

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-01	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	Do we have to report the environmental document (ED) TDM/TSM information for every federally funded single SOV project over 1 mile that is being carried over to the 2017 FTIP, or just <u>new</u> projects added to the 2017 FTIP?	Every federally funded SOV capacity enhancing project 1 mile or greater in length must meet this requirement.
FTIP-G 17-02	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	Do we have to report on SOV projects over 1 mile both on and off the highway system (e.g. arterials)?	Yes. With respect to arterials, our process provides for a “statement of overriding consideration” to address projects where alternative strategies may be impractical and/or infeasible. See June 20, 2014 letter to CEOs.
FTIP-G 17-03	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	What if the environmental document is not complete? How would we update the project info once the ED is complete – through and amendment? next FTIP update?;	If the environmental document is not complete, you may provide other planning reports such as alternatives analysis, PSR, etc. that documents that TDM/TSM alternatives were considered and/or incorporated into the project.
FTIP-G 17-04	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	Who determines that the documentation is adequate? SCAG or FHWA?;	SCAG will review the documentation to ascertain whether TDM/TSM alternatives were considered and/or incorporated into the project.
FTIP-G 17-05	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	What happens if SCAG/FHWA determines the project’s documentation, or lack of, is inadequate?	SCAG cannot program federal funds for significant SOV capacity enhancing projects unless the project has been developed through the congestion management process and meets this requirement. If adequate documentation or a statement of overriding consideration is not provided, then SCAG cannot program the project.
FTIP-G 17-06	2-Jul-15	Shirley Medina	RCTC	If we include the project in the FTIP without federal funds, but later add federal funds (e.g. a lead agency receives a federal grant) when and how would we provide the ED documentation?	As soon as the project is programmed with Federal funds, the CTC will be required to provide CMP information and attach the ED in the amendment or FTIP update where the federal funds are programmed.
FTIP-G 17-07	7-Jul-15	Peter De Haan	VCTC	I looked through the guidelines and have a few comments. The major comment regards the CMP applicability to smaller (less than \$50 M, longer than 1 mile) projects. What isn’t clear to me is what documentation might be acceptable for these smaller projects since (1) a small project isn’t going to have an AA; and (2) a project can’t have NEPA clearance until it’s in the FTIP, and this CMP rule is a requirement prior to programming in the FTIP. The guidelines seem to me to be creating a “chicken and egg” situation where the CMP section effectively says a project can’t be programmed until it has documentation from an environmental document, but as we know a project can’t receive NEPA clearance until it’s in the FTIP. We can discuss this issue more at next week’s workshop, since I do not have much experience with the CMP requirement.	The \$50M threshold has been removed. For SOV type projects that are 1 mile or more, documentation that demonstrates alternative strategies were considered will be required when programming such projects in the FTIP. Please keep in mind that the EIR/EIS is not the only type of document SCAG will accept, there are several other types of documentation that SCAG will accept, including a “statement of overriding consideration,” as spelled out in the guidelines. The CMP section does not prevent a project from being programmed without environmental documentation.
FTIP-G 17-08	7-Jul-15	Peter De Haan	VCTC	p. 138: VCTC has discontinued to brand name “VISTA” and replaced it with “VCTC,” so please make this change in the guidelines as well.	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-09	7-Jul-15	Peter De Haan	VCTC	p. 142: The STA numbers for Ventura County are very low. The latest FY 15/16 State Controller estimate is \$4,761,919	Comment noted. New estimates created and corrections made.
FTIP-G 17-10	7-Jul-15	Peter De Haan	VCTC	p. 150: It says the CMAQ and STP revenues must not be changed, but there are some situations when the revenues do change: (1) increased or decreased federal authorization; (2) Obligation of a larger amount than programmed through EPSP and Caltrans OA Management Policy, with EPSP requiring a post-obligation TIP amendment to show what was actually obligated. I’d expect that such changes could be made in the financial plan, with an explanation.	CMAQ and STP revenues are based on Caltrans’ estimates, in instances where federal authorization changes estimates or counties borrow funds from others, the revenues will be updated accordingly.
FTIP-G 17-11	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 1, Sec IA, Paragraph 2 - 2016 RTP/SCS should be spelled out here. Not paragraph 4	Comment noted. Correction made.

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-12	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 1, Sec IA, Paragraph 4 - Caltrans is already spelled out	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-13	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 2, Sec IA, Paragraph 5 - RTP/SCS spelled out again.	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-14	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 3, Sec IC - Period after web address?	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-15	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 4, Sec ID - Take out dash on left column	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-16	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 11, Sec IK, Paragraph 1 - Period after web address?	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-17	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 13, Sec IL, Paragraph 5 - Period after web address?	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-18	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 14 15, Sec IN1, Paragraph 3 - Take out comma after "23 U.S.C 134(j)(5)(A)"	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-19	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 16, Sec IO, Paragraph 1 - Period after "approved by the Regional Council"	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-20	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 17, Sec IP, Paragraph 7 - "...or agreements that distribute sub allocated Surface transportation Program funds." Should abbreviate for consistency.	This was a quote from CFR.
FTIP-G 17-21	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 18, Sec IQ, Paragraph 1 -Take out extra space between "web address" and "period"	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-22	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 22, Sec IT, Paragraph 2 -Period after web address?	Comment noted. Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-23	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 22, Sec IT, Paragraph 3 -Clarification on what is considered a large scale transportation project	Comment noted. Clarification made.
FTIP-G 17-24	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 22, Sec IT, Paragraph 4 - "The ATP has two grant cycles..." Change "cycles" to "process" or "call". Consider saying "The ATP is a two part sequential-call..." Caltrans uses "Cycles" to describe one whole call for projects IE. Cycle 1, Cycle 2.	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-25	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 23, Sec IT - Mention ATP chart/check boxes will be included.	Check boxes are included/shown in the graphic.
FTIP-G 17-26	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 25, Sec IIA - Adoption Schedule Chart: is there an extra space between "Nov 2015" and "June 2016"	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-27	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 28, Sec IIB2, Paragraph 1 - Font on the word "Part" looks different from rest of text	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-28	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 32, Sec IIIA, Paragraph 1 - SIP is defined a second time.	Comment noted. Since this is a new chapter it was decided to spell out the acronym.
FTIP-G 17-29	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 35-55, Sec IIIB - Font on page numbers look different from rest of guidelines	Comment noted. Page number font different on map pages. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-30	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 44, Sec IIIC, Paragraph 1 -The first bullet in Example 1 lists the modeling years for SCAG. Shouldn't these match with Table B-2.1?	Comment noted. Change made (added 2019 and removed 2022).
FTIP-G 17-31	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 49 - Where do HOT lanes and HOT Lane conversions fit under?	Comment noted. Added to Table III-A.
FTIP-G 17-32	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 54, Sec IIIG - 3rd bullet on the table has an extra space between "vehicles" and "1"	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-33	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 55, Sec IIIG - Last bullet on the table needs a space between ")" and "ITS02"	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-34	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 57-58, Sec IVA - The 2nd and 3rd bullet for TCM Timely implementation are not Justified.	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-35	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 62-63, Sec IVD - This Additional TCM/FTIP Listing Notes section is a bit unorganized.	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-36	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 68, Sec V6 - Local Advance Construction: could this section be expanded with more guidance?	Comment noted. Local Advance construction language on page 68 of 2017 Draft FTIP Guidelines is consistent with guidance provided in Department of Transportation's Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) Chapter 3.
FTIP-G 17-37	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 68, Sec V7 - Shouldn't the Toll Credit for Transit include the language needed that shows up in the Project Description?	TDC language needed for inclusion in Project Description is described on pg. 70.
FTIP-G 17-38	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 71, Sec V8, Paragraph 1 - The Flow Chart is missing the lines	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-39	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 82 - The Chart title is underlined and inconsistent with the other pages	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-40	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 95-98, Sec C1 -The borders in the chart are inconsistent. Some are bold some are missing.	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-41	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 106, Sec 3 - Define "locode" as location code.	Comment noted. Change made. "Locode" is actually Local Agency Code.

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-42	9-Jul-15	Ben Ku	OCTA	p. 112-117, Sec 4 - All abbreviations are redefined again. Suggest edit.	Comment noted. Since this is a new chapter/section it was decided to spell out the acronyms.
FTIP-G 17-43	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	Does the CMP checkboxes requirement refer to projects with ROW/CON funding in first 2yrs of FTIP or just within the quadrennial?	Four years.
FTIP-G 17-44	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	Will I be able to add CMP checkbox info in October when the 2017 FTIP is opened up?	Yes.
FTIP-G 17-45	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	How often will I need to update ATP costs? If a project has a cost increase or fund source change, will I be required to resubmit or reconfirm ATP costs haven't changed? Will I need to submit backup documentation with or without the change each amendment?	ATP costs will need to be updated any time there is a change (increase, decrease, etc.) If ATP costs haven't changed, no need to resubmit or reconfirm that ATP costs haven't changed.
FTIP-G 17-46	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	As I said in the meeting, could a conformity category of "TCM Achieved" or something similar be added as a way to remove the lockout feature of TCM Committed. For example, if I need to push out the completion date of a TCM Committed project that is already open to traffic (due to landscaping perhaps) I'd like to avoid phone calls to unlock the project.	Add explanation in TCM comment field. FTIP staff will then review
FTIP-G 17-47	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	I'm glad there's a new Project Sheet Report that removes the comment fields, but could there be an option to create a project sheet report for multiple projects that starts each new FTIP ID on a new page and not just directly after the previous report. This would be helpful when sending multiple projects to one agency. Projects get cut in half between several pages. This forces them (the local city) to duplicate pages to send two projects to two PMs	Comment noted. FTIP Database Staff is currently working on a project sheet report for multiple projects.
FTIP-G 17-48	14-Jul-15	James Mejia	SANBAG	Regarding the 2015 vs. 2017 I noticed on the 2017 FTIP Checklist (pg 41 of 182) that it has "changes to modeled projects". I thought all remodeling was being done in A99/A12 as part of the 2016 RTP. Does the switch from the 2015 to 2017 FTIP provide another opportunity to remodel projects? This is the part I wanted to discuss over the phone the most. To make sure I understood it correctly.	For the consistency amendment, no new projects may be added, the only changes in the consistency amendment will be to existing Amendment #15-99 projects. No changes to scope or completion years, the changes will have to be programmatic in nature. For the 2017 FTIP, new local projects may be added (without concern about any modeling issues). New state and transit projects may be added in the 2017 FTIP as long as they are consistent with the 2016 RTP/SCS.
FTIP-G 17-49	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 4, 6 bullet point red dash before FTIP.	Comment noted. Dash removed.
FTIP-G 17-50	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 5, section F paragraph 4 is partially redundant to paragraph 3.	Comment noted. Not redundant. Subcommittees and working groups have different functions.
FTIP-G 17-51	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 6, SB 743 is finally introduced. Suggest including in introduction.	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-52	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 6, footnote "a current federal approved FTIP."	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-53	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 7, should draft environmental documents be included?	Yes.
FTIP-G 17-54	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 14, County Transportation Commissions is used after CTC's.	Comment noted. Spelled out again to avoid confusion with California Transportation Commission.
FTIP-G 17-55	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 17, under 2 second paragraph, please remove the word "so."	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-56	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 17, CTC is used before the county transportation commission.	Comment noted. Spelled out again to avoid confusion with California Transportation Commission.
FTIP-G 17-57	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 18, extra parenthesis at top of page.	Comment noted. Parenthesis actually closes Note started on pg. 17.

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-58	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 18, A county Transportation commission	Comment noted. Word Transportation added.
FTIP-G 17-59	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 18, Under Section R 23 CFR Part 450.332	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-60	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 19, Section S. One suggestion is for SCAG to speak with FHWA again and use the threshold of major projects in Caltrans LAPM chapter 2.9 projects between \$100 million and \$500 million. Projects adding one mile or longer with TDM requirements may make many projects have TCM components.	Comment noted. SCAG eliminated its \$50 million threshold at the request of FHWA during SCAG's quadrennial MPO certification review. The guidance from FHWA was straightforward and unambiguous. No other MPO in the nation uses a threshold based on project cost to meet the CMP requirement. Removal of this threshold helped SCAG to avoid a corrective action on its MPO certification, and SCAG does not intend to revisit this matter with FHWA.
FTIP-G 17-61	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 29, under Section 3 2nd paragraph, "submitting 2017."	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-62	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 44, example 1 model years do not match SCAB modeling years.	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-63	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 53, Section or Part? Inconsistent throughout guidelines.	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-64	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 68, should HBP, HSIP, SRTS and ATP be added as eligible for TC since they are federal funds?	Comment noted. Fund sources listed are examples. Not all eligible fund sources are listed.
FTIP-G 17-65	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 70, Under section 8, 2nd Paragraph, should be "FY 2017 county TIP."	Comment noted. Change made.
FTIP-G 17-66	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 70-71, should Group listings be uploaded in FTIP Database or just included in submittal package? Should we add maps and bus schedules to the FTIP database and submittals?	Grouped Project Listings should be uploaded in the FTIP Database AND included in the submittal package. Include maps and bus schedules if related to modeling as discussed during the web-meeting.
FTIP-G 17-67	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Page 88, lists to attach group project listings to the FTIP Database. However Page 31 just states that grouped project listings need to be in the submittals. Please add the database language on page 31.	Comment noted. Attaching to Database language added both on pg 31 and pg 72 (#4).
FTIP-G 17-68	14-Jul-15	Eric DeHate	RCTC	Pages 95-98, bolded lines do not match up with program code. Pages 99 and 100 completed correctly.	Comment noted. Lines in Program Code table corrected.
FTIP-G 17-69	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	BUR16 - Revised from BURGS16 to BUR16	Comment noted. Typo - Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-70	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAN21 - Not in the Table but in the flow chart	That code has been moved to Non-Capacity Projects section of table and is now NCN21. It has been moved on flow chart as well.
FTIP-G 17-71	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAN71 - In the Table but not in the flow chart, TCM	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-72	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAN77 - In the Table but not in the flow chart, CMP	That code was NCR77. It has been updated on flow chart (pg 103).
FTIP-G 17-73	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CANT9 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	That code appears on the flow chart on pg. 103.
FTIP-G 17-74	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAR88 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-75	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CART9 - In the Table but not in the flow chart. Also in the table the same code appears twice with different description, TCM	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 103). Duplicate entry removed.
FTIP-G 17-76	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAX77 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-77	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	CAXT9 - New to the flow chart	Comment noted.

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-78	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	FER16 - Shown FERG16 in the flow chart but shown as FER16 in the Table	Comment noted. Typo - Correction made.
FTIP-G 17-79	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCN21 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-80	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCN35 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-81	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCN50 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-82	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCN86 - New to the flow chart	Comment noted. Not new; was in 2015 Guidelines flow chart.
FTIP-G 17-83	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCN95 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-84	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCR86 - New to the flow chart	Comment noted. Not new; was in 2015 Guidelines flow chart.
FTIP-G 17-85	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCR50 - In the Table but not in the flow chart	Comment noted. Added to flow chart (pg. 102).
FTIP-G 17-86	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCR77 - Not in the Table but in the flow chart	Comment noted. Code changed to CAN77 (on flow chart). (see comment FTIP-G 17-72).
FTIP-G 17-87	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	NCR88 - Not in the Table but in the flow chart	Comment noted. Was on flow chart (pg. 102) but now removed. Code changed to CAR88 (see comment FTIP-G 17-74).
FTIP-G 17-88	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	PPM01 - In the Table but not in the flow chart (it was removed from the flow chart)	Comment noted. Not in 2015 Guidelines flow chart.
FTIP-G 17-89	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	STUDY - In the Table but not in the flow chart (it was removed from the flow chart)	Comment noted. Not in 2015 Guidelines flow chart.
FTIP-G 17-90	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	TRNH6 - Exempt 93.127, TCM: Page 55 says it is Exempt and in page 61 it says TCM and page 50 says Modeling. Need clarification	Comment noted. Added "For Baseline Modeling" in the Modeling Table.

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-91	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	<p>In addition, I have questions regarding program codes for modeling/TCM type projects. Below are the list of program codes that are not shown in modeling information table in page 46-50 but they look like modeling type program codes. So, please review the following list and let me know whether each program code should be considered for potential modeling type project or not. If you have any comments on each program code, please provide me as well.</p> <p>- The projects listed in the following table are not included in tables in page 46~50</p> <p>CAX76 - Adding a Lane through a Bottleneck CAX60 - Bridge Restoration/Replacement –Lane Additions CAXT1 - Bridge Restoration/Repl. –Ln Add w/non-Motor/TCM CAX61 - Grade Separation – Capacity Enhancing CAXT9 - HOT Lane(s) Improvements/Expansion: Regionally Significant CAX74 - Slow Vehicle Passing Lanes/Truck Climbing Lanes CANT9 - New HOT Lane(s) CART9 - Existing HOT Lane(s) Improvement/Expansion CAY60 - Bridge Restoration/Replacement –Lane Additions CAYT1 - Bridge Restoration/Repl. –Ln Add w/non-Motor/TCM CAY61 - Grade Separation – Capacity Enhancing CAY74 - Slow Vehicle Passing Lanes/Truck Climbing Lanes CAR60 - Bridge Restoration/Replacement –Lane Additions CART1 - Bridge Restoration/Repl. –Ln Add w/non-Motor/TCM CAN61 - Grade Separation – Capacity Enhancing CAN71 - New Interchange with Ramp Meters/HOV Bypass CAN74 - Slow Vehicle Passing Lanes/Truck Climbing Lanes CAN77 - Reversible Lanes</p>	<p>PM = Potential Modeling</p> <p>PM - Yes. On Page 47 under Local Road and Arterial Projects PM - Yes. Added to modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX60 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAXT1 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX61 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX74 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX60 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAXT1 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX61 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX71 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Similar to CAX74 – No need to put in modeling table PM - Yes. Will replace NCR77 in table</p>

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-92	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	<p>Below are the list of program codes that are not shown in modeling information table in page 61-62 but they look like TCM type program codes. Please review the following list and let me know whether each program code should be considered for potential TCM type project or not.</p> <p>- The projects listed in the following table are not included in tables in page 61~62</p> <p>CANT1 - Bridge restoration/replacement (lane additions) with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT1 - Bridge restoration/replacement (lane additions) with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT1 - Bridge restoration/replacement (lane additions) with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement CANT2 - Highway/Road Improvements-Lane Additions with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT2 - Highway/Road Improvements-Lane Additions with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT2 - Highway/Road Improvements-Lane Additions with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement CANT3 - Interchange-Modify/Replace/Reconfigure with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT3 - Interchange-Modify/Replace/Reconfigure with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT3 - Interchange-Modify/Replace/Reconfigure with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement</p> <p align="center">(continued in next row)</p>	<p>Page 61-62 contains the TCM type projects table. Not the modeling table. Projects listed on Table IV-A are completely TCM type projects. The program codes for projects listed below contain TCM components.</p> <p>PT = Potentially TCM type project</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM; Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM.</p>

Draft 2017 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) Guidelines Response to Comments

FecoFd ID	Comment Date	Name	Affiliation	Comment	Response
FTIP-G 17-92 (continued)	14-Jul-15	Jeeseong Chung	Metro	<p>Below are the list of program codes that are not shown in modeling information table in page 61-62 but they look like TCM type program codes. Please review the following list and let me know whether each program code should be considered for potential TCM type project or not.</p> <p>- The projects listed in the following table are not included in tables in page 61~62</p> <p>CANT4 - New bridge with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT4 - New bridge with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT4 - New bridge with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement CANT5 - New Connections/Cross Traffic Improvements with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT5 - New Connections/Cross Traffic Improvements with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT5 - New Connections/Cross Traffic Improvements with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement CANT8 - New Overcross or Undercross with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Non-regionally significant CAXT8 - New Overcross or Undercross with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Regionally significant CAYT8 - New Overcross or Undercross with Non-motorized and/or TCM scope/facilities: Goods movement NCN29 - Sidewalks/Curb Cuts - NEW TRN92 - Track Extension BUR17 - Buses – Replacement – Alternative Fuel BUR16 - Buses – Replacement – Gas/Diesel</p>	<p>Page 61-62 contains the TCM type projects table. Not the modeling table. Projects listed on Table IV-A are completely TCM type projects. The program codes for projects listed below contain TCM components.</p> <p>PT = Potentially TCM type project</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - Yes. Non-TCM component of the project is not TCM</p> <p>PT - No. PT - Yes if capacity expansion; No otherwise. PT - No. Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM. PT - No. Replacement without capacity expansion is not TCM.</p>
FTIP-G 17-93	14-Jul-15	Michael Morris	FHWA	I did review the guidelines for the 2017 FTIP and they look great. Was appreciative most to see the change that eliminates the \$50M threshold previously used to determine CMP applicability. Happy to see the process move forward.	Comment noted.
FTIP-G 17-94	14-Jul-15	Abhijit Bagde	Caltrans	I don't have any comments. Good document.	Comment noted.