

Project Oversight Committee 7/25/2019 Meeting Summary

Members: Loretta Barren (phone), Stuart Basham, Bill Coxe, Joyce Figueroa, Andy Grzymiski, Bjorn Hansen, Ashley Landis, David McDonald, Dana Stoogenke (phone), Bill Thunberg, Andrew Ventresca (phone), Cami Weckerly

Staff: Neil Burke, Erin Kinne, Agustin Rodriguez, Theo Thomson

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
1. Welcome & Introductions		a. Bill Coxe asked POC members to introduce themselves.	Bill Coxe	
2. Fall 2019 Call for Projects Decisions	Finalize the following for presentation to the TCC and Board in August: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modal funding targets for the \$55 million in STBG-DA and TAP-DA that will be made available for programming; • Call for projects open and close dates. Discuss application content.	a. Bill C. began the discussion by recommending that the group develop funding targets for new vs. existing projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic was discussed by the group (see item d.) and they agreed it will return as a future agenda topic. b. The group discussed the need to develop criteria to evaluate shortfall (existing project) applications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Kinne said discussions in recent meetings involved basing the criteria on the volume of applications that are received. • The topic was discussed by the group and it was agreed that draft criteria based on the new-project criteria will be prepared by CRTPO staff and reviewed as a future agenda topic. 	Erin Kinne & Neil Burke	a. & b. Will be upcoming POC agenda topics. Discussion will be aided with a list/chart of already-decided policies and pending decisions. c. Modal funding targets will continue to be 80% roadway and 20% bicycle/pedestrian & transit, but dollar amounts will not be referenced in presentation. d. Neil to ask CAMPO staff about their shortfall funding targets. (Response summarized at bottom of this document.)

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<p>c. Erin showed a pie chart depicting the modal funding targets of 80% roadway and 20% bicycle/pedestrian & transit, which is included in the Discretionary Projects Policy Guide and has been adopted in prior funding rounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The chart also included <1% for local planning projects (\$500,000). • The chart identified the 80/20 dollar amounts for the total of \$55 million that is available in this call for projects. • Bill C. proposed basing the modal target amounts on the total 2019 calendar year available funds of approx. \$110M (includes the spring shortfall call). Since a low percentage of bike/pedestrian projects applied in the spring, this would increase the dollar amount to be targeted for bike/pedestrian & transit this fall. • Stuart said bike/pedestrian projects usually make up about 5% of the STIP. • The group discussed which total amount to consider as the basis for their modal funding targets and did not reach a consensus. The group agreed the modal funding targets will continue to be 80% roadway and 20% bicycle/pedestrian & transit, but dollar amounts will not be referenced in the presentation. <p>d. The group returned to the topic of developing funding targets for new vs. existing projects.</p>		<p>e. Revised language on minimum/maximum request amounts included in August presentations to TCC and Board. On consent agenda for September.</p> <p>f. Call for Projects will open August 19 and close October 31.</p> <p>g. Erin provided POC with link to draft application August 5. Comments and revisions due August 12. Application training webinar will take place in September.</p>

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<p>No specific amounts for these targets were proposed, but the group agreed that this should be discussed and decided before the application review process starts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neil said he will ask CAMPO staff what amount they typically target for shortfalls. Knowing their process may help inform the POC's discussion. • David McDonald said the new policy's contingency requirement should mean lower shortfalls in the future. He also recommended that the POC begin to deprioritize funding shortfalls (vs. new projects) in future funding rounds, as a consequence of this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Other members of the group agreed that should be the direction of future versions of the discretionary funding policies. • Neil said he will ask CAMPO staff what amount or percentage they typically use for shortfalls. Knowing their process may help inform the POC's discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Erin noted that CAMPO has been requiring the contingency percentages in project budgets for several years and have low incidences of shortfall requests now. This is a different stage from CRTPO's policy implementation. ○ CAMPO also requires a 50% match for awarded shortfall funds. 		

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<p>e. Erin showed a pie chart depicting the maximum request amount (\$13,750,000). She showed the text for the minimum/ maximum request amounts in the policy guide and asked if it needed to be reworded.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current wording: “Member jurisdictions may request a minimum discretionary fund amount of \$250,000 and a maximum of not more than 25% of all available funds for the particular federal fiscal year.” • The group agreed that this has been interpreted as a per-project and not a per-jurisdiction limit. The policy document should be amended to clarify this. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed revision for Board approval: “A project application may request a minimum discretionary fund amount of \$250,000 and a maximum of not more than 25% of all available funds for the particular federal fiscal year.” <p>f. Erin proposed opening the call for projects August 19 and closing October 31. The group agreed on these dates.</p> <p>g. Erin will provide POC with link to draft application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The goal is to use one application for all request types (new projects, existing projects, local planning projects). • Feedback will be due by August 12 so final changes can be made that week. 		

Agenda Item	Purpose	Summary/ Decisions	Person Responsible	Follow-Up / Result
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Application training webinar will take place in early September, to allow applicants to review the application and participate with their specific questions. 		
3. Upcoming Issues		The August 22 POC meeting conflicts with Scott Cole's retirement party.	Erin Kinne	August 22 meeting will be rescheduled or cancelled.
2d. Follow-Up / Result	<p>Response from CAMPO staff:</p> <p>We don't use a set aside per se for additional funding requests- we usually just use any funds that are returned if a project comes in under budget or returns its funding altogether. We will also make sure to go up to our 20% overprogramming allowance in STP and TAP in the current fiscal year, so if projects don't meet their authorization deadline within the current fiscal year, we have a little wiggle room with those funds.</p> <p>The way we frame additional funding to our LGAs is that we will award additional funding if it is available, but that is not guaranteed and it also will be at a 50/50 match rate, so they are encouraged to have stronger estimates on the front end.</p>			