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Purpose of the RTIP

• Title 23 CFR Part 450
  – MPO develop RTIP for San Diego Region
  – Federally/State funded projects
  – Implement projects identified in the Regional Plan
    • Especially Capacity Increasing and Regionally Significant Projects
  – Develop every 4 years
  – Financially constrained by Fiscal Year
Purpose

• Clean Air Act (CAA) and Title 40 CFR Part 93
  – Air Quality Conformity
  – All CI projects must be modeled

• TransNet Ordinance

• Board Policy No. 031
  – TransNet projects (Section 6 of Ordinance)
  – TransNet Payments
Link Between Regional Plan and RTIP

• Regional Plan - Long Term
  – Regional priorities for available funding

• RTIP - Short-term
  – implementing document

• Air Quality Conformity for CI projects
  – Conformity must be re-determined during each RTIP update

• Regionally Significant projects
  – defined in 23 CFR §450.104

• San Diego Forward: The Regional Plan
  – SANDAG approved October 2015
  – www.sdforward.com
Regionally significant project

- transportation project that serves regional needs (existing or planned shopping, sports complexes, employment centers or transportation terminals)

- A principal arterial or fixed guideway transit facilities that offers an alternative to highway travel
What’s New!

• Moving into the new *TransNet* Biennial
  – FYs 2019 and 2020
• ProjectTrak 2.0
  – Location Types
  – Bike/Ped Percentage
  – Total Project Cost
• MAP 21 **Performance Management**
• SB1 Funds
Regional Plan vs. RTIP

- Transportation Model has two key components: traffic demand (forecasted trips) and traffic supply (highway & transit).

- Regional Plan: long term plan (next 35+ years)
  RTIP: near term plan (next 5 years)

- Both are coded in Model
Why RTIP Coding So Important

• RTIP coding provides key inputs for building near term future year network in SANDAG model

• RTIP coding will be carried into Regional Plan, Corridor Studies, Air Quality Conformity, City and County General Plan Updates, Traffic Impact Studies, etc.
What We Are Looking For

• Information that our model needs

• Clear, Accurate and Adequate (CAA)

• New project or “Carry Over” RTIP projects
  – any length/location change?

• Project(s) dropped from 2016 RTIP submittal
RTIP for SANDAG Model
What We Are Looking For

**Project Information**

- **PROJECT TITLE**: Spell Check
- **Citracado Parkway II**

- **PROJECT DESCRIPTION - GUIDELINES**: Spell Check
  - Widen from 2 to 4 lanes with raised medians, construct bridge over Escondido Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEAD AGENCY</th>
<th>EXEMPT CATEGORY</th>
<th>CAPACITY STATUS</th>
<th>ITS</th>
<th>BIKE/PED</th>
<th>%BIKE/PED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escondido, City of</td>
<td>Non-Exempt</td>
<td>Capacity Increase</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SYSTEM</th>
<th>LOCATION TYPE</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>DIST MILE(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Street Segment</td>
<td>Citracado Parkway</td>
<td>West Valley</td>
<td>Harmony Grove</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule Info** - ONLY REQUIRED FOR CAPACITY INCREASING PROJECTS

- **VIEW PROJECT DIAGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE PHASE</th>
<th>AWARD CONST. CONTRACT</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>OPEN TO TRAFFIC</th>
<th>PHASE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2003</td>
<td>Jun 2018</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Dec 2020</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CLOSE OUT DATE**: 12/1/2021

**LAST SUBMITTED**: 4/21/2008
Freeway Information

Freeway Detail

• Mixed Flow Lanes
• Auxiliary or Truck Lanes
• HOV/ML Lanes
• Toll Lanes

Freeway Ramps

• Ramp Meter
• # of Lanes
• Direct Access Ramp
  – Transit-Only
  – HOV & Transit
  – Managed
  – ...

Freeway Information

Freeway Detail

• Mixed Flow Lanes
• Auxiliary or Truck Lanes
• HOV/ML Lanes
• Toll Lanes

Freeway Ramps

• Ramp Meter
• # of Lanes
• Direct Access Ramp
  – Transit-Only
  – HOV & Transit
  – Managed
  – ...
Freeway Example
Surface Street Information

Roadway Detail

• Roadway Classification
• Lanes/Posted Speed
• Two way or one way
• Median Type
  – Median
  – CLT

Intersection Detail

• Control Type
  – Stop (4 or 2-way)
  – Signal

• Approach Information (# of lanes)
  – Left/Thru/Right
  – Free Right
  – Prohibited Turn
Carlsbad Example

- Project Limits and Location
- Proposed # of Lanes
- Existing and Future Intersection
- Approach Information
- Control Type
- Posted / Proposed Speed
San Marcos Example

Key Elements

- Project Limits and Location
- Proposed # of Lanes
- Posted / Proposed Speed
- Existing and Future Intersection
  - Approach Information
  - Control Type
Escondido Example

Key Elements

- Project Limits and Location
- Proposed # of Lanes
- Proposed Speed
- Existing and Future Intersection
  - Approach Information
  - Control Type
CAD Drawing
Hand Drawing
SR-76 Widening at Rancho del Oro
(Planned Improvement)

1500'
Both directions

Rancho del Oro

1500'
Both directions
PLAZA BOULEVARD WIDENING PROJECT
FROM HIGHLAND AVENUE TO EUCLID AVENUE

GENERAL NOTES (CONT.)

12. Designated the City, User the Engineer is responsible for traffic safety across all intersections. The
   Engineer is responsible for the evaluation and establishment of traffic control devices and
   procedures to ensure safe travel.

13. Utility lines are to be maintained by the City and the Engineer is responsible for ensuring the
   proper placement of utility lines to avoid any obstructions.

14. All construction work shall be completed in accordance with the City’s standards and procedures.

15. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

16. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

17. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

GRADING NOTES

18. All grading work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

19. All grading work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

20. All grading work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

21. Traffic control is to be implemented in accordance with the City’s traffic control plans.

22. Traffic control shall be implemented in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

23. Traffic control shall be implemented in accordance with the specifications and plans.

STATEMENT OF THE RESPONSIBLE CHARGE

24. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s standards and procedures.

25. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

26. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

27. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

28. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

29. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

30. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

31. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

32. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

33. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

34. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

35. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

36. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

37. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

38. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

39. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

40. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

41. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

42. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

43. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

44. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

45. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

46. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.

47. All work shall be performed in a safe manner and in compliance with all applicable laws and
   regulations.

48. All work shall be performed in accordance with the City’s grading standards.

49. All work shall be performed in a manner that minimizes disruption to the community.

50. All work shall be performed in accordance with the specifications and plans.
Insufficient Detail
Presentation on Modeling

• Questions?
TransNet Requirements

Ariana zur Nieden, TransNet Project Manager
TransNet Extension Ordinance

- Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee (ITOC)
- Review all TransNet funded projects in the RTIP
- Annual Fiscal Audit
- Triennial Performance Audit

- Annual Report to the SANDAG Board
“Review and comment on the programming of *TransNet* revenues...In addition to a general eligibility review, this effort should focus on significant cost increases and/or scope changes on the major corridor projects identified in the Ordinance and Expenditure Plan”
TransNet - Annual Fiscal Audit

- Maintenance of Effort
- Congestion Relief vs. Maintenance
- Local Agency Balance Limitation
- Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program (RTCIP)
- Board Policy No. 031 as amended
**TransNet – Congestion Relief vs. Maintenance**

- **Congestion Relief**
  - At least 70%

- **Maintenance**
  - No more than 30%
  - Cumulative over life of Ordinance

- **Implementation Guidelines**
  - Board Policy No. 031
  - Table – typical eligible facility types
    - Rule #18, Attachment 2
TransNet – Regional Transportation Congestion Improvement Program

- Development exaction fee adjusted annually by the SANDAG Board
- Non-compliance - loss of funding
- Funds Regional Arterial System improvements
- RTCIP Funding Programs
**TransNet – ITOC Report Example**

### Table 2

**2016 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)**

**TransNet Local Street Improvements Program (S000s)**

**Programming Analysis through Amendment No. 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TransNet Biennial Element</th>
<th>FYs 2017 - 2018</th>
<th>FYs 2019 - 2021</th>
<th>Overall 5-Yr RTIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (^1)</td>
<td>Programmed (^2)</td>
<td>Balance</td>
<td>Percentage Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlsbad, City of</td>
<td>$22,300</td>
<td>$19,973</td>
<td>$2,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chula Vista, City of</td>
<td>$23,572</td>
<td>$23,545</td>
<td>$27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronado, City of</td>
<td>$2,287</td>
<td>$2,182</td>
<td>$105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Del Mar, City of</td>
<td>$9</td>
<td>$8</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Cajon, City of</td>
<td>$7,525</td>
<td>$7,205</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements

• Projects receiving federal or state funds

• TransNet funded project

• Projects identified as regionally significant

• Capacity increasing projects (regardless of color of money)
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements

• Must include at least 4 years of programming (preferably 5 years)
• All projects must have funding within the 2018 RTIP cycle
  – (FY 2019 – FY 2023)
• Follow project description guidelines

[(Location)  +  (Limits)  +  (Improvements)]

In El Cajon + On Main Street between Johnson Ave and Magnolia Ave + Construct Left Turn Lane
2018 RTIP Update – Location Types

- Location Type drop-down choices create additional fields that may be required such as Bridge # and Cross Streets of an Intersection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION TYPE</th>
<th>ROAD NAME</th>
<th>BRIDGE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>East Valley Pkwy/Valley Center Rd from Bev</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION TYPE</th>
<th>PRIM CROSS STREET</th>
<th>SEC CROSS STREET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intersection</td>
<td>Beven Drive</td>
<td>Northern City Limits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Many choices also require DIST MILE(S) – not filling it in will create an error.
  - Distance miles can be obtained through the map feature.
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements

• Each Phase must be fully funded
• Signed resolution/public hearing for the update and resolution necessary with every amendment involving TransNet funds
• 5-year POP – Public Hearing (Ordinance Section 6)
• Amendments – Public Hearing (Rule #7, BP #31)

Downloads:
- TransNet Resolution Template [PDF, 109 KB]
- 2018 RTIP Amendment Schedule [PDF, 50 KB]
- 2018 RTIP Update Memo to Agencies [PDF, 1059 KB]
- FFY 2016 Annual List of Obligations [PDF, 297 KB]
- FFY 2017 Annual List of Obligations [PDF, 205 KB]
- Board Policy No. 25 - Public Participation Policy (September 2017) [PDF, 165 KB]
- Board Policy No. 031 - TransNet Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Rules (January 2017) [PDF, 111 KB]
- TransNet Extension Street and Road Congestion Relief and Maintenance (70/30) Guidelines [PDF, 154 KB]
- TransNet Signage Specifications [PDF, 2999 KB]

Resolution available on RTIP webpage under “Downloads”
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements – *TransNet*

- Fiscal Constraint: Program vs. Revenue
- Reconcile prior year *TransNet* funds with actual paid
- Run *TransNet* Revenue vs. Programmed Report
  - Reports → *TransNet* Revenue Vs Programmed

![Report List]

- Table 1 - RTIP Amendment Report (PDF)
- RTIP Project Report (PDF)
- TransNet Revenue Vs Programmed
- TransNet Revenue For LSI CarryOver Projects
- RTIP Programmed Revenue By Funding Source
- RTIP Amendment Change Report
- RTIP Project Report
- Outcome Report
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements – *TransNet*

- *TransNet* Biennial Element
  - Always ends in an even year (FY 2019 – FY 2020)
  - Only allowed to draw funds programmed in these 2 fiscal years
  - Funds programmed prior to FY 2019 that are not drawn/requested, must be reprogrammed as Carry Over funds
  - No need to re-program between the 2 years in the biennial
  - Carry Over funds do not count against annual estimated revenues for that year
2018 RTIP Update – Project Requirements (cont.) – TransNet

- Example

Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PRIOR</th>
<th>2016 RTIP</th>
<th>2018 RTIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI</td>
<td>$1,660</td>
<td>$1,260</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$258</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$1,918</td>
<td>$1,518</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If these funds have not been requested, then need to re-program as LSI Carry Over in FY 16/17 or FY 17/18.

- Funds are available between the 2 years in the Biennial
2018 RTIP Update – Programming

TransNet Grant Projects

- Programmed as Grouped Project Listing unless there are Federal/State funds that require separate listing
- Payment processed through SANDAG not directly in ProjectTrak
- Regional Bike EAP (BOD approved)
2018 RTIP Update – Grouped Projects

- Similar projects are reported as part of a grouped project
- SANDAG will assign the groups based on the categories below
- You will not find an individual project in the RTIP if it is part of a grouped project – but it will be in ProjectTrak

- CAL44–HBP Projects
- CAL105–HSIP Projects
- V10–SGIP Grant Projects
- V12–TransNet Bike Projects
- V14–ATP Projects
- V16–Senior Mini-Grant Projects
- V17–ATGP Projects
SB1 Fund Types

- Senate Bill 1 Funds are being tracked by the state as one fund type: State SB1
- SANDAG is tracking SB1 funds by program and has created the following fund types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SB1 Fund Type</th>
<th>Program Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB1 - CCP</td>
<td>Congested Corridors Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 – TCEP</td>
<td>Trade Corridors Enhancement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 - LPP Formula</td>
<td>Local Partnership Program - Formula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 - LPP Comp</td>
<td>Local Partnership Program - Competitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 – STA SGR</td>
<td>State Transit Assistance State of Good Repair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 – TIRCP</td>
<td>Trade and Intercity Rail Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 – SRA Intercity</td>
<td>State Rail Assistance Intercity Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB1 – SRA Commuter</td>
<td>State Rail Assistance Commuter Rail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 RTIP Amendment Overlap

- Formal Amendments (April and July)
- If amend project in July, will need to update in 2018 RTIP
- Only amend *if* necessary
- *TransNet* programming switch in September
- Federal programming switch in December
Local Assistance – Funding Programming Overview

Bing Luu – District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE)
Bryan Ott – Local Programs Engineer
Outline

• What is Local Assistance
• Common Federal and State funding programs
• General programming guidelines and timelines
• Common errors
• Best Practices
What is Local Assistance

The Division of Local Assistance and 12 District Local Assistance Offices assist local agencies in utilizing all available state and federal transportation funds in accordance with state/federal transportation statutes and regulations.
How Do I Get My Project Funded?

• Is it adopted into the Regional Plan
• Who should I contact for funding?
  – Bridge, Safety (HSIP), ATP, Discretionary => Caltrans
  – ATP => MPO
  – Earmark => Congress
Selection by State

Bridge, Safety, ATP, Discretionary

- Caltrans issues Survey or Call for Projects
- Local agency submits applications for funding to Caltrans
- Caltrans reviews, verifies, and evaluates applications and then ranks them
- Caltrans provides approved project list to MPO for programming into RTIP
- Agencies program ATP Awards
- Caltrans D11 programs HBP and HSIP
Selection by MPO

ATP (Regional)
• MPO issues Call for Projects
• Local agency submits applications for funding to MPO for inclusion into Transportation Plan
• Local Agency programs project into RTIP
Programming Options

- Post programming
- Expedited Project Selection Procedures (EPSP)
  - Projects may be advanced or delayed within the RTIP period without the need for an amendment
  - Financial constraint still applies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO ID: 206-0000-0429</th>
<th>PPNO: N/A</th>
<th>EA#: N/A</th>
<th>Capacity Status: NCI</th>
<th>RTIP#: 17-00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE: D St. Road Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESCRIPTION: D St, from E. North Ave to E. College Ave: Pavement Rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE REASON: New project input</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RSTP</td>
<td>$513</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45</td>
<td>$468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funds</td>
<td>$91</td>
<td></td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$604</td>
<td>$62</td>
<td>$542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$62</td>
<td></td>
<td>$542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming Resources

- FTIP/FSTIP: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/oftmp.htm
- State Program: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/programInformation.htm
Federal Fund Requirements

Match Funds Required

• Federal funding programs generally require a non-federal match
• Most programs require 11.47% non-federal match, some are at 10% (e.g. HSIP)
• Toll Credit can be used to satisfy matching requirements in many cases
  – Must be approved/programmed by the appropriate body (Caltrans or MPO)
Common State Funding Programs

**State Funds:**

- Senate Bill 1 (SB1)
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Portions of ATP
Roles and Responsibilities

Federal Highway Administration

California Transportation Commission

HQ Project Implementation Team

Regional & Local Agencies

District Local Assistance Engineer
Roles and Responsibilities

• LOCAL AGENCY
  – Initiates and submits “Request for Authorization” (E-76) package to the DLAE to obligate programmed funds
  – Primarily responsible for administering projects
    • Conception
    • Planning
    • Programming
    • Environmental
    • Design
    • Maintenance
    • Construction
Common Federal Funding Programs

Federal Programs include:

- Highway Bridge Program (HBP)
- Surface Transportation Program (STP) or Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
- Active Transportation Program (ATP)
- Federal Discretionary Programs (DEMO, earmarks/repurposing)
- Emergency Relief (ER)
Frequently Asked Programming Questions

- When to program State/Federal funds
- Who programs the funds in ProjectTrak
- How to program the funds
- Timeline (obligation/allocation/delivery requirements/extensions)
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)

• New project applications accepted year-round
• When to program
  – October Survey & March Update
• Who programs the funds
  – Caltrans identifies funding per Federal Fiscal Year
  – Local Agencies program capacity increasing projects
  – Caltrans D11 programs non-capacity increasing projects
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)

• How to program the funds
  – Identify in ProjectTrak
  – Funds must reflect HBP Back-Up List (amount, fiscal year, phase)

• Timeline
  – Obligate programmed funds prior to March Update
  – HBP free-for-all of funds after March (first come first serve)
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

- Based on call for projects cycle
  - Cycle 9 anticipated May 2018
- When to program
  - Once approved and per award letter
- Who programs the funds
  - Caltrans identifies funding per Federal Fiscal Year
  - Caltrans D11 programs project funds
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)

• How to program the funds
  – Caltrans D11 identify in ProjectTrak
  – Funds must reflect HSIP Back-Up List (amount, fiscal year, phase)

• Timeline
  – Timely Use of Funds
  – PE and CON milestones must be met within specified timeline in Award Letter
Active Transportation Program (ATP)

- Based on call for projects cycle
  - Cycle 4 anticipated May 2018
- When to program
  - Once approved and per award letter
  - Upon approval of time extension
- Who programs the funds
  - CTC approves and programs funding per State Fiscal Year
Active Transportation Program (ATP)

- How to program the funds
  - Local Agency identifies in ProjectTrak
  - Funds must reflect CTC programming list (amount, fiscal year, phase)
- Timeline
  - Local Agency to request allocation/obligation/time extension of funds by end of programmed State Fiscal Year (June)
  - Timely Use of Funds – phase milestones must be met within specified timelines
DEM/HPP/Discretionary

• Projects require legislative action (Congress)
• Currently no new earmark funds
• When to program
  – Once approved, Local Agency may program as needed
• Who programs the funds
  – Local Agency
DEMO/HPP/Discretionary

• How to program the funds
  – Local Agency identify in ProjectTrak
  – Funds must reflect DEMO List (amount, fiscal year, phase)

• Timeline
  – Local Agency must obligate by end of specified Federal Fiscal Year
  – Timely Use of Funds – Local Agency must obligate prior to Congress rescission
Emergency Relief (ER)

• Projects require Federal/State proclamation

• When to program
  – Once approved, Local Agency may program as needed

• Who programs the funds
  – Emergency Opening - Projects are not programmed but require eligibility determination prior to reimbursement
  – Permanent Restoration – Projects programmed by local agencies; require FHWA approval (Authorization to Proceed)
Emergency Relief (ER)

• How to program the funds
  – Local Agency identify in ProjectTrak
  – Funds must reflect Damage Assessment Form (amount, fiscal year, phase)

• Timeline
  – Timely Use of Funds - Local Agency must obligate funds and complete project by specified dates per declared Disaster Event
  – Time extensions approved on case by case basis
State Funds

• SB1, STIP, etc
• Guidance on SB1 forthcoming
• When to program
  – Once approved, Local Agency may program
• Who programs the funds
  – CTC approves and programs funding per State Fiscal Year
State Funds

• How to program the funds
  – Local Agency identify in ProjectTrak
  – Funds must reflect programmed amount, fiscal year, and phase

• Timeline
  – Local Agency must allocate and obligate by end of specified State Fiscal Year
  – Timely Use of Funds may apply
Common Errors

• Project not programmed in RTIP
• Incorrect RTIP information
  – Not enough programmed
  – Wrong fund type
  – Wrong phase programmed
  – Wrong FFY
  – No EPSP approved
  – Outside of 4-year RTIP funding window
Best Practices

Coordinate with your District Local Assistance office early and often! Ensure project scope/cost/schedule line up with Programming EARLY (in the FFY) Delivery is highly encouraged!

Follow the Simultaneous Authorization/Allocation process already available.
Local Assistance Website

www.dot.ca.gov/localassistance
Questions?
Congestion Management Process

Sam Sanford – SANDAG Planning
Congestion Management Process

- Defined in 23 CFR 450.320
- Explained in Regional Plan–Appendix U.7
- Requirement for RTIP Process
- All CI SOV Projects
- Submittal to SANDAG
Capacity Increasing Section – ProjectTrak

• Include 2015 Regional Plan Page # in this section
• CMP (Congestion Management Process) - for CI project seeking federal funds
  – Check boxes are required
• Multi Modal Alternative analysis is required-Please consult 2015 Regional Plan Appendix U7 www.sdforward.com

```
Capacity Increasing

RTP PAGE # FOR CI PROJECTS

Is this project seeking federal funds? YES ▼
Congestion Management Project YES ▼
Has the required Multimodal alternative analysis including a non-SOV analysis been conducted? YES ▼
Please submit the Multimodal analysis (including the non-SOV capacity analysis) to SANDAG
UPLOAD TO PROJECTTRAK
SANDAG CMP APPX U7
```
Congestion Management Strategies

The following categories of strategies, or combinations of strategies, are some examples of what should be appropriately considered for each area:

(i) Demand management measures
(ii) Traffic operational improvements
(iii) Public transportation improvements
(iv) ITS technologies as related to the regional Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) architecture and
(v) Where necessary, additional system capacity
Congestion Management Process

• Where the addition of general purpose lanes is determined to be an appropriate congestion management strategy, explicit consideration is to be given to the incorporation of appropriate features into the SOV project to facilitate future demand management strategies and operational improvements that will maintain the functional integrity and safety of those lanes.

• Exceptions:
  – Safety improvements or
  – the elimination of bottlenecks

23 CFR § 450.322
Capacity Increasing Section – ProjectTrak

Include 2015 Regional Plan Page # in this section

Seeking Federal Funds triggers the CMP Process – check Yes

If you answered yes to the previous questions, you must answer yes to the non-SOV analysis and upload the document to ProjectTrak to submit the project. Analysis will be reviewed by SANDAG staff.

Links to learn more about CMP
Performance Management

Rachel Kennedy – SANDAG Planning
New Performance Management Section in ProjectTrak

• This is a new section of required fields which are being added to facilitate reporting on support of the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act Performance Management Targets
PM1 - Safety

• Check Yes For:
  – Any project which has a Safety Exempt Category
  – CI projects which have Safety Elements (i.e. guardrails, etc.)

• Estimate % of total project to be spent on Safety Features
  – HSIP and projects which have a Safety Exempt Category can be 100%
# PM1 - Safety

## Safety Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Railroad/highway crossing.</td>
<td>Projects that correct, improve, or eliminate a hazardous location or feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.</td>
<td>Shoulder improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing sight distance.</td>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.</td>
<td>Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.</td>
<td>Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fencing.</td>
<td>Skid treatments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety roadside rest areas.</td>
<td>Adding medians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.</td>
<td>Lighting improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).</td>
<td>Emergency truck pullovers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Safety Project Elements

- Sidewalks
- Crosswalks
- Pedestrian crossing beacons
- Bike lanes and other bicycle facilities
- Turn lanes
- Roundabouts
- Guardrails
- Bridge railings
- Increased sight distance
- Medians
PM1 - Safety

www.cmfclearinghouse.org
PM2 – Pavement/Bridge Condition

• Only for Projects which are located on the National Highway System (NHS)
  – If a portion of the project is located on the NHS – choose YES
  – If project improves the pavement on the NHS – choose YES

  • Enter the Lane Miles on the NHS being improved
  • Estimate the % of the project cost to be spent on NHS Pavement Improvement
PM2 – Pavement/Bridge Condition

- If project improves Bridge Deck on the NHS
  - Choose YES
    • Estimate Deck Area in Square Feet located on the NHS
    • Enter Bridge Number
    • Estimate % of total project to be spent on NHS
2018 RTIP Programming Process

Sue Alpert – SANDAG TransNet Department
ProjectTrak

• Must provide status for all current projects in the 2016 RTIP
ProjectTrak – 2018 Adoption Process

• Choose the following Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Carry Over Project In 16 TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Create New Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Carry Over Project From Previous TIP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four options for projects in the current 2016 RTIP

- Carryover
- Complete
- Delete
- Delay

---

https://projecttrak.sandag.org/secure/login.asp
Outcome/Output Data

• Result of ITOC Performance Audit
• Tracking Mechanism for *TransNet* funded projects
• First implemented for the 2016 RTIP
• Done every 2 years, during the update process
• Update for new Biennial
• Will be reviewed as part of the project acceptance process
Outcome/Output Data

- Choose Best Category for Project
  - Taken from Attach. 2 in BOD Policy No. 031
- Total Output for Current 2-Year Biennial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th># TOTAL OUTPUT</th>
<th># PROPOSED OUTPUT</th>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Widening ( Increases Capacity )</td>
<td>Road - Widening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Reduces Congestion/ Improves Traffic Flow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway rehabilitation (1-inch thick or greater)</td>
<td>Rd Recons/Rehab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Roadway Maintenance/ Reduces Congestion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Proposed Outputs and Outcomes for TransNet Local Street Improvement Funded Projects – FY 2017 - FY 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>TransNet Funds</th>
<th>Other Funds</th>
<th>Biennial Output</th>
<th>Type of Output</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New or Expanded Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Bridges (Increases Capacity)</td>
<td>Bridge - New Bridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Widening (Increases Capacity)</td>
<td>Bridge - Widening</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3,542,491</td>
<td>$93,575,343</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lanes Added</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Roadways (Increases Capacity)</td>
<td>Road - New Rd</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$5,261,173</td>
<td>$2,479,947</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Widening (Increases Capacity)</td>
<td>Road - Widening</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$38,897,829</td>
<td>$37,802,239</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Lanes Added</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Widening for Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Ped/Bike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,150,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Improve Bicycle Safety and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>New/expand - Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>$7,004,200</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New or Expanded Facilities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$56,855,793</td>
<td>$135,677,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Rehabilitation and Reconstruction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Replacement for Aesthetic Purposes</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge Retrofit or Replacement</td>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$4,820,681</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway New Sidewalk/Sidewalk Widening</td>
<td>Ped/Bike</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$20,134,278</td>
<td>$485,417</td>
<td>34,778</td>
<td>Feet Sidewalk</td>
<td>Improve Pedestrian Safety and Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Overlay (less that 1-inch thick)</td>
<td>Rd Resurface</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$4,514,495</td>
<td>$2,223,000</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavement/Pot Hole Repair, Chip Seal, Fog Seal, Crack Seal as a stand alone project</td>
<td>Rd Resurface</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$28,838,530</td>
<td>$1,495,230</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Roadway Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway drainage improvements for improving capacity impeding conditions (i.e. significant/frequent roadway flooding)</td>
<td>Rd Recons/Rehab</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3,945,878</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Minor Drainage Improvements stand alone (not part of a CR project)</td>
<td>Rd Recons/Rehab</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,675,981</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>8,604</td>
<td>Feet</td>
<td>Roadway Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Realignment (Increases Capacity)</td>
<td>RoadRecons/Rehab</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$8,166,984</td>
<td>$9,116,477</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Miles Roadway</td>
<td>Reduces Congestion/Improves Traffic Flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we will look for when reviewing submitted projects

• All Projects
  – Balance programmed amount to projected revenue
    • Run TransNet Revenue vs. Programmed Report

• Project Information
  – Consistent title, description and limits
  – Appropriate CI or Exempt category selection
  – Compliance with TransNet Bike/Ped rule
  – For Capacity Increasing projects
    • Review diagrams for air quality
    • Verify OTT date with conformity dates
    • Confirm with Regional Plan
    • Review for Congestion Management Plan
  – Has RAS information been indicated (Project ID tab)
What we will look for when reviewing submitted projects

– Verify Safety and NHS for Performance Management Section

– *TransNet* LSI
  
  • Correct CR/Maintenance choice
  
  • Completed and logical Outcome/Outputs
What we will look for when reviewing submitted projects

• Funding
  – For Federal or State funding
    • Programmed in year and phase of approved listing or CTC authorization
    • Correct match by year and phase
    • Programmed toll credits if authorized
  – TransNet
    • Reconciled to FY 17 payments and anticipated FY18 draw
    • If programming RTCIP – is this an RAS Project

• Correct change reason, informative narrative and appropriate programming for complete, delete, delay projects
Important Dates

• March 16, 2018: All projects due in ProjectTrak including all CI information
• June 29, 2018: All signed resolutions with proof of public hearing due – upload to ProjectTrak
• July 10, 2018: ITOC reviews draft 2018 RTIP
• July 27, 2018: Board releases draft 2018 RTIP including conformity determination
• September 7, 2018: TC holds public hearing
• September 28, 2018: Board adopts 2018 RTIP and conformity determination
How to get SANDAG Bonus Points

• Submit projects early!
  – We have limited time to review approximately 550 projects including the ones we program ourselves.

• Provide complete and accurate data
  – If we don’t have to email or call you with any questions – extra 50 points

• Fix your maps
  – We aren’t using this feature properly and it will really improve the RTIP with a visual representation of our projects
Map Tab

• Zoom in using the +/- buttons until the street segments turn blue.
• Click on each segment that is part of the project between the limits
• Save
  – (hint – this can be done at any time, does not need to part of an amendment)
• The result is this super cool project report
### Printer Friendly Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Prior</th>
<th>16/17</th>
<th>17/18</th>
<th>18/19</th>
<th>19/20</th>
<th>20/21</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>TransNet - L (0)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI (0)</td>
<td>$1,161,154</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,161,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Preliminary Engineering</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,461,154</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>$1,461,154</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Local RTIP (0)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>TransNet - LSI Carry Over (0)</td>
<td>$2,614,005</td>
<td>$691,977</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,306,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Construction</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,614,005</strong></td>
<td><strong>$691,977</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>$3,306,982</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Programmed</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,075,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>$901,977</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td><strong>$4,977,209</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Version History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Document</th>
<th>MPO Approval</th>
<th>State Approval</th>
<th>FHWA Approval</th>
<th>FTA Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05-00 Adoption 2008-2010</td>
<td>08/04/2006</td>
<td>09/04/2006</td>
<td>08/04/2006</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-08 Amendment 2008-2010</td>
<td>07/28/2008</td>
<td>07/25/2008</td>
<td>07/25/2008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-00 Adoption 2010-2014</td>
<td>09/24/2010</td>
<td>09/24/2010</td>
<td>09/24/2010</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-09 Amendment 2010-2014</td>
<td>07/28/2011</td>
<td>07/28/2011</td>
<td>08/15/11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-00 Adoption 2012-2016</td>
<td>09/28/2012</td>
<td>09/28/2012</td>
<td>09/28/2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-05 Amendment 2012-2016</td>
<td>04/25/2013</td>
<td>03/27/2013</td>
<td>03/26/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-00 Adoption 2014-2018</td>
<td>09/26/2014</td>
<td>09/26/2014</td>
<td>09/26/2014</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-00 Adoption 2016-2020</td>
<td>09/23/2016</td>
<td>09/23/2016</td>
<td>09/23/2016</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-09 Amendment 2016-2020</td>
<td>01/28/2018</td>
<td>01/28/2018</td>
<td>01/28/2018</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current Change Reason**

**SCHEDULE / FUNDING / SCOPE - Add new funding source, increase funding**

**Funding Change(s):**

Total project cost increased from $4,767,209 to $4,977,209
RTIP Web Site

• 2018 RTIP web page:  
  www.sandag.org/2018RTIP

• 2016 RTIP web page:  
  www.sandag.org/rtip

  – in effect until...
  
  September 28, 2018 for TransNet and state funded projects;

  December for federally funded projects
Questions

• Sue Alpert  sue.alpert@sandag.org
  – 619-595-5318
• Michelle Smith  michelle.smith@sandag.org
  – 619-595-5608