



THE ASSOCIATION OF METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS

Information on Noteworthy Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) Practices:

Cooperative Revenue Forecasting and Annual Listings of Obligated Projects

November 2001

Prepared for

Metropolitan Capacity Building (MCB) Program

Under a grant from

U.S. Department of Transportation

Prepared by



Noteworthy MPO Practices in Cooperative Revenue Forecasting

MPO	<i>Notable Features</i>		
	Cooperative Process among MPO, DOT, & Transit Operator(s)	Statewide Revenue Estimation Process	Stakeholders Consider Revenue Information Useful
<u>Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS)</u>	Yes	Yes	Yes
<u>Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission (PA/NJ)</u>	Yes*	Yes*	Yes*
<u>Maricopa Association of Governments (AZ)</u>	Yes	Yes	Evolving
<u>Pima Association of Governments (AZ)</u>	Yes	Yes	Evolving
<u>Puget Sound Regional Council (WA)</u>	Yes	No	Yes
<u>Rhode Island Statewide Planning Office</u>	Yes	Yes	Yes

*Applies only to the Pennsylvania element of DVRPC's bi-state process.

Noteworthy MPO Practices in Annual Listings of Obligated Projects

MPO	<i>N o t a b l e F e a t u r e s</i>			
	MPO Able to Access Obligation Data to Monitor TIP Program Implementation	Annual Listing Published	Annual Listing Disseminated to Public and Stakeholders	Cooperative MPO/State DOT/Transit Operator Structure
<u>Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (VT)</u>	Yes	TIP Section	Via TIP	Yes
<u>Metro (OR)</u>	Yes	TIP Section	Via TIP	Yes
<u>Metropolitan Transportation Commission (CA)</u>	Yes	Stand-alone	Via Website	Yes
<u>Rhode Island Statewide Planning Office</u>	Yes	Stand-alone	Limited	Yes
<u>South Central Regional Council of Governments (CT)</u>	Yes*	TIP Section	Via TIP	Yes
<u>Wasatch Front Regional Council (UT)</u>	Yes**	Stand-alone	Upon request only	Yes

*Biennial TIP includes obligated project information and project tracking information.

**Focuses on Urban STP and CMAQ-funded projects.

Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) Boise (Ada County), Idaho

Noteworthy Features

- **Suballocation of STP funds to all MPOs in state for TIP programming**
- **Documented state/MPO agreement on TIP funding distribution and negotiation process**
- **Local transportation fees generate revenue for programming**

Community Planning Association of
Southwest Idaho (COMPASS)
800 South Industry Way, Suite #100
Meridian, Idaho 83642

Phone: 208/855-2558

Website: www.planning.cog.id.us

Contact: Erv Olen, Deputy Director

TIP Revenue Forecasting Process

About 3 years ago, the Idaho DOT decided to suballocate STP local funds among the three MPOs in Idaho. This process is based on a mutual agreement through a memo of understanding (MOU) among the MPOs and DOT. The three MPOs meet at least annually to determine the split among them, and funds are re-suballocated throughout year as needed (e.g., if one MPO cannot use some of the suballocated funds and another needs them, the MPOs will work together to reallocate the funds to help meet pressing needs). Annually, the three MPOs split about \$5.5 million. As the largest MPO, COMPASS usually receives about \$3 million. The other Idaho MPOs often “bank” their funds over the years to accumulate enough to undertake a project. The MPO-DOT agreement includes a “hold harmless” provision pertaining to situations in which projects slip due to circumstances beyond MPO’s control. COMPASS characterized cooperation among the MPOs as “phenomenal.”

The agencies directly participating in the cooperative revenue forecasting process include COMPASS, the Idaho Department of Transportation, Ada County Highway District, ViaTrans (regional transit agency), other MPOs in Idaho, and Local Highway Technical Assistance Council.¹

In the three years this arrangement has been in effect, COMPASS has not foregone any funds. In the 12 years prior to this, however, the STP-local program forfeited \$32 million back to the state.

Because Ada County is a “non-classified nonattainment area,” COMPASS does not receive any direct CMAQ allocation, even though it is subject to conformity requirements.

It is important to note that Ada County is the only one in Idaho with a provision for local impact fees for roads, through the Ada County Highway District, which generates about \$8 million per year. The County also has an automobile registration fee add-on, which generates about \$3 million per year.

¹ The LHTAC is a statewide group that represents all non-MPO cities in Idaho over 5,000 in population in the transportation planning and programming process.

Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission Philadelphia, PA/Camden, NJ

Noteworthy Features

- **Statewide process for guiding and allocating TIP funding among and within MPOs (Pennsylvania)**
- **“Planning Partners” structure in Pennsylvania guides revenue allocation process**

Delaware Valley Regional Planning
Commission
111 S. Independence Mall, East
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Phone: 215/592-1800

Website: www.dvrpc.org

Contact: Charles Dougherty, Associate
Director for Transportation Planning

TIP Revenue Forecasting Process

Since 1997/98, the state of Pennsylvania has used a cooperative revenue forecasting process known as the “Planning Partners.” This group consists of representatives from the 14 MPOs, the six Local Development Districts (LDDs, the rural equivalents of MPOs), several independent counties, the State DOT (Central and Districts), FHWA, FTA, EPA, SEPTA (Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, the state's largest transit operator), the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission, and the State Transportation Commission.

Prior to the beginning of a TIP update cycle and based on the consensus of the Planning Partners and its Financial Work Group subcommittee, the state publishes a report entitled “Transportation Program Financial Guidance,” which includes estimates of funds available for highways and transit from Federal and state sources. Formulas are used to distribute funds among MPOs (and rural areas). The formulas vary by funding category. Included in the distribution rationale is a level of discretionary funding at the state level. The Financial Guidance reflects the consensus of the Planning Partners (see above) and discusses revenue forecasts, methods for distribution of funds among jurisdictions and includes numerous tables giving allocations for various funding categories. The state also provides the MPOs with a list of projects obligated on a quarterly basis, with a summary comparing obligations vs. targets by region and statewide.

The current Planning Partners system replaced the previous system, which was often rancorous and resulted in frequent inter-jurisdictional conflicts. In the mid-1990s, DVRPC took the initiative to suggest a more cooperative and rational process, and later won state support for this approach. The state subsequently took the lead in fostering and developing the current approach. There are now relatively few disagreements because mechanisms and formulas for distribution of funds have been worked out in advance, and because regions are able to negotiate their own solutions within known funding targets. Within the DVRPC region, the county and transit representatives meet regularly to discuss project and programming needs and jointly develop solutions.

In New Jersey, there is currently no analogous process, although the state now produces a document summarizing the revenue forecasts as part of the STIP.

Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) **Phoenix, Arizona**

Significant Features

- **Major MPO role in annual statewide revenue estimation and allocation process**
- **Improved perception of “fair share” issues for MPO region under revised current revenue forecasting structure**

Maricopa Association of Governments
302 N. First Ave., Suite 300
Phoenix, Arizona 85003

Phone: 602/254-6300

Website: www.mag.maricopa.gov

Contact: James Bourey, Executive Director

Cooperative Revenue Forecasting Process

Following TEA-21 enactment in 1998, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) conducted a “fair share” analysis that helped facilitate development of a new cooperative planning process between the MPOs in Arizona and the Arizona DOT, including the cooperative development of funding estimates. In 1997, there was no cooperative revenue estimates developed for use by MAG in the planning process. The MPOs gave advice to ADOT regarding project selection and funding levels, but the decision-making process was seen by MAG as a “black box.”

In 1998, the USDOT conducted a recertification review of the MAG transportation planning program and made a finding of a deficient cooperative revenue forecasting process. This finding, along with TEA-21’s strengthening of the cooperative revenue estimation requirement and the 90.5 percent minimum funding guarantee for Arizona, provided a catalyst for development of revised transportation planning and programming process in the state, known as the “Casa Grande Resolves.” Among its guiding principles are that “the Statewide Transportation Plan and Programs will be based on clearly defined and agreed to information and assumptions, including the resources available...” and that “the [statewide] program represents an equitable allocation of resources.”

To implement the revenue estimation process element of this new approach, an entity called the “Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC)” was convened. The RAAC includes representation from ADOT (4 officials), TMAs (2 Directors), MPO/COGs (2 Directors), and a TMA Transit Director. The RAAC is chaired by the ADOT Deputy Director. The RAAC operates on a consensus decision-making basis only; there is no voting. The RAAC is to continue functioning until a statewide needs-based allocation formula is implemented as part of adopting the new ADOT Long Range Plan, which should be completed within two years. MAG believes the “fair-share” situation is improving under the post-1998 cooperative revenue forecasting structure.

Pima Association of Governments (PAG) **Tuscon, Arizona**

Noteworthy Features

- **Agreement among PAG, other MPOs, and state on process for revenue forecasting assumptions and equitable distribution**
- **Major MPO role in annual statewide revenue estimation and allocation process**

Pima Association of Governments
177 N. Church Avenue, Suite 405
Tuscon, Arizona 85701

Phone: 520/792-1093

Website: www.pagnet.org

Contact: Thomas Swanson, Executive Director

Cooperative Revenue Forecasting Process

For the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP): PAG develops its own long-range revenue estimates, which it believes to be more reliable than those available through Arizona DOT (ADOT). Currently, there is no written agreement with ADOT regarding this process. PAG's Transportation Finance Subcommittee focuses mainly on analyzing future LRTP revenues.

For the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP): Following TEA-21 enactment in 1998, the Pima Association of Governments (PAG) coordinated with the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), the MPO for the Phoenix region, and approached ADOT regarding rethinking the traditional approach to allocating transportation funds in the state. Also in 1998, the USDOT conducted a recertification review of the PAG transportation planning program and made a finding of a deficient cooperative revenue forecasting process. This finding, along with TEA-21's strengthening of the cooperative revenue estimation requirement and the 90.5 percent minimum funding guarantee for Arizona, provided a catalyst for development of revised transportation planning and programming process in the state, known as the "Casa Grande Resolves." Among its guiding principles are that "the Statewide Transportation Plan and Programs will be based on clearly defined and agreed to information and assumptions, including the resources available..." and that "the [statewide] program represents an equitable allocation of resources."

To implement the revenue estimation process element of this new approach, ADOT convened an entity called the "Resource Allocation Advisory Committee (RAAC)." The RAAC includes representation from ADOT (4 officials), TMAs (2 Directors), MPO/COGs (2 Directors), and a TMA Transit Director. The RAAC is chaired by the ADOT Deputy Director. The RAAC operates on a consensus decision-making basis only; there is no voting. The RAAC is to continue functioning until a statewide needs-based allocation formula is implemented as part of adopting the new ADOT Long Range Plan, which should be completed within two years.

The RAAC provides funding allocation figures to PAG by August/September of each year. The draft STIP, which includes the MPO TIPs, is developed in October/November of each year, with TIP adoption by July 1, which is the start of the fiscal year.

Puget Sound Regional Council Seattle, Washington

Noteworthy Features

- **MPO maintains and applies a regional revenue forecasting model**
- **Multiplicity of regional transportation revenue sources**
- **MPO revenue forecasts considered sound by users**

Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Ave., Suite 500
Seattle, Washington 98104-1035

Phone: 206/464-7090

Website: www.psrc.org

Contact: Kevin Murphy, Program Manager

Cooperative Revenue Forecasting Process

In 1994, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) developed a revenue forecasting model as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) process. A committee of high-level agency staff (PSRC, City, County, Transit Operators, and WSDOT) cooperative oversaw the development of the revenue forecasting methodology and model. Consistency between MPO-level and state-level revenue forecasts is facilitated through its consistency with the state forecasting *methodology* and through its use of the same fuel and vehicle forecasts.

The actual forecasting process employed by PSRC looks first at current and historical financial data for the region. Then, using its model and forecasting process, PSRC prepares long-range forecasts of “current law” revenue and documents its financial forecast assumptions. Steps in the long-range revenue forecasting process include tax base projections, other revenue forecasts and assumptions, and allocation of revenues to various uses, agencies, and locations. Tax base projections include motor fuels, registered motor vehicles, retail sales, and vehicle value (local motor vehicle excise tax).

Revenue projections are produced by applying regression models to forecasted regional economic variables. A tax rate is applied to each projection to derive revenue. The Puget Sound Economic Model provides the forecast of socioeconomic variables used in local comprehensive plans, including population, employment, housing units, and personal income.

Updates to the forecasts are reviewed as part of the document/project development and adoption by the PSRC Technical and Policy Committees. Involvement and “buy-in” by partner agencies is assured through the voting representation of transit agencies, WSDOT, Cities and Counties on the committees. The revenue forecasts are indirectly adopted as part of Regional Plan and other documents.

Underlying PSRC’s revenue forecasting process are ISTEPA and TEA-21 and the Washington State Growth Management Act, which requires all Cities and Counties to prepare Comprehensive Plans, including a financial component. This law also requires these local Comprehensive Plans to be consistent with the relevant regional plan.

Rhode Island Statewide Planning Office Providence, Rhode Island

Noteworthy Features

- **MPO, DOT, and transit agency are all state agencies, thus facilitating close inter-agency coordination and communication**
- **Involvement of non-transportation agencies, including state budget office**
- **Integration of forecasts into Long Range Transportation Plan**

Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program
1 Capitol Hill
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Phone: 401/222-6479

Website: www.planning.state.ri.us

Contact: George Johnson, Assistant Chief

Cooperative Revenue Forecasting Process

The Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program, which is an agency of the Rhode Island state government, is also the designated MPO for the Providence metropolitan region, which covers the entire state. Rhode Island's "Planning Rule Number 9" governs and facilitates the MPO/state relationship and provides a procedure by which cooperative revenue forecasting is facilitated.

The processes by which revenue forecasts are developed for the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are similar. The LRTP forecast is updated on a three-year cycle. The MPO also has a biennially-updated six-year TIP. Revenue forecasts for the TIP are thus updated every other year. Parties participating in the revenue forecasting process include: RI Statewide Planning Council (MPO Policy Board), RI DOT, RI Public Transit Authority, the State Budget Office, and the MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC).

The steps in the revenue forecasting process generally include the following:

- RIDOT forecasts federal and state funds receivable and develops trend lines;
- The Rhode Island Public Transit Authority (RIPTA) provides input regarding FTA funds;
- MPO examines federal authorization levels and projections, and reviews these with State Budget Office as needed;
- The MPO examines state match capabilities; and
- The forecasts become part of the draft LRTPs and TIPs for public review.

Once the MPO staff and Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)² have received public input and reviewed and revised the forecasts, the LRTPs and TIPs are considered and adopted by the MPO policy board (RI Statewide Planning Program).³

MPO stakeholders believe the unique relationship between the MPO and Rhode Island state government allows very close cooperation, communication and coordination between the two parties, and advance resolution of problems and concerns.

² The Transportation Advisory Committee is comprised of 25 members, including between six and eight planners from local jurisdictions as well as representatives of state agency technical staffs. Its main role in the revenue forecasting process is review and comment on staff-prepared analyses and forecasts.

³ The MPO has a 15-member Policy Board, which includes local elected officials and representatives of state agencies.

Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization Burlington, Vermont

Noteworthy Features

- **Previous program year’s TIP projects tracked directly against obligations**
- **Annual obligation listing included in annual TIP Update document**
- **Information accessible via MPO website**

Chittenden County Metropolitan Planning Organization (CCMPO)
100 Dorset St., Suite 22
South Burlington, Vermont 05403

Phone: 802/660-4071

Website: www.ccmpto.org

Contact: Christine Forde, AICP, Program Manager

The Annual Listing Process

The Chittenden County MPO (CCMPO) noted the annual listing of obligated projects requirement in TEA-21 and approached the Vermont Agency of Transportation (VTrans) to determine how to satisfy the new statutory requirement. Prior to TEA-21, obligation information was provided only sporadically in response to specific requests. CCMPO and VTrans determined that the best way to approach this requirement would be through the annual TIP update process.

During the annual TIP development cycle, the CCMPO transmits to VTrans a listing of projects in the prior year’s TIP program element and requests the actual obligation amounts for each project. VTrans completes this form, drawing on its own and the transit operator’s information, and returns it to the CCMPO. The CCMPO then communicates with VTrans to clear up any questions or discrepancies. Once all parties concur with the listing, it is included in the draft and final TIP documents for public and policy board review and approval.

During the past few years, the process has evolved to point where the CCMPO now includes project-by-project actual obligations information in a separate TIP section, which readily allows comparison of the prior year’s TIP program element to the actual obligation amounts.

The CCMPO believes the process works well because of good communication and cooperation with VTrans and the regional transit operator.

TIP program monitoring information is the CCMPO’s key use of the process. The CCMPO also publishes the annual listing of obligations in its TIP document, which is disseminated in hard copy and via the CCMPO’s website.

The agencies involved in the annual listing process are the CCMPO, which compiles and publishes the information, VTrans, which researches, assembles, and provides project obligation information to CCMPO, and the CCTA (regional transit operator), which provides FTA funding information upon request and reviews listing documents as part of TIP development process

Metro Portland, Oregon

Noteworthy Features

- **Annual obligations listing used to track TIP project status**
- **MPO moving toward “real-time” obligation tracking technology**
- **DOT tracking now includes obligations for PE and ROW phases of projects**

Metro
600 NE Grand Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97232-2736

Phone: 504/797-1700

Website: www.metro-region.org

Contact: Terry Whisler, Sr. Transportation Planner

The Annual Listing Process

Metro’s annual listing of project obligations is based on the Oregon DOT’s (ODOT) tracking process. The listing includes obligations of all federal and state funds; does not include locally-funded projects. The data are based on forms filed by ODOT to obligate projects (PR-2), and are tracked by a software program and developed into a “Report 5”, which lists obligations by funding category and phase (PE, ROW, CON). From this data source, ODOT produces a report of annual projects implemented throughout the state.

There are separate lists for federal and state/local projects. Both lists are shared with the MPO. The process is based on approved and committed STIP/TIP and follows the actual obligations vs. estimates. Initial obligations are later adjusted as projects are completed. This adjustment reflects the actual federal expenditure of funds. The amount of funds incorporated by MPOs/Locals is based on federal regulations and funding agreements. The system works on the Federal Fiscal year, although the state fiscal year starts on July 1.

From Metro’s point of view, the current process has been in place for only one year. The primary player is ODOT. It came about as a response by Oregon DOT to the TEA-21 requirement. The MPO has a parallel obligation tracking process that is currently being updated with new hardware and software. Metro expects to track obligations in “real time” by the spring of 2002. A recent enhancement implemented by ODOT is the inclusion of PE and ROW phases of projects as well as Construction phases in the listing information.

The annual listing currently appears in the TIP and STIP. Metro plans to eventually produce a separate listing document that will be discussed at meetings, placed on its website and distributed to interested parties. It will be publicized through established public participation procedures.

The agencies involved in the annual listing process are Metro, which receives information and prepares listing, ODOT, which operates the project tracking process and shares information with MPOs. Tri-Met, the regional transit agency, does not directly participate as ODOT’s project tracking process covers FTA-funded projects.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) **Oakland, California**

Noteworthy Features

- **Obligation information accessible via MPO's website**
- **Special state and regional obligation deadline requirements drive need to track obligation of funds**
- **Project ID numbers used to link information across different agencies and databases**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission 101 8 th Street Oakland, California Phone: 510/464-7842 Website: www.mtc.ca.gov Contact: Ross McKeown, Programming and Allocations Section
--

The Annual Listing Process

MTC employs two different, but related, processes – 1) the annual report and 2) actual obligations information. The report is actually from CalTrans downloaded from CalTrans's Federal Aid Database System (FADS). This report is unmodified between FHWA and MTC. MTC requests the data from CalTrans and then posts it, unmodified, on the MTC website. Projects must be listed on the FADS in order for CalTrans to obligate funds for them.

The MTC region requires that project sponsors must obligate funds within two years or programming. For the MTC TIP, a separate obligation reporting process exists. MTC works closely with CalTrans to match up and track MTC projects' obligations. The federal project ID number is the data tracking key (links information across databases and agencies).

No formal reporting agreement exists between CalTrans and MTC; it is essentially a working relationship. MTC meets monthly with all counties and gives them the latest state-generated project status report. The actual obligation of funds by CalTrans (on behalf of sponsors) automatically triggers an obligation report to MTC (at least monthly). Although a county may submit obligation date information to MTC, MTC does not officially consider funds obligated until the CalTrans FADS report is received.

Obligation information from CalTrans is transmitted to MTC in both electronic and hardcopy (PDF file) form. It was in the past difficult to tie actual obligations back to MTC's TIP – project descriptions and dollar amounts often did not match. However, there now is a link between the CalTrans and MTC databases at the project ID number level, which makes it much easier to match projects and make databases agree.

The MTC annual listing document is posted to the MTC website in downloadable MS-Word document formats. Information on how to access the annual listing of obligated projects is noted in the MTC newsletter and posted on the MTC website. MTC also maintains a monthly, more "raw" internal report that is used for monthly meetings with counties on project obligation deadlines and issues.

The agencies involved in the annual listing process are the MTC, California Department of Transportation (CalTrans), and MPO member communities and agencies.

Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program Providence, Rhode Island

Noteworthy Features

- **Annual obligations listing compared with projects in TIP program for tracking of priorities**
- **MPO, DOT, and transit agency are all state agencies, thus facilitating close inter-agency coordination and communication**

Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program
1 Capitol Hill
Providence, Rhode Island 02908

Phone: 401/222-6479

Website: www.planning.state.ri.us

Contact: George Johnson, Assistant Chief

The Annual Listing Process

The Rhode Island Statewide Planning Program, which is an agency of the Rhode Island state government, is also the designated MPO for the Providence metropolitan region, which covers the entire state. Rhode Island's "Planning Rule Number 9" governs and facilitates the MPO/state relationship. For the Rhode Island MPO, the annual listing of obligated projects process began after passage of TEA-21. The MPO staff discovered the new annual listing requirement in TEA-21 and contacted the Rhode Island DOT to seek assistance with meeting this requirement.

The annual listing development process involves several steps. Once each year, the RIDOT provides a listing of the last year's obligations to the MPO Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)⁴ for review and comment. This listing mirrors the structure of the MPO Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for easy cross-reference. Once received, the listing is reviewed and discussed by the TAC in a public meeting. Typically, there are only minor "typo" errors, which are quickly corrected. The TAC then accepts the listing that is released for public access.

Using the state-provided information, the MPO produces two reports on obligations: a detailed listing tracks authorization by project; and a summary obligations report by TIP category available for public consumption. While the latter document is publicized and made available, it has not been widely distributed to date.

MPO staff believes the annual listing process is becoming more sophisticated and accessible. For example, it is currently migrating from using hard-copy based data to electronic data. In addition, the RIDOT is developing a Financial Management Information System (FMIS), which will be tied to project tracking information.

MPO staff noted that, as with the cooperative revenue forecasting process, very close state DOT-MPO cooperation makes the annual listing process "work."

⁴ The Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) is comprised of 25 members, including between six and eight planners from local jurisdictions as well as representatives of state agency technical staffs. Its main role in the revenue forecasting process is review and comment on staff-prepared analyses and forecasts.

South Central Regional Council of Governments New Haven, Connecticut

Noteworthy Features

- **MPO TIP includes annual project obligation information, including comparison to previous program year projects**

South Central Regional COG
127 Washington Ave., 4th Floor W.
North Haven, Connecticut 06473

Phone: 203/234-7555

Website: www.scrco.org

Contact: Herb Burstein, Director of
Transportation

The Annual Listing Process

The Connecticut Department of Transportation (ConnDOT) takes the annual obligation plan developed by the Bureau of Highways and submitted to FHWA for each Federal Fiscal Year, combines it with the obligations for FTA projects and converts it into Excel format and transmits it to the MPOs/RPAs. The Bureau of Public Transportation provides FTA obligations. The listing includes all FHWA and FTA funds but does not include state-funded projects or projects funded by municipalities. The current process has been in place for about 3-4 years, in response to TEA-21 requirements. The approach was developed by consensus between ConnDOT and the various MPOs. The MPOs have indicated satisfaction with the process.

The listing process is not formally documented. The TIP, which is produced biennially, includes a section that discusses obligated projects and compares them to previous TIPs. Discrepancies are noted, along with reasons and proposed responses.

The MPO's annual listing is distributed via the TIP document to local member governments, selected state agencies, and the public.

The agencies involved in the annual listing process are the MPO, who prepares the listing as part of the TIP, the ConnDOT Bureau of Highways, which prepares the list of obligated highway projects, the ConnDOT Bureau of Public Transportation, which prepares a list of projects obligated with FTA funds, and the ConnDOT Bureau of Planning, which consolidates the list of obligated projects and transmit them to MPOs and prepares the STIP.

Wasatch Front Regional Council Salt Lake City, Utah

Noteworthy Features

- **Annual obligations listing used to track implementation of Urban STP and CMAQ projects in TIP**
- **Established information-sharing process among MPO, DOT, and transit authority**

Wasatch Front Regional Council
295 North Jimmy Doolittle Road
Salt Lake City, UT 84116

Phone: 801/965-4364

Website: www.wfrc.org

Contact: Doug Hattery

The Annual Listing Process

Each year, the Utah DOT (UDOT) prepares the Statewide TIP (STIP) with funding allocations and distributes it to the MPOs. The Utah Transit Authority (UTA) prepares a Status Report for the MPOs that details actual obligations and discusses changes and/or needed revisions. UTA, UDOT and the MPOs meet periodically to review current obligations of projects and review status of available funds for future projects. The TIP is a three-year process; therefore, the funding allocations cover the current year plus two. The MPOs work with this database to prepare their listings. UDOT, UTA and the MPOs meet periodically to review current obligations of projects and review the status of available funds for future projects.

At the end of each federal fiscal year, the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) sends information about projects in the regional TIP to UDOT and the UTA, both of which indicate how much funding was obligated for each project. This process applies to federal funding obligations only; they do not include state or local funded projects in their TIP. The current practice has evolved over the past two years, after WFRC noticed that such a listing was a requirement of TEA-21 and initiated discussions with Utah DOT and UTA.

WFRC also prepares a list of obligated projects, which is generally about three pages. It is presented and distributed to the Regional Council members, who are generally chief elected officials. The list is not published or disseminated to the public as a separate document, but is available to anyone who requests it.

WFRC uses the obligations listing process to monitor implementation of TIP projects for Urban STP and CMAQ project categories and to review overall consistency with the TIP. WFRC concentrates on projects funded with STP and CMAQ funds because the MPO has the most direct focus on and control over these.

The agencies involved in the annual listing process are WFRC, which compiles and publishes the annual listing, and the Utah Department of Transportation and Utah Transit Authority, which share their records concerning obligations of Federal Funds.