

Area Transportation Partnership (ATP) Managed Program Funding Guidance

The ATP Managed Program is the new name for ATP/Local share of the Federal Target Formula funds provided to the ATPs. Details of this program and funding available for ATP programming is as follows:

FY2015 to 2016

- In the FY2014-FY2017 STIP Funding Guidance, each district revised their FY2016 program to address for funding changes due to MAP-21.
- FY2015 and FY2016 are based on the existing projects programmed in the currently STIP.

FY2017

- The FY2017 ATP Managed Program uses Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding.
- Funding table provides the distribution of funds by population. The ATP is responsible for spending these funds in accordance to the population distribution (e.g., STP-Rural funds need to be spent in areas identified as rural, etc.)
- Urban areas 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.*

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	6.1	2.2	2.9	2.3	2.1	2.3	0	22.5	22.5
*Notes											

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidance
Updated December 5, 2013

FY2018

- The FY2018 ATP Managed Program uses Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding.
- Funding table provides the distribution of funds based on the following factors:
 - 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 (\$ millions) REVISED											
FY2018	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	3.6	1.9	1.1	1.2	0	14.6	14.6
STP - Rural	3.2	2.3	5.1	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.3	2.3	0	22.8	22.8

*Notes

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.
- ATP STP funds may be SWAPPED with District STP funds to balance the "By Population" distribution within an ATP, but the total investments on the local system cannot exceed the total in the table below. The decision to swap funds between District STP and ATP STP is the District Engineer's.

Contact Information

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

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.

FY2015 to 2016

- The FY2015 to 2016 CMAQ program shown in the current STIP should be funded.

FY2017 and 2018

- The FY2017 and FY2018 CMAQ funding table is shown below (TPIC, November 2013)

CMAQ for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 & FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
FY2017								27.1		27.1	27.1
FY2018								27.1		27.1	27.1
*Notes											

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

Corridor Investment Management Strategy (CIMS) Solicitation

CIMS is a corridor-based initiative that brings MnDOT together with its local, modal, and state partners to identify opportunities for collaborative and innovative investment. As part of the overall CIMS initiative and consistent with the Minnesota GO Vision, MnDOT provided \$30 million through a competitive solicitation in 2013 to fund trunk highway projects that improve quality of life, environmental health or economic competitiveness.

FY2015 and 2016

- No funds have been identified for another solicitation in FY2015 and FY2016. (TPIC, November 2010 & November 2011)

FY2017

- \$20 M of State Road Construction (SRC) State Funds has been identified by TPIC for a solicitation program. This program may be CIMS, TED, or both. (TPIC, November 2012)

FY2018

- No funds have been identified for solicitation in FY2018 (TPIC, November 2013)

Additional Information

- The CIMS contribution towards the project cost is capped.+
- Website: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/cims/>

Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – tbd
- Office of Financial Management – Sue Thompson

District Risk Management Program Funding Guidance (DRMP)

The District Risk Management Program is the new name for MnDOT's share of the State and Federal Target Formula 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 are updated each year, though due to the late determination of these factors last year, the "Needs" are the same for FY2018 as FY2017.

Details of this program and funding available for District programming is as follows:

FY2015 to 2016

- In the FY2014-FY2017 STIP Funding Guidance, each district revised their FY2016 program to address for funding changes due to MAP-21.
- For the FY2015-2018 STIP, FY2015 and 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
STP-Statewide (Federal)	16.2	6.1	9.9	7.1	9.3	9.8	6.0	28.5	0	92.9	92.9
State Funds (State)	36.2	13.8	22.3	15.9	20.9	21.9	13.4	64.0	0	208.4	208.4
*Notes											

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
STP-Statewide (Federal)	\$23.2	\$8.8	\$14.3	\$10.1	\$13.3	\$14.0	\$8.6	\$40.9	0	133.2	133.2
State Funds (State)	\$34.4	\$13.1	\$21.2	\$15.0	\$19.8	\$20.8	\$12.7	\$60.7	0	197.6	197.6
*Notes											

Additional Information

- Additional guidance for STP eligible work: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/stp.cfm>
- 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. The District STP funds may be SWAPPED with ATP STP funds to balance the “By Population” distribution within an ATP, but the total investments on the TH system should be less than the totals in the table above. The decision to swap funds between District STP and ATP STP is the District Engineer’s.

Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Trang Chu

DRAFT FY2015 to FY2018 STIP Funding Guidance – Highway/Railroad Grade Crossings

The Highway/Railroad Grade Crossings program will continue with the exceptions/changes noted below:

FY2015 to 2016

- All projects have been selected and will be up to 100% federally funded.

FY2017 to FY2018

- 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 for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 & FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Highway / Rail Grade Crossings									4.9		4.9

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.

Contact Information

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

DRAFT FY2015 to FY2018 STIP Funding Guidance – Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

HSIP Goals identified for each District and ATP based on fatal and serious injury crashes (OTST). HSIP funds will be managed at the statewide level by OTST/OCPPM and unspent HSIP funds will be returned to the statewide program for redistribution.

FY2015 to 2016

- All FY2015 and FY2016 HSIP projects included in the 2014-17 STIP will be funded. In addition, OTST will be holding statewide solicitations for additional HSIP-eligible projects.

FY2017 to FY2018

- The Districts and ATPs will identify a District HSIP setaside equal to their respective HSIP goal plus ten percent state or local funds (match).
 - HSIPs projects **must** be identified in the first two years of the STIP. Over the next two years, Districts and ATPs will select projects based on achieving their HSIP goals:
 - For Greater Minnesota, the statewide HSIP selection committee will review and approve for funding the projects; and
 - In Metro, Met Council will continue to hold a separate HSIP solicitation for all roads.

HSIP - MnDOT and ATP Goals for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 & FY2018	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	0.7	1.9	0.9	1.4	1.0	1.0	3.7	6.9*	11.8	18.7
HSIP - ATP Managed (ATP Goals)	1.3	0.8	2.6	1.1	2.2	1.4	1.1	8.3		18.8	18.8
*Anticipated Section 164 Sanction Funds											

Additional Information

- There are Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Funds.

Contact Information

- Office of Traffic, Safety, and Technology – Brad Estochen

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.

FY2015 to 2017

- All Interstate and NHS pavement preservation projects in the current STIP should be funded.
- Additional guidance regarding cost overruns and supplemental agreements will be developed concurrently with the Materials Office.

FY2018

- The Office of Materials & Road Research will provide the Districts with a list of projects for FY2018.
- 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-Pavement for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
FY2018									145		145
*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

- Office of Materials and Road Research – Curt Turgeon
- Office of Transportation System Management – Trang Chu

Major Regional and Community Improvement Priorities (RCIPs) Commitments

Six projects have been identified as being Major RCIP Commitments. The funding of these projects currently extends beyond the STIP years. These projects will be funded from a statewide program.

FY2015

- US 53 Virginia to Eveleth (**TBD Cap**) – \$90 M Bond Funds (SP 6918-80)

FY2016

- No commitments

FY2017

- TH 60 Windom to Mountain Lake (**\$30 M Cap**) – \$24 M Federal Funds (AC) / \$6 M State Funds (SP 1703-69)
- TH 60 Mountain Lake to Butterfield (**\$4 M Cap**) **Payback** – \$4 M Federal Funds (SP 1703-70)
- I-94/TH 75 Interchange (**\$5 M Cap**) **Payback** – \$5 M Federal Funds (SP 1406-66)

FY2018

- TH 60 Windom to Mountain Lake **Payback** – \$7.2 M Federal Funds (SP 1703-69)
- TH 371 Nisswa to Jenkins (**\$58 M Cap**) – \$46.4 M Federal Funds (AC) / \$11.6 M State Funds (SP 1810-92)

FY2019

- TH 60 Windom to Mountain Lake **Payback** – \$12 M Federal Funds (SP 1703-69)
- TH 371 Nisswa to Jenkins **Payback** – \$13.9 M Federal Funds (SP 1810-92)

FY2020

- TH 60 Windom to Mountain Lake **Payback** – \$4.8 M Federal Funds (SP 1703-69)
- TH 371 Nisswa to Jenkins **Payback** – \$23.2 M Federal Funds (SP 1810-92)

FY2021

- TH 371 Nisswa to Jenkins **Payback** – \$9.3 M Federal Funds (SP 1810-92)

Additional Information

- None

Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Brian Gage, Brad Utecht
- Office of Financial Management – Sue Thompson
- Operations Division – Ed Idzorek

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.

FY2015 to 2016

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

FY2017 to 2018

- Bridge funding has been initially identified by the Bridge Office (see table below).
- NHPP funds will be distributed to the districts based on these needs. The MnDOT Bridge Office and Districts will collaborate to identify FY2017 and FY2018 NHS Bridge projects.
- 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 FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 & FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
FY2017 & FY2018	6.3	9.2	6.3	6.6	20.1	6.7	1.9	23.0		80.1	80.1

*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

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).

FY2015 to 2016

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

FY2017 to 2018

- Metro District Program was increased by \$56 M in FY2017 and \$51 M in FY2018.
- 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
- 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

DRAFT FY2015 to FY2018 STIP Funding Guidance – 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.

FY2015 to 2016

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

FY2017 to FY2018

- MnDOT's State Aid Office for Local Transportation (SALT) will develop a statewide approach to selecting off-system bridges in consultation with the District State Aid Engineers.
- 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).
- At this time, Bridge Sufficiency Rating is no longer part of the criteria for a bridge to receive federal funding.

Off-System Bridges for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions)											
FY2017 & FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	District Total	State Total
Off-System Bridges									4.5		4.5

Additional Information

- STP-Statewide Funds

Contact Information

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

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:

FY2015 to 2016

- FY2015 and FY2016 are based on the existing projects programmed in the currently STIP.

FY2017 to 2018

- The FY2017 and FY2018 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.

TAP for FY2017 & FY2018 (\$ millions) REVISED											
FY2017 & FY2018	ATP 1	ATP 2	ATP 3	ATP 4	ATP 6	ATP 7	ATP 8	Metro	State	ATP Total	State Total
TAP-Statewide	0.4	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.6	0.3	0.3	3.6		6.5	
TAP-Urban								3.3		3.3	
TAP-Small Urban	0.2	.049	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.1		1.4	
TAP-Rural	0.3	0.2	0.5	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2		2.1	
Total TAP to ATP	0.9	0.4	1.6	0.6	1.3	0.7	0.6	7.2		13.3	

*Notes

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
- 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.

FY2015

- \$20 M of State Road Construction (SRC) State Funds was been identified for a TED solicitation program in 2013 Session Law, Chapter 117; \$10 M each year for FY2014 and FY2015. These projects have been selected and should be shown in the STIP.

FY2016

- \$10 M of SRC State Funds has been identified for a TED solicitation program in 2013 Session Law, Chapter 117.

FY2017

- \$10 M of SRC State Funds has been identified for a TED solicitation program in 2013 Session Law, Chapter 117.
- \$20 M of State Road Construction (SRC) State Funds has been identified by TPIC for a solicitation program. This program may be CIMS, TED, or both. (TPIC, November 2012)

FY2018

- \$10 M of State Road Construction (SRC) State Funds has been identified for a solicitation program. (TPIC, November 2013)

Additional Information

- Website: <http://www.dot.state.mn.us/funding/ted.html>

Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – Matt Shands
- Office of Financial Management – Sue Thompson

Inflation Adjustment for FY2015 to FY2018

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 25, 2013.

Recommended Inflation Adjustments				
SFY	2015	2016	2017	2018
Inflation Rate	5%	4%	4%	4%
Multiplier	1.05	1.09	1.14	1.18

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 2015 including SFY 2014 ELLA's, as inflation will most likely be lower than the 5% recommended.

Calculation Example

- Estimate construction costs for all projects, in all years of the 2015-2018 STIP, in current (2014) 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 2015 will be let in calendar year 2015. Therefore we are recommending an inflation factor be applied to the first year of the STIP (FY 2015). Multiply current estimate by 1.05 for FY 2015 projects.
- To adjust the cost estimates for a project in FY 2016, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.09. Use the result as the cost estimate adjusted for expected inflation for FY 2016.
- To adjust cost estimates for the projects programmed for FY 2017, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.14. Use the result as the inflation adjusted cost estimate in FY 2017.
- To adjust the cost estimates for a project programmed in FY 2018, multiply the cost estimates derived in Step 1 by 1.18. Use the result as the inflation adjusted cost estimate in FY 2018.

Additional Information

- Additional information regarding inflation is at:
http://oituxs300:9080/wiki/jsp/Wiki?action=action_view_attachment&attachment=IIa+-+October+2013+Construction+Inflation+STIP%2B6+Guidance+for+SFY+2015+-+2024+%7ETPIC%7E.pdf

Contact Information

- Office of Transportation System Management – John Wilson