

**Transportation Advisory Board**  
of the Metropolitan Council of the Twin Cities

---

**ACTION TRANSMITTAL**

No. 2010-67

**DATE:** November 10, 2010  
**TO:** Transportation Advisory Board  
**FROM:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**SUBJECT:** Process for Distributing Additional Fiscal Year 2011 Federal Funds  
**MOTION:** Recommend two options with no preference for the TAB to consider in distributing additional federal funds:

- The first option is to pay off advance construction scheduled for 2014 and add those funds to the next solicitation for 2014.
- The second option is to award each of the smaller counties (Carver, Scott, Washington and Chisago) a minimum of \$750,000, and the rest of the funds should be distributed to the remaining four counties based on the state aid formula, with an emphasis on unfunded pavement preservation, ADA retrofit, or safety projects that require no environmental review or temporary or permanent right-of-way acquisition.

**BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF ACTION:** Minnesota is projected to receive approximately \$95 million in extra federal formula transportation funds in Federal Fiscal Year 2011 because there were no earmark projects for this year. MN/DOT has determined that \$24 million will be provided to their local partners, split 50/50 between the Metro District and Greater Minnesota. Approximately \$12 million will be available to the 8-county Metro District. Projects using these funds must be let by September 15, 2011 to avoid loss of budget authority.

The TAC Funding & Programming Committee had a lengthy discussion on options for the TAB to consider. The **first option** in the motion was attractive to many members of the committee because it would allow the region to use its accepted process for distributing federal funds (the regional solicitation). Deciding on this option would mean that in 2011 the region would solicit for projects to be authorized in 2014 in addition to 2015 and 2016. There was some concern among members on the committee that choosing this option would not create any new projects in the near term to take advantage of a favorable bid climate. The **second option** in the motion would divide the funding among the counties for projects that would be ready for letting by the September 15, 2011 deadline. The original motion from TAC Funding & Programming Committee was to split the funds evenly among the seven metro counties after MN/DOT provided a portion of the funds to Chisago County, and consult with cities and transit agencies on project selection. After discussion at the TAC meeting, the second option was changed as described above to be more equitable to the larger counties and to remove the city and transit agency consultation because there is not enough funding to meet their expectations.

The technical committees also considered an option to move a local project or MN/DOT project up in the TIP, which would create a new project in 2011 to take advantage of a favorable bid climate. MN/DOT Metro District did not think they had any more projects to advance into 2011 and felt it was unlikely that any local projects were ready to be advanced, and it was not included in the motion.

---

**ROUTING**

<b>TO</b>	<b>ACTION REQUESTED</b>	<b>DATE COMPLETED</b>
TAC Funding & Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	October 21, 2010
Technical Advisory Committee	Review & Recommend	November 3, 2010
TAB Programming Committee	Review & Recommend	
Transportation Advisory Board	Review & Adopt	



## Minnesota Department of Transportation

### Memo

Mail Stop 440, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor South  
395 John Ireland Blvd.  
St. Paul, MN 55155

Office Telephone: (651) 366-3770  
September 28, 2010

To: Transportation District Engineers  
Transportation Program Investment Committee

From: Abby McKenzie,  
Director, OCPPM

Subject: Guidance for FFY 11 additional funds

It is projected that Minnesota will receive an additional \$95M of federal funds in FFY11. Of that \$71M will go to MnDOT and \$24M will go to our local partners. This \$24M will be split 50/50 between Metro and Greater Mn. The outstate projects will be selected centrally by state aid with locals providing the match. TPIC has committed \$25M of TH bonds from Chapter 388, as a match to MnDOT's federal funds, for a total of \$96M of funds above our current program level.

Over the past six weeks, MnDOT has conducted a comprehensive program risk assessment to identify where additional funds should be directed. Preliminary results indicate the risk of deteriorating pavement condition was the highest risk program area and also that investments would be valuable for ensuring public trust and confidence, quality of life, and Mn/DOT's strategic vision. The risk assessment process is not complete and identifies other risk areas that must be incorporated into our long-term balanced investment approach. With funding for some RCIPs occurring through two interchange programs in FY2011 and bridges addressed with Chptr 152 bonds, there was agreement to direct FFY11 additional funds to pavements.

As a result, TPIC has determined that pavement investments should be identified in your District that meet the following criteria:

- Project(s) cost equal to your District share of the funds, adjusted to account for Metro payback of \$4M to Greater Mn Districts from FY10 additional federal funds. (See table below)
- Funds below include match for MnDOT costs. ( Districts do not need to provide match)
- Funds below cannot be used to cover local share of project costs. These are MnDOT funds only.
- Project should be a 20 yr. pavement investment for example white topping, reclamation, or concrete unbonded overlay.
- Project must be let by Sept. 15, 2011. This includes STIP amendment, plans approved and project authorized. Any project let during SFY 2011, must be delivered on time, to avoid loss of budget authority.
- If a pavement project is advanced from the STIP, it must be backfilled with another pavement project.
- As in the past, Districts will work in partnership with the Materials Office to identify and develop the proposed project.
- Appropriate safety and ADA elements should be included in the proposed project.

DISTRICT	FUNDS (\$Millions) adj for Metro payback
1	11.1
2	6.1
3	10.6
4	6.6

DISTRICT	FUNDS (\$Millions) adj for Metro payback
6	12.0
7	6.8
8	5.8
M	37.0

**Please complete the attached spreadsheet for your selected project. Submit your completed spreadsheet to Bob Hofstad by October 30, 2010. If you have any questions please contact me or Bob Hofstad. Thank you.**

