



December 2, 2009

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee  
From: Paul Thompson  
Subject: 5.g: FFY 2011-2013 Surface Transportation Program – Urban (STP-U)  
Funding Framework Recommendations

**Action Recommended:** Develop an STP-U Framework recommendation for public review and comment in preparation for final approval at the January 2010 MPC meeting.

### **Purpose**

At the November meeting the MPC reviewed the *Assessment of Existing Framework*, and a set of FFY 2011-2013 STP-U framework options for consideration and discussion. At the meeting the MPC recommended that an MPC subcommittee be established and charged with discussing the options and returning with a recommendation for consideration by the MPC at the December meeting. The purpose of this agenda item is to discuss the results of the subcommittee meeting and to craft a final STP-U Framework recommendation for public review and comment.

### **Background**

Approximately every three years the MPO has reviewed current STP-U funding practices in order to evaluate the program's effectiveness and to consider how the STP-U framework might be revised to reflect changing trends and circumstances. This review is intended to result in a STP-U framework to guide the programming of federal fiscal year (FFY) 2011 through FFY 2013 STP-U funds.

Since 2003, the Central Lane MPO has programmed STP-U funds using a model that targets portions of the funds to broad purposes, within which specific priorities are identified. The current funding model, in place since 2006, sets the following targets:

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 10% | Transportation options (transportation demand management, or TDM) activities carried out by point2point Solutions           |
| 25% | Planning activities carried out by the local member jurisdictions and the MPO under the MPO's Unified Planning Work Program |
| 65% | Project Development, Preservation, and Modernization (PPM) activities across all transportation modes within the MPO        |

### Options for Updated Framework

The *Assessment of the Existing Framework* provided data regarding the results of the current process and how they may or may not be considered to serve established and/or emerging community values. Both the MPC and CAC identified TDM and Transit as two priority areas. The STP-U framework as it exists now could prioritize these programs by funding specific project proposals, or the framework could be changed to target these priorities with specified levels or percentages of funding.

Attachment 1 presents the four STP-U framework options presented at the November MPC meeting. The first option maintains the existing framework. The remaining three options either increase the TDM funding target, establish a Transit funding target, or do both.

### Subcommittee Discussion

Subcommittee Members attending the November 20<sup>th</sup> meeting include Kitty Piercy (City of Eugene); Christine Lundberg (City of Springfield); Mike Eyster (Lane Transit District); and Pete Sorenson (Lane County). Staff attending included Tom Boyatt (City of Springfield); Rob Inerfeld (City of Eugene); Mark Pangborn (LTD); and George Kloepfel, Andrea Riner, Paul Thompson (LCOG). The members of the Subcommittee provided context for the STP-U Framework discussion by describing each agency's best case scenario for the Framework and STP-U funding, and each agency's worst fears about the results of the process.

	Best Case Scenario	Worst Fears
LTD	\$500,000 STP-U funding each year for next three years, as needed to maintain existing service levels	Significant reductions in service
City of Eugene	Framework that results in positive outcomes for priorities, such as transit, preservation and GHG reduction efforts	Developing a poorly coordinated list of pet projects with limited ability to measure outcomes
City of Springfield	Framework mutually agreeable to all agencies; Adequate funding for preservation projects	Not reaching agreement on a Framework
Lane County	Framework that assures measurable outcomes for regional priorities such as mobility, public health, GHG reduction	STP-U funds used to backfill other funds with no progress made towards priority outcomes

### **Recommendation to MPC**

Based on the above discussion, the Subcommittee recommended the following:

- Supporting an annual STP-U contribution to Lane Transit District of \$500,000 for FFY 2011, 2012 and 2013, as needed to maintain existing service levels
- Maintaining the existing Framework structure at 10% TDM, 25% Planning, and 65% for Project Development, Preservation, and Modernization (to include Transit funding)
- Defining key priority outcomes for the STP-U funding cycle – including preserving existing assets, reducing Greenhouse Gases, and promoting use of alternative transportation modes – and directing staff to prepare project funding applications for the FFY2011-13 funding cycle that address these priorities
- Establishing a process for measuring outcomes

### **CAC Recommendations**

The CAC met on November 18<sup>th</sup> and approved the following motions:

- Recommend the MPC maintain the current 10/25/65 STP-U Framework, using the flexibility provided to put dollars where they are most needed; and
- Recommend the MPC program \$500,000 of STP-U funds (per year) for Lane Transit District to maintain operational capacity.

### **Next Steps**

In the two-part process that the MPO is currently engaged in to program STP-U funds for FFY 2011 to 2013, the MPO is first considering the STP-U framework, with a goal of completing that work by January, 2010. The MPO will then engage in project solicitation, evaluation, and selection for funding over the three-year period, wrapping up that second part of the process by April, 2010.

### **Recommendation**

Develop an STP-U Framework recommendation for public review and comment in preparation for final framework approval at the January 2010 MPC meeting.

### **Attachments**

1. STP-U Framework Options