



Multimodal Transportation & Mitigation Options Fund (MMOF): SB 21-260 Changes & Opportunities

September 10, 2021



TOPICS

- MMOF Program Changes in SB260
- Opportunities for Program Improvements:
 - Funding Distribution Formula
 - Match Requirements & Reductions
 - Efficiency of utilizing funds
- Funding Appropriations
- Project Eligibility & Project Selection
- Reporting Requirements



MMOF Program Changes

New Name:

Multimodal Transportation and Mitigation Options Fund

Same Acronym:





SB260: Expanded MMOF Program Goals

- An integrated system that:
 - Benefits seniors by making aging in place more feasible
 - Benefits residents of rural and Disproportionately Impacted (DI)
 Communities by providing them with more accessible and flexible public transportation services
 - Provides enhanced mobility for persons with disabilities
 - Provides safe routes to school for children, AND
 - Reduces emissions of air pollutants and Greenhouse Gases that contribute to adverse environmental effects, including but not limited to Climate Change and adverse Human Health Effects.



Disproportionately Impacted (DI) Community

Definition:

A Census Block Group where the proportion of Households is:

- >40% Low Income,
- >40% Minority, ...or...
- >40% Housing Cost-burdened

Low-Income...means Household Income <= 200% Poverty Level Cost-burdened...means a household spends >30% of Household Income on housing



Funding Distribution

Program Improvement Opportunity: Modify Distribution Formula Criteria to align with SB260 program changes

- Formula based on population, transit ridership and other criteria
 - Current formula uses 10 criteria; splits 19% rural / 81% urban
- Formula must be developed in consultation with STAC, TRAC, transit and bike/ped groups
- MMOF Work Group included: STAC, TRAC, CASTA, Bicycle Colorado, Walk Denver, CO Commission on Aging, SRTS committee member, Colorado Advisory Council for People with Disabilities



Distribution Formula Criteria

	Current CRITERIA (2016)	Proposed CRITERIA (2019)
Population	% Population	same
	% Disabled, Senior and/or Low-income	% Low-income Households
	% of income required for housing &	% Minority Households
	trans	% Housing Cost-Burdened
	% School-Aged Children (5-18)	same
Transit Ridership	% Transit Revenue Miles	same
	% Transit Unlinked Trips	same
Other	% of Bike Crashes	same
	% of Pedestrian Crashes	same
	% of Jobs	same
	% Zero Vehicle Households	same



MMOF Funding Appropriations - SB260

- 1. \$161.34 million Federal ARPA stimulus
 - \$14.5 million to Front Range Passenger Rail / SW Chief
 - =\$146.84 million currently available for project selection
 - \$22M State (15%) / \$118M Local + \$6M Admin (85%)
 - Need to consider Local (and CDOT) capacity to distribute and use funding given demands of RMS
- 2. \$108.1 million total State Funds over 5 years between FY2023-27, depending on annual State Revenue Caps
- 3. \$10.5 million annual State Funds for 8 years, FY2025-32



MMOF Annual Funding Projections

	P	rojected Revenue	State	Local
FY2022	\$	146,840,000	\$22,026,000	\$124,814,000
FY2023	\$	27,025,000	\$ 4,053,750	\$ 18,377,000
FY2024	\$	27,025,000	\$ 4,053,750	\$ 18,377,000
FY2025	\$	37,525,000	\$ 5,628,750	\$ 27,302,000
FY2026	\$	37,525,000	\$ 5,628,750	\$ 27,302,000
FY2027	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 27,302,000
FY2028	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 8,925,000
FY2029	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 8,925,000
FY2030	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 8,925,000
FY2031	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 8,925,000
FY2032	\$	10,500,000	\$ 1,575,000	\$ 8,925,000
TOTAL	\$	338,940,000	\$50,841,000	\$273,694,050



Current Match Reduction Policy

<u>Issues / Considerations / Opportunities:</u>

- Current Match Reduction policy based on *Population* and *Poverty Rate* is a poor representation of fiscal hardship for some agencies, leaving them <u>ineligible</u> for reductions
- Varied match rates created an extraordinary administrative burden and complexity for contracting, invoicing and reporting.
- All Reductions require formal request and formal TC Resolution
- SB260 changes now permits the TC, if recommended by CDOT staff, to reduce match on individual projects (this cannot be considered under TC's current policy)



Proposed Match Reduction POLICY

Recommendations:

- Tiered rates (0%, 10%, 20%, 30%, 40%, 50%)
- Provide agencies automatic eligibility for reduced match rates - no applications, no TC resolutions required
- New in SB260: TC may approve individual reductions, if recommended by CDOT staff
- Consider/modify the original MMOF Work Group recommended formula
- Consider Alternative indicators of fiscal hardship



Proposed Match CRITERIA

- Use proven indicators* that:
 - Demonstrate Local Agency's ability to generate revenues
 - Median Household Income & Median Home Value
 - Demonstrate Local Agency's degree of <u>burden on its resources</u>
 - Percent Poverty & Percent over 65
 - Are available at both County and Municipal levels
 - Are continually maintained, updated and reliable

*Factors recommended & used by DOLA, State Demographer



Proposed Match REDUCTIONS

City & County %tile Rank	Minimum Match Rate	
1 st – 50 th	50%	
50 th – 75 th	40% 30% 20% 10%	
75 th – 100 th	0%	



SB260: Expanded Eligible Project Types

- Fixed-route and On-demand transit (fixed or operating costs),
- Transportation Demand Management programs,
- MM Mobility projects enabled by new technology,
- MM Transportation studies,
- Modeling Tools,
- GHG mitigation projects that decrease VMT or increase MM travel, AND
- Bicycle or pedestrian projects



Local MPO/TPR Project Selection

<u>Issues / Considerations / Opportunities:</u>

- ARPA funds, must be:
 - Obligated by Dec. 31, 2024
 - *Expended* by Dec. 31, 2026
- Federal Funds "Federalize" projects
- Some projects have experienced significant cost-overruns, unanticipated delays and missed cost-saving opportunities
- "Application fatigue" from local governments
 - TAP Application period also begins this fall.



Local MPO/TPR Project Selection

Recommendations:

- Develop and Finalize Distribution & Match Formulas PRONTO!
- "Shovel-Ready" is a high priority criteria
- CDOT would like the opportunity to review and advise MPOs/TPRs on proposed projects with respect to costs, delivery timelines, feasibility, and to identify opportunities to combine or coordinate with other CDOT projects - without slowing MPO/TPR project selections
- Discuss Local MMOF project selections in October



SB260: New Reporting Requirements

- Continued Annual CDOT Expenditures Report to the Legislature
 - Currently unable to obtain/track total project expenditures
- NEW annual MPO/TPR Project Status Report required
 - To include: Status, Issues, Funding, Expenditures, Timelines, etc.

Recommendation:

- CDOT proposes developing a report form for MPOs/TPRs to distribute & compile
 - First Report proposed this fall (Oct-Nov)
 - Subsequent Reports each fiscal year, due in July/Aug



Next Steps / Timeline

September

Convene MMOF Work Group

Develop Distribution & Match Formulas

October

Review Formula Recommendations (STAC, TC)

Distribute Project Status Report

Discuss & Begin Project Selection

November

STAC & TRAC final recommendations

TC Adoption of Formulas & Match Policy

Project Status Report to CDOT

NOTE: CDOT to develop recommendations for state MMOF funding; 10-yr plan options; and MPO needs for modeling help to comply with GHG rule



Questions & Discussion

For questions or comments, please contact:
 Michael Snow
 Transportation Planning Specialist
 michael.snow@state.co.us | 303.512.4123