

FAST Act Reauthorization Proposal

Priorities	Existing Law (MAP-21)	Final FAST Act
<p>Long-term, well-funded bill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two-year reauthorization • MAP-21 had \$105 billion in funding • \$52.5 billion/year average • Became law in July 2012 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five-year reauthorization, fully paid for (though not with user fees) • DRIVE Act has \$281 billion in new contract authority for the core surface transportation program; the total bill is approximately \$305 million • \$56.2 billion/year average • Uses a variety of pay-fors, including selling oil from SPR and using Federal Reserve surplus funds • Leaves a bigger funding cliff when the next reauthorization is debated
<p>Surface Transportation Program/Surface Transportation Block Grant Program</p> <p>NARC's position: <i>NARC advocated for an increase in base funding for STP and an increase in the STP local share. Both of these are achieved in the FAST Act. Local funding under STP will increase by nearly \$3.4 billion over five years compared to existing funding.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAP-21 provided \$20.1B for STP • Suballocation by population for 50% of the funds; other 50% "anywhere in the state" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renamed Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGPP). This is not expected to result in any changes in how the program operates or funds are distributed. • FAST Act STBGPP Funding (after SPR and TAP are removed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FY15: \$9.9 billion (current year) ○ FY16: \$10.0 billion ○ FY17: \$10.2 billion ○ FY18: \$10.4 billion ○ FY19: \$10.7 billion ○ FY20: \$10.9 billion ○ Five-year total: \$52.2 billion (+6% compared to flat funding; +10% comparing FY20 to FY15) • Increases suballocation by population by 1% per year to 55% by 2020 • FAST Act STBGPP suballocation by year <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FY15: \$4.9 billion (current year) ○ FY16: \$5.2 billion ○ FY17: \$5.4 billion ○ FY18: \$5.6 billion ○ FY19: \$5.8 billion ○ FY20: \$6.1 billion ○ Five-year total: \$28.1 billion (+14% compared to flat funding; +23% comparing FY20 to FY15) • Bridge funding does <u>not</u> come off the top of STBGPP • Maintains all existing eligibilities • Adds several new eligible project categories:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Safe routes to school; ○ Boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate routes or other divided highways; ○ Workforce development, training, and education; ○ Projects that facilitate direct intermodal interchange, transfer, and access into and out of a port terminal; ○ Costs associated with providing Federal credit assistance (TIFIA); and ○ Public-private partnerships
<p>Transportation Alternatives Program</p> <p>NARC’s position: NARC advocated to preserve TAP and increasing funding for the program, which the FAST Act accomplishes.</p> <p><i>We also supported 100% local share and obligation authority for TAP funds which the bill does not contain.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MAP-21 provided \$1.6 billion for TAP (2% takedown of core programs) ● Established that a competitive process is required to distribute funds ● Set suballocation by population at 50%; remaining 50% anywhere in the state 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No longer called TAP. Now referred to as “STP set-aside” (we will continue to refer to it as TAP for the time being) ● FAST Act TAP Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FY15: \$820 million (current year) ○ FYs 16-17: \$835 million per year ○ FYs 18-20: \$850 million per year ○ No longer a takedown of core programs ○ Recreational Trails set-aside maintained as a portion of these funds ● All core elements of the program and existing eligibilities are maintained ● 50/50 suballocation is preserved (<u>not</u> the 100% local suballocation that the Senate bill contained) ● Must continue to use a “competitive process” to distribute funds ● MPOs over 200,000 population may flex 50% of TAP funds for use on any STP-eligible project ● Adds requirement that MPOs must distribute funds “in consultation with the relevant state.”
<p>Metropolitan Planning Funding and Policy</p> <p>NARC position: NARC advocated for a PL funding increase, and for a fix of the transit representation issue (see below), both of which are achieved in the FAST Act.</p> <p><i>We will continue to advocate for additional PL funds, but in the FAST Act PL grew in pace with the rest of the bill.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MAP-21 provided \$625M for metropolitan planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● FAST Act PL Funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ FY15: \$313.6 million (current year) ○ FY16: \$329.3 million ○ FY17: \$335.9 million ○ FY18: \$343.0 million ○ FY19: \$350.4 million ○ FY20: \$358.5 million ○ Five-year total: \$1.7 billion (+10% compared to flat funding; +14% comparing FY20 to FY15) ● Distribution of Metropolitan Planning (PL) funding continues to be based on the amount of PL a state received in 2009. ● Intercity buses and bus facilities added to list of facilities that MPO plans and TIPs should consider (States too) ● “Tourism” and “natural disaster risk reduction” are added to the list of issues on which MPOs are encouraged to consult ● Adds to the list of issues that shall be considered as part of the planning process:

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Improve the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system and reduce or mitigate stormwater impacts of surface transportation;” and ○ “Enhance travel and tourism” ● Adds “intercity bus facilities” to list of transportation facilities that must be identified in a transportation plan; adds to the requirements for capital investment a provision mandating consideration of ways to “reduce the vulnerability of the existing transportation infrastructure to natural disasters;” and adds to a section regarding transportation and transit enhancement a requirement that the plan include “consideration of the role that intercity buses may play in reducing congestion, pollution, and energy consumption in a cost-effective manner and strategies and investments that preserve and enhance intercity bus systems, including systems that are privately owned and operated.” ● Adds “public ports”, “intercity bus operators”, and “employer-based commuting programs” as interested parties that should be given reasonable opportunity to comment on the transportation plan. ● Lists “intercity bus operators;” “employer-based commuting programs such as a carpool program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program;” and “job access projects” as examples of projects under the congestion management process. ● Makes permissible the development of a Congestion Management Plan that “includes projects and strategies that will be considered in the TIP.” Outlines a number of requirements that such a plan will contain and outlines which entities an MPO must consult with. ● Does <u>not</u> strike the congestion management process (as the Senate bill had).
<p>Transit Representation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MAP-21 added a requirement that providers of public transportation be represented on the policy board of MPOs representing TMAs ● Interpreted by DOT (in draft planning rule) to require a change to the enabling statute or MPO bylaws; and that it was impermissible for an elected official to represent their constituents while also serving as the transit representative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Designation or selection of officials shall be determined by an MPO according to the its bylaws or enabling statute ● Subject to the bylaws or enabling statute, a transit representative may also serve as a representative of a local municipality
<p>Bridges NARC position: <i>NARC advocated for additional funding for locally owned bridges without harming suballocation levels under STP, which the FAST Act achieved.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● MAP-21 eliminated the bridge program, leaving certain types of bridges without a funding source. ● Off-system bridge set-aside was preserved, funded with approximately 7.5% of the STP “anywhere in the state” funds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● On-system, non-NHS bridges are now eligible under NHPP ● Off-system bridge set-aside is preserved as in current law

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)

NARC position: *NARC advocated for additional funding for CMAQ and for obligation authority of CMAQ. FAST Act grows CMAQ funding at a slower rate than the rest of the bill and does not include obligation authority.*

- MAP-21 provided \$4.4 billion for CMAQ

- FAST Act CMAQ Funding
 - FY15: \$2.2 billion (current year)
 - FY16: \$2.3 billion
 - FY17: \$2.3 billion
 - FY18: \$2.4 billion
 - FY19: \$2.4 billion
 - FY20: \$2.4 billion
 - Five-year total: \$11.8 billion (+6% compared to flat funding; +10% comparing FY20 to FY15)
- Makes “vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment” and “port-related freight operations” eligible under CMAQ
- Does not include language that would have potentially restricted how funds could be spent in nonattainment areas for PM2.5
- Provides that “priority consideration” of PM2.5 funding does not apply in states with a density of less than 80 persons per square mile under certain circumstances
- Allows for the obligations of PM2.5 funds for port-related equipment and vehicles.