



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE

CORNELIUS

DAVIDSON

HUNTERSVILLE

INDIAN TRAIL

MATTHEWS

MECKLENBURG
COUNTY

MINT HILL

MONROE

NCDOT

PINEVILLE

STALLINGS

UNION
COUNTY

WAXHAW

WEDDINGTON

WESLEY CHAPEL

WINGATE

TO: TCC Members
FROM: Nicholas Polimeni
MUMPO Principal Planner
DATE: January 28, 2011
**SUBJECT: Technical Coordinating Committee (TCC) Agenda
February 2011 TCC Meeting—February 3, 2011**

The February 2011 TCC meeting is scheduled for **Thursday, February 3 at 10:00 AM** in **Room 267** of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center (600 East Fourth Street). Attached is a copy of the agenda.

Please call me at (704) 336-8309 if you have any questions.

MUMPO TCC
AGENDA
February 3, 2011

1. Consideration of January Meeting Minutes

Bill Coxe

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve as presented, or with amendments.

2. JARC Project Selection (15 minutes)

Angela Schlottman

ACTION REQUESTED: Approve the grantees selected for funding based upon the recommendation of the subcommittee.

BACKGROUND: CATS subcontracted with Centralina Council of Governments to facilitate the selection process for FY 09-10 New Freedom and JARC grant funds. The first and second rounds of proposals occurred in 2010. At that time, not all grant funds were awarded so CATS subcontracted with Centralina again to facilitate the selection process for a third round. The recommendations will be presented to the TCC for its approval of the grantees selected for these funds.

One eligible application was submitted. Click here to view the application: [JARC application](#)

ATTACHMENTS: Review Process Memo; Project Selection Results Memo

3. CMAQ Follow Up (10 minutes)

Nicholas Polimeni

ACTION REQUESTED: Recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed clarifications to the CMAQ ranking criteria.

BACKGROUND: A subcommittee was formed last year to evaluate projects to be funded with CMAQ dollars. As part of that process, the subcommittee also had a chance to evaluate the criteria that was used to prioritize the projects. This item was on the January TCC agenda, and it was recommended to further discuss the item at a transportation staff meeting. The item was discussed at the January 19 staff meeting. A summary of that meeting is contained in the attached memo.

ATTACHMENT: CMAQ Memorandum

4. CATS 2009-2015 TIP Amendment (5 minutes)

David McDonald

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: TIP project U-5210 was included in FY 2011 of NCDOT's 5-Year Work Program when the draft state TIP was released in August 2010. The project was described as "Flex STP funding to Charlotte Area Transit System (CATS)" and the proposed funding amount was \$1.5 million. Over the course of the 2012-2018 TIP's development, the TCC and MPO ultimately agreed to allocate the funds, provided they are used for a capital project. The funds will be used in conjunction with other CATS and Federal Funds to replace underground fuel tanks at the North Davidson Bus Maintenance Facility.

Because the funds are designated for FY 2011, an amendment to the 2009-2015 TIP is required. A recommendation to the MPO will be requested at the TCC's March meeting.

5. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (10 minutes)

Robert Cook

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the Draft TIP.

6. Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) (10 minutes)

Robert Cook

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of the UPWP.

7. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) (5 minutes)

Anil Panicker

ACTION REQUESTED: FYI

BACKGROUND: Update on the status of this project.

8. Adjourn

MECKLENBURG - UNION TECHNICAL COORDINATING COMMITTEE
Summary Meeting Minutes
Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center
Room 267
January 6, 2011

Voting Members: Bill Coxe (Huntersville), Danny Pleasant (CDOT), George Berger (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Ken Tippet (CDOT Bicycle Coordinator), Jonathan Wells – alt. for Debra Campbell (C-M Planning), Lisa Stiwinter (Monroe), Anil Panicker (NCDOT-TPB), Lauren Blackburn (Davidson), Andrew Grant (Cornelius), Adam McLamb (Indian Trail), Ralph Messera (Matthews), Shannon Martel – alt. for Brian Matthews (Stallings), Jordan Cook (Weddington), Amy Helms (Union County), Leslie Rhodes (LUESA-Air Quality), Jack Flaherty (NCDOT-Public Transportation Branch)

Staff: Stuart Basham (MUMPO), Robert Cook (MUMPO), Nick Polimeni (MUMPO), Andy Grzynski (CDOT), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Anna Gallup (CDOT), Eldewins Haynes (CDOT), Jan Whitesell (C-M Planning), Gwen Cook (Mecklenburg County Park & Recreation), Richard Hancock (NCDOT-Div. 10), Pate Butler (NCDOT), Loretta Barren (FHWA), Tim Gibbs (CDOT), Norm Steinman (CDOT), Jim Keenan (Charlotte Engineering & Property Management), Tom Tasselli (Cornelius), Jim Loyd (Monroe), Mandy Vari (Monroe), Craig Thomas (Indian Trail), Keith Sorensen (Indian Trail)

Guests: Carroll Gray (LNTC), Jason Wager (Centralina COG), Lindsey Dunevant (Carolina Thread Trail)

Bill Coxe opened the meeting at 10:05 AM.

1. Election of Officers

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Coxe stated that it is the responsibility of the TCC to annually elect new officers as the first action item of the first meeting of the year. Mr. Coxe opened the nominations for Chair of the TCC.

Chair Nominations

Mr. Pleasant nominated Bill Coxe for Chair of the TCC; Ms. Blackburn seconded the nomination. No other nominations were put forth.

Mr. Wells made a motion to close the nominations; Mr. Tasselli seconded the motion.

Upon being put to a vote, Mr. Bill Coxe was unanimously elected Chair of the TCC for 2011.

Mr. Coxe then opened the nominations for Vice-Chair of the TCC.

Vice-Chair Nominations

Ms. Helms nominated Danny Pleasant for Vice-Chair of the TCC; Mr. Messera seconded the motion. No other nominations were put forth.

Mr. Wells made a motion to close the nominations; Mr. Flaherty seconded the motion.

Upon being put to a vote, Mr. Danny Pleasant was unanimously elected Vice-Chair of the TCC for 2011.

2. Consideration of December Meeting Minutes

Mr. Coxe asked if there were any changes needed to the December minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Coxe asked if the item could be approved by consensus. The motion passed unanimously.

3. CMAQ Follow Up

Presenter: Jason Wager, Centralina COG

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Wager summarized the CMAQ subcommittee process by reviewing a memo that was attached to the TCC agenda packet. He started by emphasizing that the local area knowledge of subcommittee members was helpful throughout the project selection procedure, and went on to highlight suggested modifications to the CMAQ process proposed by the subcommittee. Mr. Wells asked if the degree of certainty regarding an applicant's ability to fund a CMAQ project was raised by the subcommittee, and Mr. Wager responded that it had not. Mr. Steinman suggested that the emissions reductions be calculated in a more transparent manner, perhaps by having a review team assigned to evaluate them in a non-competitive manner. Mr. Wager noted that the subcommittee did discuss allowing time for a debriefing session after the selection process is complete, in order to provide more information to applicants who did not receive funding about why the project was not selected. Mr. Coxe suggested that the topic be discussed further at a staff meeting.

Motion:

Mr. Pleasant made a motion to place the CMAQ item on the February TCC meeting agenda to allow for more time to discuss the item. Ms. Blackburn seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Charlotte Streetcar Project

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook indicated that the Charlotte Streetcar Amendment Report that was included as part of the TCC's agenda materials required a slight revision, including adding language regarding the required LRTP amendment as well as identifying the exact amount of grant money being awarded. He briefly described the project and the action being requested by the TCC, namely that the TCC would be recommending that the MPO release for public comment the documents associated with the streetcar project. He indicated that the public review would most likely begin at the end of January and run for 30 days and that a public meeting would be scheduled for the tentative date of February 16, 2011.

Motion:

Mr. Messera made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse, and release for public comment, the amendment to the 2009-2015 Transportation Improvement Plan, the amendment to the 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan and the conformity determination for the 2009-2015 TIP and the 2035 LRTP. Mr. Wells seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

5. Draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/Action Requested:

Mr. Cook stated that the TCC will be asked to recommend a draft project list for the 2012-2018 TIP to the MPO. He highlighted a list of changes contained in a spreadsheet that was distributed to TCC members at the January meeting. As Mr. Cook went through the changes, several comments and questions were raised

by various TCC members, which led to further modifications of the project list. The resulting project list, based on the discussion of the TCC, which incorporates the comments and suggestions made by the TCC, can be accessed by clicking [here](#). A question was asked regarding the CMAQ projects being added to the draft TIP, and Mr. Cook responded that CMAQ projects will be added. There was a question about the status of the Rea Road project in Weddington, and Jordan Cook responded that a meeting had been scheduled with NCDOT's Division 10 on January 14 to discuss that project. The TCC indicated that it would recommend that the MPO remove the project from the draft TIP unless documentation was provided that the property owner would agree to dedicate the right-of-way prior to the MPO's January 19 meeting. The TCC acknowledged that the decision would be left to the MPO based on its recommendation.

Motion:

Mr. Messera made a motion to recommend that the MPO endorse the draft project list as discussed and modified by the TCC (and attached above), including the relevant CMAQ projects that need to be added. Ms. Martel seconded the motion. Upon being put to a vote, the motion passed unanimously.

6. Draft 2012 Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP)

Presenter: Robert Cook

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Cook noted that the federal reauthorization has not yet been approved; therefore, there is uncertainty regarding the UPWP funding amount for the next fiscal year. He suggested that the MPO use the same amount of funds allocated for the current fiscal year as a conservative assumption, and stated that some of the UPWP funds have traditionally been sub-allocated to local transportation planning projects. He then briefly outlined the local projects proposed to be considered for funding in the next UPWP. It was noted that the amount of funds requested for local projects represents a large portion of the total UPWP funds available, which means some of the projects proposed may not receive the full amount requested. Mr. Cook indicated that the projects would be discussed in further detail at the January 12 transportation staff meeting, and that no action is necessary.

7. SPOT Prioritization 2.0

Presenter: Nicholas Polimeni

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Polimeni provided information to the TCC via a Power Point presentation, the contents of which are incorporated into the minutes [here](#). He went through the presentation, which outlined changes proposed to SPOT's strategic prioritization process by the NCDOT workgroup at its December 2010 meeting. He also indicated that the workgroup is requesting comments based on the proposed changes by January 7, and that the item was on the transportation staff meeting agenda prior to the TCC meeting to develop comments. The comments developed at the staff meeting were presented to the TCC for its reaction. Mr. Polimeni stated that he would send the comments to NCDOT before the January 7 deadline. Mr. Coxe suggested that if there were no objections, the TCC could indicate they are okay with the comments. The TCC gave its consensus.

8. Project Prioritization

Presenter: Nicholas Polimeni

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Polimeni noted that MUMPO's project prioritization process and criteria would need to be evaluated

this year for various reasons, including the submittal of a top 25 to NCDOT in the summer and because development of the next LRTP would begin soon. He indicated that it would require participation of staff and TCC members. He also stated that as the process moves forward, the TCC and MPO will be updated regularly. Mr. Coxe suggested that MPO members, and possibly outside parties, could be involved. Mr. Grzymiski noted that it will be important to take the SPOT criteria into account. Mr. Wells suggested that technology could play an important role, and Ms. Cook noted that it will be important to be mindful of the public as the process is carried out.

9. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP)

Presenter: Anil Panicker, NCDOT

Summary/FYI:

Mr. Panicker stated that he had two items to discuss regarding the CTP: 1) That he has begun the process of meeting with individual jurisdictions in MUMPO to make corrections to the base map, and 2) He asked what the TCC thought about using the Complete Streets guidelines as functional classifications for the CTP. He also indicated that NCDOT had released a new street cross sections document. Mr. Pleasant recommended the use of Complete Streets in the CTP. Mr. Panicker and Mr. Steinman suggested that the use of Complete Streets throughout the state will be an issue that will have to be resolved at a state level. Mr. Coxe suggested that this issue be discussed at a future transportation staff meeting.

Mr. Pleasant made the following two announcements:

- 1) There will be a Smart Growth Conference in Charlotte from Feb. 3-5, and that more information can be found at www.newpartners.org.
- 2) A ULI fellowship study panel discussion will be taking place regarding Independence Blvd, in order to discuss possible land use and transportation solutions for the corridor. Several representatives from around the country will be represented on the panel.

10. Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 12:20 PM.



TO: Members of MUMPO TCC Committee
FROM: Angela Schlottman, Centralina Council of Governments
SUBJECT: FY 09-10 JARC Review Process
DATE: January 27, 2011

Job Access and Reverse Commute Grant Funds

JARC funds are formula based programs that were created in 2005 by the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) legislation. The legislation requires that all designated recipients be selected competitively and that all projects be derived from a locally developed [coordinated human service transportation plan](#).

The primary function of JARC funds is to support employment transportation for low income individuals and families. According to the Community Transportation Association of America, “lack of access to affordable and reliable transportation has been cited as one of the biggest hurdles to finding and keeping a job, particularly for individuals with limited income, single parents, and others transitioning to work.” JARC funds address these issues by “providing funds to support the development of new transportation services, services that fill gaps in existing services, or the promotion of transportation use to employment related destinations.” The allocation of these funds is based on the number of eligible low income and welfare recipients living in each state. Since Charlotte is one of the urbanized areas, they receive a direct allocation from the FTA.

Centralina to Facilitate Grant Selection Process

In June of 2010, CATS personnel contacted Centralina staff to see if they were interested in facilitating the selection process for the FY 09-10 Job Access Reverse Commute and New Freedom funds. After meeting with CATS staff to discuss the process, Centralina staff submitted a proposal to CATS to begin the process in July 2010 with work to be completed by September 2010. A contract was subsequently executed and work began shortly thereafter. Since Centralina has facilitated this process in prior years, many of the steps involved were already pre-determined. Angela Schlottman, of Centralina’s aging staff, was selected to lead the process. She has been involved with human service transportation programs and services for several years and was a part of the selection committee for JARC and New Freedom funds in 2008 and 2009.

After a first and second round of applications, there were still remaining funds available for the Job Access Reverse Commute. CATS executed a third contract with Centralina to begin work in January 2011 to allocate the remaining JARC funds for FY 09-10.

Distribution of RFP

Centralina staff had previously collaborated with CATS staff to develop the application form for the funds. The original application and instructions were finalized in July. On January 14, 2011 the RFP was re-released publically via the Centralina website, [Charlotte Observer](#) and a blast email to eligible human service and transit providers. All applications were due to Centralina by January 21st, allowing applicants 1 week from the time of initial release, to complete the application. Two applications were received.

Selection Committee

For the first round of the grant selection process, it was pre-determined by CATS and Centralina staff that a selection committee be established to review and score all of the proposals, as well as make recommendations on funding. Although we had a pool of agencies and individuals that had participated on the selection committee in the past, it was determined that the best course of action would be to reach out to new selection committee members. The human service transportation field is relatively small, and in order to limit potential conflicts of interest, we searched for some additional members not necessarily familiar with transportation. For the third round of the grant selection process, most of the committee members were the same except for two people that were not able to participate. The chosen committee consisted of the following individuals:

Heather Parusel, Director of Grants Development & Performance, CPCC

April Elam, Vocational Evaluator, Goodwill Industries

Arlanda Rouse, Civil Rights Officer, CATS

Burhan Al-Shaik, Passenger Vehicles for Hire Manager, Charlotte Mecklenburg Police Department

Masie Jones, Transportation Manager, Mecklenburg County Department of Social Services

Vail Carter, Contracts Manager, Centralina Workforce Development Board

For the third review round, once all of the applications were received on January 21, 2011 packets were assembled for each selection committee member. By January 24, all selection committee members received a copy of each application, score sheets, instructions, and a conflict of interest/ confidentiality form to sign. Since all projects are to be derived directly from a strategy in the updated Charlotte Mecklenburg Human Services Coordination Transportation Plan, the committee was also instructed to review this document.

The selection committee convened via conference call on January 26, 2011. The meeting was facilitated by Angela Schlottman. The group was expected to have already read and scored each application prior to this meeting. This allowed the group to discuss areas of strength and concern for each application. The group reviewed the applications determined that one of the applications was ineligible because not

all sections of the application were complete. The committee voted unanimously to exclude this application from further consideration.

Since the total of the funds requested were less than the funds available, there is a sufficient amount of money to award all eligible JARC projects at their requested funds. The New Freedom funds were adequate to almost fully fund the requested amount after a revised budget was submitted. Please note that the revised budget for the New Freedom funds submitted by the applicant is not correct but CATS has indicated they will work with the applicant to finalize the budget if the grant is awarded. A breakdown of the budget has been provided on the project selection results summary memo.

If you have any additional questions or comments, please contact Angela Schlottman, Centralina Council of Governments, aschlottman@centralina.org or 704-348-2735.



TO: Members of MUMPO TCC Committee
FROM: Angela Schlottman, Centralina Council of Governments
SUBJECT: FY 09-10 JARC III Project Selection Results
DATE: January 27, 2011

Project Requests

JARC: There were two Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) applications submitted, totaling \$159,181. Before the funding recommendations from the committee were heard, the committee went through each application and discussed merits and concerns. One application was deemed ineligible because the application was not complete. The total amount of funding available was \$136,722. Once the ineligible project was removed from consideration, there were enough funds available to fund the other project at the requested levels. The two applications, scores, funding request, and amount funded are shown below.

Applicant	CATS	Aminah Ministries
Project Title	Gold Rush Service Extension	Bus Rides for Change
Grant Request	\$136,722	\$22,459
Type of Funding	Operating (50/50)	Operating (50/50) & Capital (80/20)
Amount Recommended for Funding	\$136,722	\$0
Category Scores		*3 reviewers did not score because application incomplete
Coordination (20 points)	19.8	9.33
Benefits (35 points)	32.2	15
Innovation (10 points)	9	4
Organizational Capability (15 points)	15	7.33
Budget (20 points)	18.2	11
Total (100 points)	94.2	46.66

If you have any additional questions or comments, please contact Angela Schlottman, Centralina Council of Governments, aschlottman@centralina.org or 704-348-2735.



M E C K L E N B U R G - U N I O N
METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

600 East Fourth Street
Charlotte, North Carolina 28202-2853
704-336-2205
www.mumpo.org

CHARLOTTE
CORNELIUS
DAVIDSON
HUNTERSVILLE
INDIAN TRAIL
MATTHEWS
MECKLENBURG
COUNTY
MINT HILL
MONROE
NCDOT
PINEVILLE
STALLINGS
UNION
COUNTY
WAXHAW
WEDDINGTON
WESLEY CHAPEL
WINGATE

MEMORANDUM

TO: MUMPO Technical Coordinating Committee
FROM: Nicholas Polimeni
MUMPO Principal Planner
DATE: January 25, 2011
SUBJECT: **Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ)
Follow up items for February TCC meeting**

BACKGROUND

At its January meeting, the TCC received a "Follow up" presentation based on a meeting of the CMAQ subcommittee that took place in October 2010, after the selection process was concluded. The comments are documented in a memo titled "MUMPO CMAQ Process Review and Wrap-up Notes," which was provided as supplementary information prior to the January TCC meeting. At the January TCC meeting, discussion regarding the CMAQ process led the TCC to direct staff to include CMAQ on a transportation staff meeting agenda for further discussion, and also moved to place the item on the February TCC agenda.

CMAQ was discussed at the January 19 transportation staff meeting, which was attended by MUMPO staff, CDOT staff and a few representatives of the CMAQ project selection subcommittee. The "Wrap-up Notes" memo was reviewed, and comments raised by CDOT staff were addressed. The following is a summary of the discussion:

Process

- The October 2010 meeting of the CMAQ subcommittee, as documented in the "Wrap-up Notes" memo covers most of the process issues of concern, including consideration of an outside agency to assist with the selection process – contacting the EPA or NCDAQ to assist with the process was suggested
- The local knowledge of the selection subcommittee is a useful and valuable resource for reviewing project applications
- Applicants are asked to provide the emissions and air quality benefit calculations because it would be too cumbersome and time consuming to be done by the subcommittee, or some other entity – the subcommittee reviews all calculations to ensure the numbers make sense, and when necessary, follows up with applicants to discuss or modify the calculations
- The subcommittee members in attendance reiterated a willingness to review applications that were not selected for funding with the respective applicants in order to help them understand why a project was not chosen, and to provide suggestions to improve future applications

Criteria

- There was consensus that the criteria items from the "Wrap-up Notes" memo were intended to provide more clarity and guidance to those reviewing applications, and were not intended to change MUMPO's currently adopted CMAQ ranking criteria
- Innovation is difficult to define and should not be a separate criteria
- Some comments were directed toward the point structure, but the group was satisfied that the points are allocated to each category in the ranking criteria appropriately

The January 19 transportation staff meeting provided an opportunity to discuss issues related to the CMAQ process that arose at the January 6 TCC meeting, as well as another opportunity to review the “Wrap-up Notes” memorandum. Those in attendance at the staff meeting were satisfied that the “Wrap-up Notes” memo does a good job of summarizing suggested improvements to the process and clarifications to the criteria.

It was concluded that overall, the ranking criteria is satisfactory and there is no need to open the criteria for evaluation at this time. The subcommittee members in attendance stated that the subcommittee is always interested in improving the process, considers all discussion items and comments, but does not feel it is necessary – or practical – to endorse or adopt specific process changes. In addition, the suggested clarifications to the review criteria are not substantive in nature and are only necessary to correct discrepancies, which will aid the selection committee during the review process.

NEXT STEPS

The TCC recommend that the MPO endorse the proposed clarifications of the CMAQ subcommittee as outlined in the attached CMAQ Project Ranking Process

The MPO, based on the TCC’s recommendation, take action regarding the proposed changes to the CMAQ Project Ranking Process document



Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (MUMPO) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Project Ranking Process

APPROVED BY THE MPO: November 19, 2008

BACKGROUND: The MUMPO assigned a CMAQ subcommittee in July 2008 with the task of developing criteria to recommend projects to the MUMPO based on a comprehensive and technically-oriented project ranking process. Since the total value of proposed projects often significantly exceeds available funds, so an objective evaluation of proposals is necessary to determine the best use of CMAQ funds.

The following project ranking criteria process is the result of research and discussions by air quality and transportation professionals from the MUMPO region. The committee considered specific quantitative criteria for each of the categories, although this did not always prove to be feasible. The overarching goal was to create a thorough assessment that did not place undue burdens upon the applicant. When a quantitative measure of the absolute effectiveness of the project was not possible or reasonable, criteria based on a yes/no answer was created.

The scoring list below contains work discussed over the course of four subcommittee meetings in July and August of 2008. The TCC unanimously recommended this process to the MUMPO at their September 4, 2008 meeting.

FINAL PRODUCT: The MUMPO will have a process available that allows a wide variety of eligible projects to be evaluated for funding, without creating undue burdens on applicants.

PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA

1. Pollutant Reduction (25 points possible): This is the most important consideration for a project. How many kilograms of the four main pollutants: Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x), Particulate Matter 2.5 microns in diameter (PM 2.5), Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC), and Carbon Monoxide (CO), will the project reduce over the lifetime of the project? NO_x, due to its role in Ozone formation, is the most important pollutant in the region, with PM the second most important. VOCs and CO are currently not found in high enough concentrations to significantly affect air quality, so emission reductions are not considered as a part of the pollutant reduction in this process. The applicant is responsible for all emissions calculations, with review by a MUMPO project ranking committee.

Pollutant reductions are calculated by taking the calculated yearly NO_x reductions and 25 percent of the PM 2.5 reductions, and then summing the two numbers. This yearly number is then multiplied by the number of years in the project lifetime. The result is the lifetime pollutant reduction.

EXAMPLE: A project will annually reduce NOx by 1,000 kilograms per year and PM2.5 by 1,000 kilograms per year. The applicant would take all of the NOx benefits and 250 kilograms (25 percent) of the PM2.5 reductions, and sum them. The net pollutant reduction would then be 1,250 kilograms.

The generalized project lifetimes are as follows:

- a. Bus Purchase- see Federal Transit Administration schedule for lifetime
- b. Transit Operations Improvements- length of program funding
- c. Park and Ride Lots- 20 years
- d. Intersection Improvements- 10 years
- e. Signal Improvements- 5 years
- f. HOV/ HOT Lanes- 20 years
- g. Telecommuting Center- 10 years
- h. Advocacy and Education- length of program funding
- i. TMO and TMAs- length of program funding
- j. Sidewalks, Bike Lanes, and Greenways- 20 years
- k. ITS Capital Improvements- 10 years
- l. ITS Operations Improvements- 3 years
- m. Truck Stop Electrification- 10 years
- n. Retrofit Technology- 5 years
- o. Other Project- see MUMPO staff

The lifetime pollutant reduction point breakdown is as follows:

- a. 100,000 or more kilograms removed = 25 points
- b. 75,000-99,999 kilograms removed= 20 points
- c. 50,000-74,999 kilograms removed= 15 points
- d. 10,000-49,999 kilograms removed= 10 points
- e. Less than 10,000 kilograms removed= 5 points

2. Project Cost Effectiveness (20 points possible): What is the CMAQ cost per kilogram of pollutant removed over the life of the project, with kilograms removed defined by the weighting process from Criteria #1? Projects that fall in the more-cost effective categories will receive additional points. The category breakdowns are as follows:

- a. \$24.99 or less per kilogram removed= 20 points
- b. \$25.00-\$49.99 per kilogram removed=15 points
- c. \$50.00-\$99.99 per kilogram removed= 10 points
- d. \$100.00-\$199.99 per kilogram removed= 5 points
- e. \$200.00 or more per kilogram removed= 0 points

3. Transportation Impact (15 points possible): ~~Will the proposed project improve the transportation system?~~ **The proposed project will improve the transportation system.**

Examples: Will it improve freight movement or non-single occupant vehicle (SOV) travel? Will the project address an ~~identified~~ **identified** non-vehicular safety issue? If it reduced vehicular congestion, just how much congestion does it eliminate in terms of hours of delay per day?

- a. Promotes multi-modal options, including freight movement (Yes= 5 points, no= 0 points)
- b. Improves vehicular, pedestrian, or bicyclist safety; **explain why** (Yes= 2 points, no= 0 points)

- c. Reduces congestion (0 points for non-traffic project, 2 points for projects that do reduce congestion, but did not perform calculation). The following scores are for those applicants who performed a before and after analysis of congestion:
 - 1) Less than 10 seconds of delay per vehicle reduced= 4 points
 - 2) 10-20 seconds of delay per vehicle reduced= 6 points
 - 3) Greater than 20 seconds per vehicle reduced= 8 points

4. Policy and Information Sharing (5 points possible): Does the project intend to educate the public or community decision makers on how to improve air quality? Does the applicant attempt to make institutional change in organizations to reduce pollution? (Yes= 5 points, no= 0 points)

- a. Distributes best practices to public and decision makers
- b. Involves institutional changes to agency regarding air quality and transportation

5. Applicant Financial Commitment (5 points possible): Does the applicant have a significant financial stake in the project? Are they contributing a significant amount of their own resources towards the total project cost? If so, then they will receive more points than those who may only contribute the minimum amount necessary. The ranges of percent match of total project cost, and corresponding points, are as follows:

- a. 0-20%=0 points
- b. ~~20~~ 21-49%= 2 points
- c. 50% or more= 5 points

6. Project Readiness (10 points possible): Does the project require environmental review? Has the applicant implemented projects in the past that are of similar complexity? Has the applicant implemented previous CMAQ projects, or projects similar in complexity?

- a. Environmental considerations
 - 1) Environmental study not prepared= 0 points
 - 2) Environmental document already received, categorical exclusion, or no environmental review required= 5 points
- b. Sponsor's ability to implement: does the applicant have a proven record implementing projects of similar type or difficulty?
 - 1) Yes= 5 points
 - 2) no= 0 points

7. Project Maintenance and Management (10 points possible): Has the applicant anticipated the ongoing maintenance and management obligations of the project? Does the applicant have a plan, and capability, for maintenance and supervision of completed project?

- a. Plan and resources in place= 10 points
- b. No committed or identified plan and resources= 0 points

8. Concurrency with Existing Plans (10 points possible): Has the proposed project been identified through a previous planning effort? Does the project help address an issue identified in one of the following types of plans?

- a. ~~Transportation (LRTP, TP, CTP, Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan, or other locally adopted transportation plan or list for community)~~
- b. ~~Land Use or Comprehensive Plan~~
- c. ~~Recreation Plan~~
- d. ~~Economic Development Plan~~

- a. Identified in current adopted plan (10 points)
 - Transportation (LRTP, TP, CTP, Bicycle Plan, Pedestrian Plan, or other locally adopted transportation plan or list for community)
 - Land Use or Comprehensive Plan
 - Recreation Plan
 - Economic Development Plan
- b. Not identified in current adopted plan (0 points)