

ATTACHMENT 2

CLMPO STP-U PROCESS:

PRESERVATION, PROJECT DEVELOPMENT and MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES

Program 65% of annual STP-U funds for Preservation, Project Development and Modernization activities across all modes

Ideally program STP-U funds in 2-3 year cycles

Limit each jurisdiction to 2 funding applications per fiscal year

Fund (large project) regional priorities across fiscal years, if necessary & possible

Fund projects where “overhead” cost of using STP-U funds is minimized — either projects where overhead cost=\$0, or large projects. Discourage projects of less than \$200,000 when overhead cost will be incurred.

Policy Board establishes MPO’s regional priorities for each funding cycle

Refine evaluation criteria for each funding cycle to address regional priorities

STP-U FUNDING OBJECTIVES

To enhance the flexible use of the regional STP-U funds and assist in ranking diverse types of project applications, establish a methodology that considers a combination of technical and policy considerations.

- Establish evaluation criteria that guide staff, CAC and MPC to recommendations and decisions that are objective, with the understanding that open consideration of funding applications including both technical and policy considerations allows for adjustments to arrive at the most appropriate use of the regional funds.
- Maintaining one “pot” of funds for these activity types allows the region to evaluate diverse projects, maintain flexibility while programming funds, and ultimately put the flexible regional funds to their best use.
- The application process would provide different applications tailored for discrete activity areas, such as:
 - Roadway Modernization
 - Roadway Preservation
 - Project Development
 - Transit Activities
 - Bicycle Projects
 - Pedestrian Projects
 - Freight Projects
- Across time strive to maintain jurisdictional and geographic fairness.
- The goal is to bring the best regional projects forward. Structure process so that each local jurisdiction is able to submit their 2 highest-priority funding applications per year that will compete well in the evaluation process while supporting the MPO’s identified regional priorities for the funding cycle.
- Structure funding application forms/process so that all applicants provide consistent information across applications.

Establish consistent eligibility/screening criteria

SCREENING/ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

- List in, or consistent with, financially constrained RTP
- Ability to utilize funds in FY programmed
- For eligible purpose under Federal guidelines (see Attachment 3)
- Must provide minimum required matching funds
- Sufficiency of identified funding to complete project/phase

For each 2-3 year programming cycle, Policy Board would establish priorities, and, if desired, “Targets” for funding within each year or over cycle. Targets could include:

| <u>Targets by Mode</u> | <u>Targets by Purpose</u> | <u>Target Specific Need</u> |
|------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| Roadway | Modernization | Target a specific major regional need (single project or program) such as filling funding gap for significant regional project |
| Transit | Preservation | |
| Bicycle | Project Development | |
| Pedestrian | Transit Operations | |
| Freight | | |

Within single pot of funds (65% of annual STP-U revenues), conduct initial evaluation and narrowing of applications within discrete activity areas (as listed at left), relying primarily on technical considerations (see “Process” box below)

Technical/quantitative criteria would be scored wherever possible to facilitate comparison across applications within an individual activity area. Criteria may include, as applicable:

- See Attachment 4 for examples

The application forms would also require qualitative information, such as:

- Description of need or problem addressed
- How project addresses MPO’s regional priorities
- Amount of match provided
- Assessment of potential STP-U “overhead cost”
- Specific benefits of project
- “Cost” of not doing activity/project (or description of opportunity lost)

OUTLINE OF EVALUATION PROCESS

- The draft technical recommendation will be developed by staff based primarily on technical considerations
- TPC will make a recommendation based on this information
- The CAC will review the technical recommendation, and, in combination with other considerations, develop a CAC recommendation
- Both the TPC and CAC recommendations will narrow the application set within the discrete activity areas (as described at left)
- The goal of both the TPC and CAC recommendations will be to narrow the recommended applications to no more than 150% of the available funding
- The Policy Board will consider the TPC & CAC recommendations, request additional information as needed and adjust the application set as desired
- The Policy Board will then solicit public input
- After the public comment period, the Policy Board will make a final funding decision