



**STF/STIF  
CONSOLIDATION  
PROGRESS REPORT  
AND PLAN**

**NOVEMBER 5, 2019**



Oregon Department of Transportation  
Rail and Public Transit Division



**Rail and Public Transit Division**  
**STF/STIF Consolidation Progress Report and Plan**  
**November 5, 2019**

**Contents**

Executive Summary ..... 2

Legislative Background ..... 3

ODOT Consolidation Progress ..... 3

Existing STF and STIF Programs ..... 4

CAC Selection Criteria ..... 6

Recommended Concepts..... 6

    Local Processes ..... 6

    Recipient and Project Eligibility ..... 7

    Funding Allocation Concepts ..... 7

    ODOT Administration Allocation ..... 9

    ODOT Recommended Concepts..... 10

    Additional Program Differences for Consideration ..... 10

        Supplanting ..... 10

        Project Eligibility: Improve or Expand vs. Maintain ..... 11

        Project Eligibility: Client-only Services ..... 11

ODOT Program Management and Administration..... 11

ODOT Consolidation Plan and Schedule ..... 12

Appendix A: CAC Charter..... A-1

Appendix B: CAC Roster and Workplan..... B-1

Appendix C: Concepts Considered and Rejected ..... C-1

Appendix D: Comparison of Formula Allocation Concepts.....D-1

## Executive Summary

During the 2019 Legislative Session, the Oregon Legislature directed the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) to consolidate two state-funded public transportation programs—the Special Transportation Fund (STF) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF)—into a single public transportation program. ODOT was also directed to return to the 2020 legislative session with a report on the status of this program consolidation and costs needed to administer the consolidated program.

ODOT established an STF/STIF Consolidation Advisory Committee (CAC) to develop a recommended set of concepts to inform statutory changes necessary to consolidate these two distinct programs. The CAC was comprised of a diverse cross section of public transportation providers and advocates representing a variety of user groups. This report includes the committee’s recommendations and ODOT’s plan for implementing the consolidation should the legislature enact statutory changes to the programs during the 2020 legislative session.

The concepts recommended for legislative consideration by ODOT and the CAC are summarized below. A more detailed description of the recommendations and CAC disposition and rationale for each concept are included in the Recommended Concepts section on page 7, below.

- **Local Processes:** Require a minimum of one local advisory committee to review and advise on funding proposals.
- **Recipient and Project Eligibility:** Give Qualified Entities/STF Agencies (lead agencies) the option of allowing private, for-profit and non-profit providers to be recipients or sub-recipients of funds under specific circumstances.
- **Allocation:** The CAC and ODOT recommend two options for fund allocation; these two options share programmatic characteristics while including sufficient differences that present the Legislature with a distinct policy choice.

**Concept A** is the most similar to existing STF and STIF formula funding allocations and levels of funding, in that it uses STIF to backfill STF to 2019-21 funding levels and distributes the STF formula portion of the consolidated fund by *population* and the remainder by *share of payroll*. 2019-21 STF funding levels are used to calculate a funding floor, as adjusted over time by the overall rate of change of the consolidated fund, with future payroll revenue transfers adjusted accordingly relative to fluctuations in other revenue sources.

**Concept B** also calculates the initial amount of STIF used to backfill the STF formula portion using the 2019-21 funding levels but distributes the STIF backfill portion by *share of payroll*. Additionally, future STIF backfill amounts are adjusted over time specifically at the rate of change of payroll revenues and are not responsive to changes in STF legacy revenues.

- **ODOT Administration Allocation:** The CAC recommend that ODOT take audited program administration and management costs off the top of the consolidated fund. The CAC also agreed ODOT should be eligible to expend consolidated funds on projects of statewide significance that support the transit network and to manage the operation of transit services.

## **Legislative Background**

During the 2019 Legislative Session, the Oregon State Legislature passed House Bill 2377, which directed the transfer of \$10.1 million from the STIF to the STF on July 1, 2019. The transfer distributed funds to designated transit entities to support public transportation services benefiting older adults and people with disabilities.

The Oregon Department of Transportation 2019-2021 Legislatively Adopted Budget (House Bill 5039) also included a budget note directing ODOT to merge STF and STIF into one public transit program moving forward.

“The Oregon Department of Transportation is directed to merge the Special Transportation Fund (STF) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) into one public transit program. The legislative intent is for the Department to accomplish this with the least possible disruption to the formula allocations and services provided by STF agencies. The Department shall not require STF agencies to submit new or revised plans for formula distributions in the 2019-21 biennium. The Department is directed to report during the 2020 legislative session on the status of the program consolidation, and the administrative costs, including the number of full-time equivalent positions required to administer the consolidated program.”

## **ODOT Consolidation Progress**

Since the conclusion of the 2019 legislative session, ODOT has:

- Continued to operate both programs as directed by existing statute for the 2019-2021 biennium.
- Transferred \$10.1 million from STIF to STF to keep STF agencies whole at approximately \$28 million for the 2019-2021 biennium.
- Created and consulted with an advisory committee that has recommended changes required to merge the programs and ensure a smooth transition to a consolidated state funded public transportation program.
- Developed and maintained an STF/STIF Consolidation website that provides current information about the consolidation process.
- Developed concepts that inform statutory changes needed for consolidation.
- Analyzed consolidated program management and administration staffing needs with an emphasis on reducing redundancies and finding efficiencies.
- Prepared a draft plan and schedule for program consolidation, assuming legislative action in 2020, with the goal of full consolidation by the 2021-23 biennium.

## Existing STF and STIF Programs

### Purpose and Funding Sources

#### Special Transportation Fund

The Special Transportation Fund (STF) ([ORS 391.800](#) *et. seq.*) finances and improves transportation programs and services for older adults and people with disabilities. It is funded by the Department of Transportation Operating Fund (TOF), which includes revenues from non-road gas taxes and identification cards; the STF also receives funding from certain cigarette tax revenues and other moneys appropriated or transferred by the Legislative Assembly. Over the past few biennia, the STF program has received General Fund revenues. However, no General Funds were appropriated to this program for the 2019-21 biennium.

#### Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) ([ORS 184.751](#) *et. seq.*), finances investments and improvements in public transportation services, except light rail capital, with an emphasis on:

- Increasing the frequency of service to low-income households.
- Procuring buses powered by natural gas or electricity in areas with populations greater than 200,000.
- Funding low-income fare programs.
- Expanding routes and service to reach low-income households.
- Improving frequency and reliability of service connections between communities inside and outside of the qualified entity's (QE's) service area.
- Improving coordination between providers to reduce fragmentation of services.
- Increasing student transit services for grades 9-12 (minimum of 1% per fiscal year, if practicable).

The Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund has a dedicated revenue stream, receiving all of its funding from 1/10 of 1% tax on employee payroll.

### Program Differences and Similarities

As part of the consolidation planning process, ODOT identified the [key differences and similarities](#) between the two programs. The key differences addressed by these concepts include:

#### Recipient and Project Eligibility

- STF includes more subrecipients than STIF; such as certain non-profit, private for-profit, and volunteer service providers.
- ODOT is an eligible recipient of STF funds that can be used for broader purposes, such as projects of statewide significance, program management, and to manage transit operations. ODOT may only receive STIF funds for fund administration and to support the Technical Resource Center.
- STIF focuses on the improvement or expansion of public transportation services more broadly; whereas STF is focused on transportation programs and services (note: "public" is absent) benefiting older adults and people with disabilities. For example, STF may be used

for client-only services, such as a social service agency transporting older adults to medical appointments.

#### Local Processes

- STF local advisory committee member qualifications are set in statute, whereas STIF are set by rule.

#### Allocation of Funds

- STIF allocates 90% by formula; whereas STF allocates 75% by formula.
- STIF allocates 5% to a discretionary fund and 4% to an intercommunity discretionary fund; whereas STF allocates 25% to a discretionary fund after formula requirements have been met.
- STF formula funds are distributed to local agencies based on population; whereas STIF is distributed based on where employee payroll taxes are generated. Distribution based on population means that commuter areas tend to receive larger disbursements under STF while urban areas with greater labor density tend to receive larger disbursements under STIF.
- STIF establishes a fixed base allocation of \$100,000 per year for low payroll areas; whereas STF allows for adjustment of the minimum base allocation in low population areas by administrative rule.
- STF limits local agency administrative costs to \$2,000 per year; STIF does not limit local agency administrative costs.
- STF allows ODOT administrative costs to be taken off the top; whereas STIF allocates 1% for ODOT's administration and to establish the Technical Resource Center to assist public transportation service providers (PTSPs) in rural areas with technical assistance, training, transportation planning, and information technology.

## **STF/STIF Consolidation Advisory Committee**

### **Composition**

ODOT appointed a 17-person advisory committee to assist in developing consolidation concepts to inform the statutory changes needed to merge the programs. [Members of the advisory committee](#) represented a range of public transportation service providers (large urban, small urban, rural areas, tribes, counties, cities, and non-government agencies); advocates for older adults, people with disabilities, and equity and environmental justice; and social and human services agencies. The CAC met five times over the course of two months.

### **Charter**

The CAC was [charged](#) with developing concepts that maintained the intent of both programs, reconciling differences between the programs, and identifying funding allocations. The [CAC's workplan](#) included determining characteristics of a successful consolidation to use as criteria to evaluate a range of consolidation concepts. The CAC's workplan also led the group to consider and work to reconcile key differences between the two programs needed to maintain the intent of each program and create state and local administrative efficiencies. The CAC membership roster, charter and workplan are attached in Appendices A and B.

## **CAC Selection Criteria**

The CAC developed a list of STF/STIF consolidation success criteria that committee members used to evaluate potential consolidation concepts. Success criteria for consolidation concepts are listed below:

### **Administration**

- Best supports programs.
- As efficient and streamlined as possible.

### **Clarity**

- Clear and easy to understand.

### **Funding**

- Flexible
- Responsive to changing needs of communities.
- Supports existing levels of service in rural areas.

### **Priorities**

- Includes priorities from STF and STIF:
  - Older adults and people with disabilities (STF).
  - Low income households (STIF).

### **Impacts**

- Avoids or minimizes negative impacts to existing services across all of Oregon.

### **Flexibility**

- Maintains or improves flexibility in providing services and contracting for services.

## **Recommended Concepts**

ODOT and CAC members developed alternative concepts that the CAC reviewed and evaluated. The group considered 11 concepts. Six were eliminated from further consideration after application of the success characteristics and committee dialog. See Appendix C for considered but rejected concepts. Five were carried forward for further consideration.

Below is a description of the recommended concepts, CAC disposition for each concept, the rationale for each recommendation, and dissenting minority opinions for two of the concepts.

### **Local Processes**

Concept: In a consolidated statute, require at least one advisory committee, with the following duties:

- Advise and assist governing body in prioritizing plans or projects
- Review every plan or project proposal
- May propose changes to policies or practices of the governing body to ensure that:
  - Recipients or sub-recipients applied moneys in accordance with the program plan
  - Plan or project proposal does not fragment delivery of public transportation services
- May propose changes to policies or practices of the governing body relating to distribution

### Majority Opinion

The CAC had unanimous support for this concept because it enables lead agencies the flexibility of appointing more than one advisory committee. Some lead agencies, particularly those located in urban areas, expressed an interest in retaining their STF committees as either a separate committee or a sub-committee to the more diverse STIF committee. These agencies expressed a desire to continue to have ample opportunity to hear from older adults and people with disabilities. Other lead agencies, generally in more rural areas, expressed a desire to have a single consolidated advisory committee as it can be challenging to find enough members for two committees. Members also believed this approach could streamline local agency program administration.

### **Recipient and Project Eligibility**

Concept: Give lead agencies (QEs) the option of allowing private, for-profit, and non-profit providers to be recipients or sub-recipients of funds under specific circumstances:

- If they are providing services for older adults and people with disabilities.
- Services are included in a QE's federal project management plan or a local plan.
- Services are included in a transportation plan that is reviewed by a local advisory committee to ensure transportation services are coordinated and not fragmented.

### Majority Opinion

A majority of the CAC supported this concept with 12 members in favor and two opposed. Those that supported this concept did so because it provides lead agencies the option of allowing non-profits, private, and private for-profit public transportation providers to apply for and receive consolidated funding in order to serve older adults and people with disabilities. Under the current STIF, this is not allowed, while non-profit, private, and private for-profit providers currently may apply for STF funds.

### Minority Opinion

One of the two dissenting CAC members, representing non-profit transportation service providers, hoped the consolidation would not have negative impacts on existing programs and services for older adults. The member further noted that historically, non-profits have supported their work using STF dollars and believes that older adults and people with disabilities are well served by non-profits under STF. This member also said allowing lead agencies to use their discretion whether to allow non-profits to apply for and receive funding is contrary to the current intent of STF and could be very subjective. The member stated that, in most cases, the service would not continue without a non-profit providing it.

Similarly, the second dissenting member, representing county transit providers, said it is prudent to allow a variety of transportation providers access to consolidated funds to ensure no providers are restricted from providing quality programs and was opposed to any modifications that would remove any potential provider from having an opportunity to apply for funding.

### **Funding Allocation Concepts**

The CAC and ODOT are recommending two options for allocating funding. The two options have many shared characteristics and a few differences that present a distinct policy choice.

Both Concept A and Concept B:

- Use STIF to backfill STF formula by taking funding off the top of STIF before distributing among STIF programs.
- Allocate remaining STIF funds 90% by formula, 5% by discretionary competitive processes, 4% by intercommunity discretionary competitive processes, and 1% to ODOT for a Technical Resource Center to assist transit providers in rural areas with training, planning, and technology.
- Maintain minimum base STF and STIF formula allocations for lead agencies at 2019-21 levels, and then, over time, adjust the base by the rate of change of the consolidated fund as a whole.
- Add a new area of emphasis/criterion to the STIF formula for services for older adults and people with disabilities.
- Eliminate the STF discretionary grant program.

The key differences between the two concepts and policy implications are described below:

	<b>Concept A</b>	<b>Concept B</b>
Backfill Method	Total STF formula funding set at 2019-21 level, and STIF backfills general fund resources and any reduction in legacy revenue sources (cigarette tax, non-highway gas tax, and ID cards)	STIF backfills only general fund resources to reach 2019-21 STF formula funding levels; does not backfill any reduction in legacy revenue sources (cigarette tax, non-highway gas tax, and ID cards)
Funding Adjustment	Total STF formula funding starts at 2019-2021 levels and is adjusted by rate of growth/decline of consolidated fund	Total STF formula funding starts at 2019-2021 level and is adjusted by changes in STF legacy revenue sources and rate of growth/decline of payroll tax revenues
Distribution Method	All STF formula funds distributed by population	Funding from STF legacy revenue sources distributed by population; funding from STIF backfill distributed by payroll

Concept A

At a high level, this concept is the most similar to existing STF and STIF formula funding allocations and levels of funding, in that it uses STIF to backfill STF to 2019-21 funding levels and distributes the STF formula portion of the consolidated fund by population and the remainder by share of payroll. 2019-21 STF funding levels are used to calculate a funding floor, as adjusted over time by the overall rate of change of the consolidated fund, with future payroll revenue transfers adjusted accordingly relative to fluctuations in other revenue sources.

Some CAC members support this concept because it is the most consistent with both current STF and STIF funding allocations and they see it as responsive to change and flexible. Since the STF formula portion of the allocation is based on population, it responds to population changes over time. The STF formula portion of the consolidated fund should remain fairly stable because it is indexed to the 2019-21 funding levels and will grow or decline at the rate of change of the consolidated fund overall.

Concept A prioritizes funding for older adults and people with disabilities by requiring STIF to backfill any reduction in STF formula funds (general fund and legacy revenues sources; non-highway gas tax, cigarette tax, and ID cards) on an ongoing basis. It also provides the flexibility to expend more on services for older adults and people with disabilities with the addition of the new area of emphasis/criterion that focuses on serving this population.

### Concept B

This concept also calculates the initial amount of STIF used to backfill the STF formula portion using the 2019-21 funding levels but distributes the STIF backfill portion by share of payroll. Additionally, future STIF backfill amounts are adjusted over time specifically at the rate of change of payroll revenues and are not responsive to changes in STF legacy revenues.

The formula portion of the consolidated fund:

- Distributes the STF formula legacy revenues (non-highway gas tax, cigarette tax, and ID card) by population
- Distributes remaining STF formula portion (STIF revenues) by share of payroll

Some CAC members supported this concept because it directs the STIF backfill portion of the STF formula portion of the consolidated fund to be distributed by share of payroll rather than *population*, which keeps the STIF revenues where they were generated. Members viewed this concept as being more consistent with the intent of STIF than Concept A.

Depending on changes in the STF formula legacy revenues, there could be a reduction in the aggregate STF formula fund allocation, since the STIF revenue transfer amount is not adjusted for changes in other revenues. Additionally, since the STIF backfill is allocated by share of payroll rather than by population, STF formula distributions shift from some lead agencies to others. This concept reduces certainty that services for older adults and people with disabilities will be maintained. However, this concept provides flexibility to the lead agencies where the payroll is generated to determine how much STIF funds, if any, should be expended on services for older adults and people with disabilities. See appendix D for a [comparison of the formula allocation concepts from 2019-21 to 2021-23 by lead agency](#).

### Majority Opinion

The CAC had unanimous support for recommending both Concept A and Concept B for consideration by the legislature.

### **ODOT Administration Allocation**

The CAC recommends that ODOT be allowed to take audited program administration and program management costs off the top of the consolidated fund. They also recommend that

ODOT should be eligible to expend consolidated funds on projects of statewide significance that support the transit network. ODOT should also be eligible to expend funds to manage the operation of transit services that fill gaps in the statewide network where no local provider is willing or able to.

#### Majority Opinion

Nine committee members supported this concept because it reconciles the differences between the STF and STIF statute in ODOT administration allocation methods. It also would bring ODOT into compliance with its audited federally approved indirect administration rate, which requires indirect administrative costs to be allocated equitably across all revenue sources. CAC members also stated that ODOT's program administration costs and indirect rate are reasonable.

#### Minority Opinion

Of the four CAC members that opposed this concept, two represented mass transit districts and two were advocates for older adults and people with disabilities. One of the mass transit district representatives opposed this concept because they do not believe making a recommendation on administration is within the purview of the committee. However, they acknowledged ODOT's concern with administrative costs. They further cited the reporting requirement portion of the budget note, which states, "...The Department is directed to report during the 2020 legislative session on the status of the program consolidation, and the administrative costs, including the number of full-time equivalent positions required to administer the consolidated program." The other dissenting members did not offer a rationale for their opposition.

#### **ODOT Recommended Concepts**

Through the course of the CAC's work, ODOT provided information and data about the STF and STIF programs. The CAC members engaged in very thoughtful, fact-based discussions that ensured all perspectives were considered. It is the opinion of ODOT that the concepts agreed to by the CAC, in all cases by a strong majority, are reasonable, feasible, and establish a solid framework for consolidation of the two programs. Therefore, ODOT's recommendation for consolidation includes each of the concepts the CAC recommends for local processes, recipient eligibility, funding allocation, and program administration.

#### **Additional Program Differences for Consideration**

In addition to the concepts recommended above, ODOT has identified additional differences between the two programs that the legislature might consider when drafting legislation to consolidate the programs.

#### Supplanting

STF statute ORS 391.830 explicitly states that, except in the case of a uniform budget reduction or upon order or other authorization of the department, the increase in moneys received under ORS 391.810, 323.030, 323.455, 391.810, and 391.815 may not be used to supplant moneys currently appropriated by counties, Indian Tribes, or districts providing transportation projects for older adults and people with disabilities. While there is no specific statutory language prohibiting supplanting in ORS 184.751, ORS 184.758 or other STIF statutes, the legislature did express their intent that STIF be used to improve or expand service. In addition, the supplanting of local funds is an OTC approved consideration for rejecting a QE's submitted STIF Plan. If it is the legislature's intent that the consolidated fund should not be used by Public Transportation

Service Providers to supplant local sources of public transportation funding, explicit statutory language could be included in the consolidated fund statute.

#### Project Eligibility: Improve or Expand vs. Maintain

Under STIF, the legislature's expressed intent has been to fund projects that improve or expand the public transportation system. ORS 184.751 states that funds are to be used to finance investments and improvements in public transportation services. However, after the initial expansion of funding, public transportation service providers are likely to spend the majority of STIF funding on maintaining the improved or expanded services. STF has been funding transportation programs and services for many years and those services require continued funding. A consolidated statute would require clarification that consolidated funds may be used to improve or maintain services.

#### Project Eligibility: Client-only Services

Client-only transportation providers are both governmental and private agencies who offer transportation services to limited groups of individuals. Examples include a mental health department of a county providing a limited transportation service to mental health clients, or a city agency operating a senior center with transportation services for seniors in the community. Non-profit and private businesses may also provide client-only services. In all examples, the transportation services are not open to the general public.

Client-only transportation providers are generally not eligible to receive STIF funds if the proposed use is to pay for services that are not open to the general public. Client-only transportation providers are eligible recipients of STF funding.

ODOT recommends that client-only projects be eligible for submittal to a lead agency for consideration, if the project is part of a planned and coordinated community transportation program.

### **ODOT Program Management and Administration**

STIF allocates 1% for ODOT's administration and to establish the technical resource center to assist public transportation service providers in rural areas with technical assistance, training, transportation planning, and information technology. STF allows ODOT administrative costs to be taken off the top, enabling ODOT to equitably allocate statewide program management and administrative costs across all 12 state and federal revenue sources, as federally required.

With the adoption of STIF, ODOT was directed to ensure accountability, transparency and efficient use of funds while at the same time ensuring public transportation funds are distributed to improve and expand public transportation across Oregon.

Considering the consolidation of the two state-funded programs along with ODOT's total portfolio of public transportation program management and administration responsibilities for 10 other funding programs, ODOT has determined that it could distribute an estimated 96% of all revenues to providers with a program management and administrative cost of approximately 4%, using current legislatively approved budget forecasts. Twenty-five full time equivalent staff is the correct staffing level to effectively and efficiently administer the state's public transportation program.

The CAC's recommended ODOT administration concept—take audited and reviewed program administration and program management costs off the top of the consolidated fund—in combination with ODOT's 25 FTE would result in no net gain in administrative costs and bring ODOT back into compliance with federal requirements.

## **ODOT Consolidation Plan and Schedule**

If the 2020 legislative assembly takes action on statutory amendments required to consolidate the two programs, ODOT would likely take the following major actions to fully implement the consolidation:

- Reconvene the consolidation advisory committee and complete rulemaking, Spring-Summer 2020
- Consolidate program policies, guidance documents, and other necessary forms, Summer-Fall, 2020
- Issue notice of funding availability for 2021-23 biennial solicitations, Fall 2020
- Update internal procedures and grant management systems, Summer 2020-Spring 2021.
- Review local agency plans for consolidated formula funds and begin distributions for the 2021-23 biennium, Spring 2021-Summer 2021
- Award 2021-23 biennial discretionary and intercommunity discretionary grant awards, Summer-Fall 2021



## Appendix A: CAC Charter

### STF/STIF Consolidation Advisory Committee Charter and Composition FINAL, August 2, 2019

#### Background

The 2019 Oregon State Legislature passed House Bill 2377, which directs the transfer of \$10.1 million from the STIF to the STF on July 1, 2019, to distribute to transit entities to support public transportation services benefiting seniors and persons with disabilities.

The Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) 2019-2021 Legislatively Adopted Budget (House Bill 5039) also includes a budget note directing ODOT to merge STF and STIF into one public transit program moving forward.

“The Oregon Department of Transportation is directed to merge the Special Transportation Fund (STF) and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) into one public transit program. The legislative intent is for the Department to accomplish this with the least possible disruption to the formula allocations and services provided by STF agencies. The Department shall not require STF agencies to submit new or revised plans for formula distributions in the 2019-21 biennium. The Department is directed to report during the 2020 legislative session on the status of the program consolidation, and the administrative costs, including the number of full-time equivalent positions required to administer the consolidated program.”

To this end, ODOT plans to:

- Continue operating both programs as directed by existing statute for the duration of the 2019-2021 biennium;
- Transfer \$10.1 million from STIF to STF to keep STF agencies whole at approximately \$28 million for the 2019-2021 biennium;
- Create an advisory committee to evaluate methods of program consolidation and recommend changes required to merge the programs and ensure a smooth transition to one public transit program moving forward;
- Build the 2021-2023 Public Transit budget assuming merger of the current STF and STIF programs.

#### Purpose

The Consolidation Advisory Committee (CAC) shall advise the ODOT on the key elements or concepts that would guide statutory changes needed to consolidate the two programs. Following legislative action on the statutes to affect the consolidation, the CAC may be reconvened to advise the ODOT and/or the OTC on the administrative rules.

## **Committee Charge**

The CAC is charged with developing consolidation concepts that:

- Maintain the intent of STF to provide public transportation services for seniors and persons with disabilities
- Maintain the Formula, Discretionary, Intercommunity Discretionary, and Technical Resource Center funds established by STIF statute
- Maintain the areas of emphasis established in STIF statute (improves service for low-income households, mitigates impacts of transit tax on low income households, purchases low/no emission vehicles in areas with populations greater than 200,000, fills gaps in the statewide transit network, improves coordination between transit providers, and improves public transportation services for students in grades 9-12)
- Reconcile recipient and project eligibility for STF and STIF
- Include minimum formula fund allocations for both STF Agencies and STIF Qualified Entities
- Provide for statewide discretionary solicitations
- Address Federal Transit Administration requirement that ODOT proportionally allocate indirect costs across all revenue sources consistent with 2 CFR § 200.414
- Consider and document public and stakeholder input on draft concept language

The CAC's work on the concepts should be completed no later than late October 2019 in order for ODOT to bring the consolidation concept to the 2020 Legislature.

## **Membership**

The ODOT Director will appoint approximately 15 voting members who will represent:

- Public transportation service providers: Large urban, small urban, rural areas, tribes, counties, cities, and non-government agencies
- Advocates for seniors
- Advocates for people with disabilities
- Equity and environmental justice advocates
- Social and human service agencies

## **Decision-making**

The CAC is composed of individuals from key stakeholder groups in order to develop a recommendation that is consistent with the charter, considers transit users' needs, and best meets the needs of public transportation providers across Oregon. While the committee has no decision-making authority, the committee will provide invaluable insight and feedback to ODOT. All committee feedback will be respectfully considered.

Members will work together to fulfill the committee charter and seek to achieve consensus to the extent possible. For the purpose of this committee, consensus is achieved when all members can say:

*I am fully supportive of this decision or choice.*

*or*

*While I may not be fully supportive of this decision or choice,  
I can live with it and I will not oppose it.*

If consensus on a recommendation cannot be achieved, a vote may be taken by members present. Majority and minority opinions may be included in the recommendation to ODOT.

## **Meeting Protocols**

- Meetings will be led by ODOT and actively facilitated by a neutral third party to ensure that discussions are consistent with the committee charter, and to ensure that feedback and recommendations are advanced from the group consistent with the project schedule.
- The facilitator will be a 'content neutral' party who ensures that everyone has an equal opportunity to participate.
- Members agree to follow the meeting ground rules once established by the committee with the group's facilitator in the first meeting.
- Members will make their best effort to attend all meetings either in-person or by phone and notify the facilitator or the STF/STIF consolidation project manager if unable to attend. Meetings will be held September through October 2019.
- Qualified alternates (representing a similar stakeholder perspective) may stand in for a member, with advanced notice, preparation, and discussion with the facilitator.
- Committee recommendations will not be revisited unless agreed to by a majority of the members present.
- Public notification of committee meetings will occur at least one week in advance and the agenda and meeting materials will be made available on the project website.
- ODOT will make every effort to ensure meeting materials are finalized at the time of distribution; however, there may be instances where updated versions of materials are provided. In these cases, staff will describe the changes. Please review all materials in advance and come prepared to participate.
- Meetings will begin and end on time. If agenda items cannot be completed on time, the committee will decide if the meeting should be extended, an additional meeting scheduled, or the discussion continued at the next scheduled meeting.
- Meeting summaries will be produced for each meeting to reflect group discussion, feedback, areas of agreement and tasks and assignments related to advancement of the group's work. Draft summaries will be distributed and committee members given the opportunity to clarify or edit the summary to make sure it accurately reflects the meeting.



## Appendix B: CAC Roster and Workplan

### CAC Membership Roster

This roster summarizes members of the STF/STIF Consolidation Advisory Committee. The ODOT Director appointed 17 voting members who represent public transportation service providers, advocate for seniors, people with disabilities, equity and environmental justice, and social and human service agencies.

Name	Affiliation	Title	Representing
Tammy Baney	Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council	Executive Director	Council of government, small urban transit provider
Dwight Brashear	SMART, City of Wilsonville	Transit Director	Small urban transit provider
Julie Brown	Rogue Valley Transportation District	General Manager	Oregon Transportation Commission
Teresa Christopherson	Clackamas Co. Social Services Division	Admin. Services Mngr.	Western rural transit provider
Aaron Deas	TriMet	Snr. Mngr, Govt. Affairs	Large urban transit provider
Lee Girard	Multnomah County Aging, Disability and Veterans Services Division	Director	Represents social and human service agencies
Maria Hernandez Segoviano	OPAL Environmental Justice Oregon	Policy and Advocacy Manager	Advocate for equity and environmental justice
A. J. Jackson	Lane Transit District	General Manager	Large urban transit provider
Anneliese Koehler	Oregon Food Bank	Public Policy Advocate	Advocate for anti-poverty, low income, and equity
Angie Lamborn	Harney Co. Senior & Comm. Services	Executive Director	Eastern rural transit provider
Eugene Organ	Lane Independent Living Alliance		Advocate for people with disabilities
Carmel Perez Snyder	AARP Oregon	Dir. Advocacy & Outreach	Advocate for older adults
Allan Pollock	Salem Area Mass Transit District Transit	General Manager	Large urban transit provider
Lisa Scherf	City of Corvallis	Transit Manager	City transit provider
J.D. Tovey	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	Planning Director	Tribal government transit provider
Julie Wilcke Pilmer	Ride Connection	Executive Director	Non-government transit provider
Todd Wood	Columbia County Transit Department	Transit Director	County transit provider

## CAC Workplan

This workplan summarizes the schedule for Consolidation Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings from September to October 2019. All meetings were open to the public with comment opportunity as time allowed. Written comment was encouraged and will be made part of the meeting record.

Meeting Date	Topics	Desired Outcomes
<b>Meeting #1:</b> <b>Tues. Sept 10, 2-5 pm</b> Building X, 885 Airport Rd. SE, Salem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee introductions</li> <li>• Committee charter, roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes</li> <li>• Schedule and workplan review</li> <li>• Major components of STIF and STF and how they are similar and different</li> <li>• Defining success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee familiarity with each other, committee processes and STIF and STF major components</li> <li>• Draft list of success characteristics</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 2: *</b> <b>Weds. Sept. 11, 9 am -12 pm</b> Gail Achterman Council Room, T Building, 355 Capitol St. NE, Salem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characteristics of consolidation success</li> <li>• Local process requirements</li> <li>• STF and STIF recipient and project eligibility</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalized list of success characteristics</li> <li>• Recommended local process requirements</li> <li>• Recommendations for STF and STIF recipient and project eligibility</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 3: *</b> <b>Tues. Sept. 24,</b> <b>9 am-12 pm and 2-5 pm</b> Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High St NE, Salem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing STF and STIF funding allocations</li> <li>• History of and rationale for STF and STIF formula fund allocations</li> <li>• Indirect rate requirements and potential impacts</li> <li>• Formula allocation methods and potential impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preliminary funding allocation options</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 4:</b> <b>Tues. Oct. 8, 2-5 p.m.</b> Building X, 885 Airport Rd. SE, Salem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund allocation options with preferred option identified</li> <li>• Other topics identified during the process that have not already been addressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short-list of allocation options with preferred option identified</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting 5:</b> <b>Tues. Oct. 22, 2-5 p.m.</b> Chemeketa Center for Business and Industry, 626 High St NE, Salem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final review how concept(s) measure up to characteristics of success</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CAC recommendation on consolidation concept</li> </ul>

## Appendix C: Concepts Considered and Rejected

The below concepts considered for funding allocation were eliminated due to potential for negative fiscal impacts, lack of flexibility, or lack of funding certainty for priority target areas. ODOT concurs with the CAC’s recommendation to remove the concepts from further consideration. The table below summarizes the eliminated concepts, potential effects of the concept, and rationale for removal.

**Table C: Concepts Considered and Rejected**

Topic	Description	Potential Effects	Rationale for Elimination
<b>Eligibility 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In a consolidated statute, allow an exception for certain sub-recipients to submit funding requests directly to ODOT as a specially designated lead sub-recipient, rather than requiring approval of designated lead agency recipient under certain conditions. Those conditions include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Funding request developed jointly with all potential sub-recipients in a coordinated region</li> <li>○ Funding request does not cause fragmentation of transportation service</li> </ul> </li> <li>• If funding request approved, funding flows under the same process as to any other sub-recipient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased administrative burden for ODOT</li> <li>• Decreased regional coordination and increased fragmentation of the public transportation system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Withdrawn by proposing committee member for future consideration during administrative rulemaking</li> </ul>
<b>Eligibility 3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use eligibility requirements from the current STIF statute. Under STIF, “Recipient” means a Qualified Entity or Public Transportation Service Provider that has a STIF Plan approved by the Commission or enters into an agreement directly with the Agency to receive STIF funds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limits funding eligibility for non-profits, which are currently eligible to receive STF funding as sub-recipients</li> <li>• Gives QEs more control over whether to choose to contract with non-profits and private for-profits.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-profit public transportation providers would no longer be eligible to apply for STF funding under a consolidated program</li> </ul>
<b>Allocation 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allocates STIF and STF (assumes \$0 General Funds) by payroll using STIF 90/5/4/1 percentages</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires minimum expenditures for services for older adults and people with disabilities at 2019-21 STF levels, but would reduce the amount</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution of entire formula fund using payroll allocation method would have a negative</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services for older adults and people with disabilities addressed through addition of required minimum expenditures for serving those populations, fixed to 19-21 STF allocations</li> <li>• Base allocation set at STIF and STF 2019-21 base</li> <li>• No formulaic set aside for STF Discretionary</li> </ul>	available for those services for areas that receive lower payroll taxes	fiscal impact on areas that have lower payroll taxes than population
<b>Allocation 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses STIF to backfill STF formula, by reducing each of the STIF funds proportionately</li> <li>• Formula portion of consolidated fund: Sets specific dollar amount for STF formula disbursement at 2019-21 STF levels; distributes remaining by share of payroll</li> <li>• STF formula portion adjusted by rate of growth/decline of consolidated fund as a whole</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adjusts as consolidated fund revenues change, but doesn't adjust to directly account for future changes in population within the STF formula portion of the consolidated fund</li> <li>• Lead agencies receiving minimum formula allocations will see no change in revenues; whereas the remaining lead agencies would see a 9.7% increase, on average, in STIF formula revenues and no change in STF formula revenues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not allow for adjustments based on changes in the future because the STF formula portion is based on the 2019-21 funding level as a starting point and indexed to consolidated fund growth, rather than changes in population</li> <li>• Fails to specify that STF funds must be used for services for older adults and people with disabilities</li> </ul>
<b>Allocation 3A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STF formula revenues distributed by population based on actual STF revenues, STIF formula distributed based on payroll</li> <li>• There is no transfer of revenues from STIF to STF</li> <li>• STF minimum formula allocations fixed at STF 2019-21 levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agencies that receive minimum allocations for STIF and STF formula funds will see no change; whereas all other agencies would see an 11.77% increase in STIF formula funds, on average, and a 20.47% reduction in STF Formula funds, on average</li> <li>• QEs may have the flexibility to use STIF funding to serve seniors and people with disabilities, depending on local decision-making, whether STIF funds may be used to fill loss of STF funds, and whether the non-profits providers and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negatively impacts allocations for services for older adults or people with disabilities by failing to backfill STF with STIF</li> <li>• Reduces certainty that services for older adults and people with disabilities would continue to be funded at the same level as 2019-21 biennium</li> </ul>

		<p>client-only services are eligible for STIF formula funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STF formula portion responds to population changes; potentially adjusted by growth/decline in STF revenues (cig. tax, ID cards, and non-highway gas tax)</li> </ul>	
<b>Allocation 4A</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses STIF to backfill STF formula, by reducing each of the STIF funds proportionately</li> <li>• STF formula base consists of legacy funding sources (cig. tax, ID cards, and non-highway gas tax) plus \$5 million STIF per year; starts STF at 2019-21 levels.</li> <li>• STF formula distributed by population</li> <li>• STF Formula growth/decline: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Legacy sources growth/decline</li> <li>o \$5 million per year STIF backfill</li> </ul> growth/decline based on overall STIF growth/decline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May keep STF more stable in near term if STF legacy revenues remain stable and the economy declines having a negative impact on payroll taxes</li> <li>• Keeps STF base funding dependent on potentially declining legacy revenue sources (cigarette tax, ID cards, and non-highway gas tax)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members saw 4A as similar to 3B, but opted to eliminate 4A in favor of 4B so that the legislature would have a distinct policy choice between the two recommended concepts (3B and 4B)</li> </ul>



# Appendix D: Comparison of Formula Allocation Concepts

## Concept A\*

Total STF formula funding set at 2019-21 level, and STIF backfills general fund resources and any reduction in legacy revenue sources (cigarette tax, non-highway gas tax, and ID cards)

Total STF formula funding starts at 2019-21 levels and is adjusted by rate of growth/decline of consolidated fund

All STF formula funds distributed by population

Maintains minimum base STF and STIF formula allocations for lead agencies at 2019-21 levels and is adjusted by the rate of growth/decline of consolidated fund

STF portion of the combined fund is required to be expended on services that benefit older adults and people with disabilities.

	Current 21-23 STIF Allocation Estimate**	19-21 STIF Allocation	% allocated to STF	Revised Combined Program Allocations	Revised STIF Allocations	% change from current programs to consolidated programs	% allocated to STF
Formula Program (90%)	\$ 195,353,000	\$ 21,928,328	10.09%	\$ 183,598,800	\$ 21,928,328	-5.4%	11.94%
Discretionary Grant Program (5%)	\$ 10,853,000	\$ 3,630,411	25%	\$ 10,199,922		-29.6%	0.00%
Inter community Program (4%)	\$ 8,682,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 8,159,938		-6.0%	0.00%
Technical resource center (1%)	\$ 2,259,268	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,039,984		-9.7%	0.00%

Qualified Entity (QE)/STF Agency	Current Published Allocation Estimates			Proposed Allocations 21-23 Biennium				change in % allocated to STF*
	Current STIF 21-23 Projection	19-21 STIF Allocation	% allocated to STF	Revised STIF Allocations	Revised STIF Allocations	% change from current programs to consolidated programs*	% allocated to STF	
Baker County	\$ 396,000	\$ 135,400	25%	\$ 372,100	\$ 135,400	-4.5%	27%	1%
Basin Transit Service District w/ out of district	\$ 1,793,000	\$ 324,363	15%	\$ 1,683,600	\$ 324,363	-5.2%	16%	1%
Benton County	\$ 3,902,000	\$ 442,139	10%	\$ 3,664,900	\$ 442,139	-5.5%	11%	1%
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Columbia County	\$ 880,000	\$ 247,006	22%	\$ 825,900	\$ 247,006	-4.8%	23%	1%
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Coos County	\$ 1,751,000	\$ 303,634	15%	\$ 1,643,400	\$ 303,634	-5.2%	16%	1%
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Crook County	\$ 484,000	\$ 135,400	22%	\$ 454,000	\$ 135,400	-4.8%	23%	1%
Curry County	\$ 451,000	\$ 135,400	23%	\$ 422,700	\$ 135,400	-4.8%	24%	1%
Deschutes County	\$ 7,345,000	\$ 869,772	11%	\$ 6,895,900	\$ 869,772	-5.5%	11%	1%
Douglas County	\$ 3,089,000	\$ 530,193	15%	\$ 2,899,900	\$ 530,193	-5.2%	15%	1%
Gilliam County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Grant County Transportation District	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Harney County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Hood River County Transportation District	\$ 1,073,000	\$ 135,400	11%	\$ 1,008,400	\$ 135,400	-5.3%	12%	1%
Jefferson County	\$ 518,000	\$ 135,400	21%	\$ 484,900	\$ 135,400	-5.1%	22%	1%
Josephine County	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 409,365	17%	\$ 1,859,600	\$ 409,365	-5.0%	18%	1%
Klamath Tribes	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Lake County	\$ 203,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	-0.9%	40%	0%
Lane Transit District w/out of district	\$ 13,428,000	\$ 1,757,977	12%	\$ 12,606,200	\$ 1,757,977	-5.4%	12%	1%
Lincoln County	\$ 1,363,000	\$ 230,985	14%	\$ 1,279,500	\$ 230,985	-5.2%	15%	1%
Linn County	\$ 3,850,000	\$ 590,915	13%	\$ 3,614,100	\$ 590,915	-5.3%	14%	1%
Malheur County	\$ 928,000	\$ 154,716	14%	\$ 872,100	\$ 154,716	-5.2%	15%	1%
Morrow County	\$ 598,000	\$ 135,400	18%	\$ 561,400	\$ 135,400	-5.0%	19%	1%
Rogue Valley Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 7,399,000	\$ 1,030,545	12%	\$ 6,946,300	\$ 1,030,545	-5.4%	13%	1%
Salem Area Mass Transit District w/ out of district	\$ 16,040,000	\$ 1,992,724	11%	\$ 15,059,500	\$ 1,992,724	-5.4%	12%	1%
Sherman County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Sunset Empire Transportation District	\$ 1,380,000	\$ 187,727	12%	\$ 1,295,500	\$ 187,727	-5.4%	13%	1%
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 740,000	\$ 135,400	15%	\$ 695,000	\$ 135,400	-5.1%	16%	1%
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 115,717,000	\$ 8,579,178	7%	\$ 108,638,900	\$ 8,579,178	-5.7%	7%	0%
Umatilla County	\$ 2,402,000	\$ 384,991	14%	\$ 2,255,900	\$ 384,991	-5.2%	15%	1%
Union County	\$ 772,000	\$ 135,400	15%	\$ 725,700	\$ 135,400	-5.1%	16%	1%
Wallowa County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Wasco County	\$ 940,000	\$ 135,400	13%	\$ 882,300	\$ 135,400	-5.4%	13%	1%
Wheeler County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Yamhill County	\$ 2,931,000	\$ 507,097	15%	\$ 2,751,100	\$ 507,097	-5.2%	16%	1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 195,353,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>\$ 183,598,800</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>-5.4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>1%</b>

\* Was concept 3B during CAC process.

\*\*Uses December 2018 STIF revenue forecast. Variations in % change due to rounding of allocation to nearest hundred.

## Appendix D: Comparison of Formula Allocation Concepts

### Concept B\*

STIF backfills only general fund resources to reach 2019-21 STF formula funding levels; does not backfill any reduction in legacy revenue sources (cigarette tax, non-highway gas tax, and ID cards)

Total STF formula funding starts at 2019-21 level and is adjusted by changes in STF legacy revenue sources and rate of growth/decline of payroll tax revenues

Funding from STF legacy revenue sources distributed by population; funding from STIF backfill distributed by payroll

Maintains minimum base STF and STIF formula allocations for lead agencies at 2019-21 levels and is adjusted by the rate of growth/decline of consolidated fund

STF legacy revenues (cigarette tax, non-highway gas tax, and ID cards) portion of the combined fund are required to be expended on services that benefit older adults and people with disabilities;

the STIF backfill portion of STF is expended at the discretion of the lead agency

	Current 21-23 STIF Allocation Estimate**	19-21 STF Allocation	% allocated to STF	Revised Combined Program Allocations	Revised STF Allocations	% change from current programs to consolidated programs	% allocated to STF
Formula Program (90%)	\$ 195,353,000	\$ 21,928,328	10.09%	\$ 183,598,800	\$ 21,928,328	-5.4%	11.94%
Discretionary Grant Program (5%)	\$ 10,853,000	\$ 3,630,411	25%	\$ 10,199,922		-29.6%	0.00%
Inter community Program (4%)	\$ 8,682,000	\$ -	0%	\$ 8,159,938		-6.0%	0.00%
Technical resource center (1%)	\$ 2,259,268	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,039,984		-9.7%	0.00%

Qualified Entity (QE)/STF Agency	Current Published Allocation Estimates			Proposed Allocations 21-23 Biennium				
	Current STIF 21-23 Projection	19-21 STF Allocation	% allocated to STF	Revised STIF Allocations	Revised STF Allocations	% change from current programs to consolidated programs*	% allocated to STF	change in % allocated to STF*
Baker County	\$ 396,000	\$ 135,400	25%	\$ 372,100	\$ 144,432	-2.8%	28%	2%
Basin Transit Service District w/ out of district	\$ 1,793,000	\$ 324,363	15%	\$ 1,683,600	\$ 289,012	-6.8%	15%	-1%
Benton County	\$ 3,902,000	\$ 442,139	10%	\$ 3,664,900	\$ 426,860	-5.8%	10%	0%
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Columbia County	\$ 880,000	\$ 247,006	22%	\$ 825,900	\$ 209,237	-8.2%	20%	-2%
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Coos County	\$ 1,751,000	\$ 303,634	15%	\$ 1,643,400	\$ 272,237	-6.8%	14%	-1%
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Crook County	\$ 484,000	\$ 135,400	22%	\$ 454,000	\$ 146,421	-3.1%	24%	3%
Curry County	\$ 451,000	\$ 135,400	23%	\$ 422,700	\$ 145,661	-3.1%	26%	3%
Deschutes County	\$ 7,345,000	\$ 869,772	11%	\$ 6,895,900	\$ 831,182	-5.9%	11%	0%
Douglas County	\$ 3,089,000	\$ 530,193	15%	\$ 2,899,900	\$ 475,395	-6.7%	14%	-1%
Gilliam County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Grant County Transportation District	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Harney County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Hood River County Transportation District	\$ 1,073,000	\$ 135,400	11%	\$ 1,008,400	\$ 159,878	-3.3%	14%	2%
Jefferson County	\$ 518,000	\$ 135,400	21%	\$ 484,900	\$ 147,171	-3.3%	23%	3%
Josephine County	\$ 1,980,000	\$ 409,365	17%	\$ 1,859,600	\$ 358,060	-7.2%	16%	-1%
Klamath Tribes	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Lake County	\$ 203,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	-0.9%	40%	0%
Lane Transit District w/out of district	\$ 13,428,000	\$ 1,757,977	12%	\$ 12,606,200	\$ 1,646,681	-6.1%	12%	0%
Lincoln County	\$ 1,363,000	\$ 230,985	14%	\$ 1,279,500	\$ 208,040	-6.7%	14%	-1%
Linn County	\$ 3,850,000	\$ 590,915	13%	\$ 3,614,100	\$ 539,007	-6.5%	13%	0%
Malheur County	\$ 928,000	\$ 154,716	14%	\$ 872,100	\$ 156,570	-5.0%	15%	1%
Morrow County	\$ 598,000	\$ 135,400	18%	\$ 561,400	\$ 149,028	-3.1%	21%	3%
Rogue Valley Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 7,399,000	\$ 1,030,545	12%	\$ 6,946,300	\$ 954,927	-6.3%	12%	0%
Salem Area Mass Transit District w/ out of district	\$ 16,040,000	\$ 1,992,724	11%	\$ 15,059,500	\$ 1,885,128	-6.0%	11%	0%
Sherman County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Sunset Empire Transportation District	\$ 1,380,000	\$ 187,727	12%	\$ 1,295,500	\$ 175,461	-6.2%	12%	0%
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 740,000	\$ 135,400	15%	\$ 695,000	\$ 152,270	-3.2%	18%	3%
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 115,717,000	\$ 8,579,178	7%	\$ 108,638,900	\$ 9,176,148	-5.2%	8%	1%
Umatilla County	\$ 2,402,000	\$ 384,991	14%	\$ 2,255,900	\$ 349,107	-6.5%	13%	0%
Union County	\$ 772,000	\$ 135,400	15%	\$ 725,700	\$ 153,016	-3.2%	17%	2%
Wallowa County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Wasco County	\$ 940,000	\$ 135,400	13%	\$ 882,300	\$ 156,817	-3.4%	15%	3%
Wheeler County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	40%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	0.0%	40%	0%
Yamhill County	\$ 2,931,000	\$ 507,097	15%	\$ 2,751,100	\$ 454,181	-6.8%	14%	-1%
	<b>\$ 195,353,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>\$ 183,598,800</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>-5.4%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>1%</b>

\* Was concept 4B during CAC process.

\*\*Uses 2018 STIF revenue forecast. Variations in % change due to rounding of allocation to nearest hundred.

# Appendix D: Comparison of Formula Allocation Concepts

Formula Allocation Comparison 2019-21 to 2021-23

Appendix D: Comparison of Formula Allocation Concepts	STIF 19-21 Formula Projection	STIF 19-21 Allocation	Total 19-21 Allocation	Concept A STIF Allocation	Concept A STIF Allocation								
Qualified Entity (QE)/STF Agency	STIF 19-21 Formula Projection	STIF 19-21 Allocation	Total 19-21 Allocation	Concept A STIF Allocation	Concept A STIF Allocation	Concept A Total Allocation	Concept A % STIF change	Concept A % STIF change	Concept B STIF Allocation	Concept B STIF Allocation	Concept B Total Allocation	Concept B % STIF change	Concept B % STIF change
Baker County	\$ 339,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 474,400	\$ 372,100	\$ 135,400	\$ 507,500	9.76%	0.00%	\$ 372,100	\$ 144,432	\$ 516,532	9.76%	6.67%
Basin Transit Service District w/ out of district	\$ 1,536,000	\$ 324,363	\$ 1,860,363	\$ 1,683,600	\$ 324,363	\$ 2,007,963	9.61%	0.00%	\$ 1,683,600	\$ 289,012	\$ 1,972,612	9.61%	-10.90%
Benton County	\$ 3,346,000	\$ 442,139	\$ 3,788,139	\$ 3,664,900	\$ 442,139	\$ 4,107,039	9.53%	0.00%	\$ 3,664,900	\$ 426,860	\$ 4,091,760	9.53%	-3.46%
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Columbia County	\$ 754,000	\$ 247,006	\$ 1,001,006	\$ 825,900	\$ 247,006	\$ 1,072,906	9.54%	0.00%	\$ 825,900	\$ 209,237	\$ 1,035,137	9.54%	-15.29%
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Coos County	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 303,634	\$ 1,803,634	\$ 1,643,400	\$ 303,634	\$ 1,947,034	9.56%	0.00%	\$ 1,643,400	\$ 272,237	\$ 1,915,637	9.56%	-10.34%
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Crook County	\$ 416,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 551,400	\$ 454,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 589,400	9.13%	0.00%	\$ 454,000	\$ 146,421	\$ 600,421	9.13%	8.14%
Curry County	\$ 386,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 521,400	\$ 422,700	\$ 135,400	\$ 558,100	9.51%	0.00%	\$ 422,700	\$ 145,661	\$ 568,361	9.51%	7.58%
Deschutes County	\$ 6,295,000	\$ 869,772	\$ 7,164,772	\$ 6,895,900	\$ 869,772	\$ 7,765,672	9.55%	0.00%	\$ 6,895,900	\$ 831,182	\$ 7,727,082	9.55%	-4.44%
Douglas County	\$ 2,648,000	\$ 530,193	\$ 3,178,193	\$ 2,899,900	\$ 530,193	\$ 3,430,093	9.51%	0.00%	\$ 2,899,900	\$ 475,395	\$ 3,375,295	9.51%	-10.34%
Gilliam County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Grant County Transportation District	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Harney County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Hood River County Transportation District	\$ 920,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 1,055,400	\$ 1,008,400	\$ 135,400	\$ 1,143,800	9.61%	0.00%	\$ 1,008,400	\$ 159,878	\$ 1,168,278	9.61%	18.08%
Jefferson County	\$ 443,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 578,400	\$ 484,900	\$ 135,400	\$ 620,300	9.46%	0.00%	\$ 484,900	\$ 147,171	\$ 632,071	9.46%	8.69%
Josephine County	\$ 1,698,000	\$ 409,365	\$ 2,107,365	\$ 1,859,600	\$ 409,365	\$ 2,268,965	9.52%	0.00%	\$ 1,859,600	\$ 358,060	\$ 2,217,660	9.52%	-12.53%
Klamath Tribes	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Lake County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Lane Transit District w/out of district	\$ 11,507,000	\$ 1,757,977	\$ 13,264,977	\$ 12,606,200	\$ 1,757,977	\$ 14,364,177	9.55%	0.00%	\$ 12,606,200	\$ 1,646,681	\$ 14,252,881	9.55%	-6.33%
Lincoln County	\$ 1,167,000	\$ 230,985	\$ 1,397,985	\$ 1,279,500	\$ 230,985	\$ 1,510,485	9.64%	0.00%	\$ 1,279,500	\$ 208,040	\$ 1,487,540	9.64%	-9.93%
Linn County	\$ 3,300,000	\$ 590,915	\$ 3,890,915	\$ 3,614,100	\$ 590,915	\$ 4,205,015	9.52%	0.00%	\$ 3,614,100	\$ 539,007	\$ 4,153,107	9.52%	-8.78%
Malheur County	\$ 795,000	\$ 154,716	\$ 949,716	\$ 872,100	\$ 154,716	\$ 1,026,816	9.70%	0.00%	\$ 872,100	\$ 156,570	\$ 1,028,670	9.70%	1.20%
Morrow County	\$ 512,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 647,400	\$ 561,400	\$ 135,400	\$ 696,800	9.65%	0.00%	\$ 561,400	\$ 149,028	\$ 710,428	9.65%	10.06%
Rogue Valley Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 6,340,000	\$ 1,030,545	\$ 7,370,545	\$ 6,946,300	\$ 1,030,545	\$ 7,976,845	9.56%	0.00%	\$ 6,946,300	\$ 954,927	\$ 7,901,227	9.56%	-7.34%
Salem Area Mass Transit District w/ out of district	\$ 13,746,000	\$ 1,992,724	\$ 15,738,724	\$ 15,059,500	\$ 1,992,724	\$ 17,052,224	9.56%	0.00%	\$ 15,059,500	\$ 1,885,128	\$ 16,944,628	9.56%	-5.40%
Sherman County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Sunset Empire Transportation District	\$ 1,182,000	\$ 187,727	\$ 1,369,727	\$ 1,295,500	\$ 187,727	\$ 1,483,227	9.60%	0.00%	\$ 1,295,500	\$ 175,461	\$ 1,470,961	9.60%	-6.53%
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 635,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 770,400	\$ 695,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 830,400	9.45%	0.00%	\$ 695,000	\$ 152,270	\$ 847,270	9.45%	12.46%
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District w/ out of district	\$ 99,168,000	\$ 8,579,178	\$ 107,747,178	\$ 108,638,900	\$ 8,579,178	\$ 117,218,078	9.55%	0.00%	\$ 108,638,900	\$ 9,176,148	\$ 117,815,048	9.55%	6.96%
Umatilla County	\$ 2,060,000	\$ 384,991	\$ 2,444,991	\$ 2,255,900	\$ 384,991	\$ 2,640,891	9.51%	0.00%	\$ 2,255,900	\$ 349,107	\$ 2,605,007	9.51%	-9.32%
Union County	\$ 661,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 796,400	\$ 725,700	\$ 135,400	\$ 861,100	9.79%	0.00%	\$ 725,700	\$ 153,016	\$ 878,716	9.79%	13.01%
Wallowa County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Wasco County	\$ 807,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 942,400	\$ 882,300	\$ 135,400	\$ 1,017,700	9.33%	0.00%	\$ 882,300	\$ 156,817	\$ 1,039,117	9.33%	15.82%
Wheeler County	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%	\$ 200,000	\$ 135,400	\$ 335,400	0.00%	0.00%
Yamhill County	\$ 2,512,000	\$ 507,097	\$ 3,019,097	\$ 2,751,100	\$ 507,097	\$ 3,258,197	9.52%	0.00%	\$ 2,751,100	\$ 454,181	\$ 3,205,281	9.52%	-10.44%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 167,873,000</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>\$ 189,801,328</b>	<b>\$ 183,598,800</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>\$ 205,527,128</b>	<b>9.37%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>\$ 183,598,800</b>	<b>\$ 21,928,328</b>	<b>\$ 205,527,128</b>	<b>9.37%</b>	<b>0.00%</b>