Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund 2021-23 STIF Plans for Formula Funds

Report to the PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee April 5, 2021

Executive Summary

The following is a recommendation from the Public Transportation Advisory Committee (PTAC) Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund (STIF) Plan Review Subcommittee to PTAC. This report is being submitted to PTAC, in accordance with OAR 732-042-0025, in order to inform its recommendation to the Oregon Transportation Commission (OTC) about whether to approve or reject all or a portion of a Qualified Entity's (QE) submitted STIF Plan for Formula funding.

The PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee recommends that PTAC make the following recommendation to the OTC:

- Approve 40 STIF Plans in their entirety, as submitted by Basin Transit Service Transportation District; Benton County; Columbia County; the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians; the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon; the Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation; the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation; Coos County Area Transportation District; the Coquille Indian Tribe; the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon; Crook County; Curry County; Deschutes County; Gilliam County; Grant County Transportation District; Harney County; Hood River County Transportation District; Jefferson County; Josephine County; Lake County; Lane Transit District; Lincoln County; Linn County; Malheur County; Morrow County, Rogue Valley Transportation District; Salem Area Mass Transit District; Sherman County; Sunset Empire Transportation District; the Klamath Tribes; Tillamook County Transportation District; Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District; Umatilla County; Umpqua Public Transportation District; Union County; Wallowa County; Wasco County; Wheeler County; and Yamhill County.
- The Subcommittee does not yet have a recommendation on the STIF Plans for Baker County and the Burns Paiute Tribe.

Report Organization

- 1. PTAC STIF Plan Subcommittee Review Process
- 2. PTAC STIF Plan Subcommittee Review Recommendations
- 3. Statewide Summary Tables: A series of four tables that summarize submitted STIF Plans at the statewide level
 - a. Expenditures, whether each Plan is consistent with requirements, and PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee Recommendation to PTAC
 - b. Project benefits and outcomes
 - c. Capital investment outcomes
 - d. Expenditures allocated by program criteria
- 4. Qualified Entity Summary Tables: Same series of four tables for each QE and related Public Transportation Service Providers, as applicable

PTAC STIF Plan Subcommittee Review Process

The PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee (Subcommittee) met virtually to get oriented to the Subcommittee's purpose and role in the STIF Plan decision-making process, to review conflict of interest guidelines, the outline of report contents, instructions for completing plan review, and to receive an overview of ODOT staff's completeness review. The Subcommittee received the report and access to STIF Plans from ODOT on March 15, 2021 and met on March 23, 2021 to discuss their review and formulate their recommendation to PTAC. The Subcommittee's charter is attached as Appendix A.

Prior to the Subcommittee's review, ODOT assessed each of the 42 submitted Plans for completeness and consistency with application directions, and to identify potential conditions that could cause the OTC to reject all or a portion of a STIF Plan. The review considered statutory requirements, Oregon Administrative Rules 732 Divisions 40 and 42, and the OTC-approved STIF Plan Rejection Considerations.

Since receipt of the STIF Plans on February 1, 2021, ODOT has conducted several completeness reviews and notified QEs of the results of each review. Completeness review results included detailed descriptions of completeness issues and potential revisions. ODOT also identified potential issues that could result in OTC STIF Plan rejection.

Qualified Entities had several opportunities to revise and re-submit their STIF Plans to address issues identified during the ODOT completeness reviews. Out of the 42 submitted STIF Plans, 3 Plans were considered complete with no revisions needed, and 39 QEs were given a chance to revise and re-submit at least once during the review period. Of the 39 QEs given an opportunity to resubmit, 2 QEs missed the deadline and are still working with Public Transportation Division staff to submit a complete report. This process resulted in the ODOT determination that 40 STIF Plans are complete at this time.

Copies of the completed STIF Plans and attachments are located here: https://www.oregon.gov/ODOT/RPTD/Pages/STIF-Plan-Submissions.aspx.

PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee Recommendations

STIF Plans—Recommend approval of 40 STIF Plans as submitted by the following Qualified Entities:

- Basin Transit Service Transportation
 District
- 2. Benton County
- 3. Columbia County
- 4. Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians
- 5. Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
- 6. Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation
- 7. Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
- 8. Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation
- 9. Coos County Area Transportation District
- 10. Coquille Indian Tribe
- 11. Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon

- 12. Crook County
- 13. Curry County
- 14. Deschutes County
- 15. Gilliam County
- 16. Grant County Transportation District
- 17. Harney County
- 18. Hood River County Transportation
 District
- 19. Jefferson County
- 20. Josephine County
- 21. Lake County
- 22. Lane Transit District
- 23. Lincoln County
- 24. Linn County
- 25. Malheur County
- 26. Morrow County
- 27. Rogue Valley Transportation District
- 28. Salem Area Mass Transit District
- 29. Sherman County

- 30. Sunset Empire Transportation District
- 31. The Klamath Tribes
- 32. Tillamook County Transportation District
- 33. Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation
 District
- 34. Umatilla County

- 35. Umpqua Public Transportation District
- 36. Union County
- 37. Wallowa County
- 38. Wasco County
- 39. Wheeler County
- 40. Yamhill County

The Subcommittee discussed the two STIF Plans still deemed incomplete with potential rejection considerations: Baker County and the Burns Paiute Tribe. Both QEs are located in Region 5, and their Regional Transit Coordinator, Frank Thomas, was in attendance to provide some context on each of the Plans. The Subcommittee considered the following additional details when developing their recommendation:

- Baker County's governing body asked to hold another small solicitation for projects before
 approving the STIF Plan, to better inform their decision on the advisory committee
 recommendation. Once the solicitation is complete, Baker County staff will revise the STIF
 Plan if necessary before sending it through the advisory committee for review and then to the
 governing body for adoption. Information from Baker County's advisory committee meetings
 will also be submitted to ODOT along with any revisions to the STIF Plan.
- The Burns Paiute Tribe's STIF Plan is also awaiting governing body approval, and Frank is in communication with the STIF Plan contact about how they would like to proceed. The Burns Paiute Tribe is quite small and operations have been significantly impacted by COVID-19, so local staff are working to determine if they have the capacity to move forward with their application for the 2021-23 STIF Formula cycle.

Since ODOT staff are committed to working with Baker County and the Burns Paiute Tribe staff to remedy the issues stated above, the Subcommittee wished to abstain from voting on the these two STIF Plans at this time. Both of these Plans will be either complete or withdrawn for this cycle by the April 5 PTAC meeting, and the final PTAC recommendation should encompass these two plans.

Statewide Summary Tables and PTAC Subcommittee Recommendation to PTAC

Table 1. Statewide Formula Expenditure and Consistency Summary

		Sta	atewide Tra	nsportation	Improvement	Fund - 2021-2023 F	Formula Program Summar	v			
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Expe	nditure Budget	•		1	PTAC Subcommittee	Recommendat	on to PTAC	
Qualified Entity Name	STIF Funds	STIF 19-21 Carry Forward	Other Funds	Total 2021-23 Expenditures	Funds to be Expended in Future Plan Period		If No, describe inconsistencies that may be basis for rejection of Plan.	Recommendation	Votes	Recusals	Disenting Opinions
							Pending Governing Body Adoption	Delay vote until PTAC Meeting to allow			
Baker County	\$ 531,623	\$ 155,000	\$ 358,041	\$ 1,044,664	خ	No		Qualified Entity to address areas of concern			None
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	\$ 1,596,877		\$ 1,201,974		\$ 267,109	Vec		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Benton County	\$ 5,837,645	\$ 1,201,374	\$ 7,206,840			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Benton county	\$ 3,037,043	7	7 7,200,040	3 13,044,403	,	163		Delay vote until PTAC Meeting to allow	103.0		IVOILE
								Qualified Entity to address areas of			
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 22,500	\$ 250,000	\$ 315,500	\$ 338,000	\$ 177,500	No	Pending Governing Body Adoption	concern			None
	,		,				<i>g g</i> , .		Yes: 7		
Columbia County	\$ 850,007	\$ -	\$ 2,284,733	\$ 3,134,740	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Aaron Deas	None
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umqua, and Suisl	\$ 200,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 190,000	\$ 390,000	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Community	\$ 610,000	\$ -	\$ 250,000	\$ 860,000	\$ 40,000	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation	\$ 450,000	\$ -	\$ 540,000	\$ 990,000	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservatio		\$ 45,000	\$ 45,000			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	\$ 199,999	\$ 32,287	\$ 32,287	\$ 232,286	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
									Yes: 7		
Coos County Area Transportation District	\$ 1,676,961	\$ 936,000	\$ 2,822,564	\$ 4,499,526	\$ 46,027	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Selena Kelly Irvin	None
									Yes: 7		
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 200,000	\$ 254,000	\$ 304,000			Yes		Approve STIF Plan		Selena Kelly Irvin	
Cow Creek Band of Umqua Indians of Oregon	\$ 200,000	\$ 85,000	\$ 85,000			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Crook County	\$ 465,971	\$ 368,962	\$ 368,962		•	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Curry County	\$ 443,968	\$ 153,204	\$ 153,204		\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Deschutes County	\$ 5,923,496	\$ 3,944,504	\$ 3,944,504			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Gilliam County	\$ 337,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 150,000	\$ 487,000	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
									Yes: 7		
Grant County Transportation District	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	•	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Angie Jones	None
Harney County	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000		Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Hood River Transportation District	\$ 1,059,820	\$ 330,180	\$ 2,334,180			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Jefferson County	\$ 467,921	\$ 434,003	\$ 434,003			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Josephine County	\$ 2,574,552	\$ 1,240,172	\$ 1,680,172		•	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Lake County	\$ 200,000	\$ 223,634	\$ 223,634	\$ 423,634	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
									Yes: 7		
Lane Transit District	\$ 13,103,074		\$ 17,474,572	\$ 30,577,646		Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Cosette Rees	None
Lincoln County	\$ 1,330,754		\$ 1,392,228		•	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Linn County	\$ 4,089,981	\$ 2,063,144	\$ 8,058,744			Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Malheur County	\$ 972,654	\$ 525,048	\$ 525,048					Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Morrow County	\$ 566,500	\$ 500,000	\$ 871,900	\$ 1,438,400	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
									Yes: 7		
Rogue Valley Transportation District	\$ 7,874,370	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 16,750,000	\$ 24,624,370	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Paige West	None
Solom Avon Mass Transit District	ć 15 435 354	¢ 11,002,010	ć 11 130 C10	\$ 26 553 970	¢ .	Voc		Anna CTIF Diam	Yes: 7	Stove Diekey	None
Salem Area Mass Transit District	\$ 15,425,351	\$ 11,092,619	\$ 11,128,619	φ 20,555,570		Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Steve Dickey	None
Sherman County	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ 50,000	\$ 250,000	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8 Yes: 7		None
Current Francisco Transportation District	¢ 1.070.050	¢ 277.050	¢ 2.176.002	¢ 2.247.764	¢ 800.000	Voc		Anna CTIF Diam		loff Honor	None
Sunset Empire Transportation District The Klamath Tribes	\$ 1,070,959 \$ 450,000	\$ 277,950	\$ 2,176,802	\$ 3,247,761 \$ 450,000	\$ 800,000	Yes Yes		Approve STIF Plan Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1 Yes: 8	Jeli Hazen	None None
The Namath Tribes	\$ 450,000	3 -	> -	\$ 450,000	\$ -	res		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 7		None
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 523,570	\$ 360,000	\$ 1,969,000	\$ 2,492,570	\$ 200,000	Vac		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	loff Honon	None
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 523,570	\$ 360,000	\$ 1,969,000	\$ 2,492,570	\$ 200,000	res		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 7	јен паген	none
Tri County Matronalitan Transportation District of Ore	¢ 100 272 FC0	¢ 26 549 742	ć 70.0E7.133	¢ 170 430 603	\$ 30,955,576	Yes		Approve STIF Diese		Aaran Daas	Nama
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District of Ore	\$ 108,575,56U	\$ 36,548,742	<i>⇒</i> /U,U5/,122	\$ 178,430,682	\$ 30,955,576	165		Approve STIF Plan	Abstention: 1	Aaron Deas	None
Umatilla County	\$ 2,288,550	\$ 841,634	\$ 4,460,618	\$ 6.749.168	\$ -	Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 7 Abstention: 1	Angie Jones	None
·	\$ 2,288,550	\$ 841,634	\$ 4,460,618	. , ,	· ·	Yes		Approve STIF Plan Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8	Arigie Jones	None
Umpqua Public Transportation District Union County	\$ 2,936,832	\$ 3,057,480	\$ 8,334,599					Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
						Yes			Yes: 8		None
Wallowa County Wasco County	\$ 200,000 \$ 858,399	\$ 8,139 \$ 250,119	\$ 75,359 \$ 745,343			Yes		Approve STIF Plan Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Wheeler County	\$ 858,399	250,119	745,343 د	\$ 1,603,742		Yes		Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
Yamhill County	\$ 2.480.558	\$ 2,264,118	\$ 2,540,438	<u> </u>				Approve STIF Plan	Yes: 8		None
,	, ,,	. , . , .		\$ 359,907,458		103		LAPPIONE STIF FIGH	165.0		MOHE
lotal	9188,1/5,46/	₹ //,858,32/	⇒ 1/1,5/0,991	⇒ 359,907,458	⇒ 33,U83,2U8						

Table 2. Statewide Measureable Project Benefits and Outcomes

Statewide Tra	ansportat	ion Impr	ovement	Fund - 2021-	2023 Measura	ble Project B	enefits and O	utcomes		
				People within	Low Income Households within	New Stops	Rides Provided to	Students in Grades 9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Students in Grades 9-12 with
	Revenue	Revenue		1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Shared with	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
Qualified Entity Name	Miles	Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Other Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	
Baker County	101,968	4,862	3,550	16,002	5,746	3	-	-	450	900
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	720,891	54,032	562,834	127,064	26,073	2	23,844	3,545	-	785
Benton County	1,237,459	69,845	657,708	183,545	76,678	65	6,616	-	-	=
Burns Paiute Tribe	6,760	1,820	2,500	481	120	1	-	264	264	=
Columbia County	309,060	11,570	32,910	66,792	6,292	-	510	-	-	-
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umqua, and Suislaw Indians	351,600	13,988	13,518	20,994	14,689	2	59	-	-	-
Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Community of Oregon	84,000	2,500	8,000	14,325	5,340	4	-	1,027	-	-
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation	127,084	4,755	18,518	9,113	3,736	-	=	-	-	-
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	110,400	2,003	20,027	2,352	1,364	1	200	-	-	-
Coos County Area Transportation District	609,848	40,248	124,276	80,561	16,453	4	505	593	416	-
Coquille Indian Tribe	450	2,800	340	1,330	638	-	660	-	26	-
Cow Creek Band of Umqua Indians of Oregon	20,000	7,500	15,000	14,952	2,997	-	-	-	20	20
Crook County	198,641	6,301	44,110	9,346	5,327	-	2,200	-	-	-
Curry County	98,830	6,784	8,880	56,081	10,980	-	-	160	660	-
Deschutes County	2,182,169	122,178	1,048,284	474,157	263,121	11	108,796	-	400	-
Gilliam County	5,000	350	250	30	40	-	4	-	5	-
Grant County Transportation District	89,736	5,000	20,000	3,876	783	-	5,000	-	-	-
Harney County	184,886	17,669	14,511	18,900	10,000	-	-	-	488	732
Hood River Transportation District	668,040	26,858	90,432	12,722	2,590	-	-	-	-	1,000
Jefferson County	340,767	6,000	41,995	2,410	1,400	-	4,500	-	1,050	-
Josephine County	391,203	20,932	80,559	200,500	32,418	1	18,835	-	-	-
Lake County	49,516	3,374	3,772	760	636	5	200	-	250	-
Lane Transit District	659,270	30,607	125,498	288,811	65,921	4	-	18,603	603	18,000
Lincoln County	302,800	12,112	63,500	98,979	25,631	7	8,000	1,974	-	1,974
Linn County	789,436	56,513	365,500	187,642	58,728	50	6,500	2,771	2,384	762
Malheur County	126,134	13,155	84,423	28,257	5,290	1	=	1,391	-	ı
Morrow County	48,000	2,400	1,200	3,825	23,905	-	-	275	275	ı
Rogue Valley Transportation District	1,287,043	128,777	389,648	136,214	58,077	=	=	5,065	-	3,000
Salem Area Mass Transit District	2,344,333	213,031	1,465,666	1,400,835	206,505	4	-	67,708	10	1
Sherman County	102,093	4,577	2,893	3,560	564	-	40	-	59	ı
Sunset Empire Transportation District	175,153	8,810	49,040	26,201	5,712	-	-	-	-	3,152
The Klamath Tribes	37,920	5,824	367	287	163	-	2,000	-	-	-
Tillamook County Transportation District	275,850	26,035	38,700	155,200	52,378	13	2,500	9,120	2,540	6,510
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon	8,271,497	610,906	29,566,112	1,605,260	260,918	48	47,327	6,057	2,000	33,997
Umatilla County	289,198	31,683	73,200	87,855	25,120	40	-	4,604	-	-
Umpqua Public Transportation District	904,920	38,868	90,240	137,079	49,014	6	-	7,819	-	-
Union County	74,324	5,732	18,464	23,557	8,263	5	-	-	-	1,386
Wallowa County	37,151	3,640	8,680	7,412	1,158	-	-	420	420	-
Wasco County	175,200	23,835	42,315	64,700	9,705	10	3,000	-	-	550
Wheeler County	153,000	5,865	762	-	-	-	12	-	12	-
Yamhill County	1,749,933	93,430	660,616	606,095	79,956	5	-	39,092	16,871	-
Tota	25,691,563	1,747,169	35,858,798	6,178,062	1,424,429	292	241,308	170,488	29,203	72,768

Table 3. Statewide Capital Investment Outcomes

ualified Entity Name aker County asin Transit Service Transportation District	Gas or Diesel Vehicles	CNG		Vehi	cle Assets	1				Other Assets								
aker County	Diesel Vehicles	CNG				Vehicle Assets												
,		Vehicles	Electric Vehicles	Hybrid-Diesel or Hybrid-Gas Vehicles		Replacement Vehicles	Expansion Vehicles		Facilities Constructed or Expanded	Units of Equipment	Signs and Shelters Constructed or Updated							
asin Transit Service Transportation District	1	. 0	_	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0							
	4	· O	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	2	692							
enton County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	0							
urns Paiute Tribe	1	. О	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0							
olumbia County	6	0	0	0	0	6	0	6	0	0	0							
onfederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umqua, and Suislaw Indians	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0							
onfederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Community of Oregon	2	. 0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	8							
onfederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	0							
onfederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1							
onfederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
pos County Area Transportation District	8	0	0	0	0	8	0	8	0	0	0							
oquille Indian Tribe	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
ow Creek Band of Umqua Indians of Oregon	1	. 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0							
rook County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
urry County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
eschutes County	О	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
illiam County	2	. 0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4	0	0							
rant County Transportation District	0	0	0		0	0	0			0	0							
arney County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	0							
ood River Transportation District	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0								
offerson County	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
sephine County	2	0	0		0	2	0	2	0	0	0							
ike County	0	_	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
nne Transit District	23	_	8		7	35	3	38		183	40							
ncoln County	0		0	_	0	0	0	0			1							
nn County	1	0	0	_	0	0	1	1	0	1	0							
lalheur County	0	0	0	_	0	0	0	0	0	68	0							
lorrow County	5	0	0	_	0	0	5	5	0	1	23							
ogue Valley Transportation District	0	0	0	_	0	0	0	0	1	40								
alem Area Mass Transit District	4	0	0	-	0	4	0	4	-	0								
nerman County	0		0	ŭ	0	0	0	0	, and the second	0	0							
unset Empire Transportation District	9		0	-	0	7	2	9	0	0								
ne Klamath Tribes	0		0	-	0	0	0		-	0	0							
llamook County Transportation District	13		0	_	0	8	5	13	_	0								
i County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon	25		6	•	0	24	10	34	2	789	565							
matilla County	3		0	0	0	1	2	3	1	783								
mpqua Public Transportation District	9	_	0		0	10	13	_	-	Ŭ								
nion County	0		0		0	0	0		0	0								
/allowa County	0		0	-	0	0	Ŭ		-									
/asco County	4		0	_	0	4	0		0	0								
/heeler County	0		0	_	0	0	0	•	_	0								
amhill County	1	+	0		0	0	1		5	25	ļ							
Total	124	_	16	ŭ	-	112	54	166	13									

Table 4. Statewide Expenditures Allocated by Program Criteria

Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria 4. Procures of Low or No 5. Improves frequency and Does Plan															
	Increases fre areas with high Income House	% of Low-	2. Expands routes areas with high Income Hous	% of Low-	3. Reduces communities with	th high % of	4. Procures of Emission Buses areas with pop 200,000 or	for use in ulation of	5. Improves fre reliability of serv communities i outside of QE's s	ice between nside and	6. Improves coo between PTSPs fragmentation	to reduce	7. Provides stude students in gra		If no, does the rationale
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF for Each Fiscal	demonstrate it is not
Qualified Entity Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget Year?	practicable to do so?
Baker County	\$ 261,723	38%	, ` 	31%	\$ 269,122	39%		0%	<u>' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' ' </u>	41%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	13%	-	4% Yes	
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	\$ 713,328	25% 52%	,	30% 70%	\$ 726,124	26% 7%		0%	, , , ,	79%	,	13%		3% Yes	
Benton County	\$ 3,029,289		, , , , , , ,		1 ,	0%	,	6%	, ,		,-	14%	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	14% Yes	
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 43,875	16%	-,	16%		20%		0%	1,	51%	. ,	104%	-7	10% Yes	
Columbia County	\$ 32,753	4%		17%	, , , , ,	20%		0%	, , , , ,	149%	/	5%	' -/	5% Yes	
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umqua, and Suislaw Indians	\$ 117,200	30%	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	30%	\$ -			0%		45%		45%	_ '	0% No	
Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Community of Oregon	\$ -	0%		0%	\$ -	0%	•	0%		0%		0%	· · · · ·	40% Yes	
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation	\$ -	0%		0%	\$ 890,000	198%	_	0%		0%		0%	_ '	0% No	
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation	\$ 46,500	19%	1,	37%		0%		0%		54%	,	54%	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	18% Yes	
Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation	\$ 220,286	95%	, , , , ,	77%	:	0%		0%	.,	7%			\$ 50,457	22% Yes	
Coos County Area Transportation District	\$ 45,662	2%		0%	\$ -	0%		37%		154%		4%	- /	3% Yes	
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 457,400	101%		0%	•	0%	•	0%	,	50%	,	6%		23% Yes	
Cow Creek Band of Umqua Indians of Oregon	\$ 142,500	50%		40%	\$ 114,000	40%	_	0%		30%	,	30%	·	10% Yes	
Crook County	\$ 713,741	85%		77%	\$ -	0%		0%	,'	15%	•	0%	- /	23% Yes	
Curry County	\$ 787,890	132%		0%		0%		0%	,	25%		20%		2% Yes	
Deschutes County	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 1,500,000	15%		0%	·	36%		1%	<u> </u>	29% Yes	
Gilliam County	\$ 257,400	54%	\$ 313,400	66%	\$ 33,500	7%		0%	·	43%	\$ 110,000	23%	' '	7% Yes	
Grant County Transportation District	\$ 396,000	198%		0%	\$ -	0%	_'	0%	<u>'</u>	0%	•	0%	<u>'</u>	2% Yes	
Harney County	\$ 33,976	17%	\$ 119,049	60%	\$ 176,706	88%	\$ -	0%	\$ 11,157	6%	\$ -	0%	\$ 36,341	18% Yes	
Hood River Transportation District	\$ 290,000	21%	\$ 240,000	17%	\$ 74,000	5%		4%	\$ 971,000	70%	\$ 911,000	66%	\$ 234,000	17% Yes	
Jefferson County	\$ 699,534	78%	\$ 572,346	63%	\$ -	0%		0%	\$ 127,187	14%	\$ -	0%	\$ 190,782	21% Yes	
Josephine County	\$ 1,843,200	48%	\$ 2,595,048	68%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,081,600	55%	\$ 94,000	2%	\$ 921,600	24% Yes	
Lake County	\$ 32,136	8%	\$ 414,256	98%	\$ 42,164	10%	\$ -	0%	\$ 276,786	65%	\$ 41,164	10%	\$ 40,762	10% Yes	
Lane Transit District	\$ 10,087,348	55%	\$ 13,253,035	72%	\$ 21,834,485	118%	\$ 17,975,748	97%	\$ 4,040,374	22%	\$ 3,996,574	22%	\$ 4,412,900	24% Yes	
Lincoln County	\$ 1,630,980	60%	\$ 2,011,012	74%	\$ 460,000	17%	\$ -	0%	\$ 3,191,012	117%	\$ 1,943,146	71%	\$ 100,000	4% Yes	
Linn County	\$ 3,364,330	55%	\$ 3,459,770	56%	\$ 326,400	5%	\$ 69,300	1%	\$ 2,901,755	47%	\$ 1,697,655	28%	\$ 487,040	8% Yes	
Malheur County	\$ 826,209	55%	\$ 826,209	55%	\$ 10,000	1%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,290,743	86%	\$ -	0%	\$ 42,242	3% Yes	
Morrow County	\$ 493,380	46%	\$ 726,030	68%	\$ 190,000	18%	\$ -	0%	\$ 251,600	24%	\$ 365,340	34%	\$ 106,650	10% Yes	
Rogue Valley Transportation District	\$ 6,277,840	56%	\$ 6,398,784	58%	\$ 1,686,260	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,242,880	56%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,642,976	15% Yes	
Salem Area Mass Transit District	\$ 49,709,187	187%	\$ 698,431	3%	\$ 218,308	1%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,113,060	4%	\$ 639,998	2%	\$ 656,955	2% Yes	
Sherman County	\$ 42,000	21%		18%		0%		0%		137%		21%		3% Yes	
Sunset Empire Transportation District	\$ 746,368	55%	\$ 582,043	43%		0%		0%	\$ 706,533	52%	\$ 19,760	1%	\$ 33,889	3% Yes	
The Klamath Tribes	\$ 45,000	10%	\$ 145,000	32%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 630,000	140%		0%	\$ 80,000	18% Yes	
Tillamook County Transportation District	\$ 370,485	42%	-,	43%	\$ 194,000	22%	•	8%	,	19%		28%		38% Yes	
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon	\$ 84,924,024	59%		58%	\$ 55,777,976	38%	- /-	21%	. ,	10%	-,	10%	, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	3% Yes	
Umatilla County	\$ 1,121,257	36%	1,,	38%	\$ 739.780	24%	1, - ,	0%	, , , , , ,	44%	, , ,	47%	,- ,,	11% Yes	
Umpgua Public Transportation District	\$ 2,930,079	49%	, , , ,	67%	1,	9%		9%	,- ,,	38%	, , , -	21%	, , , , , ,	7% Yes	
Union County	\$ 494,334	60%	,- ,	14%	,	53%	, -	0%	,,	14%	, , -, -	19%	,, -	16% Yes	
Wallowa County	\$ 180,814	87%		42%	<u> </u>	3%		0%		34%		22%		8% Yes	
Wasco County	\$ 861,676	78%	- /-	53%	1 -/	15%		0%	1 -,	38%	-,		\$ 24,000	2% Yes	
Wheeler County	\$ -	0%		184%		0%		0%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0%		5%		6% Yes	
Yamhill County	\$ 3,534,176	74%	· /	83%		2%	•	0%	•	19%		14%	· · · · · ·	11% Yes	
Turring County	J,JJ4,1/U	/4/0	7 عربات ب	05/0	7 103,200	2/0	7	0/0	7 313,303	13/0	, 007,003	1+/0	7 334,032	11/0 I C3	

Qualified Entity Summary Tables

Baker County

Table 5.

Baker	Со	unty - S	Sta	tewide	e Transpo	ort	ation Im	provement Fun	d - 2021-2023 For	mula Program
				Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 E	get	Are projects consistent	If No, describe		
			ST	IF 19-21				Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Cai	Carry Other			tal 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Foi	rward	Funds	Exp	penditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Baker County	\$	531,623	\$	155,000	\$ 358,041	\$	1,044,664	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	531,623	\$	155,000	\$ 358,041	\$	1,044,664	\$ -		

Table 6.

	Baker County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Baker County	101,968	4,862	3,550	16,002	5,746	3	-	-	450	900				
Totals	101,968	4,862	3,550	16,002	5,746	3	-	-	450	900				

Table 7.

	Baker County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
				Vehicl				Other Assets						
	Gas or													
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets		
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Baker County	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-			
Totals	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-			

Table 8.

	Baker County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases frequency to areas with high % of Low-to areas with high % of Low-		•	3. Reduces fa		4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of service communities in	e between	6. Improves coo		7. Provides stude	ant transit		
					_										
	Income Households Income Households		eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or 1	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation of	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12		
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Baker County	\$	261,723.00	38%	\$ 211,136.10	31%	\$ 269,121.98	39%	\$ -	0%	\$ 284,200.00	41%	\$ 87,000.00	13%	\$ 30,064.92	4%
Totals	\$	261,723	38%	\$ 211,136	31%	\$ 269,122	39%	\$ -	0%	\$ 284,200	41%	\$ 87,000	13%	\$ 30,065	4%

Basin Transit Service Transportation District Table 9.

Basin Transit Service Transport	Basin Transit Service Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program													
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe							
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may							
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of							
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.							
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	\$ 1,596,877	\$ 1,201,974	\$ -	\$ 2,798,851	\$ 267,109	Yes								
Totals	\$ 1,596,877	\$ 1,201,974	\$ -	\$ 2,798,851	\$ 267,109									

Table 10.

Basin Transit Service Tra	Basin Transit Service Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes												
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in			
				People within	Households within Shared with Pro		Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with			
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced			
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares			
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	720,891	54,032	562,834	127,064	26,073	2	23,844	3,545	-	785			
Totals	720,891	54,032	562,834	127,064	26,073	2	23,844	3,545	-	785			

Table 11.

Basin Transit Servi	Basin Transit Service Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes												
				Vehicle				Other Assets					
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other		Facilities		Signs and Shelters				
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or		
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description	
Basin Transit Service Transportation District	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	2	692	Forklift, truck with sander/plow	
Totals	4	-	-	-	-	-	4	4	-	2	692		

Table 12.

Basin	Basin Transit Service Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases fr	equency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq	· •		ordination			
	areas with higl	% of Low-	to areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	ulation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Households		Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Basin Transit Servi	\$ 713,328	25%	\$ 846,250	30%	\$ 726,124	26%	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,216,779	79%	\$ 370,330	13%	\$ 93,891	3%	
Totals	\$ 713,328	25%	\$ 846,250	30%	\$ 726,124	26%	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,216,779	79%	\$ 370,330	13%	\$ 93,891	3%	

Benton County

Table 13.

Benton County -	Benton County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program														
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe								
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may								
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of								
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.								
Benton County	\$ 1,897,898	\$ -	\$ 737,840	\$ 2,635,738	\$ -	Yes									
City of Albany	\$ 825,000	\$ -	\$6,469,000	\$ 7,294,000	\$ -	Yes									
City of Corvallis	\$ 2,874,872	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,874,872	\$ -	Yes									
City of Philomath	\$ 63,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 63,000	\$ -	Yes									
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	\$ 176,875	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 176,875	\$ -	Yes									
Totals	\$ 5,837,645	\$ -	\$7,206,840	\$ 13,044,485	\$ -										

Table 14.

Benton County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
	-			1/2 Mile of	Low Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Transit			School Served by	Students in Grades 9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced			
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares			
Benton County	469,000	32,760	69,488	54,999	39,279	23	-	-	-	-			
City of Albany	285,250	12,703	225,500	57,560	10,870	42	4,800	-	-	-			
City of Corvallis	483,209	24,382	362,720	70,986	26,529	-	1,816	-	-	-			
City of Philomath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	1,237,459	69,845	657,708	183,545	76,678	65	6,616	-	-	-			

Table 15.

Benton County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes																		
				Vehicl	e Assets						Other	Assets						
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters							
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or							
PTSP Name	Vehicles																	
Benton County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	Camera System						
City of Albany	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-							
City of Corvallis	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	Streaming infratructure, bus stop ammenities						
City of Philomath	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9	Bus stop ammenities							
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-										
Totals	23 -																	

Table 16.

	Benton	County -	Statewide Tr	ansport	ation Improv	ement F	und - 2021-20	023 Fund	ding Allocated	to Key	Program Crit	eria		
							4. Procures of L	ow or No	5. Improves freq	uency and				
	1. Increases fre	quency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	reliability of service	e between	6. Improves coo	rdination		
	areas with high	% of Low-	to areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit
	Income Hous	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or i	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Benton County	\$ 414,198.64	22%	\$ 425,198.64	22%	\$ 381,198.64	20%	\$ 365,998.64	19%	\$ 1,075,458.64	57%	\$ 391,498.64	21%	\$ 429,484.16	23%
City of Albany	\$ 345,000.00	42%	\$ 345,000.00	42%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 525,000.00	64%	\$ 270,000.00	33%	\$ 165,000.00	20%
City of Corvallis	\$ 2,220,950.16	77%	\$ 3,246,004.08	113%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 227,789.76	8%
City of Philomath	\$ 49,140.00	78%	\$ 71,820.00	114%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 5,040.00	8%
Oregon Cascades West Counc	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 176,875.00	100%	\$ 176,875.00	100%	\$ -	0%
Totals	\$ 3,029,289	52%	\$ 4,088,023	70%	\$ 381,199	7%	\$ 365,999	6%	\$ 1,777,334	30%	\$ 838,374	14%	\$ 827,314	14%

Burns Paiute Tribe

Table 17.

Burns Paiute Trib	Burns Paiute Tribe - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program												
				Fiscal Yea	ır 20	21-23 Exp	pend	iture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe	
		STIF 19-21							Fund	ds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
			Car	rry Other Total 202			al 2021-23	Expe	nded in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of		
PTSP Name	STIF F	•				Funds		enditures	Plan	Period	considerations?	Plan.	
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$	\$ 22,500 \$ 250,000 \$		\$	65,500	\$	338,000	\$ 177,500		Yes			
Totals	\$	22,500	\$	250,000	\$	65,500	\$	338,000	\$	177,500			

Table 18.

Burns Paiute	Burns Paiute Tribe - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Burns Paiute Tribe	6,760	1,820	2,500	481	120	1	-	264	264	-				
Totals	6,760	1,820	2,500	481	120	1	-	264	264	-				

Table 19.

Burns Paiute Tribe - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes															
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or														
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets				
PTSP Name	Vehicles									Equipment	Updated	Description			
Burns Paiute Tribe	1	1 1 1 1													
Totals	1	1 1 1 1													

Table 20.

	Burns Paiute Tribe - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases free		2. Expands route	•	3. Reduces fa		4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of service communities in	e between			7. Provides stude	ont transit	
	Income Hous		Income House		Low-Income Ho	_	200,000 or		outside of QE's se		fragmentation of		for students in gr		
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Burns Paiute Tribe	\$ 43,875.00	16%	\$ 43,875.00	16%	\$ - 0%		\$ -	0%	\$ 138,575.00	51%	\$ 284,300.00	104%	\$ 26,875.00	10%	
Totals	\$ 43,875	16%	\$ 43,875	16%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 138,575	51%	\$ 284,300	104%	\$ 26,875	10%	

Columbia County

Table 21.

Columbi	Columbia County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program													
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe							
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs, inconsistencies that m								
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of							
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.							
Columbia County	\$ 850,007	\$ -	\$2,284,733	\$ 3,134,740	\$ -	Yes								
Totals	\$ 850,007	\$ -												

Table 22.

Columbia County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in			
		People within Households within Shared with Provided to 9-12 Attending a Students in Grades								Grades 9-12 with			
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced			
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares			
Columbia County	309,060	11,570	32,910	66,792	6,292	-	510	-	-	-			
Totals	309,060	11,570	32,910	66,792	6,292	-	510	-	-	-			

Table 23.

Columbia County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes														
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion To							Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets		
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Columbia County	6	-	-	-	=	6	6	-	-	-				
otals 6 6														

Table 24.

	Columbia County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases free	-	2. Expands route to areas with high	•			4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of servic communities in	e between	6. Improves coo between PTSPs		7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Hous	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation of	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Columbia County	\$ 32,753	4%	\$ 140,753	17%	\$ 172,496	20%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,267,762	149%	\$ 43,124	5%	\$ 43,124	5%	
Totals	\$ 32,753	4%	\$ 140,753	17%	\$ 172,496	20%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,267,762	149%	\$ 43,124	5%	\$ 43,124	5%	

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Suislaw Indians Table 25.

Confederated Tribes of	f Coc	s, Lower	Um	pqua, and	d Suisla	w Inc	dians	- Statewi	de Transportation In	provement Fund - 202	1-2023 Formula Program
				Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-	23 Ex	pend	iture Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Other		Tota	al 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Funds		Ехре	enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Confederated Tribes of C	\$	200,000	\$	190,000	\$	-	\$	390,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	190,000	\$	-	\$	390,000	\$ -		

Table 26.

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lo	wer Umpqua,	and Suislaw Ir	dians - Sta	tewide Tran	sportation Impro	vement Fund	- 2021-2023	Measurable Pro	ject Benefits an	d Outcomes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua	351,600	13,988	13,518	20,994	14,689	2	59	-	-	-
Totals	351,600	13,988	13,518	20,994	14,689	2	59	-	-	-

Table 27.

Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Suislaw Indians - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes

				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets	
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other			Facilities		Signs and Shelters		
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	
Totals	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	

Table 28.

Confederated	Tribes of	oos, Lower	Jmpqua, and Su	islaw Ind	ians - Statewid	e Transpo	rtation Improv	ement F	und - 2021-2023	Funding	Allocated to K	ey Progra	m Criteria	
							4. Procures of L	ow or No	5. Improves freq	uency and				
	1. Increas	s frequency to	2. Expands rout	es/services	3. Reduces f	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	reliability of service	e between	6. Improves coo	rdination		
	areas with high % of Low-				communities wit	h high % of	areas with popu	ulation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit
	Income	Households	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation (of service	for students in g	
		% of STII		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amoun	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lowe	\$ 11	,200 30	% \$ 117,200	30%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 175,800	45%	\$ 175,800	45%	\$ -	0%
Totals	\$ 11	,200 30	\$ 117,200	30%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 175,800	45%	\$ 175,800	45%	\$ -	0%

Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Community of Oregon Table 29.

Confederated Tribes of the	ne Gr	ande Ron	de Com	muni	ty (of Oregor	า - St	atewide T	ransportatio	n Impro	vement Fund - 2021-20	23 Formula Program
			Fisc	al Yea	r 20	021-23 Exp	pendi	iture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF 19-	21						with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
		STIF 19-21 Funds to be Carry Other Total 2021-23 Expended in Future								uture	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	STIF Funds Forward Funds						enditures	Plan Period		considerations?	Plan.
Confederated Tribes of the Gra	\$				250,000	\$	860,000	\$	40,000	Yes		
Totals	\$	610,000	\$	•	\$	250,000	\$	860,000	\$	40,000		

Table 30.

Confederated Tribes of the Gra	nde Ronde Co	mmunity of O	regon - Sta	tewide Trans	portation Improv	ement Fund	- 2021-2023	Measurable Pro	ject Benefits an	d Outcomes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Confederated Tribes of the Grande Ronde Co	84,000	2,500	8,000	14,325	5,340	4	-	1,027	-	-
Totals	84,000	2,500	8,000	14,325	5,340	4	-	1,027	-	-

Table 31.

Confederated Trib	es of th	e Grand	e Ronde	Community	y of Ore	gon - State	wide Trar	sportati	ion Improv	ement Fu	ınd - 2021-2023	Capital Investment Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets															
	Gas or															
	Diesel															
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description				
Confederated Tribes of the Gra	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	8	Shelters, site design and sidewalk corrections				
Totals	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	8					

Table 32.

Confederated	Tribes of the G	Grande Ro	onde Communi	ty of Ore	gon - Statewide	Transpo	rtation Improv	ement Fu	nd - 2021-2023	Funding	Allocated to Ke	ey Prograi	n Criteria	
							4. Procures of L	ow or No	5. Improves freq	uency and				
	1. Increases frequency to areas with high % of Low-		2. Expands route	s/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	reliability of service	e between	6. Improves coo	ordination		
	areas with high 9	% of Low-	to areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income House	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or 1	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Confederated Tribes of the Grande	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 244,000	40%
Totals	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 244,000	40%

Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation

Table 33.

Confederated T	ribe	s of the Si	letz Res	ervat	ion	- Statewi	ide T	ransporta	ntion Improvement F	und - 2021-2023 Formu	la Program
			Fisc	al Yea	ır 20	021-23 Exp	pend	iture Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF 19-	-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carry		Ot	her	Tota	al 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	STIF Funds Forward Funds						enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Confederated Tribes of the Sile	\$	450,000	\$	-	\$	540,000	\$	990,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	450,000	\$		\$	540,000	\$	990,000	\$ -		

Table 34.

Confederated Tribes of	Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
	Low Income New Stops Rides Students in Grades Students in													
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
	1/2 Mile of 1/2 Mile of Transit Other Students in School Served by 9-12 Served by Free or Reduced													
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation	127,084	4,755	18,518	9,113	3,736	-	-	-	-	-				
Totals	127,084	4,755	18,518	9,113	3,736	-	-	-	-	-				

Table 35.

Confederated Tribe	Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes															
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets															
	Gas or															
	Diesel															
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz	-	ehicles Vehicles Vehicles Vehicles ve Fuel Vehicles Vehicles Vehicles or Expanded Equipment Updated 12 12														
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	-					

Table 36.

Con	federated Trib	es of the S	Siletz Reservati	on - State	wide Transpor	tation Im	provement Fu	nd - 2021	-2023 Funding <i>I</i>	Allocated	to Key Prograr	n Criteria		
	1. Increases fred	quency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of service			ordination		
	areas with high % of Low-		to areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	ulation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income House	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or 1	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Re	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 890,000	198%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%
Totals	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 890,000	198%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation

Table 37.

Confederated Tribes	of the	Umatilla	Indi	an Rese	rvation	- Stat	tewi	de Transp	ortation Improveme	ent Fund - 2021-2023 For	mula Program
			ı	Fiscal Yed	ar 2021-	23 Ex	pend	iture Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF	19-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carr	y	Other		Tota	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of	
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Forw	ard	Funds		Ехре	nditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Confederated Tribes of the Umatil	\$	200,000	\$	45,000	\$	-	\$	245,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	45,000	\$	-	\$	245,000	\$ -		

Table 38.

Confederated Tribes of the	Umatilla Indi	an Reservation	ı - Statewi	de Transport	ation Improveme	nt Fund - 20	21-2023 Mea	surable Project I	Benefits and Ou	tcomes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian R	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 39.

Confederated Tribes of the I	Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
		Vehicle Assets Other Assets												
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles													
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian R	-	1												
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1			

Table 40.

Confeder	ated Tribes of	the Umat	illa Indian Rese	rvation -	Statewide Tra	nsportatio	on Improveme	nt Fund -	2021-2023 Fund	ding Alloc	ated to Key Pro	ogram Cri	teria	
	1. Increases fre	quency to	2. Expands route	s/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of service	-	6. Improves coo	rdination		
	areas with high	gh % of Low- to areas with high % of Low-		communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs t	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Households		Income House	holds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or i	nore	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation of	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla	\$ 46,500	19%	\$ 90,500	37%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 132,000	54%	\$ 132,000	54%	\$ 44,000	18%
Totals	\$ 46,500	19%	\$ 90,500	37%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 132,000	54%	\$ 132,000	54%	\$ 44,000	18%

Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation

Table 41.

Confederated Tribes	of the	e Warm S	Spring	gs Reser	vation	Stat	ewid	e Transpo	rtatio	n Improvemer	nt Fund - 2021-2023 For	mula Program
			ı	Fiscal Yed	ır 2021-	23 Exp	pend	iture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF	19-21					to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
		Carry Other Total 2021-23 Expended in Future							ded in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of	
PTSP Name	STIF	STIF Funds Forward					Ехре	enditures	Plan P	eriod	considerations?	Plan.
Central Oregon Intergovernmenta	\$	199,999	\$	32,287	\$	-	\$	232,286	\$	-	Yes	
Totals	\$	199,999	\$	32,287	\$	-	\$	232,286	\$	-		

Table 42.

Confederated Tribes of th	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council	110,400	2,003	20,027	2,352	1,364	1	200	-	-	-				
Totals	110,400	2,003	20,027	2,352	1,364	1	200	-	-	-				

Table 43.

Confederated Tribes of the	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
		Vehicle Assets Other Assets												
	Gas or													
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets					
PTSP Name	Vehicles													
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council	-													
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 44.

Confede	rate	d Tribes of	the Warı	m Springs Rese	rvation - S	Statewide Tran	sportatio	n Improvemen	t Fund - 2	021-2023 Fund	ing Alloca	ated to Key Pro	gram Crit	eria	
	1. Increases frequency to areas with high % of Low-to areas with high % of Low-to areas with high % of Low-			•	3. Reduces fa		4. Procures of L Emission Buses	for use in	5. Improves frequently of services	e between	6. Improves coo				
		•				Ū	areas with popu		communities in		between PTSPs		7. Provides stude		
	Income Households		holds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho		200,000 or i		outside of QE's se		fragmentation (for students in gr	
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	,	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Central Oregon Intergovernmental	\$	220,286	95%	\$ 177,829	77%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 16,000	7%	\$ -	0%	\$ 50,457	22%
Totals	\$	220,286	95%	\$ 177,829	77%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 16,000	7%	\$ -	0%	\$ 50,457	22%

Coos County Area Transportation District

Table 45.

Coos County A	rea Transport	ation District	- Statewide	Transportatio	n Improvement Fund	l - 2021-2023 Formula P	rogram
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Exp	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Coos County Area Transportation	\$ 1,676,961	\$ 936,000	\$1,886,564	\$ 4,499,526	\$ 46,027	Yes	
Totals	\$ 1,676,961	\$ 936,000	\$1,886,564	\$ 4,499,526	\$ 46,027		

Table 46.

TUDIC TO:												
Coos County Area Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes												
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in		
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with		
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced		
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares		
Coos County Area Transportation District	609,848	40,248	124,276	80,561	16,453	4	505	593	416	-		
Totals	609,848	40,248	124,276	80,561	16,453	4	505	593	416	-		

Table 47.

Coos County Area Tra	ansporta	ation Dis	strict - S	Statewide Tra	ansporta	ation Impro	vement F	und - 20	21-2023 (Capital Inv	estment Outco	mes			
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or	or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters													
	Diesel														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Coos County Area Transportation District	8	8 8 - 8													
Totals	8	-	-	-	-	8	-	8	-	-	-				

Table 48.

Co	oos County Are	a Transpo	ortation Distric	t - Statew	ide Transporta	tion Imp	ovement Fun	d - 2021-2	023 Funding All	ocated to	Key Program	Criteria		
		s fraguency to 2 Evnands routes/service					4. Procures of	Low or No	5. Improves freq	uency and				
	1. Increases free	quency to	2. Expands route	s/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	reliability of service	e between	6. Improves coo	rdination		
	areas with high	to areas with high % of Low-		communities with	n high % of	areas with pop	ulation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Households		Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation (of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Coos County Area Transportation D	\$ 45,662	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 977,000.00	37%	\$ 4,022,875	154%	\$ 95,407	4%	\$ 84,978	3%
Totals	\$ 45,662	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 977,000	37%	\$ 4,022,875	154%	\$ 95,407	4%	\$ 84,978	3%

Coquille Indian Tribe Table 49.

	Cod	quille Indi	an 1	Γribe - Sta	tew	ide Tran	spor	tation Imp	provement F	und - 20	21-2023 Formula Progr	am
				Fiscal Yea	ır 20	21-23 Exp	pendi	iture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					Funds to be		with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Oth	ner	Tota	al 2021-23	Expended in	Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Fun	ds	Expe	enditures	Plan Period		considerations?	Plan.
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$	200,000	\$	254,000	\$	50,000	\$	504,000	\$	-	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	254,000	\$	50,000	\$	504,000	\$	-		

Table 50.

					÷					
	Coquille India	n Tribe - Statev	wide Trans	sportation Im	provement Fund	- 2021-2023	Measurable	Project Benefits	and Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Coquille Indian Tribe	450	2,800	340	1,330	638	-	660	-	26	-
Totals	450	2,800	340	1,330	638	-	660	-	26	-

Table 51.

Co	quille Ir	ndian Tr	ibe - Sta	tewide Tran	sportat	ion Improv	ement Fu	nd - 202	21-2023 Ca	pital Inve	stment Outcom	es				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets															
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets					
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Coquille Indian Tribe	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					

Table 52.

	C	oquille Ir	ndian Tribe - Sta	atewide T	ransportation	Improven	nent Fund - 202	21-2023 F	unding Allocate	ed to Key	Program Crite	ria		
	1. Increases free areas with high 9		2. Expands route	•	3. Reduces fa		4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of servic communities in	e between	6. Improves coo		7. Provides stude	ont transit
	Income House	eholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation of	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
PTSP Name	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget	Amount	% of STIF budget
Coquille Indian Tribe	\$ 457,400	101%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 224,800	50%	\$ 29,400	6%	\$ 102,400	23%
Totals	\$ 457,400	101%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 224,800	50%	\$ 29,400	6%	\$ 102,400	23%

Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon Table 53.

Cow Creek Ban	d of l	Jmpqua	Indi	ans of Or	egon - S	State	wide	Transpor	tation Improvement	Fund - 2021-2023 Form	ula Program
		•		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-	23 Ex	pendi	iture Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	IF 19-21				•	Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Other		Tota	al 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	ward	Funds		Expe	nditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.	
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$	465,971	\$	368,962	\$	-	\$	834,933	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	465,971	\$	368,962	\$	-	\$	834,933	\$ -		

Table 54.

Cow Creek Band	of Umpqua Ir	ndians of Orego	on - Statev	vide Transpo	rtation Improvem	ent Fund - 2	021-2023 Me	asurable Project	Benefits and O	utcomes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Central Oregon Intergovernm	198,641	6,301	44,110	9,346	5,327	-	2,200	-	-	-
Total	198,641	6,301	44,110	9,346	5,327	-	2,200	-	-	-

Table 55.

Cow Creek Band o	f Umpq	ua India	ns of O	regon - State	ewide Tr	ansportati	on Impro	vement	Fund - 202	1-2023 Ca	apital Investme	nt Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets															
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets							
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Equipment	Updated	Description										
Central Oregon Intergovernm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-					

Table 56.

Co	w Cr	eek Band	of Umpqı	ua Indians of	Oregon - S	tatewide Trans	portation	Improvement	Fund - 20	21-202	3 Fundin	ng Allocat	ed to Key	Prog	ram Crite	ria	
		ncreases frec	-	2. Expands ro	•			4. Procures of I Emission Buses	for use in	reliabilit	ty of servic	uency and e between	•		rdination		
		s with high 9		to areas with I	•		_	areas with pop			nunities in				to reduce	7. Provides stude	
	Ir	ncome House		Income Ho		Low-Income Ho		200,000 or	T	outside	of QE's se		fragmen	ation c	of service	for students in gr	
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Α	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Am	nount	budget	Amou	nt	budget	Amount	budget
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$	713,741	85%	\$ 643,1	2 779	6 \$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	121,590	15%	\$	-	0%	\$ 191,384	23%
Totals	\$	713,741	85%	\$ 643,1	2 779	6 \$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	121,590	15%	\$	-	0%	\$ 191,384	23%

Curry County Table 57.

	Curry Count	y - Statewide	Transportat	tion Improvem	ent Fund - 2021-202	B Formula Program	
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Curry County	\$ 443,968	\$ 153,204	\$ -	\$ 597,172	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 443,968	\$ 153,204	\$ -	\$ 597,172	\$ -		

Table 58.

14010 001										
	Curry County	- Statewide Tr	ansportat	ion Improver	ment Fund - 2021-	2023 Measu	rable Project	Benefits and Ou	itcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Curry County	98,830	6,784	8,880	56,081	10,980	-	-	160	660	-
Total	98,830	6,784	8,880	56,081	10,980	-	-	160	660	-

Table 59.

	Curry Co	unty - St	atewide	e Transporta	tion Im	provement	Fund - 20	21-2023	Capital In	vestment	: Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters				
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets			
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Curry County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				

Table 60.

		Curry Cou	inty - Sta	atewide	e Transpo	rtation Im	prove	ement Fu	ınd -	- 2021-2023	Funding	Allo	ocated to Ke	ey Progra	m (Criteria			
	Increases frec	% of Low-	to areas	with high		3. Redu	s with	high % of	En	. Procures of Lo nission Buses f eas with popu	or use in lation of	relia co	Improves freque ability of servic ommunities in	e between side and	6. be	. Improves coor	o reduce	7. Provides stude	
	Income House	eholds	Inco	me House	eholds	Low-Incon	ne Hou	ıseholds		200,000 or n	nore	out	side of QE's se		fı	ragmentation o	f service	for students in gr	ades 9-12
		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amo	unt	budget	Amount		budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Curry County	\$ 787,890	132%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	150,000	25%	\$	121,172	20%	\$ 14,110	2%
Totals	\$ 787,890	132%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	150,000	25%	\$	121,172	20%	\$ 14,110	2%

Deschutes County

Table 61.

	Deschutes County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program													
	Fiscal Year 2021-23 Expenditure Budget Are projects co													
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may							
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of							
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.							
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$ 5,923,4	6 \$ 3,944,504	\$ -	\$ 9,868,000	\$ -	Yes								
Totals	\$ 5,923,4	6 \$ 3,944,504	\$ -	\$ 9,868,000	\$ -									

Table 62.

10010 021														
De	Deschutes County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Central Oregon Intergovernm	2,182,169	122,178	1,048,284	474,157	263,121	11	108,796	-	400	-				
Total	2,182,169	122,178	1,048,284	474,157	263,121	11	108,796	-	400	-				

Table 63.

Des	Deschutes County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Central Oregon Intergovernm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 64.

	D	eschutes (County - Statew	ide Trans	portation Imp	rovement	Fund - 2021-20	023 Fundi	ng Allocated to	Key Prog	gram Criteria			
	1. Increases fre areas with high	-	2. Expands route to areas with high	-	3. Reduces fa		4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of servic communities in	e between	6. Improves coo		7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income Hous	seholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or i	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation (of service	for students in gr	ades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 1,500,000	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 3,578,000	36%	\$ 103,600	1%	\$ 2,820,000	29%
Totals	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 5,867,200	59%	\$ 1,500,000	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 3,578,000	36%	\$ 103,600	1%	\$ 2,820,000	29%

Gilliam County Table 65.

	Gilliam County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program													
		Are projects consistent	If No, describe											
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may							
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of							
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.							
Gilliam County	\$ 337,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 487,000	\$ -	Yes								
Totals	\$ 337,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 10,000	\$ 487,000	\$ -									

Table 66.

	Gilliam County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
	People within Households within Shared with Provided to 9-12 Attending a Students in Grades Grades													
				1/2 Mile of 1/2 Mile of Transit Ot		Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Gilliam County	5,000	350	250	30	40	-	4	-	5	-				
Total	5,000	350	250	30	40	-	4	-	5	-				

Table 67.

	Gilliam County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other			Facilities		Signs and Shelters				
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or			
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description		
												Land acquisition, Ice damage repair,		
Gilliam County	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	3	4	-	-	water drainage upgrades, new facility		
Totals	2	-	-	-										

Table 68.

		G	illiam Co	unty - Statew	de Transp	ortation Impro	vement F	und - 2021-202	23 Fundin	g Allocated	o Key Progi	ram Criteria	·		
	1.	. Increases freq	juency to	2. Expands rou	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		•	requency and ervice between		oordination		
	ar	areas with high % of Low-				communities witl	h high % of	areas with pop	ulation of	communit	s inside and	between PTS	s to reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit
		Income House	eholds	Income Hou	seholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of Q	s service area.	fragmentation	n of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Gilliam County	\$	257,400	54%	\$ 313,400	66%	\$ 33,500	7%	\$ -	0%	\$ 205,	.00 43%	\$ 110,0	0 23%	\$ 34,500	7%
Totals	\$	257,400	54%	\$ 313,400	66%	\$ 33,500	7%	\$ -	0%	\$ 205,	43%	\$ 110,0	0 23%	\$ 34,500	7%

Grant County Transportation District Table 69.

Grant Cou	Grant County Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program													
	Fiscal Year 2021-23 Expenditure Budget Are projects consistent If No, describe													
			STIF 19	-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may			
			Carry		Other		Tota	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of				
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			Expe	nditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.				
Grant County Transportation	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	200,000	\$ -	Yes				
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	200,000	\$ -					

Table 70.

Grant Coun	Grant County Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of 1/2 Mile of Transit Oth		Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Grant County Transportation	89,736	5,000	20,000	3,876	783	-	5,000	-	-	-				
Total	89,736	5,000	20,000	3,876	783	-	5,000	-	-	-				

Table 71.

Grant County	Grant County Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Grant County Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 72.

	Grant	Count	y Transpo	ortation Disti	ict - Statev	vide Transport	ation Imp	rovement Fund	l - 2021-2	023 Funding Al	located to	Key Program	Criteria		
	areas wi	th high %		2. Expands roo to areas with h	igh % of Low-	communities wit	h high % of	4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in ulation of	5. Improves freq reliability of servic communities in	ce between side and	6. Improves coo between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	
	Incom	e House	holds	Income Ho	useholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation of	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amou	ınt	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Grant County Transportation	\$ 3	96,000	198%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 4,000	2%
Totals	\$ 3	96,000	198%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 4,000	2%

Harney County Table 73.

	Harney Cour	nty - Statewid	e Transporta	ation Improver	nent Fund - 2021-202	23 Formula Program									
	Fiscal Year 2021-23 Expenditure Budget Are projects consistent If No, describe														
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may								
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of								
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.								
Harney County	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -	Yes									
Totals	\$ 200,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 200,000	\$ -										

Table 74.

10010 / 11										
	Harney Count	y - Statewide T	ransporta	tion Improve	ment Fund - 2021	-2023 Measu	ırable Projec	t Benefits and O	utcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Harney County	184,886	17,669	14,511	18,900	10,000	-	-	-	488	732
Total	184,886	17,669	14,511	18,900	10,000	-	-	-	488	732

Table 75.

На	arney Co	unty - S	tatewid	e Transport	ation In	nprovemen	t Fund - 2	021-202	3 Capital I	nvestmer	t Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters														
	Diesel														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Harney County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-	Benches				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	-				

Table 76.

		Н	arney Co	unty	y - Statewid	le Transp	orta	ation Impro	vement F	une	d - 2021-202	3 Fundin	g Al	llocated to k	(ey Progra	am	Criteria				
	are	Increases freques	% of Low-	to a	Expands route	% of Low-	com		high % of	E	1. Procures of Lo mission Buses for areas with popu	or use in lation of	reli	. Improves frequiability of servic	e between side and	6 b	i. Improves coo etween PTSPs t	o reduce		Provides stude	
	Income Households		eholds		Income House	eholds	Lo	ow-Income Ho	useholds		200,000 or r	nore	ou	tside of QE's se	rvice area.	f	ragmentation o	of service	fo	r students in gr	ades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget
Harney County	\$	33,976	17%	\$	119,049	60%	\$	176,706	88%	\$	-	0%	\$	11,157	6%	\$	-	0%	\$	36,341	18%
Totals	\$	33,976	17%	\$	119,049	60%	\$	176,706	88%	\$	-	0%	\$	11,157	6%	\$	-	0%	\$	36,341	18%

Hood River Transportation District Table 77.

Hood Riv	er Transporta	tion District -	Statewide T	ransportation	Improvement Fund	- 2021-2023 Formula Pr	ogram
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Hood River Transportation Di	\$ 1,059,820	\$ 330,180	\$2,004,000	\$ 3,394,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 1,059,820	\$ 330,180	\$2,004,000	\$ 3,394,000	\$ -		

Table 78.

Hood Rive	r Transportati	on District - St	atewide T	ransportatio	n Improvement Fu	und - 2021-20	023 Measura	ble Project Bene	fits and Outcom	nes				
	Low Income New Stops Rides Students in Grades Students in Grades Students in Grades Oracles 9-12 Attending a Students in Grades Grades 9-12 with													
				People within	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with								
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Hood River Transportation Di	668,040	26,858	90,432	12,722	2,590	-	-	-	-	1,000				
Total	668,040	26,858	90,432	12,722	2,590	-	-	-	-	1,000				

Table 79.

Hood River	Transpo	rtation	District -	- Statewide	Transpo	rtation Imp	rovemen	t Fund -	2021-202	3 Capital I	nvestment Out	comes		
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Hood River Transportation Di	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-			

Table 80.

	Hood River Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases free	quency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of servi		6. Improves cod	ordination			
	areas with high	% of Low-	to areas with high % of Low-		communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	nside and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Hous	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Hood River Transportation Di	\$ 290,000	21%	\$ 240,000	17%	\$ 74,000	5%	\$ 60,000.00	4%	\$ 971,000	70%	\$ 911,000	66%	\$ 234,000	17%	
Totals	\$ 290,000	21%	\$ 240,000	17%	\$ 74,000	5%	\$ 60,000	4%	\$ 971,000	70%	\$ 911,000	66%	\$ 234,000	17%	

Jefferson County Table 81.

	Jeffe	rson Cou	nty ·	- Statewic	le Trans	sport	atior	n Improve	ement Fund - 2021-20)23 Formula Program	
				Fiscal Yea	ar 2021	23 Ex	pendi	iture Budg	get	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Other		Tota	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of		
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Funds		Expe	enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$	467,921	\$	434,003	\$	-	\$	901,924	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	467,921	\$	434,003	\$	-	\$	901,924	\$ -		

Table 82.

Je	efferson Coun	ty - Statewide	Transport	ation Improv	ement Fund - 202	1-2023 Meas	urable Proje	ct Benefits and (Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Central Oregon Intergovernm	340,767	6,000	41,995	2,410	1,400	-	4,500	-	1,050	-
Total	340,767	6,000	41,995	2,410	1,400	-	4,500	-	1,050	-

Table 83.

Jeff	ferson C	ounty -	Statewi	de Transpor	tation I	mproveme	nt Fund - 2	2021-20	23 Capital	Investme	nt Outcomes			
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Central Oregon Intergovernm	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 84.

144.6															
	Jefferson County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
							4. Procures of L	ow or No	5. Improves freq	uency and					
	1. Increases fre	quency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces f	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	reliability of service	e between	6. Improves cod	ordination			
	areas with high			communities wit	h high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit		
	Income Hous	eholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	nore	outside of QE's se	rvice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Central Oregon Intergovernm	\$ 699,534	78%	\$ 572,346	63%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 127,187	14%	\$ -	0%	\$ 190,782	21%	
Totals	\$ 699,534	78%	\$ 572,346	63%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 127,187	14%	\$ -	0%	\$ 190,782	21%	

Josephine County Table 85.

Tubic 051							
	Josephine Cou	nty - Statewi	de Transpor	tation Improve	ement Fund - 2021-20	023 Formula Program	
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Josephine County	\$ 2,574,552	\$ 1,240,172	\$ 440,000	\$ 4,254,724	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 2,574,552	\$ 1,240,172	\$ 440,000	\$ 4,254,724	\$ -		

Table 86.

Jo	sephine Coun	ty - Statewide	Transport	ation Improv	rement Fund - 202	1-2023 Mea	surable Proje	ect Benefits and	Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Josephine County	391,203	20,932	80,559	200,500	32,418	1	18,835	-	-	-
Total	391,203	20,932	80,559	200,500	32,418	1	18,835	-	-	-

Table 87.

Jos	sephine (County -	Statewi	ide Transpoi	rtation I	mproveme	nt Fund -	2021-20	23 Capital	Investme	ent Outcomes					
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets					
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets				
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Josephine County	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-					
Totals	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-					

Table 88

		Jos	sephine C	ounty - Statew	ide Trans	portation Impi	ovement	Fund - 2021-20	23 Fundi	ng Allocated to	Key Prog	ram Criteria			
	1. Increases frequency to areas with high % of Low-Income Households		uency to 6 of Low-	2. Expands rout	es/services h % of Low-		ares in h high % of	4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu 200,000 or	ow or No for use in Ilation of	5. Improves freq reliability of servic communities in outside of QE's se	juency and ce between nside and		to reduce	7. Provides stude	
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Josephine County	\$	1,843,200	48%	\$ 2,595,048	68%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,081,600	55%	\$ 94,000	2%	\$ 921,600	24%
Totals	\$	1,843,200	48%	\$ 2,595,048	68%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 2,081,600	55%	\$ 94,000	2%	\$ 921,600	24%

Lake County Table 89.

	La	ke County	/ - S	tatewide	Transpo	ortati	ion Ir	mprovem	ent Fund - 2021-2023	Formula Program	
				Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-2	23 Ex	pendi	iture Budg	get	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			ST	F 19-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Other		Tota	al 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	ward	Funds		Expe	enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.	
Lake County				223,634	\$	-	\$	423,634	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	223,634	\$	-	\$	423,634	\$ -		

Table 90.

	Lake County	- Statewide Tra	ansportati	on Improven	nent Fund - 2021-2	2023 Measur	able Project	Benefits and Ou	tcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Lake County	49,516	3,374	3,772	760	636	5	200	-	250	-
Total	49,516	3,374	3,772	760	636	5	200	-	250	-

Table 91.

1	ake Cou	inty - St	atewide	Transporta	tion Imp	provement	Fund - 20	21-2023	Capital In	vestment	Outcomes					
				Vehicl	e Assets						Other Assets					
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets				
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Lake County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					

Table 92.

		Lake Cou	ınty - Statewide	e Transpo	rtation Improv	ement Fu	nd - 2021-2023	Funding	Allocated to Ke	ey Progran	m Criteria	•		
	1. Increases fro	equency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces f	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of service		6. Improves cod	ordination		
	areas with high	% of Low-	to areas with high	n % of Low-	communities witl	h high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income Hou	seholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Lake County	\$ 32,136	8%	\$ 414,256	98%	\$ 42,164	10%	\$ -	0%	\$ 276,786	65%	\$ 41,164	10%	\$ 40,762	10%
Totals	\$ 32,136	8%	\$ 414,256	98%	\$ 42,164	10%	\$ -	0%	\$ 276,786	65%	\$ 41,164	10%	\$ 40,762	10%

Lane Transit District

Table 93.

Lane Transit Distri	ict - Statew	ide Transı	portation l	mproveme	ent Fund - 2021-	2023 Formula Pro	gram
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enditure Budge	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry		Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Other Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
City of Cottage Grove	\$ -	\$ 211,185	\$ -	\$ 211,185	\$ -	Yes	
City of Eugene	\$ -	\$ 490,000	\$ 36,500	\$ 526,500	\$ -	Yes	
Lane Council of Governments	\$ -	\$ 120,000	\$ 1,080,000	\$ 1,200,000	\$ -	Yes	
Lane Transit District	\$ 13,103,074	\$ 4,580,000	\$ 10,956,887	\$ 28,639,961	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 13,103,074	\$ 5,401,185	\$12,073,387	\$ 30,577,646	\$ -		

Table 94.

14516 541										
Lane Transit	District - Sta	tewide Trans	ortation	Improveme	nt Fund - 2021-20	023 Measur	able Project	Benefits and C	utcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
City of Cottage Grove	68,850	1,350	5,000	12,149	1,794	4	-	-	-	ı
City of Eugene	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lane Council of Governments	220,800	7,488	9,968	17,840	12,185	-	-	-	-	ı
Lane Transit District	369,620	21,769	110,530	258,822	51,942	-	-	18,603	603	18,000
Totals	659,270	30,607	125,498	288,811	65,921	4	-	18,603	603	18,000

Table 95.

Lane Tran	sit Distr	ict - Stat	tewide 1		on Impr	ovement F	und - 202:	1-2023 (Capital Inv	estment C	Outcomes	
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets	
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters	
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets	
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description
City of Cottage Grove	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
City of Eugene	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80	-	Bikes and Bike hubs
Lane Council of Governments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
												Remote Displays,
												Real Time Software,
Lane Transit District	23	-	8	-	7	35	3	38	-	103	40	Fare Validators
Totals	23	-	8	-	7	35	3	38	-	183	40	

Table 96.

	La	ane Trans	it Distric	:t -	Statewide	Transpo	orta	tion Impro	ovemen	t Fund - 20	21-20	23 Fu	unding Alloca	ited to Ke	ey Program C	riteria		
					_			3. Reduces fares in		4. Procures			5. Improves free					
	1.1	Increases freq	uency to	2.	. Expands route:	s/services		3. Reduces fa	res in	Emission Bus	es for us	se in	reliability of servi	ce between	6. Improves cod	ordination		
	are	areas with high % of Low-		% of Low-	com	nmunities with	high % of	areas with p	opulatio	on of	communities in	nside and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit		
	I	Income House	eholds		Income House	useholds Lo		w-Income Hou	seholds	200,000	or more	2	outside of QE's s	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% o	of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	bud	ıdget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
City of Cottage Grove	\$	84,474	40%	\$	126,711	60%	\$	42,237	20%	\$ -		0%	\$ 84,474	40%	\$ 84,474	40%	\$ -	0%
City of Eugene	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	416,500	85%	\$ -		0%	\$ 220,500	45%	\$ 240,100	49%	\$ 102,900	21%
Lane Council of Governments	\$	240,000	200%	\$	240,000	200%	\$	-	0%	\$ -		0%	\$ 240,000	200%	\$ 240,000	200%	\$ -	0%
Lane Transit District	\$	9,762,874	55%	\$	12,886,324	73%	\$	21,375,748	121%	\$ 17,975,7	48	102%	\$ 3,495,400	20%	\$ 3,432,000	19%	\$ 4,310,000	24%
Totals	\$	10,087,348	55%	\$	13,253,035	72%	\$	21,834,485	118%	\$ 17,975,7	48	97%	\$ 4,040,374	22%	\$ 3,996,574	22%	\$ 4,412,900	24%

Lincoln County Table 97.

	Lincoln Coun	ty - Statewide	e Transporta	tion Improven	nent Fund - 2021-202	23 Formula Program	
		Fiscal Yea	ar 2021-23 Ex	penditure Budg	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry	Other	Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Lincoln County Transportatio	\$ 1,330,754	\$ 1,392,228	\$ -	\$ 2,722,982	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 1,330,754	\$ 1,392,228	\$ -	\$ 2,722,982	\$ -		

Table 98.

	Lincoln County	y - Statewide T	ransporta	tion Improve	ment Fund - 2021	-2023 Measu	ırable Projec	t Benefits and O	utcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Lincoln County Transportation	302,800	12,112	63,500	98,979	25,631	7	8,000	1,974	-	1,974
Total	302,800	12,112	63,500	98,979	25,631	7	8,000	1,974	-	1,974

Table 99.

Lir	ncoln Co	ounty - S	tatewid	e Transport	ation Im	provemen	t Fund - 20	021-202	3 Capital II	nvestmen	t Outcomes					
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets															
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion Total Constructed Units of Constructed or Other Assets														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Lincoln County Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100	Signage				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100					

Table 100.

	L	incoln Co	unty - Statewic	le Transp	ortation Impro	vement F	und - 2021-202	3 Fundin	g Allocated to I	Key Progra	am Criteria			
	1. Increases free	-	2. Expands route	-	3. Reduces for		4. Procures of L	for use in	5. Improves freq	e between	6. Improves coo		7 Dunidas stud	
	_	areas with high % of Low- Income Households		eholds	communities with Low-Income Ho	•	areas with popu 200,000 or i		communities in outside of QE's se		between PTSPs fragmentation of		7. Provides stude for students in gr	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Lincoln County Transportation	\$ 1,630,980	60%	\$ 2,011,012	74%	\$ 460,000	17%	\$ -	0%	\$ 3,191,012	117%	\$ 1,943,146	71%	\$ 100,000	4%
Totals	\$ 1,630,980	60%	\$ 2,011,012	74%	\$ 460,000	17%	\$ -	0%	\$ 3,191,012	117%	\$ 1,943,146	71%	\$ 100,000	4%

Linn County

Table 101.

Linn County - S	Sta	tewide ¹	Tra	nsporta	atio	n Impr	ove	ement F	unc	d - 2021-202	3 Formula Progra	m
				Fiscal Yea	ar 20	21-23 Exp	endit	ture Budge	?t		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					Fun	ds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carı	ry			Tota	al 2021-23	Ехре	ended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STI	F Funds	For	ward	Oth	er Funds	Ехре	enditures	Plan	Period	considerations?	Plan.
City of Albany	\$	1,110,356	\$	580,144	\$ 3	3,829,600	\$	5,520,100	\$	-	Yes	
City of Lebanon	\$	1,123,000	\$	-	\$	596,000	\$	1,719,000	\$	-	Yes	
Linn Couny	\$	1,826,000	\$ 1	L,483,000	\$ 1	L,570,000	\$.	4,879,000	\$	-	Yes	
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	\$	30,625	\$	-	\$	-	\$	30,625	\$	-	Yes	
Totals	\$	4,089,981	\$ 2	,063,144	\$ 5	,995,600	\$ 12	2,148,725	\$	-		

Table 102.

TUDIC 102.										
Linn Cou	nty - Statewi	de Transport	ation Imp	rovement Fu	ınd - 2021-2023 l	Measurable	Project Ber	efits and Outco	omes	
				-					Students in Grades	Students in Grades 9-12 with Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
City of Albany	395,250	21,503	247,500	110,616	26,412	40	4,000	-	-	-
City of Lebanon	173,600	19,728	73,500	33,264	8,116	3	-	2,259	2,259	1
Linn Couny	220,586	15,282	44,500	43,762	24,200	7	2,500	512	125	762
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Total	789,436	56,513	365,500	187,642	58,728	50	6,500	2,771	2,384	762

Table 103.

Linn Co	ounty -	Statewi	de Trans	portation Ir	nproven	nent Fund	- 2021-202	23 Capit	al Investm	ent Outco	mes				
				Vehicl	e Assets						Other Assets				
	Gas or			Signs and Shelters											
	Diesel														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
City of Albany	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	Scheduling software			
City of Lebanon	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-				
Linn Couny	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Oregon Cascades West Council of Governme	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Totals	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	-				

Table 104.

		Linn Co	ounty - S	ta	tewide Tra	nsportat	ion Impro	veme	ent Fur	nd	- 2021-202	3 Fundi	ng	Allocated t	o Key Pr	og	ram Criter	ia			
										4	4. Procures of Lo	ow or No	5	. Improves frequ	uency and						
	1	L. Increases free	quency to	2	. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduc	es fares	s in	Ε	Emission Buses f	or use in	rel	liability of servic	e between	6	. Improves coo	rdination			
	а	reas with high 9	% of Low-				communities	with hig	gh % of	а	areas with popu	lation of		communities in	side and	b	etween PTSPs t	o reduce	7.	Provides stude	ent transit
		Income House	eholds		Income House	Low-Income	House	holds		200,000 or n	nore	ου	itside of QE's se	rvice area.	fı	ragmentation o	of service	for	students in gr	ades 9-12	
			% of STIF			% of STIF		%	of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	b	oudget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget
City of Albany	\$	754,650.00	45%	\$	754,650.00	45%	\$ 23,100	.00	1%	\$	69,300.00	4%	\$	1,182,750.00	70%	\$	281,550.00	17%	\$	315,000.00	19%
City of Lebanon	\$	741,180.00	66%	\$	606,420.00	54%	\$ 112,300	.00	10%	\$	-	0%	\$	404,280.00	36%	\$	336,900.00	30%	\$	44,920.00	4%
Linn Couny	\$	1,868,500.00	56%	\$	2,098,700.00	63%	\$ 191,000	.00	6%	\$	-	0%	\$	1,284,100.00	39%	\$	1,048,580.00	32%	\$	127,120.00	4%
Oregon Cascades West Counc	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$		0%	\$	-	0%	\$	30,625.00	100%	\$	30,625.00	100%	\$	-	0%
Totals	\$	3,364,330	55%	\$	3,459,770	56%	\$ 326,4	00	5%	\$	69,300	1%	\$	2,901,755	47%	\$	1,697,655	28%	\$	487,040	8%

Malheur County

Table 105.

	Mall	heur Cour	nty -	Statewid	e Trans	port	atio	n Improvei	ment Fund -	2021-20	23 Formula Program	
				Fiscal Yea	ır 2021	23 Ex	pen	diture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			ST	F 19-21						with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
			Car	ry	Other		To	tal 2021-23	Expended in	Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Funds		Exp	enditures	Plan Period		considerations?	Plan.
Malheur County				525,048	\$	-	\$	1,497,702	\$	45,996	Yes	
Totals	\$	972,654	\$	525,048	\$	-	\$	1,497,702	\$	45,996		

Table 106.

								•		
l l	Malheur Count	ty - Statewide ⁻	Transporta	ation Improve	ement Fund - 202:	L-2023 Meas	urable Proje	ct Benefits and C	Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Malheur County	126,134	13,155	84,423	28,257	5,290	1	-	1,391	-	-
Total	126,134	13,155	84,423	28,257	5,290	1	-	1,391	-	-

Table 107.

		Mal	heur Co	ounty - State	wide Tra	ansportatio	n Improv	ement F	und - 202	1-2023 Ca	pital Investmer	nt Outcomes						
				Vehicl	e Assets							Other Assets						
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters							
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion											
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles or Expanded Equipment Updated Other Assets Description										
												Signage, lighting, Radio station updgrade, fleet management						
Malheur County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68 - software, GIS real time software, dispatch software									
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	68	-							

Table 108.

		M	alheur Co	ounty - Statewi	de Transp	ortation Impro	ovement l	Fund - 2021-20	23 Fundir	ng Allocated to	Key Prog	ram	n Criteria				
	1	. Increases frec	quency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves free reliability of servi			i. Improves coo	ordination			
	a	reas with high 🤋	% of Low-	to areas with high	n % of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	ulation of	communities in	nside and	b	etween PTSPs	to reduce	7.	Provides stude	nt transit
		Income House	eholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's s	ervice area.	f	ragmentation (of service	fo	r students in gr	ades 9-12
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget
Malheur County	\$	826,209	55%	\$ 826,209	55%	\$ 10,000	1%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,290,743	86%	\$	-	0%	\$	42,242	3%
Totals	\$	826,209	55%	\$ 826,209	55%	\$ 10,000	1%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,290,743	86%	\$	-	0%	\$	42,242	3%

Morrow County Table 109.

	Mor	row Cour	ity -	Statewid	e Tı	ransporta	itio	n Improver	ner	nt Fund - 2021-202	23 Formula Program	
				Fiscal Yea	ır 2	021-23 Ex	oen	diture Budg	et		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					nds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
			Car	ry	Ot	her	То	tal 2021-23	Exp	pended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Fui	nds	Exp	penditures	Pla	ın Period	considerations?	Plan.
Morrow County	\$	566,500	500,000	\$	371,900	\$	1,438,400	\$	-	Yes		
Totals	\$	566,500	\$	500,000	\$	371,900	\$	1,438,400	\$	-		

Table 110.

TUDIC 1101										
ľ	Morrow Count	y - Statewide	Transporta	tion Improve	ement Fund - 2021	L-2023 Meas	urable Proje	ct Benefits and C	Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Morrow County	48,000	2,400	1,200	3,825	23,905	-	-	275	275	-
Total	48,000	2,400	1,200	3,825	23,905	-	-	275	275	-

Table 111.

Me	orrow Co	ounty - S	Statewic	le Transport	tation In	nprovemen	t Fund - 2	2021-202	23 Capital I	nvestme	nt Outcomes					
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets					
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets				
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Morrow County	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	-	1	23	iTransitNW				
Totals	5	-	-	-	-	-	5	5	-	1	23					

Table 112.

10010 1111																			
		M	lorrow Co	unty	- Statewic	de Transp	ortation Im	rovemer	nt Fu	und - 2021-202	23 Fundin	ng All	located to I	Key Progr	am	Criteria			
	1.	. Increases frec	quency to	2. Ex	pands route	s/services	3. Reduce	s fares in		4. Procures of L Emission Buses			Improves freque	-		. Improves coo	rdination		
	ar	reas with high 9	% of Low-	to are	eas with high	% of Low-	communities	vith high %	of	areas with popu	lation of	со	ommunities in	side and	be	etween PTSPs t	o reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit
		Income House	eholds	In	ncome House	holds	Low-Income	Households	;	200,000 or i	nore	outs	side of QE's se	rvice area.	fr	ragmentation o	f service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of S7	1F		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget	A	\mount	budget	Amount	budge	t	Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Morrow County	\$	493,380	46%	\$	726,030	68%	\$ 190,0	00 1	8% \$	\$ -	0%	\$	251,600	24%	\$	365,340	34%	\$ 106,650	10%
Totals	\$	493,380	46%	\$	726,030	68%	\$ 190,0	00 1	8% \$	\$ -	0%	\$	251,600	24%	\$	365,340	34%	\$ 106,650	10%

Rogue Valley Transportation District Table 113.

Rogue Va	lley Transport	ation District	- Statewide T	ransportation	Improvement Fund	- 2021-2023 Formula Pr	ogram
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enditure Budge	et .	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry		Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Other Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Rogue Valley Transportation	\$ 7,874,370	\$ 3,250,000	\$ 13,500,000	\$ 24,624,370	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 7,874,370	\$ 3,250,000	\$13,500,000	\$ 24,624,370	\$ -		

Table 114.

Rogue Valle	ey Transportat	tion District - S	tatewide ⁻	Transportation	on Improvement F	und - 2021-2	2023 Measur	able Project Ben	efits and Outco	mes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Rogue Valley Transportation	1,287,043	128,777	389,648	136,214	58,077	-	-	5,065	-	3,000
Total	1,287,043	128,777	389,648	136,214	58,077	-	-	5,065	-	3,000

Table 115.

Rogue	Valley T	ranspoi	rtation [District - Stat	ewide T	ransportat	ion Impro	vement	Fund - 20	21-2023 (Capital Investme	ent Outcomes				
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Asse	ts				
	Gas or	CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion Total Constructed Units of Constructed or														
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or					
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description				
Rogue Valley Transportation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	40	-	Campus Improvements, LCD Screens				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	40	-					

Table 116.

	Rogue Va	lley Transp	ortation Distric	t - Statew	vide Transporta	tion Impr	ovement Fund	- 2021-20	023 Funding All	ocated to	Key Program	Criteria		
	1. Increases	requency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L		5. Improves freq	-	6. Improves co	oordination		
	areas with hi	gh % of Low-	to areas with high	as with high % of Low- comn		n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSP	s to reduce	7. Provides stude	
	Income H			come Households Low		useholds	200,000 or i		outside of QE's se		fragmentation	1	for students in g	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Rogue Valley Transportation I	\$ 6,277,8	10 56%	\$ 6,398,784	58%	\$ 1,686,260	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,242,880	56%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,642,976	15%
Totals	\$ 6,277,8	10 56%	\$ \$ 6,398,784	58%	\$ 1,686,260	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 6,242,880	56%	\$ -	0%	\$ 1,642,976	15%

Salem Area Mass Transit District

Table 117.

Salem Area Mass Transi	t Distr	ict - S	State	ewide	Trai	nsporta	ati	on Impro	ovemen	t Fund -	2021-2023 Formu	ula Program
			ı	Fiscal Yea	ır 202	21-23 Exp	end	iture Budge			Are projects consistent	<u>-</u>
			STIF 1						Funds to b	_	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carry					tal 2021-23	•		guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Fu	nds	Forwa	ard	Othe	er Funds	Exp	penditures	Plan Period	t	considerations?	Plan.
City of Silverton	\$ 12	25,000	\$ 4	420,301	\$	-	\$	545,301	\$	-	Yes	
City of Woodburn	\$ 75	51,500	\$ 3	339,000	\$	36,000	\$	1,126,500	\$	-	Yes	
Salem Area Mass Transit District	\$ 14,54	48,851	\$ 10,3	333,318	\$	-	\$:	24,882,169	\$	-	Yes	
Totals	\$ 15,42	25,351	\$11,0	092,619	\$	36,000	\$ 2	26,553,970	\$	-		

Table 118.

Salem Area Mass 1	Transit Distric	t - Statewide	Transpor	tation Impro	vement Fund - 2	021-2023 N	leasurable F	Project Benefits	and Outcomes	;
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
City of Silverton	19,500	1,040	10,400	10,000	2,400	-	-	-	10	-
City of Woodburn	124,000	9,310	16,650	100,000	16,000	2	-	3,000	-	-
Salem Area Mass Transit District	2,200,833	202,681	1,438,616	1,290,835	188,105	2	-	64,708	-	-
Total	2,344,333	213,031	1,465,666	1,400,835	206,505	4	-	67,708	10	-

Table 119.

Salem Area Mass	Transi	t District	t - State	wide Transp	ortation	Improven	ent Fund	- 2021-2	2023 Capit	al Investn	nent Outcomes					
				Vehicl	e Assets						Other Assets					
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters					
	Diesel	CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion Total Constructed Units of Constructed or Other Assets														
PTSP Name	Vehicles															
City of Silverton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
City of Woodburn	4	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	-					
Salem Area Mass Transit District	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Totals	4	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	-					

Table 120.

Sale	m	Area Mass	Transit	Di	istrict - Stat	ewide T	rar	nsportatio	n Improv	/er	ment Fund	- 2021-2	202	23 Funding	Allocate	d t	o Key Prog	gram Crit	eria	
						, .					4. Procures of L			. Improves freq	-					
			eases frequency to vith high % of Low- me Households 2. Expands routes/services to areas with high % of Low- Income Households			-	cor	3. Reduces fa mmunities with			Emission Buses i areas with popu			liability of servic communities in			6. Improves coo etween PTSPs t		7. Provides stude	ent transit
		Income House	eholds		Income House	ncome Households Lov		ow-Income Ho	useholds		200,000 or i	more	ου	itside of QE's se	rvice area.	f	ragmentation o	of service	for students in gr	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
City of Silverton	\$	327,180.60	60%	\$	327,180.60	60%	\$	196,308.36	36%	\$	-	0%	\$	109,060.20	20%	\$	109,060.20	20%	\$ 21,812.04	4%
City of Woodburn	\$	371,250.00	34%	\$	371,250.00	34%	\$	22,000.00	2%	\$	-	0%	\$	1,004,000.00	92%	\$	275,000.00	25%	\$ 137,500.00	13%
Salem Area Mass Transit Distr	\$	49,010,756.36	197%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	255,938.26	1%	\$ 497,643.38	2%
Totals	\$	49,709,187	187%	\$	698,431	3%	\$	218,308	1%	\$	-	0%	\$	1,113,060	4%	\$	639,998	2%	\$ 656,955	2%

Sherman County Table 121.

	She	rman Cou	nty - St	atewi	de Tra	ansporta	tion	Improver	nent Fund - 2021-202	23 Formula Program	
	If No, describe										
			STIF 19	9-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carry				Tot	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of	
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Forwar	ď	Othe	er Funds	Ехр	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.	
Sherman County	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	50,000	\$	250,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	50,000	\$	250,000	\$ -		

Table 122.

S	herman Count	ty - Statewide	Transporta	ation Improv	ement Fund - 202	1-2023 Meas	surable Proje	ct Benefits and (Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Sherman County	102,093	4,577	2,893	3,560	564	-	40	-	59	-
Total	102,093	4,577	2,893	3,560	564	-	40	-	59	-

Table 123.

She	erman C	ounty -	Statewi	de Transpor	tation lı	mprovemei	nt Fund - 2	2021-20	23 Capital	Investme	nt Outcomes			
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or	as or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters												
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Sherman County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 124.

		Sherman	County - Statev	vide Trans	portation Impr	ovement	Fund - 2021-20	23 Fundiı	ng Allocated to	Key Prog	ram Criteria			
		frequency to	2. Expands rou	-			4. Procures of L Emission Buses	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of servi	e between	6. Improves cod			
		igh % of Low- louseholds		-	communities wit	_	areas with popu 200,000 or i		communities in outside of QE's se		between PTSPs fragmentation		7. Provides stude for students in gr	
		% of STI		Income Households % of STIF		% of STIF	,	% of STIF		% of STIF	agentation	% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Sherman County	\$ 42	000 21	% \$ 36,120	18%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 274,000	137%	\$ 42,000	21%	\$ 5,880	3%
Totals	\$ 42	000 21	% \$ 36,120	18%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 274,000	137%	\$ 42,000	21%	\$ 5,880	3%

Sunset Empire Transportation District Table 125.

Sunset Em	pir	e Transpor	tati	on Distric	t - Stat	tewide '	Tra	nsportatio	n Improv	ement Fund	- 2021-2023 Formula P	rogram
				Fiscal Ye	ar 202 1	1-23 Ехр	end	liture Budge	t		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					o be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
		Carry Total 2021-23 Expended in Futur								d in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	ST	IF Funds Forward Other Funds Expenditures Plan Period									considerations?	Plan.
Sunset Empire Transportation					\$ 1,8	398,852	\$	3,247,761	\$	800,000	Yes	
Totals	\$	1,070,959	\$	277,950	\$ 1,8	98,852	\$	3,247,761	\$	800,000		

Table 126.

Sunset Emp	ire Transporta	tion District -	Statewide	Transportati	on Improvement	Fund - 2021-	2023 Measu	rable Project Ber	nefits and Outco	mes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Sunset Empire Transportation	175,153	8,810	49,040	26,201	5,712	-	-	-	-	3,152
Total	175,153	8,810	49,040	26,201	5,712	-	-	-	-	3,152

Table 127.

Sunset Empire	Sunset Empire Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets		
PTSP Name	Vehicles								or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Sunset Empire Transportation	9	-	-	-	-	7	2	9	-	-	3	Shelters and signage		
Totals	9	-	-	-	-	7	2	9	-	-	3			

Table 128.

	Sunset Empire Transportation District - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases free	quency to	2. Expands route	2. Expands routes/services		ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of service		6. Improves cod	ordination			
	areas with high	% of Low-	to areas with high	o areas with high % of Low-		h high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit	
	Income Hous	eholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	nore	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Sunset Empire Transportation	\$ 746,368	55%	\$ 582,043	43%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 706,533	52%	\$ 19,760	1%	\$ 33,889	3%	
Totals	\$ 746,368	55%	\$ 582,043	43%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 706,533	52%	\$ 19,760	1%	\$ 33,889	3%	

The Klamath Tribes

Table 129.

										i de la companya de	
	The K	(lamath T	ribes - S	tatew	ide Tra	anspor	tatio	n Improv	ement Fund - 2021-2	023 Formula Program	
			Are projects consistent	If No, describe							
			STIF 19	-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carry				Tot	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of	
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Forward	t	Other	Funds	Exp	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.	
The Klamath Tribes	\$	450,000	\$	-	\$ -			450,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	450,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	450,000	\$ -		

Table 130.

Th	e Klamath Tril	bes - Statewide	Transpor	tation Impro	vement Fund - 20	21-2023 Mea	asurable Proj	ect Benefits and	Outcomes	
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
The Klamath Tribes	37,920	5,824	367	287	163	-	2,000	-	-	-
Total	37,920	5,824	367	287	163	-	2,000	-	-	-

Table 131.

The	Klamatl	h Tribes	- Statew	vide Transpo	rtation	Improveme	ent Fund -	2021-2	023 Capita	l Investm	ent Outcomes			
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets													
	Gas or													
	Diesel													
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
The Klamath Tribes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			

Table 132.

	•	he Klamat	h Tribes - State	wide Tran	sportation Imp	rovemen	t Fund - 2021-2	023 Fund	ing Allocated t	o Key Pro	gram Criteria			
	1 Incresses	ivanuana, ta	2 Evnanda rau	tos /somiloss	3. Reduces f	ionos in	4. Procures of L		5. Improves freq	-	C Improves see	a dination		
	areas with h	frequency to gh % of Low-	•	2. Expands routes/services to areas with high % of Low-			Emission Buses areas with popu		reliability of service communities in		6. Improves coo between PTSPs		7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income H	useholds		Income Households		ouseholds	200,000 or		outside of QE's se		fragmentation		for students in g	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
The Klamath Tribes	\$ 45,0	00 109	\$ 145,000	32%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 630,000	140%	\$ -	0%	\$ 80,000	18%
Totals	\$ 45,0	00 109	6 \$ 145,000	32%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 630,000	140%	\$ -	0%	\$ 80,000	18%

Tillamook County Transportation District Table 133.

Tillamook C	oun	ty Transp	orta	tion Distr	ict - Statewid	e T	ransportati	on Improv	ement Fur	nd - 2021-2023 Formula	Program
		-		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enc	diture Budge	t		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21			e	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may		
			Car	ry		To	otal 2021-23	Expended	in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Other Funds	Ex	penditures	Plan Perio	d	considerations?	Plan.
Tillamook County Transporta	\$	523,570	\$	360,000	\$ 1,609,000	\$	2,492,570	\$	200,000	Yes	
Totals	\$	523,570	\$	360,000	\$ 1,609,000	\$	2,492,570	\$	200,000		

Table 134.

10010 10-11			•							
Tillamook Cou	unty Transpor	tation District	- Statewid	le Transporta	tion Improvemen	t Fund - 202	1-2023 Meas	urable Project B	enefits and Outo	comes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Tillamook County Transporta	275,850	26,035	38,700	155,200	52,378	13	2,500	9,120	2,540	6,510
Total	275,850	26,035	38,700	155,200	52,378	13	2,500	9,120	2,540	6,510

Table 135.

Tillamook Coun	ty Tran	sportati	on Distr	ict - Statewi	de Tran	sportation	Improven	nent Fur	nd - 2021-2	023 Capit	al Investment C	Outcomes				
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets					
	Gas or															
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets				
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description				
Tillamook County Transporta	13	-	-	-	-	8	5	13	-	-	-					
Totals	13	-	-	-	-	8	5	13	-	-	-					

Table 136.

	Tillamook Cou	inty Trans	sportation Distr	ict - State	ewide Transpor	rtation Im	provement Fu	nd - 2021	-2023 Funding	Allocated	to Key Program	m Criteria		
	1. Increases fre	quency to	2. Expands route	s/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of service	-	6. Improves coo	ordination		
	areas with high	% of Low-	to areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	iside and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income Hous	eholds	Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or i	nore	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation (of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Tillamook County Transporta	\$ 370,485	42%	\$ 380,485	43%	\$ 194,000	22%	\$ 73,314.00	8%	\$ 167,200	19%	\$ 243,828	28%	\$ 337,828	38%
Totals	\$ 370,485	42%	\$ 380,485	43%	\$ 194,000	22%	\$ 73,314	8%	\$ 167,200	19%	\$ 243,828	28%	\$ 337,828	38%

Tri County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon Table 137.

Tri County Metropolitan Transpo	ortation Dist	rict of Orego	on - Statewi	de Transport	ation Improveme	nt Fund - 2021-2023	Formula Program
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enditure Budge	t	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
		Carry		Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Other Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Canby Area Transit	\$ 620,302	\$ 520,675	\$ -	\$ 1,140,977	\$ -	Yes	
City of Portland	\$ 1,442,000	\$ -	\$ 29,100,000	\$ 30,542,000	\$ -	Yes	
City of Sandy	\$ 1,359,614	\$ 328,936	\$ -	\$ 1,688,550	\$ 108,749	Yes	
Clackamas County	\$ 2,512,199	\$ 1,633,690	\$ 304,300	\$ 4,450,189	\$ -	Yes	
Columbia County Rider	\$ 116,976	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 116,976	\$ -	Yes	
Multnomah County	\$ 1,201,278	\$ 988,931	\$ -	\$ 2,190,209	\$ -	Yes	
South Clackamas Transportation District	\$ 478,000	\$ 196,500	\$ -	\$ 674,500	\$ -	Yes	
South Metro Area Regional Transit	\$ 3,036,230	\$ 897,386	\$ 1,464,602	\$ 5,398,218	\$ -	Yes	
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation Distr	\$ 94,603,873	\$ 31,185,042	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 127,688,915	\$ 30,846,827	Yes	
Washington County	\$ 3,003,088	\$ 797,582	\$ 739,478	\$ 4,540,148	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$108,373,560	\$36,548,742	\$33,508,380	\$178,430,682	\$ 30,955,576		

Table 138.

Tri County Metropolitan Transp	ortation Dist	rict of Oregor	า - Statewi	de Transpor	tation Improven	nent Fund -	2021-2023 I	Measurable Pro	ject Benefits a	nd Outcomes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Canby Area Transit	43,400	9,015	20,000	49,137	14,371	-	-	1,453	-	-
City of Portland	427,910	71,000	4,500,000	28,000	5,699	-	-	-	-	-
City of Sandy	296,465	18,944	79,920	76,747	10,124	1	200	1,211	-	1,211
Clackamas County	299,200	16,928	41,658	146,745	39,388	6	2,100	-	500	-
Columbia County Rider	50,490	1,464	3,400	33,396	8,149	-	-	1,933	-	-
Multnomah County	108,036	8,863	74,928	423,747	142,192	22	-	-	-	-
South Clackamas Transportation District	126,700	5,294	13,400	42,000	7,180	-	-	1,460	-	-
South Metro Area Regional Transit	717,898	16,545	159,520	32,504	3,488	8	-	-	-	-
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation Distr	5,484,613	415,312	24,354,857	642,005	15,450	-	-	-	-	32,786
Washington County	716,785	47,541	318,429	130,979	14,877	11	45,027	-	1,500	-
Totals	8,271,497	610,906	29,566,112	1,605,260	260,918	48	47,327	6,057	2,000	33,997

Table 139.

Tri County Metropolitan	Transpo	ortation	District	of Oregon -	Statewi	ide Transpo	rtation In	nproven	nent Fund	- 2021-20	23 Capital Inves	stment Outcomes
				Vehic	le Assets						Other Assets	3
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters	
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description
Canby Area Transit	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	
City of Portland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
City of Sandy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	Stop improvements
Clackamas County	9	-	-	-	-	3	6	9	-	1	42	Dispatch software, signs, shelters
Columbia County Rider	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Multnomah County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
South Clackamas Transportation District	3	-	-	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	156	Signage and shelters
South Metro Area Regional Transit	-	3	2	-	-	4	1	5	-	2	-	Electric chargers
												Sanitation equipment, digital
												displays, security cameras,
Tri County Metropolitan Transportation Distr	11	-	4	-	-	14	1	15	-	786	340	lighting, shelters, concrete pads
												Electric chargers, signs, shelters,
Washington County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	26	concrete pads
Totals	25	3	6	-	-	24	10	34	2	789	565	

Table 140.

Tri County Metro	ро	litan Trans	sportation	on	District of	Oregon -	- Statewide T	ransport	tation Impro	vement	Fu	nd - 2021-2	023 Fund	ding	g Allocate	d to Key	Program Cri	teria
									4. Procures of I	Low or No	5	5. Improves freq	uency and					
	1.	. Increases fred	quency to	2	2. Expands route	s/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	Emission Buses	for use in	re	liability of servic	e between	6.	Improves coo	rdination		
	ar	reas with high 🤋	% of Low-	to	areas with high	% of Low-	communities with	n high % of	areas with pop	ulation of		communities in	side and	bet	tween PTSPs t	to reduce	7. Provides stud	lent transit
		Income House	eholds		Income House	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	οι	utside of QE's se	rvice area.	fra	agmentation o	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Canby Area Transit	\$	729,451.20	64%	\$	729,451.20	64%	\$ 29,867.50	3%	\$ -	0%	\$	280,181.20	25%	\$	124,160.40	11%	\$ 90,167.50	8%
City of Portland	\$	1,442,000.00	100%	\$	1,442,000.00	100%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$ -	0%
City of Sandy	\$	709,920.50	42%	\$	839,288.50	50%	\$ 10,360.00	1%	\$ 10,360.00	1%	\$	945,980.10	56%	\$	767,322.10	45%	\$ 88,868.80	5%
Clackamas County	\$	1,930,507.50	47%	\$	693,868.50	17%	\$ 3,030,116.20	73%	\$ -	0%	\$	763,013.20	18%	\$	892,212.30	22%	\$ 566,176.30	14%
Columbia County Rider	\$	105,278.40	90%	\$	-	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	116,976.00	100%	\$	-	0%	\$ 11,697.60	10%
Multnomah County	\$	960,604.00	44%	\$	960,604.00	44%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	1,229,605.00	56%	\$:	1,229,605.00	56%	\$ -	0%
South Clackamas Transportati	\$	113,550.00	17%	\$	38,000.00	6%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$	504,400.00	75%	\$	293,700.00	44%	\$ 35,350.00	5%
South Metro Area Regional Tr	\$	1,092,575.74	28%	\$	503,801.06	13%	\$ 907,632.56	23%	\$ 1,768,346.56	45%	\$	1,108,354.06	28%	\$:	1,121,854.06	29%	\$ 307,028.96	8%
Tri County Metropolitan Trans	\$ 7	76,668,433.00	61%	\$	76,668,433.00	61%	\$ 51,800,000.00	41%	\$ 28,689,200.00	23%	\$	7,875,882.00	6%	\$	7,875,882.00	6%	\$ 2,000,000.00	2%
Washington County	\$	1,171,704.00	31%	\$	1,654,834.00	44%	\$ -	0%	^ \$ -	0%	\$	1,767,536.50	47%	\$:	2,076,865.00	55%	\$ 930,400.50	24%
Totals	\$	84,924,024	59%	\$	83,530,280	58%	\$ 55,777,976	38%	\$ 30,467,907	21%	\$	14,591,928	10%	\$	14,381,601	10%	\$ 4,029,690	3%

Umatilla County

Table 141.

Umatilla County	- S	tatewid	e T	ranspo	rta	ation In	np	rovemer	nt	Fund - 2021-2	023 Formula Prog	gram
				Fiscal Yea	r 2	021-23 Ex	pen	diture Budg	jet		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STI	F 19-21					Fu	ınds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Car	ry	Ot	ther	To	tal 2021-23	Ex	pended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	ST	TF Funds	For	ward	Fu	nds	Ex	penditures	Pla	an Period	considerations?	Plan.
City of Hermiston	\$	205,000	\$	-	\$	115,000	\$	320,000	\$	-	Yes	
City of Milton-Freewater	\$	345,000	\$	-	\$	941,000	\$	1,286,000	\$	-	Yes	
City of Pendleton	\$	1,181,966	\$	66,634	\$2	2,346,400	\$	3,595,000	\$	-	Yes	
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian R	\$	316,584	\$	100,000	\$	116,584	\$	533,168	\$	-	Yes	
Umatilla County	\$	240,000	\$	675,000	\$	100,000	\$	1,015,000	\$	-	Yes	
Totals	\$	2,288,550	\$	841,634	\$3	3,618,984	\$	6,749,168	\$	-		

Table 142.

			•				•			
Umatilla C	ounty - State	wide Transpo	rtation In	nprovement	Fund - 2021-202	3 Measurab	le Project B	Benefits and Ou	tcomes	
				1/2 Mile of	Low Income Households within 1/2 Mile of Transit		Students in	School Served by	Students in Grades 9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
City of Hermiston	80,000	6,570	16,000	36,801	6,488	-	-	1,500	-	-
City of Milton-Freewater	48,600	6,400	12,500	14,420	5,440	8	-	1,004	-	-
City of Pendleton	100,000	17,300	38,000	24,676	6,000	26	-	1,700	-	-
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian R	58,000	1,365	6,500	5,887	4,035	1	-	400	-	-
Umatilla County	2,598	48	200	6,071	3,157	5	-	-	-	-
Totals	289,198	31,683	73,200	87,855	25,120	40	-	4,604	-	-

Table 143.

Umatilla	a Count	y - State	wide Tr	ansportatio	n Impro	vement Fur	nd - 2021-	2023 Ca	pital Inves	tment Ou	tcomes					
		Vehicle Assets Other Assets See on A Dishvid Discolar Other														
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters					
	Diesel															
PTSP Name	Vehicles															
City of Hermiston	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
City of Milton-Freewater	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
City of Pendleton	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	1	-	-	Bus Barn Construction				
Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian R	2	-	-	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-					
Umatilla County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
Totals	3	-	-	-	-	1	2	3	1	-	-					

Table 144.

		Umatilla	County	- St	tatewide T	ransport	tatio	on Improv	ement l	Fui	nd - 2021-2	023 Fun	diı	ng Allocate	d to Key	Pr	ogram Crit	eria		
										4	4. Procures of L	ow or No	5	5. Improves frequ	uency and					
	1	Increases fred	quency to	2.	. Expands route	es/services		3. Reduces fa	ares in	E	Emission Buses f	or use in	rel	liability of servic	e between	6	i. Improves coo	rdination		
	a	reas with high 9	% of Low-	to	areas with high	% of Low-	com	munities with	n high % of	ā	areas with popu	lation of		communities in	side and	b	etween PTSPs t	o reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
		Income House	eholds		Income House			w-Income Ho	useholds		200,000 or r	nore	ου	utside of QE's se	rvice area.	fı	ragmentation o	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
City of Hermiston	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	192,700.00	94%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	196,800.00	96%	\$ 20,500.00	10%
City of Milton-Freewater	\$	172,500.00	50%	\$	34,500.00	10%	\$	172,500.00	50%	\$	-	0%	\$	172,500.00	50%	\$	69,000.00	20%	\$ 69,000.00	20%
City of Pendleton	\$	499,440.00	40%	\$	499,440.00	40%	\$	374,580.00	30%	\$	-	0%	\$	499,440.00	40%	\$	499,440.00	40%	\$ 124,860.00	10%
Confederated Tribes of the Ur	\$	83,316.80	20%	\$	291,608.80	70%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	249,950.40	60%	\$	166,633.60	40%	\$ 41,658.40	10%
Umatilla County	\$	366,000.00	40%	\$	366,000.00	40%	\$	-	0%	\$	-	0%	\$	457,500.00	50%	\$	549,000.00	60%	\$ 91,500.00	10%
Totals	\$	1,121,257	36%	\$	1,191,549	38%	\$	739,780	24%	\$	-	0%	\$	1,379,390	44%	\$	1,480,874	47%	\$ 347,518	11%

Umpqua Public Transportation District Table 145.

Umpqua P	ublic	Transpoi	rtation Distric	t - Statewide	Transportatio	n Improvement Fund	d - 2021-2023 Formula F	Program
			Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enditure Budge	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may
			Carry		Total 2021-23	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Forward	Other Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Umpqua Public Transportatio	\$ 2	2,936,832	\$ 3,057,480	\$ 5,277,119	\$ 11,271,431	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$ 2	2,936,832	\$ 3,057,480	\$ 5,277,119	\$ 11,271,431	\$ -		

Table 146.

Umpqua Pul	olic Transporta	ation District -	Statewide	Transportati	ion Improvement	Fund - 2021	-2023 Measu	rable Project Be	nefits and Outco	omes
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in
				People within	Households within	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with		
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares
Umpqua Public Transportatio	904,920	38,868	90,240	137,079	49,014	6	-	7,819	-	-
Total	904,920	38,868	90,240	137,079	49,014	6	-	7,819	-	-

Table 147.

Umpqua Publi	c Trans	portatio	n Distric	t - Statewid	e Trans	portation I	mprovem	ent Fund	d - 2021-20	23 Capita	al Investment O	utcomes			
				Vehicle	e Assets						Other Assets				
	Gas or														
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets			
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Umpqua Public Transportatio	9	-	-	14	-	10	13	23	-	-	3	Shelters			
Totals	9	-	-	14	-	10	13	23	-	-	3				

Table 148.

,	Umpqua Puk	lic Transp	ortation Distri	ct - State	wide Transport	ation Imp	provement Fun	d - 2021-2	2023 Funding A	llocated t	to Key Program	Criteria		
	1. Increases fre	• •	2. Expands route	•	3. Reduces for		4. Procures of L Emission Buses areas with popu	for use in	5. Improves freq reliability of service communities in	e between	6. Improves coo		7. Provides stude	ont transit
	Income Hous		Income Hous		Low-Income Ho		200,000 or		outside of QE's se		fragmentation		for students in g	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Umpqua Public Transportatio	\$ 2,930,079	49%	\$ 4,044,634	67%	\$ 540,605	9%	\$ 523,178.40	9%	\$ 2,303,176	38%	\$ 1,243,237	21%	\$ 403,716	7%
Totals	\$ 2,930,079	49%	\$ 4,044,634	67%	\$ 540,605	9%	\$ 523,178	9%	\$ 2,303,176	38%	\$ 1,243,237	21%	\$ 403,716	7%

Union County Table 149.

	Uı	nion Coun	ty - S	tatewide	Trans	portat	ion l	mprovem	ent Fund	- 2021-2023	Formula Program	
				Fiscal Ye	ar <mark>202</mark> 1	-23 Ехр	endi	ture Budge	et .		Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF	19-21				be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may		
			Carr	у			Tota	d in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of		
PTSP Name	STIF	F Funds	Forv	vard	Other	Funds	Ехре	enditures	Plan Perio	od	considerations?	Plan.
Union County	\$	782,015	\$	42,000	\$	-	\$	824,015	\$	53,000	Yes	
Totals	\$	782,015	\$	42,000	\$	-	\$	824,015	\$	53,000		

Table 150.

14510 1501											
	Union County	- Statewide Ti	ransportat	ion Improver	ment Fund - 2021-	2023 Measu	rable Projec	t Benefits and Ou	ıtcomes		
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in	
			People within Households within Shared with Provided to 9-12 Attending a Students in Grades G								
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced	
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares	
Union County	74,324	5,732	18,464	23,557	8,263	5	-	-	-	1,386	
Total	74,324	5,732	18,464	23,557	8,263	5	-	-	-	1,386	

Table 151.

l	Jnion Co	unty - S	tatewid	e Transporta	ation Im	provement	Fund - 20	21-202	3 Capital Ir	vestment	t Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters														
	Diesel CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion Total Constructed Units of Constructed or Other Assets														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Union County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				

Table 152.

		Union Co	unty - Statewid	e Transpo	ortation Improv	vement F	und - 2021-202	3 Funding	g Allocated to K	ey Progra	m Criteria			
	1. Increases fr	equency to	2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces fa	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves freq reliability of servi		6. Improves cod	ordination		
	areas with higl	reas with high % of Low- to areas with high % of Low				n high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	side and	between PTSPs	to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income Hou	seholds	Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	nore	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Union County	\$ 494,334	60%	\$ 114,903	14%	\$ 435,778	53%	\$ -	0%	\$ 114,903	14%	\$ 156,850	19%	\$ 128,179	16%
Totals	\$ 494,334	60%	\$ 114,903	14%	\$ 435,778	53%	\$ -	0%	\$ 114,903	14%	\$ 156,850	19%	\$ 128,179	16%

Wallowa County

Table 153.

										i de la companya de	
	Wa	llowa Cou	inty - State	wic	de Trai	nsporta	atior	n Improver	ment Fund - 2021-20	23 Formula Program	
			Fisca	l Ye	ar 2021	1-23 Ехр	end	iture Budge	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe
			STIF 19-2:	L				Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may	
			Carry				Tot	Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of	
PTSP Name	STII	F Funds	Forward		Other	Funds	Ехр	enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Wallowa County	\$	200,000	\$ 8,1	39	\$	67,220	\$	275,359	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$ 8,1	39	\$	67,220	\$	275,359	\$ -		

Table 154.

	•	•		•	•	•	•	•	•			
V	Vallowa Coun	ty - Statewide '	Transporta	ation Improve	ement Fund - 202	1-2023 Meas	urable Proje	ct Benefits and C	Outcomes			
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in		
			People within Households within Shared with Provided to 9-12 Attending a Students in Grades									
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced		
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares		
Wallowa County	37,151	3,640	8,680	7,412	1,158	-	-	420	420	-		
Total	37,151	3,640	8,680	7,412	1,158	-	-	420	420	-		

Table 155.

W	'allowa C	County -	Statewi	de Transpor	tation lı	mprovemer	nt Fund - 2	2021-20	23 Capital	Investme	nt Outcomes				
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters														
	Diesel CNG Electric or Hybrid-Gas Alternati Replacement Expansion Total Constructed Units of Constructed or Other A														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Wallowa County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				

Table 156.

1 4 5 1 5 1 5 1																			
		W	allowa Co	ount	ty - Statewic	de Transp	oortation Impr	ovement	Fun	nd - 2021-20	23 Fundir	ng A	Allocated to	Key Progi	ram	n Criteria			
	1	Increases frec	quency to	2. 1	Expands routes	s/services	3. Reduces f	ares in		I. Procures of Lo mission Buses f			. Improves frequiability of service	-		. Improves coo	rdination		
	aı	reas with high 9	% of Low-	to a	areas with high % of Low-		communities wit	n high % of	a	reas with popu	lation of	(communities in	side and	b	etween PTSPs t	o reduce	7. Provides stud	ent transit
		Income House	eholds		Income House	holds	Low-Income Ho	useholds		200,000 or r	nore	ou	itside of QE's se	rvice area.	f	ragmentation o	f service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF			% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget		Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Wallowa County	\$	180,814	87%	\$	87,372	42%	\$ 6,884	3%	\$	-	0%	\$	70,060	34%	\$	45,697	22%	\$ 17,312	8%
Totals	\$	180,814	87%	\$	87,372	42%	\$ 6,884	3%	\$	-	0%	\$	70,060	34%	\$	45,697	22%	\$ 17,312	8%

Wasco County Table 157.

	Wa	asco Cour	ıty -	Statewid	e Tr	ansportat	ion	Improvem	ent Fund - 2021-202	3 Formula Program						
		Fiscal Year 2021-23 Expenditure Budget Are projects consistent If No, describe														
			ST	IF 19-21					Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may					
			Car	ry			Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of							
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	For	ward	Oth	ner Funds	Exp	penditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.					
Mid-Columbia Economic Deve	\$	858,399	\$	250,119	\$	495,224	\$	1,603,742	\$ -	Yes						
Totals	\$	858,399	\$	250,119	\$	495,224	\$	1,603,742	\$ -							

Table 158.

				•			•							
	Wasco County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Mid-Columbia Economic Deve	175,200	23,835	42,315	64,700	9,705	10	3,000	-	-	550				
Total	175,200	23,835	42,315	64,700	9,705	10	3,000	-	-	550				

Table 159.

W	Wasco County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes													
Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or													
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Alternati	Replacement	Expansion	Total	Constructed	Units of	Constructed or	Other Assets		
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description		
Mid-Columbia Economic Deve	4	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	2	Shelters		
Totals	4	-	-	-	-	4	-	4	-	-	2			

Table 160.

14010 2001															
	Wasco County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	1. Increases frequency to		2. Expands route	es/services	3. Reduces f	ares in	4. Procures of L Emission Buses		5. Improves fred reliability of servi		6. Improves co	ordination			
	areas with high	% of Low-	<u>-</u>	-	communities witl	h high % of	areas with popu	lation of	communities in	nside and	between PTSP	s to reduce	7. Provides stude	ent transit	
	Income Households		Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	more	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF	
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	
Mid-Columbia Economic Deve	\$ 861,676	78%	\$ 591,815	53%	\$ 168,000	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 421,468	38%	\$ 91,792	L 8%	\$ 24,000	2%	
Totals	\$ 861,676	78%	\$ 591,815	53%	\$ 168,000	15%	\$ -	0%	\$ 421,468	38%	\$ 91,791	L 8%	\$ 24,000	2%	

Wheeler County

Table 161.

	Wh	eeler Cou	nty - St	atewi	de Tran	sporta	tion	Improven	ment Fund - 2021-20	23 Formula Program	
			Are projects consistent	If No, describe							
			STIF 1	9-21				with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may		
			Carry				guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of			
PTSP Name	STIF	Funds	Forwa	rd	Other	Funds	Ехре	enditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.
Wheeler County Community	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	200,000	\$ -	Yes	
Totals	\$	200,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	200,000	\$ -		

Table 162.

Table 102.														
V	Wheeler County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Wheeler County Community	153,000	5,865	762	-	-	-	12	-	12	-				
Total	153,000	5,865	762	-	-	-	12	-	12	-				

Table 163.

Wh	Wheeler County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Capital Investment Outcomes														
	Vehicle Assets Other Assets														
	Gas or	s or Hybrid-Diesel Other Facilities Signs and Shelters													
	Diesel														
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Description			
Wheeler County Community	-														
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				

Table 164.

	W	/heeler Co	ounty - Statewi	de Transp	ortation Impro	ovement l	Fund - 2021-20	23 Fundir	ng Allocated to	Key Progi	ram Criteria			
	1 Image and from		2 Francisco de verrito	/	2 Dadwas fr	i-	4. Procures of L		5. Improves freq	-				
	1. Increases free areas with high		2. Expands route to areas with high	•	3. Reduces for communities with		Emission Buses areas with popu		reliability of service communities in		6. Improves coo between PTSPs		7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Income Hous		Income House		Low-Income Ho		200,000 or i		outside of QE's se		fragmentation		for students in gr	
		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Wheeler County Community	\$ -	0%	\$ 368,000	184%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 10,000	5%	\$ 12,000	6%
Totals	\$ -	0%	\$ 368,000	184%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ -	0%	\$ 10,000	5%	\$ 12,000	6%

Yamhill County

Table 165.

	Yamhill County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Formula Program														
		Fiscal Ye	ar 2021-23 Exp	enditure Budge	et	Are projects consistent	If No, describe								
		STIF 19-21			Funds to be	with statute, OARs,	inconsistencies that may								
		Carry		Expended in Future	guidance, and OTC	be basis for rejection of									
PTSP Name	STIF Funds	Forward	Other Funds	Expenditures	Plan Period	considerations?	Plan.								
Yamhill County Transit	\$ 2,480,558	\$ 2,264,118	\$ 276,320	\$ 5,020,996	\$ 500,000	Yes									
Totals	\$ 2,480,558	\$ 2,264,118	\$ 276,320	\$ 5,020,996	\$ 500,000										

Table 166.

10010 2001														
,	Yamhill County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Measurable Project Benefits and Outcomes													
					Low Income	New Stops	Rides	Students in Grades		Students in				
				People within	Households within	Shared with	Provided to	9-12 Attending a	Students in Grades	Grades 9-12 with				
				1/2 Mile of	1/2 Mile of Transit	Other	Students in	School Served by	9-12 Served by	Free or Reduced				
PTSP Name	Revenue Miles	Revenue Hours	Rides	Transit Stop	Stop	Providers	Grades 9-12	Transit	Demand Response	Fares				
Yamhill County Transit	1,749,933	93,430	660,616	606,095	79,956	5	-	39,092	16,871	-				
Total	1,749,933	93,430	660,616	606,095	79,956	5	-	39,092	16,871	-				

Table 167.

		Yamhill	County	- Statewide	Transpo	nt Fund	- 2021-202	3 Capital	Investment Out	comes		
			Vehicle			Othe	r Assets					
	Gas or			Hybrid-Diesel	Other				Facilities		Signs and Shelters	
	Diesel	CNG	Electric	or Hybrid-Gas	Constructed or							
PTSP Name	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	ve Fuel	Vehicles	Vehicles	Vehicles	or Expanded	Equipment	Updated	Other Assets Description
												Real Time software, mobile ticketing, digital
												display, gate & security system, tenant
Yamhill County Transit	1		-	-	-	1	1	5	25	192	improvements, shelter improvements	
Totals	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	5	25	192	

Table 168.

	Yamhill County - Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund - 2021-2023 Funding Allocated to Key Program Criteria														
	4 1	6		2 F		2 Dadwar fr		4. Procures of L		5. Improves freq	-				
			uency to % of Low-	-		3. Reduces fa communities with		Emission Buses areas with popu		reliability of service communities in		6. Improves co between PTSPs		7. Provides stude	ent transit
	Incom	ncome Households		Income Hous	eholds	Low-Income Ho	useholds	200,000 or	nore	outside of QE's se	ervice area.	fragmentation	of service	for students in g	rades 9-12
			% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF		% of STIF
PTSP Name	Атοι	nt	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget	Amount	budget
Yamhill County Transit	\$ 3,5	34,176	74%	\$ 3,927,176	83%	\$ 109,200	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ 913,369	19%	\$ 667,803	14%	\$ 534,632	11%
Totals	\$ 3,5	34,176	74%	\$ 3,927,176	83%	\$ 109,200	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ 913,369	19%	\$ 667,803	14%	\$ 534,632	11%

APPENDIX A

Public Transportation Advisory Committee Statewide Transportation Improvement Fund Plan Review Subcommittee Charter March 11, 2021

Mission

The PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee's mission is to review and make a recommendation to PTAC on whether to recommend OTC approval of some or all of the STIF Plans submitted by Qualified Entities to receive STIF Formula Funds. This charter provides an overview of the PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee role in this process.

Membership

PTAC STIF Plan Review Subcommittee consists of a minimum of 7 members. Rotating positions are filled by both transportation provider organizations and affiliate groups. The subcommittee will be chaired by a PTAC member, but may include non-PTAC members as co-chair or as subcommittee participants.

Terms of Participation

- Subcommittee members are eligible to serve for two consecutive two-year terms. However, three of the initial subcommittee members will be appointed to one-year terms so that members' terms are staggered.
- Subcommittee members are appointed by the PTAC Chair, in consultation with PTAC.
- Subcommittee members are expected to actively participate in the business of the Subcommittee. A member may be removed or replaced if they are unable to actively participate in the business of the committee.

Responsibilities

The Subcommittee shall be empowered to advise the PTAC on all matters related to the STIF Plans. The Committee shall collaborate with ODOT to facilitate communication of the Subcommittee's recommendations to PTAC. Specific responsibilities include:

- Review ODOT STIF Plan summary reports and STIF Plans, as necessary, to determine whether conditions exist that
 would merit a recommendation that PTAC recommend rejection of all or a portion of the STIF Plan and the rationale
 for such a recommendation.
- Participate in PTAC STIF Plan Subcommittee review meetings, to be scheduled by ODOT.
- Discuss individual findings as a group and reach consensus, if possible, on recommendation to PTAC. If consensus cannot be reached, majority vote rules. The vote and any dissenting opinions will be included in the recommendation for each QE's STIF Plan.
- Recommend to PTAC whether to approve or reject some or all of the STIF Plans, identifying reasons for potential rejection.

Process

- The Subcommittee shall meet or teleconference to receive information about the Subcommittee's charter and STIF Plan review process and schedule.
- The Subcommittee meetings are not public meetings but the PTAC meetings are public meetings.
- Regional Transit Coordinators will attend the review meetings and respond to QE specific questions, if possible.
- ODOT completeness reviewers and PTAC STIF Subcommittee members should be mindful of the roles and levels of authority throughout the Plan review process.

 The Subcommittee's recommendation to PTAC will be a public document and subject to public review and comment, as part of PTAC public review process.

Decision Making

- Subcommittee recommendations will be made by consensus, to the extent possible. When not possible, recommendations will be made by majority rules with votes and dissenting opinions recorded and shared with PTAC.
- A quorum must be present (in-person, or through any other approved meeting format) to vote on issues referred to the PTAC. A quorum is a simple majority plus one of the voting Subcommittee members.

Conflicts of Interest

- Committee members shall discharge their duties in good faith with the care a prudent person in a like position
 would exercise under similar circumstances, and in a manner which the member reasonably believes to be in the
 best interests of public transit.
- Committee members will disclose conflicts of interest prior to participating in a vote and recuse themselves from voting as appropriate.
- Potential personal conflicts of interest identified by members will be resolved as allowed by state law.
- Members will abstain from discussions and votes on their own QE's STIF Plan as well as any STIF Plans of other QE's where the member's QE has an interest in the outcome, such as a project that would benefit the member's agency is included in another QE's STIF Plan.
- OAR 731-001-0007(3) sets out two possible types of "conflict."
 - The first type of conflict is if there is an "actual conflict of interest as defined in ORS 244.020(1)." OAR 731-001-0007(3). ORS 244.020(1) defines "actual conflict" for the Public Ethics Law, excepting from the definition circumstances described in ORS 244.020(13):
 - Any action in the person's official capacity which would affect to the same degree a class consisting of all inhabitants of the state, or a smaller class consisting of an industry, occupation or other group including one of which or in which the person, or the person's relative or business with which the person or the person's relative is associated, is a member or is engaged. The exception would apply when an action applies to the group to the same degree it applies to any individual associate.
 - The second type of conflict is if the effect of the action "would be to the benefit or detriment of a beneficiary to
 whom the member owes a legally imposed duty to act in the best interests of and to whom the member owes
 the highest degree of loyalty." OAR 731-001-0007(3). That "conflict" does not apply to generally applicable
 deliberations and actions that will be applied consistently to all Qualified Entities or all PTSPs.
- Specific to the STIF Plan Review Subcommittee:
 - Members must disclose any affiliation with a Qualified Entity or Public Transportation Service Provider
 - o Members must recuse themselves from any vote specific to that QE's or PTSP's interests
 - Members will not advocate for their own Projects or Plans, or share new information about those Projects or Plans not already included in STIF Plan materials
 - Final recommendations will note any recusals or abstentions