

**From:** [Nordholm, Gail \[DOT\]](#)  
**To:** [Nordholm, Gail \[DOT\]](#)  
**Subject:** HBP Fiscal Constraint - Final Targets for FY 2012-2015  
**Date:** Thursday, March 24, 2011 9:19:00 AM

---

**TO:** County Engineers

**CC:** District Local Systems Engineers, Service Bureau,  
and Office of Local Systems

**FROM:** Office of Local Systems

**SUBJECT:** HBP Fiscal Constraint - Final Targets for FY 2012-2015

**DATE:** March 24, 2011

The purpose of this note is to communicate some very important information regarding the county Highway Bridge Program (HBP) **Final funding targets** and the new fiscal constraint procedures for programming county HBP funds in the FY 2012-2015 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).

#### HBP Funding Targets

The spreadsheet at the following link shows the **Final** HBP funding targets for FY 2012-2015. Please use these targets as a guide as you plan your program of bridges that will use HBP funds.

[http://www.iowadot.gov/local\\_systems/mailling/2011/march/hbp\\_fy2012\\_targets\\_3-21-11.pdf](http://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/mailling/2011/march/hbp_fy2012_targets_3-21-11.pdf)

There are several important things to note about the targets:

1. These targets are based on a total estimated annual allocation to counties of \$28 million. This is less than the actual amount allocated to counties in FY 2010, but given the current uncertainties about Federal funding, we feel that a conservative estimate should be used for programming purposes.
2. Each county's targets are estimated using its beginning balance, projects let to-date, projects in development, and its estimated annual allocations. The amounts shown for the projects in development for FY 2011 are based on what is currently shown in TPMS Development for the April through October 2011 lettings.
3. If your target is higher than what you plan to let in a given fiscal year, then only program what you think you will realistically let in that year. If you are under programmed, that is okay. Being under programmed helps allow other counties

to program more than their target, either because they have a small target amount, or they have a large bridge that may take all four years of their target amounts.

4. When looking at which bridges to program, make sure you are being realistic and only program bridges with a reasonable chance of making it to letting within the fiscal year the funds are programmed. You can program more than your target, just keep in mind that you may have to reduce your program if the counties as a whole come in over programmed.
5. There are a few counties that are currently borrowed ahead enough that their targets for all four years, as well as their total target, is \$0.00. This does not mean that such counties can't program any bridges, it just means that if the counties as a whole come in over programmed, these counties will be required to make a proportionally larger reduction in the amount of HBP funds programmed.
6. Counties can now decide which bridge projects to promote from the County Five Year Program (CFYP) to the RPA's draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for inclusion in the STIP. If your project has already been let, but is still included in the CFYP, **do not include it in the TIP**. The Service Bureau has added a feature in TPMS for counties to promote the bridges to the TIP. Counties should be selective about which projects they submit for inclusion in the TIP.

#### HBP Fiscal Constraint Requirements

The document at the following link provides some background explaining the fiscal constraint requirements. This document also outlines the process we will use to review county HBP programming in the 2012-2015 STIP to ensure fiscal constraint is met for the counties as whole. Please review this document carefully.

[http://www.iowadot.gov/local\\_systems/mailling/2011/march/hbp\\_fiscal\\_constraint\\_requirements.pdf](http://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/mailling/2011/march/hbp_fiscal_constraint_requirements.pdf)

If you have any questions, **please do not reply to this note**. Instead, you may contact me as shown below.

Thank you,

Nicole Fox  
Office of Local Systems  
Phone: 515-239-1506  
[nicole.fox@dot.iowa.gov](mailto:nicole.fox@dot.iowa.gov)

Some of the documents referenced above are in Adobe Acrobat's Portable Document Format (PDF). If you do not have the Adobe Acrobat Reader software, you can download it free of charge at:

<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>.

Mailings are available at the Office of Local Systems Weekly Mailings web page  
at: [http://www.iowadot.gov/local\\_systems/mailing/main\\_mailing.htm](http://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/mailing/main_mailing.htm)

# County Highway Bridge Program Funding Targets FY 2012-2015

All numbers in \$1000s

21-Mar-11

County	FY11 Beginning Balance	Projects let in FY11 to date	Projects in		Estimated Annual Allocation	FY12 Target	FY13 Target	FY14 Target	FY15 Target	4 year Target
			TPMS Development for FY11	FY11 Ending Balance						
Adair	\$702	\$0	\$1,043	(\$341)	\$292	\$0	\$243	\$292	\$292	\$827
Adams	\$972	\$0	\$0	\$972	\$289	\$1,262	\$289	\$289	\$289	\$2,130
Allamakee	\$317	\$0	\$0	\$317	\$199	\$515	\$199	\$199	\$199	\$1,112
Appanoose	\$302	\$264	\$432	(\$394)	\$232	\$0	\$70	\$232	\$232	\$533
Audubon	\$280	\$0	\$0	\$280	\$256	\$536	\$256	\$256	\$256	\$1,302
Benton	\$2,045	\$0	\$224	\$1,821	\$504	\$2,325	\$504	\$504	\$504	\$3,837
Black Hawk	\$621	\$0	\$216	\$405	\$427	\$832	\$427	\$427	\$427	\$2,111
Boone	\$716	\$0	\$360	\$356	\$332	\$688	\$332	\$332	\$332	\$1,686
Bremer	\$1,134	\$0	\$0	\$1,134	\$301	\$1,435	\$301	\$301	\$301	\$2,337
Buchanan	(\$532)	\$0	\$0	(\$532)	\$325	\$0	\$118	\$325	\$325	\$768
Buena Vista	\$339	\$196	\$160	(\$17)	\$143	\$126	\$143	\$143	\$143	\$555
Butler	\$243	\$0	\$0	\$243	\$439	\$681	\$439	\$439	\$439	\$1,998
Calhoun	\$644	\$0	\$224	\$420	\$138	\$558	\$138	\$138	\$138	\$972
Carroll	\$619	\$494	\$0	\$125	\$267	\$392	\$267	\$267	\$267	\$1,195
Cass	\$1,465	\$0	\$800	\$665	\$366	\$1,031	\$366	\$366	\$366	\$2,130
Cedar	(\$65)	\$357	\$480	(\$902)	\$437	\$0	\$0	\$408	\$437	\$845
Cerro Gordo	\$577	\$631	\$240	(\$294)	\$241	\$0	\$188	\$241	\$241	\$670
Cherokee	\$648	\$0	\$288	\$360	\$270	\$631	\$270	\$270	\$270	\$1,441
Chickasaw	(\$633)	\$0	\$600	(\$1,233)	\$250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Clarke	\$24	\$0	\$454	(\$430)	\$166	\$0	\$0	\$68	\$166	\$234
Clay	\$89	\$0	\$0	\$89	\$171	\$261	\$171	\$171	\$171	\$774
Clayton	\$118	\$0	\$0	\$118	\$338	\$456	\$338	\$338	\$338	\$1,469
Clinton	(\$683)	\$0	\$240	(\$923)	\$207	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Crawford	(\$1,441)	\$0	\$300	(\$1,741)	\$358	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Dallas	(\$215)	\$273	\$0	(\$488)	\$262	\$0	\$36	\$262	\$262	\$560
Davis	\$1,114	\$0	\$294	\$820	\$326	\$1,146	\$326	\$326	\$326	\$2,124
Decatur	\$288	\$0	\$82	\$206	\$185	\$391	\$185	\$185	\$185	\$946
Delaware	\$74	\$248	\$240	(\$414)	\$245	\$0	\$76	\$245	\$245	\$566
Des Moines	\$515	\$470	\$0	\$45	\$193	\$238	\$193	\$193	\$193	\$816
Dickinson	\$46	\$0	\$0	\$46	\$103	\$149	\$103	\$103	\$103	\$457
Dubuque	(\$185)	\$0	\$392	(\$577)	\$258	\$0	\$0	\$197	\$258	\$455
Emmet	\$334	\$228	\$0	\$106	\$108	\$215	\$108	\$108	\$108	\$540
Fayette	(\$375)	\$0	\$440	(\$815)	\$301	\$0	\$0	\$87	\$301	\$388
Floyd	\$306	\$599	\$0	(\$293)	\$254	\$0	\$216	\$254	\$254	\$724
Franklin	\$955	\$0	\$820	\$135	\$333	\$468	\$333	\$333	\$333	\$1,468
Fremont	\$578	\$0	\$0	\$578	\$155	\$733	\$155	\$155	\$155	\$1,197
Greene	\$517	\$0	\$0	\$517	\$181	\$698	\$181	\$181	\$181	\$1,239
Grundy	\$872	\$0	\$800	\$72	\$247	\$318	\$247	\$247	\$247	\$1,058
Guthrie	\$690	\$147	\$560	(\$17)	\$320	\$303	\$320	\$320	\$320	\$1,263
Hamilton	\$330	\$0	\$0	\$330	\$180	\$510	\$180	\$180	\$180	\$1,051
Hancock	(\$882)	\$0	\$120	(\$1,002)	\$232	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Hardin	\$630	\$0	\$0	\$630	\$276	\$906	\$276	\$276	\$276	\$1,734
Harrison	\$980	\$0	\$200	\$780	\$268	\$1,048	\$268	\$268	\$268	\$1,852
Henry	\$400	\$0	\$215	\$185	\$239	\$424	\$239	\$239	\$239	\$1,141
Howard	\$549	\$168	\$0	\$381	\$207	\$589	\$207	\$207	\$207	\$1,211
Humboldt	\$267	\$0	\$160	\$107	\$155	\$262	\$155	\$155	\$155	\$728
Ida	\$481	\$0	\$419	\$62	\$163	\$225	\$163	\$163	\$163	\$714
Iowa	\$1,941	\$0	\$880	\$1,061	\$393	\$1,453	\$393	\$393	\$393	\$2,632
Jackson	\$1,382	\$0	\$480	\$902	\$263	\$1,164	\$263	\$263	\$263	\$1,953
Jasper	\$1,010	\$0	\$0	\$1,010	\$335	\$1,344	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$2,348
Jefferson	\$555	\$100	\$0	\$456	\$237	\$692	\$237	\$237	\$237	\$1,403
Johnson	\$198	\$0	\$880	(\$682)	\$314	\$0	\$0	\$259	\$314	\$573
Jones	\$946	\$0	\$1,000	(\$54)	\$281	\$227	\$281	\$281	\$281	\$1,071
Keokuk	\$475	\$0	\$0	\$475	\$282	\$758	\$282	\$282	\$282	\$1,604
Kossuth	\$117	\$0	\$440	(\$323)	\$325	\$1	\$325	\$325	\$325	\$976
Lee	\$529	\$412	\$0	\$118	\$230	\$347	\$230	\$230	\$230	\$1,036

# County Highway Bridge Program Funding Targets FY 2012-2015

All numbers in \$1000s

21-Mar-11

County	FY11 Beginning Balance	Projects let in FY11 to date	Projects in		Estimated Annual Allocation	FY12 Target	FY13 Target	FY14 Target	FY15 Target	4 year Target
			TPMS Development for FY11	FY11 Ending Balance						
Linn	\$539	\$0	\$1,600	(\$1,061)	\$411	\$0	\$0	\$172	\$411	\$583
Louisa	(\$300)	\$423	\$80	(\$803)	\$284	\$0	\$0	\$50	\$284	\$334
Lucas	\$29	\$0	\$0	\$29	\$213	\$242	\$213	\$213	\$213	\$881
Lyon	\$1,118	\$100	\$0	\$1,018	\$341	\$1,359	\$341	\$341	\$341	\$2,382
Madison	\$1,822	\$0	\$440	\$1,382	\$426	\$1,807	\$426	\$426	\$426	\$3,084
Mahaska	\$36	\$0	\$120	(\$84)	\$368	\$284	\$368	\$368	\$368	\$1,387
Marion	(\$633)	\$0	\$0	(\$633)	\$326	\$0	\$20	\$326	\$326	\$673
Marshall	\$262	\$0	\$0	\$262	\$320	\$582	\$320	\$320	\$320	\$1,542
Mills	\$1,438	\$0	\$768	\$670	\$335	\$1,004	\$335	\$335	\$335	\$2,008
Mitchell	\$278	\$0	\$320	(\$42)	\$239	\$197	\$239	\$239	\$239	\$913
Monona	(\$199)	\$0	\$0	(\$199)	\$214	\$16	\$214	\$214	\$214	\$658
Monroe	\$1,069	\$0	\$0	\$1,069	\$305	\$1,374	\$305	\$305	\$305	\$2,289
Montgomery	\$992	\$0	\$800	\$192	\$416	\$608	\$416	\$416	\$416	\$1,856
Muscatine	\$681	\$358	\$0	\$323	\$293	\$616	\$293	\$293	\$293	\$1,494
Obrien	\$246	\$0	\$314	(\$68)	\$201	\$133	\$201	\$201	\$201	\$735
Osceola	(\$119)	\$0	\$0	(\$119)	\$120	\$1	\$120	\$120	\$120	\$361
Page	\$563	\$0	\$0	\$563	\$274	\$837	\$274	\$274	\$274	\$1,660
Palo Alto	(\$237)	\$0	\$0	(\$237)	\$148	\$0	\$60	\$148	\$148	\$356
Plymouth	\$372	\$499	\$684	(\$811)	\$581	\$0	\$352	\$581	\$581	\$1,515
Pocahontas	\$655	\$164	\$516	(\$25)	\$167	\$141	\$167	\$167	\$167	\$641
Polk	(\$39)	\$0	\$493	(\$532)	\$269	\$0	\$6	\$269	\$269	\$545
Pottawattamie	\$1,569	\$0	\$790	\$779	\$762	\$1,541	\$762	\$762	\$762	\$3,827
Poweshiek	\$740	\$0	\$407	\$333	\$262	\$595	\$262	\$262	\$262	\$1,381
Ringgold	\$345	\$0	\$240	\$105	\$231	\$336	\$231	\$231	\$231	\$1,030
Sac	\$784	\$318	\$0	\$466	\$265	\$731	\$265	\$265	\$265	\$1,527
Scott	\$377	\$0	\$0	\$377	\$155	\$532	\$155	\$155	\$155	\$998
Shelby	\$741	\$0	\$760	(\$19)	\$386	\$367	\$386	\$386	\$386	\$1,523
Sioux	\$356	\$230	\$224	(\$98)	\$383	\$285	\$383	\$383	\$383	\$1,435
Story	\$1,142	\$720	\$0	\$422	\$265	\$687	\$265	\$265	\$265	\$1,483
Tama	\$2,510	\$381	\$1,200	\$929	\$451	\$1,380	\$451	\$451	\$451	\$2,734
Taylor	\$683	\$860	\$0	(\$177)	\$276	\$99	\$276	\$276	\$276	\$926
Union	\$93	\$0	\$0	\$93	\$163	\$256	\$163	\$163	\$163	\$745
Van Buren	\$822	\$0	\$256	\$566	\$284	\$850	\$284	\$284	\$284	\$1,702
Wapello	\$1,914	\$500	\$0	\$1,414	\$406	\$1,820	\$406	\$406	\$406	\$3,038
Warren	\$821	\$0	\$0	\$821	\$513	\$1,334	\$513	\$513	\$513	\$2,873
Washington	\$505	\$0	\$0	\$505	\$309	\$814	\$309	\$309	\$309	\$1,742
Wayne	\$598	\$0	\$215	\$383	\$191	\$574	\$191	\$191	\$191	\$1,146
Webster	(\$1,038)	\$219	\$224	(\$1,480)	\$279	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Winnebago	\$218	\$0	\$0	\$218	\$90	\$308	\$90	\$90	\$90	\$578
Winneshiek	\$1,809	\$0	\$859	\$950	\$450	\$1,400	\$450	\$450	\$450	\$2,752
Woodbury	\$856	\$266	\$1,573	(\$983)	\$466	\$0	\$0	\$415	\$466	\$880
Worth	\$454	\$0	\$160	\$294	\$117	\$411	\$117	\$117	\$117	\$762
Wright	\$282	\$0	\$560	(\$278)	\$245	\$0	\$212	\$245	\$245	\$703
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$49,072</b>	<b>\$9,623</b>	<b>\$28,086</b>	<b>\$11,363</b>	<b>\$28,000</b>					

## County HBP Fiscal Constraint Requirements

### Background

Federal regulations (23 CFR Part 450 and 49 CFR Part 613) require that the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) be fiscally constrained, both in total and for each year of the STIP. Fiscal constraint requires that funding shown in the STIP (federal, state, local, and private) can “reasonably expected to be available”, while also providing for the operation and maintenance of the existing highway and transit systems.

This requirement is applied to each program included in the STIP. Because the Highway Bridge Program (HBP) funds for Iowa are divided between the Iowa DOT, the cities, and the counties, it is important that each of these groups program their HBP funds in accordance with the fiscal constraint requirements. Since the Iowa DOT selects the city bridge projects and its own projects for HBP funding, it can ensure these requirements are met. However, since each county selects its own projects for HBP funding, additional procedures are necessary to ensure that the amount of HBP funds programmed by the counties in the STIP does not exceed the amount that can reasonably expected to be available for the counties as a whole.

Therefore, the Iowa DOT, in consultation with the Iowa County Engineers Association and the FHWA, developed the process described in the section below for reviewing, and if necessary, adjusting the amount of county HBP funds programmed in the STIP. The following principles were used in developing this process to ensure that it is workable, fair, and produces the desired result:

- Programming is an inherently inexact process; therefore, if the county HBP funds are over-programmed by 20% or less of the amount of funds available, in total and for each year, fiscal constraint will be considered satisfied.
- In order to preserve the maximum flexibility for counties and minimize the possibility of increasing the unobligated balance of HBP funds for counties, fiscal constraint will be managed at the statewide level. This preserves the ability for a county to program more funds than are actually available to them on an individual basis.
- Required adjustments to amounts programmed by a county should be proportional to the amount that the county is over-programmed. That is, those counties that are over-programmed the most will have to make the largest adjustments to their programs. Counties that are only slightly over-programmed will need to make only slight adjustments to their programs. Counties that are not over-programmed will not have to make any adjustments to their programs.
- The programming changes required of individual counties will be clearly identified and quickly communicated so that they can make the necessary changes in a timely manner.
- Because of the limited time to make changes, there will be no variances or waivers granted to the required programming changes. If counties fail to make the required programming changes, the RPA's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will not be approved by the Iowa DOT.
- This process imposes no additional restrictions on the County Five Year Program (CFYP); however, the bridge projects promoted from the CFYP to the draft Regional Planning Affiliation (RPA) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) will be subject to the restrictions outlined in the process below. Therefore, counties should be selective about which projects they submit for inclusion in the draft TIP.

### Fiscal Constraint Review Process

The following process is used to ensure that the counties HBP funds meet the fiscal constraint requirements. This process begins in January of each year and concludes with FHWA approval of the STIP, usually in early October of each year.

1. The Iowa DOT Office of Local Systems, with assistance from the Office of Program Management, prepares estimated targets for county HBP funding for the next fiscal year and the following three. These targets will include a statewide total and individual county allocations. The targets will be estimated using the beginning balances, estimated annual allocations, obligations to-date, and estimated remaining obligations for the current fiscal year.

2. Using the HBP targets as a guide – but not a strict requirement – counties submit their bridge projects for inclusion in the RPA's draft TIP using the existing process, except that only selected projects are promoted from the CFYP to the TIP. Counties should include only those projects with a reasonable chance of being ready for obligation within the proposed program year.
3. After all counties have submitted their bridge projects for inclusion in their respective TIPs, the Office of Local Systems will perform the HBP fiscal constraint calculations to determine if the county HBP programming is within acceptable limits, both for the total program and for each year of the program. If so, the process is complete. If not, go to the next step.
4. The Office of Local Systems will provide the counties with the HBP fiscal constraint calculations. For each county, these calculations will indicate if programming adjustments must be made, and if so, the amount of funds that must be removed from or rescheduled in the TIP.
5. Each county will review the HBP fiscal constraint calculations and make the required adjustments to the amount of HBP funds they have proposed for inclusion their RPA's TIP. No waivers or exceptions will be granted.
6. After all the affected counties make the required adjustments to the draft TIP, Local Systems will re-run the fiscal constraint calculations to verify that, as a whole, the counties are within the acceptable programming limits, both for the total program and for each year. If so, the process is complete. If not, go to the next step.
7. If fiscal constraint has not been achieved, Local Systems will provide the revised fiscal constraint calculations to counties and request that they make additional changes as indicated.
8. Repeat steps 5-7 as needed until fiscal constraint is achieved.
9. If the adjustments should result in under-programming for a given year or in total, counties will be afforded an opportunity to increase the amount programmed, within the acceptable programming limits, in the following order:
  - First, by increasing the funding level of projects already programmed that have less than a full 80% Federal share. Priority to increase funding amounts will be given to those counties that are the most under-programmed on an individual county basis.
  - Second, by adding or moving projects up in the program. Priority to add or move-up projects will be given to those bridges that score the most points under the state-funded County Bridge Construction Program.

The Office of Local Systems will contact those counties that have an opportunity to add funding or projects, and upon confirmation from the county, adjust the fiscal constraint calculations accordingly to determine if more funds or projects can be added or not.

10. After the STIP has been approved by FHWA, counties may make changes to their program of HBP projects using the existing procedures for TIP amendments or modifications. If a county wants to add or move up a project up in the program, the county should also remove or delay other projects as needed to preserve fiscal constraint. However, fiscal constraint will not be recalculated with each proposed amendment or modification.