

## Statewide Performance Program (SPP) – Interstate and National Highway System (NHS) Pavement

The Statewide Performance Program (SPP) – Pavement is a statewide program that provides funding for Trunk Highway and Local pavement preservation on the Interstate and National Highway System. This program has the goal of meeting the minimum condition levels for interstate pavements as defined under MAP-21 and meeting the performance targets established by MnDOT for the NHS.

### FY2016 to 2018

- All Interstate and NHS pavement preservation projects in the current 2015-2018 STIP should be funded.
- If a District needs to move an SPP project, they should work with the Office of Materials and Road Research to ensure that there are similar outcomes for the system.
- Additional guidance regarding cost overruns and supplemental agreements will be developed concurrently with the Materials Office.

### FY2019

- The Office of Materials & Road Research will review the previously identified FY 2019 projects from the 2015- 2024 Work Plan. The Office will compare that list of projects to the available funding identified in the table below for FY 2019 and adjust the recommended list in order to ensure that the total number of SPP Pavement projects equals, but does not exceed this target level. This list of projects will then be given to the appropriate districts to be programmed at that level.
- Changes to projects by the districts need to be approved by the Office of Materials & Road Research to ensure that the outcomes for Interstate and NHS pavement are being met while the overall cost of projects does not exceed the budget shown below.
- The state match for these projects are included in the target amount and should not come from the District Risk Management Program.

SPP-Pavement for FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY2019	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	Statewide	District Total	State Total
FY2019	5.8	8.7	22.3	7.0	41.0	6.8	9.5	45.5	2.4	146.6	149
*Notes											

### Additional Information

- The SPP-Pavement program is currently under-programmed for FY 2019. The Office of Materials will work with districts to identify additional projects to meet the program budget.
- This program is funded with National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds. Additional guidance for NHPP eligible work:  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidenhpp.cfm>

## State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidance

Updated December 3, 2014

- If any portion of the work is on or adjacent to the NHPP system, then the whole project is NHPP eligible and should be funded with NHPP funds.

### Contact Information

- Office of Materials and Road Research – Steve Lund
- Office of Transportation System Management – Trang Chu

## Statewide Performance Program (SPP) – National Highway System (NHS) Bridges

The Statewide Performance Program (SPP) – Bridge is a statewide program that provides funding for Trunk Highway and Local Bridges on the National Highway System. This program is transitioning from the Chapter 152 Bridge Program with the goal of meeting the minimum condition levels as defined under MAP-21 and MnSHIP.

### FY 2016 – FY 2018

- All NHS Bridge Projects in the current 2015-2018 STIP should be funded.

### FY 2019

- Bridge funding has been initially identified by the Bridge Office based on projects in the current 10-Year Work Plan (see table below).
- NHPP funds will be distributed to the districts based on these projects. The MnDOT Bridge Office and Districts will collaborate to identify new projects or changes to projects in the existing project list.
- OTSM/OFM will adjust each District SRC Budget.
- The state match for these projects will be provided from the Statewide fund and NOT from the District Risk Management Program.

SPP-Bridge for FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY 2019	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	Statewide	District Total	State Total
FY 2019	5.8	-	6.3	3.4	29.5	16.7	-	18.0	0.3	79.7	80.0
*Notes											

### Additional Information

- This program is funded with National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds. Additional guidance for NHPP eligible work:  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidenhpp.cfm>
- If any portion of the work is on or adjacent to the NHPP system, then the whole project is NHPP eligible and should be funded with NHPP funds.

### Contact Information

- Bridge Office, Planning and Hydraulics – Petra DeWall
- Office of Transportation System Management – Brad Utecht

## Statewide Performance Program (SPP) – National Highway System (NHS) Performance/Mobility

A statewide program to address the NHS Performance has been established to move towards the anticipated performance objectives of MAP-21. Initial investments address Metro Reliability. Future investments may consider statewide performance (once MAP-21 performance measures are defined).

### FY 2016

- Metro District received an additional \$20 M per year for FY2014-FY2016. These projects should be in STIP.

### FY2017 to 2019

- Metro District Program's was increased in FY2017 and beyond by about \$30 M.
- This program may be over-matched to optimize MnDOT's overall capital program (estimate) –
  - FY2017: \$35.6 M Federal Funds / \$20.4 M State Funds
  - FY2018: \$36.2 M Federal Funds / \$14.9 M State Funds
  - FY2019: \$42.4 M Federal Funds / \$10.6 M State Funds
- The state match for these projects will be provided from the Statewide fund and NOT from the District Risk Management Program.

### Additional Information

- This program is funded with National Highway Performance Program (NHPP) funds. Additional guidance for NHPP eligible work:  
<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidenhpp.cfm>
- If any portion of the work is on or adjacent to the NHPP system, then the whole project is NHPP eligible and should be funded with NHPP funds.

### Contact Information

- Metro District, Office of Planning, Program Management, and Transit – Brian Isaacson
- Office of Transportation System Management – Brian Gage

## District Risk Management Program Funding Guidance (DRMP)

The District Risk Management Program is MnDOT’s share of the State and Federal funds provided to the Districts. The distribution is based on the following factors:

- 20% – Non-Principal Pavement Needs
- 20% – Non-Principal Bridge Needs
- 30% – Trunk Highway Lane Miles
- 24% – Trunk Highway Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)
- 6% – Trunk Highway Heavy Commercial Vehicle Miles Traveled (HCVMT)

The “Needs” factors were updated for FY2017.

### FY2016

- In the FY2014-FY2017 STIP Funding Guidance, each district revised their FY2016 program to address for funding changes due to MAP-21.
- For the FY2016 to 2019 STIP, FY2016 are based on the existing projects programmed in the currently STIP.

### FY2017

- The table below provides the STP and State funds available to the Districts for FY2017.

DRMP for FY2017 (\$ millions)											
FY2017	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Federal Funds	16.2	6.1	9.9	7.1	9.3	9.8	6.0	28.5	0	92.9	92.9
State Funds	36.2	13.8	22.3	15.9	20.9	21.9	13.4	64.0	0	208.4	208.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>52.4</b>	<b>19.9</b>	<b>32.2</b>	<b>23.0</b>	<b>30.2</b>	<b>31.7</b>	<b>19.4</b>	<b>92.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>301.3</b>	<b>301.3</b>
<i>May not total correctly due to rounding. The numbers shown in this table are hard targets and should not be exceeded</i>											

## State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidance

Updated November 21, 2014

### FY2018

- The table below provides the STP and State funds available to the Districts for FY2018.

DRMP for FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Federal Funds	23.2	8.8	14.3	10.1	13.3	14.0	8.6	40.9	0	133.2	133.2
State Funds	34.4	13.1	21.2	15.0	19.8	20.8	12.7	60.7	0	197.6	197.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>57.6</b>	<b>21.9</b>	<b>35.5</b>	<b>25.1</b>	<b>33.1</b>	<b>34.8</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>101.6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>330.8</b>	<b>330.8</b>

*May not total correctly due to rounding.  
The numbers shown in this table are hard targets and should not be exceeded.*

### FY2019

- The table below provides the STP and State funds available to the Districts for FY2019.

DRMP for FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY2019	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Federal Funds	21.3	8.1	13.1	9.3	12.3	12.9	7.9	37.6	0	122.5	122.5
State Funds	39.6	15.0	24.4	17.3	22.8	23.9	14.6	69.9	0	227.6	227.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>60.9</b>	<b>23.1</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>26.6</b>	<b>35.0</b>	<b>36.8</b>	<b>22.5</b>	<b>107.5</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>350.1</b>	<b>350.1</b>

*May not total correctly due to rounding.  
The numbers shown in this table are hard targets and should not be exceeded.*

### Additional Information

- Additional guidance for STP eligible work: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/stp.cfm>
- Federal funds may be either NHPP (for NHS routes) or STP (for non-NHS routes).
- Regional & Community Investment Priorities Expectations – District RCIP investments should be approximately 2% of the combined total of STP and State funds in table above.
- Safety – Additional investments above the HSIP Goal may be used to address sustainable crash locations (as defined and calculated through OTST process).
- Use of District Risk Management Program Funds for non-TH work – The funds identified in the table above is to be used on the TH system and not on any local system..

### Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Trang Chu

## Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) Managed Program Funding Guidance for Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds

The ATP Managed Program is made up of four parts (STP funds, HSIP funds, TAP funds, and CMAQ funds) that together represents the ATP/Local share of the Federal Target Formula funds provided to the ATPs. The details presented here are for the **STP share** of the ATP Managed Program.

Minnesota receives STP Funding designated for use on federal-aid eligible roads based on the distribution of roads by population. Minnesota, specifically MnDOT, is responsible for overseeing the spending these funds in accordance to the population distribution (e.g., STP-Rural funds need to spent in areas identified as rural, etc.). While MnDOT recommends that the ATPs take the distribution of funds into consideration when selecting projects, MAP-21 provides Minnesota sufficient flexibility to allow the ATPs to select the best projects for their region without matching the funding distribution exactly.

Population designations are defined in Federal-aid highway law (Section 101 of Title 23, U.S. Code) as follows:

- "The term 'urban area' means an urbanized area or, in the case of an urbanized area encompassing more than one State, that part of the urbanized area in each such State, or an urban place as designated by the Bureau of the Census having a population of five thousand or more and not within any urbanized area, within boundaries to be fixed by responsible State and local officials in cooperation with each other, subject to approval by the Secretary. Such boundaries shall, as a minimum, encompass the entire urban place designated by the Bureau of the Census."
- Small urban areas are those urban places, as designated by the Bureau of the Census having a population of five thousand (5,000) or more and not within any urbanized area. Urbanized areas are designated as such by the Bureau of the Census.
- Rural areas comprise the areas outside the boundaries of small urban and urbanized areas, as defined above.

### FY 2016

- In the FY2014-FY2017 STIP Funding Guidance, each district revised their FY2016 program to address for funding changes due to MAP-21.
- All FY2016 projects included in the FY2015 to 2018 STIP will be funded at that programmed level in the FY2016-2019 STIP.

**State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidance**  
Updated November 21, 2014

**FY2017**

- The FY2017 ATP Managed Program for Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding using the population distribution identified under MAP-21.

ATP Managed Program for FY2017 (\$ millions)											
FY2017	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	ATP Total	State Total
STP - Urban								37.3	0	37.3	37.3
STP - Small Urban	2.1	0.6	2.9	1.2	4.1	1.7	0.9	1.2	0	14.7	14.7
STP - Rural	2.9	1.7	6.2	2.2	2.9	2.3	2.1	2.3	0	22.7	22.7
<b>STP Total for ATP</b>	<b>5.0</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>9.1</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>40.9</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74.8</b>	<b>74.8</b>
<p><i>May not total correctly due to rounding. The splits between urban and rural are goals, however the STP Total for ATP is a hard target.</i></p>											

**FY2018 and FY2019**

- The FY2018 and FY2019 ATP Managed Program for Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding is distributed as follows:
  - 50% - Distributed by ATP population consistent with the 2010 Census; distributed by the definitions for rural, small urban, and urban as defined in MAP-21; and
  - 50% - Distributed by the average of the ATPs' CSAH and MSAS Needs as calculated by MnDOT's State Aid for Local Transportation (SALT).
- The ATP should use the distribution shown below as **general guidance** for how the funds should be spent (e.g., STP-Rural funds should be spent in areas identified as rural, etc.).

ATP Managed Program for FY2018 and FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY2018 and FY2019	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	ATP Total	State Total
STP - Urban								37.3	0	37.3	37.3
STP - Small Urban	2.2	0.8	2.5	1.3	3.7	1.9	1.1	1.2	0	14.6	14.6
STP - Rural	3.2	2.3	5.1	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.3	0	23.0	23.0
<b>STP Total for ATP</b>	<b>5.4</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>7.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>74.8</b>	<b>74.8</b>
<p><i>May not total correctly due to rounding. The splits between urban and rural are goals, however the STP Total for ATP is a hard target.</i></p>											

**Additional Information**

- Additional guidance for STP eligible work: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/stp.cfm>
- Local Transit Capital Programs – ATP must continue some level of commitment (greater than zero) for local transit programs. In Greater Minnesota, Local Transit Capital Programs may be funded with either STP-Small Urban or STP-Rural funds.

**Contact Information**

- Office of Transportation System Management – Trang Chu
- State Aid for Local Transportation – Merry Daher

## **Off-System Bridges**

MAP-21 off-system bridge apportionment is to be used for bridges that are not on a federal-aid highway (i.e., for bridges on local roads or rural minor collectors). Federal-aid eligible bridges will be funded through STP and NHPP apportionment. STP funds must be used for non-NHS, federal-aid highway bridges, and NHPP funds will be used for NHS bridges.

### **FY 2016**

- Existing Off-system bridge projects in the current STIP will be funded.

### **FY2017, FY2018, & FY2019**

- MAP-21 off-system bridge apportionment is to be used for bridges that are not on a federal-aid highway (i.e. bridges on local roads or rural minor collectors).
- MnDOT's State Aid Office for Local Transportation (SALT) has developed a statewide approach to selecting off-system bridges in consultation with the District State Aid Engineers. This program will select off-system bridges through a solicitation process for submission in the draft ATIPs. The funding level for this program is \$5,300,000 per year in federal funds. These federal funds require a 20% local match.
- Bridge Sufficiency Rating is no longer part of the criteria for a bridge to receive federal funding.

### **Additional Information**

- STP-Statewide Funds

### **Contact Information**

- State Aid for Local Transportation (SALT) – Patti Loken

## FY2016 to FY2019 STIP Funding Guidance – Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and Section 164 Sanction Funds

HSIP **Goals** identified for each District and ATP based on fatal and serious injury crashes (OTST). For Greater Minnesota, the statewide HSIP selection committee will review submitted projects and recommend approval for funding the District and ATP HSIP projects. In Metro, the Met Council will continue to hold a separate HSIP solicitation process for all roads. As a reminder, these are **Goals** and not hard targets, so it is not necessary for a District to spend exactly the amount should below.

Section 164 Sanction funds are special federal funds that come to Minnesota separate from other federal funds. OTST will work with the Districts to select the projects for FY2016. These projects may be funded at 100% Federal; please confirm with OTST whether your projects are 100% Federal or if they are 90%/10% Federal/Match.

### LETTING INFO:

Lettings for Section 164 Sanction fund projects should be distributed at follows:

- Third Quarter SFY – 40% of anticipated funding (\$2.8 M)
- Fourth Quarter SFY – 60% of anticipated funding including one “bubble project” identified by OTST (\$4.1 M)

### FY 2016

- All FY2016 projects included in the FY2015 to 2018 STIP will be funded at that programmed level in the 2016-2019 STIP.

### FY 2017

- For FY 2017 the Districts and ATPs will identify actual projects in the FY2016 to 2019 STIP equal to the HSIP investment goal listed in the below table **plus** an additional ten percent of state or local funds for the match.

### FY 2018 & FY 2019

- For FY 2018 and FY 2019 the Districts and ATPs will identify either District HSIP set-a-sides or actual projects equal to their respective HSIP investment goal listed in the below table **plus** an additional ten percent of state or local funds for the match.

MnDOT and ATP HSIP Investment Goals for FY2017, FY2018, & 2019 (\$ millions)											
	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
HSIP - District Managed (MnDOT Goals)	1.2	0.6	1.8	0.9	1.4	1.0	1.0	3.6	6.9*	11.4	18.3
HSIP - ATP Managed (ATP Goals)	1.3	0.8	2.6	1.1	2.1	1.4	1.1	8.0		18.4	18.4

\*Anticipated Section 164 Sanction Funds  
*The goals have been adjusted from FY2015 to 2018 goals to align with updated MAP-21 Apportionment*

**Additional Information**

- These are Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Funds and should be shown as HSIP in the STIP.

**Contact Information**

- Office of Traffic, Safety, and Technology (OTST) – Brad Estochen

## Highway/Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Program

Projects for the Highway/Railroad Grade Crossing Safety Program will continue to be recommended by MnDOT's Office of Freight and Commercial Vehicle Operations.

### FY 2016

- All projects in the previous 2015-2018 STIP will be 100% federally funded and included in the FY 2016-2019 STIP.

### FY2017, FY2018, & FY2019

- Rail Crossing needs will be determined by the OFCVO-Railroad Administration Unit;
- OFCVO will lead an annual solicitation process and distribute Rail Grade Crossing funds; and
- Program distributed through statewide solicitation at 100% Federal funds.

Highway/Rail Grade Crossings Safety Target for FY2017, FY2018, & FY 2019 (\$ millions)											
	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Highway / Rail Grade Crossings									5.4		5.4
<p><i>May not total correctly due to rounding. The numbers shown in this table are targets; they are not hard numbers that have to hit exactly.</i></p>											

### Additional Information

- OFCVO will align solicitations and select projects with the development of the draft/final STIP.
- These are Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Funds.
- These projects will be shown in the STIP as FHWA Target Funds, but the projects will all be Advance Construction when authorized by the Project Authorization Unit.

### Contact Information

- Office of Freight and Commercial Vehicle Operations, Railroad Administration –Paul DeLaRosa
- Office of Transportation System Management – Brian Gage

## Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)

Under MAP-21, transportation enhancements, scenic byways, safe routes to school, and several other discretionary programs have been grouped together under the Transportation Alternatives Program. These funds are provided to the ATPs. Guidance and funding for TAP is as follows:

### FY2016 to FY2018

- FY2016 to FY2018 are based on the existing projects programmed in the currently STIP.
- For FY2017 and FY2018 anticipated apportionment has been revised to be consistent with the level of funding Minnesota actually is receiving under MAP-21. As a result the amounts shown are slightly less than in last year's guidance. ATP should NOT adjust their projects; the difference is too small.

### FYU2019

- The FY2019 TAP funding table provides the distribution of funds by population. MnDOT recognizes that this distribution may limit the ability for an ATP to best utilize these funds, therefore even though the ATPs are responsible for managing their own competitive grant process, the funds will be balanced at a statewide level by OTSM.
- The table below reflects a slight reduction due to the actual MAP-21 Apportionments Minnesota is receiving. Please remember that these are soft targets and the ATPs goal is to identify projects close to the targets shown below, not necessarily hitting the amount exactly.
- The table below shows a slight reduction for ATP 6, ATP 7, and Metro. Taking into account the historical difficulties related to delivering TAP projects, these ATPs may consider slightly over programming to the FY2017/FY2018 levels.

TAP for FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY2019	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	DNR	ATP Total	State Total
TAP-Statewide	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	3.5	2.2	6.4	8.6
TAP-Urban								3.2		3.3	3.3
TAP-Small Urban	0.2	.05	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1		1.3	1.3
TAP-Rural	0.3	0.15	0.5	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2		1.9	1.9
<b>Total TAP to ATP</b>	<b>0.9</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>7.0</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>12.9</b>	<b>15.1</b>
<p><i>May not total correctly due to rounding. The numbers shown in this table are a general target and do not have to be exactly the amount shown.</i></p>											

### Additional Information

- Additional guidance for TAP eligible work: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/tap.cfm>

**Contact Information**

- Office of Transportation System Management – Chris Berrens and Katie Caskey
- Office of Transit – Tim Mitchell
- State Aid for Local Transportation (SALT) – x

## Transportation Economic Development (TED) Program

The Transportation Economic Development Program is a joint effort of the Department of Transportation and the Department of Employment and Economic Development. The program's purpose is to fund construction, reconstruction, and improvement of state and local transportation infrastructure in order to:

- create and preserve jobs
- improve the state's economic competitiveness
- increase the tax base
- accelerate transportation improvements to enhance safety and mobility
- promote partnerships with the private sector

The program provides state funding to close financing gaps for transportation infrastructure improvement construction costs. These improvements will enhance the statewide transportation network while promoting economic growth through the preservation or expansion of an existing business--or development of a new business.

### FY2016 to FY2019

- \$10 M per year of SRC State Funds has been identified for a TED solicitation program in 2013 Session Law, Chapter 117. In addition about \$5 M of FY2015 funds are still available. Under the current legislation these funds are available until spent.
- OTSM will develop a multi-year solicitation program in the Spring of CY2015 for this program. Depending on the outcome of the solicitation, TED projects will either be amended into the STIP or added to the FY2017 to 2020 STIP next year.
- At this time only one remaining TED project will be in the STIP (SP 3505-32).

### Additional Information

- These funds are State Funds (SF).
- Website: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/funding/ted.html>

### Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Patrick Weidemann
- Office of Financial Management – Sue Thompson

## Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) Program

The CMAQ program is continued in MAP-21 to provide a flexible funding source to State and local governments for transportation projects and programs to help meet the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Funding is available to reduce congestion and improve air quality for areas that do not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, or particulate matter (nonattainment areas) and for former nonattainment areas that are now in compliance (maintenance areas). Currently only the Metro District/Met Council is eligible for these funds.

### FY2016

- The 2016 CMAQ program shown in the current STIP should be funded.

### FY2017 to FY2019

- The CMAQ funding table is shown below. This amount has been revised based on adjustments in the MAP-21 Apportionment levels (from \$27.1M to \$27.6M).

CMAQ for FY2017 to FY2019 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 to FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
CMAQ								27.6		27.6	27.6
<i>May not total correctly due to rounding.</i>											

### Additional Information

- Guidance for CMAQ eligible work: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/cmaq.cfm>

### Contact Information

- Metro District, Office of Planning, Program Management, and Transit – Pat Bursaw

## Federal Funding Contingency for FY2016

ATPs are required to identify 30% of their FY 2016 projects as contingent should actual Federal appropriations to Minnesota decline. Each ATP should identify projects equaling 30% of their targeted federal funds (state and local) for the contingency. These projects should not have lettings before **February 1, 2016**. With the Balanced Letting Schedule, the MnDOT projects identified as contingency may include all of end of the fiscal year projects.

Please submit this list to the Office of Transportation System Management (Trang Chu) by July 6, 2015.

### Additional Information

- ATP 1 - \$17 M
- ATP 2 - \$7 M
- ATP 3 - \$18 M
- ATP 4 - \$10 M
- ATP 6 - \$21 M
- ATP 7 - \$8 M
- ATP 8 - \$8 M
- Metro - \$63 M
- Total - \$153 M

### Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Brian Gage

## Inflation Adjustment for FY2016 to FY2019

The Districts will need to adjust construction estimates to nominal values (inflated values). The inflation rates shown in the following table were approved by TPIC on October 16, 2014.

Recommended Inflation Adjustments				
SFY	2016	2017	2018	2019
Inflation Rate	4%	5%	4%	5%
Multiplier	1.04	1.09	1.14	1.19

Conversion of construction cost estimates to year of construction dollars can be done by following the procedure below. Please use your discretion when determining inflation on projects with known let dates early in SFY 2016 including SFY 2015 ELLA's, as inflation will most likely be lower than the 4% recommended.

### Calculation Example

- Estimate construction costs for all projects, in all years of the FY2016 to 2019 STIP, in current (FY2015) dollars. That is, as if all of the projects were to be programmed in the first year of the STIP.
- Many of the projects in SFY 2016 will be let in calendar year 2016. Therefore we are recommending an inflation factor be applied to the first year of the STIP (FY 2016). Multiply current estimate by 1.04 for FY 2016 projects.
- To adjust the cost estimates for a project in FY 2017, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.09. Use the result as the cost estimate adjusted for expected inflation for FY 2017.
- To adjust cost estimates for the projects programmed for FY 2018, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.14. Use the result as the inflation adjusted cost estimate in FY 2018.
- To adjust the cost estimates for a project programmed in FY 2019, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.19. Use the result as the inflation adjusted cost estimate in FY 2019.

### Additional Information

- Additional information regarding inflation is at:

[http://oituxs300:9080/wiki/jsp/Wiki?action=action\\_view\\_attachment&attachment=IVa+-+October+2014+Construction+Inflation+Forecast.pdf](http://oituxs300:9080/wiki/jsp/Wiki?action=action_view_attachment&attachment=IVa+-+October+2014+Construction+Inflation+Forecast.pdf)

### Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – John Wilson