

Project Oversight Committee 7/17/2019 Meeting Summary

Members: Wayne Herron (POC Chair), Loretta Barren (phone), Stuart Basham, Brett Canipe, Scott Cole, Joyce Figueroa (phone), Andy Grzynski, Bjorn Hansen (phone), Ashley Landis, David McDonald, Charlie Menefee, Anil Panicker, Dana Stoogenke, Bill Thunberg, Andrew Ventresca (phone), David Wasserman, Cami Weckerly (phone)

Staff: Curtis Bridges, Neil Burke, Bob Cook, Jovani Jacinto (intern), Erin Kinne, Catherine Mahoney, Theo Thomson

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up Status
1. Welcome & Introductions		a. Wayne Herron asked POC members to introduce themselves.	Wayne Herron	
2. STBG-DA funds for Fall 2019 project call	Continue discussion: How many years of STBG-DA funding allocations should be programmed? ○ Will programming several years' funding with this call for projects drastically reduce the funds in next year's call? ○ Will it force projects funded next year to experience delays of several years?	a. Wayne said the purpose of today's meeting is to determine how much STBG-DA and TAP-DA should be available for programming in the fall call for projects. We need to understand the possible impact on available funds for next year in order to make this decision. b. Ashley Landis summarized the concern that programming 4-5 years' funding could force next year's awarded projects to have delayed starts, as well as our available funding being reduced after this year. c. David Wasserman displayed a series of funding examples in which most new projects spend the bulk of their money (in construction) in FY 2024. We program all three phases at the time of award and reflect changes to year and amount as they occur. He clarified that the snapshot of the unprogrammed funds we are	David Wasserman	a. Agreed to make \$55 million in STBG-DA and TAP-DA funds available for programming in Fall 2019 call for projects. d. & e. POC will revisit these topic within the next two meetings.

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If we cashflow future year funds, is it likely that we eventually won't be able to hold a project call each year (need to skip some years)? 	<p>referencing will change due to unspent funds being reprogrammed into FY 20 and other factors that prompt a balancing of the funds allocated to each fiscal year. He explained that NCDOT can cashflow dollars to different years based on where we need them programmed once we've made our funding decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d. Stuart cautioned against using federal funds for PE due to delays it can cause for project schedules and recommended that local jurisdictions cover PE. Brett asked if the STIP would be able to accurately reflect local match if it is all committed in one phase that does not receive federal funds. Dana raised the concern that this could be cost prohibitive for local jurisdictions. Bill stated that jurisdictions can use on-call contracts when funding locally and would not have to procure services for this phase in the same way NCDOT does when using federal funding. e. Ashley said David W's explanations made her comfortable with programming approx. 4-5 years' worth of funding if years 4 and 5 were tapered (not programmed at 100%). f. Bjorn asked whether the POC is considering moving away from funding all phases of projects in one application, and the consensus was no. CRTPO will continue to program funds for all phases that a project applies for. g. David McDonald addressed the issue of tapering the use of programmable funds and said underfunding can create the problem of having projects waiting for funding. It is better 		

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up Status
		<p>to have projects developed and programmed or overprogrammed. David W. noted that there are occasional awards of extra funding and suggested overprogramming by 10%. Scott noted that this allows NCDOT to adjust project funding as needed. David W. suggested using a dollar figure that covers approx. 5 years of funding and includes overprogramming. As discussed at the last meeting, this would be about \$42M in STBG-DA and \$7M in TAP-DA. The group discussed overprogramming to round up to \$50M, then revised to \$55M.</p> <p>h. Loretta noted that this would probably begin in FY 2022 by the time awards are made so we need to look at when we start the five-year clock. Neil asked if we program the entire amount this year, how much is available for next year, and David W. responded that there will be about \$21-22M additional STBG-DA and TAP-DA funding each year. He added that existing unspent funds will also figure in to the amount available.</p> <p>i. The group was comfortable with an amount of \$55 million for this round of funding. Erin said we'll want to identify the available amount when we announce the call for projects at end of July. Neil said we also need to finalize modal funding targets.</p>		
<p>3. Upcoming Issues</p>		<p>Develop modal funding targets for the fall call for projects, for discussion at next meeting.</p>	<p>Erin and Neil</p>	<p>On agenda for July 25 POC meeting.</p>

Starting Amounts		\$ 9,218	\$ 61,179	\$ 11,703	\$ 10,203	\$ 6,950	\$ 25,700	Total
Project	Phase	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	
Shortfalls			\$ 56,600					
Remaining Available		\$ 9,218	\$ 4,579	\$ 11,703	\$ 10,203	\$ 6,950	\$ 25,700	\$ 68,353
A	PE	\$ 1,000						
	R/W			\$ 3,000				
	CON					\$ 3,000	\$ 3,000	
B	PE	\$ 100						
	R/W		\$ 1,000					
	CON			\$ 2,000				
C	CON	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,500					
D	R/W			\$ 1,500				
	CON				\$ 4,000	\$ 4,000		
E	PE		\$ 500					
	R/W				\$ 1,200		\$ 3,500	
	CON							
Remaining Available		\$ 5,618	\$ 579	\$ 5,203	\$ 5,003	\$ (50)	\$ 19,200	\$ 35,553

2026	2027	2028	2029
\$ 18,200	\$ 18,200	\$ 18,200	\$ 18,200

PROJECT: U-4744
ROUTE: VARIOUS

DESCRIPTION:
 STBG-DA IN CHARLOTTE REGIONAL
 TRANSPORTATION PLANNING
 ORGANIZATION (CRTPO).

LENGTH: MILES
COUNTY:
 IREDELL
 MECKLENBURG
 UNION

%	MPO / RPO	%
40	CHARLOTTE	100
35		
25		

PROJECT BREAKS

BRK	SPOT ID	DESCRIPTION	COUNTY(S)	MPO/RPO(S)	NON COMMITTED / COMMITTED	FUNDING CATEGORY ELIGIBLE / FUNDED	HWY NON	6%															
FUNDING	FY20	FY21	FY22	FY23	FY24	FY25	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	POST YEARS												
BGDA	C	9218	C	61179	C	11703	C	10203	C	6950	C	25700	C	18200	C	18200	C	18200	C	18200			
L	C	2305	C	12236	C	2341	C	2041	C	1390	C	5140	C	3640	C	3640	C	3640	C	3640			

COMMENTS:

FY19

BGDA			
L			

- INTRASTATE SYSTEM
- LOOP PROJECT
- NHS (NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM)
- ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
- FEASIBILITY STUDY PROJECT

SPOT ID

U	PROGRAM
DIV	ELIGIBLE
DIV	FUNDED
HWY	HWY_NON

- 6_PERCENT
- COMMITTED
- NON_COMMITTED

PRIOR YEARS:	
PROGRAMMED:	237,766
POST YEARS:	
TOTAL COST:	237,766