



## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County • Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation

### Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda

---

**Date:** Thursday, May 20, 2021  
**Time:** 9:00am to 11:00am  
**Location:** Join Zoom Meeting: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87651575084>  
Phone: 1-669-900-6833  
Meeting ID: 876 5157 5084, Passcode: 2020  
**Contact:** Catherine Rohan, Transportation Planner

- 1) 9:00 **Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Roll Call** **Chair, Gary Stockhoff**
  
- 2) 9:05 **Public Comments** **Chair**
  
- 3) 9:10 **Approval of Meeting Minutes (Attachment A)** **Chair**  
April 15, 2021 TAC Meeting  
  
***ACTION:** Approve minutes*
  
- 4) 9:15 **COVID Relief Funding** **Meltzer**  
AAMPO will receive extra dollars as part of COVID relief funding for planning, construction and maintenance projects. Members were asked to add project ideas [HERE](#). Staff will discuss next steps  
  
***ACTION:** Discussion*
  
- 5) 9:50 **MTIP Revision Policy Update (Attachment B)** **Rohan**  
Staff are considering updating AAMPO's MTIP revision policy to include TAC expertise in decision making and to further align AAMPO and CAMPO's MTIP revision policies.  
  
***ACTION:** Discussion and feedback on update to revision policy*
  
- 6) 10:10 **ATS Implementation Strategy (Attachment C)** **Meltzer**  
Albany Transit System is planning for the medium term scenario identified in their 2018 Transit Development Plan. Staff will provide an overview of the work so far. Additional information and a survey about transit options being considered can be found [HERE](#). Note survey closes May 28<sup>th</sup>.  
  
***ACTION:** Information only*

- 7) **10:20 Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria (Attachment D)** **Rohan**  
Staff will present revised project prioritization criteria and walk the TAC through two examples detailing how the criteria would be applied.  
  
***ACTION:** Discussion and feedback on project prioritization criteria*
- 8) **10:50 Jurisdictional Updates/Other Business** **All**
- 9) **11:00 Adjournment** **All**  
Next meeting: June 17<sup>th</sup>, 2021 at 9:00am

**ALBANY METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TAC REMOTE MEETING  
Thursday, April 15, 2021  
9:00 – 11:00 am**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

**Members:**

Chris Bailey  
Chuck Knoll  
Gary Stockhoff  
Georgia Edwards  
James Feldmann  
Walt Perry

**Ex-Officio**

Jasmine Harris

**Guests**

Ron Irish  
Cody Meyer  
Mark Volmert  
Stacie Belcastro  
Greg Jones  
Joe Samaniego  
Brian Hurley  
Matthew Ruetters  
Barry Hoffman

**Representing:**

Albany  
Linn County  
Benton County  
Tangent  
ODOT  
Jefferson

FHWA

City of Albany  
DLCD  
Linn County  
City of Albany  
City of Tangent  
City of Tangent  
ODOT  
City of Albany  
City of Albany

**Staff:** Catherine Rohan, Nick Meltzer, Emma Chavez

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION / CONCLUSION
1. Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Roll Call	Cody Meyer, Transportation and Land Use Planner with DLCD introduced himself to members. Meyer reported that he and Brian Hurley will be providing an update on the Strategic Assessment.  Joe Samaniego introduced himself as the new City Manager of the City of Tangent.	<b>Meeting called to order at 9:01 am by Chair Gary Stockhoff.</b>  <b>Chair Stockhoff asked guests to introduce</b>

	<p>Staci Belcastro introduced herself as the city engineer for the city of Albany Public Works Department.</p> <p>Brian Hurley introduced himself with the climate office at the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).</p> <p>Matthew Ruetters introduced himself as the current Development Services Manager who will be transitioning into the Community Development Director position for the City of Albany as of May 1<sup>st</sup>.</p>	<p><b>themselves.</b></p> <p><b>There were no changes to the agenda.</b></p>
2. Public Comment	<p>Mark Volmert, Linn County Special Rural Coordinator stated that he has comments on agenda items 5, 6, and 7.</p> <p>Agenda Item 5 Comment: From the reporting, there does not seem to be a connection in the priorities for transit. COG recently applied for, and received, tentative approval for a transit connection grant for first mile- last mile. In looking at the criteria in the draft plan, did not see the transit.</p> <p>Agenda Item 6 Comment: Last April, the Linn County Transportation Advisory Committee suggested that AAMPO have a conversation about COVID related funds of \$2.8 million and now there is an additional \$385 thousand dollars out of the CARES Act. Volmert noted that he is looking forward to that conversation.</p> <p>Agenda Item 7 Comment: There have been requests for COG planners to reach out to the Linn Shuttle and it does not seem that has occurred yet. Volmert would like this discussion to happen under jurisdictional updates.</p>	<p><b>The Chair asked for Volmert to share his thoughts/questions and Staff can address them during each agenda item.</b></p>
3. Board Approval of March 11, 2021 TAC Meeting Minutes	<p>Changes to the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agenda Item 6, last sentence; change Traffic Committee to Traffic Safety Commission</li> </ul>	<p><b>Consensus to approve the March 11, 2021 TAC meeting minutes with correction.</b></p>
4. Strategic Assessment	<p>Cody Meyer with DLCD and Brian Hurley provided a presentation on the status of the Strategic assessment.</p>	<p><b>Consultants to bring back a draft report to the June meeting for final review.</b></p>

	<p>DLCD had extra funds in their budget a couple of years ago and hired the consultant firm DKS to work with them on a Strategic Assessment for a few MPOs.</p> <p>In 2018, the AAMPO Policy Board initiated a request to begin the project. The Policy Board voiced an interest in policy options related to livability, congestion, and mobility. Once the project initiated; the AAMPO TAC vetted data and refined the policy options for testing. In the meantime, ODOT and DLCD worked with DKS to prepare the VisionEval model for analysis.</p> <p>Meyer went on to report that a Strategic Assessment is a voluntary process that has been in the works for 7-8 years in Oregon. It is used as a planning tool to estimate how well adopted plans and policies come to achieving desired outcomes. The process allows for testing of different policy choices to inform decision making and demonstrate how different choices can lead to potentially different outcomes. It also informs other planning efforts, including the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Meyer shared an example of some of the levers utilized through the model.</p> <p>For this process; current adopted regional and local land use and transportation plans will be used with the thought that in 2040 everything will happen as it was predicted to happen.</p> <p>Councilor Walt Perry asked if plans are developed; who will they be directed to? Meyer answered that the consultants will present the information and AAMPO will be able to decide what to do with it.</p> <p>Meyer and Hurley went on to share the key finds of the Trend Scenario. The takeaway from the findings is that the local plans do not reach the State's 20% GHG reduction target. To this, Staff Meltzer asked if that is a State mandate. Meyer advised that the 20% reduction is not a mandate but rather a voluntary target. There is work going on now with the Governor's climate order that will use it to be more of a mandate. However, that will begin with the Eugene and</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Salem areas while other areas will only need to do monitoring and reporting.</p> <p>Meyer and Hurley moved on to provide an overview of the key policy tests of Land Use, Transit, Active Transportation – Percentage of Single Occupancy Vehicle trips diverted to biking or scooters, Transportation Options (TO) – Transportation Demand Management programs, and Local Pricing – Parking Pricing and Local Gas Taxes.</p> <p>Chuck Knoll asked if consultants had taken into account the fact that much of the employment in AAMPO is in the Millersburg area and that there is no more room in downtown Albany for more businesses. Meyers stated that this did not come up when the tests were being developed. Now that the region has a model, it is something that could be done.</p> <p>Councilor Perry asked how recreation is taken into account. He asked that members hold off to address these at that time. Hurley stated that recreational trips are accounted for.</p> <p>Meyer moved on to note that Staff and the Policy Board worked to identify four policy areas; increased transit ridership, reduced VMT, reduced vehicle delay, and greenhouse gas reductions. Meyer stated that these were taken as constraints and looked at combinations of actions taken and pulled out which combination of actions are looped in to those four areas. What was found was that land use, transit, and active transportation were key in all four areas.</p> <p>Hurley then reviewed the relative impacts of individual policies, stating that the results indicate that you cannot rely on one goal area to get to 20% GHG reduction, rather you need a combination of actions to reach the goals. In terms of the AAMPO area; more density and more transportation options are very effective for reaching those goals, and furthermore; when you combine pricing and gas tax, the AAMPO area surpasses the 20% reduction goal. Hurley then moved on to review the impacts of the combined scenarios to the goal areas.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Meyer reported that AAMPO is conducting other related work such as the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP), the Albany Transit Implementation Plan, and the Salem to Albany Transit Corridor Feasibility Study that fit in line with the key findings of the Strategic Assessment and help support the outcomes.</p> <p>Meyer moved on to provide details on the Trend Scenario (Adopted Plans) resilience to alternative futures. Hurley stated that this tests what happens if those collaborative actions don't happen and what that means to the local plans. He noted that the results indicate that we cannot rely on the State or locals to do it on their own. There needs to be a combination or collaborative work to achieve the goals.</p> <p>Chair Stockhoff read the three questions posed by staff to members; what from the findings surprises you most, what from the findings stands out to you, and what from the findings do you want more detail on. Staff Catherine Rohan added that the Strategic Assessment isn't a Plan onto itself; It is information that the MPO can use to guide the planning and policies into the future. Staff, ODOT, and DLCD is looking to create a document that can be used moving forward.</p> <p>Member Questions/Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Chris Baily shared the following feedback:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ If a GHG mandate is imposed on AAMPO; this is a good way to say that the region has already completed some of the work and the document is a way of indicating what has already been accomplished.</li><li>○ If traffic congestion/delays become an issue; what additional information can the model provide that is a way to address those.</li><li>○ In regards to the conclusion where GHG reduction, parking price increases have a greater impact than a local gas tax, however, it is important that jurisdictions consider how a single action may benefit GHG reduction and achieve other city goals at the same time</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>(multiple benefits).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jasmine Harris with FHWA indicated that she is very impressed with the findings and the work that has been involved. The information is a very useful resource. Harris then asked if the State is planning on doing something like that again. She went on to state that if that was the case, it would be good for AAMPO to know in order to gear up for upcoming expectations.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Meyer responded that rulemaking is underway right now, along with the Governor’s order for that program. There is wording that would require it from local jurisdictions but not the MPOs. Aside from the metro area, Eugene, Springfield, and now Salem, DLCDC is proposing a regional performance monitoring framework that would use some of this information to help inform what kind of local actions the cities and counties need to take.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Chuck Knoll stated that it seems that the policies are focused on Albany, specifically downtown Albany which doesn’t fit the geography and the changes that are occurring in the AAMPO area.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chair Stockhoff indicated that AAMPO was provided with a menu of strategies and a good platform to work from.</li> <li>○</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Chair Stockhoff asked for additional feedback to be emailed to Staff Catherine and noted that updates will be provided at future meetings.</p>	
<p>5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (BPP)</p>	<p>Staff Rohan provided an update on efforts thus far. She advised that there is a BPP survey out and as of yesterday, 226 results have been received. Rohan then moved on to share the BPP mapping exercise in order to share the comments provided thus far. Rohan noted that both the map and survey feedback will close at the end of day on April 26<sup>th</sup>. She also noted that an open house will be held on April 22<sup>nd</sup>.</p> <p>Staff Rohan noted the BPP memo in the AAMPO TAC agenda packet that she would review. She noted that in 2020 the MPO developed</p>	<p><b>Staff to bring this discussion back to the next meeting.</b></p>

	<p>seven goals for the BPP and that soon the MPO will have a list of projects. Staff Rohan reviewed the BPP Vision and Goals, as well as a proposed project prioritization criteria. She asked members to provide feedback on the prioritization structure and criteria.</p> <p>Before moving the member feedback, Staff Rohan answered guest Mark Volmert question/comments during public comments. Staff Rohan stated that she considers transit stops as key destination therefore they are included under that category (see memo in agenda packet).</p> <p>Chair Stockhoff asked if there is a timeframe for providing feedback. Staff Rohan stated that it needs to be provided by the end of the month. The reason for this is because ideas and projects are being submitted and in order to review those; the criteria and needs to be established. Once AAMPO has a prioritization list, the list will be included in the Plan which will allow for member jurisdictions to reference it when applying for funding if they too adopt the Plan at the city/county level.</p> <p>Member Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mark Volmert reference criteria #8 and stated that transit stops is more than that. He went on to state that the TAC may wish to consider transit as its own criteria. He went on to note that Albany Transit is in the process of doubling service, the Linn-Benton Loop service is also expanding and millions of dollars a year are being invested in transit. Volmert went on to advise that the COG has put together a grant application as preliminary funding to do a consideration of the transit connection piece which is very important. Also ODOT has long discussed the challenges of the first mile - last mile and the importance of public transportation. Volmert reiterated that the TAC may want to consider separating transit from the other eight items as they more of points of interest instead of specific criteria. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Chair Stockhoff asked Volmert what the wording for the</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>criteria could be; Volmert indicated something along the lines of “being a link to bike ped programs to transit stops and transit hubs”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff Rohan indicated that if transit was pulled out to be its own criteria, the project would get a point if it connected to a bus stop or transit hub, and it would get an additional point if it connected to a community destination other than transit.</li> <li>○ Stockhoff asked TAC members for feedback on including a separate criteria for transit.</li> <li>○ Bailey stated that transit could be a key destination to a bike path to get people to and from transit stops. It also addresses connectivity. She stated that either there could be a separate categories or an enhanced score for connectivity and destinations. Bailey stated that this gets to equity as well with most of the transit users being low or extremely-low income residents.</li> <li>○ Rohan stated that she can set up a survey with different options for a transit category and members can provide feedback.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Volmert went on to state that item #4 has a key component of Safe Routes to School. He stated that he is not suggesting a separate criteria for Safe Routes to School but rather to include it as an asterisk under item #4.</li> <li>● Councilor Walt Perry stated that he does not see a difference between item #4 and #7. Councilor Perry stated that item #7 will be automatically forced into a lower category. Furthermore, he stated that Employment Density should be Employment Destiny. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff Rohan answered that some of the criteria may be overlapping and where you have high employment density; likely there will also be key destinations also. That is when you would have projects building points and rising to the top of the priority list. The criteria is not necessarily exclusive.</li> <li>○ Councilor Perry stated that he is referring to bikeways</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
--	---	--

	<p>and bicycles and it's not just employment density but rather a user's density.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Staff Rohan asked to have a conversation with Councilor Perry in regards to his concern. Councilor Perry agreed.</li> </ul> <p>Chat Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jasmine Harris to Everyone: 10:39 AM <i>"Great work Catherine! Without trying to make this table complicated, I just wanted to suggest specifying how the criteria links to the specific MTP/RTP Goals. May be a cross walk table with this criteria and MTP Goals, just brainstorming here. The idea is to convey that this criteria clearly links to the MTP/RTP Goals.</i></li> <li>• Chris Bailey to Everyone: 10:40 AM <i>"I second Jasmine's comment. I think that's a good idea.</i></li> <li>• James Feldmann (ODOT) to Everyone: 10:42 AM <i>"Hi Catherine, here was my comment on AT plan priorities, regarding safety: 1) address whether a project that avoids a crash location is still captured (e.g., neighborhood bikeway or path that goes around a crash site) and 2) address crash severity, may want to exclude property damage only, for example.</i></li> </ul>	
<p>6. COVID Relief Funding</p>	<p>Staff Meltzer reported that AAMPO will be receiving close to \$960,000 in funds from the State. Staff has learned that the intention of those funds is for them to be unrestricted. The funds have yet to be received; however, staff would like to start the conversations to plan on how to utilize the funds.</p> <p>Staff Meltzer stated that AAMPO may want to consider the current STBG funding. Linn County requested and was approved \$100,000 for the Gold Fish Farm Road Design project. That project is not intended to receive funds until calendar year 2023. In looking at the current plan for funding; the next couple of years is intended to go to the City of Albany for the Queen Avenue project. What Staff has learned about the Queen Avenue project is that construction may be delayed a year.</p>	<p><b>Staff to email the STBG Handout to members for feedback.</b></p> <p><b>COVID Relief Funding conversation to continue at the next meeting.</b></p>

	<p>Members may want to consider giving Linn County \$100,000 of the 2021 fiscal year allocation funds that can be taken out of their fiscal year 2023 allocation. To this, Chris Bailey stated that the Queen Avenue project has been pushed to at least 2023 and it Staff's proposal is acceptable. Staff Meltzer stated that Staff will plan to move forward with that proposal.</p> <p>As far as the stimulus funding, Staff Meltzer went on to advice that starting in 2022, the State of Oregon will be reducing the State fund exchange rate from .94 cents to .90 cents. In looking at the following years, this has the potential to affect some of the projects. Staff propose for AAMPO to review the STBG projects first to ensure they are fully funded.</p> <p>Staff then looked at where there are some low-dollar but high-value projects that could be implemented. Ideas that Staff came up with are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Jefferson/Tangent: Portion of funds for each city to construct a combination of sidewalk gaps and shoulder bicycle lanes</li> <li>• Millersburg/Linn County: Identify general locations of future transit stops and amenities</li> <li>• Albany/Benton County: intersection improvements at Highway 20 and Springhill, Highway 20 and 1<sup>st</sup></li> <li>• Albany: Sidewalk improvements, pedestrian crossings, bicycle lanes, traffic calming</li> </ul> <p>Member Feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verify the cost difference of the exchange dollars.</li> <li>• If AAMPO does not put funds towards covering the monetary gap created by the reduction in exchange rate (from an exchange rate of .94 cents to .90 cents) , projects will need to be delivered as federally funded projects which have costs associated and the projects may take longer to deliver.</li> <li>• When asked if the new funding has a timeline of when the funds need to be spent, Staff Meltzer responded that there is no time limit.</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>Staff Meltzer asked if members agreed to an informal process to select projects with the intent to spread the funds amongst the jurisdictions. Chris Bailey stated that she is in favor of not having a full STBG type of process and is in favor of considering relatively impactful projects to the region as well as projects that are in the RTP but may not get funded. To this, Georgia Edwards stated that she agreed to not having a formal process but developing a list to review as a TAC.</p> <p>Member of the public Volmert asked if the funds were limited to RTP projects or if they were flexible. Staff Meltzer responded that it is important to honor the RTP projects and process. He went on to note that if a project is not in the RTP but is of regional significance; a conversation could be had by members in regards to funding it.</p>	
7. Jurisdictional Updates/Other Business	Chair Stockhoff asked staff to reach out to guest Mark Volmert to discuss and clarify any standing concerns.	
8. Adjournment	Next Meeting scheduled for May 20 <sup>th</sup> .	<b>Meeting adjourned at 10:59 am</b>

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



**Date:** May 6, 2021  
**To:** AAMPO TAC  
**From:** Catherine Rohan, AAMPO Assistant Transportation Planner  
**Re:** Update to AAMPO MTIP Revision Policy

### Background

Earlier this year both AAMPO and CAMPO staff were contacted about a revision to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and each MPO's respective Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). During this process, staff recognized that the MPOs have different MTIP revision policies. Notably, CAMPO's revision policy involves the CAMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), while AAMPO's policy does not involve the AAMPO TAC.

Staff believe that the AAMPO MTIP revision process could benefit from including the TAC in revision decisions, as CAMPO does. Updates to include the TAC in the MTIP revision policy also provide an opportunity to align the language of both MPOs' MTIP revision policies. Aligning revision policy language makes revisions affecting both MPO's easier to process and increases cross jurisdictional understanding and consistency.

### Importance of MTIP Revision Policies

While the text in an MPO's MTIP changes very little during the four year life of the document, the projects programmed within the MTIP are regularly amended, revised, split, canceled, etc. These projects include infrastructure construction projects, capital purchases, plan development, engineering activities, outreach programs, and others. Incorporating changes into the MTIP and STIP, which contains all projects from across the state, is essential to project delivery and must be completed before revising intergovernmental agreements (IGAs) and executing fund transfers.

Project changes must be approved by the MPO before they can be incorporated into the MTIP and the STIP. The MTIP is maintained by the MPO and cross-referenced to match the STIP, which is maintained by the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT). ODOT, FTA, and FHWA have a separate policy agreement on how STIP revisions take place.

### Current MTIP Revision Policies

AAMPO's current MTIP revision policy was established with the adoption of AAMPO's first MTIP, FFY18-21, in May of 2017. CAMPO's MTIP revision policy was updated in October of 2020 following CAMPO staff's review of other Oregon MPO MTIP revision policies.

Each MPO currently has three types of revisions, reflecting the range of revision changes; major, intermediate, and minor changes. Each revision type has its own associated procedure, from requiring only staff approval to necessitating a public comment period and Policy Board approval. Both MPOs' MTIP revision policies are attached at the end of this memo. A summary of each MPOs' revisions types is included below.

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### AAMPO

- **Amendments:** An amendment involves a major change to a project in the TIP and requires a 30-day public comment period and approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting.
- **Adjustments:** An adjustment is a less significant change to the TIP. Adjustments still require approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting but do not require a 30-day public comment period.
- **Administrative Modifications:** Administrative modifications involve minor changes to the TIP and do not require a 30-day public comment period nor approval by the Policy Board at a public meeting. Administrative modifications are processed by MPO staff in cooperation with project sponsor and ODOT and are brought to the Policy Board as informational items

### CAMPO

- **Full Amendment:** Full amendments involve a major change to a project and require the greatest level of scrutiny. At a minimum, the item will be reviewed by the TAC and placed on the next Policy Board agenda for Policy Board approval. The TAC will determine if significant public outreach is necessary. Additional outreach may include a public comment period, the holding of a public meeting for the specific amendment, and any other actions deemed advisable by the TAC.
- **Administrative Amendment:** Project changes that have a smaller impact to the region or member communities are classified as administrative amendments. Administrative amendments require less scrutiny and are usually familiar to local staff members. Administrative amendments will be brought to the TAC for discussion and approval. Following a TAC decision, the Policy Board will be notified of the revision at their next regularly scheduled meeting.
- **Adjustment:** Staff approves minor adjustments on behalf of the MPO, and informs the TAC as appropriate.

### What will a MTIP Revision Policy update mean for AAMPO?

Updating AAMPO's MTIP revision policy will accomplish multiple objectives including:

- Matching the level of review with the appropriate decision makers (i.e. more technical items brought to TAC, more policy oriented decisions brought to Policy Board)
- Providing more flexibility in completing TIP revisions
- Aligning AAMPO's revision policy with CAMPO's for staff ease and efficiency

More specifically, the main change would be the incorporation of TAC input in full amendment and administrative amendment revisions. The terminology of revision types would also shift, though the three main categories of revisions will remain essentially the same (major changes, intermediate changes, and minor changes).

The CAMPO MTIP revision policy also allows for TAC approval of administrative amendments and "other scenarios" via email and telephone if a decision is urgently needed. The AAMPO MTIP revision policy does not have a similar provision. Incorporating language similar to CAMPO's would provide AAMPO added flexibility and guidance should a time sensitive situation arise.

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation

---



### Next Steps

Staff are seeking initial feedback on the proposal to update AAMPO's MTIP revision policy, as the revisions would require more involvement from the TAC to align with CAMPO's policy. Specifically:

1. Is the TAC in favor of being more involved in MTIP revisions?
2. Does the TAC feel the level of TAC involvement in CAMPO's MTIP revision policy is appropriate?
  - If not, what level of TAC involvement would be appropriate?
3. Is the TAC in favor of more closely aligning AAMPO's MTIP revision policy language with CAMPO's policy?

If the TAC is generally in favor of updating AAMPO's MTIP revision policy, staff will draft a new policy. If the TAC is in favor of more closely aligning AAMPO's MTIP revision policy language with CAMPO's, then the new policy language will largely echo CAMPO's MTIP revision policy, but may also include clarifying language, more specific scenario language, and options for virtual video meetings. Staff will bring the draft policy back to the TAC at their June meeting for further review and will then take the draft policy to the Policy Board for consideration.

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### AAMPO's Current MTIP Revision Policy

As found on pages three through four of AAMPO's 2021-2024 MTIP found [HERE](#)

*A TIP revision is a change that is made between full updates of the TIP. There are several types of TIP revisions, some of which require a 30-day public comment period and some of which are technical corrections completed by staff. All TIP revisions should be submitted to MPO staff to determine the appropriate revision procedure.*

**TIP Amendments:** *An amendment involves a major change to a project in the TIP and requires a 30-day public comment period and approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting. The following changes qualify as Amendments:*

- *Changes in the total project cost exceeding either \$100,000 or 20% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Adding or cancelling a project funded with AAMPO STP/ STBGP funds*
- *Adding or deleting any project that significantly affects roadway capacity, vehicle volumes or travel speeds, such as construction of a new regionally significant roadway or new interchange or the widening of a regionally significant roadway that will significantly affect roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds*
- *Major changes in project schedule or scope, including addition of a construction phase*

**TIP Adjustments:** *A TIP Adjustment is a less significant change to the TIP. Adjustments still require approval by the MPO Policy Board at a public meeting but do not require a 30-day public comment period. The following changes qualify as Amendments:*

- *Changes in the total project cost exceeding either \$50,000 or 10% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Adjustments to previously approved MPO STP/STBGP funded projects that transfers more than \$100,000 of STP/STBGP funds between different phases of a project*
- *Actions related to adding, deleting, or modifying projects that do not significantly affect existing roadway capacity, vehicle volumes, or travel speeds, including but not limited to:*
  - *safety improvements*
  - *same site bridge replacements not requiring significant additional right-of-way*
  - *signal interconnection, installation or removal*
  - *resurfacing or rehabilitation projects not requiring significant additional right-of-way*
  - *bike lanes*
  - *bus purchases, bus shelters, or bus stop improvements*
  - *projects implementing ADA or ADA paratransit requirements*
  - *MPO planning support*

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



**Administrative Modifications:** *Administrative modifications involve minor changes to the TIP and do not require a 30-day public comment period nor approval by the Policy Board at a public meeting. Administrative modifications are processed by MPO staff in cooperation with project sponsor and ODOT and are brought to the Policy Board as informational items. The following are examples of items that may be processed as administrative modifications:*

- *Changes in the total project cost that are less than either \$50,000 or 10% of the total project cost (whichever is greater)*
- *Moving less than \$100,000 in MPO STP/STBGP funds from one project phase to another previously approved phase within the same project where there is no change to total project STP/STBGP funding amount*
- *Minor changes in project or phase initiation dates*
- *Adding or deleting a phase other than construction*
- *Minor changes in funding sources for previously included projects*
- *Splitting or combining individually listed projects, provided that these changes do not create major changes to overall cost, schedule, or scope*
- *Minor corrections to make the TIP consistent with naming conventions and project descriptions*
- *Minor corrections to fix typographical errors or missing data*
- *Adding an emergency repair and relief project that does not involve substantial change in function and location*

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### **CAMPO's Current MTIP Revision Policy**

CAMPO's current MTIP Policy is not included in the MPO's 2021-2024 MTIP. The adoption timeline for the updated revision policy precluded the new policy's inclusion in the MTIP. CAMPO's current MTIP revision policy is copied in whole below.

*There are three types of MTIP changes processed by the MPO: full amendments, administrative amendments and adjustments. Full amendments require the greatest level of scrutiny including communicating basic project information to the Policy Board and the provision of a public comment period. Administrative amendments are largely handled by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). CAMPO staff has the authority to approve adjustments and informs the TAC as appropriate. A full description of the procedures associated with the three types of MTIP changes is included later in this document.*

*The table below (on the next page) lists a number of potential MTIP actions and illustrates whether they require a full amendment, administrative amendment, or an adjustment.*

### **Full Amendment: Technical Advisory Committee Determines Public Outreach**

*For full amendments, the TAC will determine if significant public outreach is necessary. At a minimum, the item will be reviewed by the TAC and placed on the next Policy Board agenda, which comes with public notifications requirements. The requirements are met by including information about the amendment on the Policy Board agenda and meeting packet. All CAMPO Policy Board meetings are advertised via CAMPO's website and an interested parties email list a week in advance of the meeting, with the invitation for members of the public to attend and provide comment.*

*Additional items for consideration include a public comment period (two weeks), the holding of a public meeting for the specific amendment, and any other actions deemed advisable by the TAC.*

### **Administrative Amendment: Technical Advisory Committee Approval**

*Project changes that have a smaller impact to the region, or CAMPO member communities, are classified as Administrative Amendments. They require less scrutiny and usually familiar to local staff members. Administrative amendments will be brought to the TAC for discussion and approval. Following a decision, the Policy Board will be notified at their next regularly scheduled meeting. TAC meetings are open to the public with meetings and agendas distributed at least one week in advance.*

*If projects are on a critical schedule, input from the TAC can be given via email or telephone.*

### **Adjustment: Staff Approval**

*Staff approves minor adjustments on behalf of the MPO, and informs the TAC as appropriate. It is expected that with a planning project, both the TAC and Policy Board have been made aware of the grant proposal prior to submission, and had an opportunity to comment; therefore the project has preliminarily been approved. Staff adjustments rely on the concurrence of affected agencies rather than quorum action.*

*The primary goal of incorporating staff level adjustments into the MTIP process is to minimize delays and improve approval turn-around times. Staff adjustments help ensure minor project changes move forward more quickly than otherwise possible. Delays are only necessary for those changes requiring a public comment period.*

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### Other Scenarios

TAC either approves, or recommends full adoption. Conversation can be had over telephone conference if urgent.

Type of Change	Full Amendment	Administrative Amendment	Adjustment
<b>If a project is NOT in the MTIP</b>			
1. Planning Grant or Project (i.e. non-construction) less than \$100,000			X
2. Planning Grant or Project (i.e. non-construction) more than \$100,000		X	
3. Adding a project with previously identified funding		X	
4. Adding a federally funded project using MTIP dollars	X		
<b>If a project is ALREADY in the MTIP</b>			
5. Cancelling a federally funded, and regionally significant project	X		
6. Advancing or delaying a project by one year, or a cost overrun of less than 10% involving MTIP dollars			X
7. Advancing or delaying a project by more than one year, or cost overruns between 10% and 20% involving MTIP dollars		X	
8. Cost overruns more than 20% involving MTIP dollars	X		
9. Scope changes including extension or shortening of a project	X		
10. Combining of two projects into one, or separating of one project into two		X	
11. Moving allocated funds between phases of the same project (e.g. moving funds from UR to RW)			X
12. Advancing or Slipping an approved project/phase outside its current MTIP			X
13. Other scenarios	X	X	

ALBANY TRANSIT IS IMPROVING SERVICE

# WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU!

GIVE US YOUR FEEDBACK ON THE THREE  
OPTIONS BY MAY 28TH

<https://tinyurl.com/albanytransit>



# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



**Date:** May 6, 2021  
**To:** AAMPO TAC  
**From:** Catherine Rohan, AAMPO Assistant Transportation Planner  
**Re:** **Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria**

### Background

Staff presented a draft of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan project prioritization criteria to the TAC at their April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. With limited time for the TAC to provide input on a fairly complicated issue, it was not surprising that we received limited input. Staff committed to engaging the TAC further after the meeting, and after additional thought, staff thought it would be prudent to take a step back and re-think the decision making framework for the criteria. This led to a retooling of criteria around the question, *“What would be most useful for member jurisdictions?”*

### Proposed Criteria

Following this question, staff scaled back the April project prioritization criteria to the table seen below. The table maintains six of the nine previously proposed criteria and expands the key destinations criterion, breaking out schools and transit stops. The thought process for removing some of the criteria is grounded in making the prioritization criteria useful to the people who will be constructing the projects; i.e. local members. In this sense, the following questions were asked and considered:

- What is useful information if a member desires to apply for a grant to construct a project? I.e. what criteria does ODOT rank highly in their applications?
- Are there tangential grant opportunities that a project could fit into? I.e. Safe Routes to School, transit infrastructure, etc. How can we prioritize these projects?
- Will using MPO-wide population and employment density criteria result in the de-prioritization of projects in smaller communities?
- If our intent is to suggest accessible and comfortable projects, do we really need an accessibility and comfort criterion?
- If a corridor project touches two bicycle/pedestrian projects yet funding is limited, which project should be prioritized to have a higher impact?

Upon further reflection, accessibility and comfort, population density, and employment density criteria were removed. Staff feel that the eight criteria listed below are the most useful for all member jurisdictions when determining which project to implement first.

In further recognition of the unique planning and construction dynamic that exists between MPOs and member jurisdictions, staff plan to create priority project lists for each jurisdiction in addition to an MPO-wide priority project list. Criteria for jurisdiction specific lists will remain the same with the exception of the public priority criterion. Jurisdiction specific lists will only consider public comments received within a jurisdiction’s boundaries.

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



#	Criteria	Response	Goal Alignment
1	<b>Safety</b> – Is the project located along a segment or intersection at which a crash was reported in the last five years? <b>OR</b> Does the project provide a comparable, alternative route that avoids a crash location?	Yes/No	1
2	<b>Connectedness</b> – Does the project fill an identified gap in the existing pedestrian or bicycle network?	Yes/No	2, 3, 5
3	<b>Key destinations (community destinations)</b> – Does the project provide access to a community destination?*	Yes/No	2, 3
4	<b>Key destinations (schools)</b> – Does the project provide access to a school?***	Yes/No	2, 3
5	<b>Key destinations (transit)</b> – Does the project provide access to a transit stop?***	Yes/No	2, 3
6	<b>Equity</b> – Is the project located within or directly adjacent to an underserved census block group as identified by the composite equity index map (4 <sup>th</sup> quartile)?	Yes/No	4
7	<b>Adoption &amp; Implementation</b> – Is the project identified in a local Transportation System Plan?	Yes/No	7
8	<b>Public priority</b> – Has the project received significant comments from the public?	Yes/No	N/A

\* Community destinations include but are not limited to libraries, hospitals, grocery stores, parks and recreation centers, government and community services, and points of interest.

\*\*\*Projects that provide access to transit stops and schools receive two points under this criterion.

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### Request

Staff is looking to gather input and feedback on the usefulness of a priority project list and proposed project prioritization criteria. Answers to the following questions can help guide the group conversation.

- 1) Would the proposed project prioritization criteria be useful for you?
  - a. If not, how might it be changed so it is useful?

### Additional questions regarding criteria

- 1) Key Destinations criterion: Should a project receive multiple points for providing access to multiple community destinations?
  - a. Ex: A project provides access to a strip center with a transit stop, grocery store, and post office. Should the project receive three points (two for the transit stop and one for the community destination) or four points (two for the transit stop, one for the grocery store, and one for the post office)?
- 2) Key Destinations criterion: What physical distance from the terminal point of a project is considered “providing access to a community destination”?
  - a. Ex: A new sidewalk project connects to an existing sidewalk at a point a block away from a grocery store. The grocery store is located along the existing sidewalk. Does the new sidewalk project receive a point for providing access to the grocery store, a community destination?
- 3) Safety criterion: If multiple crashes have been recorded along a project’s route, does the project receive one point for each crash?

# MEMORANDUM

## **Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization**

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation

---



### **AAMPO Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Goals (reference)**

- Goal 1: *Create a network that is safe, comfortable, and intuitive for all users*
- Goal 2: *Create a network that connects Jefferson, Millersburg, Albany, and Tangent*
- Goal 3: *Create a network that is locally connected and provides access to key destinations*
- Goal 4: *Create a network that prioritizes equity*
- Goal 5: *Create a network that builds on existing infrastructure and is expandable in the future*
- Goal 6: *Support economic development by including recommendations that encourage walking and biking to businesses*
- Goal 7: *Support plan adoption and local implementation through feasible infrastructure, policy, and programing recommendations*

# MEMORANDUM

## Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization

City of Albany • City of Jefferson • City of Millersburg • City of Tangent • Linn County •  
Benton County • Oregon Department of Transportation



### April Draft Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan Project Prioritization Criteria (reference)

#	Criteria	Response	Goal Alignment
1	<b>Safety</b> – Is the project located along a segment or intersection at which a crash was reported in the last five years? <b>OR</b> Does the project provide a comparable, alternative route that avoids a crash location?	Yes/No	1
2	<b>Accessibility &amp; Comfort</b> – Will the bicycle level of stress will be a 1 or 2 / will the sidewalk network quality be excellent or good?*	Yes/No	1
3	<b>Connectedness</b> – Does the project link existing pedestrian or low stress bicycle routes?	Yes/No	2, 3, 5
4	<b>Key destinations</b> – Does the project provide access to a community destination? **	Yes/No	2, 3, 6
5	<b>Equity</b> – Is the project located within or directly adjacent to an underserved census block group as identified by the composite equity index map (4 <sup>th</sup> quartile)?	Yes/No	4
6	<b>Population density</b> – Is the project located within or directly adjacent to a census block group with high population density (4 <sup>th</sup> quartile)?	Yes/No	6
7	<b>Employment density</b> – Is the project located within or directly adjacent to a census block group with high employment density (4 <sup>th</sup> quartile)?	Yes/No	6
8	<b>Adoption &amp; Implementation</b> – Is the project identified in a local Transportation System Plan?	Yes/No	7
9	<b>Public priority</b> – Has the project received significant comments from the public?	Yes/No	N/A

\* **Bicycle level of Stress 1:** Strong separation of bicycles from all vehicle traffic except low speed, low volume traffic. Includes dedicated multi-use paths, simple crossings and is suitable for children. **Bicycle level of stress 2:** Except in low speed / low volume traffic situations, bicyclists have their own place to ride that keeps them from having to interact with traffic except at formal crossings. Physical separation from higher speed and multilane traffic. Crossings that are easy for an adult to negotiate. **Excellent sidewalk network quality:** Sidewalks with substantial separation between the sidewalk and roadway, or if the sidewalk in question is an off-street multi-use path. **Good sidewalk network quality:** Sidewalks on both sides of the roadway.

\*\* Community destinations include but are not limited to libraries, schools, hospitals, grocery stores, parks and recreation centers, government and community services, points of interest, and transit stops. Projects that provide access to **transit stops** and **schools** receive two points under this criterion.