Agenda

California Federal Programming Group
(CFPG)

December 3, 2002
10:00 – 2:00

FTA Regional Office
201 Mission Street, Suite 2210
San Francisco, CA

Meeting called by:	Standing Meeting	
Facilitator:	Caltrans Transportation Programming	
Recorder/Time Keeper:	Caltrans Transportation Programming	
	Agenda topics	
	Description	**Presentor**
	Topics/Agenda/Introductions	Kris Balaji/ Paul Page
	Approval of the items from the 10/29/2002 DBUG meeting Announcements	All Kris Balaji
Follow-Up Items:	-Group Name -Annual Listing of Projects- Follow up on Task Force -Financial Plan to FHWA by April 1, 2004 -MPO /Transit Operators agreements -IPG Calendar	Kris Balaji Rosemary Ayala Abhijit Bagde Paul Page Wade Hobbs
	Carry over of obligated projects to current FTIP cycle	Kris Balaji / Wade Hobbs
	MPO Board Calendar Meeting Dates	Abhijit Bagde
	Project Description field in CTIPS	Abhijit Bagde
	Split “PE” phase into “PA & ED” and “PS & E” phases.	Kris Balaji
	Importance of updating amendments in CTIPS	Abhijit Bagde
	Moving funds from one phase to another through amendments	Kris Balaji
	Multiple lead agencies for one project (STIP Prop 35)	Kris Balaji
	Open Forum/ Next Meeting Date	
	Adjourn/Close	

:

CFPG Meeting Minutes

December 3, 2002

In Attendance

Name	Agency	Email	Telephone
Kris Balaji	Caltrans	kris_balaji@dot.ca.gov	(916) 654-2983
Muhaned Aljabiry	Caltrans	Muhaned_aljabiry@dot.ca.gov	(916) 657-5066
Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	abhijit_bagde@dot.ca.gov	(916) 654-3638
Wade Hobbs	FHWA	wade.hobbs@fhwa.dot.gov	(916) 498-5027
Sookyung Kim	SANDAG	ski@sandag.cog.ca.us	(619) 595-5350
Jerome Wiggins	FTA	Jerome.wiggins@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2819
Ray Sukys	FTA	Ray.sukys@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2802
Steve Guhin	SACOG	Sguhin@sacog.org	(916)733-3247
Hymie Luden	FTA	Hymie.luden@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2732
Raymond Odunlami	MTC	rodunlami@mtc.ca.gov	(510)464-7717
Donna Turchie	FTA	Donna.Turchie@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2737
Bob Swensen	Caltrans	bob_swensen@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-4366
Liz Levine	MCTC	lizmctc@psnw.com	(559)675-0721
Dan Little	Shasta	dlittle@co.shasta.ca.us	(530)245-6819
Raquel Carabajal	KCOG	rcarabajal@kerncog.org	(661)861-2191
Lorraine Lerman	FTA	lorraine.lerman@fta.dot.gov	(415)744-2735
Paul Page	FTA	paul.page@fta.dot.gov	(415)855-6868
Harlan Woo	Caltrans	harlan_woo@dot.ca.gov	(916)654-4716
Phone Participants			
Todd Muck	AMBAG	tmuck@ambag.org	(831)883-3750
Sue Hall	SLOCOG	Shall@slocog.org	(805)781-4255
Diane Grindall	SJCOG	Dgrindall@sjcog.org	(209)468-3913
Susan Wilson	CT-D3	susan.wilson@dot.ca.gov	(916)274-0639
Laura Fields	CT-D1	lfields@dot.ca.gov	(707)445-6358
Mac Cavalli	CT-D6	Mcavalli@dot.ca.gov	(559)445-5285

The CFPG meeting was held at FTA in San Francisco from 10:00 am- 2:00 pm

Agenda Items Covered:

Topics/Agenda/Introduction (K. Balaji)

Meeting started with introduction of attendees and review of agenda items.

Approval of meeting minutes from 10/29/02 DBUG meeting (All)

Approved with no comments

General discussion items

- Group forum for programming discussion will include Caltrans Districts.
- Group will discuss Federal programming issues only, not State.
- Group suggested issuing first draft of minutes for comments before finalizing. Minutes will be sent to members for comments.
- K. Balaji introduced his draft of the Group mission statement

"Facilitate interagency consultation on Federal Programming to effectively manage California's Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program"

Group members are encouraged to offer suggestions to refine the mission statement before it is finalized.

Announcements (K. Balaji)

Muhaned Aljabiry was introduced as the FTIP Coordinator for Caltrans districts 6,7,8,9,10, and 12. Abhijit Bagde will be the Coordinator for districts 1, 2, 3, 4,5 and 11. Muhaned will be in charge of:

- Processing TIP amendments.
- For those MPO's with their own databases, work to upload MPOs FTIP database into CTIPS.
- Running the CFPG meetings.

Questions regarding the database transfer process:

Q: Will CTIPS have obligation info?
A: CT- no resources at this time because of budget constraints.

Q: Will there be a Federal Aid Number?
A: CT- Yes

Q: What is the timeline of integration of upload?
A: CT- About one year will be the target date. This will be contingent upon availability of MPO's and CT resources

Q: Where are we at with CTIPS? What is Agency involvement?
A: CT- All MPO's are on CTIPS except SCAG. SACOG is almost done with transfer process.

Q: Will there be approval of amendments in CTIPS?
A: CT- Yes, it is currently being done. Official amendment approval is paper approval not electronic signature process because the accuracy of data in CTIPS is not satisfactory yet.

K. Balaji announced that December 1, 2002 is the due date from CT to FHWA for TIP amendments and for MPO's not to send amendment that require conformity determination.

Follow up Items from previous meeting

- Group Name- the Group was surveyed and California Federal Programming Group (CFPG) was chosen.
- Annual Listing of Projects- Follow up on Task Force
  Rosemary Ayala (SCAG) could not attend the meeting, Kris filled in. The Task force will identify:
  - Preferred format and what should be included
  - Fiscal or calendar- Federal fiscal year will be used.
  - The Annual listing includes State local and transit projects.
  - Task force should start work as soon as possible to come up with recommendations before the next meeting.

- Although the legislation stipulates MPOs are responsible for the annual listings, since MPOs do not have these information readily available, Mr. Balaji stressed that Caltrans will assist as much as possible.

- **Financial Plan to FHWA by April 1, 2004**

Abhjit Bagde spoke about submitting financial plan to FHWA by April, 2004. CT, FTA and FHWA will come up with guidelines by April, 2003. MPO's will be consulted during the preparation of the guidelines. Wade Hobbs said that MPO's can include the financial plan as a chapter in their Long Range Transportation plan, FTIP or can be submitted as a stand alone document under separate cover.

- **MPO/Transit Operators agreements**

Jerome Wiggins (FTA) spoke about 2002 FSTIP corrective action and for MPO's to enter into cooperative agreements with transit operators for Transit projects. Deadline is January 1, 2003. Agreements are required by FTA. Handouts were given regarding the agreement issue and will be sent to phone participants. Agencies that may need extension to the deadline must contact Jerome immediately (See handout 1). Mr Wiggins suggested that a copy of the agreement(s) be included in the MPO's annual Overall Work Program (OWP).

- **IPG Calendar**

Wade Hobbs spoke about
Schedule sheet (See handout 2)
Overall work program happens annually. Draft is completed (See handout 3). Planning emphasis areas should be available by the time the draft IPG is submitted. Draft is available right now. CT planning office will include this in the MPO's Overall Work Program document.
Q: Have the new MPO's been added into the IPG schedule?
A: The new MPO's (Kings and Madera) will be added into the 2003 IPG meeting schedule, however the dates for the Kings and Madera meetings have not yet been set. FHWA will provide additional information as meetings are scheduled.

<u>Carry over of obligated projects to current FTIP cycle (K. Balaji and W. Hobbs)</u>

23 CFR section 450.324 identifies what the TIP must include. Suggestion to include in the description that these projects are already fully obligated in the previous cycle and carried over for information only (See follow up item 6). Question was raised as to whether funds can be added administratively for previously deobligated components. Administrative amendment guidelines will need to be revised (See follow up item 3). Another question was raised regarding how projects are identified if CTIPS does not include a " for information only" field. Recommendation to include a check box to identify "approval is for information only" (See follow up item 6).

<u>MPO Board calendar Meeting Dates (A. Bagde)</u>

MPO's need to provide CT with board meeting dates to be maintained in FTIP website for Districts' use. Some MPO's have their schedules posted on their websites.

Project description field in CTIPS (A. Bagde)

CT will provide template for transit and highway project description in the CTIPS. Description should not be very detailed, but sufficient information should be included (See follow up item 5). If MPO's need additional space for detailed description, the MPO comments section of the CTIPS can be used. These additional details are especially required for CMAQ projects to establish eligibility.

Split "PE" phase into "PA&ED" and "PS&E" phases (K. Balaji/ Wade Hobbs)

Mr. Hobbs had proposed that the PE phase be divided between PAED and PSE, however, the majority in CFPG oppose the split. If a project is proposed to be approved for PE phase only, then identifying the phase in the comment field or in the description as "PA&ED and PS&E" or "PA&ED only" is recommended. A check box or a pull down menu is being considered to be included in CTIPS for non-exempt projects proposed for environmental phase only.

Importance of updating amendments in CTIPS (A. Bagde)

Mr. Balaji pointed out that there are number of MPO/RTPAs in which the paper amendments that were approved by their Board do not match the CTIPS version of the amendment. This discrepancy creates more work for Caltrans staff. Between now and full implementation of the uploading mechanism with all MPO's, Mr. Balaji requested that CTIPS be updated concurrently and reconciled with the paper submittal of FTIP amendments.

Moving funds from one phase to another through amendments (K. Balaji)

If moving funds from one phase to another is significant, then an explanation is necessary. The cover letter should include a statement to assure that all project phases are fully funded after the funds are moved. Fiscal constraints and air quality conformity should be considered.

Multiple lead agencies for one project (STIP Prop 35) (K. Balaji)

With the passage of Prop 35, which allows the local agencies to contract out project components, some STIP projects will be implemented by more than one agency. For such projects, the MPO's can use "VAR" as the implementing agency and the lead agencies must be identified in the MPO's comment section of the CTIPS. The lead agencies must be consistent with the STIP project listing.

Follow up Items for next meeting

Description	Agency	Due
1. Call Rosemary on task force	CT	Done
2. Post Bob Swensen's annual listing for projects on the website	CT	Done*
3. Potential revisions to administrative amendment guidelines to: • Add funds to previously obligated components • Move funds between components	CT/FHWA/FTA	1/30/03
4. TIP listing requirement for CFR's	FHWA	2/18/03
5. Template for project description on FTIP website	CT	2/18/03
6. Check box in CTIPS for project approvals for information only	CT	
7. Should PE be split into PA&ED and PS&E or not?	FHWA	2/18/03
8. What can be done in CTIPS for multiple lead agency on a single project when uploaded from STIP.	CT	2/18/03

* see link "Local Assistance Federal Programs 2002 OA" in the FTP/FSTIP website.

Open forum/ next meeting date (All)

A concern was raised that the cost of conference calls is high and it should be shared rather than have FHWA pay for it when the meeting is hosted by FHWA.

SANDAG agreed to host the next meeting. The date suggested was Feb 11, 2003, however Sookyung Kim has requested that the meeting be moved to the following **Tuesday Feb 18, 2003**. Please mark your calendars.

2003 Planning Certifications

(Draft-August 16, 2003)

Month and Location	Day	Dates	Start Time
October			
San Francisco	T-Th	7-9	10:00am
November			
Santa Barbara	W&Th	12-13	10:00am
San Diego	T&W	18-19	10:00am
December			
Honolulu	T&W	09-10	10:00am

§450.310 Metropolitan planning organization: Agreements.

a. The responsibilities for cooperatively carrying out transportation planning (including corridor and subarea studies) and programming shall be clearly identified in an agreement or memorandum of understanding between the State and the MPO.
b. There shall be an agreement between the MPO and operators of publicly owned transit services which specifies cooperative procedures for carrying out transportation planning (including corridor and subarea studies) and programming as required by this subpart.
c. In nonattainment or maintenances areas, if the MPO is not designated for air quality planning under section 174 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7504), there shall be an agreement between the MPO and the designated agency describing their respective roles and responsibilities for air quality related transportation planning.
d. To the extent possible, there shall be one cooperative agreement containing the understandings required by paragraphs (a) through (c) of this section among the State, MPO, publicly owned operators of mass transportation services, and air quality agencies.
e. Where the parties involved agree, the requirement for agreements specified in paragraphs (a), (b), and (c) of this section may be satisfied by including the responsibilities and procedures for carrying out a cooperative process in the unified planning work program or a prospectus as defined in §450.314(c).
f. If the metropolitan planning area does not include the entire nonattainment or maintenance area, there shall be an agreement among the State department of transportation, State air quality agency, affected local agencies, and the MPO describing the process for cooperative planning and analysis of all projects outside the metropolitan planning area but within the nonattainment or maintenance area. The agreement also must indicate how the total transportation related emissions for the nonattainment or maintenance area, including areas both within and outside the metropolitan planning area, will be treated for the purposes of determining conformity in accordance with the U.S. EPA conformity regulation (40 CFR part 51). The agreement shall address policy mechanisms for resolving conflicts concerning transportation related emissions that may arise between the metropolitan planning area and the portion of the nonattainment or maintenance area outside the metropolitan planning area. Proposals to exclude a portion of the nonattainment or maintenance area from the planning area boundary shall be coordinated with the FHWA, the FTA, the EPA, and the State air quality agency before a final decision is made.
g. Where more than one MPO has authority within a metropolitan planning area or a nonattainment or maintenance area, there shall be an agreement between the State department(s) of transportation and the MPOs describing how the processes will be coordinated to assure the development of an overall transportation plan for the metropolitan planning area. In metropolitan planning areas that are nonattainment or maintenance areas, the agreement shall include State and local air quality agencies. The agreement shall address policy mechanisms for resolving potential conflicts that may arise between the MPOs, e.g., issues related to the exclusion of a portion of the nonattainment area from the planning area boundary.
h. For all requirements specified in paragraphs (a) through (g) of this section, existing agreements shall be reviewed for compliance and reaffirmed or modified as necessary to ensure participation by all appropriate modes.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG) AND THE NORTH SAN DIEGO COUNTY TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (NSDCTDB) REGARDING TRANSIT PLANNING, PROGRAMMING AND FUND ALLOCATION

Purpose. The purpose of this agreement is to set forth the basic structure for cooperative planning and decision making between the NSDCTDB and SANDAG. It does not apply to the allocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) and Local Transportation Sales Tax (TransNet) revenues which is addressed in other documents.

This document replaces the 1976 Memorandum of Understanding between the Comprehensive Planning Organization (now called SANDAG) and the NSDCTDB. Upon execution, it shall remain in effect until modified by agreement of both parties.

Overall Work Program. In accordance with state and federal requirements, SANDAG annually prepares, adopts and updates an Overall Work Program (OWP) describing regional planning activities and studies. The OWP relates regionally significant planning activities of the state, Metropolitan Transit Development Board (MTDB), NSDCTDB and other participating local government agencies in an integrated, comprehensive program document.

NSDCTDB agrees to annually prepare and submit to SANDAG for inclusion in the OWP the description of regionally significant, transportation related planning work intended to be carried out by NSDCTDB.

Regional Transit Coordination. SANDAG and NSDCTDB agree to work cooperatively with each other and with the other transit operators and participating local government agencies in ensuring the provision of coordinated, region-wide transit services. Such coordination should include fares, transfer and pass policies, transit information and marketing, schedule and service coordination, data needs to meet periodic reporting requirements, and other activities as required.

Short Range Transit Plan. NSDCTDB agrees to prepare, adopt and maintain, as required, a Short Range Transit Plan. This document will provide the planning basis for projects submitted by NSDCTDB to SANDAG for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG agrees to prepare, adopt and maintain, as required, a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). SANDAG agrees to use the NSDCTDB Short Range Transit Plan for the NSDCTDB area short range transit component of the RTP. SANDAG and NSDCTDB agree to work cooperatively in the refinement of the RTP through the conduct of and participation in multi-modal transportation studies. NSDCTDB agrees to be primarily

responsible for the refinement of transit corridors within its area of jurisdiction which are identified in the RTP.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program. SANDAG is responsible for the periodic development, endorsement and amendment of a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). SANDAG agrees that the RTIP will be prepared cooperatively on a fair and equitable basis with NSDCTDB and all public agencies eligible to receive project funding. SANDAG agrees to include in the RTIP those projects recommended by NSDCTDB which relate to discretionary transit funds made available directly to NSDCTDB subject to a finding by SANDAG of consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG shall not endorse any transit projects for the NSDCTDB area which have not been recommended by NSDCTDB.

Designated Recipient Responsibilities. As the federal designated recipient, SANDAG is responsible for allocating certain federal formula transit funds to the NSDCTDB and the MTDB. SANDAG shall allocate the federal transit operating funds based on a formula developed cooperatively with NSDCTDB and MTDB. SANDAG shall allocate federal transit capital funds based on a cooperative process with NSDCTDB and MTDB.

If a dispute regarding the allocation of funds arises between NSDCTDB and MTDB, the two agencies shall negotiate in good faith to resolve the dispute. If such negotiation does not result in resolving the differences, SANDAG shall resolve the dispute and allocate the funds accordingly.

Richard Fifer
Executive Director
NSDCTDB

Date: 4-19-96

Kenneth E. Sulzer
Executive Director
SANDAG

Date: 4/15/96

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SAN DIEGO ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS (SANDAG) AND THE SAN DIEGO METROPOLITAN TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT BOARD (MTDB) REGARDING TRANSIT PLANNING, PROGRAMMING AND FUND ALLOCATION

Purpose. The purpose of this agreement is to set forth the basic structure for cooperative planning and decision making between the MTDB and SANDAG. It does not apply to the allocation of Transportation Development Act (TDA) and Local Transportation Sales Tax (TransNet) revenues which is addressed in other documents.

This document replaces the 11/6/84 agreement between the MTDB and SANDAG. Upon execution, it shall remain in effect until modified by agreement of both parties.

Overall Work Program. In accordance with state and federal requirements, SANDAG annually prepares, adopts and updates an Overall Work Program (OWP) describing regional planning activities and studies. The OWP relates regionally significant planning activities of the state, MTDB, North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NSDCTDB) and other participating local government agencies in an integrated, comprehensive program document.

MTDB agrees to annually prepare and submit to SANDAG for inclusion in the OWP the description of regionally significant, transportation related planning work intended to be carried out by MTDB.

Regional Transit Coordination. SANDAG and MTDB agree to work cooperatively with each other and with the other transit operators and participating local government agencies in ensuring the provision of coordinated, region-wide transit services. Such coordination should include fares, transfer and pass policies, transit information and marketing, schedule and service coordination, data needs to meet periodic reporting requirements, and other activities as required.

Short Range Transit Plan. MTDB agrees to prepare, adopt and maintain, as required, a Short Range Transit Plan. This document will provide the planning basis for projects submitted by MTDB to SANDAG for inclusion in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG agrees to prepare, adopt and maintain, as required, a Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG agrees to use the MTDB Short Range Transit Plan for the MTDB area short range transit component of the RTP. SANDAG and MTDB agree to work cooperatively in the refinement of the RTP through the conduct of and participation in multi-modal transportation studies. MTDB agrees to be primarily responsible for the refinement of transit corridors within its area of jurisdiction which are identified in the RTP.

Regional Transportation Improvement Program. SANDAG is responsible for the periodic development, endorsement and amendment of a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). SANDAG agrees that the RTIP will be prepared cooperatively on a fair and equitable basis with MTDB and all public agencies eligible to receive project funding. SANDAG agrees to include in the RTIP those projects recommended by MTDB which relate to discretionary transit funds made available directly to MTDB subject to a finding by SANDAG of consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan. SANDAG shall not endorse any transit projects for the MTDB area which have not been recommended by MTDB.

Designated Recipient Responsibilities. As the federal designated recipient, SANDAG is responsible for allocating certain federal formula transit funds to the MTDB and the NSDCTDB. SANDAG shall allocate the federal transit operating funds based on a formula developed cooperatively with MTDB and NSDCTDB. SANDAG shall allocate federal transit capital funds based on a cooperative process with MTDB and NSDCTDB.

If a dispute regarding the allocation of funds arises between MTDB and NSDCTDB, the two agencies shall negotiate in good faith to resolve the dispute. If such negotiation does not result in resolving the differences, SANDAG shall resolve the dispute and allocate the funds accordingly.

Tom Larwin
General Manager
MTDB

Date: 4/17/96

Kenneth E. Sulzer
Executive Director
SANDAG

Date: 4/15/96

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

BETWEEN THE

SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

AND

SAN JOAQUIN REGIONAL RAIL COMMISSION

"Regarding the Coordination of Ongoing Transit Planning and Programming Federal Funds that Support the Ongoing and Future Deployment of Transit Services by the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission".

This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is entered into between the SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS, (hereinafter referred to as (SJCOG), and the SAN JOAQUIN REGIONAL RAIL COMMISSION, (hereinafter referred to as (SJRRC), a public transit operator, as of this 28th day of August 2002. The purpose of this MOU is to:

1) **Foster a cooperative and mutually beneficial working relationship between SJCOG and SJRRC in order to provide comprehensive, effective, and coordinated transit planning, for the purpose of the delivery passenger rail service; and,**
2) **Delineate the transit planning responsibilities for the purpose of programming projects within the SJCOG Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).**

RECITALS

WHEREAS, in 1995, the seven cities and the county of San Joaquin entered into a joint powers agreement **that created SJRRC; and,**

***WHEREAS*, SJRRC is a public transportation provider that is eligible to apply for and receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) 5307 funding designated to San Joaquin County for capital, operating, and planning assistance for the delivery of passenger rail services including, but not limited to, the Altamont Commuter Express; and,**

WHEREAS, SJRRC is a public transportation provider that is eligible to apply for and receive FTA funding designated to San Joaquin County for establishing new rail transit projects, improving and maintaining existing rail transit and other fixed-guideway systems; and,

WHEREAS, SJCOG is a joint powers agency, created in 1968 by the County of San Joaquin and the cities of Stockton, Lodi, Manteca, Tracy, Ripon, and Escalon. In 1991, the newly incorporated City of Lathrop signed onto the Joint Powers Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, SJCOG is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and the Metropolitan Planning Agency (MPO), for San Joaquin County; and,

WHEREAS, SJCOG has a committee structure which advises the SJCOG Board on all planning and policy questions. These committees include the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), the Management and Finance Committee (M&FC), the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC), and the Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC); and,

WHEREAS, the Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) requires MPOs to work cooperatively with public transit providers to develop Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs) for urbanized areas. These plans and programs are intended to further the national interest in to encouraging and promoting the safe and efficient management, operation, and development of surface transportation systems. These systems increase the mobility of people and freight, and foster economic growth and development within and through urbanized areas, while minimizing transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution; and,

WHEREAS, SJCOG provides a forum wherein the development of public transit service in the region will be accomplished. As a part of the coordinated regional transportation system, SJCOG will promote the continuing, cooperative, and consistent planning of the fixed rail passenger system and its relationship with the regional and interregional transit network; and,

***WHEREAS*, SJCOG and the SJRRC rely upon a cooperative relationship to foster comprehensive regional transit planning which feeds directly into State and national planning; and,**

***NOW, THEREFORE*, in consideration of the mutual benefits to the parties hereto, and in consideration of the covenants and conditions herein contained, the parties agrees as follows:**

SECTION 1: Cooperative Relationship

1.1 Communication

SJCOG and SJRRC recognize the reliance upon a cooperative relationship and agree to foster comprehensive regional transit planning which feeds directly into State and national planning. A critical component of this relationship involves open and productive communication, which leads to setting project priorities and federal funding needs.

Title 23, section 450 of the United States Code requires SJCOG to update the FTIP every even numbered year. The need to ensure responsive communication between the two parties is imperative in order to meet this federal programming mandate.

The Executive Director of SJCOG and the Executive Director of SJRRC are the primary individuals responsible for ensuring that the provisions specified in this MOU are followed through.

1.2 Representation on SJCOG Board and/or Committees

SJRRC shall appoint one (1) representative and alternate to serve as a voting member of the SJCOG Technical Advisory Committee.

SECTION 2: Transit Planning

2.1 Short-Range Transit Plan

In accordance with Title 23, section 450 of the United States Code planning regulations and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance, SJRRC will prepare a five (5) year short-range transit plan to support sound financial and operational decision-making in the transit planning and programming process. Consistent with the Short-Range Transit Plan, SJRRC will provide a draft list of projects for federal transit funding. The list shall:

a) Identify and describe the scope of specific projects that will respond to ongoing and increased transit demands found through the Short-Range Transit Planning process and other related studies. As part of the planning process, the needs of those represented under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) must be recognized and addressed. San Joaquin County is designated as a nonattainment area. Therefore, Transportation Control Measure (TCM) type with sufficient detail (design, concept, and scope) to permit air quality conformity analysis performed by SJCOG must be included in the planning process.

b) Provide qQualitative and quantitative information supporting the basis of the project that responds to the transit needs.

c) Identify the amount and type of federal and non-federal funds required supporting the projects for each year represented in the plan, including the recognition of all discretionary funding estimates for the FTIP.

2.2 Long-Range Transit Plan

SJRRC will develop a Long-Range Transit Plan. The Long-Range Plan will assess the transportation needs of SJRRC and sets forth improvements necessary to address those needs over a twenty (20) year period; it will be updated every five (5) years to be consistent with the Short Range Transit Plan.

In accordance with Title 23, section 450 of the United States Code planning regulations and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) guidance, the Plan at a minimum will address the following:

a) Existing transit framework.
b) Trends and projections.
c) Market framework.
d) System improvement strategies with time frames.
e) Resource/funding framework.
f) Public participation Process.

2.3 Planning Assistance

The need to prepare short and long-range transit plans for the development of sound financial and operation decisions in the transportation planning and programming process is essential. Comprehensive planning is required by federal regulation for establishing the project need and protocol used to program federal funds into the Federal Transit Improvement Program (FTIP).

SJCOG shall provide input into the development of SJRRC's transit planning documents. In addition, SJCOG will work cooperatively with and support SJRRC in its efforts to generate planning and forecasting information needed to establish and maintain the transit planning documents. This input includes, but is not limited to, the following:

a) Obtain and analyze data from various sources to develop concrete demographic, growth, and use assumptions for the purpose of transit forecasting and development.
b) Assist in securing funds to conduct transit demand studies and in-depth analysis.
c) Assist SJRRC in obtaining state and federal funding of projects consistent with the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan.

2.4 FTIP Programming Criteria

As part of the FTIP updating process, projects descriptions with costs are programmed on behalf of all transit providers receiving federal funds identified in the FTIP by SJCOG. Consensus by all stakeholders

involved regarding the criteria used for the programming of federally funded projects within the SJCOG FTIP is essential. SJCOG and SJRRC agree to employ the following selection criteria to establish priorities for transit funding:

a) Project purpose and need.
b) Anticipated benefits.
c) Degree in which project will improve transit accessibility.
d) Degree in which project will improve transit on time performance.
e) Air quality benefits.
f) Overall cost effectiveness.
g) Leveraging other funding sources.

2.5 Regional Planning

SJCOG will be responsible for the development of regional planning documents such as the Regional Transportation Plan, the Regional Transit Systems Plan, and the Analysis and Determination of Unmet Transit Needs. SJRRC will provide input into the development of these regional planning documents.

SJRRC will assist SJCOG with efforts to achieve regional goals including the attainment of federal air quality standards.

2.6 Applications for Transit Funding

SJRRC will prepare applications to the FTA for transit funding that is consistent with the FTIP. Prior to submission to FTA, SJCOG will review the accuracy of applications and will prepare a letter of concurrence indicating consistency with the FTIP. In addition, SJRRC's applications for federal funding shall be consistent with the SJCOG Regional Transportation Plan. SJRRC shall work cooperatively with SJCOG to develop consistent funding requests from all potential transit funding sources.

SECTION 3: FTIP Project Monitoring & Maintenance

3.1 Progress Reporting

The SJCOG will be responsible for tracking the overall progress of all projects in the FTIP and will produce a mid-year report, for review by the SJCOG Board of Directors, which identifies those transit projects that have been approved for funding and implementation and those that are behind schedule. In addition, as per the Transportation Equity Act-21, SJCOG will produce an annual listing of projects for which federal funds have been approved in the proceeding year and will ensure that it is made available for public review.

SJRRC will assist SJCOG's effort to track the overall progress of FTIP projects by submitting quarterly reports that address the status of each project receiving federal funds. At a minimum, the quarterly report will include:

a) Identification and correlate projects to individual categories as identified in the FTIP (e.g., Operations, Planning, Capital Purchase, Facility Maintenance, Planning).
b) Document the stage of project deployment.
c) If project is behind schedule, the reasons for the delay.
d) Status of amount of federal obligated, received, and used to support project.
e) Identify the need for FTIP amendment.

In addition to monitoring project deployment, SJRRC will provide SJCOG with a copy of all documents/products produced as an end result from all planning activities exercised thirty (30) days after the end of each fiscal year. These results will be used by SJCOG to ensue that 5307 funds were used accordingly as per FTA's request.

3.2 FTIP Amendments

SJCOG's Executive Director will exercise the authority delegated to process minor administrative amendments, involving for example, changes in the project scope, shifting of federal funds between project phases within the triennial element of the FTIP.

As a part of the quarterly progress report, or deemed sooner by SJRRC, SJCOG, or FTA, SJRRC will alert SJCOG as to the need for amending the FTIP. In general, reasons for FTIP amendment includes e.g., funding shortfalls, delays in project deployment, and/or new projects that need to be included to the document. Other controls may need to be established to foster consistent communication to ensure the FTIP is amended in a timely fashion.

SECTION 4: MOU Amendment

This MOU may not be amended except by the written consent of both parties.

SECTION 5: MOU Termination

Either party, upon thirty (30) days written notification to the other, may terminate this MOU, without liability, of any nature, to the other.

IT IS SO AGREED:

8/28/02		8/28/02	
STACEY MORTENSEN SJRRC Executive Director	Date	JULIA E. GREENE SJCOG Executive Director	Date

450.324 Transportation improvement program: General.

a. The metropolitan transportation planning process shall include development of a transportation improvement program (TIP) for the metropolitan planning area by the MPO in cooperation with the State and public transit operators.

b. The TIP must be updated at least every two years and approved by the MPO and the Governor. The frequency and cycle for updating the TIP must be compatible with the STIP development and approval process. Since the TIP becomes part of the STIP, the TIP lapses when the FHWA and FTA approval for the STIP lapses. In the case of extenuating circumstances, FHWA and FTA will consider and take appropriate action on requests to extend the STIP approval period for all or part of the STIP in accordance with §450.220(d). Although metropolitan TIPs, unlike statewide TIPs, do not need to be approved by the FHWA or the FTA, copies of any new or amended TIPs must be provided to each agency. Additionally, in nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation related pollutants, the FHWA and the FTA, as well as the MPO, must make a conformity determination on any new or amended TIPs (unless the amendment consists entirely of exempt projects) in accordance with the Clean Air Act requirements and the EPA conformity regulations (40 CFR part 51).

c. There must be reasonable opportunity for public comment in accordance with the requirements of §450.316(b)(1) and, in nonattainment TMAs, an opportunity for at least one formal public meeting during the TIP development process. This public meeting may be combined with the public meeting required under §450.322(c). The proposed TIP shall be published or otherwise made readily available for review and comment. Similarly, the approved TIP shall be published or otherwise made readily available for information purposes.

d. The TIP shall cover a period of not less than 3 years, but may cover a longer period if it identifies priorities and financial information for the additional years. The TIP must include a priority list of projects to be carried out in the first three years. As a minimum, the priority list shall group the projects that are to be undertaken in each of the years, i.e., year 1, year 2, year 3. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, the TIP shall give priority to eligible TCMs identified in the approved SIP in accordance with the U.S. EPA conformity regulation (40 CFR part 51) and shall provide for their timely implementation.

e. The TIP shall be financially constrained by year and include a financial plan that demonstrates which projects can be implemented using current revenue sources and which projects are to be implemented using proposed revenue sources (while the existing transportation system is being adequately operated and maintained). The financial plan shall be developed by the MPO in cooperation with the State and the transit operator. The State and the transit operator must provide MPOs with estimates of available Federal and State funds which the MPOs shall utilize in developing financial plans. It is expected that the State would develop this information as part of the STIP development process and that the estimates would be refined through this process. Only projects for which construction and operating funds can reasonably be expected to be available may be included. In the case of new funding sources, strategies for ensuring their availability shall be identified. In developing the financial analysis, the MPO shall take into account all projects and strategies funded under title 23, U.S.C., and the Federal Transit Act, other Federal funds, local sources, State assistance, and private participation. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, projects included for the first two years of the current TIP shall be limited to those for which funds are available or committed.

f. The TIP shall include:

    1. All transportation projects, or identified phases of a project, (including pedestrian walkways, bicycle transportation facilities and transportation enhancement projects) within the metropolitan planning area proposed for funding under title 23, U.S.C., (including Federal Lands Highway projects) and the Federal Transit Act, excluding safety projects funded under 23 U.S.C. 402, emergency relief projects (except those involving substantial functional, locational and capacity changes), and planning and research activities (except those funded with NHS

STP, and/or MA funds). Planning and research activities funded with NHS, STP and/or MA funds, other than those used for major investment studies, may be excluded from the TIP by agreement of the State and the MPO;

2. Only projects that are consistent with the transportation plan;
3. All regionally significant transportation projects for which an FHWA or the FTA approval is required whether or not the projects are to be funded with title 23, U.S.C., or Federal Transit Act funds, e.g., addition of an interchange to the Interstate System with State, local, and/or private funds, demonstration projects not funded under title 23, U.S.C., or the Federal Transit Act, etc.;
4. For informational purposes and air quality analysis in nonattainment and maintenance areas, all regionally significant transportation projects proposed to be funded with Federal funds, including intermodal facilities, not covered in paragraphs (f)(1) or (f)(3) of this section; and
5. For informational purposes and air quality analysis in nonattainment and maintenance areas, all regionally significant projects to be funded with non-Federal funds.

g. With respect to each project under paragraph (f) of this section the TIP shall include:
   1. Sufficient descriptive material (i.e., type of work, termini, length, etc.) to identify the project or phase;
   2. Estimated total cost;
   3. The amount of Federal funds proposed to be obligated during each program year;
   4. Proposed source of Federal and non-Federal funds;
   5. Identification of the recipient/subrecipient and State and local agencies responsible for carrying out the project;
   6. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, identification of those projects which are identified as TCMs in the applicable SIP; and
   7. In areas with Americans with Disabilities Act required Paratransit and key station plans, identification of those projects which will implement the plans.

h. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, projects included shall be specified in sufficient detail (design concept and scope) to permit air quality analysis in accordance with the U.S. EPA conformity requirements (40 CFR part 51).

i. Projects proposed for FHWA and/or FTA funding that are not considered by the State and MPO to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, geographic area, and work type using applicable classifications under 23 CFR 771.117 (c) and (d). In nonattainment and maintenance areas, classifications must be consistent with the exempt project classifications contained in the U.S. EPA conformity requirements (40 CFR part 51).

j. Projects utilizing Federal funds that have been allocated to the area pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(3)(E) shall be identified.

k. The total Federal share of projects included in the TIP proposed for funding under section 9 of the Federal Transit Act (49 U.S.C. app. 1607a) may not exceed section 9 authorized funding levels available to the area for the program year.

l. Procedures or agreements that distribute suballocated Surface Transportation Program or section 9 funds to individual jurisdictions or modes within the metropolitan area by predetermined percentages or formulas are inconsistent with the legislative provisions that require MPOs in cooperation with the State and transit operators to develop a prioritized and financially constrained TIP and shall not be used unless they can be clearly shown to be based on considerations required to be addressed as part of the planning process.

m. For the purpose of including Federal Transit Act section 3 funded projects in a TIP the following approach shall be followed:
   1. The total Federal share of projects included in the first year of the TIP shall not exceed levels of funding committed to the area; and

2003 Intermodal Planning Group Schedule

(Draft-August 16, 2002)

Month and Location	Day	Date	Time
February			
Santa Barbara	Tues.	25	9:30am
San Luis Obispo	Wed.	26	9:30am
March			
Merced	Tues.	04	1:00pm
Modesto	Wed.	05	10:00am
Stockton	Thurs.	06	1:00pm
Honolulu	Tues.	11	8:30am
Redding	Tues.	11	9:00am
Chico	Tues.	11	2:00pm
San Francisco	Tues.	18	10:00am
Monterey	Thurs.	20	10:00am
Bakersfield	Tues.	25	2:00pm
Tulare	Wed.	26	10:00am
Fresno	Wed.	26	1:00pm
Sacramento	Thurs.	27	10:00am
April			
Yuma	Tues.	01	1:00pm
Tucson	Wed.	02	1:00pm
Phoenix	Thurs.	03	10:00am
Flagstaff	Fri.	04	10:00am
San Diego	Tues.	08	10:00am
Tahoe	Thurs.	10	10:00am
Reno	Tues.	15	1:00pm
Las Vegas	Wed.	16	10:00am
Los Angeles	Wed.	23	10:00am

Planning Emphasis Areas for Fiscal Year 2003

The FTA and FHWA identify Planning Emphasis Areas (PEAs) annually to promote priority themes for consideration, as appropriate, in metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes. To support this, FTA and FHWA will prepare an inventory of current practice, guidance and training in those areas. Opportunities for exchanging ideas and experiences on innovative practice in these topic areas also will be provided throughout the year. For FY 2003, FTA and FHWA are continuing with the five key planning themes originally identified for FY 2002. These are: 1) considering safety and security in the transportation planning process; 2) integration of planning and environmental processes; 3) consideration of management and operations within planning processes; 4) consultation with local officials; and 5) enhancing the technical capacity of planning processes.

1. Safety and Security in the Transportation Planning Process. TEA-21 emphasizes 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 into all stages of the transportation planning process.

FTA and FHWA are working together to advance the state-of-practice in addressing safety and security in the metropolitan and statewide planning process through workshops and case studies. A report prepared by the Transportation Research Board (TRB), Transportation Research Circular E-C02, “Safety-Conscious Planning,” January 2001, describes the issues and recommendations

identified at a Safety in Planning workshop held earlier. The report is available on the TRB website at [www.nas.edu/trb]. Also, the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) has prepared a discussion paper on the topic, entitled "The Development of the Safer Network Transportation Planning Process," which is posted to their website at [www.ite.org].

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

3. Consideration of Management and Operations within Planning Processes. TEA-21 challenges the FTA and FHWA to move beyond traditional capital programs for improving the movement of people and goods – focusing on the need to improve the way transportation systems are managed and operated. The FTA and FHWA have convened a working group and have commissioned discussion papers on the topic. This information is available at [http://plan2op.fhwa.dot.gov].

4. Consultation with Local Officials. Consultation with local officials is a vital yet sensitive issue within the transportation planning process. Within metropolitan areas, the MPO provides the venue and policy context for this. Outside of metropolitan areas, FTA and FHWA are working to facilitate the most effective consultation processes within each State. FTA and FHWA will continue

to ensure effective consultation between States and local officials in non-metropolitan areas in reviewing statewide planning and specifically, in making findings in support of FTA and FHWA STIP approvals.

5. Enhancing the Technical Capacity of Planning Processes. Reliable information on current and projected usage and performance of transportation systems is critical to the ability of planning processes to supply credible information to decision-makers to support preparation of plans and programs that respond to their localities' unique needs and policy issues. To ensure the reliability of usage and performance data, as well as the responsiveness of policy forecasting tools, an evaluation is needed of the quality of information provided by the technical tools, data sources, forecasting models, as well as the expertise of staff to ensure its adequacy to support decision-making. And if this support is found to be lacking, the responsible agencies within metropolitan and statewide planning processes are encouraged to devote appropriate resources to enhancing and maintaining their technical capacity.

The metropolitan and statewide transportation planning processes have become critical tools for responding to increasingly complex issues at the State and local levels. Many of these issues are encompassed in previously listed planning emphasis areas (e.g., integrated planning and environmental processes, management and operations, analytical tools and methods) and include much more. It is essential that FTA and FHWA provide technical assistance, training, and information to our customers to further enhance the skills and capabilities they utilize to conduct effective transportation planning processes. The FTA and

FHWA have created the Metropolitan Capacity Building (MCB) Program, and the Statewide and Rural Capacity Building Programs as tools to disseminate and coordinate information, training, and foster a dialogue for the exchange of ideas. More information on the MCB program can be found at [www.mcb.fhwa.dot.gov].

For further information on these PEAs, contact Ken Lord, FTA Metropolitan Planning Division, (202) 366-2836, or Shana Baker, FHWA Office of Metropolitan Planning and Programs, (202) 366-1862.