



## 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

**Policy Board Meeting**  
**Wednesday, January 25, 2023**  
**2:30 pm to 4:30 pm**

VIRTUAL MEETING

Via Teams by Clicking [HERE](#)

Meeting ID: 294 775 811 756

Passcode: ocwzng

Mobile One Click Number

[1 872 242 8088](tel:18722428088)

Phone Conference ID: 687 870 480#

Contact: Billy McGregor, [bmcgregor@ocwcog.org](mailto:bmcgregor@ocwcog.org)

### AGENDA

- |    |      |   |       |
|----|------|---|-------|
| 1) | 2:30 | Call to Order and Chair Elections   | Staff |
| 2) | 2:35 | Public Comments   | Chair |
| 3) | 2:45 | Approve minutes of December 15, 2022, Meeting (Attachment A)  | Chair |
|    |      | <i>ACTION: Decision on minutes</i>  |       |
| 4) | 3:00 | Introductions and MPO 101 (Attachment B)<br>Introductions to familiarize the group and welcome new members.<br>AAMPO overview slides. Confirm meeting time works.                     | All   |
|    |      | <i>Action: Decision on meeting time</i>   |       |
| 5) | 3:15 | Appointment of Policy Board Chair and Representatives to Statewide Groups (Attachment C1 & C2)<br>Appoint representatives to Linn-Benton Loop Policy Board.                           | All   |
|    |      | <i>Action: Decision on AAMPO representatives</i>  |       |
| 6) | 3:30 | TIP Amendments (Attachment D)<br>Attachment D contains Memo for Full Amendments to the STIP. Needs approval or additional public outreach.  | Staff |
|    |      | <i>Action: Approval Decision</i>  |       |
| 7) | 3:45 | RTP Schedule Update & Goal Objectives (Attachment E)<br>Current work includes screening objectives from TSPs (Attachment E), modeling with TPAU, and determining existing conditions. | Staff |
|    |      | <i>Action: Information and Discussion</i>   |       |

---

The meeting location is accessible to persons with disabilities. Sign language, interpreter services or other accommodations can also be provided by contacting Ashlyn Muzechenko at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. Ashlyn can be reached at 541-812-2002 (TTY/TTD 711) or [amuzechenko@ocwcog.org](mailto:amuzechenko@ocwcog.org).

8) 4:10 Jurisdictional Updates/Other Business

All

9) 4:30 Adjournment  
Next meeting: February 22, 2022

Chair

### ATTENDANCE (FOR QUORUM PURPOSES)

Board Members	Jurisdiction	Attendance
VACANT	City of Jefferson	
Councilor John Sullivan	City of Millersburg	
Councilor Ray Kopczynski (Vice Chair)	City of Albany	
Councilor Greg Jones	City of Tangent	
Commissioner Roger Nyquist	Linn County	
Commissioner Pat Malone	Benton County	
Darrin Lane (Chair)	Citizen Representative	
Savannah Crawford	Oregon Department of Transportation	
Alternates	Jurisdiction	Attendance
Walt Perry	City of Jefferson	
Janelle Booth	City of Millersburg	
Chris Cerklewski	City of Albany	
Joe Samaniego	City of Tangent	
Wayne Mink	Linn County	
Gary Stockhoff	Benton County	
James Feldmann	Oregon Department of Transportation	

**Quorum Requirement:** MPO business may be conducted provided a quorum of the Policy Board is in attendance. A quorum consists of at least four members of the Policy Board or their alternates. The Policy Board members may participate telephonically or by other means of electronic communication as provided in Section 6.D (Special or Emergency Meetings).

– AAMPO Policy Board Bylaws, Section 6: Meeting, Subsection E: Quorum

*Meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. If you will need any special accommodations, please contact Ashlyn Muzechenko at least 72 hours prior to the meeting. Ashlyn can be reached at 541-812-2002. TTY/TTD 711*

**Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO)**

**Joint AAMPO TAC and Policy Board Hybrid Meeting with Microsoft Teams Technology**

**Thursday December 15, 2022**

**9:00 am – 11:00 am**

**DRAFT MINUTES**

<b>TAC Members</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Walt Perry	City of Jefferson	Yes
Janelle Booth (Chair)	City of Millersburg	No
Chris Cerklewski (Vice Chair)	City of Albany	Yes
Joe Samaniego	City of Tangent	No
Daineal Malone	Linn County	No
Gary Stockhoff	Benton County	No
James Feldmann	Oregon Department of Transportation	Yes
<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Councilor Dave Beyerl	City of Jefferson	No
Councilor John Sullivan	City of Millersburg	Yes
Councilor Ray Kopczynski	City of Albany	No
Councilor Greg Jones	City of Tangent	No
Commissioner Rodger Nyquist	Linn County	No

Commissioner Pat Malone	Benton County	Yes
Darrin Lane	Citizen Representative	Yes
Savannah Crawford	Oregon Department of Transportation	Yes
<b>Alternates</b>	<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Attendance</b>
Walt Perry	City of Jefferson	Yes
Janelle Booth	City of Millersburg	No
Chris Cerklewski	City of Albany	Yes
Joe Samaniego	City of Tangent	No
Wayne Mink	Linn County	No
Gary Stockhoff	Benton County	No
James Feldmann	Oregon Department of Transportation	Yes

**Guests: Jennifer Boardman, Barry Hoffman, Rob Romeo, and Heide Schulte**

**Staff:** Transportation Manager Nick Meltzer, AAMPO Assistant Planner Billy McGregor, CWACT Planner Steph Nappa, and CED Administrative Assistant Ashlyn Muzechenko

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	DECISION/CONCLUSION
1. Call to Order, Agenda Review, and Roll Call	<p>Staff Nick Meltzer conducted roll call.</p> <p>At the start of this joint meeting, it was concluded that there was a quorum for the AAMPO Policy Board, but not for the AAMPO TAC.</p>	<p><b>AAMPO Board Chair Darrin Lane called meeting to order at 9:03 a.m.</b></p> <p><b>There were no changes to the agenda.</b></p>
2. Public Comments		<p><b>No public comments were made.</b></p>
<p>3. Approve AAMPO TAC Minutes of November 17, 2022 (Attachment A1) and the AAMPO Policy Board minutes of October 26, 2022 (Attachment A2)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Decision on Minutes</p>	<p>There were no changes or comments on the minutes.</p> <p>The AAMPO TAC minutes were tabled as there was not a TAC quorum.</p>	<p><b>The AAMPO Policy Board minutes of October 26, 2022, were approved by consensus.</b></p>
<p>4. Bike Pedestrian Plan Review (Attachment B)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Discussion or Approval Decision</p>	<p>Staff Nick Meltzer summarized the Bike and Ped plan as the COG has been discussing it for around 2 years and have presented it to the AAMPO TAC and Board for review multiple times.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa noted that this is the Bike Ped Plan that Catherine Rohan and Dana Nichols worked on, and Steph Nappa picked up to finish.</p>	<p><b>The Policy Board agreed by consensus to review the edits and bring the Bike Ped Plan back to the board in January.</b></p>

	<p>Staff Steph Nappa gave an overview for the Policy Board members. Staff Nappa introduced why the plan was made, and how it bridges past TSPs from cities in the AAMPO area. Staff Steph Nappa also added that the demand for bike recreation has increased recently as well.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa added there was 3 different rounds of stakeholder outreach and public outreach that were involved with this plan. Staff Nappa added there is a large project list that has been labeled as priority projects.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa noted that this Bike Ped Plan has a section on implementation and monitoring as well.</p> <p>James Feldmann noted that there were questions from Dorthey Upton that don't seem to be addressed in this plan.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa noted they were not included in the BPP as it was past time for public comments.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane noted that to not incorporate the comments would be concerning for himself and ODOT staff.</p> <p>Staff Steph Nappa pulled up Dorthey Upton's updates for the group to review</p> <p>Savannah Crawford noted that she was not aware that Dorthey Upton of ODOT had submitted review comments, and Crawford is not ready to approve them at this time.</p> <p>James Feldmann added that ADA has asked members to be more diligent on color choices on projects.</p> <p>Pat Malone added that approving the routine corrections from Dorthey Upton would be a lot more work, that he isn't sure if it is needed.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted that staff should put a meeting on the calendar with ODOT to go over the comments and would bring it back to the Policy Board in January.</p> <p>The Policy Board agreed by consensus to review the edits and bring the Bike Ped Plan back to the board in January.</p>	
<p>5. RTP Goals Approval (Attachment C)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Discussion or Approval Decision</p>	<p>Staff Billy McGregor introduced the revised and edited goals where language was updated.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane asked if this was the mirror of the CAMPO Goals</p> <p>Staff Billy McGregor noted that no it wasn't, however AAMPO did reduce their goal numbers down to 7, like CAMPO, but the goals are not the same.</p> <p>The AAMPO Policy Board members approved the AAMPO RTP Goals by consensus.</p>	<p><b>The AAMPO Policy Board members approved the AAMPO RTP Goals by consensus.</b></p>
<p>6. AAMPO RTP Scenarios Memo (Attachment D)</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Discussion Information</p>	<p>Staff Billy McGregor introduced Attachment D which covers the AAMPO RTP scenarios memo.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer shared that through the staff transitions, staff are working on getting up to speed with the RTP. Staff Meltzer noted that the scenarios needed to be brought back to the Policy Board for approval again, as they were initially approved in February.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted that AAMPO Staff have approved three different scenarios to go with the AAMPO RTP. Staff Nick Meltzer added that these were previously approved, however staff just wanted clarification to make sure no opinions had changed.</p> <p>Walt Perry noted that this is a great document, however times have changed. Perry added that scenario is a what if word. Walt Perry asked if this is an amendable document that will adjust as time moves along.</p>	<p><b>AAMPO Board Members decided by consensus to confirm the AAMPO RTP Scenarios with the addition of the emergency preparedness chapter later on.</b></p>

	<p>Walt Perry noted that ODOT has plans on how to address the Cascadia Earthquake as an emergency function and asked if AAMPO has made any plans for emergency preparedness as well.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted this document can be changed by AAMPO, and the scenarios are future scenarios, with the base year of 2019. Meltzer added in terms of Cascadia and prepping for emergency management, it hasn't been discussed in the RTP before, however it doesn't mean that it couldn't be added.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane asked if emergency preparedness is outside the scope of regular transportation planning.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted that it could be a section in the RTP that could support other projects that relate to emergency preparedness.</p> <p>Walt Perry added that flooding and fire emergencies should also have plans on how to react to them since they are more likely in the AAMPO region.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane noted that the issues Walt is addressing, these are important issues. Lane added that he doesn't believe there is a negative aspect of including this in the RTP Plan, however there should be additional research to add a future revision for emergency preparedness.</p> <p>Pat Malone noted that these scenarios are outside of the MPO's reign, however they should be investigated and revised into the plan later after talking with other agencies that have this as part of their wheelhouse.</p> <p>Staff Billy McGregor noted that in other documents, there has been emergency preparedness mentioned.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>AAMPO Board Members decided by consensus to confirm the AAMPO RTP Scenarios with the addition of the emergency preparedness chapter later on.</p>	
<p>7. FY24 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) Update</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Information and Discussion</p>	<p>Staff Billy McGregor noted that AAMPO is now open for suggestions regarding their Unified Work Plan Program. Staff McGregor added that CAMPO is working on these updates as well.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted that Task 100, 400, and 500 will not be changing, However Task 200 and 300 will most likely have changes in their make-up.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer added that one idea that will pop into his mind would be the Albany reached out to talk about an electric bus replacement plan, which Meltzer would recommend for task 300.</p> <p>Barry Hoffman added that when Albany Transit are applying for 5339 and other grants, there is a requirement to have a fleet transition plan. Hoffman noted that staff have reached out to AAMPO Staff to work on the fleet completion plan.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane asked if there is enough in the budget to cover that additional work.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer added that since it is a joint project there should be enough in the budget to cover that time.</p> <p>Pat Malone noted that he is familiar to have things in writing before going after funding, and he supports this project in order to get in the game for future funding activities.</p> <p>Staff Billy McGregor noted that he has pulled up CAMPOs proposed task 200 and 300 changes for the group to look at for an example. Staff McGregor added that CAMPO work plans are very regionally specific.</p>	

	<p>Staff Billy McGregor noted that there are a few work items that will be expiring and need to be replaced.</p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer noted that staff will be drafting the UPWP through February before it goes through state and federal review. Staff Meltzer added that up until it is submitted for state and federal review, staff will take recommendations from both the Board and TAC if there are ideas on how staff time should be spent.</p>	
<p>8. Jurisdictional Updates and Other Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• January Meetings – In Person or Virtual?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Staff Updates:</b></p> <p>Staff Nick Meltzer added that Dave Beyerl has retired, and staff created a plaque for his service that will get brought to Dave, as he was part of the founding and incorporating of AAMPO.</p> <p>Staff Billy McGregor asked the groups preference on hybrid or virtual.</p> <p>Chair Darrin Lane and Commissioner Pat Malone are in favor of hybrid meetings.</p> <p>James Feldmann noted that if the TAC was virtual in January that would be ok.</p> <p>Chris Cerklewski and Walt Perry added that having a hybrid meeting for the TAC would be the best option.</p> <p>John Sullivan noted that he agreed that there should be hybrid meetings.</p> <p><b>Jurisdictional Updates:</b></p> <p>Walt Perry for Jefferson noted that he will not be part of the TAC or Board starting in 2023, as he lost his seat. Perry noted that Dave Beyerl will definitely be missed. Walt Perry added that Jefferson and adopted their TSP and is updating several other things that involve transportation. Walt Perry added that the smaller cities are important to this region and hopefully other small cities will join in as well.</p>	

	<p>John Sullivan for Millersburg shared that today is the Grand Opening of the Intermodal Facility in Millersburg. Sullivan noted that it will be a great solution for the valley.</p> <p>Chris Cerklewski added that new residential development has dried up with the economy being uncertain for the future. Cerklewski added that staff are still working on construction for the first phase of transit stops which will be implemented in Spring of 2023. Barry Hoffman confirmed and noted that the only thing in the way would be to hire drivers. Chris Cerklewski added that Ron Irish had elaborated on the issues with Union Pacific Railroad and Cerklewski shared that summary with the Policy Board.</p> <p>Pat Malone for Benton County shared that the Railroad situation is unfortunate. Malone added that it should be on our agenda to see what progress the issues is making. Pat Malone noted that he was re-elected so he will remain a member. Malone stated that there has been talk of combining AAMPO and CAMPO to make a larger organization with more clout.</p> <p>Savannah Crawford added that the Oregon Transportation division will approve the list of the STIP projects and Crawford will provide the list for AAMPO and CAMPO when OTC releases it.</p>	
9. Adjournment	The next AAMPO TAC meeting will be on January 19, 2023, and the next AAMPO Policy Board meeting will be on January 25, 2023. Both meetings will be hybrid meetings as discussed by the TAC and Board members today.	<b>Meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m. by Policy Board Chair Darrin Lane</b>



# Albany Area MPO Member Handbook

*February 2021*

*Development of this document was made possible with funding from the Federal Highway Administration, the Federal Transit Administration, and the Oregon Department of Transportation.*

# Table of Contents

- Chapter 1: Introduction ..... 1
  - What is a Metropolitan Planning Organization?..... 1
  - What does a Metropolitan Planning Organization do? ..... 1
  - Historical Context..... 3
- Chapter 2: AAMPO Overview..... 4
  - What is the Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization?..... 4
  - Administrative Structure & Relationships..... 3
  - Albany Area MPO Governing Documents & Agreements..... 6
- Chapter 3: Metropolitan Planning Organization Work Products..... 7
  - Core Documents ..... 7
  - Additional Responsibilities..... 10
- Chapter 4: Metropolitan Planning Organization Funding..... 14
  - Primary Federal Funding Sources ..... 14
  - Secondary Funding Sources ..... 16
  - Federal Funding Process ..... 17
- Appendix A: Relationship between the State and MPO long range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs..... 19

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### What is a Metropolitan Planning Organization?

A Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is a transportation policy making body made up of representatives from local governments and transportation agencies with authority and responsibility in metropolitan planning areas. Federal legislation passed in the early 1970s required the formation of a MPO for all urbanized areas (UZAs) with a population greater than 50,000. Today, there are more than 300 MPOs across the country, including eight Oregon MPOs. In addition, there are two bi-state MPOs primarily functioning within the state of Washington.

The MPOs in Oregon include:

- Albany Area MPO (AAMPO)
- Bend MPO (BMPO)
- Central Lane MPO (CLMPO)
- Corvallis Area MPO (CAMPO)
- Middle Rogue MPO (MRMPO)
- Portland Metropolitan Area (Metro)
- Rogue Valley MPO (RVMPO)
- Salem-Keizer Transportation Study (SKATS)



The bi-state MPOs include:

- Walla-Walla Valley MPO (containing the city of Milton-Freewater and Umatilla County)
- Longview-Kelso-Rainier MPO (containing the city of Rainier)

The MPOs with 200,000 or more population are also designated as **Transportation Management Areas (TMAs)**, a designation that brings on additional responsibility and authority. Portland Metro, Central Lane, and Salem-Keizer MPOs are the only three MPOs in Oregon with TMA status.

### What does a Metropolitan Planning Organization do?

MPOs were created in order to ensure that existing and future expenditures for transportation projects and programs in metropolitan areas are based on a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive (3-C) planning process. **Additional federal funding for the construction of transportation projects is channeled through the MPO. Note that since MPOs do not have jurisdiction over the physical infrastructure however, construction is completed by member cities and counties. Instead, MPOs create the regional plans that guide the development of those projects. The primary functions of a MPO are to:**

- Establish a setting for **fair, impartial and effective regional decision-making** for the MPO area
- **Identify and evaluate transportation improvement options** for the MPO area.
- **Develop and update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan** for the MPO area covering a planning horizon of at least 20 years that fosters mobility and access for people and goods, efficient system performance and preservation, and good quality of life.

- **Develop a short-range Transportation Improvement Program** that is based on priorities identified in the long-range plan. This program should be designed to achieve the area’s goals using spending, regulating, operating, management and financial tools.
- **Involve the public** and other affected constituencies in the functions listed above.

Implementation of these primary functions must also be consistent with overarching federal policy. Current federal policy is to “encourage and promote the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems that will serve the mobility needs of people and freight and foster economic growth and development within and between States and urbanized areas, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution.”

More specifically, federal policy guidance dictates that MPO planning and programming activities take into account the following **Eight Planning Factors**:

1. Support economic vitality.
2. Increase transportation safety for motorized and non-motorized users.
3. Increase transportation security for motorized and non-motorized users.
4. Increase accessibility and mobility of people and freight.
5. Protect and enhance the environment, promote energy conservation, improve quality of life, and promote consistency between transportation improvements and state and local planned growth and economic development patterns.
6. Enhance the integration and connectivity of the transportation system across and between modes for both people and freight.
7. Promote efficient system management and operation.
8. Emphasize preservation of the existing transportation system.

**Additional Federal Guidance for Consideration:**

The following federal recommendations can help guide the planning process, but are not required:

- *Livability Principles*: From the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The principles focus on providing transportation choices; expanding access to affordable housing located close to transit, enhancing economic competitiveness, targeting federal funds toward existing communities to spur revitalization and protect rural landscapes, increasing collaboration among federal, state, and local governments, and valuing the unique qualities of all communities.
- *Bike/pedestrian accommodations*: USDOT policy is to incorporate safe and convenient walking and bicycling facilities into transportation projects. Transportation agencies are encouraged to go beyond minimum standards in providing facilities for these modes.

### Additional Guidance from the State of Oregon:

In addition to meeting federal mandates, MPOs often have additional responsibilities under state law. For example, in Oregon, MPOs are required to comply with the Transportation Planning Rule (TPR). The TPR guides preparation and adoption of transportation system plans. The rule includes specific requirements for MPOs to expand transportation choices.

Additionally, some Oregon MPOs are required to begin scenario planning work, which addresses climate change mitigation through emissions reductions and other strategies. MPOs can choose to partner with ODOT on other projects as well, including assistance on land use analysis, transportation-related computer modeling, application of access management principles, and other projects.



### Historical Context

While the earliest beginnings of urban transportation planning go back to the post-World War II years, the federal requirement for urban transportation planning emerged during the early 1960s.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1962 created the federal requirement for urban transportation planning largely in response to the construction of the Interstate Highway System and the planning of routes through and around urban areas. The Act required, as a condition attached to federal transportation financial assistance, that transportation projects in urbanized areas of 50,000 or more in population be based on a continuing, comprehensive, urban transportation planning process undertaken cooperatively by the states and local governments — the birth of the so-called 3C, “continuing, comprehensive and cooperative planning process.”

It was not until 1974 that the U.S. Congress amended the Federal Aid Highway Act and mandated the formation of Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to carry out the required planning process. MPOs were established to ensure local and regional governments were able to effectively carry out regional transportation planning and programming.

The passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991 further strengthened the metropolitan planning process by enhancing the role of local elected officials, requiring stakeholder involvement, and emphasizing multi-modal planning, system efficiency, mobility, and access. The role and authorities of MPOs have been retained by subsequent transportation funding and authorization legislation, including the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21), in place from 2012 to 2014, and the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act (FAST), in place since 2015 and set to expire in September of 2021.

## Chapter 2: AAMPO Overview

### What is the Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization?


The Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO) was formed following the 2010 Census, which determined that the Albany Urbanized Area had reached a population of 56,997. AAMPO was formally designated by the Governor of Oregon on February 6<sup>th</sup> 2013.

As designated, the AAMPO Planning Area covers the Albany Urbanized Area, which is composed of the cities of Albany, Jefferson, Millersburg, and Tangent as well as adjacent parts of Linn, Benton and Marion Counties that are anticipated to become urbanized during the 20 year planning horizon. Note, that although the AAMPO planning area includes a small portion of Marion County around the City of Jefferson, Marion County is not a member of AAMPO. Figure 1 on the following page shows the extent of the AAMPO Planning Area.

AAMPO membership includes:

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

Figure 1: AAMPO Planning Area



## Administrative Structure & Relationships


MPOs have unique internal administrative structures as well as multi-faceted relationships with other transportation planning agencies. Figure 2 depicts AAMPO's internal organization.

### Policy Board

AAMPO is governed by an eight-member Policy Board composed of elected representatives from the cities of Jefferson, Millersburg, Albany, and Tangent, and Benton and Linn Counties as well as a staff person from the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and a citizens' representative.

Policy Board members are designated by the governing body of member jurisdictions (i.e. mayor/city council or the county board of commissioners). The Policy Board's decision-making process is based on consensus building among the members. A complete description of the Policy Board's decision making process and the election of officers is outlined in AAMPO's Policy Board Bylaws.

**Figure 2: AAMPO Organization Chart**



Per the federal transportation planning regulations (USC, Title 23), the MPO Policy Board is empowered to make transportation planning and programming decisions for the MPO area. The federal government recognizes a transportation plan adopted by the MPO Policy Board as the official transportation plan for the MPO area. Federal dollars will not be released to any transportation project in the MPO area that is not consistent with the goals and objectives of the MPO's transportation plan.

The Policy Board is also empowered to establish the area's transportation priority projects and to allocate federal dollars to those priority projects. ODOT is required to honor the integrity and the priority order of the MPO's transportation projects.

### Technical Advisory Committee

The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provides technical assistance to the Policy Board. The TAC is made up of professional staff of the member jurisdictions, as designated by the Policy Board. The TAC also includes ex-officio members representing the following federal and state agencies:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD)
- Oregon Department of State Land (DSL)
- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)

Meetings of the TAC, their decision making process, and the election of officers proceed according to the AAMPO's TAC Bylaws.

### MPO Staff

MPO staff assist the Policy Board and TAC by preparing documents, fostering interagency coordination, facilitating public input and feedback, and managing the planning process. MPO staff may provide committees with technical assessments and evaluations of proposed transportation initiatives. The MPO staff may engage consultants to generate needed data. MPO staff typically include a manager and one or more planning, administrative, and technical staff. In addition to staffing the MPO Policy Board and TAC, MPO staff may also play a role in other regional, transportation related committees.

### Relationship with Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments

MPOs can be broadly grouped into two administrative categories, independent or hosted. Independent MPOs act as their own fiscal agents and staffing decisions are left to the discretion of the policy board. A MPO is considered to be hosted when another organization acts as the fiscal agent for the MPO and holds the power to hire and fire the MPO's employees. Hosted MPOs are generally housed within Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs) or Councils of Governments (COGs). **It is important to note that a hosted MPO's policy boards operate independently of the policy board of the hosting entity (i.e. AAMPO's Policy Board is independent of Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments' Policy Board).**

**AAMPO is hosted by Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments (OCWCOG) and housed within OCWCOG's Community and Economic Development (CED) department.** AAMPO's staffing, including fiscal and administrative support, is provided through a contract with OCWCOG. Staffing for AAMPO includes a full-time Transportation Planner, assistance from the CED Executive Administrative Assistant,

and assistance as needed from the Transportation Planning Manager, CED Director, and other planning staff. Figure 3 shows AAMPO’s position within OCWCOG and lists key staff.

**Relationship with Area Commission on Transportation**

Area Commissions on Transportation (ACTs) are advisory bodies to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC). The OTC establishes state transportation policy and guides the planning, development and management of a statewide integrated transportation network, the OTC also serves as the Board of Directors for Oregon Department of Transportation. Initially, ACTs were created to advise OTC on funding priority of transportation modernization projects. Over the time, their consultative role has been expanded to other transportation issues.

The Cascades West Area Commission on Transportation (CWACT) is one of the oldest and most active of the 12 ACTs in Oregon. CWACT is made up of representatives of the public and private entities in Linn, Benton, and Lincoln Counties. AAMPO staff serve as voting members of the CWACT Technical Advisory Committee and as ex-officio members of the full Commission. AAMPO and CWACT have signed a coordination/cooperation protocol that outlines procedures for synchronization of transportation priorities and decisions between the two entities.

**Relationship with Linn-Benton Loop**

The Linn-Benton Loop is a bus service that primarily serves riders traveling between Linn Benton Community College in south Albany and Oregon State University in Corvallis. The Loop is funded with a portion of FTA 5307 funds received by the transit providers within AAMPO and CAMPO. Albany and Corvallis are the designated Direct Recipients of AAMPO and CAMPOs’ 5307 funds, respectively. FTA 5307 funds are matched with local funds contributed by Linn Benton Community College and Oregon State University, as well as STIF monies from Linn and Benton Counties. The Loop is operated by Albany Transit Service. The Loop is governed by a Policy Board which receives support from a Technical Advisory Committee. AAMPO staff are a voting member of the Loop Technical Advisory Committee.

**Relationship with Oregon MPO Consortium**

The Oregon MPO Consortium (OMPOC) is a forum for Oregon’s MPOs to address common needs, issues, and solutions to transportation and land use challenges facing Oregon’s metropolitan regions and

**Figure 3: OCWCOG Organization Chart**



surrounding areas. OPMPOC membership consists of representatives from Oregon’s designated MPOs. Each MPO is represented by two voting Policy Board members. MPO staff act as non-voting ex-officio members of OMPOC.

### Relationship with State and Local Government

Upon the formation of AAMPO, Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) were signed between AAMPO and ODOT, and AAMPO and local governments. These IGAs call for cooperation among the signatories and the designation of a representative to the AAMPO Policy Board and AAMPO Technical Advisory Committee.

### Albany Area MPO Governing Documents & Agreements

Numerous documents and agreements govern relationships within and outside of AAMPO. AAMPO’s governing documents and agreements are listed and described below in Table 1.

**Table 1: Summary of AAMPO Governing Documents**

<b>AAMPO Governing Documents</b>	
<b><i>Intergovernmental Agreement Establishing the Albany Area MPO</i></b>	MPOs are established through intergovernmental agreement, with formal designation by the Governor. The IGA establishing the Albany Area MPO was executed on January 13 <sup>th</sup> , 2013 and the Oregon Governor designated the Albany Area MPO on February 6 <sup>th</sup> , 2013.
<b><i>Policy Board Bylaws &amp; Technical Advisory Committee Bylaws</i></b>	The roles and authorities of the MPO Policy Board and its Technical Advisory Committee are outlined in their respective bylaws, as adopted by the Policy Board. Bylaws for the AAMPO Policy Board and Technical Advisory Committee were adopted in May 2013.
<b>Other Agreements</b>	
<b><i>Intergovernmental Agreement between AAMPO and OCWCOG</i></b>	This agreement establishes the relationship between AAMPO and Oregon Cascades West Council of Governments (OCWCOG). It designates OCWCOG as AAMPO’s administrative and fiscal agent; outlining AAMPO staff responsibilities and how funds are received and spent. This agreement was most recently executed in July of 2020, the current contract period extends to June 2023.
<b><i>ODOT/MPO/Transit Operator Agreement for Financial Plans and Obligated Projects Lists</i></b>	This agreement defines the roles and responsibilities in carrying out the metropolitan planning and financial planning processes. This agreement was executed in February 2014.
<b><i>Annual Intergovernmental Agreement to fund the Unified Planning Work Program</i></b>	This annual agreement establishes the contractual responsibilities of AAMPO and ODOT for implementation of the MPO’s annual Unified Planning Work Program.

**Table 1: Summary of AAMPO Governing Documents CONTINUED**

Other Agreements	
<b><i>Direct Recipient of 5307 funds</i></b>	This resolution by the Policy Board establishes the City of Albany as the Direct Recipient of AAMPO's FTA 5307 funds. The resolution states that the funds should be spent on Albany Transit Service programs within the MPO area and in a manner consistent with guidance provided by the AAMPO Policy Board. This resolution went into effect in March 2013, and was filed with ODOT and the FTA.

## Chapter 3: Metropolitan Planning Organization Work Products

In accordance with federal regulations, AAMPO's role is to provide a setting for cooperative regional transportation planning. The MPO supports and builds off local transportation planning efforts and provides a coordination role for planning and programming funds for projects and operations. Specific responsibilities of AAMPO include development or completion of:

- An annual Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)
- A long-range (20 year) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- A four-year Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP or TIP)
- A Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan
- A Public Participation Plan (PPP)
- An annual List of Obligated Projects
- An annual Performance and Expenditure Report
- Quarterly Reports and Invoices
- An annual Self-Certification
- Updated Federal Aid Urban Boundaries and Federal Functional Classification Maps

The sections below describe the MPO work products in more detail.

### Core Documents

Core MPO documents include the Unified Planning Work Program, the Regional Transportation Plan, the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program, the Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan, and the Public Participation Plan. Table 2 summarized the core documents and their update schedules.

**Table 2: Summary of Core Documents and their Timelines**

Document	Approval	Content	Update Schedule
<b>Unified Planning Work Program</b>	MPO	Planning studies and tasks for fiscal year	Annually
<b>Regional Transportation Plan</b>	MPO	Assess transportation needs and projects	Every 5 years
<b>Transportation Improvement Plan</b>	MPO/ Governor	Transportation investments	Every 4 years
<b>Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan</b>	MPO	Plan to ensure non-discrimination	Review periodically
<b>Public Participation Plan</b>	MPO	Plan to engage and inform the public	Review periodically

### Unified Planning Work Program

The purpose of the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) is to outline the transportation planning and programming activities of the MPO during the course of the fiscal year. The AAMPO UPWP describes major work tasks and serves as a guiding document for MPO staff and committee members. The AAMPO UPWP contains the following elements:

- A description of planning tasks the MPO will undertake with federal funds (e.g., data collection and analysis, public outreach, preparation of the TIP, etc.) and the products that will result from these activities
- An estimate of funding to be spent on each activity
- Estimated staff time needed to complete each activity
- A timeline for completion of each activity

The UPWP must be approved by the MPO's Policy Board and submitted to the state DOT by April of each year. A full overview of AAMPO activities can be found in the most recent UPWP, available on [AAMPO's website](#).

### Regional Transportation Plan

The purpose of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is to identify how the Albany Metropolitan Area will meet the needs of the transportation system over a 20-year planning horizon. The RTP contains projects and policies to guide the development of a multi-modal transportation system (including transit, highway, bicycle, pedestrian, and accessible transportation) which meets the region's economic, transportation, development and sustainability goals, while remaining fiscally constrained.

Federal and state regulations require that transportation projects be derived from an adopted RTP. This means that transportation funds cannot be released to projects that are not recommended in the RTP. The AAMPO RTP is recognized by federal and state transportation agencies and serves as the requisite

document for the flow of federal funds to the area. In Oregon, a RTP can also serve as the Regional Transportation System Plan (RTSP) to establish compliance with Oregon Transportation Planning Rule (TPR).

Per the federal regulations, the RTP is a financially constrained document. In that, every project in the RTP must have a “reasonably anticipated” funding source. As such, the RTP includes a financial plan that demonstrates a balance between the costs of all recommended projects and the reasonably anticipated funds available to the MPO. Needed projects for which no funding sources can be identified are listed as “Illustrative Projects” in the RTP. When and if additional funds become available, the MPO can amend the RTP to move a project from the illustrative project list onto the recommended projects list.

The Policy Board is empowered to amend the RTP for any necessary additions, deletions, or modifications, granted that the amendment meets all applicable federal requirements. Amendments that make substantive changes to the RTP may require public involvement and the evaluation of financial impacts of the change. A minor or administrative amendment, on the other hand, may not trigger these processes.

AAMPO’s current RTP was developed during 2017 and 2018. The AAMPO Policy Board adopted the RTP in May 2018. Federal rules require the RTP to be updated every five years. AAMPO is in the early stages of updating the RTP with an anticipated adoption of the updated plan in 2023.

### **Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program**

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP or TIP) is a short-range capital improvement program that lists priority transportation projects in the Albany Metropolitan Area for funding. Current federal regulations require that the MTIP cover a minimum of four years and be updated at least every four years.

**Projects in the MTIP must conform to and be consistent with the approved RTP in order to be approved for federal funds.** The MTIP is a more precise document than the RTP, specifying the phases of a project, the schedule, the costs, the funding source(s), and the sponsor(s) of each project that is ready for implementation. Just like the RTP, the MTIP must be fiscally constrained. This means that the MTIP may include a project, or an identified phase of a project, only if full funding can reasonably be anticipated to be available within the time period contemplated for completion of the project.

The MTIP development process relies on building consensus among federal, state and local agencies on funding priorities of near term transportation projects. All federally funded transportation projects (inclusive of all travel modes) within the MPO’s boundaries must be included in the MTIP. In addition, the MTIP should include projects that are considered regionally significant, regardless of funding source. MPOs may also include local, non-regionally significant projects in the MTIP as a way of keeping track of improvements throughout their transportation networks.

The MTIP must be approved by both the MPO Policy Board and the Governor (or the Governor’s designee). MPOs are responsible for monitoring the progress and financial status of projects listed in its

MTIP. See Appendix A for a more detailed description of the relationship between the RTP, MTIP, Oregon Transportation Plan, and State TIP.

### **Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan**

The Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan is a federally required document which reflects AAMPO's commitment to ensuring that no person shall - on the grounds of race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability or income status - be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity conducted by the MPO. AAMPO's Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan was developed to meet obligations under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the President's Executive Order on Environmental Justice (1994) and subsequent orders and enforcement regulations. AAMPO's current Title VI Nondiscrimination Plan was last updated in April 2020.

### **Public Participation Plan**

The MPO is responsible for actively seeking the participation of citizens, stakeholders and all relevant agencies in the planning process. Towards this effort, every MPO must develop a Public Participation Plan (PPP) in consultation with citizens and other interested parties. The PPP describes methods, strategies, and desired outcomes for public participation, addressing outreach to a broad audience of interested parties. The PPP outlines the policies and procedures adopted by the AAMPO Policy Board for involving the general public in the MPO's transportation decision-making processes. AAMPO's current PPP was last updated in January 2016.

### **Additional Responsibilities**

Outside of the core documents listed above, AAMPO is also responsible for preparing an annual List of Obligated Projects, Quarterly Reports and Invoices, and an annual Performance and Expenditure Report. AAMPO also completes an Annual Self-Certification and updates Federal Aid Urban Boundaries and Federal Functional Classification Maps.

#### ***Planning for the Fiscal Year***

*Because MPOs coordinate with federal, state and local partners, several fiscal years can affect an MPO's operational functions:*

- 1. State Fiscal Year: July 1 - June 30*
- 2. Federal Fiscal Year: October 1 - September 30*
- 3. Calendar Year: January 1 - December 31*

### **Annual List of Obligated Projects**

This is a list of all surface transportation projects within the MPO that have had federal funds obligated within the preceding fiscal year. The list of obligated projects is submitted directly to FHWA and ODOT after the close of the federal fiscal year.

### **Quarterly Reports and Invoices**

MPOs provide Quarterly Reports to the state DOT, documenting progress on tasks outlined in the UPWP. At the same time, the MPO submits an invoice for reimbursement of work performed under the UPWP that quarter. Generally speaking, the invoice delineates the costs of staff, services and supplies required to accomplish the work of that quarter, along with the amount of local match applied to the federal funds requested.

### Annual Performance and Expenditure Report

In addition to quarterly reports, MPOs must prepare Annual Performance and Expenditure Reports documenting how the MPO accomplished the work outlined in its UPWP. A year-end financial report is also submitted at this time. These reports must be submitted to the state DOT, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and the Regional Office of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) within 90 days following the close of the state fiscal year.



### Annual Self-Certification


The state DOT and MPO must jointly certify that the MPO's transportation planning process is compliant with federal transportation planning laws and regulations, including Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. AAMPO completes an annual self-certification each year to satisfy this requirements, concurrent with the TIP. In addition to self-certification, MPOs with populations greater than 200,000 also undergo a formal review by FHWA at least every four years.

### Federal Aid Urban Boundaries and Federal Functional Classifications

Following each decennial U.S. Census, FHWA requires state DOTs to work with local jurisdictions and MPOs to update Federal Aid Urban Boundaries (FAUBs) and corresponding Federal Functional Classifications of local roadways throughout the state. Updates may also be completed outside of this formal process by contacting the state DOT.

**The FAUB** is the dividing line between urban and rural federal functional classifications. It includes the Urbanized Area and MPO planning area; however, consideration is also given to major traffic generators, major bus routes, interchanges, bridges and continuity of roadway classification. Figure 4 on the next page shows AAMPO's Urbanized Area, FAUB and MPO planning area.

Figure 4: AAMO Urbanized Area, Federal Aid Urban Boundary, and Planning Area (2014)



**The Federal Functional Classification** system is used to identify roadways eligible for federal funds. Typically, to qualify for federal funds, a facility must be classified higher than a ‘local’ road on the urban and rural system. There are seven functional classifications, each representing a different balance of mobility and access. The Federal Functional Classification system, from highest to lowest classification, is described below in Table 3.

**Table 3: Federal Functional Classification**

Classification	Description
<b>Interstate (highest classification)</b>	Interstates are limited access, divided highways offering high levels of mobility while linking the major urban areas. Interstates have very limited access and do not serve abutting land uses. <i>Examples include I-5</i>
<b>Freeway/Expressway</b>	Similar to interstates, freeways/expressways are designed to maximize mobility and do not serve abutting land uses. They have directional travel lanes that are usually separated by some type of physical barrier and their access points are limited to on- and off-ramp locations or a very limited number of at-grade intersections. There are no <i>examples of freeways or expressways in the AAMPO area</i>
<b>Principle Arterial</b>	Principle arterials offer high mobility between urban areas and also serve abutting land uses by including driveways to specific parcels and at-grade intersections with other roadways. <i>Examples include HWY20 and 99E</i>
<b>Minor Arterial</b>	Minor arterials provide service for trips of moderate length and serve geographic areas that are smaller than their higher arterial counterparts. Minor arterials ‘feed’ into the higher arterial system and may carry local bus routes in urban settings. <i>Examples include Waverly Dr., Queen St., and North Albany Rd. in Albany</i>
<b>Major Collector &amp; Minor Collector</b>	Collectors serve the critical role of gathering and channeling traffic from local street to the arterial network. The distinction between major collectors and minor collectors is often subtle. Generally, major collector routes are longer in length, have lower connecting driveway densities, higher speed limits, higher annual average traffic volumes, and may have more travel lanes than minor collectors. <i>Examples of major collectors include Ferry St. and Marion St. in Albany. Examples of minor collectors include 28<sup>th</sup> Ave. and 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. in Albany</i>
<b>Local (lowest classification)</b>	Local streets are low traffic volume roads that provide direct access to abutting land, such as the street in front of your home. They are not intended to be used for long-distance through movements. <i>Examples include Elk Run Dr. and SE Sherman St. in Albany</i>

## Chapter 4: Metropolitan Planning Organization Funding

### Primary Federal Funding Sources


Federal funds provided by the Federal Highway Administration and the Federal Transit Administration are the primary funding source for AAMPO planning and programming activities. ODOT and the City of Albany provide the required match for federal funds, either with state funds (ODOT) or in-kind funds (Albany). MPOs with populations over 200,000 typically receive their federal funds directly from the USDOT while MPOs with populations under 200,000, like AAMPO, receive their federal funding through the state DOT. Below is a list of the funds available to AAMPO. Figure 5 graphically depicts the AAMPO’s main federal funding sources.

### Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBG) Funds

Surface Transportation Block Grant (previously the Surface Transportation Program) funds are a flexible multi-modal block grant-type program administered by the FHWA. STBG funds provide for a broad range of transportation uses and may be used for projects on the Federal-aid highway system (including the NHS), bridge projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities. Funds are used to implement projects identified in the Regional Transportation Plan and prioritized by the MPO.

MPOs with 200,000 or greater in population receive STBG allocations directly from FHWA whereas smaller MPOs receive their STBG funds through the state DOT. In Oregon, STBG funds are distributed to MPOs under 200,000, cities, and counties based on an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Association of Oregon Counties, League of Oregon Cities,

Figure 5: AAMPO Main Federal Funding Sources



and ODOT. According to this agreement, small MPOs receive STBG funding based on population. The State of Oregon allows jurisdictions within small MPOs to complete fund exchange agreements with ODOT, which allows additional flexibility in how the funds are used. Over the past few years, AAMPO's annual STBG share has been approximately \$750,000. AAMPO commonly chooses to exchange all federal STBG funds through ODOT's state fund exchange. Beginning with 2022 fund allocations, STBG funds can be exchanged with ODOT at a 90% cost basis, meaning AAMPO members receive \$0.90 from ODOT for every STBG dollar exchanged.

### **PL Funds**

FHWA metropolitan planning funds (PL funds) are AAMPO's main source of operational funds. PL funds support MPO operations and tasks outlined in the annual Unified Planning Work Program. This includes developing long-range regional transportation plans, transportation improvement programs, and the planning process in general as described in 23 USC §134.



Currently, PL funds are apportioned to the states based on a ratio of urbanized population in individual states to the total nationwide urbanized area population. In Oregon, ODOT redistributes the state's allocation of PL funding among Oregon's MPOs according to a statewide formula, with lesser amounts provided to the bi-state MPOs. ODOT currently provides the required 10.27% match for Oregon MPOs.

### **5303 Funds**

These FTA metropolitan transit planning funds are intended for multimodal transportation planning in MPO areas. 5303 funds are one of AAMPO's main source of operational funding (the other being PL funds). 5303 funds are apportioned to states by a formula that includes each state's urbanized area population in proportion to the total urbanized area population for the nation, as well as other factors. Similar to the PL funds, the 5303 funds are redistributed by state DOTs to MPOs by statewide formulas. The City of Albany currently provides the required 20% match for these funds through in-kind work related to the MPO.

### **5310 Funds**

FTA 5310 funds are intended to enhance mobility for transit-dependent seniors and persons with disabilities by providing programs beyond traditional public transportation services and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) complementary paratransit services. A portion of each state's 5310 allocation is intended to be spent within MPO areas. MPOs with populations of 200,000 or greater receive these funds directly; however, the funds intended to be spent within smaller MPOs flow through the state DOT.

In Oregon, 5310 Special Transportation Fund (STF) agencies receive the 5310 funds on behalf of the smaller MPOs (with populations less than 200,000). The STF agencies coordinate with MPOs to

determine how 5310 funds will be spent within the MPO area. AAMPO's STF agency is Linn County. Projects selected for funding must be included in a coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan.

### **5307 Funds**

FTA 5307 funding is provided to MPOs for public transportation capital, planning, job access and reverse commute projects. 5307 funds may also be used for operating expenses in MPOs of less than 200,000 or if the system has fewer than 100 buses.

The State of Oregon is the 'Designated Recipient' of these funds for MPOs under 200,000. ODOT sub-allocates these funds to 'Direct Recipients' approved by each MPO. The City of Albany, which operates Albany Transit System, is the Direct Recipient of AAMPO's 5307 funds. The funds should be expended by the City of Albany consistent with the AAMPO regional transportation plan and the guidance provided by the AAMPO Policy Board.

### **Secondary Funding Sources**

The secondary funding sources listed below can be used for planning and project construction in the AAMPO planning area, but unlike primary funds, secondary funds are not received on a consistent basis and can be competitive in nature.

### **Transportation Growth Management Program Grants**

The Transportation Growth Management (TGM) Program is a state fund program administered jointly by ODOT and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD). The TGM program consists of five program areas, including the planning grant program. The planning grant program awards grants on an annual basis to support policy decisions through development of transportation plans or integrated land use and transportation plans. Examples of TGM grant projects include city level transportation system plans (TSPs), downtown plans, bicycle and pedestrian plans, and mobility hub feasibility studies.



### **Discretionary State Transportation Improvement Funds**

State Transportation Improvement Funds (STIF) are used for improving or expanding public transportation service in Oregon. ODOT disburses the majority of STIF funds based on formula allocation. The remaining STIF funds are split into two categories and distributed bi-annually on a competitive basis.

The STIF Discretionary Fund receives 5 percent of STIF funds. ODOT awards Discretionary funds to public transportation service providers based on a competitive grant process.

The STIF Intercommunity Discretionary Fund receives 4 percent of STIF funds. ODOT awards Intercommunity funds to public transportation service providers to improve public transportation between two or more communities based on a competitive grant process.

### **Oregon Community Paths Program**

The Oregon Community Paths (OCP) Program is an ODOT grant program dedicated to helping communities create and maintain connections through multiuse paths. ODOT uses money from the state Multimodal Active Transportation fund and federal Transportation Alternatives Program to fund the OCP program. Grants can be used for project development, construction, reconstruction, major resurfacing or other improvements of multiuse paths that improve access and safety for people walking and bicycling. Grants are awarded on a bi-annual cycle to cities and counties. MPOs cannot apply for OCP grants directly, but can assist member jurisdictions in their grant applications.

### **National Highway Performance Program**

The National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) is administered by the FHWA to support progress toward achievement of national performance goals for improving infrastructure condition, safety, mobility, or freight movement on the national highway system. To meet funding requirements, projects must be on an eligible facility and be consistent with metropolitan and statewide planning requirements. Funds are allocated to the Oregon Department of Transportation annually through a formula methodology.

### **National Highway Freight Program**

The National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) is administered by the FHWA to improve the efficient movement of freight on the National Highway Freight Network. Funds are allocated to the Oregon Department of Transportation annually through a formula methodology.

## **Federal Funding Process**

Federal funds are made available through a specific process, detailed below.

- **Authorizing Legislation:** Congress enacts legislation that establishes or continues the existing operation of a federal program or agency, including the amount of money it anticipates to be available to spend or grant to states, MPOs, and transit operators. Congress generally reauthorizes federal surface transportation programs over multiple years. The amount authorized, however, is not always the amount that ends up actually being available to spend.
- **Appropriations:** Each year, Congress decides on the federal budget for the next fiscal year. As a result of the appropriation process, the amount appropriated to a federal program is often less than the amount authorized for a given year and is the actual amount available to federal agencies to spend or grant.
- **Apportionment:** The distribution of program funds among states and metropolitan areas (for most transit funds) using a formula provided in law is called an apportionment. An

apportionment is usually made on the first day of the federal fiscal year (October 1) for which the funds are authorized. At that time, the funds are available for obligation (spending) by a state, in accordance with an approved STIP. In many cases, the state is the designated recipient for federal transportation funds; in some cases, transit operators are the recipient.

- **Determining Eligibility:** Only certain projects and activities are eligible to receive federal transportation funding. Criteria depend on the funding source.
- **Match:** Most federal transportation programs require a non-federal match. State or local governments must contribute some portion of the project cost. This matching level is established by legislation. For many programs, the amount the state or local governments have to contribute is 20 percent of the capital cost for most highway and transit projects.

## Appendix A: Relationship between the State and MPO long range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs

Oregon's statewide planning process, and AAMPO's place within the process, can be confusing. The relationship between state and MPO long range transportation plans and transportation improvement programs is shown graphically in Figure 6.

All transportation projects stem from long range transportation plans, which are created at both the state and MPO level. MPO's bundle transportation projects that are intended to be completed in the next four years into Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Programs (MTIP).


The MTIP must identify all capital and non-capital surface transportation projects within the MPO planning area that are proposed for federal funding during fiscal years covered by the MTIP. The MTIP must also include any 'regionally significant' projects, whether or not they are proposed for federal funding.

**A MPO's MTIP must be consistent with its long range regional transportation plan (RTP).**

**Federally funded projects** from MTIPs from all MPOs across the state are then packaged together, along with projects being completed outside of MPO planning areas, to create the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). **Note that projects that are not federally funded are not included in the STIP.** Just as a MTIP must be consistent with a MPO's RTP, the STIP must be consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP), the state's long range transportation system plan.

Once projects from across the state are packaged in the STIP, it is sent to the FHWA and FTA for review and approval. Once approved, funds are released to individual MPO members and non MPO-areas to implement projects in the STIP and MTIPs.

**Figure 6: Relationship of RTP, MTIP, OTP, and STIP**



**Oregon Transportation Plan (OTP):** Long-range (20 year) transportation system plan for the state. It establishes a vision and policy foundation to guide transportation system development and investment. Also referred to as a State Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP).

**Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP):** Detailed project list showing how federal funds will be spent over a 4 year period, it is a mechanism to focus and prioritize the short-term schedule and funding programming for the improvements identified in the OTP. The STIP must be consistent with the Oregon Transportation Plan.

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP):** Long-range (20 year) transportation system plan for a MPO. RTPs are updated every 4 or 5 years. RTPs establish a vision and goals to guide transportation system development and investment, they also identify projects to be completed over the next 20 years.

**Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP):** Detailed project list showing how federal funds will be spent over a 4 year period, it is a mechanism to focus and prioritize the short-term schedule and funding programming for the improvements identified in the RTP. The MTIP must be consistent with the MPO's Regional Transportation Plan. Often referred to as simply the "Transportation Improvement Program", or TIP.

## AAMPO Board Chairmanship History

### Bylaws Section 5: Officers and Duties

#### A. Selection and Terms of Chair and Vice Chair

The Policy Board shall select a Chair and Vice Chair at its first meeting. Thereafter, the Policy Board shall select a Chair and Vice Chair at the first meeting of each calendar year. In the absence of the Chair, or upon her/his inability to act or serve, the Vice Chair shall have the powers of the Chair. The Chair shall not serve for more than two consecutive years.

#### B. Duties

The Chair shall preside at and be responsible for the conduct at all meetings. The Chair shall be available for consultation by MPO staff on the development of meeting agendas and shall also serve as a liaison with the TAC and any other advisory group as the need arises.

#### C. Alternates

In the absence of the Chair from a Policy Board meeting, his or her alternate may sit only as a voting member of the Committee and the Vice Chair will preside over the meeting. In the absence of both the Chair and Vice-Chair at a Policy Board meeting, the MPO staff shall preside.

Year	Chair	Vice-Chair
2013	Floyd Collins (Albany)	Roger Nyquist (Linn County)
2014	Floyd Collins (Albany)	Roger Nyquist (Linn County)
2015	Roger Nyquist (Linn County)	Dave Beyerl (Jefferson)
2016	Roger Nyquist (Linn County)	Dave Beyerl (Jefferson)
2017	Roger Nyquist (Linn County)	Dave Beyerl (Jefferson)
2018	Dave Beyerl (Jefferson)	Ray Kopczynski (Albany)
2019	Dave Beyerl (Jefferson)	Bill Coburn (Albany)
2020	Pat Malone (Benton County)	Darrin Lane (Citizens' Representative)
2021	Pat Malone (Benton County)	Darrin Lane (Citizens' Representative)
2022	Darrin Lane (Citizens' Representative)	Ray Kopczynski (Albany)

**AAMPO Linn Benton Loop Representative History**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Representative</b>
2016	Rodger Nyquist
2017	Rodger Nyquist
2018	Rodger Nyquist
2019	Rodger Nyquist
2020	Rodger Nyquist
2021	Rodger Nyquist
2022	Rodger Nyquist

# 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:** January 9, 2023  
**To:** AAMPO TAC & Policy Board  
**From:** Billy McGregor, AAMPO Transportation Planner  
**Re:** Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Revisions

### Action Requested

Recommendation by TAC for Policy Board regarding Approval of Amendment(s) or Additional Public Outreach Requirements.

### Overview

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an update on recent revisions to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) relevant to the Albany Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (AAMPO). A summary table of recent revisions can be found on the following page.

### Background on the STIP and MTIP

The STIP is the Oregon Department of Transportation's capital improvement plan for state and federally funded transportation projects. The current STIP (FY2021-2024) went into effect October 1, 2020 and expires September 30, 2024. AAMPO acts as the regional coordinator to the STIP helping ensure that revisions and other adjustments are processed appropriately. AAMPO also maintains a Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) which is consistent with the STIP.

### Revision Types

There are three types of STIP and MTIP revisions processed by AAMPO, listed below. Additional details on STIP and MTIP amendments can be found in the AAMPO MTIP policy [HERE](#).

- **Full Amendments:** Require the greatest level of scrutiny and are brought to the Policy Board for discussion and approval. The TAC makes a recommendation to the Policy Board regarding approval of the amendment and also determines what level 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 notification requirements. Additional items for consideration include provision of a public comment period (two weeks), holding a public meeting, and any other actions deemed advisable by the TAC.
- **Administrative Amendment:** Require less scrutiny and are usually familiar to local staff members. Administrative amendments are brought to the TAC for discussion and approval. The Policy Board is notified of Administrative Amendments at their next regularly scheduled meeting.
- **Adjustment:** For minor changes, AAMPO staff has the authority to approve adjustments. Adjustments do not require committee approval or public notice.

## STIP Revisions

Row	Revision Type	Project Key Number/s & Name/s	Project Description	Revision Information
1	Full Amendment  Seeks to create a new copy of same project.  30 day public comment period initiated 12/15/2022, will run through 1/14/2022 (as required by ODOT)	23143  Albany area MPO planning SFY23	Albany area MPO planning funds for Federal fiscal year 2022. Projects will be selected in the future through the MPO process.	Create a new project K23143.  Add new project, same ID as original, moving the Preliminary Engineering from the 2024-2027 STIP for delivery in federal fiscal year 2023.  Project will keep the same description of "Replace the bridge with one that meets current standards."
2	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	21731  OR164: Jefferson (Santiam River) Bridge	Strengthen the bridge and overlay the bridge driving surface to ensure continued safety.	Increase the Construction phase by \$633,339 for a total of \$6,072,439 using Bridge Program funds. AT Leverage funds will be reduced by \$559,000 and Fix-It SW Bridge funds will be increased by \$1,222,339.
3	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22223  FY24 Loop Operations (AAMPO)	Albany Area MPO (5307) funds for loop operations projects to improve traffic flow.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.
4	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22224  FY24 Loop Preventative Maintenance (AAMPO)	Funds (5307) for loop operations projects to improve traffic flow.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.

# 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



5	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22242  FY24 ATS/PT Operations	Funds (5307) used to operate Albany Transit System and paratransit for access to health, employment, shopping, and recreation for the community.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.
6	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22243  FY24 ATS/PT Preventative Maintenance	Funds (5307) used for regular maintenance and repair of Albany Transit System (ATS) buses to ensure vehicle reliability, longevity, and passenger safety.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.
7	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22244  FY24 ATS 1% for Safety	Funds (5307) used to improve safety.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.
8	Full Amendment  Two-week public notice period from 1/10/23-1/24/23	22249  FY24 First 20% ATS ADA Paratransit Operations	Funds (5307) used for ADA complimentary paratransit service for equal access for seniors and disabled throughout the community.	Project is being canceled from the current STIP. It is a duplicate entry and will remain in the draft 2024-2027 STIP.

# 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:** January 12, 2023  
**To:** AAMPO Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Billy McGregor, AAMPO Transportation Planner  
**Re: Regional Transportation Plan: Draft Objectives**

This memorandum contains an overview of draft objectives prepared for the 2043 AAMPO Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

### Background

Project selection in the RTP will be guided in part by the MPO's preferred goals for 2043. The MPO has pulled five applicable objectives for each goal from a pool of 127, taken from five local transportation system plans (TSPs). An order of importance/significance has not yet been determined.

### Suggested Objectives

The following are the seven goals based on categories defined by the federal government and determined most important to the region by the TAC, with five objectives associated to each goal. The objectives are taken from local Transportation System Plans within AAMPO's region. Objective language has been changed to more appropriately represent the AAMPO region (ie. Replacing county with AAMPO, etc)

**Goal 1: Accessibility** – Provide an equitable transportation system that ensures mobility for all members of the community.

- a) Confirm or revise city transportation design standards (as needed) to help ensure that they meet the requirements set forth in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- b) Identify improvements that complement pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities, and that encourage increased use of these facilities.
- c) Ensure that the transportation system provides equitable access to underserved and vulnerable populations (e.g. those who cannot obtain their own transportation due to a disability, age, or income).
- d) Provide a complete pedestrian and bicycle network throughout the city that provides connectivity and access to transit facilities and services.
- e) Identify areas that support additional transit services, and coordinate with transit providers to improve the coverage, quality and frequency of services

**Goal 2: Safety/Security** – Support a safe and comfortable transportation system for all travel modes.

- a) Manage access to highways, arterials, and collectors where practical to improve safety, and to reduce congestion and conflicting travel patterns. Support consolidated and shared access points.
- b) Ensure an adequate truck route network to reduce commercial/neighborhood conflicts.
- c) Install amenities at signalized pedestrian crossings to improve safety of underserved and vulnerable populations (e.g., chirpers, tactile crossings).

- d) Prioritize projects that improve safety for all users and identify opportunities for including system management solutions.
- e) Implement streetscape projects that enhance the comfort and aesthetics of the surrounding environment, promoting safe active transportation modes.

**Goal 3: Connectivity** – Ensure the transportation system meets existing and future needs through wholistic, context sensitive multimodal solutions.

- a) Add local streets, as identified in AAMPO Member's adopted TSPs, to increase connectivity.
- b) Identify necessary changes to the land development code to ensure connectivity between compatible land uses for pedestrian and bicycle trips.
- c) Improve existing connections and create new connections between households and schools, parks, transit stops, employers, neighborhood commercial centers, health and social services and other essential destinations.
- d) Reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through improved connectivity where “barriers” exist (such as Interstate 5, railroads, waterways, incomplete connections).
- e) Preserve and protect corridors of local and regional significance that are identified for vehicular and non-vehicular routes.

**Goal 4: Efficiency** – Partner with local and state agencies on regional transportation issues.

- a) Work with neighboring jurisdictions to identify and promote opportunities to commute to and around the AAMPO extended region by means other than single occupant vehicles.
- b) Pursue grants and collaboration with other agencies to efficiently fund transportation improvements and programs
- c) Support statewide and regional transit opportunities, including high-speed rail and passenger rail.
- d) Coordinate transit services, facilities, and improvements with local jurisdictions within AAMPO.
- e) Coordinate regional project development and implementation with local jurisdictions (e.g., evacuation routes, countywide transit, and jurisdictional transfer of roadways).

**Goal 5: Economy** – Ensure the transportation system supports a prosperous local and regional economy that leverages strengths to compete globally.

- a) Improve the freight system efficiency, access, capacity and reliability.
- b) Identify transportation improvements that will enhance access to employment.
- c) Reduce system lifecycle costs through advanced planning (maintenance and preservation).
- d) Maintain the existing transportation system assets to preserve their intended function and maintain their useful life.
- e) Consider the needs of the population that are unable to afford housing in close proximity to employment and daily needs in the project selection process.

**Goal 6: Environmental** – Plan and design a transportation system to enhance livability and supports positive environmental health outcomes.

- a) Minimize negative transportation related impacts to the scenic, natural, and cultural resources within the AAMPO region.

- b) Maintain acceptable roadway and intersection operations where feasible considering environmental, land use, and topographical factors.
- c) Improve health and wellness of the general population by increasing active transportation choices and access to care facilities.
- d) Reduce total lifecycle CO<sub>2</sub>, toxin, and air contaminants created by the transportation system.
- e) Support access to public spaces and encourage active transportation and social interaction.

**Goal 7: Travel/Tourism** – Provide an efficient transportation system that facilitates the local and regional multimodal movement of people and goods.

- a) Support travel options that allow individuals to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips
- b) Prioritize projects that support a comfortable and inviting downtown to promote regional tourism.
- c) Support connectivity between the various communities within the county and nearby (e.g. Harrisburg and Mill City).
- d) Minimize conflicts along high volume and/or high speed corridors.
- e) Adopt a standard for mobility to help maintain a minimum level of freight and/or motor vehicle travel efficiency and by which land use amendments and development proposals can be evaluated.

### **Next Steps**

Staff requests feedback on the draft objectives from Technical Advisory Committee members before sharing with the Policy Board.