Rebalancing will be required *every year* due to returned funds and obligation extension requests

- For 2018, nine projects requested extensions, totaling $14.3 million
- With returns and extensions, the total required to advance into 2018, as of April = $23.8m (*all sources*)
- Reviewed progress reports and reached out to sponsors to find ready to go projects
  - Needed to advance two projects from 2020 to accomplish rebalancing
2018 Rebalancing and Target Delivery

Since rebalancing efforts concluded in early May *(for June 1 PSRC target)*:

- Final 2018 federal allocations received – modest increase in funding over estimates
  - Significant de-obligations of project funding
    - Between November and March - $1.75 million de-obligated, incorporated into rebalancing
    - *Between April and June - $2.1 million de-obligated*
  - New “gap” in achieving target = $3.6 million
2018 Rebalancing and Target Delivery

Solution:

• State target is August 1
  • No time for a STIP amendment
  • All “ready to go” projects had already been utilized for advancement
  • Goal of not straying too far from policies and procedures, yet ensure target is met – no loss of federal funds in our region

• Needed to find a project that could:
  1. absorb additional 2018 federal funds, and
  2. would result in no net increase to the project – i.e., swapping future federal in a later phase for local in a current phase
2018 Rebalancing and Target Delivery

Solution:

- Fife’s Port of Tacoma Road Interchange Improvements project
- 2-stage project
- Total of $11.1 million previously awarded
  - $4.1m to PE and ROW
  - $7.0 m to CN for stage 1
- New 2022 award of $3.62m for CN of stage 2
- Large amount of federal, state and local funds in total project
2018 Rebalancing and Target Delivery

Solution: Fife’s Port of Tacoma Road Interchange Improvements project

• Fife offered to add the $3.6m to stage 1 and obligate immediately
• Local funds will move to stage 2
• No net change to the project
• The project will not recompete for stage 2 construction

• This solution will achieve our target by August 1

• Reminder: how we handle the rebalancing process and target delivery each year will not affect the standard procedure for tracking returned funds and awarding to each forum’s contingency list
2018 Rebalancing and Target Delivery

Future Work and Other Issues:

• The “regular” rebalancing effort earlier this year was difficult
  • Fewer “ready to go” projects – work paused due to projects being moved to a later year
  • Add to that any late-breaking issues = we don’t have enough buffer to ensure our target is met
• Also, significant delivery issues with local agency projects funded with WSDOT managed federal funds
  • We need to ensure the full federal allocation is delivered each year
Future Work and Other Issues:

- Propose we work together in the coming months:
  - identify issues causing lagged delivery
  - brainstorm ideas for Plans B and maybe C for target delivery
    - *How can we be ready and nimble with projects*
    - *How do we develop “ready to go” projects waiting in the queue?*
  - Suggestion – separate working group, including countywide engagement, to report back to RPEC
2018 Project Selection
2018 Project Selection Process

Executive Board approved projects July 26

• Next step is development of Draft 2019-2022 Regional TIP
• To be released for public comment in September
• Adoption in October

Initial debrief items for discussion:

• New features in 2018 – i.e., funding limits, readiness “feasibility,” balancing by year
• Overall thoughts on outcomes
A total of 124 projects were recommended for the available $533 million.

Over 80% of recommended projects include construction / implementation phases.

### Recommended Projects by Major Project Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>2018 Project Selection Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Capital</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.7% 5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle / Pedestrian</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Multimodal: 11.8%
- Transit Capital: 21.2%
- Preservation: 35.8%
- Other: 5.7% 5.1%
- Bicycle / Pedestrian: 13.1%
- Equipment: 8.0%
While “stand-alone” bicycle/pedestrian projects represent 13% of all projects (and 13% of the FHWA funds):

- Over 90% of the remaining projects include some bicycle or pedestrian component – sidewalks, bicycle facilities, pedestrian lighting, curb ramps, bicycle storage, etc.
- These are incorporated into projects containing almost 50% of the total available funding.
PSRC has a large amount of data available to help assess certain issues, or inform discussions; e.g.:

- Geographic data related to freight routes, transit routes, regional centers
- Data by agency – county, size of jurisdiction, etc.
- Financial partnership data

High level comments from Board:

- concern for small jurisdictions
- to the extent possible, coordinate with TIB and other funding partners
- overall positive feedback on results
Next steps:

- Would it still be useful to prepare a debrief survey of participants?
- Are there particular policy issues to be addressed before the next cycle?
  - *e.g.*, readiness, *balancing and delivery*
- Are there data points you would find helpful to review as it relates to project selection processes over time?