

DRAFT



***Central Lane TMA
Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program
Fiscal Years 2005-2007***

Lane Council of Governments
99 E. Broadway, Suite 400
Eugene, Oregon 97401-3111
(541) 682-4283
www.lcog.org

November 2004

DRAFT

DRAFT

*Central Lane TMA
Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program
FY 2005 to FY 2007*

Published by
Lane Council of Governments
99 East Broadway, Suite 400
Eugene, Oregon 97401-3111

This report was financed in part by the Oregon Department of Transportation,
the Federal Highway Administration, and the Federal Transit Administration.

DRAFT

DRAFT

DRAFT

Table of Contents

Introduction..... 1

TIP Requirements 1

 Federal Requirements 2

 Time Period..... 2

 Financial Constraint..... 2

 Allocation of Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) Funds 2

 Relationship Between MTIP and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)..... 3

1990 Clean Air Act Amendments..... 3

Development and Modification of the MTIP 4

Project Lists 5

 Description of Project Listings 5

 Note on Locally Funded Projects..... 7

Demonstration of Financial Constraint..... 7

 Table 2: FY04-06 MTIP Financial Constraint Assessment.....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

Appendix A: STP-U Fund Allocation Process 21

Appendix B: Air Quality Exemptions and Regionally Significant Project Description 32

 Exempt Projects 32

 Table 2 - Exempt projects 32

 Projects exempt from regional emissions analyses..... 33

 Table 3 - Projects Exempt From Regional Emissions Analyses 34

Appendix C: Transportation Committees of the Central Lane MPO 38

Appendix D: Financial Resources 42

 Federal Sources..... 42

 State Sources..... 43

 Local Sources..... 43

Appendix E: Project Location Map**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

DRAFT

Introduction

The Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) is a listing of transportation improvements scheduled in the Central Lane Transportation Management Area (TMA) during fiscal years 2005-2007. The MTIP lists federally funded and locally funded projects that comprise construction and operational improvements anticipated by local agencies and the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT).

The MTIP contains a three-year listing of anticipated expenditures for locally funded projects drawn from the capital improvement programs of Eugene, Springfield, Coburg, Lane County, Lane Transit District, and ODOT. In addition, the MTIP lists projects for which application of specific federal funds will be made in the next three years. Priorities for the use of federal Surface Transportation Program–Urban (STP-U) funds are established during development of the MTIP.

Projects included in the MTIP for receipt of federal funds must also be included in or consistent with the region's long-range transportation plan. As such, the MTIP is an important tool in guiding the implementation of the region's long-term goals and addressing the region's long-range transportation needs.

By adopting the MTIP, the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) has selected the projects identified in Table 1, *Programmed Projects by Year*, for implementation and funding as scheduled. No additional action by MPC is required for the funding of these projects. The schedule of projects utilizes all of the anticipated federal funds as quickly as possible. If additional funds become available or if a project experiences an unexpected delay, MPC may select other projects from the first three years of the schedule to take advantage of the additional funds or to replace a delayed project.

MTIP Requirements

Federal legislation requires that Central Lane TMA, the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the region, in cooperation with the state and transit operators, develop a MTIP that is updated and approved at least every two years by MPC and the Governor. Copies of the MTIP are provided to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Specific requirements for the MTIP are outlined in various implementation rules developed by FHWA, FTA, and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This section of the MTIP provides a brief explanation of these requirements.

Federal Requirements

Regulations developed to help guide the implementation of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) specify several requirements:

Time Period

The MTIP must cover a period of not less than three years, but may cover a longer period if it identifies priorities and financial information for the additional years. As a minimum, the priority list must group the projects that are to be undertaken in each of the years. The MTIP must include all federally funded projects (including pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities, and transportation enhancement projects) to be funded under Title 23 and the Federal Transit Act and regionally significant projects. In addition, the MTIP must be consistent with funding that is expected to be available during the relevant period, and projects in the MTIP must be consistent with the long-range transportation plan. There must be reasonable opportunity for public comment prior to approval.

Financial Constraint

The MTIP must be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources. Only projects for which funds are reasonably expected to be available can be included in the MTIP.

Allocation of Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U) Funds

As part of the transition to Transportation Management Area (TMA) status, the Central Lane MPO is required to develop a process for allocating the MPO's Federal Surface Transportation Program Urban (STP-U) funds. STP-U funds are allocated and programmed for eligible projects at the discretion of the MPO, following federal guidelines. These federal funds must be matched with local funds or other non-federal funds at a minimum currently set by congress at 10.27 percent of the total funding. In other words, a project totaling \$100,000 would have a local match of \$10,270 and a federal STP-U component of \$89,730.

A process was developed for the use of a set of screening or eligibility criteria and a set of evaluation criteria to be applied to applications for STP-U funding. MPC approved the criteria and target funding levels for 4 categories of need. Appendix A provides additional details on the STP-U fund allocation process. The application form developed for this process is presented in Figure A-1.

DRAFT

Relationship Between MTIP and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

The frequency and cycle for updating the MTIP must be compatible with Oregon's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) development and approval process. After approval of the MTIP by MPC and the Governor, the MTIP must be included without modification directly or by reference in the STIP. The portion of the STIP in metropolitan planning area shall be developed by the Central Lane TMA in cooperation with ODOT.

1990 Clean Air Act Amendments

On November 15, 1990, amendments to the Clean Air Act (Act) were approved by the federal government. On June 7, 1991, the EPA and the U.S. Department of Transportation issued guidance for determining conformance of transportation programs with the Act during this interim period. On July 16, 1991, these interim guidelines were provided to the MPOs in Oregon. New, final conformity guidelines were issued in November 1991.

On March 3, 1995 the Environmental Quality Commission (EQC) adopted new rules regarding the air quality conformity of transportation plans, programs and projects to federal and state implementation plans. These new rules establish criteria and procedures for determining such conformity. The state rule mirrors, and in some instances is more stringent than, the federal rule. By meeting the state standards for purposes of demonstrating air quality conformity, the federal standards are also met.

The Central Lane TMA region has been redesignated to attainment status for CO and is in the required maintenance period (1994-2014). There has not been a violation of the CO standards since 1980. Demonstration requirements in the state rule include conformity analysis for the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the MTIP; and projects contained in the MTIP. This conformity analysis is required to show that any additions to the transportation system do not jeopardize the region's attainment and maintenance of the air quality standards. Specifically, the state rule states that demonstration of conformity for CO be consistent with the motor vehicle emissions budget.

The Eugene-Springfield PM₁₀ Statewide Implementation Program established that emissions from motor vehicles are not a significant contributing factor to overall PM₁₀ emissions and concludes that control of emissions from motor vehicles is not necessary to demonstrate attainment with the PM₁₀ standards. EPA has approved and concurred that Plan and MTIP conformity determinations for PM₁₀ are not required. There has not been an exceedance of the PM₁₀ standards in this area since 1987. The Lane Regional Air

DRAFT

Pollution Authority (LRAPA) is in the process of applying to the federal Environmental Protection Agency for a redesignation to attainment status for PM₁₀.

Regional emissions analysis is required on regionally significant projects (Appendix B) located within the Central Area Transportation Study (CATS) boundary. The CATS area encompasses the greater downtown Eugene area and is bounded by 5th Avenue on the north, 19th Avenue on the south, Lincoln Street on the west, and Agate Street on the east. EPA has determined that the nature of the CO problem in the Central Lane area is limited to the CATS boundary. All transportation projects within the Central Lane Air Quality Maintenance Area (approximately the Eugene/Springfield UGBs) are subject to the “project-level conformity” requirements.

The Conformity Analysis for the FY05-07 MTIP has been completed. The Conformity Determination will be approved following adoption of the MTIP. The MPO Policy Board is expected to approve the determination on December 30, 2004. The results of the Conformity analysis are as follows:

**Carbon Monoxide Emissions Analysis
within the CATS boundary**

Analysis Year	Tons/Year of Carbon Monoxide	
	SIP motor vehicle budget	Projected Emissions
		All facilities
1990	6,021*	
2002 (Base Year)		2,033
2007 (MTIP Horizon)		1,336
2015		982
2025 (RTP Horizon)		891

* Established emissions budget based on Federal Register, Vol. 58, No. 232, Page 64163, December 6, 1993.

Development and Modification of the MTIP

The draft Central Lane area MTIP was developed by the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC), the regional staff group which is responsible for most of the technical details of the transportation planning process. The TPC assembled the MTIP from the adopted capital improvement programs (CIPs) of the participating agencies.

TPC recommends the MTIP to the MPC for review and adoption. As the Central Lane TMA policy body, MPC, which is composed of elected or appointed officials from Eugene, Springfield, Lane County, Lane Transit District, Coburg and ODOT, conducts a public hearing and adopts the MTIP. Membership of the TPC and the MPC is shown in Appendix C.

DRAFT

The MTIP may be modified by the MPC. TPC may make specific changes determined to be administrative in nature. These include:

1. Deletions of local projects which are provided for information purposes,
2. Moving projects from one year to another year in the MTIP period or
3. Minor cost estimate revisions that do not affect financial constraint of the MTIP or the MTIP's air quality conformity.

Proposals for additions or deletions of regionally significant or federally funded projects must be approved by MPC.

Project Lists

Two tables are presented in this document. Table 1 presents the list of Projects by agency and by year, including federally funded projects. Projects in this Table are consistent with Regional Transportation Plan policy and include local projects that implement the RTP. This Table also indicates if the project is included within the area for which the regional emissions analysis must be conducted for purposes of air quality conformity (the "CATS" area). Local projects may be *exempt* from regional emissions under the Oregon Conformity Rulings (see Appendix B). A local project may be considered to be a regionally insignificant project or may be outside of the regional emissions analysis area. . The TPC, as the standing committee for air quality under the Oregon Conformity Rulings, has established criteria for determining regionally significant projects (see Appendix B). For more details, see the corresponding air quality conformity determination.

Table 2 provides a summary of the demonstration of financial constraint. Financial constraint is described in more detail in the section titled "Demonstration of Financial Constraint" below.

Description of Project Listings

This section describes the information provided in Table 1. Individual projects vary enough that their descriptions are necessarily general. For street projects, all are assumed to be urban cross-section with curb, gutter, underground drainage, and sidewalks, unless otherwise noted. When provisions for bicycles are anticipated, they are specifically mentioned.

Total and *federal cost* columns indicate the costs for engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and actual construction, or whatever the project description indicates. Costs are only estimates, although some are more refined than others.

Funding source refers to the agencies expected to participate in the project. In some cases, funding agreements have not yet been finalized so agencies listed will

DRAFT

not necessarily participate in the project listed. A description of the various funding sources is provided in Appendix D. Meanings of the abbreviations used in MTIP tables are as follows:

A	Assessment of adjacent property owners
C	City of Coburg
D	Private Developer
E	City of Eugene
F	Federal Funding
FD	Federal Demonstration Funds
HBR	Highway Bridge Replacement Funds
HCB	High Cost Bridge Projects
HES	Hazard Elimination
IOF	Immediate Opportunity Funds
LC	Lane County
LCOG	Lane Council of Governments
LTD	Lane Transit District
O	Oregon Department of Transportation
OTIA	Oregon Transportation Investment Act
RRP	Rail-Highway Protection (off-system)
RRS	Rail-Highway Protection (on-system)
S	City of Springfield
S5303	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Metropolitan Planning Program
S5307	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Formula Funds
S5309	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Capital Program
S5310	Federal Transit Act (FTA), Elderly and Persons with Disabilities
SBR	Special Bridge Replacement
SDC	System Development Charge
STF	Special Transportation Fund
STP	Surface Transportation Program Funding
STP(E)	Surface Transportation Program Enhancement Funding
TEA-21	Transportation Equity Act for the 21 st Century
TSM	Federal Transportation Systems Management Grants
WEP	West Eugene Parkway

Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County have remonstrance clauses in their charters that may allow property owners to object to assessments on some types of street projects. Thus, anticipated assessments on some projects may not materialize.

The RTP *project number* provides an indication of the consistency of the project with the long-range plan. A number indicates that the project was specifically identified in the 2004-2025 RTP, adopted on December 9, 2004, and corresponds to its project number. For projects not specifically identified in the RTP, an RTP policy is indicated to demonstrate consistency with the plan.

DRAFT

Note on Locally Funded Projects

Each metropolitan area has the option of including other projects (projects not applying for federal funds) in the MTIP. For purposes of providing comprehensive information on transportation improvements programmed for the Central Lane area, an attempt has been made to include all major transportation projects in Table 1. Improvements to minor streets and maintenance activities were excluded. The local projects listed in Table 1 are based upon the currently adopted local CIPs, the approved FY04-07 STIP, and the draft FY06-09 STIP.

Demonstration of Financial Constraint

As indicated above, ISTEA and TEA-21 require that the MTIP be financially constrained by year. Specifically, the MTIP:

“shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources”

The financial plan must be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the state and the transit operator. ODOT and the Lane Transit District must provide the MPO with estimates of available federal and state funds, which the MPO must utilize in developing financial plans. Only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included. Projects in the first two years of the MTIP must be limited to those for which funds are available or committed. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability must be identified. In developing the financial analysis, the MPO must take into account all projects and strategies funded under title 23, U.S.C., the Federal Transit Act, other federal funds, local sources, state assistance, and private participation.

Table 2 below provides a summary of the financial analysis and demonstrates that the MTIP is financially constrained. Revenues in the first two years are committed, as programmed in the capital improvement programs of the local and state jurisdictions.

DRAFT

Table 2: FY05-07 MTIP Financial Constraint Assessment				
				Total
Description	FY05	FY06	FY07	FY05 - FY07
Total Revenue	\$79,316,549	\$82,647,170	\$23,420,000	\$185,383,719
Total Expenditures	\$79,316,549	\$82,647,170	\$23,420,000	\$185,383,719
Difference Between Revenues & Expenditures	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Statement of MTIP Financial Constraint: Each project included in the Fiscal Constraint list of the Central Lane MPO FY05-07 MTIP has an identified funding source or combination of sources reasonably expected to be available over the planning period.				

DRAFT

Insert project list pgs 9-18

-- see MPC 3a – Attachment 2

DRAFT

Appendix A
STP-U Allocation Process

DRAFT

DRAFT

Appendix A: STP-U Fund Allocation Process

As part of the transition to Transportation Management Area (TMA) status, the Central Lane MPO is required to develop a process for allocating the MPO's Federal Surface Transportation Program Urban (STP-U) funds. STP-U funds are allocated and programmed for eligible projects at the discretion of the MPO, following federal guidelines. These federal funds must be matched with local funds or other non-federal funds at a minimum currently set by congress at 10.27 percent of the total funding. In other words, a project totaling \$100,000 would have a local match of \$10,270 and a federal STP-U component of \$89,730.

A process was developed for the use of a set of screening or eligibility criteria and a set of evaluation criteria to be applied to applications for STP-U funding. MPC approved the criteria and target funding levels for 4 categories of need. This appendix provides additional details on the STP-U fund allocation process. The application form developed for this process is presented in Figure A-1.

Initial Screening Or Eligibility Criteria

A proposal must meet all three of the following criteria to be considered for STP-U funding in the time frame of the MTIP update:

1. Included in, or consistent with, the long-range financially constrained Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The project must be either:

- Included on the financially constrained project list (e.g. a specific street, bike path, or transit project), or capable of being added to the list by amending the Plan within the MTIP time frame;

or

- Included within a broader category of projects or planning and program actions described in the Plan (e.g. pavement preservation projects, planning activities, TDM programs, etc).

2. Eligible for STP-U funding based on federal guidelines. The project or program must meet the criteria of TEA-21 (see attached excerpt of federal guidelines for STP-U funding). Most projects within the Central Lane MPO are likely to fit one of the following categories:

- Transportation improvement projects for any surface transportation mode (streets, bridges, bike facilities, sidewalks, transit facilities, traffic operational improvements, etc.)--most of these kinds of projects could also be described as "modernization" projects

DRAFT

- Capital preservation projects such as street overlays and reconstruction (*Note: If the project includes improvement or preservation of a street or road, it must be a collector or arterial. Local streets are not eligible for STP-U funding.*)
- Ongoing or one-time programs such as TDM and transportation planning programs needed to help implement the policies, programs, and projects of the adopted Plan.

3. Capable of being implemented within the MTIP time frame. Projects should be capable of being implemented during the fiscal year for which they are proposed in the MTIP. At a minimum, the federal STP-U funding for a project must be obligated (i.e. officially encumbered through state and federal processes) no later than the end of the designated fiscal year.

Factors To Consider In Prioritizing Projects For STP-U Funding

Projects and program proposals will be evaluated for relative priority based on consideration of the following three factors:

1. The ability of the proposal to leverage other public or private funding. Examples might include other federal funds, local matching funds beyond the required match amount, provision of project right-of-way, or provision of private funding from developers or other private sources.
2. The extent to which the proposal addresses one or more of the adopted RTP policies. Each proposed project will be assessed for the degree to which it responds to one or more of the adopted policies in the RTP. Some of the policies are likely to be more useful than others for the process of evaluating potential projects to receive STP-U funds – for example:
 - Policies which provide overall, strategic guidance for one side of the Transportation Triangle--such as Land Use Policy #1: Nodal Development; Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Policy #1: TDM Program Development; and Transportation System Improvements (TSI) Policy #1: Transportation Infrastructure Protection and Management.
 - Policies which emphasize the importance of moving forward with implementation for particular modes or program areas--such as TSI Transit Policy #2: Bus Rapid Transit; and TSI Bicycle Policy #4: Priority Bikeways.
 - Finance Policies, which form the "base" on which the Transportation Triangle rests, and particularly those finance policies which focus on allocation of specific resources – such as Finance Policy #3: Prioritization of State and Federal Revenue; and Finance Policy #5: Short-term Project Priorities.

Many other RTP policies may also be relevant to particular projects, while some of the policies, though important for other purposes, may not be directly useful for this exercise of allocating STP-U funds.

DRAFT

3. The extent to which the proposal addresses one or more of the adopted RTP Alternative Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Performance Measures. During the RTP adoption process, a set of Alternative TPR Performance Measures was developed and incorporated as a key component of the plan. These measures focus on aspects of plan performance judged most likely to have a positive impact on future reductions in vehicle miles of travel per capita. Each proposed project will be assessed for the degree to which it responds to specific alternative performance measures.

Scoring System For Evaluation Of Proposals

Various methods can be used to rate and compare the relative merits of proposed projects for STP-U funding, using the criteria discussed above. The two main options are some form of purely relative scoring such as High, Medium, or Low ratings for each criterion; or a point system that assigns a numeric score for each project's rating under each of the criteria. Based on discussions to date, staff would suggest the use of a simple point system, with the following preliminary ranges for each of the prioritizing factors:

1. Priority Factor 1, Leverage: A score of up to 20 points is possible for this criterion, in order to recognize the value of additional funding beyond the minimum match requirement without giving this factor too large a weight in comparison to the policies or performance measures. Points would be assigned to each project based on how much local or "other," non-STP-U funding is available for the project above the minimum match requirement of approximately 10 percent. For example:

- 10 percent match is provided – no extra points, since this much local match is required for any STP-U project
- 20 percent match – 5 points
- 30 percent match – 10 points
- 40 percent match – 15 points
- 50 percent match – 20 points (recommended upper limit for this measure)

2. Priority Factor 2, RTP Policies: A score of up to 60 points is possible for this criterion, in view of the importance of using the adopted policies in the plan for guiding decisions on funding priorities. Points would be assigned to each project based on how many RTP policies the project directly addresses. For example:

DRAFT

- 5 points for each policy that would be directly impacted by the project in a positive manner
- No more than two policies (10 points) would be counted within the same topic heading (i.e. Land Use, TDM, TSI, Roadway, Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian, Goods Movement, Other Modes, Finance)
- Maximum of 60 points for this factor

3. Priority Factor 3, RTP Alternative TPR Performance Measures: A score of up to 20 points is possible on this criterion, based on the significance of the alternative measures within the overall scope of plan performance and monitoring. Since the alternative measures focus on a narrower range of actions and outcomes than the comprehensive set of concerns addressed by the policies, this factor is not given as much weight as Priority Factor 2, Policies. Points would be assigned to each project based on how many alternative measures the project directly addresses. For example:

- 5 points for each alternative measure the project helps to advance
- Maximum of 20 points for this factor

The maximum possible total score summed across all three priority factors for any project would be 100 points.

Adaptation of Criteria for City of Coburg Projects

An adaptation of the criteria scoring system for City of Coburg project applications was provided. Because the City of Coburg was not part of the process that developed and adopted the RTP, it is in a different position than the other MPO member jurisdictions that were part of that process. For example, while one or more RTP policies and one of the APMs directly refer to designated “Priority Bikeway Miles,” there are no priority bikeway miles within Coburg’s jurisdiction. There are other examples where the adopted RTP policies or APMs simply do not apply to Coburg, or can not be measured within Coburg’s current transportation system framework.

For this reason, instead of evaluating Coburg projects against RTP policies, those project proposals have been evaluated against the policies contained in Coburg’s adopted Transportation System Plan (TSP). Similar to how the RTP policies also serve a dual role as the TSP policies for Eugene and Springfield, Coburg’s TSP policies directly reflect the local priorities and goals of that jurisdiction. The scoring system for this criteria could be applied exactly the same against both RTP policies and the Coburg TSP policies – there are a total of 38 adopted policies in the RTP and 36 adopted policies in the Coburg TSP.

Staff is also recommending a substitute for directly evaluating the Coburg projects against the RTP’s alternative performance measures. Of the six APMs in the RTP which projects may earn points for supporting, three could be applied to Coburg projects (with one minor modification). These three are Percent Non-Auto Trips, Percent Transit Mode

DRAFT

Share on Congested Corridors and Priority Bikeway Miles (assuming for the sake of evaluation that any bikeway projects in Coburg at this time would qualify under this criteria). The remaining three RTP APMs all relate to nodal development, which is not an adopted strategy in Coburg. To substitute for these three APMs in the case of Coburg projects, staff is recommending that Coburg projects that can be shown to be supportive of mixed-use, pedestrian and alternative modes friendly development should receive points under this evaluation criteria. This alternative approach to evaluating Coburg projects against the APMs would allow Coburg projects to potentially score five points for supporting each of four “APM Measures” for a potential maximum on this criteria of 20 points, the same maximum as all other jurisdictions’ projects could score.

Using this point system, each proposal would be scored and then its total point value would be compared to other project proposals within the same project category. The point values would be a major tool for evaluating and ranking projects within each category, but final adjustments would be expected to occur based on factors such as mode balance and a sense of equity among the partner jurisdictions over the time frame of the entire MTIP.

Need Category Funding Targets

In the development of the STP-U fund allocation process it was recognized that there is an inherent difficulty in comparing diverse project proposals with one another, especially given the wide variety of project types that are eligible for these federal funds and the large backlog of needs. For example, any evaluation scheme that attempts to weigh the relative merits of a bikeway project, a resurfacing project on a major arterial, and funding of an ongoing TDM program, is likely to produce outcomes that are overly favorable to one or two types of projects while totally excluding other types. In order to help achieve a degree of balance among the competing project priorities MPC approved a process similar to the process used for establishing the statewide STIP priorities. In the STIP process, policy direction is established for major categories of need – for example, modernization, preservation, etc. Along these lines, MPC approved an overall framework of four major project categories, and preliminary funding targets for each broad category, as follows:

1. System Modernization: The majority of previous STP-funded projects have consisted of examples such as reconstruction of major streets to bring them up to urban standards; construction of off-street bike paths; traffic operational improvements such as new signals or intersection reconstruction; and addition of transit enhancements such as passenger shelters, park and ride lots, and so forth. All of these examples could be considered "modernization" projects since they either provide a new facility, or upgrade and expand an existing one. While the large modernization projects on the state highway system will likely continue to require major funding by ODOT, there are numerous local agency projects in the RTP that also fall within this broad category. Moreover, as in past MTIPs the modernization category includes examples within all of the modes--roadway, transit, bike and pedestrian.

In order to address the highest-priority projects across the range of travel modes, a target of 20 percent of STP-U funding in the 2005-2007 MTIP for system modernization projects has been established.

DRAFT

2. System Preservation: Preserving the life and functionality of the existing transportation system is recognized as one of the highest priorities for all levels of government who share responsibility for the system. Again, this is a multi-modal issue. While local roadways have the greatest backlog of need and represent the foundation for all the other modes, there are also needs related to off-street bicycle and pedestrian paths, and the ongoing preservation and vehicle replacement cycle of the transit system. Because of the fundamental importance and the current deep backlog of preservation needs, especially on the street system, a target of 50 percent of the STP-U funding for 2005-2007 for allocation to system preservation has been established.

3. Transportation Planning and Project Development: This category includes two different types of activities. The first type is ongoing transportation planning in support of the overall metro-wide planning process and implementation of the RTP. A recent MTIP amendment provides STP-U funding to support the MPO work plan for fiscal year 2004. STP-U funds are likely to be requested by local agencies to support their individual transportation planning efforts.

The second kind of planning activity that can be supported with STP-U funds is more specific project-related planning for those projects included in the RTP that require extensive project development. Examples would include preliminary scoping of BRT routes or developing alternatives for interchange improvements. (This category would not include detailed engineering or preparation of final construction plans. That type of project engineering is generally included in the overall scope of projects that fall within the two categories above.)

In order to ensure a base level of ongoing metro-area transportation planning activity as well as some added support for project-level planning on the larger, more complex projects, a target of 20 percent of STP-U funding in fiscal years 2005-2007 for transportation planning and project development has been established.

4. Transportation Demand Management (TDM): The major source of funding for the MPO's ongoing TDM program during the past decade has been STP-local funding. With the transition to TMA status, the MPO is expected to allocate a portion of the MPO's STP-U funds to TDM rather than rely on statewide funding through the STIP. Further, as one of the three essential legs of the transportation triangle, TDM needs a base level of funding to sustain a minimal program, and to begin very incremental expansion above the existing levels of TDM in the community. Examples of TDM projects include Commuter Vanpools to and from Salem and Corvallis, the Gateway Transportation Management Area Program, and the LTD Group Pass Program.

To implement a regional TDM program, as described in the RTP, a target of 10 percent of STP-U funding in fiscal years 2005-2007 to be allocated to TDM programs has been established.

DRAFT

DRAFT
Figure A-1
APPLICATION FOR STP-U FUNDS FOR 2005-2007 MTIP
UPDATE

Date of this application _____

Contact person _____

A. Background Information

1. **Project title:** (Example: Resurface Thompson Street from 2nd Avenue to Schwetz Lane.)

2. **Project category:** (Example: modernization, preservation, or planning/project development)

3. **Lead agency:** (Example: Lane County, LTD, Springfield, Eugene, Coburg)

4. **Project description:** (Example: this project will overlay Thompson Street from 2nd Avenue to Schwetz Lane; add sidewalks to several segments with no sidewalk at present; and restripe Thompson to add bike lanes, and a left-turn pocket at the intersection with 2nd Avenue.)

5. **Project cost estimate:** (all numbers in \$000s)

STP-U funds requested for this project \$ _____

Other funding(type of funds, e.g. federal, state, local, etc.) \$ _____

\$ _____

\$ _____

Total cost estimate \$ _____

6. **Project timing:** STP funds requested for FY 05-06 \$ _____

FY 06-07 \$ _____

FY 07-09 \$ _____

B. Evaluation of this project based on STP-U Screening Criteria:

1. **Project is:** Included in the RTP 20-year financially constrained project list _____
 (Project # _____)
 or Capable of being added to the list during MTIP time frame _____
 or Included in a category of projects or program actions in the Plan _____

Comments:

2. **Project is eligible for STP-U funding based on TEA-21 criteria:** yes_____
 no____

Comments:

3. **Project can be implemented within the MTIP time frame:** yes_____
 no____

Comments:

DRAFT

C. Evaluation of this project based on STP-U Priority Factors:

1. Leverage of other funding:

Briefly describe sources and amounts of other funding for the project (recap of information in Project Cost Estimate field above).

Score for leverage: (mark appropriate line)

- _____ other funding is less than 20 per cent of project total = no points
- _____ other funding is 20 per cent of project total = 5 points
- _____ other funding is 30 per cent of project total = 10 points
- _____ other funding is 40 per cent of project total = 15 points
- _____ other funding is 50 per cent of project total = 20 points

Score for this project: _____points (20 points maximum for this component)

2. Support of RTP policies:

Briefly describe how the proposed project supports or addresses RTP policies--one or two sentences for each policy supported. (Example: since this project includes adding sidewalks to close gaps on a collector street, it supports Policy TSI Pedestrian # 3, Sidewalks.)

Note that the project can score points for no more than two policies in any one topic area. The RTP policy topic areas are as follows:

Land Use	TDM	TSI System-Wide	TSI Roadway
TSI Transit	TSI Bicycle	TSI Pedestrian	TSI Goods Movement
TSI Other Modes	Finance		

Score for this project: _____policies supported times 5 points each = _____total points.
(Maximum score for this component = 60 points)

3. Alternative TPR Performance Measures:

Briefly describe how the proposed project supports or addresses the RTP alternative TPR performance measures--one or two sentences for each measure supported. (Example: since this project includes restriping Thompson Street to add bicycle lanes, and this portion of street is included on the RTP priority bikeway mileage, the project supports the Priority Bikeway Miles measure.)

Score for this project: _____Measures supported times 5 points each = _____total points.
(Maximum score for this component = 20 points)

TOTAL SCORE FOR THIS PROJECT:

Leverage	_____	points
Policies	_____	points
Alt. Measures	_____	points
Total:	_____	points

DRAFT

**Appendix B
Air Quality Exemptions and
Regionally Significant Project Description**

DRAFT

DRAFT

Appendix B: Air Quality Exemptions and Regionally Significant Project Description

The Transportation Planning Committee, as the standing committee for air quality under the Oregon Conformity Rulings, has determined regionally significant projects to be:

A transportation project, other than an exempt project, that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs, such as access to and from the area outside the region, major activity centers in the region, major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves, and would normally be included in the modeling of a metropolitan area's transportation network, including at a minimum:

- *All fixed guideway transit facilities that offer an alternative to regional highway travel;*
- *Projects on facilities classified as arterial level and above;*
- *Projects on multi-lane facilities that impact speed and/or capacity; and*
- *Construction of new roadways classified as arterial level and above.*

Exempt Projects

OAR 340-252-0270 Notwithstanding the other requirements of this rule, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 2 are exempt from the requirement that a conformity determination be made. Such projects may proceed toward implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and MTIP. A particular action of the type listed in Table 2 of this section is not exempt if the MPO or ODOT in consultation with other agencies under OAR 340-252-0060, and the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potentially adverse emissions impacts for any reason. States and MPOs must ensure that exempt projects do not interfere with TCM implementation.

Table 2 - Exempt projects

Safety

Railroad/highway crossing.
Hazard elimination program.
Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.
Shoulder improvements.
Increasing sight distance.
Safety improvement program.
Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.
Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.
Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.
Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.
Pavement marking demonstration.

DRAFT

Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125).
Fencing.
Skid treatments.
Safety roadside rest areas.
Adding medians.
Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.
Lighting improvements.
Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
Emergency truck pullovers.

Mass Transit

Operating assistance to transit agencies.
Purchase of support vehicles.
Rehabilitation of transit vehicles.
Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities.
Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.).
Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems.
Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks.
Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures).
Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and trackbed in existing rights-of-way.
Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet.
Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR 771.

Air Quality

Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion activities at current levels.
Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Other

Specific activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction such as:
 Planning and technical studies.
 Grants for training and research programs.
 Planning activities conducted pursuant to titles 23 and 49 U.S.C.
 Federal-aid systems revisions.
Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.
Noise attenuation.
Advance land acquisitions (23 CFR 712 or 23 CFR 771).
Acquisition of scenic easements.
Plantings, landscaping, etc.
Sign removal.
Directional and informational signs.
Transportation enhancement activities (except rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities).
Repair of damage caused by natural disasters, civil unrest, or terrorist acts, except projects involving substantial functional, locational or capacity changes.

Projects exempt from regional emissions analyses

DRAFT

OAR 340-252-0280 Notwithstanding the other requirements of this rule, highway and transit projects of the types listed in Table 3 of this section are exempt from regional emissions analysis requirements. The local effects of these projects with respect to CO or PM-10 concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required prior to making a project-level conformity determination. These projects may then proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and MTIP. A particular action of the type listed in Table 3 is not exempt from regional emissions analysis if the MPO or ODOT in consultation with other agencies, the EPA, and the FHWA (in the case of a highway project) or the FTA (in the case of a transit project) concur that it has potential regional impacts for any reason.

Table 3 - Projects Exempt From Regional Emissions Analyses

- Intersection channelization projects.
- Intersection signalization projects at individual intersections.
- Interchange reconfiguration projects.
- Changes in vertical and horizontal alignment.
- Truck size and weight inspection stations.
- Bus terminals and transfer points.

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Appendix C
Transportation Committees of
the Central Lane MPO**

DRAFT

DRAFT

Appendix C: Transportation Committees of the Central Lane MPO

Metropolitan Policy Committee

Two Council Members of the Eugene City Council
Two Council Members of the Springfield City Council
Two Commissioners of Lane County
Two Board Members of Lane Transit District
One Council Member of the City of Coburg
One Member from ODOT
City Manager, Eugene (non-voting)
City Manager, Springfield (non-voting)
County Administrator, Lane County (non-voting)
General Manager of Lane Transit District (non-voting)
City Administrator, City of Coburg (non-voting)
Director of the Oregon Department of Transportation or his/her designee (non-voting)

Transportation Planning Committee

Director of Public Works, Lane County
Director of Public Works, City of Eugene
Director of Public Works, City of Springfield
Director of Planning, Lane County
Planning Director, Eugene
Planning Manager, Springfield
Planning Director, City of Coburg
Director of Administrative Services, Lane Transit District
Planning and Development Manager, Lane Transit District
Transportation Planning Engineer, Lane County
Transportation Engineer, Eugene
Traffic Engineer, Springfield
Region 2 Transportation Representative, Oregon Department of Transportation
Manager, Eugene Airport
Representative, Lane Regional Air Pollution Authority
Representative, City of Veneta
Representative, City of Junction City
Representative, City of Creswell
Representative, City of Cottage Grove

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Appendix D
Financial Resources**

DRAFT

Appendix D: Financial Resources

Many sources of funding are available for transportation projects from federal, state, and local sources. A short explanation of the different funding programs follows.

Federal Sources

On December 18, 1991, the President signed the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 providing authorizations for highways, highway safety, and transit transportation for the next six years. State and local governments are given more flexibility in determining transportation solutions, whether transit or highways. The MTIP development process must address the ISTEA and TEA-21 requirements and give full consideration to the flexibility provisions in the act. Reflecting the broader mandates of the transit program, the Federal Transit Administration administers transit programs.

Surface Transportation Program (STP), a block grant program replacing federal-aid systems, is available for all roads not functionally classified as local or rural minor collector. Transit capital projects and bicycle-pedestrian projects are also eligible under this program.

Enhancement funds are available for environmental programs such as pedestrian and bicycle activities and mitigation of water pollution due to highway runoff. Enhancement projects must have a direct relationship to the intermodal transportation system and go beyond what is customarily provided as environmental mitigation. Requests for enhancement funding will be submitted to the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Oregon Transit Commission (OTC) as part of the metropolitan planning process.

High Cost Bridge Projects, congressionally designated highway projects, are funded as part of ISTEA and TEA-21. \$23.7 million for the Ferry Street Bridge was funded under this special program.

FTA Section 5309 funds are available for transit capital improvements. Funds are administered by the FTA regional office and are granted on a project-by-project basis. Lane Transit District (LTD) anticipates receiving some Section 5309 funds during the next five years. Should these funds be available, they will be used to finance one-time capital improvements. The funding ratio for these funds is 80 percent federal and 20 percent local.

FTA Section 5307 funds are distributed on a statutory formula basis to support capital, operating, and planning expenditures for publicly owned transit systems. LTD anticipates receipt of some funding from this program in the next few years. When used for capital or planning projects, Section 5307 funds have a funding ration of 80 percent federal and 20 percent local; when used for operating, the maximum federal percentage is 50 percent.

DRAFT

FTA Section 5310 program provides transportation services for elderly and disabled persons. The funds are allocated to ODOT for distribution to local transit agencies. The funds may go to private, non-profit organizations or to public bodies that coordinate service. ODOT is currently recommending an allocation formula based on operating miles and population. OTC will make a decision on the allocation formula when it adopts the transit section of the ODOT Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

FTA Section 5311 funds are used to fund capital, operating, and planning needs of public transit. The Section 5311 program has a new program element under ISTEA, an inter-city bus program. It provides for planning, marketing, capital assistance, purchase of service agreements, user-side subsidy projects and demonstrations, and rural connections coordinating between inter-city bus and rural public transportation operators.

State Sources

The state plays a major role in the street and highway program and a minor role in the transit program.

The State Highway Fund consists primarily of user fees, such as the state gas tax, license fees, and weight-mile tax. Nearly one-third of the fund is transferred to cities and counties throughout the state for street and highway improvements. Most of the remaining portion of the fund is available to the state for maintenance, state construction, and matching of federal aid funds. One percent of state highway construction funds is required by law to be used for bicycle facilities. Priorities for use of the State Highway Fund are established by the OTC. Generally, the state provides all of the eight percent match required on interstate projects and half of the 12 percent match required on federal highway-related projects.

The State General Fund is the source of funding for the State's Public Transit Division, including funds that it distributes to transit districts including LTD. In the past, Oregon's Public Transit Division provided some funding for capital purchases. Future state funding for capital projects is uncertain.

Local Sources

The State Highway Fund Transfer results in state-collected user fees being distributed to the cities and county for local improvements. Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County collectively receive about \$4 million annually through this transfer. This amount could change if the state increases the gas tax, license fees, and weight-mile tax.

Federal Timber Receipts received by Lane County from timber sales on federal lands make up a majority of the County's budget for street and highway improvements. By law, 75 percent of the Federal Timber Receipts must be used for street and highway projects, but legislative proposals at the federal and state levels could reduce this percentage. Federal Timber Receipts currently account for a significant portion of the county's annual road improvement budget.

DRAFT

Economic Development Assistance Program funds are available from Lane County to finance public road improvements needed for projects that result in the creation or retention of permanent jobs.

Assessments of adjoining property owners often constitutes a large portion of the total cost of specific street improvements. The assessment depends on the type of street and the agency. The cost of curbs, gutters, and sidewalks is usually assessed to property owners. Sometimes, assessments include part of the cost of the pavement, underground drainage and street lighting. The cost of features not normally required on similar streets, as well as oversize facilities or additional width, are absorbed by the implementing agency. The public works department of the implementing agency should be consulted for the specific details of the assessment on individual projects.

Local funds are derived by the cities from user fees, parking revenues, citations, bond issues, and other taxes. A large number of locally generated funds are used by the cities for street improvements. The Employer Payroll Tax accounts for a majority of LTD's local revenues.

DRAFT

DRAFT

**Appendix E
Project Location Map**

DRAFT

MAP KEY		
Jurisdiction	Map Key	Project Name
Eugene	F	Fern Ridge Path Resurfacing
Eugene	198/Green Dot	Courthouse District Transportation Improvements
Eugene	450	3rd-4th Connector
Eugene	Not shown	Judkins Point Interchange/Glenwood Blvd Intersection Improvements
Eugene	435	Legacy Extension, Avalon to Royal
Eugene	680	Chad Drive Extension
Eugene	172, 251	Monroe Street/Friendly Street Bikeway
Eugene	Not shown	North Bank Trail Resurfacing
Eugene	429	Roosevelt Extension, Terry to Royal
Eugene	Not shown	Garden Way Path Resurfacing
Eugene	499	Airport Rd realignment
Eugene	199	Patterson St. Underpass
Springfield	906	21st Street Preservation and Reconstruction
Springfield	713	126 at 42nd Street Ramp Signal
Springfield	Not on Map	Pioneer Parkway Pavement Preservation
Springfield	768	MLK Parkway
Springfield	954	42nd Street, McKenzie Hwy to Jasper Rd
Springfield	15	69th Street Upgrade to Urban Standards
Springfield	789	Gateway/Beltline intersection
Lane County	66	Jasper Road Extension, 57th to Jasper
Lane County	638	Delta/Beltline Interchange
Lane County	654	Game Farm North, Eugene City Limit to Coburg Road
Lane County	E	Delta Highway pavement preservation
Lane County	481	Royal Avenue, Terry Street to Greenhill Road
Lane County	527	Hunsaker/Beaver St upgrade with sidewalks and bike lanes
Lane County	454, 485	Greenhill Rd upgrade shoulders, curbs and gutters
Coburg	1001	Diamond Street Overlay
Coburg	1002	Locust Street Improvements
LTD	Orange Box	River Road Transit Station Improvements
LTD	Blue Line/BRT	Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 - Franklin EmX Corridor
LTD	1115	Bus Rapid Transit, Pioneer Parkway
LTD	1135	Springfield Transit Station
LTD	Not Shown	RideSource Facility
ODOT	B	I105: Willamette River to Pacific Highway
ODOT	D	Operational ITS Improvements-Vehicle Management System
ODOT	A	OR-126/Franklin Blvd sidewalks
ODOT	C	OR222 Safety Project
ODOT	606	I-5 @ Beltline interchange construction, phases 1 and 2
ODOT	622	Beltline Hwy @ Coburg Road Interchange
ODOT	336	West Eugene Parkway Unit 1 Part A Seneca- Rd to Beltline Highway
ODOT	Not Shown	Hwy 99, Barger to Washington/Jefferson, Overlay
ODOT	Not Shown	OR99/7 th St and Eugene-Springfield Highway safety project
ODOT	Not Shown	OR 99 7 th St at Garfield safety project

DRAFT

<insert map here>