



**Oregon Transportation Commission**  
**Considerations to Reject a Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Plan for**  
**Formula Funding, Approved, October 19, 2018**

Reason to Reject	Basis	Indicators	Potential Mitigation
1. The Qualified Entity (QE) did not establish an Advisory Committee or established one inconsistent with membership requirements in these rules	OAR 732-042-0025(5)(a)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not meet minimum number of members</li> <li>• Committee does not include three required constituencies</li> <li>• A QE that is a mass transit or transportation district fails to include members from both within and outside district boundaries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
2. QE failed to confer with its Advisory Committee	OAR 732-042-0025(5)(b)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of publicly available documentation that demonstrates the required meetings occurred, such as public notice, meeting agenda and minutes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
3. The STIF Plan is incomplete or does not adequately explain how the QE will accomplish the goals of the Projects in the STIF Plan, including Recipient Accountability Methods, Sub-Recipient Accountability Methods, or Remediation Strategies, if applicable	OAR 732-042-0025(5)(c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recipient or sub-recipient accountability methods fail to address one or more of the programmatic areas specified in OAR 732-040-0015(3), which includes program management; financial management; operations management, procurement, use and maintenance of equipment; records retention; compliance with state and federal civil rights laws; and compliance with ADA.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>
4. The STIF Plan does not contain the sections and elements listed in OAR 732-042-0015(1), (2) and (3) [NOTE: This refers to all STIF Plan content requirements]	OAR 732-042-0025(5)(d)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Form is incomplete, despite ODOT staff and Public Transportation Advisory Committee requests for additional information</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• None</li> </ul>

Reason to Recommend Rejection	Basis	Indicators	Potential Mitigation
5. The QE failed to allocate 1% each year for student transit services for students in grades 9 through 12	OAR 732-042-0010(9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STIF Plan does not allocate 1% each year for student transit for students in grades 9 through 12</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is determined it is not Practicable, as defined by OAR 732-040-0005, to provide student transit services for grades 9 through 12 in the QEs Area of Responsibility</li> </ul>
6. The QE failed to substantively adhere to STIF accountability requirements during a previous funding cycle	Legislative intent of increased accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The QE has substantive audit or compliance review findings, especially in the areas of financial management and use and maintenance of vehicles and equipment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
7. QE proposes light rail project other than operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Statute</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STIF Plan that includes a project requesting funding for a light rail project other than light rail operations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None</li> </ul>
8. QEs STIF Plan fails to expand or improve service to low income households	Legislative intent to serve low income households	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STIF Plan fails to include at least one project that would improve service to low income households</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>QE's that only receive minimum allocation propose planning and/or administrative staffing projects during first funding cycle</li> </ul>
9. STIF Plan proposes to use STIF funds to maintain existing services, rather than expand or improve services	<p>Legislative intent to prioritize expansion or improvement of services</p> <p>[NOTE: Solicitation guidance specifies potential cause for rejection]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project was previously funded by local funds that are being re-allocated for non-transit purposes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continues a pilot operations project</li> <li>One-time discretionary funding ended</li> <li>Maintains a project that was a STIF Formula Fund expansion or improvement project during a previous funding cycle</li> </ul>
10. QE's STIF Plan fails to fund one or more projects proposed by a Public Transportation Service Provider (PTSP), despite a QEs Advisory Committee recommendation to do so	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Legislative intent that QEs share funding</li> <li>Administrative rules sub-allocation requirement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A QE's Advisory Committee recommends funding a PTSP's project, the QE's governing body makes a contrary decision using rationale that is inconsistent with statute or administrative rules, such as the QE substantially retains Formula funding for itself when its sub-allocation method and Advisory Committee would indicate otherwise</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advisory Committee recommendation failed to adequately consider the selection criteria specified in OAR 732-042-0020(5)</li> </ul>

Reason to Recommend Rejection	Basis	Indicators	Potential Mitigation
11. QE failed to collaborate with PTSPs when developing the sub-allocation method	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legislative intent that QEs share funding</li> <li>• Administrative rules require collaboration [NOTE: Solicitation guidance specifies this potential cause for rejection]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of documentation (meeting agenda and minutes) indicating that collaboration occurred</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• QE attempted to collaborate with PTSP by sending meeting invitations or other correspondence and PTSP did not respond</li> </ul>
12. A QE's Advisory Committee failed to substantively consider one or more PTSP's project proposal(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OAR 732-042-0020(3) requires Advisory Committees to meet as needed to advise the QE and review Project proposals</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of evidence that a QE's Advisory Committee had the opportunity to review complete Project proposals submitted by a PTSP to a QE`</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The PTSP's application was incomplete and did not include sufficient information for Advisory Committee evaluation</li> </ul>