Mountainland MPO
Technical Advisory Committee

Monday, August 28, 2017

Mountainland Conference Room
586 East 800 North, Orem, UT
1:30 P.M.

1. Welcome, Introductions and Public Comment - Richard Nielsen, Chair

2. Approve July 31, 2017 Minutes - Richard Nielsen, Chair

3. TIP Amendment/Tiger Projects - Bob Allen, MAG

4. Spanish Fork City Main Street Study and Design, Approve allocation of $25,000 from the existing MAG Work Program - Planning Opportunities Contingency - Shawn Seager, MAG


6. Provo Orem Bus Rapid Transit Update- Andrew Jackson, MAG Staff

7. Annual Open and Public Meeting Training

   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PBrcOgE6wQU&t=1722s

   - Andrew Jackson, MAG Staff

8. Other Business

   UTA

   UDOT

Next TAC Meeting is scheduled for September 25, 2017

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during this meeting should notify Jessica Adams at 801-229-3845 or jadams@mountainland.org at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

* Meeting minutes are recorded. A hard copy of the attendees, a brief summary, and all motions made during a meeting will be approved at the next meeting. Audio recordings of these meeting are available at www.mountainland.org/tac
AGENDA ITEM # 3

DATE: 8/24/17
SUBJECT: TIP Modification – TIGER Grant – Bike/Ped Facilities
PREPARED BY: Bob Allen and Jim Price

BACKGROUND: In 2016 MAG, WFRC, UDOT and UTA coordinated a grant application to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for TIGER funds. The application consisted multiple bicycle and pedestrian projects across the Wasatch Front. UTA, as the primary applicant, was awarded the grant. 3 of the projects are within the MPO and need to be added to the TIP

1. $4.9M – Pedestrian overpass in Lehi over SR-92 (Murdock Trail)
2. $3.98M – Pedestrian overpass in Provo over railroad tracks at Provo Front Runner Station
3. $48,153 – Bike/Ped improvements at Lehi, AF, Orem and Provo FR stations (bike racks, message boards, repair stands)

PROPOSAL: UTA would like to add these projects to the TIP to meet FTA requirements.

RECOMMENDATION: MPO Staff recommends a modification of the TIP to add the identified TIGER projects.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I move that the MPO Technical Advisory Committee recommend to the MPO RPC that the TIP be modified to add the identified TIGER projects.

CONTACT PERSON: Bob Allen, 801-229-3813 or rallen@mountainland.org
ATTACHMENT: Map
Project Location Maps
AGENDA ITEM # 4

DATE: Aug 28, 2017

SUBJECT: Spanish Fork City Main Street Study and Design, Approve allocation of $25,000 from the existing MAG Work Program - Planning Opportunities Contingency -

PREPARED BY: Shawn Seager

BACKGROUND: MAG Funds special studies from time to time for individual cities or regional areas.

Spanish Fork city has assembled the following revenue to define the future of Spanish Fork City’s Main Street and create a blueprint for future investment. UDOT will manage the study.

UDOT $25k
MAG $25k
SF City $25k
UTA $10k

$85k Total Project Value

Purpose - SF Main Street Vision and future construction standard.

TAC RECOMMENDATION AND MOTION: I move that TAC Approve MAG staff to allocate $25,000 to this effort.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approve request

SUGGESTED MOTION:

CONTACT PERSON: Shawn Seager

ATTACHMENTS:
March 28, 2017

Shawn Seager  
Director, Regional Planning Department  
Mountainland Association of Governments  
588 East 800 North  
Orem, Utah  
84097

Dear Shawn,

Spanish Fork City has worked closely for the past several years with the Spanish Fork Area Chamber of Commerce and downtown merchants to explore ways to improve a portion of our Main Street corridor.

This effort has included several different projects. In 2010, Spanish Fork City employed Project Engineering Consultants to develop conceptual designs for potential enhancements to Main Street. In 2012, our staff worked closely with an urban planning class from Brigham Young University to develop an inventory of Main Street land uses and a vision for its future. In 2013, volunteers from the American Institute of Architects performed a design exercise in Spanish Fork. During this event, the AIA developed specific recommendations related to improving our downtown and Main Street. The last significant project was completed in 2015. The American Planning Association sponsored a Community Planning Assistance Team who spent a week in Spanish Fork before delivering a set of detailed recommendations titled "Rediscover Historic Downtown Spanish Fork, Implementation Strategies to Promote Business, Heritage, and Community".

During this same period of time, we've noticed an increase in traffic on our Main Street. We also have unfortunately experienced some tragic auto-pedestrian accidents. Additionally, our downtown has recently seen a significant increase in private sector investment as several buildings have been restored or adapted for new uses.

I believe it is now time to take the next step in planning for Main Street's future. I understand that American Fork City recently collaborated with Mountainland Association of Governments and UDOT to develop a vision for their Main Street. I believe that project can serve as a good model for us in Spanish Fork. Please contact my Community Development Director, Dave Anderson, to discuss any ideas you may have on how to initiate a project like American Fork's.

As always, thank you for your work and your help on Spanish Fork City projects.

Steve Leifson, Mayor  
Spanish Fork City
March 30, 2017

Shawn Seager
Director, Regional Planning Department
Mountainland Association of Governments
586 East 800 North
Orem, UT 84097

Dear Shawn Seager:

Downtown On Main (DT on Main) is a coalition of stakeholders vested in the success of Spanish Fork Main Street. It is comprised of downtown merchants and property owners as well as representatives from both the City of Spanish Fork and The Spanish Fork Salem Area Chamber of Commerce.

DT on Main together with the City and Chamber has for several years been working towards the common goals of driving business to Main Street merchants, rebuilding the downtown Main Street area as a community-gathering place for activities and socializing as well as the beautification of Main Street.

While we have made significant strides in achieving these goals we still have a way to go. As our plans have taken shape and begun to come to fruition, some of the things that before were minor issues have become larger obstacles to the complete realization of a successful downtown gathering destination for shopping, socializing and celebrating as a community.

Some of these hindrances are:

- Spanish Fork Main Street’s increased traffic flow combined with an often exceeded speed limit has been the contributor to a rise in accidents involving vehicles and people with some even resulting in death. The Main Street corridor is also seen as a dividing barrier between the east and west sides of Main Street as pedestrians are hesitant to cross the street due to the danger.

- Deep gutters as a wintertime hazard and the removals of crosswalks have also created an impediment to crossing Main Street as mentioned by residents.

- Lack of parking is often citing as another impediment to frequenting downtown by residents. The City is working with property owners to open up public parking behind the Main Street buildings and is also planning parking striping this spring. Many merchants have requested diagonal parking as opposed to the current parallel parking that is currently in place. Speed and traffic flow make this difficult if not impossible.

DT on Main is aware of American Fork’s Main Street Vision Plan and is asking that MAG and UDOT collaborate with Spanish Fork City to develop a plan and vision for Main Street Spanish Fork that preserves both the needs to facilitate traffic and provide a welcoming atmosphere for residents and guests of the community to gather and patronize ‘Downtown On Main’.

Sincerely,

Aaron Stern
Director
DT on Main

www.dtonmain.com • email: info@dtonmain.com
Dear Shawn,

The Spanish Fork Salem area Chamber of Commerce has been working closely with Spanish Fork City, and the Downtown on Main committee in Spanish Fork, to find ways to improve not only the aesthetics of our downtown area, but to also provide a safer business friendly environment for the residents of the Spanish Fork area.

In the past year we have had a few unfortunate auto-pedestrian accidents along Main Street in Spanish Fork. As the director for the Chamber of Commerce we want to help drive business to our Historic Downtown area, but we don’t want to compromise the safety of the consumers, in doing so.

Spanish Fork City has also been working with UDOT to find ways to improve the parking situation along Main Street to help accommodate our downtown shoppers. The downtown business community would like to see more parking options available to their customers. With the current configuration of Main Street, the options are extremely limited.

According to the Community Planning Assessment Team which recently visited Spanish Fork City, they recommended various ways to improve our “Historic Main Street”. Their recommendations would help to improve not only the parking along Main Street, but also the safety concerns for foot traffic. Spanish Fork City’s community development director, Dave Anderson, has mentioned that MAG has been working with American Fork City to develop a Main Street Vision plan, very similar to what the CPAT team recommended for Spanish Fork City. This would be an ideal model for doing something similar here in Spanish Fork.

We appreciate all that you have done to support projects here in Spanish Fork City.

Sincerely,

Heather Youd
Executive Director
Spanish Fork & Salem Area Chamber of Commerce
AGENDA ITEM # 5

DATE: 08/28/2017
SUBJECT: Congestion Management/TIP Selection Process Update
PREPARED BY: Shawn Eliot

BACKGROUND: The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is the funding program for all regional transportation projects within the MPO. UDOT, UTA, and MPO programmed projects are listing in it. The Congestion Management/TIP Selection Process document outlines the policies and procedures in selecting MPO programmed projects.

CHANGES: Over the last selection process cycle, numerous changes were made to the selection process. It was proposed at the time, to work through these changes and codify them later. Also, major changes including the state exchanging MPO federal funds for state funds have required a project management process to be developed (with MPO TAC and the county). Changes proposed to the document include; small corrections and updates, policy updates, adding the project management joint process between the MPO and the county.

POLICY UPDATES: There are six policy changes that staff would like to discuss with MPO TAC. These items have been discussed by members of the committee in the past and MPO staff would like direction (see yellow highlighted items in policy document). They include:

Project Idea Report Cost Estimate (see Section 1.3): At the project idea stage, these projects are very draft and not fully vetted. Some have suggested in the past that a cost estimate at this state not be required. Should a cost estimate at the project idea stage be required?

Moving from Project Idea Report to Concept Report (1.4): In the past projects at the project idea stage were scored with a line drawn for what projects should move forward to Concept Report stage. Sponsors were advised that if their project was below this line, the project should not move forward, but they could still move forward if they choose to. Should low scoring projects be allowed to move to concept stage?

Project Progress (2.5): The state and federal government requires that if a project doesn’t progress to the end of a phase (PE, environmental, construction, etc.) that the sponsor shall refund the funds expended for that phase. For instance, if a sponsor abandons the project midway through PE, but had already completed the environmental, the sponsor would be required to refund the PE costs, but no costs of a prior phase (environmental). Note that this is very rare that a project would be abandoned min-way through a process. Should the MPO process have the same clause as the state and feds?

Scope Change (2.6): Expanded what constitutes a major scope change. Any suggestions of other major scope changes?

Scoring Matrix for Project Selection Process (Section 3): Added and removed some questions. Any suggestions of additional technical questions that should be scored by MPO staff?

MPO Staff Technical Score (3.2): MPO staff score each Concept Report based on the information supplied in Section 3 of the report. It clearly spells out each question and how it will be scored. Currently MPO staff create a score for each project and create a list showing how each project scored. This list is given to the MPO TAC as information toward their scoring of the
projects, but is non-binding. Some has suggested that since the MPO Staff Technical Score is a technical review that the score should weigh toward the final project scores given to each project by the MPO TAC. Should the MPO staff score weigh toward the overall score? If so by how much, a 1/4, 1/3, 1/2, etc.?

RECOMMENDATION: MPO staff recommends that the changes proposed be approved and that the questions above under POLICY CHANGES be discussed and a decision made on each.

SUGGESTED MOTION: I move that the MPO Technical Advisory Committee recommend to the MPO RPC that the Congestion Management Program/Project Selection Process be changed as shown in the markup document, along with the following changes;...

CONTACT PERSON: Shawn Eliot, 801-229-3841 or seliot@mountainland.org
ATTACHMENT: Congestion Management Program/Project Selection Process markup
Section One | Project Development and Selection Process

1.1 | MPO Congestion Management Program/Project Selection Process - Program overview
1.2 | Kick Off Meeting - Introduce project and process to MPO committees
1.3 | Project Idea Report - Pre-concept reports of project ideas completed by sponsors
1.4 | Project Idea Report Review Meeting - Pre-concept review by TAC committee of project ideas
1.5 | Transportation Studies - Review of project study ideas submitted by sponsors and MAG
1.6 | Project Concept Reports - Official application of projects completed by sponsors
1.7 | MPO Staff Technical Score - Scores given by MPO staff based off Concept Reports
1.8 | Field Review - TAC reviews projects in the field, sponsors present
1.9 | Project Priority List - Create list to prioritize funding

1.1 | MPO Congestion Management Program/Project Selection Process

The Mountainland MPO administers the Metropolitan Planning Organization over the Provo/Orem Urban Area with a planning area that includes all the municipalities within Utah County. The MPO programs transportation funds from federal, state, and county sources. The MPO is appropriated federal transportation funds are appropriated to the MPO based off the urban populations of the cities from Eagle Mountain through Provo to Santaquin. The majority of federal funds are exchanged with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to allow the MPO to program state funds. Utah County Transportation Sales Tax funds derived countywide are also used. This Funding is programmed by the MPO to eligible applicants including member jurisdictions, UDOT, UTA, state agencies, and private organizations. The MPO selects projects through its committees based off congestion relief strategies, mode choice, air quality improvement, and safety.

1.2 | Kick Off Meeting

Biennially (every two years) MPO staff will review with the TAC Committee and Regional Planning Committee the process for selecting projects to be funded with MPO federal funds. MPO staff will also compile a draft listing of projects derived from the MPO transportation plan, transportation studies, traffic model results, public involvement, and past projects discussed by the TAC Committee. This list can be used by the MPO TAC Committee members or others in compiling their Project Ideas submittals listed in 1.3 below.

1.3 | MPO TAC Project Ideas Project Idea Report Meeting (Municipal, Agency, Private)

Project and study suggestions from MPO member jurisdictions, state agencies, the transit district, and private organizations are submitted to the MPO in the form of a Project Idea Report. This one-page report includes the project description, project type, phasing, right-of-way needed, a draft cost estimate, and a history of the local process and approvals the project has been through (if local approvals have been done, will need to be completed by concept stage). Maps and supporting information can be submitted as supplements to the one-page report. Any projects presented suggested by MPO staff in 1.2 above must have a sponsor by this stage.

Individual projects should focus on improving the efficiency of the regional transportation system, be associated with corridors or programs identified in the MPO transportation plan, and emphasize the following four areas of concern:

1. — Congestion Relief— projects intended to improve Levels of Service and/or reduce average delay along those corridors identified in the Regional Transportation Plan as high congestion areas.

2. — Mode Choice— projects improving the diversity and/or usefulness of travel mode other than single-occupant
vehicles.

3. Air Quality Improvements — projects showing demonstrable air quality benefits.

4. Safety — improvements to vehicular, pedestrian, and bicyclist safety.

The project sponsor submits the draft Project Idea Report(s) to the MPO. MPO staff will schedule time to meet with each sponsor to review the report(s), give suggestions and feedback and answer any questions. Final reports are then submitted to the MPO and are compiled by MPO staff to be disseminated to the MPO TAC committee members before they meet to review and score projects moving forward to Concept Report stage. The TAC Committee will review the proposals and vote which projects should move forward to complete a Concept Report.

1.4 | Project Idea Report Review Meeting
At the MPO TAC committee meeting where the Project Idea Reports are presented and scored, each sponsor can take five minutes to present their ideas and answer questions. The TAC committee can give feedback and suggestions. Each member jurisdiction and agency shall have one voterrepresentative score each project. All advancing projects must have a sponsor, private sponsored projects should must partner with a government agency. The TAC committee will decide after creating a scored listing of project ideas what projects can move forward to the Concept Report stage. Projects cannot move forward to Concept Report stage without first being approved through the Project Idea stage.

1.5 | Project Concept Reports
The sponsor of projects advancing from the Project Ideas Reports Meeting shall complete a Concept Report. Concept Reports take time and extra resources to complete. When the draft Concept Report is submitted, MPO staff will determine whether projects meet the minimum requirements of the report including:

1. Preliminary Design
2. Right of Way needs
3. Cost Estimates
4. Cost effectiveness (safety improvements, LOS changes over time, average travel time reductions over time, projected air quality benefits.)
5. Project is consistent with the MPO TAC approved projects list.
6. Road project is on a facility identified on the Utah State Functional Class Map.
7. The project is regional in nature.
8. Project scope (total or phase) is an appropriate size to be funded with limited MPO federal funds.
9. Project is consistent with sponsor general or transportation plan
10. Officially supported by political leadership – approved by legislative body
11. Other transportation agencies or municipalities that are affected by the project are in agreement.
12. Local matching funds are approved.
13. Funding is adequate to clear design and completes the project.
14. Phased projects are proposed in logical increments.
15. Sponsor commitment to completion of project within 5 years from date of award.

After reviewing the draft Concept Reports, MPO staff schedule time to meet with each sponsor to review the draft report(s), give suggestions and feedback, and answer any questions. After meeting with MPO staff, sponsors will make any changes and submit the final Concept Report(s) to the MPO.

1.7 | MPO Staff Technical Score
MPO staff review each project and give a score based off section 3 of the Concept Report. Different types of projects, (road, transit, active transportation, etc.) score well in one ranking category and not as well in another. This allows all projects types to score against another. Once all Concept Report projects are scored, MPO staff will disseminate the results as well as the Concept Reports to the MPO TAC committee for review before the Field Review.

1.6 | 1.8 | Field Review
The MPO TAC Committee can should attend the Field Review of the projects. The field review should generally last one a whole day at the most with each project being hosted presented by the project sponsors to explain the proposal and allow the participants to get a better understanding of the project. Each sponsor will be responsible to present each project concept on the Field Review. Projects not visible in the field will be presented in at the TAC Review of Concept Reports Project Priority List Meeting listed in 1.7-9 below.

1.7 | 1.9 | TAC Review of Concept Reports Meeting Project Priority List Meeting
MPO staff will submit for MPO TAC review those projects that meet the minimum requirements listed under 1.6 Project Concept Reports. MPO TAC shall consider each project on its technical merits, and in relation to the other proposed projects and use the following to aid in their decision of a final project selection list:

1. Field Review
2. TAC Committee members rankings (submitted at meeting) Project Idea TAC Score
3. MPO staff Staff ranking Technical Score
4. Funding available

During an regularly scheduled MPO TAC Committee meeting, the body, under the direction of the Chair or Vice Chair shall negotiate and vote on score each project to create a fully funded Projects Priority List. Each member jurisdiction and agency shall have one representative scoring the individual projects. Once this list is complete and acceptable to the body, the MPO TAC Committee shall determine by vote whether or not to make recommendation to MPO RPC the list to the MPO Regional Planning Committee for approval, change or disapprove the Project Priority List and funding.

The draft priority list is next presented to the MPO RPC. MPO RPC will have a month to review the MPO TAC work and recommendations. MPO RPC will next meet to discuss any changes to the priority order and make a final approval of the list. The final Project Priority List will be used to fund projects until the next selection process, two years later.
Section Two | TIP Policies and Procedures

2.1 | Project Eligibility - List of type of projects eligible for MPO funding
2.2 | Funding - Funding sources and policies
2.3 | Contingency Fund / Cost Overruns - Funding available for cost overruns
2.4 | Project Cost Savings - Funds to be returned to MPO balance
2.5 | Project Tracking and Progress - Outlines tracking system and coordination
2.6 | Scope Change - Defines types of scope changes and approval process
2.7 | Regional Project - Defines what regional projects are
2.8 | New Projects Outside Biennial Process - Adding new projects outside normal process

The following outlines the policies and requirements regarding MPO federally funded projects:

2.1 | Project Eligibility
The types of projects that can be funded include:
1. Capacity increasing highway projects
2. Shoulder and turn-lane projects
3. Spot improvements that mitigate congestion or safety issues
4. ITS projects
5. Pedestrian/trail and active transportation projects
6. Transit and park and ride projects
7. Air quality equipment
8. Transportation studies
9. Other transportation related projects

Capacity increasing highway projects and general shoulder improvement projects can be funded, but due to limited funds must be either small in scope, phased, or have additional matching funds. All roadway type projects must be identified on the Utah State Functional Class Map. They also should correspond with the projects and/or programs of the MPO Metropolitan Regional Transportation Plan.

2.2 | Funding
Funding can come from various sources including the MPO federal funds, Utah County transportation sales tax funds, Utah County vehicle registration fees, and state exchange funds. UTA funds, local funds supplied by the municipalities or the county and private funds. Federal funds include Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality funds (CM/AQ), CM/AQ PM2.5, Surface Transportation Program Small Urban Area (STP-SU-MAG) funds, and the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) funds. In programming funds,

To program funding to a specific project, MPO staff will recommend to the MPO TAC Committee which funds should be used with for each all new projects on the Project Priority List. proposed project based on available MPO federal funding types and other non-MPO funds pledged by each sponsor. Generally, MPO staff will propose that state and county funds be used first for the higher scored projects. Federal funds, being more restrictive, will first be programmed to UDOT, UTA, or lower scored projects within the available funding identified. All MPO federal funds require a match be paid. The required match is normally 6.77% of the total project cost, but the committee can require a higher match. The match shall be paid by the project sponsor.
Projects not receiving funding that scored lower on the Priority List or new projects amended into the program can be eligible for any new funding identified outside the normal biennial selection process. MPO staff will compile any new reports and present the additional funding to the MPO TAC and MPO RPC for their respective recommendations and approvals.

2.3 | Contingency Fund / Cost Overruns
The MPO will hold back 10% of each federal funding category each year as a contingency fund for project cost overruns and other needs. At the end of each federal fiscal year, any leftover contingency funds shall be placed back into the general fund of each federal funding category and made available for new projects in the biennial selection process or used for planning studies proposed by the MPO as part of the Unified Planning Work Program | future projects. The inter-local agreement between the MPO/county and the sponsor requires that if a project cost escalates above what was awarded by the MPO, the sponsor is required to cover the cost overrun. A project sponsor can request to MPO staff to help cover small cost overruns up to 10% of the approved cost of the project. There is no guarantee the project will receive the additional funds. Any cost overrun over 10% must be recommended by presented to the TAC Committee MPO TAC to the Regional Planning Committee MPO RPC for their recommendation/approval.

The Utah County sales tax funds are scheduled to receive an annual Build America Bond (BAB) payment that can also be used for contingency funds, when needed. The same process for federal funds will be used for programming contingency funds and placing remaining contingency funds on new projects.

2.4 | Project Cost Savings
If a project does not require utilize all MPO federal funding that was programmed to it, any remaining funds shall be returned to the general MPO account to be reallocated in the next biennial selection process to future projects. If the sponsor has additional MPO funded projects that require additional funds, MPO staff can transfer remaining funds between these projects. No new projects or projects that are not funded with MPO funds can have MPO funds transferred to it without first going through the normal biennial selection process or amendment process to receive funding.

2.5 | Project Tracking and Progress
MPO staff will track all projects quarterly to ensure the project is progressing and to help with any problems. Regular updates will be given to the TAC and Regional Planning committees of all projects and programs to show what progress has been made. It is hoped that through project tracking, the MPO and the project sponsor will be able to better coordinate and avoid potential conflicts. This coordination will also help to determine the best years to program the project within the TIP. If a project is found not to be making progress, MPO staff will work with the sponsor to move the project forward to a later year. If staff cannot resolve the problem, then the project sponsor will report to the MPO TAC Committee their plan to move forward the project. The committee can recommend to the MPO Regional Planning Committee that a project that is not moving forward be canceled and removed from the TIP. Any federal funds expended toward the an unfinished phase of a project shall be required to be reimbursed by the sponsor.

2.6 | Scope Change
Minor scope changes to a project are allowed common and should be handled through the project tracking management process. A major scope change needs to be approved by the MPO TAC Committee. A major change can include changing project limits to a point that a logical terminus is excluded, reducing or expanding capacity, adding major components to the projects that were not approved, or subtracting major components that were approved, adding equipment not part of the scope, or adding additional work to the project because of left over funding. A sponsor can add major scope items to a project if the sponsor demonstrates that it is fully funding the additional work.
2.7 | Regional Project
All projects funded by the MPO must be regional in nature. This includes road projects being highways listed on the Utah State Functional Class System map, and projects being listed on the MPO transportation plan or supporting the goals and programs of the plan (functionally classified collector roads are not individually listed in the plan, but the collector system as a whole is supported, therefore improvements on these corridors are eligible for MPO funds). If a road project is proposed that is not on the functional class map, the MPO TAC Committee can review and determine that the corridor is regional and recommend to the state that it be included on the functional class map.

2.8 | New Projects Outside Biennial Process
The MPO supports funding all new projects through the biennial selection process, but there are instances where a project's need or timing might require approval of funding outside the normal process. A sponsor can request that a project be reviewed by the MPO TAC Committee to seek its approval and to be amended into the program. Generally, the same processes required for all projects will be followed (review by MPO staff for available funding, Project Idea Form, MPO TAC Committee approval to fill out a Concept Report, a Field Review, and final approval).

2.9 | CM/AQ Exempt Projects
Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CM/AQ) funds have federal regulations that require funding only go to projects that show a reduction to air pollution. A quantitative or qualitative analysis showing the amount of pollution reduction benefit will occur with the project is required. This process can be quite technical. The MPO has staff that can help with this portion of the Concept Report. Basically, all projects except for additional capacity highway projects (widen lanes, shoulders) must fill out the CM/AQ portion of the Concept Report. Listed below are the types of projects that can qualify for CM/AQ funds. The project sponsor must be able to show that a project is an eligible activity from one of the items listed.

1. Acquisition of diesel retrofits, including tailpipe emissions control devices, and the provision of diesel-related outreach activities.
2. Intermodal equipment and facility projects that target diesel freight emissions through direct exhaust control from vehicles or indirect emissions reductions through improvements in freight network logistics.
3. Alternative fuel projects including participation in vehicle acquisitions, engine conversions, and refueling facilities.
4. Establishment or operation of a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility, including the installation of advanced truck stop electrification systems.
5. Projects that improve traffic flow, including efforts to provide signal systemization, construct HOV lanes, streamline intersections, add turning lanes, improve transportation systems management and operations that mitigate congestion and improve air quality, and implement ITS and other CMAQ-eligible projects, including efforts to improve incident and emergency response or improve mobility, such as through real time traffic, transit and multimodal traveler information.
6. Projects or programs that shift travel demand to nonpeak hours or other transportation modes, increase vehicle occupancy rates, or otherwise reduce demand through initiatives, such as teleworking, ridesharing, pricing, and others.
7. Transit investments, including transit vehicle acquisitions and construction of new facilities or improvements to facilities that increase transit capacity. The MAP21 provision on operating assistance (23 USC 149(m)) is being reviewed and guidance interpreting the provision will be issued in the future.
8. Non-recreational bicycle transportation and pedestrian improvements that provide a reduction in single-occupant vehicle travel.
9. Vehicle inspection and maintenance programs.
2.10 | Selection Process Time Line — Biennial

Every two years the MPO facilitates the selection process on the following schedule:

Jan = Kick Off Meeting, regular January MPO TAC Committee Meeting — MPO staff present the TIP selection process and make project recommendations based on traffic model and MPO transportation plan projects and programs.

Feb = Project Idea Form Submittals, due mid-February — TAC Committee members and others submit project ideas to MPO staff to compile.

Feb = TAC Committee Project Ideas Meeting at regular February MPO TAC Committee Meeting — MPO TAC Committee finalizes draft list and votes on which projects move forward to Concept Report level.

Apr = Concept Reports, due end of April — MPO staff starts review and ranking projects.

May = Field Review, end of May — A field review of projects is done. The review is usually held the morning of the May MPO TAC Committee Meeting.

May = TIP Selection Meeting, regular May MPO TAC Committee Meeting — MPO TAC Committee uses Field Review findings, MPO staff ranking, cost effectiveness of solution, geographic distribution of projects, available funding, and phasing to make final project list recommendation to the MPO Regional Planning Committee.

June = MPO Regional Planning Committee reviews MPO TAC Committee recommendations and approves a funded projects list.
Section Three | MPO Staff Scoring Process

3.1 Scoring Matrix for Project Selection Process - Outlines scoring process
3.2 MPO Staff Technical Score - Process for assigning technical score
3.3 Congestion Relief - Items to be scored
3.4 Mode Choice - Items to be scored
3.5 Environmental Quality - Items to be scored
3.6 Safety - Items to be scored
3.7 Other Considerations - Items to be scored

3.1 | Ranking Scoring Matrix for Project Selection Process

General procedure: For each of the 4 categories listed in section 1.3. MPO staff assigns an overall score representing their judgment of the project’s relative merit based off the Concept Report. The maximum score for each category reflects its relative significance in the ranking process. Rankings are coupled with the following guidelines when selecting projects to fund:

1. The process should be simple.
2. It should recognize the special characteristics of our region.
3. The process should include geographical balance.
4. The process should consider transit, ITS, pedestrian/bike, as well as congestion relief for roads.
5. High priority should be given to projects that are federal law requires recommendations to be funded.
6. The outcome should not be completely dependent on scoring, but should also allow for each jurisdiction’s own priorities.
7. MPO staff review the ranking questions with the MPO TAC Committee prior to the start of a selection cycle and make changes as deemed necessary by the committee.

3.2 | MPO Staff Project Ranking Technical Score

The following categories are addressed in the Concept Report. MPO staff will score the responses in each and give a ranking technical score for each project. MPO staff’s recommendations Technical Scores will be made available to the MPO TAC Committee for their use in making the final draft P project Priority List selection recommendations. The MPO staff ranking score is a tool to aid the MPO TAC Committee in their final selection. The committee is not required to pick projects solely on MPO staff rank scores.

3.3 | Congestion Relief (25 Points)

a) Provides alternate transportation facility that corrects identified congested problem.
b) Reduces congestion by reducing the number of vehicles.
c) Reduces need for additional highway lanes for peak hour capacity.
d) Increases efficiency of transportation system through traffic management measures.
e) Adds turning movements to relieve congested intersection.

3.4 | Mode Choice (25 points)

a) Benefits multiple transportation systems (transit and highway, pedestrian and transit).
b) Promotes alternative transportation solution to SOV use.
c) Creates or improves linkages between transportation modes.

d) Reduces physical, psychological, or economic barriers to carpool, bike, walk, or transit use.

\[ \text{3.5 | Environmental Quality (15 points)} \]

a) Provides cost effective emission reductions (amount of reduction justifies cost).

b) Helps efforts to attain and maintain national air quality standards.

c) Minimizes environmental impacts or reduces existing impacts (e.g. air/water/noise pollution).

d) Enhances the natural, cultural, or historic environment.

e) Mitigates invasive impacts to existing neighborhoods/commercial areas (minimal relocations).

\[ \text{3.6 | Safety (20 points)} \]

a) Corrects/improves a verified or potential safety or accident problem.

b) Improves information/communications for traffic operations and emergency responders.

c) Reduces severity of crashes.

d) Enhances safe movement of pedestrian, bicycle traffic.

e) Provides an intermodal safety improvement (e.g. separation of vehicles-trains, vehicles-pedestrian).

\[ \text{3.7 | Other Considerations (15 points)} \]

a) Effectively distributes funding throughout the MPO area.

b) Phases project in a manner that the MPO can use limited funds efficiently.

c) Cost effectiveness is appropriate for the amount of improvement made. Additional funding above required match is pledged toward project.

d) Benefits transportation users from adjacent municipalities. Project sponsor ranking of project.

e) Is supported by elected officials.
Section Four | MPO / Utah County Joint Project Management Process

4.1 Project Management Process
The following policies and procedures apply to all local government projects funded through the Mountainland Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) using state transportation funds exchanged for federal funds with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) and Utah County Transportation Sales Tax funds. All project funds awarded to UDOT or the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) will be managed by their respective agencies with an inter-local agreement and a required statement of completion.

4.2 Purpose
1. Help jurisdictions develop complete, efficiently delivered, lasting transportation projects.
2. Remain accountable to the MPO committees (Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and the Regional Planning Committee (RPC)) that awarded the funds.
   a. Ensure approved projects are completed in a timely manner.
   b. Help local jurisdictions overcome unforeseen project funding or scoping issues.
   c. Follow proven project delivery processes and standards.

4.3 Funding
The MPO has multiple federal, state, and local transportation funds to program for regional transportation projects.

1. MPO Funds - The MPO has entered into agreement with UDOT to exchange Urban STP federal funds for state funds at an .85-cents to the dollar exchange rate. State funds are more flexible than federal funds when funding the smaller regional projects programmed through the MPO. They also have less regulations, projects typically are less expensive, and are completed in less time, all justifying the discounted exchange rate.
2. Utah County Transportation Sales Tax Funds - The MPO is also tasked with developing and recommending a list of projects that utilize the two county transportation sales taxes. The county commission has the final approval of these funds, but by state law can only approve or deny the MPO recommended project list.
3. Funding Participation - Both the MPO state funds and county sales tax funds require local or sponsor participation. The MPO/county will pay 93.23% of the total awarded project cost with the local jurisdiction or project sponsor required to pay 6.77% matching funds for each project.
4. Soft Match - A soft match that claims work done by the sponsor, Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition, or other approved related incurred costs may be used toward the 6.77% matching funds if established within the inter-local agreement.
5. **Additional Funds** - The local jurisdiction can pledge additional funds above the required cash match to fund different aspects of the project including betterments. These funds add value to the total project, but do not require additional cash match.

### 4.4 Responsible Agency

The Project Management Process for MPO Exchange funds will be managed by the MPO with County sales tax funds managed by Utah County. A local jurisdiction or agency, known as the Project Sponsor, will work directly with the MPO or county, known as the Project Manager, based on which funding source a project is awarded. The Project Manager will manage each project as outlined below from the beginning of the Inter-Local Agreement, to approving and paying invoices, to project completion. Both the MPO and the county will collaboratively share information about the projects they manage to allow accountability to the MPO committees and the county commission on all approved projects. If a project is within multiple jurisdictions and/or agencies, one jurisdiction or agency will enter into the interlocal agreement and interface with the Program Manager as the Project Sponsor. Multiple jurisdictions and/or agencies interactions will be outlined within a separate interlocal agreement between said jurisdictions and/or agencies.

### 4.5 Process

The process to start, design, construct and fund a project is as follows:

1. **Inter-Local Agreement** - The Project Manager and Project Sponsor will enter into an inter-local agreement confirming the total project funds awarded by the MPO, matching funds, other pledged funds, soft match, project scope and adherence to the project management process herein. No project activities paid for by the Project Sponsor prior to an approved Interlocal Agreement shall be reimbursed by the Project Manager except as allowed for soft match purposes.

2. **Project Initiation** - The Project Sponsor will designate a qualified project engineer from its staff or hire a project engineer from the Project Sponsor's consultant pool or the prequalified UDOT pool, who will be responsible for project delivery. The designated project engineer will be responsible for the completion of the project.

3. **Project Development** - The Project Sponsor and the designated project engineer, will design, acquire the necessary ROW, bid out and manage the construction of the Approved Project.
   a. **Design Standard**: The project design will adhere to American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), UDOT, American Public Works Association (APWA), or other applicable local/state/national standards.
      1) The local jurisdiction and the project engineer will acquire the appropriate clearances and permits through the design process.
   b. **Environmental Work**: The Project Sponsor will acquire the appropriate clearances and permits through the design process. The Project Sponsor can follow their own adopted environmental process or follow the Recommended Environmental Guidance / Mountainland & Utah County Programmed Projects document (including designating with the Program Manager the type of environmental work to be completed). The Project Sponsor must follow any National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements required (Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, etc.).
   c. **Design Work**: The Project Sponsor will involve the Program Manager at the following design milestones:
1) Kickoff Meeting.
2) 30% Scope and Schedule Review.
3) 60% On Site Plan Review.
4) 90% Plans, Specifications and Estimate.

d. Final Design Approval: Once project design is complete the Project Sponsor will review the final design with the Program Manager. Both parties shall agree that the project is ready for the construction phase.

e. ROW Acquisition: The Project Sponsor will be responsible to acquire all necessary ROW adhering to state and local laws. The Project Sponsor can follow their own adopted ROW acquisition process or follow the Recommended Right of Way Acquisition Guidance / Mountainland & Utah County Programmed Projects guidance document.

f. Procurement: Advertising of the Approved Project will follow the Project Sponsors established procurement policies. All construction bids will include a 10% construction contingency. The Project Sponsor will provide a copy of the notice of award to the Program Manager.

4. **Project Signage/Contact Info**

   It is recommended that the Project Sponsor install signage informing the public of the following:

   a. Project name.
   b. Project description.
   c. Start and completion dates (general).
   d. Contact name, phone number, website address, email.
   e. Use the sentence “This project funded with Mountainland Transportation Funding”.
   f. List project sponsors and their logos (Project Sponsor, Mountainland, Utah County).
   g. Generally, one sign at each access point to the project shall be installed.
   h. Signs should be at least 4’ x 6’, or large enough for passing motorists to read.
   i. Signs should be installed prior to construction and stay in place through construction.

5. **Construction Process**

   The Project Sponsor will manage the construction process. The Program Manager will be notified by the Project Sponsor of any changes that affect the scope of the project or costs that exceed the construction contingency.

6. **Project Completion**

   Program Manager staff will be notified and allowed to attend the final inspection of the completed project.

7. **Project Hold**

   The Program Manager has the authority to place a project on hold during the Project Development process or withhold reimbursement of invoices during the Construction Process if the Program Manager deems that the project is not within the Approved Project scope or budget. The Program Manager shall notify the Project Sponsor of the hold in writing and will work with the Project Sponsor to rectify the issues promptly. If the Project Sponsor
and Program Manager cannot bring the Approved Project back into scope or if additional funding is needed above what the Program Manager or the Project Sponsor can provide, the issues will be brought to the Mountainland MPO committees for their review, recommendations, and approvals.

8. **Total Project Cost**

Both the Program Manager and Project Sponsor acknowledge that the Approved Project has been authorized by the Mountainland MPO Regional Planning Committee (Utah County Commission must also approve if county funds are used) to be funded at an amount not to exceed $(enter Total Project Cost amount) (Total Project Cost) for the direct costs of the Approved Project.

a) **Matching Funds:** The Project Sponsor is required to pay a match or portion of the Total Project Cost. This amount is 6.77% of the Total Project Cost. The use of Project Sponsor equipment and/or Project Sponsor employee time for the project shall not be reimbursable, but can be claimed by the Project Sponsor as a soft match toward the required 6.77% matching funds required from the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor is required to pay the difference between the required match and the value of the soft match, if any.

b) **Reimbursement:** The Project Sponsor, if desiring reimbursement for the direct costs of the Approved Project, will provide the Program Manager with one monthly itemized invoice detailing actual costs for the ROW acquisition, design, utility relocation, construction, or other approved elements of the project. Appropriate backup materials shall also be supplied. The Program Manager agrees to reimburse the Project Sponsor within 30 days of receiving acceptable itemized invoices establishing the validity of the direct costs of the Approved Project. The maximum amount of reimbursement from the Program Manager to the Project Sponsor shall not exceed the Total Project Cost less the matching funds. Any costs which exceed the Total Project Cost less the matching funds shall be the sole responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Program Manager will review and approve monthly each itemized invoice and will reimburse the total invoice amount less the required matching funds.

c) **Cost Overruns:** The Program Manager maintains an account for cost overruns. The Project Sponsor may request additional funds above the approved Total Project Cost with supporting documentation demonstrating the need for additional funds. The Program Manager may approve up to 10% of the Total Project Cost up to a maximum of $500,000. The MPO Regional Planning Committee can approve higher amounts (Utah County Commission must also approve if county funds are used). The addition of these contingency funds would require a modification to this agreement. If no additional funds are awarded or the project still requires additional funds, the Project Sponsor will be responsible to fund the overrun.

d) **Surplus Funds:** Any surplus funds remaining after the completion of the Approved Project will be returned to the Mountainland or Utah County fund balance to be reallocated to other projects selected through the MPO project selection process. Note that Mountainland and Utah County selects and funds projects, not sponsors.
Surplus funds cannot be moved to a new project not already approved though the MPO project selection process. Any surplus funds paid by the Project Sponsor shall be returned to the Project Sponsor.

2. **Ownership and Maintenance of Approved Project**: The Project Sponsor shall own and be responsible for maintenance, repair and replacement of the completed project.

3. **Inspection of Approved Project**: The Program Manager and its designees, upon reasonable notice, reserve the right to enter upon the Approved Project to inspect the same to verify compliance with this Agreement.

4. **Other Expenses**: Except as otherwise expressly stated herein, all expenses not identified as a part of the Approved Project or executed prior to the Agreement shall be the sole responsibility of the Project Sponsor.

5. **Amendments**: The interlocal agreement may not be amended, changed, modified or altered except by an instrument in writing which shall be one of the following: (a) approved by Resolution of the governing body of each of the parties, (b) executed by a duly authorized official of each of the parties, and (c) filed in the official records of each party.

6. **Change Orders**: Changes can occur throughout a project. Changes that are outside the approved scope outlined in the interlocal agreement must be amended. Minor changes and adjustments that fall within the original project scope can be addressed with a change order. A change order is defined as that additional effort necessary by reason of changed conditions which are radical, unforeseen, and completely beyond the control of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall create the change order and keep records of them. Any additional costs incurred can be covered by the construction contingency or by added local funding and should be addressed in the change order. If additional costs are more than the construction contingency and available local funds, the Project Sponsor shall contact the Program Manager to review funding options.