

Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

| FecoFd ID | Comment Date | Name | Affiliation | Comment | Response |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTIP-G 15-01 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 44 – at the top, “a” and “b” do not seem to have a heading or subheading when coming from pg 43 | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-02 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 52 – Table III-B under “Other” still lists TE projects | Comment noted. TE activities continue to be exempt from Conformity (TE funding was eliminated in MAP-21, but TE type projects are now funded by TAP). |
| FTIP-G 15-03 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg 55 – Paragraph for the SCAG, TCM-type projects and programs only includes three categories but the categories expand in detail on Pg. 59-61. Perhaps it would be good to make reference to Pg. 59-61 for detailed listing of TCM type projects | Comment noted. The reference has been added. |
| FTIP-G 15-04 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 58 and Pg. 78 – pg. 58 lists fewer than 5 expansion buses are non-reportable TCM’s while SI 58 lists 25% or new fleet for minor expansion could be grouped together. Could SCAG define what Minor Expansion of Fleet means? 25% of a large operator could be a large expansion and could be more than 5 expansion buses. | Comment noted. The minor expansion of fleet is for grouped project listings purposes and may include more than 5 expansion buses while a non-reportable TCM is a de minimis committed TCM, not required to be reported nor substituted, and may not include more than 5 expansion buses. Page 78. The 25% change refers to the percentage change to vehicle purchases and not the percentage of the agency’s fleet. |
| FTIP-G 15-05 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 65 – Will there be a different CMAQ code for PM 2.5 if 25% is to be used? Is there a carryover of PM 2.5 if a county utilizes 35% one year and 15% the next year? | Comment noted. The CMAQ code will not change, it remains the same. There is no "carryover" from one year to the next. |
| FTIP-G 15-06 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 66 – Toll credits for flex transfers are 11.47%, Transit Operating match is 20% and Capital is 50% (This was mentioned in the web conference but wanted to make sure it was addressed). | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated as follows, "For transit projects the use of toll credits may be used as the local match in part or in its entirety, in accordance with applicable federal requirements. The amount of the local match depends on the fund source or project type." |
| FTIP-G 15-07 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 102 – What is the difference between a non-reportable TCM and a non-reportable TCM committed? Why not just one? | Comment noted. There is no difference. The Final 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to clarify that non-reportable TCMs are non-reportable committed TCMs. |
| FTIP-G 15-08 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 8 – Large gaps at the bullet points | Comment noted. The formatting has been adjusted. |
| FTIP-G 15-09 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 9 – 1) Implementation of RTP modeled projects. “The project must be amended in the model...or through an FTIP-G cycle update.” | Comment noted. The projects are amended in the model through an RTP amendment or new RTP. |
| FTIP-G 15-10 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 14 – AB1246 paragraph – delete the word “in” on the 3rd line next to Commissions. | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-11 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Throughout 2015 FTIP-G document “23 CFR 450.330” stated differently: please see pgs. 15, 17, 19, 26 and 27 as examples. | Comment noted. The references to CFR are citing different sections as appropriate, thus different numbers. Formatting is adjusted on some citations in the 2015 FTIP Guidelines to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-12 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 25 and pg. 30 – Projects consistent with “amended or approved” 2012 RTP/SCS? | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been modified to read "currently approved." |
| FTIP-G 15-13 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Pg. 132 – Could the Fund Summary follow the financial plan exactly? Or vise versa? I tend to go back and forth throughout the financial plan and fund summary | Comment noted. The fund summary cannot follow the financial plan exactly because new funds are added all the time making it difficult to have the FP and summary exactly the same. |
| FTIP-G 15-14 | 3-Sep-13 | Eric DeHate | RCTC | Current 2013 FTIP-G, FUL52 – Fueling misspelled. Example please look at RIV130610 | Comment noted. The spelling has been corrected. |
| | | | | | |

Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

| FecoFd ID | Comment Date | Name | Affiliation | Comment | Response |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTIP-G 15-15 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 46 State Highway Projects – New highways Revise CATT5 to CAYT5 Remove CAX69, CAY69 State Highway Projects – New connections Add CAN69 (CAN69 replaces CAX69 and CAY69) Remove CAX69, CAY69 | Comment noted. Program code CAYT5 should be listed under New Connections. The remaining code changes will be made as suggested. |
| FTIP-G 15-16 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 59 A. High Occupancy Vehicle Measures Remove CAX69, CAY69, CAN71 | Comment noted. Program Code CAN71 should remain and has been added to Program Code list. The remaining code changes will be made as suggested. |
| FTIP-G 15-17 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 98 Capacity Increasing Highway & Road Projects Add CAN21, CAN37 Non-Capacity Construction Projects (All Types) Add NCR93, NCR90, NCR91, NCRT2 Remove NCN21, NCR77 | Comment noted. The changes will be made as suggested. |
| FTIP-G 15-18 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 99 Regionally Significant (Non Goods Movement) Add NCR77, CAN69 Remove CAX69 Regionally Significant (Goods Movement) Add NCR77, CAN69 Remove CAY69 | Comment noted. Program code CAY69 is for HOVs and should not be listed under Goods Movement. Other code changes will be made as suggested. |
| FTIP-G 15-19 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 100 Mass Transportation and Rail Projects Add BU002 (under Bus Transit/Paratransit) Remove NCN86, NCR86 (under Codes that Apply Across Bus and Rail Modes) | Comment noted. Program code changes will be made as suggested. |
| FTIP-G 15-20 | 5-Sep-13 | Jeeseong Chung | Metro | Page 101 Adm/Planning /TDM Add PPM01, STUDY Grouped Project Listing Categories Add LUM06 | Comment noted. Program code LUM06 will be added. However, the PPM01 and STUDY codes are MISC, not Adm/Planning/TDM. (MISC not shown on chart). |
| FTIP-G 15-21 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Various acronym changes and punctuation corrections pg 1-4 | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-22 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Comment on pg 5 (last paragraph) [Can't read it] Possible page break issue | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |

Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

| FecoFd ID | Comment Date | Name | Affiliation | Comment | Response |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTIP-G 15-23 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Any guidance on the STIP requirement regarding RTIP relating to SCS & how that is accomplished? Pg8 | Comment noted. There is no specific guidance on how to address that issue, other than providing a “quantitative or qualitative” assessment of how the FTIP will facilitate implementation of the SCS. That being said, SCAG will work with the county commissions to develop the required assessment. The goal in developing this assessment will be to demonstrate “progress” in the implementation of the SCS. At this point, it is anticipated that qualitative assessments will be undertaken in lieu of quantitative data being available. SCAG will work closely with the county commissions in developing these assessments and satisfying this requirement. |
| FTIP-G 15-24 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | How to program Implementation Goals on pg 9 | Comment noted. The goals listed on pg. 9 can be implemented by programming projects consistent with the goals stated for TDM and Non-motorized investment. |
| FTIP-G 15-25 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 10 Where do the amounts in table come from? | Comment noted. Please refer to the 2012 RTP/SCS Expenditure table (See subscript 2 at bottom of page). |
| FTIP-G 15-26 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Various acronym changes and punctuation corrections pg 11-14 | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-27 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 15 Only 1st 4 years regarding Expedited Project Selection? | Comment noted. Yes, the Expedited Project Selection is restricted to the first four years of the FTIP. |
| FTIP-G 15-28 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 16 Acronym change | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-29 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 30 Put periods after 5 required tests listed | Comment noted. The update has been made consistent by removing period after "TCMs". |
| FTIP-G 15-30 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 44 Remove period in table (bottom – interchange project (1)) | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-31 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 45 Table format adjustment | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-32 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 46 Table format adjustment | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-33 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 47 Table format adjustment | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-34 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 48 Remove period in table, and behind parens | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-35 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 56 Page break needed for section C. | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-36 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 58 Explain how we make the TCM substitution | Comment noted. Please refer to the top of page 57 in the 2015 FTIP Guidelines. |
| FTIP-G 15-37 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 60 Regarding TCM substitution, must total improvement from Whole group be equivalent? Or for project? No longer project by project? | Comment noted. The replacement will be done project by project with project level equivalency which will also result in equivalent scope and implementation schedule at the group level. |
| FTIP-G 15-38 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 65 Comment re: MAP-21 requirement that 25% CMAQ funds be allocated To projects addressing PM2.5 . (New – no guidelines) | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines will be updated to address comment, as appropriate, once guidance has been published. |
| FTIP-G 15-39 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 66 Underline “Conversion” statement | Comment noted. |
| FTIP-G 15-40 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 66 Toll Credit – Can use on other projects besides transit? | Comment noted. Yes, Toll Credits can be used on other projects besides transit. |

Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

| FecoFd ID | Comment Date | Name | Affiliation | Comment | Response |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTIP-G 15-41 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 66 Toll Credit – include other funding % examples | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated as follows, "For transit projects the use of toll credits may be used as the local match in part or in its entirety. The amount of the local match depends on the fund source or project type." |
| FTIP-G 15-42 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 68 Flow chart blurred | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-43 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 107 Missing colon at end of top sentence | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-44 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 122 Underline 40% or 10 Million statement under ii. | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-45 | 6-Sep-13 | Louis Zhao | OCTA | Pg 125 remove period after RTP/SCS section I | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |
| FTIP-G 15-46 | 6-Sep-13 | Peter De Haan | VCTC | p. 67: The second complete paragraph says that a Grouped Projects Listing can be changed without a TIP amendment, provided that the total funding amount does not change. VCTC staff had previously thought that a TIP amendment for a Grouped Project Listing was required any time there was a change to any of the individual annual fund type amounts, or annual toll credits amounts, that are shown in the FTIP listing. Please let us know if it is really possible to change a grouped project listing without an amendment, while moving funds between years or fund types, or else clarify in the guidelines when a TIP amendment is required. | Comment noted. The FTIP Amendments or FTIP Administrative Modifications of Grouped Project Listings are required if the fund source changes or if the funding amount changes. If the fund sources and the funding amounts remain the same, changes to the Grouped Project Listings may be made without having to go through an FTIP Amendment or an FTIP Administrative Modification. |
| FTIP-G 15-47 | 6-Sep-13 | Peter De Haan | VCTC | p. 86: Please provide more explanation as to what a "bookkeeping project" is. | Comment noted. We consider bookkeeping projects to be projects that are submitted in an amendment where all the changes take place in the prior years. In some cases, the projects are 100% Prior only. We have discussed the possibility of performing Technical Amendments if CTCs need to make these type of updates or submit any other technical changes. |
| FTIP-G 15-48 | 6-Sep-13 | Peter De Haan | VCTC | For the first time, the fund codes include separate codes for each FTA fund for each urban area. VCTC is aware that each urban area has a separate apportionment for FTA fund codes, but the same is true for STP funds. VCTC puts considerable effort into tracking the various FTA funds by urban area, and since many of the transit projects serve multiple areas, it often becomes a funds management process to determine which areas to obligate funds from, similar to the process Caltrans Local Assistance uses to obligate STP funds. In the past when separate urban area codes were suggested, VCTC was always opposed, and we would still prefer not to have the separate codes due to the significant additional effort entailed for VCTC to display the separate codes in the TIP listings and to submit numerous TIP amendments to shift funds between areas as VCTC manages the funds. During the last amendment, when these new funds codes were first required, this issue was discussed with Rosemary who suggested that the separate urban area funds codes could be used on a trial basis. See also assured me that the concurrence for FTA grants would not be held up pending a TIP amendment moving FTA funds between the Ventura County urban areas. However, this written comment is still being submitted, to be on record. | Comment noted. |

Draft 2015 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

| FecoFd ID | Comment Date | Name | Affiliation | Comment | Response |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| FTIP-G 15-49 | 6-Sep-13 | Peter De Haan | VCTC | p. 140: The STA estimates for Ventura County are very low. For example, the FY 13/14 estimated apportionment per the State Controller is \$4.8 million. | Comment noted. The SCAG Financial Forecast figures are updated every four years to coincide with the new RTP/SCS. Thus the SCAG Financial Forecast in the 2015 FTIP Guidelines are based on the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS. As a result, some of the figures may be low since it does not reflect subsequent events since the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS was approved. |
| FTIP-G 15-50 | 10-Sep-13 | Maria Lopez | Metro | FFY years on page 90 (second paragraph) of draft guidelines is not correct. FFY 13/14 would be prior in 2015 TIP | Comment noted. The 2015 FTIP Guidelines has been updated to address comment, as appropriate. |