



Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee Update

May 16, 2017

Today's Revenue Sharing Program Topics

- **Revenue Sharing Committee Background**
- **Revenue Sharing Committee Recommendations**
- **Draft Policy Review**
- **Next Steps on Guideline Changes**

Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee

- Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee established by Secretary Layne at February CTB meeting
- **Members:**
 - F. Dixon Whitworth, Jr. – Staunton District CTB Member (committee Chair),
 - Court G. Rosen – At-Large Rural CTB member
 - Mary Hughes Hynes – Northern Virginia District CTB member
 - John Malbon – Hampton Roads District CTB member

Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee

COMMITTEE PRIORITIES FOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Emphasize fair and equitable distribution of funds
- Provide a high level of funding predictability and certainty for all stakeholders
- Allow Revenue Sharing allocations to be used as financial leverage for other transportation funding programs
- Ensure the effective use of Revenue Sharing allocations and expeditious completion of Revenue Sharing projects
- Emphasize that allocations are provided to localities for specified projects

Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee

- **Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee Public Meetings:**
 - March 14 – 15
 - April 17
 - May 15
- **Committee provided with survey feedback Local Assistance Division received from localities and districts to assist in their reviews**
- **Committee reviewed historical data to assist in their analysis of the Program**

Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee Allocation Recommendations

- **Reduce the maximum a locality can apply for each fiscal year from \$10M to \$5M**
(\$10M max per biennium)
- **Establish a lifetime allocation maximum of \$10M (state match) per project, including transfers to the project**

Revenue Sharing Study Committee Transfer Recommendations

- *Surplus funds from a completed project can continue to be transferred administratively to an existing revenue sharing project*
 - *District CTB member concurrence will be required as part of documentation*
- *Surplus funds from a cancelled project will be deallocated and go back to the statewide revenue sharing account; these funds can only be reallocated by the CTB*

Revenue Sharing Study Committee Transfer Recommendations (cont)

- All other transfers will be consistent with the current deallocation transfer process which specifies projects must need funds to meet an advertisement or award date within 1 year of request or that address an existing deficit on a completed project (within a locality)
 - District CTB member concurrence will be required if transfer is to an existing revenue sharing project
 - Full CTB approval will be required if transfer is to an existing Six-Year Plan project that has not received prior revenue sharing funds and needs funds to meet advertisement or award date within 1 year of request
 - Any funds transferred from an existing active projects cannot backfilled with future Revenue Sharing funds
 - Transferred funds may be deallocated if project does not meet the 1 year commitment. (The deallocation process is spelled out in Revenue Sharing Guidelines)

Next Steps

- **CTB Policy Change presented at May workshop meeting**
 - **Seek Board concurrence of Policy Changes at June action meeting**
- **Revise Revenue Sharing Program Guidelines to support policy changes as appropriate**
- **Review other items that were discussed regarding future of the Program**
- **Present Revenue Sharing Program Guidelines Update in June**
 - **Approve by July CTB meeting**
- **Notify localities of Policy and Guidelines update**



Revenue Sharing Program Study Committee Update

May 16, 2017