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TIP PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHOP TOPICS

• Introductions
• Purpose, Objectives, and Responsibilities
• Project Delivery Expectations
• Funding Programs and Project Eligibility
• Project Selection and Development Process
• Project Guidance
• Project Modifications, Tracking, and Close-out
• Questions/Comments
PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES
PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

• Provide a refresher on the TIP project implementation process
  - Transportation needs
  - Sources of funding
  - Project selection and development
  - TxDOT & NCTCOG construction/implementation guidelines
  - Project tracking and closeout processes for TxDOT and NCTCOG

• Emphasize the importance of expedient and efficient project delivery practices
TRANSPORTATION FUNDING AND PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION
A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT

Local Governments
- Cities
- Counties

Texas Department of Transportation
- Dallas
- Fort Worth
- Paris

Transit Agencies
- DART
- FWTA (The T)
- DCTA & Others

Transportation Agencies
- NTTA
- DFW Airport
- Others
MAIN PROGRAMMING FUNCTIONS

RTC ROLES

• Project selection and funding
• TIP documents, currently 2013-2016
  - Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
  - Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
    - 2015-2018 pending State and federal approval
• Quarterly modifications to the TIP/STIP
• Evaluates, selects and recommends projects for RTC approval
• Develops the TIP document and quarterly modifications
• Provides project implementation assistance
• Aids in the implementation and tracking of all active and completed projects
• Provides guidance/assistance through the process
• Determines eligibility of project elements (in coordination with TxDOT and federal agencies)
• Implements RTC funds and policies consistently
• Acts as a steward of public funds
• Funding of TxDOT categories including the provision of State matches
• Project tracking
• Fund tracking and reporting
• Agreements
• Invoicing
PROJECT DELIVERY EXPECTATIONS
PROJECT DELIVERY EXPECTATIONS

• RTC expects that all project phases will adhere to the schedules as reported by the agencies
  − Data collected through TIP modifications and TIP Development

• Insufficient or inaccurate communication on the project schedule results in the following:
  − Project delays
  − Financial constraint problems
  − Increase in number of TIP modifications to accommodate fiscal year changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIP Modification Cycle</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DELIVERY EXPECTATIONS
TXDOT STIP ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

• State legislative mandate to ensure timely project delivery
• It is a State performance measure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Dallas</th>
<th>Fort Worth</th>
<th>Paris</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROJECT DELIVERY EXPECTATIONS

INACTIVE PROJECTS

• Federal Highway Administration Inactivity List
  – Projects that do not have charges at least four months after agreement execution
  – Engineering obligations over 10 years old
  – Right-of-way obligations over 20 years old

• Timely billings for Federal reimbursements are needed to remain off the inactive projects list
  • Bill regularly to avoid being flagged as inactive
FUNDING PROGRAMS AND PROJECT ELIGIBILITY
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES

• STP-MM
• CMAQ
• CMAQ “Flex”
• Metropolitan Corridor
• RTC/Local
• Texas Mobility Funds
• Toll Bonds
• Regional Toll Revenue

• Proposition 14
• Proposition 12
• Transportation Development Credits
• Transportation Enhancement Program
• Transportation Alternatives Program
• Category 12 Strategic Priority (Category 5 & 7 Reconciliation)
• Known as “Mobility Funds”

• Federal funds

• Selected by the RTC

• Used on capacity increasing projects (Freeway/HOV improvements, arterial street widenings/extensions, traffic flow improvements, air quality projects, etc.)

• Receive $89M/year on average
• Known as “Air Quality Funds”
• Federal funds
• Selected by the RTC
• Used on projects with emissions benefits (Traffic flow improvements, bus/rail transit expansion, other air quality projects)
• Receive $74M/year on average
MAP-21 legislation enabled up to 50% of CMAQ funds to be converted to a more flexible source

- Federal funds
- Selected by TxDOT and the RTC
- Fund eligibility similar to STP-MM funds
- Variable amount of funding (only $25M to date for our region)
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES

METROPOLITAN CORRIDOR FUNDS

• Also known as “Category 2 Funds”
• Combination of federal and State funds
• Selected jointly by the RTC and TxDOT (generally through the Unified Transportation Program or UTP approval process)
• Used on capacity increasing projects along major urban highway corridors
• Only available to projects on the state highway system
• Variable amount of funding per year
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
RTC/LOCAL FUNDS

• Local funds created by and available to the RTC
• Selected by the RTC
• Primarily used for Air Quality and Sustainable Development projects
• $83M in authorized funds exist and is mostly programmed
• Hope to develop future partnerships that will refuel this fund
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
TEXAS MOBILITY FUNDS (TMF)

• Funded by registration/user fees
• Used on major transit and highway projects
• Selected by the RTC with final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission (TTC) or just by the TTC
• Variable amount of funding
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
TOLL BONDS

• Funded by North Texas Tollway Authority (NTTA) or through Comprehensive Development Agreements (CDAs) [CDAs are also known as public-private partnerships]

• Toll bonds typically used to finance projects that produce revenue such as toll roads and HOV/managed lane projects

• Variable amount of funding
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
REGIONAL TOLL REVENUE (RTR) FUNDS

- Funded with toll proceeds from toll projects--NTTA or CDA
- Source of funds:
  - Up-front payment by tolling entity,
  - Excess revenue payment by tolling entity, or
  - Interest accrued on these funds
- May be spent on state highway system, public transit, or air quality projects
- Selected by the RTC with strong participation levels from local agencies (cities, counties, etc.)
- Final approval by the Texas Transportation Commission
- Variable amount of funding—to date, the region has ≈ $3.6 billion in RTR funds from SH 121 and SH 161
- $2.19 billion spent as of June 2014
• Revenue bonds backed by future dollars in Fund 6
• Fund monies may be spent to acquire right-of-way, build, maintain and police public roadways, and to enforce traffic and safety laws
• Helps to advance projects to reduce project backlog
• Does not bring new money to the table (debt financing)
• Variable amount of funding
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
PROPOSITION 12

• Backed by funds from the State’s general fund
• Fund monies may be spent to acquire right-of-way, build, maintain and police public roadways, and to enforce traffic and safety laws
• Helps to advance projects to reduce project backlog
• Does not bring new money to the table (debt financing)
• Variable amount of funding
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
TRANSPORTATION DEVELOPMENT CREDITS (TDCs)

• TDCs are “earned” by the region when toll revenues are used to fund capital projects on public highways
• TDCs are not money or cash
• They do not increase funding for a given project
• Eligible “match” to federal funding award
• 465 million credits available presently in DFW region
• 131.46 million TDCs programmed to date
Projects with specific importance to the State

Funds projects that:

- Promote economic opportunity
- Increase efficiency on military deployment routes
- Retain military assets in response to the federal military base realignment and closure reports
- Maintain the ability to respond to both man-made and natural emergencies

Provide pass-through toll financing for local communities

Projects are selected by TxDOT
FUNDING SOURCES/CATEGORIES
CATEGORY 12 STRATEGIC PRIORITY (CMAQ & STP-MM RECONCILIATION)

• NCTCOG staff in coordination with TxDOT staff work to reconcile the Category 5 and 7 funds annually.

• These funds represent a periodic reallocation of funds identified as part of the annual reconciliation

• Funds are placed into the following subcategories
  – Category 12 (S) for Category 7 (STP-MM) Reconciliation
  – Category 12 (C) for Category 5 (CMAQ) Reconciliation

• Shown as Category 12 (S) and Category 12 (C) in the TIP/STIP

• Variable amount of funding
ELIGIBILITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS
FEDERAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional Classification Eligibility</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterials (Rural/Urban), Including Interstates</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterials</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Collectors</td>
<td>Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Collectors</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td>Not Eligible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projects must be on the Federal-aid Highway System, and Facility must be functionally classified above a major collector.
PROJECT SELECTION AND DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT SELECTION

Occurs through:

• Calls for projects
• Funding initiatives

Involves:

• Competitive project selection (technical review),
• Strategic project selection (based on priorities), or
• Partnerships (“roundtable discussions”)

Timing:

• Federal funds = every 2-3 years or as funds become available
• Regional Toll Revenue, RTC/Local = as funds become available
PROJECT SELECTION

Projects Can Be Submitted:

- Through calls for projects
- In between calls for projects, agencies can request project funding; however, there is no guarantee that the project will be funded between calls

Future Calls for Projects:

- Anticipate funding the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) in the future
- In this scenario, there would be no large calls for projects
- Instead, Staff and the RTC would review the staging of the MTP to identify the next subset of projects to fund
APPROVAL PROCESS

• Staff review & recommendation
• Public Involvement
• STTC Action
• RTC Action
• Commission approves projects through UTP
• Commission concurrence on RTR-funded projects
• Add projects to TIP/STIP
• Local agency signs agreement with TxDOT
PRIORITIZATION OF IMPROVEMENTS IN THE MOBILITY PLAN

- **Maintenance and Operation of Existing Facilities**
  - Trans. System Management
  - Intelligent Trans. Systems

- **Improve Efficiency of Existing Facilities**
  - Management & Operations (ITS,TSM/TDM, Bike/Ped)

- **Remove Trips From System**
  - Carpool/Vanpool Program
  - Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities

- **Induce Switch to Transit**
  - Bus/Commuter Rail/Light Rail

- **Increase Auto Occupancy**
  - HOV System

- **Additional Single Occupant Vehicle Capacity**
  - Freeway/Tollway
  - Regional Arterial

- **2035 Plan**
MPO PLANNING AREA AND SUBREGIONS

Legend
- Nonattainment Area (CMAQ Eligible)
- Subregion Boundary
- MPA Boundary (STP-MM Eligible)

Western Subregion

Eastern Subregion
Typical Roadway Project Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Local Consensus</th>
<th>FHWA Decision</th>
<th>Project Letting</th>
<th>Project Opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Long Range Planning</td>
<td>Environmental Study/ Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Final Design/ PE/ROW Acquisition</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1+ Years</td>
<td>3-6 Years</td>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
<td>2-5 Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Litigation/Public Opposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add 5-10+ Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning to Operation: 8-17+ years

Typical Transit Project Development Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Transit Agency Takes On Project</th>
<th>FTA Decision</th>
<th>FTA Decision</th>
<th>FTA FFGA Approval</th>
<th>Project Opens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Long Range Planning</td>
<td>Alternatives Analysis / EIS</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1+ Years</td>
<td>2-4 Years</td>
<td>2-3 Years</td>
<td>3-7 Years</td>
<td>Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Litigation/Public Opposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add 5-10+ Years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planning to Operation: 8-15+ years
PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

Project Idea

Preliminary Design

Initial Estimate of Costs

Submit as Candidate for Funding

Project Evaluation and Scoring

Project Selection and Funding Commitment

Placement of Project in TIP

Placement of Project in STIP

Commission Approval (via UTP)
Development of LPAFA → Collection of Local Match → LPAFA Executed → FPAA Issued → Environmental Clearance (Federal/State) → Development of Plans, Specifications, & Estimates → Acquisition of Right-of-Way → Utility Relocation → Performance Monitoring → Project Opening → Project Construction → Project Letting
PROJECT GUIDANCE
COST ESTIMATES

• Specify Requested Funding by Phase (i.e., Environmental, PE, ROW, Utilities, Construction, E&C)
  – Ranges/Estimates provided in packet, used by staff when reviewing project requests
  – Utilities (Eligibility, Match Agreement)

• Provide Cost Breakdown by Phase

• Provide Date of Latest Cost Estimate

• Show Roadway and Non-Roadway Costs
  – Landscaping
  – Mitigation
  – Pedestrian Amenities

• Eligible project costs and construction cost ranges available in packet
COST ESTIMATES (CONTINUED)

• Amenities and Landscaping
  – One percent (1%) threshold (construction costs) for On-System Projects
  – Above 1% may be eligible for federal funding, but not eligible for State match for On-System Projects
  – Some amenities may be 100% local and not apply toward 20% Match

• E&C Charges
  – What are they?
  – When do they apply?
  – Estimate is given as an average, as they change every year
  – Make sure to account for them in project cost estimates
  – See handout in packet for general guidelines
PROJECT COSTS

• Pros and cons of using federal funds for PE and ROW
  – Federal/TxDOT design standards
  – Federal procedures
  – Timing

• Pros and cons of using local funds for PE and ROW

• Items typically funded 100% locally on federal projects
  – May not count toward the local match requirement
  – Examples include environmental mitigation - hazardous waste, tree mitigation, wetlands
  – Cost for zoning/ordinances required above TxDOT standards

• Guidance regarding eligible project costs is available in the packet
LOCAL MATCH

• Generally a 20% local match is required for federal funds
  – Cash match is best
  – In-kind match is possible, but difficult to implement or justify
  – Local funds spent prior to LPAFA execution does not count in the 20% match calculation

• Regional Toll Revenue and RTC/Local funds have varying local match requirements
  – Cash match up to 20% generally required
  – In-kind matches may be accepted on a project by project basis
UTILITIES

• Federally funded, On-System, non-interstate project (i.e., SH, US, FM, BUS), in which utilities are in State's ROW—if utilities must be moved to widen facility, owner must move at owner’s or local government’s expense

• Federally funded, On-System, non-interstate project in which utilities are in own easement—if Roadway encroaches upon easement, federal and State funds can pay for relocation

• Federally funded, On-System, interstate project—utility relocation funded with 100% federal funds

• Federally funded, Off-System project, in which utilities are located in easement—relocation reimbursed with federal funds
• Federally funded, Off-System project, in which utilities are located in easement—relocation funded 100% locally

• Federally funded, Off-System project, in which utilities are not in easement—relocation funded 100% locally

• Federal or state funded, bridge program—local entities must buy ROW and pay for relocation costs (100% local)

• RTC/Locally Funded project—relocation not eligible

• Burying utilities—not eligible

• Additional information available in workshop materials and on TxDOT’s local government web page
OTHER REQUIREMENTS

• ITS Architecture statement required for all ITS projects
• See handout in packet for details
CONTRACTING WITH TXDOT

• Applies to all federally and State-funded projects

• Local agreement execution process
  – Once project is approved in TIP/STIP, implementing agency should contact district representative
  – District sends draft LPAFA to implementing agency
  – Implementing agency sends executed LPAFA to district with first installment of local match
  – District sends final LPAFA to TxDOT Austin
  – TxDOT sends request to FHWA for FPAA
  – FPAA is received from FHWA
  – Project initiation
    • TxDOT Fort Worth initiates kickoff meeting
    • Agencies in TxDOT Dallas District should initiate kickoff meeting
    • TxDOT Paris District works in coordination with agencies to initiate kickoff meeting
• Timeline

• Supplemental agreements

• Implementing agencies must sign standard agreement
  – LPAFA (example in handout)
  – Right-of-Way Participation Agreement (example in handout)
  – Terms are not negotiable

• Link and Table of Contents for TxDOT’s Local Government Project Procedures Manual is provided in the packet
CONTRACTING FOR RTR PROJECTS

• **On-system Projects**—Some or all work on the State Highway System

• **Off-system Projects**—Projects are entirely off the State Highway System

• **Sustainable Development RTR Projects**
  – Three party agreement between TxDOT, NCTCOG, and Agency
  – Guidance is available online at: http://www.nctcog.org/trans/sustdev/landuse/funding/CFP09.asp

• Templates available in the packet
CONTRACTING FOR RTC/LOCAL PROJECTS

• Coordinate with NCTCOG staff to initiate the agreement process

• Ensure that the Agency’s policy board has taken all necessary actions to receive RTC/Local funds

• Require before and after photos to close out (if applicable)
FEDERAL STANDARDS/PROCESS

• TxDOT standards and specifications required on all federally and State-funded projects

• Required even if project is locally let

• If paying for PE 100% locally, agencies must still use Federal/TxDOT standards on federal projects

• If paying for ROW 100% locally, agencies must still follow federal/TxDOT requirements on federal projects
Types of Environmental Documentation

- **Categorical Exclusions (CE):**
  - ALL Approved at District Level (since Feb of 2014)
    - Examples of **c-Listed** projects: bike/ped; safety projects; landscaping; signal work; pavement markings
    - Examples of **d-Listed** projects: Adding shoulders, auxiliary lanes; bridge replacement/reconstruction; changes in access control

- **Environmental Assessments (EA) and Environmental Impact Statement (EIS):**
  - Both will be approved at ENV Level pending NEPA Assignment (anticipated by the end of 2014)
    - EA Example: Added Capacity
    - EIS Example: Toll Road
    - More collaboration will occur between Districts and ENV in developing these documents
    - Early coordination and approval of Technical Memorandums prior to submittal of the formal document
Environmental Document must be completed **Before** project can go to letting or project **Will Be Delayed**

Early coordination with respective district ENV Coordinators is essential to the project schedule
- Project scoping needs to be done prior to beginning any ENV work
- Communication between environmental and design staff is crucial to project development
- Engineering plans cannot pre-determine the outcome of the Environmental Documentation

Implementing agencies should be **Proactive** in completing their Environmental Documentation
- Coordination should begin at the very beginning of the process and not the end

Depending upon the type of document, the timeframe can vary from 6 months to as long as 36 months
Items to be included in Environmental Documents are now accessible via the Environmental Compliance Toolkit on TxDOT’s website

– search for the keyword “environmental compliance”

If a consultant is performing the Environmental Documentation, we recommend that they are Pre-certified in the TxDOT Work Categories,

– If the Implementing Agency is not seeking federal reimbursement, Pre-Certification is not necessary, but Highly Recommended

– search for the keyword “precertification” on TxDOT’s website for more information

ROW Acquisition cannot occur prior to Environmental Clearance, unless not seeking federal reimbursement for ROW Expenses
Environmental Handbooks

- Replaced the Environmental Manual
- Covers 20 Subjects
- Focused on process steps necessary to develop Environmental Documents
- Released on-line in the Environmental Toolkits
Environmental Compliance Toolkits

Official ENV Division Documents are only found here in the “Environmental Compliance Toolkits”

Go to www.txdot.gov
Search for the key word “environmental compliance”
TxDOT Websites that you should be aware of:

- You can access the Environmental Compliance Toolkits at http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/compliance-toolkits.html


- Training and Development (Non-TxDOT staff, consultants or contractors may attend the following events or training classes) at http://www.txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/professionals.html

• All RTR projects require environmental review per 43 TAC, Part 1, Chapter 2, Subchapter A.

• The type depends on if the project is on the federal or state highway system and if the project also has federal and state monies.

• Purpose is to ensure that the implementing agency is complying with applicable state and federal laws and regulations.

• The environmental process must be completed before monies for either right-of-way acquisition or construction are distributed by TxDOT.
• Documentation can be submitted based on your own local environmental review process.

• Checklist can be completed before funding agreement is signed with TxDOT.

• Send to NCTCOG via regular mail or e-mail, but document needs to include a signature. NCTCOG review averages about two weeks.

• The approval should follow typical approval process for each implementing agency (i.e., city council or board approval).

• Following approval, submit letter or resolution to NCTCOG.
Many local governments do not have a formal local environment review process for transportation projects.

To assist in fulfilling the local environmental review requirements, NCTCOG has developed two local environmental review checklists with instructions.
WHICH CHECKLIST SHOULD BE USED?

• Full Checklist (8 pages)
  – Use if a project requires right-of-way, major construction, or permitting or is controversial.

• Simplified Checklist (1 page)
  – Use if a project would have little or no environmental impacts based up the type of work that is performed under normal circumstances.
  – Typical projects that may qualify include landscaping, fencing, signing, pavement markings, sidewalks, and traffic signals.

BEFORE using the Simplified Checklist, please call Nathan Drozd or Sandy Wesch to verify it is appropriate.
• Under “Implementing Local Entity Projects with RTR Funds” on RTR web site

• Instructions/Guidelines:  

• Full Checklist:  

• Simplified Checklist:  

www.nctcog.org/trans/rtr/
HELPFUL HINTS

• If hiring a consultant, make them aware of the checklist and/or contact NCTCOG to help develop the scope for the environmental work

• If using the checklist, the document needs to include a signature

• If a NEPA document was approved for the project prior to the funding change to RTR, submit the document and approval letter to fulfill the environmental requirement

• Attach additional pages, as necessary, to answer the questions
TxDOT REVIEW OF PLANS

• Every federal or state funded project requires TxDOT review of plans

• 30% Plans
  – Implementing agency sends to TxDOT District
  – TxDOT reviews plans

• 60% Plans
  – Implementing agency sends to TxDOT District
  – TxDOT reviews plans

• 90-95% Plans
  – Implementing agency sends to TxDOT District
• 100% Plans (Final Review)
  – Implementing agency sends to TxDOT District
  – Plans are processed for letting

• Other review requirements
  – Bridge layouts
  – Railroad crossings

• Timeline of the plan review process is available in the packet
LOCAL LETS

• What is a locally let project?

• TxDOT makes the decision regarding ability to locally let a project upfront

• Differences between TxDOT let and locally let projects

• Process/Requirements
  • Implementing Agency Requests Local Letting
  • TxDOT Staff Must Sit in on Bid
  • Inspected Periodically to Verify Billing Submittals
  • Plans Must Meet AASHTO Standards

• Timeline

• Local agency has to attend the TxDOT Local Government Project Procedures training
PROJECT MODIFICATIONS, TRACKING, AND CLOSE-OUT
DEVELOPMENT OF THE TIP

www.nctcog.org/trans/tip/

• Inventory of funded projects

• Identifies
  – Scope of work
  – Approved funding types, amounts, and phases
  – Approved timing for projects

• Approved by the RTC

• Included in the Statewide TIP (STIP)

• Financially constrained using allocations from the Unified Transportation Program (UTP)
MODIFICATION OF THE TIP

• Governed by Regional Transportation Council TIP modification policy
• Includes RTC action items, administrative amendments, previous action items, and staff action items
• Quarterly cycle (Feb., May, Aug., & Nov.)
• Information on the TIP modification process is available at http://www.nctcog.org/trans/tip/modification.asp
• Requests for adding, deleting, or modifying projects must be submitted online in the Revenue and Project Tracking System (RAPTS) at http://rtrinternal.nctcog.org
• TIP modification submittal workshop was held in July 2014; detailed information available online:
  – http://nctcog.swagit.com/play/07082014-536 (Video Recording)
TIP MODIFICATIONS
(CONTINUED)

• STIP Revision Policy
  – Only Applies to Certain Modifications
  – Entails Federal and State Review (two additional months of review time)

• Types of changes that require a TIP modification are:
  – Changes in fiscal year
  – Funding revisions
  – Scope, limits, or facility changes
  – Others (See policy)

• Fixed Funded Projects
  – Sustainable Development
  – ITS
TIP MODIFICATIONS (CONTINUED)

- Established “TIP Points of Contact” must enter TIP modifications

- TIP Modifications deadlines must be met and are available in your packet and continually updated at http://www.nctcog.org/trans/tip/modification.asp
PROJECT VERIFICATIONS

• Verification of project status should be completed by local partners throughout the project development process.

• Specifically, agencies should check the TIP/STIP six months prior to:
  – Environmental clearance
  – Starting any phase of the project (includes engineering, ROW acquisition, utilities, and construction)
  – Letting

• Lack of planning can cause significant project delays
Transportation Funding and the
Transportation Improvement Program

Within metropolitan areas across the country, regional transportation projects are tracked through Transportation Improvement Programs. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a staged, multyear program of projects approved for funding by federal, state, and local sources within the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Every two to three years, the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), local governments, and transportation agencies, develops a new TIP.

General Information
- Frequently Asked Questions about the TIP
- How are transportation projects funded?

RAPTS - TIP Modification Submittal System
- TIP Modification Submittal Workshop Handout
- Video Recording of TIP Modification Submittal Workshop

2013-2016 TIP
- RTC approved on April 12, 2012
- FHWA and FTA approved on November 1, 2012. See Appendix G for federal approval letter.
- Modification of the TIP - policies, procedures, archived modifications

2015-2018 TIP—pending State and federal approval

Previous TIPS
2011-2014 TIP - 2011 Amendment (Federal Highway Administration and RTC-approved)
2008-2011 TIP - 2009 Amendment

Annual Project Listings

RAPTS - Revenue and Project Tracking System (Current as of May 2014) - click on icon below:

TIPINS - Transportation Improvement Program Information System (Current as of August 2014)
- Project Search Engine

Funding Initiatives/Calls for Projects
FINDING PROJECT-SPECIFIC INFORMATION

Transportation Funding and the Transportation Improvement Program

Within metropolitan areas across the country, regional transportation projects are tracked through Transportation Improvement Programs. The Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is a staged, multiyear program of projects approved for funding by federal, state, and local sources within the Dallas-Fort Worth area. Every two to three years, the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG), in cooperation with the Texas Department of Transportation (TDOT), local governments, and transportation agencies, develops a new TIP.

General Information
- Frequently Asked Questions about the TIP
- How are transportation projects funded?

RAPTS - TIP Modification Submittal System
- TIP Modification Submittal Workshop Handout
- Video Recording of TIP Modification Submittal Workshop

2013-2016 TIP
- RTC approved on April 12, 2012
- FHWA and FTA approved on November 1, 2012. See Appendix G for federal approval letter.
- Modification of the TIP - policies, procedures, archived modifications

2015-2018 TIP - pending State and federal approval

Previous TIPS
2011-2014 TIP - 2011 Amendment (Federal Highway Administration and RTC-approved)
2009-2011 TIP - 2009 Amendment

Annual Project Listings

RAPTS - Revenue and Project Tracking System (Current as of May 2014) - click on icon below:

TIPINS - Transportation Improvement Program Information System (Current as of August 2014)
- Project Search Engine

www.nctcog.org/trans/tip
RTR PROJECT CLOSEOUTS

• RTR projects must be closed out properly so that any remaining funds are placed back in the appropriate accounts and made available for future programming.

• Information on the closeout process is available at the following web address.

• Sample RTR closeout checklist provided in the packet
Regional Toll Revenue Funding Initiative Overview

The Regional Toll Revenue funding initiative expedites transportation projects by providing desperately needed funding.

The Texas Legislature enabled the Texas Department of Transportation to consider public- and private-sector partnerships to finance roadways. The result is a completed project with a toll component and revenue for transportation projects.

Reliance on traditional funding sources will not be sufficient to meet mobility needs of the growing region.

Increasing costs, an aging infrastructure system and decreasing revenue contribute to a funding shortfall. A general summary of how transportation projects move from idea to funding to implementation is available.

+ SH 121 and Other Transportation Projects

+ RTR Calls for Projects
### SH 121 RTR Funding Balances as of June 30, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Account 1</th>
<th>Account 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTR Initial Allocation</td>
<td>$2,459,931,000</td>
<td>$737,173,248</td>
<td>$3,197,104,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Received</td>
<td>$187,446,273</td>
<td></td>
<td>$233,022,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Reclassifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,576,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payoffs Received</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Disbursements</td>
<td>-$1,432,592,514</td>
<td>-$625,917,155</td>
<td>-$2,058,509,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTR Investment Balance</td>
<td>$1,237,509,747</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,665,537,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advances to Local Entities</td>
<td></td>
<td>$49,915,287</td>
<td>$782,907,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Entity Interest</td>
<td>$15,123,424</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,213,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Entity Expenditures</td>
<td>-$287,779,798</td>
<td>-$21,853,694</td>
<td>-$309,633,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTR Funds Balance as of 6/30/2014*</td>
<td>$1,697,846,027</td>
<td>$456,179,594</td>
<td>$2,154,025,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Spent to Date amounts are less than TxDOT reported expenditures to reflect the unused advance balances being held by Local RTR Entities by $473,374,429

### SH 121 RTR Project Commitments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Account 1</th>
<th>Account 2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTR Initial Balances</td>
<td>$2,459,931,000</td>
<td>$737,173,248</td>
<td>$3,197,104,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earned</td>
<td>$187,446,273</td>
<td></td>
<td>$233,022,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Reclassifications</td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,576,519</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Committed Projects*</td>
<td>-$2,728,068,482</td>
<td>-$557,763,143</td>
<td>-$3,285,831,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Committed Projects*</td>
<td>-$136,858,400</td>
<td>-$527,333,394</td>
<td>-$664,191,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Payoffs Received</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for Future projects</td>
<td>-$194,824,621</td>
<td>-$31,351,932</td>
<td>-$226,176,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = Committed Funds are as of May 1, 2014

** = Negative Available Funds are Committed Loans to be paid back in near term.
**SH 121 RTR Funding Balances By County as of June 30, 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>RTR Initial Allocation</th>
<th>Interest Received</th>
<th>Spent To Date</th>
<th>Reclassifications</th>
<th>Ending Balances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLIN</td>
<td>$873,675,036</td>
<td>$72,616,130</td>
<td>$416,288,335</td>
<td>$25,746,766</td>
<td>$555,749,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLAS</td>
<td>$509,618,479</td>
<td>$26,758,496</td>
<td>$337,005,572</td>
<td>$78,338,587</td>
<td>$77,709,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHART</td>
<td>$1,608,602,851</td>
<td>$120,026,720</td>
<td>$566,280,973</td>
<td>$19,907</td>
<td>$1,162,368,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS</td>
<td>$3,560,674</td>
<td>$917,737</td>
<td>$27,642,701</td>
<td>$24,100,000</td>
<td>$943,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>$4,198,212</td>
<td>$211,437</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$4,409,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAUFMAN</td>
<td>$2,727,555</td>
<td>$431,562</td>
<td>$27,259,438</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$186,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKER</td>
<td>$3,411,047</td>
<td>$171,877</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$3,582,839</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCKWALL</td>
<td>$8,490,069</td>
<td>$1,166,903</td>
<td>$41,715,074</td>
<td>$23,142,344</td>
<td>$815,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARRANT</td>
<td>$117,812,324</td>
<td>$5,933,437</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$120,234,356</td>
<td>$3,511,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST SET ASIDES</td>
<td>$37,600,000</td>
<td>$3,405,917</td>
<td>$4,343,962</td>
<td>$2,048,488</td>
<td>$38,710,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST SET ASIDES</td>
<td>$27,400,000</td>
<td>$1,382,579</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$28,782,579</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIOUS</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,197,104,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>$233,022,795</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,605,670,967</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,481,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,830,000,410</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SH 121 RTR Project Commitments By County**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>RTR Initial Allocation</th>
<th>Interest Reclassifications</th>
<th>Project Commitments</th>
<th>Loan Commitments</th>
<th>Funds for Future Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COLLIN</td>
<td>$873,675,036</td>
<td>$72,616,130</td>
<td>$25,746,766</td>
<td>$19,102,758</td>
<td>$-15,958,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DALLAS</td>
<td>$509,618,479</td>
<td>$26,758,496</td>
<td>$337,005,572</td>
<td>$485,810,065</td>
<td>$-497,280,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEHART</td>
<td>$1,608,602,851</td>
<td>$120,026,720</td>
<td>$19,907</td>
<td>$1,670,792,457</td>
<td>$38,754,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLIS</td>
<td>$3,560,674</td>
<td>$917,737</td>
<td>$24,100,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$186,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOOD</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNT</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNSON</td>
<td>$4,198,212</td>
<td>$211,437</td>
<td>$4,409,649</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAUFMAN</td>
<td>$2,727,555</td>
<td>$431,562</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$-15,005,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Gotti</td>
<td>Sr. Program Manager</td>
<td>817 608 2338</td>
<td>cgotti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Person</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant</td>
<td>817 608 2349</td>
<td>lperson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omar Barrios</td>
<td>Sr. Transportation Planner</td>
<td>817 608 2337</td>
<td>obarrios</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Initiatives; Regional Toll Revenue Projects &amp; Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Beckom</td>
<td>Prin. Transportation Planner</td>
<td>817 608 2344</td>
<td>abeckom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Malkowski</td>
<td>Transportation Planner I</td>
<td>817 608 7353</td>
<td>amalkowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Overton</td>
<td>Transportation Planner II</td>
<td>817 704 2548</td>
<td>moverton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Smith</td>
<td>Transportation Planner III</td>
<td>817 695 9254</td>
<td>asmith2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIP/STIP and Federal/State Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth Bunkley</td>
<td>Sr. Transportation Planner</td>
<td>817 695 9288</td>
<td>kbunkley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandy Wesch</td>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td>817 704 5632</td>
<td>swesch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Drozd</td>
<td>Transportation Planner III</td>
<td>817 704 5635</td>
<td>ndrozd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Mandapaka</td>
<td>Sr. Transportation Planner</td>
<td>817 704 2503</td>
<td>pmandapaka</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trey Ingram</td>
<td>Transportation Planner II</td>
<td>817 704 2505</td>
<td>tingram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Beckham</td>
<td>Grants and Contract Supervisor</td>
<td>817 608 2308</td>
<td>ebeckham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TXDOT CONTACT INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TxDOT Dallas District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes McClure</td>
<td>Advanced Transp Plan Director</td>
<td>214 320 4461</td>
<td>wes.mcclure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Williams</td>
<td>Environmental Specialist</td>
<td>214 320 6686</td>
<td>sandra.williams2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chelsea Dilday</td>
<td>Contract Specialist</td>
<td>214 320 6124</td>
<td>chelsea.dilday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamelia Spillman</td>
<td>Transp Planner</td>
<td>214 320 4476</td>
<td>tamelia.spillman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perge</td>
<td>Asst Advanced Project Engineer</td>
<td>214 320 6283</td>
<td>dan.perge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TxDOT Fort Worth District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyl Bussell</td>
<td>Director of Transp Plan &amp; Dev</td>
<td>817 370 6532</td>
<td>loyl.bussell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Bolin</td>
<td>Advanced Transp Plan Director</td>
<td></td>
<td>michael.bolin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Hawkins</td>
<td>Transp Funding Specialist</td>
<td>817 370 6948</td>
<td>shannon.hawkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Finch</td>
<td>Transp Funding Specialist</td>
<td>817 370 6868</td>
<td>sara.finch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TxDOT Paris District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Mackey</td>
<td>Director of Transp Plan &amp; Dev</td>
<td>903 737 9375</td>
<td>ricky.mackey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sansom</td>
<td>Transportation Planner</td>
<td>903 737 9373</td>
<td>penny.sansom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS