RSTP/CMAQ Update

September 10, 2020



Election of Officers

- Subcommittee Chair
- Subcommittee Vice-Chair







- RSTBG flexible and covers wide range of projects
- CMAQ limited project types and geographic reach

- Programs date to the early 1990s (ISTEA)
- MPO oversees allocations and tracks funding
- MPO responsible for selecting projects



- Funding was largely allocated based on population in 1990s
- In 2004, project selection guidelines were adopted to comply with federal regulations
- Methodology borrowed from Hampton Roads PDC; criteria initially developed in 1992 with some revisions before RRTPO adoption



- Program has seen several revisions over the past 16 years
 - Increase years allocated from 3 (TIP) to 6 (SYIP)
 - RideFinders baseline allocation
- Document needs comprehensive review
 - Old organizational references RAMPO
 - Dated language (accident vs. crash)
 - Criteria almost 30 years old



- Alternative funding opportunities
 - Smart Scale
 - CVTA
- Evolving Transportation Priorities
 - Equity
 - Vision Zero
 - Resilience/Climate Change







1. Unified Scoring Process

- LRTP moving toward data-driven, performance-based evaluation for all projects
- HRTPO made similar move in 2009 and updated RSTBG highway scoring to match; transit and bike-ped coming
- Consistent scoring and prioritization across all TPO work
- Alternatives for studies; programs



- 2. Guidelines for Transportation Alternatives (TA)
 - TA is a third source of funding overseen by the MPO
 - Funding for alternatives (mostly bike-ped)
 - No adopted guidance for program
 - Different visions for TA funds from sponsors
 - Include all MPO allocated funds in guidelines



3. Leveraging Guidance

- New sources of funding for projects
- Outside sources larger than MPO funds
- Guidelines encourage leveraging
- Define standard leveraging process



4. Refining Allocation Guidance

- Order of allocations in guidelines
- Target balances, general approach not included
- Consider alternative approaches (as discussed at TAC)
- Increased transparency
- Include guidance for transfers, schedule changes



- 5. Improve Project Delivery and Tracking
 - Costs average 35% over initial estimate since 2010
 - Planned obligations not consistent with actual schedule
 - Move toward sponsor reporting
 - End Goal: Provide TPO dashboard for public/sponsors







- Task 1: Screening and Eligibility
 - Program Overviews
 - Project Screening
 - Federal Regulations
 - Cost Estimates
 - Schedules
 - LRTP Consistency Workflow



- Task 2: Scoring and Selection
 - Scoring for RSTBG/CMAQ Projects
 - Scoring for Studies and Programs
 - TA Project Scoring
 - Prioritization



- Task 3: Allocations
 - Order of Allocations
 - Balance Entry/Allocation Approach
 - Leveraging
 - Transfers
 - Advancing Projects
 - Cost Overruns
 - Reporting and Tracking



- Task 4: Adoption
 - Draft Document Prep/Review
 - Subcommittee Recommendation
 - TAC Recommendation
 - Public Review Period (15 days)
 - Policy Board Adoption







Proposed Schedule

Topic	Month	Action Requested
Kick-off; Scope and Schedule	September	Consensus
Task 1: Screening	October	Consensus
Task 2: Scoring/Prioritization	January	Consensus
Task 3: Allocations	February	Consensus
Draft to Subcommittee	End of February	N/A
Subcommittee Recommendation	March	Yes, Majority Vote
TAC Recommendation	April	Yes
Public Review	End of April	N/A
Policy Board Adoption	May	Yes





