FY 2003/2004

Regional Transportation Planning Agency Overall Work Program Guidance

For individuals with sensory disabilities, this document is available in Braille, large print, on audiocassette, or compute disk. To obtain a copy in one of these alternate formats, please call or write to the California Department of Transportation Office of Regional and Interagency Planning, 1120 N Street, Room 5302, (MS-32), Sacramento, California 95814. Or call (916) 653-2355 or (800) 735-2929 TTY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1	Rural Planning Assistance Estimates for 2003/2004	Pg 3
Section 2	OWP Timeline	Pg 4
Section 3	Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)	Pg 5
Section 4	Transportation Planning Process Certification	Pg 6
Section 5	Planning Themes	Pg 7
Appendix A	Planning Funds Descriptions	Pg 9
Appendix B	Planning Funds Uses	Pg 10
Appendix C	OWP Information Element (other entity planning activities)	Pg 13
Appendix D	OWP Review	Pg 14
Appendix E	Context Sensitive Planning	Pg 16
Appendix F	Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)	Pg 17
Appendix G	Mainstreaming ITS Planning	Pg 18

SECTION 1
Rural Planning Assistance

26 Rural Regional Transportation Planning Agencies	Total Formula Allocation Per Agency
Alpine	$ 75,000
Amador	$ 145,000
Calaveras	$ 145,000
Colusa	$ 95,000
Del Norte	$ 145,000
El Dorado	$ 210,000
Glenn	$ 145,000
Humboldt	$ 210,000
Inyo	$ 145,000
Lake	$ 185,000
Lassen	$ 145,000
Mariposa	$ 95,000
Mendocino	$ 185,000
Modoc	$ 95,000
Mono	$ 145,000
Monterey	$ 265,000
Nevada	$ 185,000
Placer	$ 210,000
Plumas	$ 95,000
San Benito	$ 185,000
Santa Cruz	$ 210,000
Sierra	$ 75,000
Siskiyou	$ 145,000
Tehama	$ 185,000
Trinity	$ 95,000
Tuolumne	$ 185,000
TOTAL	**$ 4,000,000**

Estimate 2003-2004

Pending State Budget adoption, the total statewide allocation for RPA funds is estimated to be $4,000,000.

SECTION 2
OWP Timeline

The full cycle of an OWP from draft through audit closeout is approximately 30 months.

2001/2002 Overall Work Program Close Out Prior Year		2002/2003 Overall Work Program Accomplish Current Year	2003/2004 Overall Work Program Draft/Review/Adopt/Approve Next Year
July 1-June 30 = State Fiscal Year			
Jl – 01	July 31, Q4 Progress Report due to District.	After passage of the State Budget, Accounting encumbers funds for RTPAs using complete and accurate OWPs/OWPAs. RTPAs begin work.	
Ag–01	August 15, Q4 Progress Report due to ORIP By August 31, Year-End Package due to District. **		
Sp– 01	September 15, Year-End Package due to ORIP. **		
October 1- September 30 = Federal Fiscal Year			
Ot–01		October 31, Q1 Progress Report due to District.	October – December, ORIP's annual OWP Guidance.
Nv-01		November 15, Q1 Progress Report due to ORIP.	November – June RTPAs draft, circulate and finalize OWPs.
Dc–01			
Jn– 02	January 1, Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audit Report due to District	January 31, Q2/mid-year Progress Report due to District. January-February, District mid-year OWP status meeting with RTPAs.	February - May Districts review and circulate draft OWPs
Fb–02	February 15, Districts send Annual Fiscal and Compliance Audit Reports to Audits, ORIP, Accounting and FHWA.	February 15, Q2/mid-year Progress Report due to ORIP.	
Mr- 02			March 1 RTPA draft OWPs due.
Ap–02		April 1, deadline for 2002/2003 OWP amendments (complete package due to ORIP). April 30, Q3 Progress Report due to District.	
My-02		May 15, Q3 Progress Report due to ORIP.	
Jn– 02			Final, adopted OWPs due, Districts approve RTPA OWPs
July 1-June 30 = State Fiscal Year			
Jl – 02		July 31, Q4 Progress Report due to District.	Before July 1, Final approved and adopted OWP and fully executed OWPA due to ORIP. After passage of the State Budget, Accounting encumbers funds for RTPAs using OWPAs.
Ag– 02		August 15, Q4 Progress Report due to ORIP. August 31, Year End Package due to District.	
Sp – 02		September 15, Year-End Package due to ORIP.**	

** For RTPAs who only get Rural Planning Assistance, a Year End Package consists of the Final Invoice, i.e. the last Request for Reimbursement for the OWP cycle clearly marked "FINAL".

For RTPA recipients of a federal Consolidated Planning Grant discretionary grant, the Year-End Package also includes a Certification of Expenditure by Fund Source including the Final Statement of Expenditures attachment.

SECTION 3
Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs)

FTA/FHWA identify Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) annually to promote priority themes for consideration, as appropriate, in transportation planning. For FY 2003, they are continuing with the five PEAs originally identified for FY 2002.

1. Safety and Security in the Transportation Planning Process. TEA-21 emphasized the safety and security of transportation systems as a national priority and calls for transportation projects and strategies that "increase the safety and security of transportation systems." This entails integration of safety and facility security at all stages of transportation planning.

A report prepared by the Transportation Research Board, Transportation Research Circular E-C02, "Safety-Conscious Planning," describes the issues and recommendations identified at a January 2001 workshop. See their website at www.nas.edu/trb. An Institute of Transportation Engineers-prepared discussion paper, "The Development of the Safer Network Transportation Planning Process," is posted on their website: www.ite.org.

2. Integrated Planning and Environmental Processes. TEA-21 mandated elimination of the Major Investment Study as a stand-alone requirement, while integrating the concept within planning and project development/environmental review. A training, "Linking Planning and NEPA", is being developed and will be available at: www.ntionline.com.

3. Consideration of Management and Operations within Planning Processes. TEA-21 challenged transportation entities to move beyond traditional capital programs to improve the movement of people and goods, to focus on the need to improve the way transportation systems are managed and operated. FTA/FHWA convened a working group and commissioned discussion papers; see http://plan2op.fhwa.dot.gov.

4. Consultation with Local Officials. Consultation with local officials is vital in transportation planning. In metropolitan areas, the MPO provides the venue and policy context for this. In California, rural RTPAs provide the venue and policy context for this outside urban areas. FTA/FHWA review statewide planning to ensure effective consultation between States and local officials, particularly in making findings to support Federal State Transportation Improvement Program approvals.

5. Enhancing the Technical Capacity of Planning Processes. Reliable information about current and projected usage and performance of transportation systems enables decision-makers to support plans and programs that respond to their locality's unique needs and policy issues. To ensure the reliability of such information, data sources, forecasting models and tools, and staff expertise need to be evaluated. If any of these is found to be lacking, the responsible planning agency is encouraged to devote resources to enhance and maintain technical capacity.

SECTION 4
Transportation Planning Process Certification

A fully executed versions of this transportation planning process certification must be provided with each adopted, Final OWP.

Transportation Planning Process Certification

In accordance with 23 CFR 450.334 and 450.220, and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Caltrans and the _____ Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the _____ urbanized area(s) hereby certify that the transportation planning process is addressing the major issues in the metropolitan planning area and is being conducted in accordance with all applicable requirements of:

I. 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135;

II. Sections 174 and 176 (c) and (d) of the Clean Air Act as amended (42 U.S.C. 7504, 7506 (c) and (d)) **(Note – only for Metropolitan Planning Organizations with non-attainment and/or maintenance areas within the metropolitan planning area boundary);**

III. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Title VI Assurance executed by California under 23 U.S.C. 324 and 29 U.S.C. 794;

IV. Section 1101(b) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (Pub. L. 105-178 112 Stat. 107) regarding the involvement of disadvantaged business enterprises in the FHWA and FTA funded projects (FR Vol. 64 No. 21, 49 CFR part 26); and,

V. The provision of the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat 327, as amended) and the U.S. DOT implementing regulations (49 CFR 27, 37 and 38).

_____	_____
RTPA Authority Signature	Caltrans District Director Signature
_____	_____
Title	Title
_____	_____
Date	Date

SECTION 5
Intermodal Planning Group (IPG) Themes

IPG Themes

Stressed throughout the FHWA/FTA's 2002 meetings with MPOs, please consider these themes when developing, reviewing, and commenting on draft RTPA OWPs.

1. Planning funds may only be used for planning, not project implementation. For example, developing project study reports (PSRs) or other project initiation documents, updating rideshare participant databases, preparation of transit marketing materials are project implementation, not planning.

2. State and federal planning money may *not* be used for lobbying efforts. OWP work elements listing such activities should include a distinct disclaimer and list which non-federal and/or non-state funding sources will be used to fund them.

3. All regional agencies should have a Public Participation Plan, which is evaluated and updated every few years. With the involvement of the public, this entails review and assessment of existing methods, enhancement of what is effective, addition of new approaches, and deletion/reduction of activities, which have proved not successful.

4. Presidential Executive Order 12898, and several California state statutes emphasize environmental justice (EJ). EJ calls for special efforts to include minority, low income and other under-represented groups in transportation planning. The goal is to help assure no disparate transportation-related benefits or dis-benefits for groups and communities. (See Appendix E, Context Sensitive Planning for more information on this subject.)

5. Formal consultation with Native American Tribal Governments is different from public participation. Formal consultation is decision-maker to decision-maker; the Tribal Chair or designated representative interacting with the regional agency's Board or the Board's representative.

6. A Planning Emphasis Area in 2002/2003 and again in 2003/2004 is: *Safety and Security in the Transportation Planning Process*. Particularly FTA stressed the "security" component of this emphasis area. Although many regional agencies included emergency response (e.g., earth quakes, floods, mud slides, fires, etc.) activities in their OWPs, FHWA/FTA suggested the need to add preventive approaches, e.g., security devices for transit, etc. (See Section Three hereof for more information on this subject.)

7. Environmental streamlining entails early involvement of resource agencies in planning to facilitate project delivery, and development of tools to facilitate this, e.g., GIS databases of environmentally sensitive areas, etc.

8. The 1999 *RTP Guidelines* stressed inclusion of solid purpose and need statements for the projects in the action element of Regional Transportation Plans. Urban areas will adopt RTPs in 2004 and rural areas in 2005. Solid purpose and need statements should be emphasized as RTPs are developed or updated.

9. Regional agencies are required to prepare annual progress/status reports for projects with obligated federal transportation dollars.

10. If there are any intelligent transportation systems (ITS) in the region, regional agencies need to develop an ITS regional architecture by April 8, 2005, to implement the architecture, and to develop an ITS Architecture Maintenance Plan. This requirement applies if there is *any* ITS: Caltrans, city, county, transit, etc. (See Appendix F for more information on this subject.)

Appendix A
Planning Funds Descriptions

Numerous funding sources are included in OWPs, four of which are listed below. Only RPA and the two Consolidate Planning Grant (CPG) grant sources are to be shown on the OWPA and invoiced using Requests for Reimbursement.

Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) Funds

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2003/2004, RPA funds are anticipated to be available for allocation to rural Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) after approval of the State Budget. Currently, the total statewide allocation is estimated to be $4,000,000.

FTA State Planning and Research (Section 5313 (b) Discretionary Transportation Planning Grant Funds

For FY 2002/2003, there was approximately $1.6 million available statewide and a similar amount is anticipated for 2003/2004. Guidance and direction for this competitively funded discretionary planning grant is distributed in the Fall, with proposals due by the date specified in the guidance. FTA Section 5313(b) is one of the four CPG funding sources.

FHWA State Planning and Research - Partnership Planning Element Funds

For FY 2002/2003, there was approximately $850,000 available statewide and a similar amount is anticipated for 2003/2004. Guidance and direction for this competitively funded discretionary planning grant is distributed in the Fall, with proposals due by the date specified in the guidance. FHWA State Planning and Research – Partnership Planning Element is one of the four CPG funding sources.

Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM)

PPM funds are administered by the Office of Local Assistance. For further information, RTPAs should contact their District Local Assistance Engineer. Although PPM funded planning activities should be included in RTPA OWPs, PPM funds cannot be shown on the OWPA and cannot be invoiced using the same forms and procedures as RPA and CPG. Per Section 14527 (g) of the Government Code, RTPAs who do not receive federal metropolitan planning funds may use up to 5 percent of their Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds for planning, programming and monitoring.

Appendix B
Regional Transportation Planning Funds Uses

A wide variety of regional transportation planning activities is an eligible use for transportation planning funds. For example:

Regional planning studies and activities:

- Participate in Federal and State Clean Air Act transportation related air quality planning activities.
- Identify and analyze issues relating to integration of transportation and community goals and objectives in land use, housing, economic development, social welfare and environmental preservation.
- Develop and/or modify tools that allow for better assessment of transportation impacts on community livability.
- Consider alternative growth scenarios that provide information on compact development and related infrastructure needs and costs.
- Participate in appropriate local level mandates.
- Involve the public in the transportation planning process.
- Establish and maintain formal consultation with Native American Tribal Governments enabling their participation in local and state transportation planning activities.
- Identify and document transportation facilities, projects and services required to meet regional and interregional mobility and access needs.
- Define solutions and implementation issues in terms of the multimodal transportation system, land use and economic impacts, financial constraints, air quality and environmental concerns (including wetlands, endangered species and cultural resources).
- Assess the operational and physical continuity of transportation system components within and between metropolitan and rural areas, and interconnections to and through regions.
- Identify the rights of way for construction of future transportation projects, including unused rights of way needed for future transportation corridors and facilities including airports and intermodal transfer stations.
- Investigate methods to reduce vehicle travel and to expand and enhance travel services.
- Incorporate transit and intermodal facilities, bicycle transportation facilities and pedestrian walkways in plans and programs where appropriate.
- Conduct transit needs assessments and prepare transit development plans and transit marketing plans as appropriate.
- Consider airport ground transportation, and transportation to ports, recreational areas and other major trip-generating sites in planning studies as appropriate.
- Develop life cycle cost analyses for all proposed transportation projects and services, and for transportation rehabilitation, operational and maintenance activities.

Regional planning consensus efforts:

- Participate with regional, local and state agencies, the general public and the private sector in planning efforts to identify and plan policies, strategies, programs and actions that maximize and implement the regional transportation infrastructure.
- Conduct collaborative public participation efforts to further extend transportation planning to communities previously not engaged in discussion.
- Create, strengthen and use partnerships to facilitate and conduct regional planning activities among California Department of Transportation (Department), MPOs, RTPAs, Native American Tribal Governments, transit districts, cities, counties, the private sector and other stakeholders.
- Develop partnerships with local agencies responsible for land use decisions to facilitate coordination of transportation planning with land use, open space, job-housing balance, environmental constraints, and growth management.
- Utilize techniques that assist in community-based development of innovative transportation and land use alternatives to improve community livability, long-term economic stability and sustainable development.
- Work with appropriate agencies and developers to reach agreement on proper mitigation measures, and strategies to finance, implement and monitor these mitigation measures; after mitigation measures are implemented and determined to be effective, report status to project sponsors.
- Use partners to identify policies, strategies, programs and actions that enhance the movement of people, goods, services and information.
- Ensure that projects developed at the regional level are compatible with statewide and interregional transportation needs.
- Review the regional project screening process, ranking process, and programming guidelines ensuring comprehensive cost/benefit analysis of all project types are considered.
- Develop and implement joint work programs with transportation and air quality agencies, including transit operators, to enhance coordination efforts, partnerships, and consultation processes; eliminate or reduce redundancies, inefficient or ineffective resource use and overlapping review and approvals.
- Identify and address issues relating to international border crossings, and access to seaports, airports, intermodal transportation facilities, major freight distribution routes, national parks, recreation areas, monuments and historic sites, military installations; and military base closures.
- Conduct planning and project activities (including corridor studies, and other transportation planning studies) to identify and develop candidate projects for the FY 2004/2005 Federal State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP).
- Preserve existing transportation facilities, planning ways to meet transportation needs by using existing transportation facilities more efficiently, with owners and operators of transportation facilities/systems working together to develop operational objectives and plans which maximize utilization of existing facilities.

- Involve federal and state permit and approval agencies early and continuously in the regional transportation planning process to identify and examine issues to develop necessary consensus and agreement; collaborate with Army Corps of Engineers, National Fish and Wildlife Service, Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies responsible for permits and National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) approvals and with state resources agencies for compliance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
- Document environmental and cultural resources, and develop and improve coordination between agencies using Geographic Information Services (GIS) and other computer-based tools.

Regional planning documents, consistent with federal and state requirements:

- Overall Work Programs (OWP) and Amendments
- Overall Work Program Agreements (OWPA) and Amendments
- Master Fund Transfer Agreements (MFTA)
- Regional Transportation Plans (RTP)
- Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP)
- RTP and TIP environmental compliance
- Corridor studies

Appendix C
OWP Information Element

District staff is required to prepare a list of the Department's transportation planning activities in the region and provide it to the RTPAs for inclusion as an informational element in the RTPA's OWP (23 CFR 450.314). See Sample Format.

SAMPLE FORMAT

Activity	Activity Description	Product(s)	Comments

Appendix D
OWP Review

The following checklist can assist District staff as they review draft OWPs. RTPAs may also use the list to draft more complete OWPs. The list is illustrative, not inclusive.

The Content of the OWP Should:

_____ Respond appropriately to planning priorities, including the PEAs, and the seven TEA-21 Planning Factors.
_____ Comply with state and federal planning/administration program requirements and policies.
_____ Contain the MPO's annual certification to FHWA/FTA. The MPO planning process should address the major issues facing the region and should be conducted in accordance with all applicable laws.
_____ Respond adequately and appropriately to District concerns, regional transportation issues, regional transportation planning activities and transportation problems and needs facing the region.
_____ Respond to appropriate TEA 21 and SB 45 requirements, planning emphasis and focus areas, or explain why any of these is not met.
_____ Reflect the progress made by the MPO in carrying out the previous year's program and its performance capabilities. All anticipated continuing activities should be clearly identified.
_____ Contain a work element in the Draft OWP for each discretionary planning grant application for i.e., FHWA Partnership Planning and/or FTA Section 5313 (b) funds. (Include only **approved** discretionary-funded projects in the Final OWP.)
_____ Include an information element, which lists the transportation planning activities being done by other transportation planning entities in the region.
_____ Show non-planning sources for all project work in the OWP, e.g., PIDs, transit marketing, ride matching, transportation engineering and Transportation Development Act (TDA) required activities, etc.

The Financial Information in the OWP Should:

_____ Reflect the accurate fund source, type and amount for each work element and show the same source, type and amount in the Budget Revenue Summary.
_____ Include the correct local match for each federal fund source and type.
_____ Show consistency between the fund amounts in the individual work elements and the fund amounts in the Budget Revenue Summary.
_____ Identify any carryover from prior years by fund source, type, amount and fiscal year within work elements and the Budget Revenue Summary.

The Work Elements in the OWP Should:

_____ Illustrate an organized and logical flow of work element tasks and activities from project inception to project completion.

_____ Contain a reasonable task statement; estimated project schedule with completion date; detailed fund source, type and amounts; description of any related work accomplished in previous OWPs; and final products/activities for each work element.

_____ Identify all planning contracts in both the task and budget statements.

District regional planning staff are responsible for obtaining District and Headquarters review of Draft OWPs. A copy of each Draft OWP and a transmittal memo requesting review, highlighting work activities of particular interest to the reviewer, stating a reasonable date by which comments should be returned, and identifying the District Coordinator to whom they are to be returned, should be sent to:

- Division of Aeronautics, Attn: Leslie Snow, Office of Aviation Planning
- Division of Local Assistance
  (Headquarter Division of Local Assistance requests Final OWPs only. Some District Local Assistance Engineers may be interested in seeing draft OWPs. District should contact them directly and ask if they are interested.)
  Attn: North – Denix Anbiah
  Attn: South – Fardad Falakfarsa
- Division of Mass Transportation, Attn: Gale McIntyre
- Division of Research and Innovation, Attn: Pat Conroy
- Division of Rail, Attn: Warren Weber
- Division of Transportation Planning
  Attn: Sharon Scherzinger, Office of Regional and Interagency Planning
  Attn: Pam Korte, Office of State Planning
  Attn: Patricia Weston, Office of Advanced & System Planning
  Attn: Tom Neumann, Office of Community Planning
  Attn: Helen Rainwater, Office of Project/Plan Coordination
  Attn: Richard Nordahl, Office of Goods Movement

- Any other Headquarters or District staff deemed appropriate for OWP review, depending on the situation.

Appendix E
Context Sensitive Planning

Context sensitive planning is about identifying the needs and concerns of low-income, minority, Native American and other under-represented communities in the planning process to prevent or mitigate negative impacts and to improve their mobility, access and quality of life. This is accomplished through improved public participation in decision-making to achieve a balance between the need for investing in our transportation infrastructure and preserving community values. A context sensitive solution is reached through a continuous process of education and engagement that empowers diverse communities to become active stakeholders in planning.

Determining how to include all communities in planning as stakeholders requires a close examination and use of demographic information, community organizations and community leaders, innovative and culturally sensitive approaches, and updating policies and procedures to make improved public participation part of an institution's mission and philosophy.

Presidential Executive Order 12898, which calls on all Federal agencies to make environmental justice (context sensitive planning) part of their mission, actually amplifies Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and its successor, the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-first Century (TEA-21), stress the importance of considering social, economic and environmental concerns during metropolitan and statewide transportation planning and project development.

Context sensitive planning does not simply mean adding new wording to policies in order to comply with Federal laws—rather, it requires a fundamental change in how we perceive and practice public participation. Some methods to ensure inclusive participation of Title VI groups include the following:

- Early Identification and engagement of low-income, minority and Native American communities through the use of demographic information and direct contacts with community members to identify their transportation issues, needs and priorities.
- Use of (bilingual) interpreters and ethnic media to reach communities that normally would not be reached with English language media.
- Close and continuous involvement of Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and community leaders to build relationships and trust and to include the suggestions and insights of these groups and individuals in planning and conducting outreach.
- Listening to all voices and responding to communities. This is essential to context sensitive planning. This builds relationships, which can also have a long-term benefit for future planning and project development.
- Forming citizens advisory committees of community members who have an interest in community development to help ensure more successful outcomes. This should begin in the early phases of planning and maintained through design, construction, operation and maintenance of the transportation system. This enables agencies to respond to issues before they become major problems and allows transportation agencies to keep pace with changes in their communities.

The California Department of Transportation and the United States Department of Transportation support solutions that improve mobility and safety while complementing and enhancing community values and objectives, and fostering responsible stewardship of the environment. The California Department of Transportation is committed to supporting and assisting agencies in the implementation of context sensitive solutions.

Appendix F
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)

Prior to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), intelligent transportation systems (ITS) were mainly traffic management applications, e.g., signal coordination, ramp metering, changeable message signs, and loop detectors, but with ISTEA, a new paradigm emerged: integrated operations, developed on a multi-modal, system-wide basis.

ISTEA proposed the National ITS Architecture, a definition of User Services, and required Early Deployment Plans (EDPs), wherein regions tailor ITS to their needs. EDPs, also called Strategic ITS Deployment Plans or SDPs, examine how transportation problems can be addressed with ITS, and determine which User Services are the highest priority for the region. The plans identify regional transportation system needs based on extensive stakeholder input and apply technology and innovative system management to enhance the safety and efficiency of all modes.

The ITS concepts of ISTEA are carried forward into the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), but whereas ISTEA set aside funds to 'kick start" ITS, TEA-21 encourages ITS to be funded with traditional sources such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and National Highway System (NHS).

Two of the challenges of ITS planning are: 1) integration of new transportation strategies and projects into plans and programs, and 2) coordination and cooperation among jurisdictions (e.g., city-, county-, or region-wide, statewide, nationwide, or even internationally) to implement those strategies and projects.

ITS involves working collaboratively to find innovative transportation solutions.

Some opportunities for mainstreaming ITS include:

1. Using the MPO/RTPA as the forum for coordination, communication, and consensus building across all modes, by partners, decision-makers, stakeholders, service providers and community members.

2. Systems- and project-level evaluation of ITS enhancements as part of the options under review; and consideration of the interface of communications and control systems through architecture and standards, to determine whether ITS offers a better alternative.

3. Incorporation of ITS into Plan and Program scopes of work and budgets. A "regional blueprint", developed as part of an EDP or RTP, allows assessment of how various blends of ITS elements contribute to system performance.

4. Currently, most California regions have a completed EDP or Strategic ITS Deployment Plan (SDP) that can be incorporated into the RTP. Projects from the EDP/SDP can be incorporated in the project listing and prioritized for consideration in the RTIP.

5. Programming for both capital and operation and maintenance costs. In addition, to CMAQ, STP or NHS, funds may also be available through sources linked to transit, rail, aeronautics, goods movement, and non-highway modes, pooling of development fees, or the private sector.

Appendix G
Mainstreaming ITS Planning

Prior to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA), intelligent transportation systems (ITS) were mainly traffic management applications, e.g., signal coordination, ramp metering, changeable message signs, and loop detectors, but with ISTEA, a new paradigm emerged: integrated operations, developed on a multi-modal, system-wide basis.

ISTEA proposed the National ITS Architecture, a definition of User Services, and required Early Deployment Plans (EDPs), wherein regions tailor ITS to their needs. EDPs, also called Strategic ITS Deployment Plans or SDPs, examine how transportation problems can be addressed with ITS, and determine which User Services are the highest priority for the region. The plans identify regional transportation system needs based on extensive stakeholder input and apply technology and innovative system management to enhance the safety and efficiency of all modes.

The ITS concepts of ISTEA are carried forward into the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), but whereas ISTEA set aside funds to 'kick start" ITS, TEA-21 encourages ITS to be funded with traditional sources such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and National Highway System (NHS).

Two of the challenges of ITS planning are: 1) integration of new transportation strategies and projects into plans and programs, and 2) coordination and cooperation among jurisdictions (e.g., city-, county-, or region-wide, statewide, nationwide, or even internationally) to implement those strategies and projects.

ITS involves working collaboratively to find innovative transportation solutions.

Some opportunities for mainstreaming ITS include:

1. Using the MPO/RTPA as the forum for coordination, communication, and consensus building across all modes, by partners, decision-makers, stakeholders, service providers and community members.

2. Systems- and project-level evaluation of ITS enhancements as part of the options under review; and consideration of the interface of communications and control systems through architecture and standards, to determine whether ITS offers a better alternative.

3. Incorporation of ITS into Plan and Program scopes of work and budgets. A "regional blueprint", developed as part of an EDP or RTP, allows assessment of how various blends of ITS elements contribute to system performance.

4. Currently, most California regions have a completed EDP or Strategic ITS Deployment Plan (SDP) that can be incorporated into the RTP. Projects from the EDP/SDP can be incorporated in the project listing and prioritized for consideration in the RTIP.

5. Programming for both capital and operation and maintenance costs. In addition, to CMAQ, STP or NHS, funds may also be available through sources linked to transit, rail, aeronautics, goods movement, and non-highway modes, pooling of development fees, or the private sector.