundtable discussion with the advisory committees on their perspectives on opportunities and challenges. The OTC and ODOT believe that ACTs have been underutilized given the experience and commitment of the ACT members, and many ACT members expressed desire to play a broader role. It was agreed that this would be the first meeting of this type and not just a one-time event.

The 2015-2018 STIP selection process will address these priorities by expanding the “universe” of potential transportation projects that are compared side by side. This will avoid the artificial separation of projects by funding source that existed up to this point. The overarching point of agreement that emerged in the past year was similar to some of the conclusions that emerged from the governor’s direction and the previous OTC work: ODOT no longer has the resources to keep doing what we have been doing and how we have been doing it, and neither do the local jurisdictions. While our collective years of experience still have value, in order to be successful, we will all need to evolve and adapt to the financial and institutional changes that have taken place over the last 20 years. Rather than viewing this as a negative situation, it should really be seen as an opportunity for all of us to improve the way we do things to manage the transportation system in Oregon.

1.6 *Fix-It Program for STIP*

The *Fix-It* category includes all the capital funding categories that maintain or fix ODOT's portion of the transportation system. It is important to note that the capital funding categories do not include the noncapital maintenance and operations programs because these are not included in the STIP. Noncapital maintenance/ operations and other agency funding is addressed by the OTC via the state budget decisions.

Project activities eligible for the *Fix-It* category of funds include:

- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities on state routes only
- Bridges (state owned)
- Culverts
- High Risk Rural Roads
- Illumination, signs and signals
- Landslides and Rockfalls
- Operations (includes ITS)
- Pavement Preservation
- Rail-Highway Crossings
- Safety
- Salmon (Fish Passage)
- Site Mitigation and Repair
- Stormwater Retrofit
- Transportation Demand Management (part of Operations)
- Work zone Safety (Project specific)

The selection of projects for the *Fix-It* category is intended to start with input from ODOT infrastructure management systems and be supported by consultation with ACTs and MPOs. Management systems are repositories of data about the system. They can identify problems and the general idea for a solution. Management system analysis is used, for example, for State Bridge, Pavement Preservation, and Safety projects. The systems provide asset management information and help prioritize needs. Each ODOT transportation region will then share the *Fix-It* project lists with its ACTs and MPOs in order to:

1. Identify opportunities to leverage funds
2. Identify opportunities to maximize projects' support of Oregon objectives, community goals and system asset management
3. Identify opportunities to coordinate project timing and outcomes better
4. Identify opportunities to coordinate safety improvements

At the July 18, 2012, OTC meeting the OTC directed ODOT to begin work on the *Fix-It* category project lists for the 2015-2018 STIP. The Commission requested ODOT prepare an expanded project list that will be available to the ACTs and other STIP contributors as they discuss potential *Enhance* projects, so there is opportunity to look

at linkages, leveraging resources, enhancing project benefits, etc. This will also provide an opportunity for ACTs to direct comments to ODOT program managers regarding proposed **Fix-It** projects in an area.

Below are the principles guiding the **Fix-It** category of STIP funding.

| Fix-It Category Funding Allocation and Project Selection Guiding Principles | |
|--|---|
| Balance | Maintain relative balance between Fix-It programs while allowing route priority within individual programs, taking into account risks (safety), sustainability, and magnitude of investment. |
| Leverage | Leverage existing funding to attract more revenue opportunities to support a sustainable transportation system. |
| Maintenance | Focus investments on features that are difficult and expensive to maintain. |
| Safety | Maintain or improve transportation safety on the system within funding level availability. |
| Regulatory Compliance | Ensure minimum environmental, federal, state, and local compliance is maintained on the transportation system. |
| Economy | Maximize economic opportunities and minimize economic hardships as a result of transportation investments. |
| Cost Effectiveness | Allocate funding in a way that maximizes return on investment to support a sustainable transportation system. |
| System Continuity | Fund investments that minimize risk of transportation system failure. |

When the initial proposed lists of **Fix-It** projects are developed, ODOT staff will report back to the OTC on how the proposed dispersal of funds will affect the overall condition of the system.

2.0 2015-2018 STIP Cycle Enhance Project Selection

Described below are key steps in the 2015-2018 STIP update cycle. See the attached timeline for a list of all due dates and other key dates in this process. There is also an information and instructions document to accompany the **Enhance** application. All these documents are available on [ODOT's website](#).

2.1 OTC approval of 2015-2018 STIP Process

Throughout the spring of 2012, ODOT has had discussions with the OTC about approaches to the 2015-2018 STIP funding and project selection. At the OTC's July 2012 meeting, the Commission decided to go ahead with the **Fix-It** and **Enhance** approach to the STIP. The Commission directed ODOT to begin the **Fix-It** project selection process and wait until September to provide the final decision on the proposed **Enhance** process.

The September approval target provides more opportunity for ODOT to reach out to ACTs, MPOs, and others, in order for stakeholders to better understand the process, and for ODOT and the OTC to hear concerns and make improvements to the **Enhance** process to respond to those concerns. During the summer of 2012, ODOT staff is discussing the new process with each ACT and others.

2.2 Application Available

The **Enhance** projects application will be available in September 2012, shortly after the OTC meeting and provided the decision is to move forward. The application contains basic project information and it includes a section on benefit of the projects. These are organized in categories. First is benefits to the state system, then nine more categories mirror the categories of impacts that the STIP Stakeholder Committee designated as most important for Oregon's least cost planning process to evaluate. Least cost planning, now called Mosaic, is being developed and tested for use in the planning process, not for project-level decisions at this time. However, the nine Mosaic categories are basic categories of impacts of the transportation system and investments in that system and this application provides a qualitative way to respond to those same categories for project decisions.

The benefits section is also similar to the project selection criteria many individual STIP funding programs used for recent STIP cycles. The application does not use the term "criteria," because it is intended to be broader than any of the criteria used in the past to include a wide range of modes and possible investments. The benefits information will also be used to prioritize and compare projects.

Not all projects are expected to have impacts on all categories of benefit. Reviewers will need to discuss the different benefits of different projects and use a consensus process to develop their prioritized lists.

Regions, ACTs, and MPOs may not add to or alter the application or the benefit information requested. This is a change from prior STIP procedures. It is important that all **Enhance** projects are evaluated similarly across the state.

ODOT staff can provide assistance in answering questions about the application and about the application review process. Each region has designated a representative to lead this process for the region and they are the ones to whom to direct questions. See below for the list of region representatives. (If you are unsure about which region to direct questions to, see the online [ODOT Region Map](#).)

| Region | Representative | Phone | Email |
|----------|----------------|--------------|--|
| Region 1 | Jeff Flowers | 503.731.8235 | Jeffrey.A.FLOWERS@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 2 | Terry Cole | 503.986.2674 | Terry.D.COLE@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 3 | Lisa Cortes | 541.957.3643 | Lisa.CORTES@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 4 | Katie Parlette | 541.388.6037 | Katie.M.PARLETTE@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 5 | Dawn Hubble | 541.963.1325 | Dawn.L.HUBBLE@odot.state.or.us |

2.3 Application Due

Applications must be **received** by the appropriate ODOT region mailbox before **12:00 PM, noon, on November 27**. The region emails are listed below. See the application instructions for further details about how to use email to submit applications. Other key dates in this process are listed in the attached draft Timeline.

| | |
|----------|--|
| Region 1 | STIPEnhanceAppsRegion1@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 2 | STIPEnhanceAppsRegion2@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 3 | STIPEnhanceAppsRegion3@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 4 | STIPEnhanceAppsRegion4@odot.state.or.us |
| Region 5 | STIPEnhanceAppsRegion5@odot.state.or.us |

2.4 Region Staff Review of Applications

Applications received by the due date will be reviewed by ODOT region staff for general eligibility and completeness. Applications will be checked to verify that:

1. The sponsor is a public agency
2. The proposed project is of the type covered by **Enhance** funds
3. The application is complete. Information that must be included:
 - Item 1: Project sponsor
 - Item 3: Project name
 - Item 5: Project summary
 - Item 8: Project problem statement
 - Item 9: Project location
 - Item 11: Project description
 - Item 14: Timetable lines 1 and 8
 - Item 27: Estimated project costs
 - Item 28: Project participants and contributions
 - Item 29: Project sponsor signature

Regions will send applications for **Enhance** projects that include at least this information to ACTs and MPOs for review and prioritization in early December 2012.

2.5 ACT and MPO Application Reviews

Regions will send eligible, complete applications to the applicable ACT and MPO for review. The current long-standing STIP development processes in which ACTs, MPOs, and region staff work together to prioritize projects, are expected to continue.

Generally, where an MPO is part of an ACT, there are processes in place to discuss MPO priorities within the ACT and agree on area priorities. The Portland area is unique in that there is an MPO, but not an ACT. ODOT Region 1 will work with its stakeholders to better define the coordination process for the region as a whole.

Projects recommended through the STIP Update process and within the boundaries of an MPO need to be included in the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The MPO Policy Board approves the final MTIP and then sends it to the governor for further approval. After these approvals, the MTIP is incorporated into the STIP.

Regions, ACTs, and MPOs will receive a template to report their conversations and process to develop their recommended project lists. This will provide a record of what concerns they discussed, how they selected priorities, and why they selected projects. This record will be important. It should be developed during selection of the 150 percent list. It can later be revised or updated during conversations to reduce the list to the final recommended list. This record will be essential to the OTC, OTC advisory committees, and others in order to understand how the projects were selected.

While this template is still under development, we anticipate the ACTs will provide responses to questions similar to:

- How does this project improve transportation choices for people in your community?
- Why is now the right time for this project?
- How does this project improve the lives of people in your community?

The Oregon Transportation Commission is the state's final decision-making body, responsible for approving the final STIP and sending it to US DOT for final approval. ACTs work with their ODOT region and sometimes other ACTs in the region to put together the region's final recommended STIP project list. This list then goes to the OTC for approval.

Definitions:

150 percent List:

A list of projects generated early during the review of applications that would use roughly 150 percent of the region's available STIP Enhance funds

Recommended List:

A list of projects generated after projects are scoped to identify a final recommendation from ACTs that would use roughly all of the region's available STIP Enhance funds

ODOT has expectations for how the applications will be reviewed and for documenting how the final lists were selected. The following expectations will be included in the direction to ACTs, MPOs, and others to guide their review of applications and their development of prioritized project lists:

- a. The process used to review applications and establish priorities should be as inclusive of participants and as transparent as possible.
- b. No benefit category is to be defined as more important than others, and project applications do not need to show benefit in all categories to be eligible. Reviewers are to discuss the project benefits holistically and strive for consensus. Because different types of projects will have different kinds of benefits, to decide before review that certain benefits are most important will disadvantage some projects that may be important to the area. Likewise, reviewers should not use overall numerical scores to determine outcomes, but use a discussion and consensus process.

Reviewers may use qualitative rankings within the benefit categories. For example, different projects may have high, medium, or low benefits for individual benefit categories such as mobility or livability. Discussion and consensus will then decide how to prioritize projects with very different benefits.

- c. Reviewers can use state and local plans and goals and policies described in plans to help determine priority. Plans may include the Oregon Transportation Plan, the Oregon Highway Plan, other Oregon transportation topic or mode plans, local transportation system plans, local comprehensive plans, etc.
- d. Reviewers are expected to consider the merits of the project regardless of the level of detail in the application. For example, some jurisdictions may have access to considerable data and analyses to support their project. Other jurisdictions with more limited staff resources and experience may have less detail to report, but their applications must be considered equally.
- e. ODOT will require that the decision-making process be documented in a consistent manner throughout the state. The department will provide a template to accomplish this.
- f. Some programs included in **Enhance** have previously developed STIP selection criteria. Reviewers are not required to use these other STIP criteria in establishing priorities. However, reviewers are welcome to consider these other STIP criteria if they are helpful in the prioritization process.
- g. Reviewers must include any required elements of project prioritization in their evaluations. For example, ODOT is required in statute to give priority to freight projects in the STIP. ODOT region staff will explain such requirements to reviewers. The final list and documentation will show how they were considered. Similarly, ODOT will ensure that the final STIP meets all legal requirements, such as minimum amounts for certain types of projects including bicycle and pedestrian projects.

- h. MPOs will need to maintain their appropriate role in the prioritization and selection process. (They are federally-chartered bodies with specified project selection responsibilities.) ODOT expects that the ACTs will coordinate as they do today in similar processes with the MPOs. ODOT region staff is responsible for ensuring this coordination is accomplished.

2.6 ACT Development of 150 Percent List

ACTs and MPOs will receive the applications from ODOT region staff in early December. Reviewers will then prioritize and narrow considered projects to their “150 percent list.” This means that highest-priority projects will be listed to a bit over the expected funding available for the region’s **Enhance** program.

2.7 Scoping of 150 Percent Lists

All projects on the 150 percent list of projects will then be “scoped” in more detail, meaning that their location, components, cost, and details will be examined more closely to verify estimates and establish the final project scope. ODOT region staff will manage the scoping process with assistance from other ODOT staff and/or the local jurisdiction. Region staff will work with applicants to accomplish the detailed scoping. This detailed information will be shared with ACTs and MPOs to help reviewers narrow the list to the final region-wide recommended list.

2.8 Statewide Advisory Committee Review

During scoping of the 150 percent list the following statewide committees, advisory to the OTC, will also review the lists of potential projects:

- the Transportation Enhancement Advisory Committee working jointly with the Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- the Oregon Freight Advisory Committee

These advisory committees will review the projects in the 150 percent lists and share any feedback on the projects and priorities from their respective areas of expertise with the OTC.

The advisory committees will provide thematic analysis regarding the 150 percent lists in a memo format. This memo may focus comments at statewide, ODOT region-wide and ODOT area-wide geographic scale. They will be asked to provide their comments while scoping of the 150 percent lists is ongoing.

2.9 OTC Review of STIP Development

The OTC will review the overall progress of the STIP development periodically throughout the process. The commission will analyze the 150 percent lists and input from the statewide advisory committees and other stakeholders for overall themes and will provide feedback and additional direction to the ACTs.

2.10 ACT Development of Final Recommendation

Information from scoping and from the statewide advisory committee reviews will be passed back to the ACTs and MPOs, for their next step to reduce the 150 percent list to the recommended list of projects for the STIP. Each region will have a slightly different process to develop the final list, but will be in general alignment with past practices.

2.11 OTC Review and “20 percent” Project Identification

The OTC will review the recommended lists and consider the 20 percent of the **Enhance** budget that was held back for statewide consideration by the OTC. The OTC will consider any apparent gaps in the recommended lists, such as a multimodal focus, and statewide goals, policies, and priorities.

2.12 Draft STIP

Once the recommended STIP is complete, including assigning the OTC’s statewide 20 percent, the Draft STIP will be compiled, presented to the OTC and released for public review and comment.

2.13 Final STIP

After the application review and STIP development steps, there are several more steps that need to occur before the STIP is final. For example, technical steps, such as air quality conformity determinations will be completed where needed. Any further metropolitan area projects from their Transportation Improvement Programs are added in also. Comments received on the Draft STIP are considered before the STIP is finalized. When these steps are complete, a Final STIP is prepared and released for public comment.

2.14 OTC STIP Approval

The OTC has final approval of the STIP for all of ODOT. After the public comment period on the Final STIP and consideration of comments received, the Final STIP goes to the OTC for approval. The OTC has the authority to make changes or add conditions to projects.

2.15 STIP Federal Approval

The final step in the STIP process is federal agencies approval. After OTC approval, the STIP must receive approvals from the Federal Highway and Federal Transit Administrations. The new STIP is active once federal agencies approved.

3.0 The 2017-2020 STIP

The 2015-2018 STIP will set in place projects for implementation in 2016, 2017, and 2018 (projects for 2015 were selected with previous procedures.) The Oregon STIP is updated every two years. This means that in two years, we will have the opportunity to revisit projects slated for 2017 and 2018 and make any necessary improvements to the selection process based on lessons learned from this selection cycle.

2015-2018 STIP Enhance Project Application/Selection Process Anticipated Timeframes

9/21/12

- **September 24, 2012** Application process begins
- **October 16, 2012** OTC meeting with ACT chairs
- **November 27, 2012** Applications must be submitted to specified region e-mail address by noon this day
- **Nov 27-Dec 5, 2012** Regions review applications for eligibility
- **December 6, 2012** Applications distributed to ACTs and MPOs for deliberation and 150 percent list development and prioritization
- **March 15, 2013** ACTs submit 150 percent recommendations to regions by close of business
- **March 18-July 19, 2013** Regions scope 150 percent lists
- **March 21, 2013** Regions provide their ACTs' 150 percent lists to TDD for Distribution to OTC, OFAC and Joint TE-OBPAC
- **June 19, 2013** OTC, OFAC and Joint TE-OBPAC Committee provide input on 150 percent lists
- **July 22, 2013** Regions provide scoping information to Area Managers and ACT chairs; ACTs and regions begin developing project recommendation lists
- **October 4, 2013** Regions provide their project recommendation lists to TDD for compilation and OTC consideration
- **Oct 7-Nov 13, 2013** OTC review of project recommendation lists and allocation of discretionary 20 percent
- **December 18, 2013** OTC releases draft 2015-2018 STIP for review
- **February 14, 2014** Draft STIP Public Review process complete
- **March 14, 2014** ACT/MPO/OTC etc. review of comments complete
- **April 18, 2014** Complete any necessary adjustments to draft STIP
- **April 21-Aug 15, 2014** Conduct air quality conformity determinations
- **September 30, 2014** Final STIP available for review
- **Oct 1-Nov 19, 2014** Review of final STIP
- **November 19, 2014** OTC review and approval of final 2015-2018 STIP
- **February 2015** USDOT review and approval of 2015-2018 STIP

2015-2018 STIP DEVELOPMENT TIMELINE

| | | Process review by staff, stakeholders and OTC | 100% prioritized rec'd list development | OTC review of 150% lists | Appl. review & 150% rec'd project list development | Discussions with stakeholders on new process and expanded roles of the ACTs | |
|--|----------|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| Final STIP development, review and approval | | Air quality conformity and modeling | Draft STIP development, review and approval | Scoping Enhance | | Scoping Fix-it | |
| USDOT approval of Final 2015-2018 STIP. <i>Note: The STIP is not final until all necessary Federal approvals are received - approximately two months after OTC approval.</i> Transition Amendment completed, Final STIP distributed. | | Final STIP prepared for review. October 1 - Final STIP available for review by ACTs, MPOs, other stakeholders. November 19 - OTC review and approval of Final STIP. STIP air quality conformity paper due to STIP office. Final STIP to USDOT for approval. MTIPs to Governor for approval. | Air quality conformity determinations and modeling continues. PCSX closed to Regions. August 31 - Add final MTIP data to PCSX. Air quality conformity determinations and modeling complete. Adjust as necessary based on OTC direction and public input. Air quality conformity determinations and modeling begins (entire draft STIP packet needed to do the modeling). Metro needs the full four months. Air quality conformity determinations and modeling continues. | Targets to actuals process begins. Oct 4 - deadline for ACTs and Regions to complete 100% prioritized project recommendation list. Oct 7 - Regions provide their 100% lists to TDD for compilation and inclusion in October OTC meeting packet as an information item. Oct 14 - Deadline for Region STIP Coordinators to complete upload of project list into PCSX or new system application. Oct 15 to Nov 12 - Salem staff conducts process of constraining the draft STIP. Nov 13 to Dec 11 - Salem staff develops draft STIP document; draft STIP printed, distributed. December 18 - OTC releases draft STIP for public review. Public review process continues. Public Review process complete; comments summarized. Public comments reviewed by OTC, ACTs, MPOs, regions, programs, planning. | June 19 - deadline for OTC, OFAC and Joint TE-OBPAC committee input on 150% lists. Input will be provided to each region for distribution to their ACTs. Regions complete draft program for review by stakeholders. July 22 - Regions complete project scoping for both categories (Fix-it and Enhance). Scoping results for Enhance category forwarded to respective Area Manager and ACT Chair. ACTs work to develop their 100% project recommendation list. Determine process for staff and OTC development of 20% discretionary project list in this general timeframe. | March 15 - deadline for ACTs to submit prioritized 150% Enhance list to Region for scoping. Regions will provide the 150% lists to TDD for compiling and sharing with OTC, OFAC and Joint TE-OBPAC Committee for their information, review and input. Compiled 150% lists in April OTC packet and distributed to OFAC and Joint TE-OBPAC. PCSX open for input of projects. Regions prepare draft program for review by stakeholders. December 7 - ACTs and MPOs begin application review and project selection for 150% Enhance list. STIP Development Manual ready for distribution. | Begin 15-18 STIP update; programs begin data collection; draft performance goals. Regions can be scoping projects as warranted through the end of September 2013. Data collection continues. April 26 - Letter from Chair Egan to ACT chairs sent. Data collection complete. OTC reviewed draft application including project benefits (criteria). Update Funding Allocations for 15-18 timeframe. OTC reviewed recommended scenario. July 18 - OTC approved moving ahead with Fix-it category process. OTC allows two additional months of clarifying and vetting of Enhance process. |
| 2015 Legislative Session | | 2014 | | 2013 Legislative Session | | 2012 | |
| Ongoing State and Local Planning Activities | | Ongoing State and Local Planning Activities | | Ongoing State and Local Planning Activities | | Ongoing State and Local Planning Activities | |
| Apr | Mar | Feb | Jan 2015 | Dec | Nov | Oct | |
| Sept | Aug | July | June | May | Apr | Mar | |
| Feb | Jan 2014 | Dec | Nov | Oct | Sept | Aug | |
| July | June | May | Apr | Mar | Feb | Jan 2012 | |
| 2015 | 2014 | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 | |
| CALENDAR YEAR | | | | | | | |
| FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR | | | | | | | |
| STATE FISCAL YEAR | | | | | | | |
| Final 2010-2013 STIP | | Final 2012-2015 STIP | | Final 2010-2013 STIP | | Final 2010-2013 STIP | |

STIP = Statewide Transportation Improvement Program ACT = Area Commission on Transportation MTIP = Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program MPO = Metropolitan Planning Organization

OTC = Oregon Transportation Commission ODOT = Oregon Department of Transportation DOT = Department of Transportation PCSX = Project Control System Data Entry Screen

2015-2018 STIP FUNDING ALLOCATIONS

Does not include OTIA, ARRA, or JTA bond funds. Approved by the OTC on July 18, 2012.

| | 2015* | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2016-2018 | 2015-2018 |
|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|
| Annual STIP Funding Level (millions) | \$229.1 | \$335.1 | \$335.1 | \$335.1 | \$1,005.3 | \$1,234.4 |
| ENHANCE** | \$17.7 | \$75.9 | \$75.9 | \$75.9 | \$227.7 | \$245.4 |
| Project Selection by ACTs and OTC*** | | \$62.2 | \$62.2 | \$62.2 | \$186.6 | \$186.6 |
| OTC Allocation for State Priorities*** | | \$13.7 | \$13.7 | \$13.7 | \$41.1 | \$41.1 |
| FIX-IT | \$211.4 | \$259.2 | \$259.2 | \$259.2 | \$777.6 | \$989.0 |
| Preservation | \$102.8 | \$97.1 | \$97.1 | \$97.1 | \$291.3 | \$394.1 |
| Bridge | \$45.5 | \$43.2 | \$43.2 | \$43.2 | \$129.6 | \$175.1 |
| Major Bridge Maintenance | \$8.2 | \$8.2 | \$8.2 | \$8.2 | \$24.6 | \$32.8 |
| Bridge Total | \$53.7 | \$51.4 | \$51.4 | \$51.4 | \$154.2 | \$207.9 |
| Operations | \$7.7 | \$1.7 | \$1.7 | \$1.7 | \$5.1 | \$12.8 |
| Slides, Rockfalls | \$2.2 | \$3.7 | \$3.7 | \$3.7 | \$11.1 | \$13.3 |
| Intelligent Transportation Systems | \$3.0 | \$3.5 | \$3.5 | \$3.5 | \$10.5 | \$13.5 |
| Signals, Signs, Illumination | \$2.9 | \$6.3 | \$6.3 | \$6.3 | \$18.9 | \$21.8 |
| Transportation Demand Management | \$0.4 | \$0.6 | \$0.6 | \$0.6 | \$1.8 | \$2.2 |
| Operations Total | \$16.2 | \$15.8 | \$15.8 | \$15.8 | \$47.4 | \$63.6 |
| Safety (including HSIP) | \$19.0 | \$18.6 | \$18.6 | \$18.6 | \$55.8 | \$74.8 |
| Section 164 Penalty | \$6.8 | \$9.6 | \$9.6 | \$9.6 | \$28.8 | \$35.6 |
| High Risk Rural Roads | \$1.2 | \$1.2 | \$1.2 | \$1.2 | \$3.6 | \$4.8 |
| Work Zone Safety (project specific) | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$6.3 | \$8.4 |
| Rail Crossing Safety (federal) | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$2.1 | \$6.3 | \$8.4 |
| Safety Total | \$31.2 | \$33.6 | \$33.6 | \$33.6 | \$100.8 | \$132.0 |
| Special Programs | | | | | \$0.0 | |
| Fish Passage | \$4.4 | \$2.2 | \$2.2 | \$2.2 | \$6.6 | \$11.0 |
| Stormwater Retrofit | \$0.0 | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | \$2.0 | \$6.0 | \$6.0 |
| Large Culvert Improvement | \$2.8 | \$2.8 | \$2.8 | \$2.8 | \$8.4 | \$11.2 |
| Site Mitigation and Repair | \$0.3 | \$0.3 | \$0.3 | \$0.3 | \$0.9 | \$1.2 |
| Special Programs Total | \$7.5 | \$7.3 | \$7.3 | \$7.3 | \$21.9 | \$29.4 |
| Agency Priorities | | \$54.0 | \$54.0 | \$54.0 | \$162.0 | \$162.0 |

2015-18

ODOT's New STIP Project Selection Process



September 2012
Oregon Department of Transportation



How is the STIP Process Changing?



What Led to the Change?

- **Limited/declining** federal, state, and local transportation **funding**
- ODOT “right-sizing” and functional **reorganization** to adapt to funding realities and business changes
- Need to **balance** maintenance with high-value multimodal system enhancements
- Need to select **most effective projects** rather than those that fit into prescribed funding categories



What Led to the Change?

- Direction from the **Governor and Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC)** to:

- **Maintain** existing transportation system assets
- Develop a more **sustainable and multimodal** system
- Weigh a **wide range of values** to meet a wider range of community objectives

- Consider who should **best manage and own** transportation assets
- Use process to **better leverage** transportation investments
- Incorporate **least cost planning and practical design** in project selection/development



New Allocation Process

STIP will be divided into two primary funding categories...

- **Fix-it projects** – selected through ODOT management systems and staff based on guiding principles
- **Enhance-it projects** – selected by OTC based on recommendations from Area Commissions on Transportations (ACTs) and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs)



“Fix-It” Projects

Guiding Principles

- Balance
- Cost Effectiveness
- Economy
- Leverage
- Maintenance
- Regulatory Compliance
- Safety
- System Continuity

Eligible Project Types

- Culverts
- Fish passage
- High risk rural roads
- Illumination, signs, signals
- Landslides & rockfalls
- Operations (include ITS)
- Pavement preservation
- Rail highway crossings
- Safety
- Site mitigation & repair
- State bridges
- Stormwater retrofit
- Transportation demand management to Regions
- Work zone safety

Fix-it projects will be shared with ACTs and MPOs to identify leverage funding opportunities and coordinate project timing and outcomes



“Enhance-It” Projects

Eligible Project Types

- Bike and pedestrian
- Flexible funds
- Modernization
 - Construction
 - Protective ROW
 - Development STIP
- Recreational trails (non-parks)
- Safe Routes to Schools
- Scenic byways
- TDM to Public Transit Division
- Transit capital projects
- Transportation enhancement



Funding

About \$1.3 billion available statewide
2015-18...



\$320 M (24%)
recommended for
Enhance-it Projects

\$1 B (76%)
recommended for
Fix-it Projects



Funding...

- **20% of Enhance-it funds** will be allocated directly for OTC discretion
- Total funds by category will be distributed by **traditional region splits**
- Region 3's share of the 2016-18 Enhance-it allocation is **about \$27 million** (~15% of state total)
- **Funds for 2015 not included** since they were included in the 2012-15 STIP
- Goal is to select projects equal to **150% of available funds for scoping** (~ \$40 million R3)



Other STIP Project Types

Some projects and programs will be outside the new process...

Transportation System Planning

- MPO Planning
- State Planning & Research
- Transportation Growth Management

Enhance -Type Activities

- Congestion Management
- Immediate Opportunity
- Recreational Trails
- Public Transit (elderly & disabled)
- Transportation Management Areas

Fix -Type Activities

- Local Bridge
- Public Transit Discretionary
- Rail highway crossings
- Public Transit (FTA discretionary)
- Safety (TBD)
- STP Allocation to Cities



Application & Selection

A single application will be used for Enhance-it projects...

- Applicant must be **government or public agency**
- Projects must be **ready to obligate** in the year requested
- Project **planning** (NEPA) and **project development** are eligible
- Region 3 staff will be **available to assist** with applications process



Application & Selection...

ODOT and the ACTs have specific roles in the process...

ODOT Staff

- 1 Develop guidelines/tools for project selection & documentation
- 2 Review submitted application for completeness and eligibility
- 4 Scope a 150% list based on priorities agreed to by ACTs/MPOs
- 5 Provide initial prioritized 100% scoped project list for Act review

ACT/MPO Members

- 3 Review and submit priority project lists for ODOT scoping
- 6 Act recommends 100% list to OTC

Followed by public review, adjustments, final STIP



Draft Timeline

2012

September

- Application process begins

November

- Applications due - Region review - ACTs/MPOs begin 150% prioritization

2013

March

- ACTs/MPOs submit 150% scoping prioritization - Region begins scoping

July

- Region finishes scoping - Submits 100% prioritized list to Area Managers and ACT Chairs

October

- ACT produces 100% project recommendation list for OTC review

2014

February

- Draft 2015-18 STIP available for review

September

- Draft STIP Public Review completed



Draft Timeline...

2014

April

- Make adjustments based on review and begin air quality conformity determinations

August

- Complete air quality conformity determinations

September

- Begin final STIP review by ACTs, MPOs, and other stakeholders

November

- OTC review and approval of final 2015-18 STIP

2015

February

- USDOT review and approval of 2015-18 STIP



Questions?



August 2012
Oregon Department of Transportation



Date: March 4, 2013

To: Oregon Transportation Commission

Cc: Oregon Freight Advisory Committee
Oregon Bike Ped/Transportation Enhancement Committee

From: Rogue Valley ACT
ODOT Region 3

Subject: ACT Cover Memo for the 2015-2018 STIP Enhance Process
150% Recommendation List

Deliberations

Logistics.

Number of meetings, and hours spent at each, dedicated to Enhance application review and development of the 150% list. What percent of ACT membership attended each of the meetings?

September 11, 2012 Reviewed application and instructions – 30 minutes – 81% attendance

November 13, 2012 Discuss and approve considerations to be used in review of applications – 30 minutes – 81% attendance

January 8, 2013 Enhance applicant presentations – 6 hours – 88% attendance

January 29, 2013 Prioritize Enhance Application – 2.5 hours – 88% attendance

Total hours: 9.5

Participation.

What opportunities were provided for the public, including applicants, to participate in the process? What other interested parties attended the meetings? Did you have diverse participation from mode experts or representatives, from cities, from counties, from MPOs, etc.? Were community members given any additional way to provide comment beyond attending the meeting?

In August 2012, all eligible applicants were informed of the upcoming process and given the opportunity to attend ACT meetings and a special meeting in Roseburg to discuss the upcoming process and schedule.

All ACT meeting materials were emailed to eligible public agencies, advertised, and posted to the ODOT ACT website. Meeting notices with meeting materials were emailed to RFACT members, staff and interested parties. There are 188 people currently on the email list. In addition, we worked with the Rogue Valley MPO (RVMPO) Technical Advisory (RVMPO TAC) and Policy Committees. All of their meetings were advertised and posted on their website.

All Rogue Valley cities, counties, RVMPO, and ACT modal representatives participated with the exception of Butte Falls.

Community members were given an opportunity to provide public comment at each meeting. No other opportunities were provided during this phase of project selection.

Communications.

Describe the full outreach process and efforts. How were applicants notified of meetings? How was information disseminated to the public (including minority and low income communities) and to parties likely to be interested in the Enhance project selection process? Describe any other outreach efforts.

In August 2012, all eligible applicants were informed of the upcoming process and given the opportunity to attend ACT meetings and a special meeting in Roseburg to discuss the upcoming process and schedule. All ACT meeting materials were emailed to eligible public agencies, advertised, and posted to the ODOT ACT website. Meeting notices with meeting materials were emailed to RVACT members, staff and interested parties. There are 188 people currently on the email list. We took the process through the Rogue Valley MPO Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Agenda packets were sent out a week before the meeting to 90 recipients including state and federal agencies, elected officials, employees for local newspapers, and the general public. Agendas were posted at www.rvmmpo.org a week before the meeting. This website also includes meeting minutes.

Legal advertisement was placed in the Medford Mail Tribune and the Grants Pass Daily Courier, publications of record for Jackson and Josephine Counties. We distributed news releases to all local media and interested stakeholders using the GovDelivery system.

Process.

Describe the overall process used by the ACT to develop the 150% recommended project list. How did you make the process as inclusive of participants and as transparent as possible? Describe any strategies employed to frame project selection and prioritization. What groundwork did you lay for project review by individual members? Describe any changes or decisions that were made as you moved through the process.

At the November meeting, we discussed the role of the ACT and shared general guidelines, themes, and considerations from the OTC, governor, legislature, statutes, and modal plans to assist with overall composition of projects. The ACT reviewed the ten project benefits included in the application and discussed adding additional benefits to consider in project selection. We described the recommendations should be solution based, balanced, mixed, efficient and leveraged, tied to goals, objectives and priorities.

At the November meeting, the RVACT approved the following considerations to assist in development of their 150% list.

Additional consideration added by ACT:

- Does the project relate to a Fix-It project?
- Does the project improve freight mobility?
- Is it the right time for the project?

Benefits listed in the application:

- Benefits to State-Owned Facilities
- Mobility
- Accessibility
- Economic Vitality
- Environmental Stewardship
- Land Use and Growth Management

- Livability
- Safety and Security
- Equity
- Funding and Finance

The applications and proposed ODOT Fix-It projects were provided to the ACT in advance for review and in January, applicants presented their projects and were able to answer questions.

The process included the RVMPO TAC and Policy Committee. The OTC general guidelines, considerations, and process was shared with both Committees. In December, the TAC heard presentations from each of the 11 applicants in the RVMPO boundary and decided to individually rank the projects as a starting point for discussion at their January meeting to provide a recommendation the MPO Policy Committee.

At the January 8 meeting, staff requested that each ACT member provide their project rankings (e.g. high/medium/low) and comments as they listened to the presentations and based on review of the applications. The rankings were not separated into funding tiers. The rankings needed to include seven high, six medium, and six low rankings. This information would be used as a starting point at the next meeting to begin developing the 150% list. During the meeting, ACT members requested phasing information for some of the projects. This information was subsequently provided by staff via email and considered by ACT members. The ACT was advised to rank the whole project, but include a comment about their ranking if it was based on the project’s ability to be phased or a phase.

At the January 22 meeting, the RVMPO Policy Committee developed a project priority list to be considered by the ACT at their January 29 meeting. There is an agreement in place between the RVMPO and ACT that addresses any potential funding alignment problems.

At the January 29 meeting, the considerations and OTC guidance were reviewed prior to sharing of the initial rankings and comments. The RVMPO Policy Committee priority list of the projects was shared with the ACT. Twenty-two out twenty-six priority ranking spreadsheets from ACT members were returned. Staff requested that the ACT allocate the projects into a funding tier. The tiers applied as follows:

| Funding Recommendation | Funding Tier (High, Medium, Low) | Description |
|---|---|---|
| RVACT 150% Recommended Project List (Totaling approximately \$23 million) | High | This tier would equal an approximate 100% list, which is estimated at around \$15 million of funded projects |
| | Medium | This Tier will be the remaining 50% of the overall 150% list. This will make up the remaining \$8 million on the 150% list. |
| Projects not prioritized for funding by the RVACT | Low | These projects will not be included on the 150% list, as the added cost of these projects will exceed the \$23 million benchmark. |

The ACT was able to use their initial rankings and comments to develop a 150% list based on the tiers. Some projects were phased, but the ACT ensured they still provided the same benefits considered in the original project.

Considerations

Project Benefits.

Describe how project benefits were considered in developing the recommended project list? For example, different projects may have been given high, medium or low rankings for individual benefit categories and then via discussion and consensus it was determined how to prioritize projects with very different benefits. [Reminder: no benefit category is defined as more important than others and projects do not need to show benefit in all categories.]

Project benefits as listed on the application were identified and discussed prior to hearing presentations and providing initial and final priority rankings. Applicants were asked to cover project benefits to be considered. Members were encouraged to provide comments as to why they prioritized projects as they did. Comments were provided to and discussed among the ACT. They prioritized the projects based on discussion and voting.

Note: Almost all applicants stated they met all project benefits in their application(s), whether it was true or not. Staff did not attempt to change, interpret or question those statements. The presentations and discussions helped identify how well they addressed a benefit.

Additional priorities and considerations.

(The purpose of this section is to help answer the question of why the ACT selected the projects that it did. What moved projects farther up or down the list?) What other considerations figured prominently in the decision making? Include any area/regional strategy employed to frame project selection or specify needs (for example, does your area have a congestion mitigation, freight management, or natural hazard minimization strategy that helps guide project selection?). What local, area or regional priorities (if any) were considered? Were state or local plans, goals or policies used to help determine priority? Were any project comparison tools developed? Did the ACT use qualitative rankings as a part of their process? If yes, what were they and how were they applied?

The ACT used the benefits provided in the application, presentation information, OTC expectations, and discussion to select projects. The ACT approved the following additional considerations:

- Does the project relate to a Fix-It project?
- Does the project improve freight mobility?
- Is it the right time for the project?

The ACT felt that they should consider projects that improve freight mobility because of local and state importance as well as direction from ORS 184.611 to give priority to freight mobility projects that: (a) Are located on identified freight routes of statewide or regional significance; (b) Remove identified barriers to the safe, reliable and efficient movement of goods; and (c) Facilitate public and private investment that creates or sustains jobs.”

While not official, the ACT considered equity and included projects on the 150% list from both Jackson and Josephine Counties. The ACT ensured that they selected the best projects that overall provided a list that was mixed, balanced, solution based, efficient and leveraged, and tied

to goals, objectives, and priorities. The ACT selected projects based on their timeliness, cost, and ability to be phased and still provide solutions to the problem.

Decision Making and Results

Method.

Overall, what was the method of decision making in developing the prioritized 150% list: Consensus? Majority? Other? Was the ACT able to achieve consensus regarding project benefits and priority? If yes, how? If no, what were the barriers?

The overall method for prioritizing was majority votes, striving for consensus. The first motion to remove the initial 6 lowest projects from consideration for inclusion in the 150% list was passed unanimously. The second motion to include the five top scoring projects as high was passed unanimously. The next motion to include the next highest ranked project on the list in the high tier was passed by majority. Subsequent motions to develop the 150% list were passed unanimously. They were able to pass most motions unanimously as a result of initial rankings as a starting point and discussion.

Participation.

List (or attach a list of) the names and affiliations of the decision makers. Was it the ACT membership or were modifications made for this process?

The ACT membership was used to make decisions: John Stromberg and Mike Faught, Ashland; Roy Hewson, Cave Junction; Ruth Jenks and Robert Miller, Eagle Point; Hank Williams and Tom Humphrey, Central Point; John Vial, Jackson County; Dan DeYoung, Grants Pass; Rob Brandes, Josephine County; Al Densmore, Medford; Arthur Anderson, ODOT; Pam VanArsdale and John Krawczyk, Rogue River; Wade Six, RVTD; William Cecil and Joan Dean, Talent; Ron Holthusen, Shady Cove; Mike Quilty, RVMPO; Alan DeBoer, Mike Montero, Earl Wood, Craig Stone, Justin Gerlitz, Stan Wolfe, Robert McCraley and Larry Ford private sector representatives from Jackson and Josephine Counties. Decision Makers not in attendance at final 150% priority meeting: Butte Falls; Gold Hill; Phoenix; Jacksonville; and private sector representatives James Lowe and Robert McCraley.

According to an agreement between the ACT and the RVMPO, the MPO priority rankings were considered by the ACT in their priority. The MPO members include: Art Anderson, ODOT; Jeff Bellah, Mayor of Phoenix; Julie Brown, RVTD; Bill Cecil, Mayor Talent; David Chapman, Ashland City Council; Al Densmore, Medford City Council; Ruth Jenks, Eagle Point City Council; Jim Lewis, Jacksonville City Council; Mike Quilty, Central Point; Don Skundrick, Jackson County Board of Commissioners.

Results.

Describe how your 150% list is consistent with the OTC's expectations described in their letters. Does the 150% list reflect a balance between transportation modes and promote a healthy transportation system? Does the overall recommended list represent a diversity of state system (state owned routes) and off-state system routes? Do the projects on the list promote a multimodal transportation system? Is there synergy among projects on the list?

The 150% list is consistent with the OTC's expectations. All projects legitimately address at least one or more of the benefits areas included in the application and most address more than

one. The ACT added three additional considerations based on in their development of the list including:

- Does the project relate to a Fix-It project?
- Does the project improve freight mobility?
- Is it the right time for the project?

The overall list includes projects on state-owned and local facilities, including highway, transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. Some of the projects address freight mobility and are timely. Some projects have been phased to provide the most efficient and best solution to the problem at this time considering leverage and funding.

**Rogue Valley Area Commission on Transportation
Final 150% List**

| App # | Project Name | ACT H,M,L | MPO | Requested Enhance Funds |
|-------|--|--------------|-----|-------------------------------|
| 3-35A | ODOT OR- 140: Exit 35 to Blackwell Road Intersection Widening | H | 5 | \$4,900,000 |
| 3-8 | Jackson County Lozier Lane | H | 1 | \$786,795 |
| 3-13 | Jackson County Bear Creek Greenway Hwy 62 Connection | H | 2 | \$449,000 |
| 3-12 | City of Central Point Twin Creeks Crossing 99 Rail Crossing | H | 3 | \$1,550,000 |
| 3-23 | City of Eagle Point Linn Rd OR-62-Buchanan Bike-Ped Streetscape | H | 6 | \$1,476,000 |
| 3-2 | City of Ashland E Nevada St Extension | H | 7 | \$2,736,765 |
| 3-26A | ODOT OR -238: Phase 1: New Hope Road to Morris Lane | H | NA | \$4,200,000 |
| 3-1 | RVTD Passenger Fare Collection | H | 4 | \$685,817 |
| | High Total | | | \$16,784,377 |
| 3-5A | Josephine County Fixed Route three vehicles - covers worst capacity problems | M | NA | \$870,000 |
| 3-9 | Jackson County Table Rock Road | M | 8 | \$5,473,530 |
| | Medium Total | | | \$6,343,530 |
| | High & Medium Total | | | \$23,127,907 |

In the ACT Review and Recommendation Documentation section for each project, describe why you selected this project and how it meets OTC general expectations and considerations:

1. Solution-based projects. What problem(s) does this project solve/address? *Might include issues involving safety, mobility, accessibility, economic development, sustainability, energy, health, community livability, mixed use development, integrating/connecting multimodal systems, etc.)*
2. Efficiency and leverage. *Project recommendations should include the most efficient and effective projects available to solve the transportation problems at hand and leverage as much additional funding as possible.*
3. What local values or concerns does this project address? How does this project improve the lives of people or the economy in your community?
4. Is this project complementary to other projects or community development activities? *Offers the chance for the whole to be greater than the sum of the parts.*
5. How does this project improve transportation choices for people in your community?
6. Why is now the right time for this project?
7. For what other reasons than the above did you pick this project?

| Question 1 | Question 2 | Question 3 | Question 4 | | Question 5 | Question 12 | | | | | | | ACT Priority | |
|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---|-------------|------------|---------|-----|------|--------|-------|--------------|---|
| Organization Name | Co-Sponsor(s) | Project Name | Total Costs | Requested Funds | Summary of Project | Pass. Rail | Light Rail | Transit | Ped | Bike | Hwy/Rd | Other | H/M/L | |
| Ashland | NA | E. Nevada St. Extension (Ashland) | \$3,050,000 | \$2,736,765 | The E. Nevada St. Extension project involves construction of a new 0.12 mile paved roadway which links the existing terminus of E. Nevada St. with N. Mountain Ave., providing much needed capacity improvements and an additional route for local, multimodal east-west travel. The new street will require construction of a bridge over Bear Creek with bicycle lanes and sidewalks providing connectivity to the Bear Creek Greenway. | | | X | X | X | X | | | H |

ACT Review and Recommendation Documentation

The project will bridge Bear Creek and allow for improved connectivity on the north side of Ashland. The project is important for people traveling by bike or on foot because it significantly reduces out of direction travel for residents and visitors to the northeast side of Ashland. The East Nevada Street connection is a critical element for the extension of the Bear Creek Greenway. The 17.5-mile paved, multi-use trail currently connects from Pine Street in Central Point to Nevada Street at the Ashland Dog Park entrance. The connection will provide an improved route for the Rogue Valley Transit District and the senior population in the area.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| Central Point | NA | Twin Creeks Rail Crossing | \$2,850,000 | \$1,550,000 | The Twin Creeks Crossing is a urban at grade rail crossing connecting vehicles, bicycles, pedestrian and bus routes to Highway 99 and to Crater High School and the Central Point Downtown. | | | X | X | X | X | | | H |
|---------------|----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|--|---|

ACT Review and Recommendation Documentation

The project supports the development of a transit oriented development and leverages an almost 50% local and developer match. The project is timely in that it will connect with a new developer funded rail crossing, traffic signal, one mile of new welded rail, and an Oregon Bicycle and Pedestrian grant to provide bike lanes and sidewalks connecting Crater High School to the downtown. The crossing will provide access to 20 acres of employment commercial and 30 acres of mixed use development that is planned with infrastructure already built. There is also over 500 existing residential units, two residential care facilities and an additional 300 future planned units in the TOD. It completes a path connecting to the business and downtown mixed use district and allow RVTD to expand bus service to the TOD. It is anticipated that TOD businesses that are dependent on accessibility will commit to develop. The project could relieve congestion at the intersection of Pine and Highway 99, which is a major freight route linking Exits 35 and 19.

