

## Information Item

**DATE:** November 9, 2016  
**TO:** TAC Funding and Programming Committee  
**PREPARED BY:** Joe Barbeau, Senior Planner (651-602-1705)  
**SUBJECT:** Developing Funding Alternatives for the Regional Solicitation

With final scores for the 2016 Regional Solicitation tabulated, the Funding & Programming Committee, TAC, and TAB will turn toward development of funding alternatives. In order to enable TAB to approve final funding options at its January 18, 2017, meeting, Funding & Programming will need to finalize scoring options by its December 15, 2016, meeting. Tasks for today's meeting are as follows:

### Review Preliminary Funding Scenarios:

1. Base Scenario: Focused on the mid-points of the TAB-approved funding ranges (58% for Roadways, 27% for Transit, and 15% for Bicycle/Pedestrian) and then dividing the funding within each mode based on the number of applications received or total federal funding requested in each category compared to the other categories within the same mode.
2. Expansion-Heavy Scenario: Same modal splits as the Base Scenario, but tilted toward expansion projects in the Roadway and Transit modes.
3. Modernization-Heavy Scenario: Same modal splits as the Base Scenario, but tilted toward modernization projects in the Roadway and Transit modes.
4. Transit/Bike/Ped-Heavy Scenario: Based on using the top of the funding range for the Transit (35%) and Bicycle/Pedestrian (20%) modes and the lower end of the range for Roadways (48%). The funding was divided then within each mode based on the number of applications received or total federal funding requested in each category compared to the other categories within the same mode.
5. Roadway-Heavy Scenario: Based on using the top of the funding range in the Roadway mode (68%) and the lower end of the ranges for Transit (22%) and Bicycle/Pedestrian (10%). The funding was divided then within each mode based on the number of applications received or total federal funding requested in each category compared to the other categories within the same mode.

### Review 2022 approach:

As discussed at the last F&P meeting, a limited number of projects for 2022 (the funding is scheduled for 2021 and prior) will be included as part of the funding scenarios. Looking back at the 2014 Regional Solicitation, an additional seven originally unselected projects were funded since the original project selection by TAB. These projects were funded through TAB's Federal Funds Management Process as projects withdrew, scope changes lessened project awards, and other money came to the region. However, it was often difficult for sponsors of originally-unfunded projects to accept funds after not being selected and, usually, discontinuing project development. By selecting a small number of 2022 projects (one per mode) and encouraging sponsors to start working on these projects, the region will be in a better place when reallocation of funds is needed. TAB would encourage the 2022 project sponsors to advance construct their projects in 2021 (this approach would put these projects first in line when a 2021 project in the same mode withdraws, according to TAB's Federal Funds Management Process). The intent of this approach is not to have projects claiming 2022 funds before the next Regional Solicitation is underway, but to have seamless reprogramming of extra funds that meets TAB's general

philosophy of funding projects that have been through a scoring process as opposed to providing more funds to higher-cost projects with federal capacity.

In the funding scenarios developed, one 2022 project was selected per mode. Projects for 2022 were selected primarily based on where there were small scoring gaps between the last funded project and the first unfunded project.

**Identify Other Assumptions or Observations:**

As directed by TAB, all funding scenarios assume that \$2.7 million is allocated off the top to the Travel Behavior Inventory. No other unique projects are shown as funded yet in the scenarios.

Many of the total scores are lower than in previous solicitations. This is largely the result of a change of scoring methodology that allocated scores proportional to the top-scoring project. When the the top-scoring project was an obvious outlier in one or more measures compared to the rest of the projects, then lower scores were seen for the other projects.