



MEETING NOTICE

MEETING:	METROPOLITAN POLICY COMMITTEE
DATE:	Thursday, August 6, 2020
TIME:	11:30 AM - 1:30 PM
LOCATION:	VIRTUAL: Call-in +1 (408) 650-3123 Access Code: 438-004-613
	Web cast: http://metrotv.ompnetwork.org/
CONTACT PERSON:	Paul Thompson, 541-682-4405

A G E N D A (Revised 8/5/2020)

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS
2. CALL TO ORDER
3. APPROVE JULY 9, 2020 MPC MEETING MINUTES
4. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS
5. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE *(Anyone wishing to comment is asked to sign up on the public comment sheet provided at the meeting. A limit of 3 minutes per person is requested.)*
6. METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES
 - a. Revisions to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Approval Authority (15 min)
Staff Contact and Presenter: Dan Callister, LCOG
Action Requested: Staff presentation; Hold Public Hearing
 - b. Federal Performance Measures Process Agreement
Staff Contact: Paul Thompson, LCOG
Action Requested: Agree to ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets
 - c. Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) 24-27 STIP Funding Allocations. (20 min)
Staff Contact: Paul Thompson, LCOG
Presenter: Erik Having, ODOT
Action Requested: Presentation; provide feedback
 - d. Travel Barriers Survey Process and Results Draft Report (45 min)

-OVER-

Location is wheelchair accessible (WCA). American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation is available with 48 hours notice.

LCOG Main Office: 859 Willamette Street, Suite 500, Eugene, Oregon 97401-2910

Phone: (541) 682-4283 • Fax: (541) 682-4099 • TTY: (541) 682-4567 • Web: www.lcog.org

Staff Contact: Paul Thompson, LCOG

Presenter: Tony Iaccarino and John Horvick, DHM Research

Action Requested: Presentation; provide feedback

- e. Follow-up and Next Steps (10 min)
- 1) ODOT Update
 - 2) MTIP Administrative Amendments (see attachment)
 - 3) Next Steps/Agenda Build

UPCOMING MEETINGS:

September 3 Eugene Library
October 1 Springfield Justice Center
November 5 Eugene Library
December 3 Springfield Justice Center

PLEASE NOTE:



LCOG is now posting meetings on its website at <http://www.lcog.org/346/Metropolitan-Policy-Committee>. These postings will include the agenda, minutes and attachments. If you no longer want to receive your meeting announcement in paper format, please contact Laura Campbell, 541-682-4006 or lcampbell@lcog.org.



This meeting will be broadcast live, and rebroadcast on Metro Television, Comcast cable channel 21, at 1:30 PM on Mondays, 7:00 PM on Tuesdays, and 11:00 AM on Sundays for the rest of the month. A webcast will also be archived for future viewing on the LCOG website. Get details through links at <http://www.lcog.org/346/Metropolitan-Policy-Committee>.

Please mute your phone or computer microphone when connecting to the virtual meeting . . .

And remember to un-mute it if you are speaking to the meeting!

Thanks!

MINUTES

Metropolitan Policy Committee Virtual Meeting via Zoom

July 9, 2020
11:30 a.m.

PRESENT: Christine Lundberg, Chair; Joe Pishioneri (City of Springfield); Lucy Vinis (City of Eugene); Pete Sorenson, Joe Berney (Lane County); Ray Smith (City of Coburg); Frannie Brindle (Oregon Department of Transportation); Carl Yeh (Lane Transit District), members; Anne Heath (City of Coburg); Matt Rodrigues for Sarah Medary (City of Eugene); Sasha Vartanian for Steve Mokrohisky (Lane County), *ex officio* members.

Brenda Wilson, Paul Thompson, Kelly Clarke, Ellen Currier, Syd Shoaf, Drew Pfefferle, Rachel Dorfman, Dan Callister, (Lane Council of Governments); Rob Inerfeld, Jenifer Willer (City of Eugene); Emma Newman, Tom Boyatt (City of Springfield); Jeff Kernan, Megan Winner (City of Coburg); Tom Schwetz, Andrew Martin, Theresa Brand (Lane Transit District); Bill Johnston (Oregon Department of Transportation); David Reesor (University of Oregon); Rob Zako, Claire Roth (Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation); Dennis Mitchell (DKS).

WELCOME, CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Lundberg called the meeting of the Metropolitan Policy Committee (MPC) to order and noted that a quorum was present.

APPROVE June 4, 2020, MEETING MINUTES

Mr. Pishioneri, seconded by Mr. Yeh, moved to approve the June 4, 2020, minutes as presented. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

ADJUSTMENTS TO THE AGENDA/ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM MPC MEMBERS

None.

COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Mr. Thompson stated that he had received a number of public comments via email and had forwarded those to MPC members.

Rob Zako, representing Better Eugene-Springfield Transportation (BEST), stated he was following up on a letter sent to MPC members from himself and other community members in reference to the Central Lane MPO's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation. He said the MPC had discussed the matter at length during its June 4 meeting and two points were noted: 1) there was insufficient funding for active transportation projects and more was needed, and 2) the MPC did not have land use authority. He said while those points were accurate, the MPC spent 25 minutes discussing what it could not do. It was long overdue to take action on climate change and Oregon was aware of the problem in 1988 and 30 years ago there was a plan to take integrated land use and transportation action seriously with a goal to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 20 percent by the year 2005. He said the letter listed four areas for action:

compact urban development, parking policies, active transportation, and integrated planning and measuring. He urged the MPC members to take action separately and coordinate activities.

Claire Roth, BEST, shared her support for especially important and time-sensitive MPO projects on the proposed list: Safe Routes to School Coordinator, Hunsaker Lane improvements, Laura Street upgrade, Springfield Walking and Biking Network improvements, Q Street reconstruction and Mohawk Boulevard preservation. She said BEST support all projects on the list, but wanted to highlight a few that played a role in increasing the quality of transportation safety in the Eugene, Springfield, Lane County and beyond area. She said some of the projects were time-sensitive because if safety improvements were not made now more lives would be lost to unsafe conditions on streets and sidewalks.

METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION (MPO) ISSUES

Central Lane MPO (CLMPO) Funding Applications

Mr. Callister said the applications for the FY 2022-2024 Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Transportation Alternatives (TA) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) discretionary funding were presented at the June 4 MPC meeting. He reviewed a table comparing the recommended funding to the original proposal and changes to the recommendations presented in June. Because of those changes he requested that another public hearing be held, following by action on the resolution with amended recommendations.

Ms. Lundberg opened the public hearing.

Mr. Thompson noted that the comments provided to MPC members electronically, along with comments from Claire Roth, related to the funding recommendations and should be part of the public record.

Ms. Lundberg determined there was no one wishing to speak and closed the hearing.

Ms. Lundberg pointed out that Coburg Road was one of the main roads in Eugene that actually interfaced closely with Springfield and many residents depended on the corridor to travel to Eugene. She said originally the EmX corridor route that went to International Way and the employment center was planned to be on Coburg Road; Eugene tabled the plan before the route was finalized and EmX was looped back to downtown Springfield. She felt that was a glaring omission and was concerned with projects along Coburg Road that would create more congestion. She encouraged Eugene to think about its plans for Coburg Road because congestion was a serious issue and contrary to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

Ms. Vinis agreed that Coburg Road was a critical corridor and timing and preparation were not far enough along for the project to be submitted during the application process while other projects could be fully funded in this round.

Mr. Pishioneri, seconded by Ms. Vinis, moved to approve Resolution 2020-05.
The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Plan Overview

Mr. Thompson introduced consultant Dennis Mitchell, DKS, who had been working with local jurisdictions collecting baseline data and other information, to present details about the project.

Mr. Mitchell said the project included three different efforts: update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a Congestion Management Plan and the ITS Plan. He used a slide presentation to illustrate details of the ITS and plan development. He said the plan would be a living document that could be updated on a regular basis. He said the MPO was updating all three plans simultaneously and in coordination; that was a first in the state and would allow RTP goals and objectives to be part of the ITS plan and vice versa. Strategies from plans could influence each other. Staff from all jurisdictions were engaged in the effort and helping to establish the goals and objectives of the ITS plan in conjunction with goals and objectives of individual jurisdictions.

Mr. Berney shared his experience 30 years ago with integrating traffic signal controls and programmable controls into all of the training apprentice electricians received. He said he failed to see how an ITS was intelligent if it did not have the following components: carbon reduction objectives for the transportation system specifically and a discussion of how its investments would increase business opportunities and local job opportunities in its communities.

Mr. Smith agreed with Mr. Berney's comments regarding carbon reduction. He discussed the importance of traffic signal coordination and asked if there was a feedback process once assumptions had been programmed into traffic controls. He used the signals at Coburg Road and Game Farm Road, which were programmed with an assumption that Game Farm Road should have a priority. He said evaluating the effectiveness and practical impact of those assumptions should be part of an intelligent system.

Mr. Mitchell commented that communications allowed systems to better react, but did not determine how individual signals were programmed; that decision was up to the jurisdiction responsible for that signal. He agreed that from an efficiency standpoint most of the green time should go to the largest number of vehicles, but there were many factors to balance when making programming decisions. The ITS did not define how that was decided, it only caused other signals downstream to react. He said feedback would be through the agency managing that signal.

Mr. Rodriguez said the ITS also allowed for the placement of cameras to observe intersection performance and determine if changes were having a positive impact on traffic flow.

Mr. Smith said when incidents occurred on Interstate 5, Coburg's streets were gridlocked. He said cameras as part of the ITS infrastructure would help the city to monitor and respond to those situations.

Mr. Sorenson asked if carbon reduction and climate change were components of his project. Mr. Mitchell said those had an effect, but were not directly related. ITS was intended to make the current system more efficient, which would reduce carbon emissions, but that was a byproduct and not the target of an ITS.

Mr. Sorenson agreed with Mr. Berney and Mr. Smith that carbon reduction or climate change should be factored into the project, but it did not sound as though that was something that could be measured or known. He asked if there were ways to determine the carbon reduction impact of an ITS if that was a desired performance measure. Mr. Mitchell said current federal efforts were exploring tools and modeling in relation to ITS because there was no way at this time to evaluate climate impacts. He said ITS was an inexpensive way to help reduce congestion, reduce delay and reduce accidents. The byproduct should be lower emissions but there was no way to measure that.

Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) Letter of Support

Ms. Newman said a draft letter of support for the Springfield Safe Routes to School application was included in the agenda packet, along with maps of the project. She provided an overview of the Springfield

SRTS initiative and said the application was for two crossway enhancements along Jasper Road near Douglas Gardens Elementary School and Mt. Vernon Elementary School, both of which were Title I schools. She explained the selection process to determine which SRTS projects to put forward for funding.

Mr. Pishioneri asked for additional information on the placement of the crosswalk near Douglas Gardens Elementary on the west side instead of the east side of Dondea Street. Ms. Newman said she would follow up with traffic engineers and provide Mr. Pishioneri with the explanation.

Ms. Vinis said that the City of Eugene was also submitting two applications for SRTS projects; one would be in the Eugene 4J School District and one would be in the Bethel School District. She said a letter of support had been requested from the LaneACT (Area Commission on Transportation).

Ms. Lundberg said both schools were located on roads that were considered rural and children trying to cross. She was pleased that the project would provide enhancements for children trying to reach their schools safely.

Mr. Berney also supported the projects as he drove Jasper Road frequently and the cross walks would be a major safety improvement for school children.

Mr. Berney, seconded by Mr. Pishioneri, moved that the Metropolitan Policy Committee write a support letter for the Springfield Safe Routes To School application. The motion passed unanimously, 7:0.

Follow-up and Next Steps

- **ODOT Update**—Ms. Brindle announced the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) would meet on July 15, 2020, to approve the FY 21-24 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and begin discussing development of the FY 24-27 STIP. That process would begin with allocation of available funding among categories and programs. She said the goal was to have funding allocations by program decided by December 2020. Packets of information would be developed to help MPOs and advisory committees provide input on those funding categories. She suggested reserving time on a future MPC agenda to receive a presentation on the process. The OTC was also planning another meeting with MPO and ACT chairs later in the year.

Mr. Thompson added that the packet for the July 15 OTC meeting included direction to staff to assume a 10 percent reduction in federal funding; if funding was received above that level additional direction would be provided on how those funds would be used. He said current funding categories were enhancement, safety, non-highway, local programs, fix it and other functions. If those categories were approved by the OTC, discussions about the allocations among categories would begin. He said the Oregon MPO Consortium had requested a letter be sent to the OTC asking that it not wait to decide how additional federal funds would be spent, but rather to include that as part of the current discussion.

- **MTIP Administrative Amendments**—There were no questions.
- **Next Meeting**—Ms. Lundberg noted the meeting was tentatively set for the Springfield Justice Center but would likely be a virtual meeting.

Mr. Sorenson asked if staff planned to send a response to members of the public who commented about their concern regarding the time spent by the MPC discussing restrictions on its ability to address climate change because it did not regulate land use. Mr. Thompson said the MPC should consider that those concerns would be taken into consideration as it moved forward. He said the letter responded to the MPC's discussion last month regarding the Land Conservation and Development Commission (LCDC) rule-making process. Staff would keep the MPC apprised of how that rule-making process was proceeding on the issue of mandating regional coordination and regional planning with respect to greenhouse gas reduction.

Ms. Vinis suggested that the MPC could designate the relevance of agenda items to climate change and greenhouse gas emissions to keep those issues in front of the committee and the public.

Mr. Berney agreed with Ms. Vinis's suggestion. He asked staff for additional information on areas where the state was considering mandates to regions and jurisdictions so those could be discussed at future MPC meetings to decide if responses or actions should be initiated before mandates were thrust upon members.

Ms. Lundberg said she had provided testimony on behalf of the MPC to LCDC advocating for flexibility and against mandates.

Ms. Lundberg adjourned the meeting at 12:35 p.m.

(Transcribed by Lynn Taylor)



July 27, 2020

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee
From: Daniel Callister
Subject: Item 6.a: Proposed Revisions to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program Amendment Approval Authority

Action Recommended: Conduct public hearing; Provide feedback to staff

Issue Statement

Revisions are proposed to the Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP) amendment process. The revised process allows certain MTIP project amendments, adjustments, revisions, and corrections to be approved by MPO staff, which currently require approval of the Transportation Planning Committee (TPC).

Background

While the text of the MTIP document changes little and rarely requires amending during the three-year life of the document, the projects programmed within the MTIP are constantly being amended, revised, split, canceled, etc. These projects include infrastructure construction projects, capital purchases, plan development, engineering activities, evolving outreach and education programs, and others. Any changes to these projects require approval from the MPO before those changes can be reflected in the MTIP and the State-wide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is necessary to revise inter-governmental agreements (IGAs), execute fund transfers, conform with federal law requiring that the TIP be financial constrained, in short- to be able to deliver the projects.

The current FY 2018-2021 MTIP and the recently approved FY 2021-2024 MTIP describe the process by which changes to the MTIP and its program of projects are approved by the MPO (see Attachment 1). The Metropolitan Planning Committee (MPC) retains general authority in all MTIP actions, however authority is delegated to TPC to approve most actions on behalf of the MPO. Staff can make only minor corrections.

The existing process often results in delays that are detrimental to project schedules, and in some cases necessitate postponement of funding obligation – something for which MPOs in Oregon are currently under increased scrutiny by FHWA and ODOT and which may result in penalties including loss of funding. It is with this heightened obligation scrutiny in mind that the revisions are proposed. The proposed changes are intended to improve approval turn-around times by reducing unnecessary delays. This is accomplished by expanding the approval authority of MPO staff to include certain types of common amendments such as phase slips and advances (moving a project

phase from one year to another), funding adjustments which do not involve new programming of MPO discretionary funds, and minor changes in scope. These changes and others that are proposed to fall under the approval authority of MPO staff currently require approval of the TPC, which meets monthly. With MPO staff approval, these changes could potentially move forward immediately, with delays only necessary for those changes requiring two-weeks for public outreach.

Additional language in the MTIP will describe how staff approvals will rely on the concurrence of affected agencies rather than quorum action, and how these staff approvals will be provided in summary form to TPC for their information, and be compiled along with TPC's approvals to be provided in summary form to MPC.

Discussion

The figure below identifies the proposed revised MTIP approval authority matrix to be incorporated into the FY 2018-2021 MTIP and the recently approved FY 2021-2024 MTIP. The approval authority of MPC remains unchanged, while fewer MTIP changes will require action by TPC. MPO staff will have authority to approve on behalf of the MPO, all actions not listed in the figure.

MTIP Action	Approval Authority		
	MPC	TPC	Staff
Adoption of MTIP and document content updates	x		
Revisions to MTIP policies and procedures	x		
Initial programming of TMA funds (STBG, TA, CMAQ)	x		
Re-programming of TMA funds to project(s) <u>not</u> previously approved by MPC for TMA funding	x		
Re-programming of TMA funds to project(s) previously approved by MPC for TMA funding	x	x	
Adding or cancelling a federally funded, and regionally significant project to the STIP and state funded projects which will potentially be federalized	x	x	
Major change in project scope (by Federal criteria)	x	x	
Changes in Fiscal Constraint (by Federal criteria)	x	x	
Adding an emergency relief repair project (permanent or temporary) that involves (or does not involve) substantial change in function and location.	x	x	
Advancing or Slipping an approved project/phase outside its current TIP	x	x	
Recommendation for Project or Program Authority Retraction	x	x	
All other MTIP actions	x	x	x

Public Involvement

A 30-day public comment period will be open from July 30 to August 29. A public hearing is requested August 6. MPC approval will be requested at the September meeting.

Action Recommended: Conduct public hearing; Provide feedback to staff

Attachments

1. Current Approval Authority Language (taken from 18-21 and 21-24 MTIP)

MPC 6.a – ATTACHMENT 1

Federal Approval Required

TPC acts on these unless TMA funds are involved (if so, MPC acts):

1. Adding or cancelling a federally funded, and regionally significant project to the STIP and state funded projects which will potentially be federalized
2. Major change in project scope. Major scope change includes:
 - Change in project termini - greater than .25 mile in any direction
 - Changes to the approved environmental footprint
 - Impacts to AQ conformity
 - Adding capacity per FHWA Standards
 - Adding or deleting work type
3. Changes in Fiscal Constraint by the following criteria:
 - FHWA project cost increase/decrease:
 - Projects under \$500K – increase/decrease over 50%
 - Projects \$500K to \$1M – increase/decrease over 30%
 - Projects \$1M and over – increase/decrease over 20%
 - All FTA project changes – increase/decrease over 30%
4. Adding an emergency relief permanent repair project that involves substantial change in function and location.

Does Not Require Federal Approval:

TPC acts on these unless programming of TMA funds is involved (if so, MPC acts):

Other changes to an adopted TIP, described by FHWA and FTA as “administrative/technical adjustments,” may be made via a more expedited process. These include:

Advancing or Slipping an approved project/phase within the current TIP (If slipping outside current TIP, see FHWA/FTA amendments #2)

Adding or deleting any phase (except CN) of an approved project below FHWA/FTA amendments #3

Combining two or more approved projects into one or splitting an approved project into two or more, or splitting part of an approved project to a new one.

Splitting a new project out of an approved program-specific pool of funds (but not reserves for future projects) or adding funds to an existing project from a bucket or reserve if the project was selected through a specific process (i.e. ARTS, Local Bridge...)

Minor technical corrections to make the printed STIP consistent with prior approvals, such as typos or missing data.

Changing name of project due to change in scope, combining or splitting of projects, or to better conform to naming convention. (For major change in scope, see FHWA/FTA amendments #2)

Adding a temporary emergency repair and relief project that does not involve substantial change in function and location.

***TPC currently acts on the following administrative/technical adjustments, unless it involves approval for programming of TMA funds:**

1. Additions or deletions of projects which do not involve any funding decision or funding transfer on the part of the MPO (for example, projects which are already fully funded via local, state or federal processes and are required to be included in the MTIP) and which do not affect the financial constraint or air quality conformity of the MTIP;
2. Cost revisions to reflect funding decisions at the local, state or federal level which do not involve any further funding decision on the part of the MPO and which do not affect the financial constraint or air quality conformity of the MTIP;
3. Deletions of local projects which are provided for information purposes;
4. Moving projects from one year to another year in the MTIP period if they do not trigger the need for an air quality conformity determination;
5. Change in project scope, where no funding decision or funding transfer by the MPO is involved, and which does not affect the air quality conformity of the MTIP;
6. Combining or separating projects (for contracting efficiency or other purposes) in the adopted MTIP where the project scope is unchanged and the total project cost is unchanged or involves a minor cost revision;
7. Moving funding from one project phase to another within the same project where no funding decision or funding transfer by the MPO is involved;
8. Other minor cost revisions that do not affect financial constraint of the MTIP or the MTIP's air quality conformity;
9. Emergency additions where an imminent public safety hazard is involved; and
10. Recommendation for Project or Program Authority Retraction
 - a. Agencies that have not completed a project prospectus or contract with the ODOT local programming unit, have not obligated project authority or have not received approval of an amendment to reprogram fund authority by the end of the federal fiscal year in which their project was programmed for funding are subject to potential retraction of fund authority. These agencies will be notified by the MPO of this status when it occurs and will have 60 days from the date of the notification documentation to complete the prospectus, contract, obligation or amendment prior to consideration by TPC of a recommendation to MPC for an amendment to retract the funding authority for the project or program.
 - b. Unspent or un-obligated MPO flexible funding authority following final voucher closing of a project (or other action such as a project funding amendment) reverts back for redistribution through the regional project prioritization process.

MPO Staff currently approves:

Minor corrections to make the MTIP consistent with naming conventions or a jurisdiction's project description language, or to fix typographical errors or missing data, may be made by MPO staff.



August 3, 2020

To: Metropolitan Policy Committee
From: Paul Thompson
Subject: Item 6.a.2: Federal Performance Measures Process Agreement

Action Recommended: Agree to ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets

Subsequent to completing the agenda for the August 6, 2020 MPC meeting, we received a request from ODOT for an action by each of Oregon's MPO Policy Boards prior to August 30th. This cover memo and attachment constitute the addition of an agenda item to Thursday's meeting agenda: Federal Performance Measures Process Agreement.

Background

Oregon's MPOs are required to coordinate work with ODOT on the development, adoption, and revision of the federally-required transportation performance measures. Broadly speaking, in the Central Lane MPO the Performance Measures (PMs) cover Safety, Transit, System Performance, System Condition, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). A detailed list of the PMs is available [here](#). Each MPO has the option of choosing to formally support the state's PMs, or to adopt PMs of its own. In the Central Lane MPO, MPC has chosen to support the state PMs in all cases (MPC Resolutions 2018-01, 2018-10, 2019-02). In order to facilitate the coordinated work of ODOT and the Oregon MPOs and transit providers, a Process Agreement is also maintained among the partners. Earlier versions of this Process Agreement have been in place for several years.

Discussion

An updated version of the Process Agreement (Attachment 1) is what is currently before MPC for formal approval. The attached document is a draft of version 4 of the agreement - the state and the MPOs have previously been informally operating under versions 1, 2, and 3 of the agreement. Most notable in this new version is documentation of how revisions to the PMs will be handled (so far the state and the MPOs have only been working on developing and adopting the new PMs), and the inclusion of the Transit performance measures.

The USDOT, via the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), are now specifically asking for MPO Policy Boards to agree to the

PM Process Agreement with the state DOT. As ODOT staff put it, "We have been asked to validate by FHWA/FTA that this is something we have all collaboratively agreed to use to document how we all work together in setting targets and reporting."

The attached draft of version 4 of the Agreement is the result of a nearly year-long development and review effort by ODOT, staff from all of the Oregon MPOs, and staff from many of the transit providers. Only very minor comments were submitted by any MPO staff after the initial draft was circulated by ODOT. LCOG MPO staff were involved in that process, and recommend approval by MPC on August 6th.

Action Recommended: Agree to ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets

Attachments

1. Draft v4 ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets

ODOT Coordination Process with MPOs in Setting, Monitoring, and Reporting State Performance Measure Targets¹

July 2020 (Rev. 4)

This process paper provides an overview of the required coordination and collaboration between Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) and the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) within Oregon in setting federally required performance measure targets. Federally required performance measures are defined in rules approved by the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT). Since federally required performance measures are approved by rule, both the state and the MPO shall continue to coordinate in setting appropriate statewide and MPO specific targets. This process paper contains five sections. Section I describes how ODOT coordinates with MPOs in setting the statewide targets. Section II describes the coordination and roles for ODOT and MPOs in setting MPO performance measure targets if the MPOs elect to do so. Section III outlines the roles and responsibilities for monitoring and reporting on statewide and MPO performance measures and targets. Section IV describes the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan target setting process. Finally, Section V describes the Transit Asset Management Plan target setting process. This process paper is meant to be a living document and as the State and MPOs gain more experience in setting various targets, it may continue to be modified. The [Oregon Transportation Plan](#) has been amended to acknowledge the role of the group Transportation Asset Management Plan with regards to federal performance management regulations. As per 23 CFR 450.314(h)(2)(ii), this documentation is required and in order to be more responsive to changes MPO target setting decisions, ODOT, working with their applicable stakeholders, decided this process document (group TAM Plan) met this requirement outside of the currently established metropolitan planning / ODOT / Transit agreements.

Section I Coordination and Collaboration Process for Setting Statewide Transportation Performance Measure Targets

1. ODOT will host target setting conversations with the MPOs (only exceptions are for safety and transit measures as there is already a prescribed process – see below). These conversations have previously be in-person meetings, however, other options such as phone or on-line meeting tools may be as effective as well.
 - a. When it is appropriate and responsible, ODOT Staff (as listed below in paragraph 3) will be ready to begin the process for making any revisions to existing performance measure targets, ODOT will hold a preliminary coordination discussions with the MPOs that will cover the following at a minimum:
 - i. What performance measure(s) is/are being addressed
 - ii. Review scope and scale of the proposed measure
 - iii. Review anticipated data sources that may be useful in the development of statewide and/or MPO targets. Gain consensus between ODOT and MPOs on data sources, collection policies, and analytical methods to be used for specific performance measure at both the state and MPO level.

¹ This coordination process was the process used in the development of the initial targets but has been revised to reflect the process for revising any performance targets.

- iv. Review any further federal guidance in setting specific Performance Measure Targets
 - v. Review general timeline for ODOT decision-making
 - vi. Review final Target approval action defining the 180 day clock for MPOs
 - vii. Identify if and how the performance measures and targets will be published in an official government report or plan.
- b. Any material that is available for this early coordination will be shared with the MPOs electronically one week prior to the meeting if possible.
 - c. Regarding the highway Safety performance measures target setting, this process can be found [here](#).
 - d. Regarding the Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan performance measures target setting, this process can be found in Section IV.
 - e. Regarding the Transit Asset Management Plan performance measure target setting, this process can be found in Section V.
2. Target Estimating Discussion
- a. After ODOT has developed a revised target, ODOT will invite the MPOs to participate in the Target Estimating Discussion. Please note that the safety PMs discussion will be part of the highway safety PMs prescribed process
 - i. ODOT will review historical and recent data trends, analysis, and methodologies for setting the specific performance measure(s).
 - ii. ODOT will review general funding trends and assumptions.
 - iii. ODOT will provide draft revised statewide targets to MPOs.
 - iv. Provide time for discussion, review, questions between MPOs and ODOT including the ODOT and MPO subject matter experts (SMEs).
 - v. Discuss how potential statewide targets may relate to each specific MPO.
 - vi. MPOs will have 45 days to provide any recommendations, suggestions, or concerns with proposed ODOT targets (except for Safety PMs)
 - vii. In some situations, state level targets will be incorporated into a report or plan found [here](#). Additional deadlines and public engagement steps will need to be taken in to account in case of overlap or conflict on the calendaring of decisions.
 - b. ODOT will consider any and all feedback from MPOs regarding the proposed target. Subject matter experts from ODOT will make the target recommendations to the ODOT approval authority (described in step 3 below). Feedback from MPOs and how that feedback was incorporated, if applicable, will be considered in the final target approval process.
3. Target Approval
- a. The Transportation Safety Division (TSD) Administrator shall have the authority to approve all federally required transportation safety performance measure targets for ODOT. For Safety measures, the TSD Administrator shall seek concurrence from the Oregon Transportation Safety Committee for all proposed performance measure targets.

- b. The Highway Division Administrator shall have the authority to approve all federally required performance measure targets for transportation system assets (such as pavement and bridge).
 - c. The Transportation Development Division Administrator shall have the authority to approve all federally required performance measure targets for system performance items (such as reliability, freight, etc.).
 - d. The Public Transportation Division Administrator shall have the authority to approve all federally required performance targets for transit program assets addressed in the group Transit Asset Management Plan. Transit agencies who prepare their own TAM Plans obtain approval for their agency transit asset targets from their own governance.
 - e. If any Division Administrator named above believes that a proposed (future) federally required performance measure should be a joint responsibility for the target setting, they have the authority to jointly share the target setting responsibility as appropriate.
 - f. The appropriate division administrator above will be responsible for development of a staff report or equivalent to document the process to establish the proposed target and the final approved target, including feedback received from the MPOs under step 2. The ODOT staff report will include key aspects of the proposed target and any potential impacts the target may have and validation that this coordination process was followed.
4. Communication of Performance Measure Target Adoption
 - a. ODOT will notify each MPO (by letter or e-mail or similar documentable communication) that ODOT has formally approved a specific statewide Performance Measure Target and inform the MPOs that they have 180 days to either adopt the state's target or complete establishment of the MPO's Target if applicable.
 - b. ODOT notification will be sent within one week of the formal Performance Measure Target approval by ODOT, or adjustment of a state-wide target.

Section II Coordination and Collaboration Process For Setting MPO Performance Measure Targets

As per 23 CFR 450.314(h), MPOs, ODOT, and public transportation providers are to develop specific written provisions for cooperatively developing and sharing information related to transportation performance data and the selection of the performance targets. ODOT acknowledges the coordination and collaboration process with each specific MPO² may be slightly different as each MPO has different level of staff expertise and knowledge, analysis capabilities, organizational structures, etc. While the steps below do not contain all the specific steps and requirements, the intent is to ensure coordination and collaboration between each MPO and ODOT to gain a clear agreement and understanding on data to be used and collection

² As bi-state MPO's, the Longview/Kelso/Rainier MPO will align with WA and Milton-Freewater will align with Walla Walla Valley MPO (WA).

policies, analysis methods and responsibilities, thereby assuring compatibility of MPO targets to the statewide target.

1. If a MPO chooses to establish an MPO specific target for any federally required performance measure, they will notify the ODOT Performance Measure Coordinator of their intent. The ODOT Performance Measure Coordinator is responsible for coordinating with the appropriate ODOT staff and subject matter experts. In developing a specific MPO performance target, the MPO is required by federal rule to coordinate with ODOT to ensure consistency to the maximum extent practical.
2. The appropriate ODOT subject matter experts (and data owners) will provide data used by ODOT in setting the statewide targets to the MPOs. This data will be specific to the MPO and will meet the requirements of the specific federal performance measure and will be based on the agreed-to structure, data elements, etc. that match the statewide PM process.
3. The appropriate ODOT subject matter experts will provide expertise as requested by MPOs in evaluating the data and performing any required analysis to help the MPO in setting a specific MPO performance measure target. The SME's role shall be limited to these elements. ODOT's Performance Measure Coordinator will provide a supporting role in facilitating communication.
4. ODOT and the MPO will document in writing the agreed upon data and analysis parameters to be used in setting the MPO specific target and future reporting. ODOT will provide the necessary data set for the MPO specific target as long as the data and parameters do not change those used in the statewide processes. If the MPO chooses to use a different data set or parameters of the data set (as is their option), the MPO may be responsible for all data analysis in setting the specific target as well as reporting. ODOT staff can only provide forecasts of conditions of the state highway system and cannot necessarily forecast the condition of local assets.
5. Prior to the MPO taking any formal action to approve the performance measure target, they will give ODOT the opportunity to review and provide comment on the proposed target value. This written endorsement may be by letter or e-mail and shall copy FHWA and FTA as appropriate.
6. After official approval of an MPO specific target, the MPO shall notify the ODOT Performance Measure Coordinator, and the respective ODOT program manager in writing of the approved target. This notification may also be in letter or e-mail form. Additionally MPOs can change their 4-year targets at the mid-performance period, even if ODOT doesn't adjust theirs.

Section III Monitoring and Reporting

1. ODOT's Performance Measure Coordinator will be responsible for ensuring coordination of the State's submission of all federally required performance measure reports to FHWA and FTA. Additionally, MPOs must report their performance to ODOT as required by Federal Rules listed below.
2. Subject to FHWA and FTA defining the specific reporting process, ODOT program SMEs (described in Section I) are responsible for providing the required reporting

information to the ODOT Performance Measure Coordinator for the statewide performance measures and targets.

3. Where ODOT has agreed with the MPO (in Section II) to calculate the current performance measure results from the statewide and federal data systems, the ODOT Performance Measure Owners /SMEs will complete the appropriate analysis and provide the results to the MPO and the ODOT Performance Measure Coordinator in a timely manner for compliance with federal reporting requirements.
4. The MPO will be responsible for documenting any other federally required Performance Measure reporting information including relationship to the MPO Performance Based Planning and Programming process.
5. ODOT will be responsible for ensuring all federally required performance measure reporting elements are completed for the statewide report, including any relationship to the State Performance Based Planning and Programming process.
6. Based upon the reporting information, any adjustment to a federal performance measure target at either the State or MPO level will follow the appropriate section of this process paper.

NOTE: "MPO reporting requirements are (§490.107(c):

1. The MPO shall report their established targets to their respective State DOT in a manner that is documented and mutually agreed upon by both parties.
2. The MPO shall report base line condition/performance and progress toward the achievement of their targets in the system performance report in the metropolitan transportation plan in accordance with Part 450 of this chapter.
3. Had an MPO declared not to support the state's targets in a performance area they shall report performance to ODOT IAW §490.107(c)
4. The MPO's shall re-declare if the State (ODOT) adjusts the target either at the mid report period or every four years when the State is required to reset their target. If ODOT maintains our respective target thru the mid-reporting period, ODOT will NOT ask the MPO's to re-declare at the mid-report period.
5. MPO response to State DOT target adjustment. If the State DOT adjusts a 4-year target in the State DOT's Mid Performance Period Progress Report and if, for that respective target, the MPO established a target by supporting the State DOT target, then the MPO shall, within 180 days, report to the State DOT whether it will either:
 - (i) Agree to plan a program of projects so that they contribute to the adjusted State DOT target for that performance measure; or
 - (ii) Commit to a new quantifiable target for that performance measure for its metropolitan planning area.
6. Target adjustment. If the MPO establishes its target by committing to a quantifiable target, or establishes target(s) for the Total Emissions Reduction measure, then the MPOs may adjust its target(s) in a manner that is collectively developed, documented, and mutually agreed upon by the State DOT and MPO. Any adjustments made to 4-year targets, established for CMAQ Traffic Congestion measures, shall be collectively developed and agreed upon by all State DOTs and MPOs that include any portion of the NHS in the respective urbanized area applicable to the measure.
7. Reporting. The MPOs shall report targets and progress toward the achievement of their targets as specified in §490.107(c). After the MPOs establish or adjust their

targets, the relevant State DOT(s) must be able to provide these targets to FHWA upon request.”

(Specific Statutory Language)

(c) **MPO Report.** The MPOs shall establish targets in accordance with § 490.105 and report targets and progress toward the achievement of their targets in a manner that is consistent with the following:

(1) The MPOs shall report their established targets to their respective State DOT in a manner that is documented and mutually agreed upon by both parties.

(2) The MPOs shall report baseline condition/performance and progress toward the achievement of their targets in the system performance report in the metropolitan transportation plan in accordance with part 450 of this chapter.

(3) The MPOs serving a TMA and meeting criteria, specified in § 490.105(f)(6)(iii), shall develop a CMAQ performance plan as required by 23 U.S.C. 149(l). The CMAQ performance plan is not required when the MPO meets the criteria specified in § 490.105(f)(6)(vii) or (viii).

(i) The CMAQ performance plan shall be submitted to FHWA by the State DOT, and be updated biennially on the same schedule as the State Biennial Performance Reports.

(ii) For the CMAQ Traffic Congestion and Total Emissions Reduction measures in subparts G and H of this part, the CMAQ performance plan submitted with the State DOT's Baseline Performance Period Report to FHWA shall include:

(A) The 2-year and 4-year targets for the CMAQ Traffic Congestion measures, identical to the relevant State DOT(s) reported target under paragraph (b)(1)(ii)(A) of this section, for each applicable urbanized area;

(B) The 2-year and 4-year targets for the Total Emissions Reduction measure for the performance period;

(C) Baseline condition/performance for each MPO reported CMAQ Traffic Congestion targets, identical to the relevant State DOT(s) reported baseline condition/performance under paragraph (b)(1)(ii)(B) of this section;

(D) Baseline condition/performance derived from the latest estimated cumulative emissions reductions from CMAQ projects for each MPO reported Total Emissions Reduction target; and

(E) A description of projects identified for CMAQ funding and how such projects will contribute to achieving the performance targets for these measures.

(iii) For the CMAQ Traffic Congestion and Total Emissions Reduction measures in subparts G and H of this part, the CMAQ performance plan submitted with the State DOT's Mid Performance Period Progress Report to FHWA shall include:

(A) 2-year condition/performance for the CMAQ Traffic Congestion measures, identical to the relevant State DOT(s) reported condition/performance under paragraph (b)(2)(ii)(A) of this section, for each applicable urbanized area;

(B) 2-year condition/performance derived from the latest estimated cumulative emissions reductions from CMAQ projects for each MPO reported Total Emissions Reduction target;

- (C) An assessment of the progress of the projects identified in the CMAQ performance plan submitted with the Baseline [Performance Period](#) Report toward achieving the 2-year [targets](#) for these measures;
- (D) When applicable, an adjusted 4-year [target](#) to replace an established 4-year [target](#); and
- (E) An update to the description of projects identified for CMAQ funding and how those updates will contribute to achieving the 4-year performance [targets](#) for these measures.
- (iv) For the CMAQ Traffic Congestion and Total Emissions Reduction [measures](#) in subparts G and H of this part, the CMAQ performance plan submitted with the State DOT's Full [Performance Period](#) Progress Report to FHWA shall include:
- (A) 4-year condition/performance for the CMAQ Traffic Congestion measures, identical to the relevant State DOT(s) reported condition/performance reported under [paragraph \(b\)\(3\)\(ii\)\(A\)](#) of this section, for each applicable urbanized area;
- (B) 4-year condition/performance derived from the latest estimated cumulative emissions reductions from CMAQ projects for each [MPO](#) reported Total Emissions Reduction [target](#); and
- (C) An assessment of the progress of the projects identified in both paragraphs (c)(3)(ii)(C) and (c)(3)(iii)(D) of this section toward achieving the 4-year [targets](#) for these measures.

Section IV Public Transportation Agency Safety Plans

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Public Transportation Agency Safety Plan (PTASP) Final Rule was published July 19, 2018. The PTASP Final Rule requires certain operators of public transportation systems that receive federal funds under FTA's Urbanized Area Formula Grants to develop safety plans that include the processes and procedures to implement Safety Management Systems (SMS). The PTASP rule became effective on July 19, 2019. The PTASP compliance deadline is December 31, 2020.³

The PTASP must include safety performance targets.⁴ Find additional guidance on planning and target setting on FTA's [Performance Based Planning](#) pages. Transit operators also must certify they have a safety plan in place meeting the requirements of

³ There are eleven transit providers in the state of Oregon that are required to develop a PTASP. Three of those transit providers are writing their own plan. Oregon DOT contracted with RLS and Associates to write each plan in consultation with the remaining transit providers. Five of those safety plans are complete and adopted by their governing bodies. Two other safety plans are complete awaiting governing body approval. The last safety plan is nearing completion and is expected to be adopted on May 28, 2020.

⁴ Some transit providers generated their own safety performance targets in their PTASP following the guidelines provided by FTA on the [Performance Based Planning](#) pages. Some of the larger transit providers have been reporting on these safety performance targets in years past. Oregon DOT and RLS and Associates worked with the remaining transit providers and followed the same guidance while explaining how to gather the data needed. In a couple cases, RLS and Associates developed a spreadsheet wherein they could input the past years data to compute the anticipated safety performance targets based on their historic data. In-depth information and definitions on each safety performance target was also provided.

the rule by December 31, 2020. The plan must be updated and certified by the transit agency annually.

MPOs will have one year from the establishment of the transit agency safety targets to establish performance targets that address the performance measures or standards established under [23 CFR part 490](#) (where applicable), and [49 U.S.C. 5329\(d\)](#) to use in tracking progress toward attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the Metropolitan Planning Organization (49 CFR§450.306(d)).

By statute, the MPO is directed to coordinate to the maximum extent possible with the State DOT and public transportation providers when setting performance targets required under 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 5329(d) (49 CFR§450.206(c)(2), 49 CFR§450.306(d)(2)(ii)), and 49 CFR§450.306(d)(3)(iii)).⁵

Section V Transit Asset Management Plans

The Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Transit Asset Management Final Rule was published July 26, 2016 in the Federal Register and will become effective October 1, 2016. The final rule defines the term *state of good repair* and establishes minimum Federal requirements for transit asset management. This applies to all recipients of Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 who own, operate, or manage public transportation capital assets.

ODOT, through consultation with sub recipient transit partners, decided to prepare a group Transit Asset Management (TAM) Plan, and hired a consultant to collaborate with participating agencies to draft an Oregon group TAM Plan.

To be eligible to participate in a group plan, agencies must own, operate, or manage 100 or fewer vehicles in revenue service during peak regular service across all non-rail fixed route modes or in any one non-fixed route mode; sub recipient under the 5311 Rural Area Formula program; a sub recipient under the 5310 Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities program who operates an open-door service; or any American Indian tribe. Only TriMet and Salem Area Mass Transit District are not participating in ODOT's TAM Plan.

In the summer of 2018, as Oregon was in the process of preparing a group TAM Plan covering 53 transit agencies, ODOT began communication with MPOs around TAM target setting. ODOT presented an overview of the State's group TAM Plan in July of

⁵ MPO distribution information is located in Section 3 of the transit provider safety plan. It conveys the name of their MPO and identifies the month when the transit provider anticipates sharing the targets and any amendments to those targets with the MPO. Each transit provider selected the month based on their meeting schedule, TAM target sharing, end of fiscal year or other reason. RLS and Associates did not advise on when the transit providers should share the targets other than be consistent each year. It was suggested grouping the PTASP targets with TAM targets for efficiency and planning ease. It is the responsibility of each MPO to obtain target data from the transit providers and report on performance against those targets to Oregon DOT.

2018. In September of 2018, ODOT held a conference call with Oregon MPOs to discuss the TAM Plan and MPO roles.

MPO area asset reports, including performance targets were sent to the MPO's in October 2018, and MPO's were provided with a sample resolution to adopt their own transit performance measures and targets for State of Good Repair.

In summary, the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) met with the MPOs prior to the adoption of the group TAM Plan. The MPO's were given an opportunity to ask questions and provide feedback. The final TAM and MPO asset reports with performance measure targets were published on the Public Transportation Division [website](#) in October 2018.

ODOT records all federally funded assets through our OPTIS database. With the implementation of the group TAM Plan, providers were required to enter all non-federally funded assets in OPTIS. Providers report on mileage and condition for all vehicles and facilities on a quarterly basis in OPTIS. Public Transit sends condition assessments to providers who own facilities and equipment (non-revenue vehicles) to be completed and returned after the end of the state fiscal year.

The information submitted in OPTIS and condition assessments is used to prepare the annual TAM reports and targets. This information is included in the annual NTD report and [Key Performance Measures](#) for ODOT. When ODOT completes annual reporting on transit assets, the data is published to the Public Transportation Division [TAM](#) website. A notification will be sent to all transit providers and MPO's providing them with the location and how to access the data, annually.

FTA requires a TAM Plan to forecast projects, targets and activities for at least four years and the plan should be updated every four years coinciding with the Oregon Statewide Transportation Improvement Program cycle, or when significant changes need to be made. ODOT's group Transit Asset Management Plan updates will include, in addition to asset inventory and condition, the current public involvement plan, detail regarding MPO involvement and the process for adding new agencies to the group TAM Plan. Updates will also include information on when and how MPO's receive notifications of updates or results.

MTIP Amendments
Transportation Planning Committee
July 15, 2020

I. 21174 – Springfield

S. 28th Street dust mitigation

Description: Pave gravel portion of S. 28th St from S. F St to city limits; pave shoulders and driveway approaches and improve surface drainage.

Amendment: Cancel 2020 Utility Relocation phase and move those funds to 2021 Construction phase. Slip Right of Way Acquisition phase from 2020 to 2021

II. 21385 – Lane County

Gilham Road: Ayers Road to Mirror Pond Way

Description: Design and final construction of pavement, curb, gutter, storm water and sidewalk on Gilham Rd between Ayres Rd and Ashbury Dr, and sidewalk along westerly portion of Gilham Rd between Ashbury Dr and Mirror Pond Wy.

Amendment: Slip Construction phase from 2021 to 2022

III. STIP Key TBD – LTD

LTD Technology Innovation Project

Description: The LTD Technology Innovation Project (Novus) will eliminate barriers to transportation to improve health outcomes and decrease health disparities experienced by disadvantaged communities.

Amendment: Add new 2020 project (\$76,000 FTA-5310, \$326,000 LTD funds, total project = \$400,000)

IV. 20433 – ODOT

OR126: Willamette River WB Bridge

In April TPC approved an amendment (following OTC action) to cancel CN phase (~\$7M) and move those funds to the Umpqua River Bridge Replacement project. ODOT now wants to decline that amendment and instead fund CN of the Willamette River WB Bridge project at a reduced amount, pending July OTC approval.

Amendment: Cancel Right of Way Acquisition phase and move those funds to CN. Fund construction phase at \$5,834,200. Advance CN phase to 2020.

V. 20294 – Eugene

Coburg Rd: Ferry St RR bridge to Willamette R bridge

Description: Bridge #06648: Cleaning, preparation, and spot paint; concrete overlay and other repairs per inspection report. Bridge #40056: Deck sealing, crack repairs to girder top/deck interface, epoxy injection cracks, repair spalling. Perform seismic analysis and preliminary design for seismic strengthening on bridges #06648, 40056 and 07214A.

Amendment: Cancel Right of Way Acquisition phase and Utility Relocation phase, Transfer funds from those phases to the Construction phase.

VI. 20206 – Eugene

River Rd at Irving Rd

Description: Upgrade signal hardware. Add left turn lanes on Irving Road approaches. Install urban green bike lanes on River Road at the intersection.

Amendment: Add local funds to Right of Way Acquisition phase *see Drake McKee for amount details*; cancel Utility Relocation phase and add those funds to the Right of Way phase.

VII. 20216 – Eugene

City of Eugene signal enhancements

Description: Provide signal enhancements at various locations throughout the City of Eugene. Install a yellow flashing beacon with advanced intersection warning at Coburg Rd & MLK Jr Blvd.

Amendment: Utility Relocation phase is not required and will be canceled. Funds to be added to CN phase.

VIII. 21515 – Eugene

South Bank shared use path

Description: Repair and realign South Bank Path; rebuild 3,000 lineal feet of path; replace asphalt pavement with 12ft wide concrete; lighting and trail amenities.

Amendment: add local funds including \$15,000 for ODOT construction oversight.

IX. 21405, 21406, and new Electric Fleet Procurement project– LTD

LTD Frequent Transit Network (2020 & 2021)

Description: Various safety and amenity improvements to LTD's frequent transit network

21405 is funded with \$244,784.72 STBG + \$126,700.10 CMAQ (includes match amounts).

21406 is funded with \$620,577.29 CMAQ (includes match amount).

Amendment (part 1): Replace all CMAQ amounts in 21405 and 21406 with LTD Formula Funds.

Amendment (part 2): Add \$747,277.39 CMAQ (includes match) to new 2022 LTD Electric Fleet Procurement CMAQ project (new project total: \$2,976,186.34)