

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) PUBLIC COMMENTS

FISCAL YEARS 2015 - 2018

QUESTION #1

Projects that will not get built in the 2015-2018 timeframe - need to have the anticipated completion data and future expected allocations.

If you do not know this info - then how can these projects be considered "constrained", i.e. that you have known identified funding for them - within the TIP window or at least a defined window if it occurs past the current TIP window?

The amount of funding is constrained, not the projects within the TIP. The TIP consists of projects (or particular phases of projects) that are receiving/ programmed to receive federal transportation funds. If phases of a project fall after the 4 year period of the TIP, they will be included in the following 4-year TIP.

QUESTION #2

I note that on the Rappahannock Parkway - (first one I looked at) that it shows a total estimated cost at 200 million but it only shows 40.5 million in allocations.

VDOT's SYIP shows different info for the same UPC:

Prelim. Eng. (PE)	\$9,500	Underway
Right of Way (RW)	\$20,000	FY2017
Construction (CN)	\$70,500	FY2018
Total Estimate	\$100,000	

How do we reconcile these differences? more important - we need the estimate construction data in FAMPOs TIP as well as the balance to complete ...

The UPC attached to the Rappahannock Parkway is now the southbound portion of the Rappahannock River Crossing Improvement Project. In the Draft Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP), the project has been further broken down. There are separate UPC numbers for the Northbound River Crossing, the Southbound River Crossing and the Rappahannock Parkway.

The figures located within the TIP were provided from Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) and are current as of January 1, 2014. January 1st was used as the cut-off date on a statewide basis to ensure the new TIPs and the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) all had the same financial information, and all met the fiscal constraint for each MPO and the State as a whole.

In July, FAMPO will be amending the TIP with an updated project and funding list which will match what is within the newly adopted Fiscal Years 2015-2020 SYIP.

FAMPO will be incorporating more information regarding previous and future allocations as well as remaining balances into the project line items.

QUESTION #3

How can there be a 30 million dollar project without a single dollar being allocated in the TIP? How does a project like this get included in the TIP when there is no allocation of funding?

This project is located within the grouped project section which does not require a funding breakdown. We have requested to pull this project out of the grouping. FAMPO is awaiting information from VDOT; once this information is received, the tables will be updated to reflect the funding allocations.

QUESTION #4

There are a number of projects included in the TIP that show a total cost but no funds allocated in the TIP window. Is this a mistake or is there an explanation for this?

These are projects that FAMPO staff had pulled from Appendix A titled *Project Groupings*. FAMPO will be updating these in July after the SYIP has been adopted.

QUESTION #5

UPC 90077 shows more allocations than total funding needed...

According to the TIP on Project Page ix (9), there is \$3,879,655 allocated in Fiscal Year 2018, and a total cost of \$6,429,097 needed for the project.

QUESTION #6

UPC 93066 shows less total allocations than total costs... when is the rest of money allocated?

UPC 93066 shows a total cost of \$14,865,363 for the construction of the Spotsylvania Virginia Railway Express (VRE) station. The TIP shows \$11,484,188 allocated in Fiscal Year 2015 including the match. The remaining \$3,381,175 was already allocated in previous fiscal years. Again, we are working to add additional information regarding previous and future allocations as well as cost to complete figures.

QUESTION #7

What is Appendix A, and why are projects in Appendix A not documented in the standard TIP format?

Appendix A is a list of grouped projects. Smaller scale projects are grouped within specific categories and are not required to be listed in the TIP in as great of detail as larger scale projects. Groupings are utilized to streamline the programming process at both the MPO and state level. It provides the ability for MPOs to shift small to moderate amounts of funding between projects in the same groupings without needing to amend the STIP.

Per 23 U.S.C. §450.324(f) - Development and content of the transportation improvement program (TIP): projects that are not considered to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, work type, and/or geographic area. Other projects that may be grouped include those which are not regionally significant and/or are exempt from air quality conformity regulations.

FAMPO is in the process of developing more detailed information, including funding, on grouped projects for display on the interactive TIP map found on the FAMPO website.

QUESTION #8

UPC 100439 - where is the TIP entry for this? Lafayette Boulevard/Kenmore Avenue Roundabout.

This is located on page xvii (17) in the TIP projects. This project will be removed from the TIP due to the project schedule being pushed back. The new anticipated start date for this project to receive funding and begin the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase is Fiscal Year 2020.

QUESTION #9

Some secondary road improvements in the long range constrained plan are said to be funded from proffers or the County. Where are these projects in the TIP?

The purpose of the TIP is to show where federal funds are being expended in the MPO. Should a secondary road receive federal funds, it will be included in the TIP, otherwise, those projects will be included in VDOT's SYIP unless the project is of regional significance or expected to receive federal funds

in the future. FAMPO staff has enhanced the language regarding which projects are and are not included in the TIP as well as the federal definition of Regional Significance. See page 6 of the TIP document.

QUESTION #10

A fair amount of verbiage about CMAQ and RSTP which is on a percentage basis - far less than other funding....I believe it should be made clear that most of the projects in the FAMPO region are funded from Federal funds not targeted at CMAQ or RSTP. Reference should be made to the Commonwealth Transportation Fund (CTF) which details all the funding, where it comes from and what it is spent on:

<https://www.dmv.virginia.gov/general/#revenues.asp>

FAMPO should point out how much of the total state funding - detailed in the CTF - is spent in our region.

The purpose of the TIP is to document federal funding sources, which include Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP). A breakdown of all federal funds to be expended in the FAMPO Region can be found on pages 26 and 27 of the TIP. State funds and state-funded projects are included in the VDOT SYIP which includes all transportation projects regardless of funding origination. However, projects that are funded with a mix of state and federal funds are shown in the TIP, and FAMPO is working to provide greater detail in the project listings.

A note of referencing, the Commonwealth Transportation Fund (CTF) has been linked from FAMPO the website.

QUESTION #11

On page 7 - the discussion on prioritization of CMAQ and RTSP may lead people astray as to how the rest of the TIP projects (with other funding) are prioritized. Mention should also be made of the new state prioritization process - which may well affect projects in our area.

FAMPO only prioritizes projects in the TIP that are found in the FAMPO Constrained Long-Range Plan (CLRP), and projects that receive funding via CMAQ and RSTP allocations. FAMPO staff has enhanced the language pertaining to the project prioritization methodology used for the Long-Range Plan. See pages 7 the TIP document.

FAMPO will include information on the new statewide prioritization process as it is developed and implemented. FAMPO (as well as other MPOs in the Commonwealth) will be working with the Commonwealth Transportation Board (CTB), VDOT, the Department of Rail and Public Transportation (DRPT) and the Virginia Secretary of Transportation's office over the next year to develop the statewide prioritization methodology.

The TIP purpose is to be an accounting to the public but in many places it reads as if it is directed at FHWA and VDOT... using agency nomenclature - citing US laws, etc.

This doc should be simple. You can footnote the agency, legal, and regulatory stuff but people should not have to wade through all of it. One or two paragraphs at the front should take care of it for the average citizen, and if someone wants to know more about the legal and regulatory specifics - refer them to the footnotes.

The TIP is a federally-required document and is directed towards Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and VDOT; however, FAMPO has and will continue to make a concerted effort in attempting to make it more informative to the public as a whole. Compared to many other TIPs around the country, the FAMPO TIP is by far one of the most user-friendly documents available.

QUESTION #12

Projects seem to be uniquely identified with UPCs but in the FAMPO TIP - the UPCs info is not consistent with VDOT SYIP info... major differences in the funding profiles and allocations in the years. It disturbs me that we are essentially duplicating info - the UPCs but the data is not the same between VDOT and FAMPO. Here may well be a simple explanation but it ought to be at least mentioned that VDOT maintains a database with the projects kept up to date while FAMPO has no such up-to-date database which renders the TIP not that useful once it ages.

See the response for question # 1. Also, the TIP is updated every time funding is added whether funds are moved between projects or removed completely from the FAMPO Region. This is done in the form of TIP Amendments adopted during FAMPO's monthly Policy Committee meetings, and the TIP document itself is updated and posted to the website to include all the TIP Amendments as they are approved.

In the public eye, the TIP is much more up-to-date than the SYIP. This is due to the fact VDOT only publishes the SYIP once a year, and the public does not have access to the live SYIP.

QUESTION #13

I typically do not reference the FAMPO TIP because I consider the VDOT SYIP more up to date - and more accurate. That should be a concern to FAMPO in my view if you want the public to rely on you to be the go-to place in the region for current information. Otherwise - we're focused on generating documents - primarily - and not up-to-date project information

In the public eye, the TIP is much more up-to-date than the SYIP. This is due to the fact VDOT only publishes the SYIP once a year and the public does not have access to the live SYIP.

You mention in the narrative that amendments are made - more or less regularly - but you provide no place for people to go - to get the latest info including the amendments...

As stated above, the TIP is updated as amendments are passed and is regularly updated and posted on the [FAMPO TIP webpage](#), along with the TIP Amendments themselves. A link and language regarding the FAMPO webpage with reference to updates and amendments has been added to the financial assumptions section of the TIP on page 27

FAMPO needs to move away from generating documents and towards maintaining current project information that people can find and assume is up-to-date and reliable.

As stated previously, amendments are made regularly and are included within the TIP as they arise. The TIP webpage has a link to each and every TIP amendment, and the Fiscal Years 2012-2015 TIP includes all amendments.

The public SYIP document is updated once a year and serves as the basis for all of the TIPs information. As previously stated, the two documents will mesh together much more closely after the July TIP amendment where all the funding allocations in the SYIP will be represented in the TIP.

QUESTION #14

Virginia has divided up the state into planning districts - in the 1960's and the purpose was to foster regional planning. The MPOs had a similar goal but I think it helps to identify the current counties in Planning District 16 and to allude to their actual and potential existing and future membership... in the MPO...

General comment, no answer provided.

To reinforce the idea that both VA and the Feds believe that regional planning is important - and that the association is on an economic regional basis - as opposed to boundaries drawn up by the King of England. These are simple concepts that many simply do not appreciate the basis for things like MPOs... thinking of them - as Federal "intrusion" into local affairs

We need to point out that Virginia, long before MPOs, wanted counties to be thinking regionally- in the same way and that MPOs fit nicely into that concept as opposed to the Feds "forcing" us to become an MPO.

General comment, no answer provided.

FAMPO needs to justify its role as a legitimate planning role. That is beneficial to citizens. Beyond the idea that the "law requires it".

General comment, no answer provided.

It will be interesting if in the current political environment in Congress if the concept of MPOs is regarded as important enough to continue funding... or allowing localities to decide to voluntarily not have a Federal MPO.

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #15

There is good verbiage about this in the document but would ask if a graphical depiction of it would draw people to the graphic first - like a flowchart perhaps (that shows that projects can come from different sources - and go through different development processes - but still show up in the TIP basically to serve the purpose of the TIP to be essentially a clearinghouse of all regional projects regardless of how they came to be a project.

FAMPO is always working to improve our planning documents, the TIP included. We are working to incorporate simple, user-friendly graphics and descriptions of processes and the mechanics of the transportation planning and programming processes.

For instance, you have HOT lanes - which FAMPO has little to do with other than providing information about them.

General comment, no answer provided.

Other projects like locally-built roads like Southpoint Parkway or the Spotsylvania Parkway (which do not appear in this TIP) - would be an example of a locally-funded (and perhaps locally administered) project

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #16

Because I cannot see the comments I have already made - I may end up making duplicative comments and I am unable to see others comments either and as far as I know - the folks who comment - never get to see their own comments or others comments and that's not a good thing.

General comment, no answer provided.

If you want to involve the citizens in the region more, and encourage them that their comments are actually read - the comments need to be responded to and made available online for the originators to see as well as the rest of the regions interested citizens.

While FAMPO recognizes the benefits of online commenting; we have a very small staff and do not have the resources to properly maintain and moderate an online commenting system.

Presently, FAMPO is meeting the letter of the rules for public participation of its major products - the TIP and LRTP and UPWP but it's not likely a successful endeavor if it is judged on actual participation - or at the least, citizens in the region have no idea of the volume of comments and points made.

General comment, no answer provided.

More comments from more of the public would be, in my view, an important goal to demonstrate that public participation is not only meeting the minimum specs for MPOs but it's actually a sign of a well-regarded MPO process that proves it has become an important institution in the community for its mission - transportation planning.

General comment, no answer provided.

The more that FAMPO focuses on providing up to date info and a continuing ability for citizens to participate and get questions answers - more than just commenting at certain times - the more FAMPO will become a known and valued regional institution.

General comment, no answer provided.

And citizens will truly guide you on the kinds and types of information they'd like to see - not just one or two "commentators" but a good mix that will better reflect the sentiments of the communities and constituencies in the region.

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #17

As commenting on previously - the generation of the TIP - and subsequent amendments to it is primarily a paper process and if someone wants to see the "real" TIP a few months after the initial release - how would they be able to see all of it - to include the amendments made to it?

See response to question 13.

A document that is maintained up-to-date becomes something that citizens would use more often - rely on for current information.

See response to question 13.

A static document that essentially goes out of date shortly after it is published is not as useful and can actually mislead people - who go online to read it and don't realize that changes have been made - that are not so noted and not provided integrated into the document.

See response to question 13.

I personally would rather see FAMPO concentrate on trying to keep the two main documents - the TIP and LRTP - in a more user-friendly, up-to-date for that people in the region can rely on - as current status - and less on scenario planning.

General comment, no answer provided.

FAMPO needs to (in my opinion) shift from a generator of static documents to a provider of current status information for transportation planning in the region.

Again, regarding the TIP, see the response to question 13. In reference to FAMPO's other planning documents, we are in the process of creating an interactive map which will show traffic congestion and travel time/speed data. This interactive map will be updated on a monthly basis to fulfill our requirements for the MPO Congestion Management Process (CMP).

QUESTION #18

While there is an area map in the TIP - there are not maps for the specific projects as there are for projects in the LRTP (and used to be in the VDOT SYIP database).

We are currently working to integrate individual maps for each project found in the TIP. FAMPO also has an interactive web map (referenced and linked in question 13) showing all of the TIP projects.

Maps help average citizens better appreciate the geographic location, scope, and how it relates to other roads in the area.

General comment, no answer provided.

Maps and other graphics tend to draw people into the document where they will then be motivated to read the narratives and spend more time in reading the document and digesting the content.

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #19

The TIP is really a "clearing house" accounting of funds from different sources expended for various transportation projects - of which FAMPO has no real decision-making role.

The purpose of the TIP is to show how federal transportation funds are spent in a MPO area. The MPO can, by federal law, prevent a federally-funded project from advancing by voting to not include it in the TIP. No federal transportation funds can be spent on a project if it is not included in the TIP.

Even for projects that FAMPO has prioritized - the "programming" of the funding and schedule is not FAMPO but instead VDOT.

General comment, no answer provided.

The most significant power that FAMPO has is that it can decide one project over another in the TIP. And if the project does not appear in the TIP - it cannot be programmed by VDOT.

General comment, no answer provided.

I feel that this is an important distinction not well recognized even by elected representatives on the Policy Committee.

General comment, no answer provided.

What discretionary projects that get into the TIP have to be decided by vote/consensus and if the Policy Committee leaves money available - on the table - because they cannot agree on what to allocate it on - the region could lose the money to other projects in the Fredericksburg District or other highway districts.

General comment, no answer provided.

The TIP process of how a project qualifies for inclusion in the TIP from the LRTP is worth explaining.

A graphic flowchart showing this relationship is under development and enhanced language has been included into the TIP under the TIP PROJECT SELECTION OVERVIEW heading, beginning on page 7 of the TIP document.

VDOT can choose to fund projects in the LRTP. And in fact, it's not clear if FAMPO actually votes to move projects from the LRTP to the TIP at all.

FAMPO does vote on all projects to be included into the TIP via amendments and adoption of a new TIP every four years. Again, no federal transportation funds can be spent on a project if it is not included in the TIP.

I think that a one page basic explanation of the process would be worth including in the TIP document - if for no other reason that for members of the Policy Committee to confirm they also concur with the "process" narrative.

See above response regarding flowchart.

Every new BOS that sends new reps to FAMPO apparently does not realize this and learns it through trial and error.

FAMPO issues every new committee member (Policy Committee (PC), FAMPO Technical Committee (FTC) and Transportation Advisory Group (TAG)) an orientation packet containing a New Member Orientation Manual that outlines each of the MPO's federal requirements, including the TIP and the purposes it serves.

We need for citizens and leaders in the region to well understand how the TIP works and how important it is - to really work toward consensus.

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #20

This comment does not pertain to many (if any) secondary road projects in the TIP but it troubles me in the LRTP that secondary roads are said to have "local" funding with some of it said to be from "proffers" - at the same time the localities are changing their proffer policies... and have no real capital fund for the specified project.

General comment, no answer provided.

Perhaps some statement about what "likely" means on prospective funding should be included because the county's will include projects in their Comp Plans by explaining that they appear in the FAMPO list of transportation projects.

It is unclear where your "likely" reference comes from. FAMPO has no control over local comprehensive plans, and how they may list the prospective funding sources for road projects contained therein.

I believe that VDOT now has a responsibility to review local Comp Plans for their consistency with transportation planning documents which leads to a bit of a conundrum if the project does not appear in the SYIP but does appear in the FAMPO LRTP.

The VDOT SYIP is a short-range financial document, whereas the FAMPO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) is a long-range vision for transportation improvements that are needed (Needs Plan) and are shown to have the projected financial resources to be completed within the plans horizon (Constrained Plan).

In short - secondary roads listed in the LRTP with proffer funding sources - unless more substantially verified - are really just unfunded needs. Especially if they have no specified start date.

Finally - the process for moving secondary road projects from a "need" to the SYIP - could be explained better and I'd suggest that it talk about the BOS involvement in communicating to VDOT what their priorities are. This process, at best, is a bit murky and not well explained in the TIP itself which I would (of course) suggest that it be better explained.

TIP and the SYIP are two different documents, and it is not under the purview of the TIP to address how secondary road projects go from simply being identified as a need to being included into the VDOT Six-Year Program.

However, in order for secondary road projects to be included in the SYIP; the locality must identify the secondary road as being a local priority and work with the VDOT District office in getting it included in the Secondary Six-Year Program.

QUESTION #21

What is the relationship between the Long Range Transportation Plan and the TIP?

The TIP is a short-term (4 year) listing of projects that are currently being developed and the LRTP is a long-term vision plan. Major projects get added to the TIP once they begin to receive funding. In the case of small scale projects such as intersection improvements; there is a category of funds identified in the LRTP for this purpose (TSM/Park and Ride Lots) to account for these projects. [See Chapter 7, page 153](#) of the LRTP for more information on this category and the types of projects included therein. All of the CMAQ and RSTP revenues (approximately \$139 million) contained in the LRTP through 2040 were lumped into this category.

Can projects that are not in the FAMPO Long Range Transportation Plan be put into the TIP?

Yes, projects can come from the VDOT SYIP, the FAMPO Congestion Management Process or other sources (studies, etc). If the project comes with its own dedicated funding source and/or is regionally significant, the project may then be amended into the LRTP.

What is the purpose of the LRTP if it does not show projects that are intended to be put into the TIP?

Projects contained in the LRTP will be included in the TIP once they begin to receive funding.

If projects in the LRTP have no relationship to the TIP - then what is the purpose of the LRTP and why is it constrained?

See above responses

The TIP needs to better explain how projects get put into the TIP.

FAMPO staff has included enhanced language explaining how projects get into the TIP under the TIP PROJECT SELECTION OVERVIEW heading, beginning on page 7 of the TIP document.

Aren't all projects that are in the LRTP prioritized for funding and intended to eventually go into the TIP?

If the project receives funding, yes.

If not - can it be explained better in the TIP that the LRTP is not necessarily a list of potential TIP projects?

It would seem the whole idea of constrained funding in the LRTP would relate to selecting which projects would go forward - and be including in the TIP when money is committed...

They are related, see above responses.

QUESTION #22

The public should be informed in the TIP that the TIP will undergo changes - and tell people how to find out when those changes are made - and how to specifically identify the changes made.

A link to the FAMPO TIP webpage and language regarding changes/amendments is provided under the FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS heading in the TIP document.

If the TIP does not provide accurate and timely information about specific updates, - then people will not rely on it to inform them about projects in our region and a key goal of the MPO TIP process will not be achieved - and that is to provide to citizens - and elected officials the current status of transportation projects in the MPO region.

General comment, no answer provided.

QUESTION #23

There appears to be a lack of consistency in the definition and use of "Regionally Significant" in the TIP as compared to the LRTP.

In the ELECTRONIC CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS e-CFR Data is current as of June 10, 2014

Regionally Significant is defined as:

" Regionally significant project means a transportation project (other than projects that may be grouped in the TIP and/or STIP or exempt projects as defined in EPA's transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR part 93)) that is on a facility which serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside the region; major activity centers in the region; major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, or employment centers; or transportation terminals) and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel."

If you remove the part in parenthesis - you get this:

"Regionally significant project means a transportation project and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel."

The CFC says "at a minimum" - those roads that ARE modeled in the MPO transportation network.

There should be a common definition used in both the LRTP and TIP and a note should be included that explains what kinds of projects are NOT included in the LRTP and TIP.

The definition of Regionally Significant from 23 C.F.R. 450.104 has been inserted into the TIP on page 6 and will be incorporated into the LRTP.

QUESTION #24

It is not fully clear how projects get placed into the TIP.

The current verbiage:

" Project recommendations are selected from the TIP or LRTP and are prioritized by the Fredericksburg MPO, and submitted to the Commonwealth Transportation Board for final approval for inclusion into the Virginia Six Year Improvement Program (SYIP)."

The above wording makes it sound like - projects - already in the TIP are - again submitted ...for approval

Is that really true?

Yes, they are not necessarily submitted again, but project funding (i.e. CMAQ and RSTP funds) is voted on every year because funds get shifted based on estimates and schedules.

Aren't projects that get put into the TIP - approved by VDOT programmed for funding and construction and the TIP (as well as the SYIP) will then show the funding sources, multi-year annual funding allocations over the years for the defined TIP window, an expected start and completion date, and if not fully funded/completed in the current TIP window - a column that shows the balance needed to complete in the future out years.

Yes, again stated in the answer to question 2, we are working to provide additional project information in the TIP.

The VDOT SYIP uses that format but in the FAMPO TIP - the start dates and dates of completion are not shown nor is the "balance to complete" shown.

See previous answer

If this information is not available at the time the TIP is put out for comment, then perhaps it should be recommended to citizens to consult with the VDOT SYIP database - with the proviso that actually dollar values may be more up to date in the TIP.

We have incorporated references to the SYIP database on page 6 of the TIP.

There need not be perfect completeness and accuracy that overwhelms FAMPO Staff but the major numbers like date of construction should be present so citizens actually have an idea of when a project is anticipated to be complete.

See above answers

In those areas where numbers can change frequently, it should suffice to advise citizens of that possibility.

It is noted under the FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS header that funding is frequently shifted between projects and the FAMPO TIP webpage should be referenced frequently for updates to project funding.

QUESTION #25

I think some of my earlier comments were expectations I had that related to what is in the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 450 - Planning Assistance and Standards.

<http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=9e8eadbcd18cf0fa306239126f6a86fa&node=23:1.0.1.5.11&rgn=div5#23:1.0.1.5.11.3.1.14>

Regionally significant project means a transportation project (I deleted the info in parens) and would normally be included in the modeling of the metropolitan area's transportation network. At a minimum, this includes all principal arterial highways and all fixed guideway transit facilities that offer a significant alternative to regional highway travel.

As stated in the answer to question # 23, the definition of regionally significant per 23 C.F.R. 450.104 has been added to page 6 of the TIP and will be incorporated in the LRTP.

Statewide transportation improvement program (STIP) means a statewide prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of four years that is **consistent with the long-range statewide transportation plan, metropolitan transportation plans, and TIPs**, and required for projects to be eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53.

The FY15-18 TIP and the 2040 LRTP are consistent with each other. There are a number of projects and initiatives that are found in both documents. The TIP also contains a number of projects that advance the overall goals and objectives of the 2040 LRTP.

Transportation improvement program (TIP) means a prioritized listing/program of transportation projects covering a period of four years that is developed and formally adopted by an MPO as part of the metropolitan transportation planning process, **consistent with the metropolitan transportation plan**, and required for projects to be eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. and title 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53.

See above response.

Consistency between the LRTP and the TIP in the use of "regionally significant" and consistency with the SYIP in nomenclature and the use of dates for the PE, R/W ,CN phases as well as the Total, start date and anticipated completion date or explain why they are different.

Regarding "regionally significant", see above responses. FAMPO staff is reviewing both documents to ensure consistency between SYIP and TIP nomenclature as well as phase start/end dates.

Include in the TIP - the Column that says "Required after" - to indicate that funding will not be complete within the current TIP window.

FAMPO staff will incorporate a project "balance to complete" cell the project tables.

Explain that funding in the TIP can be an draft/estimate until the money is actually obligated and that future funding is not necessarily assured and funding changes can and do occur.

Language regarding allocations vs. obligations was incorporated in the under the FINANCIAL ASSUMPTIONS heading.

Be consistent in outlining the funding sources. If a project shows local funding in the LRTP - then show it the same way in the TIP.

The "Potential Funding Sources" column in Table 7.4 is intended to show that each of the projects have the ability to receive different types of funding (federal, state or local). It does not commit a particular funding source to a particular project. This is done in order to promote the ability to be flexible in the ever changing realm of transportation funding.

Show a simplified funding table (modeled after the one you use in the LRTP) that shows all Federal Funding, all State funding and all Local funding rather than the multiple detail funding tables - or at least include a summary at the top.

Detailed federal funding summary tables are found on pages 30 and 31. FAMPO staff is working to incorporate supplementary summary tables also showing state and local funding sources.

Explain to readers how to determine if a TIP project has been amended...and what specifically - changed. Refer people to the VDOT database to get additional perspective but warn of the stale data issue.

A reference to the FAMPO TIP webpage that contains TIP amendments can be found on page 7 and a reference to the VDOT SYIP webpage can also be found on page 7 of the TIP document.

Explain and find a way to reconcile the difference between the TIP 4 year timeline and the SYIP 6yr timeline and explain it in simple terms.

Explain how UPC's work and why there are different UPCs that are seemingly inconsistent between the TIP and SYIP.

UPC codes are defined on page 15 of the TIP document and all UPC #'s in the TIP and the SYIP are consistent with one another.

Explain what "grouping" is and try to keep grouped UPCs separate from the more major projects that are not grouped.

All grouped projects are contained in Appendix A and are separate from major projects. A definition of grouped projects has been included in under the TIP FINANCIAL PLAN heading found on page 18

On page 12, it would be useful (also) to know how many miles of roads are in our region and even per jurisdiction.

This information has been included under the INTRODUCTION TO FAMPO heading.

On page 14 - if we are going to show a list of all possible funding sources, are we using those same funding source names consistently in the specific TIP projects ?

FAMPO staff is reviewing funding all funding source terminology to ensure consistency.

Looking through the projects - the nomenclature from one project to another does not appear to remain the same. If, for instance, funding is going to be identified as PE or CN in one - it should be done that same way in all of the projects... If funding phase is zero... better to show that - than not showing it at all - in my view. Showing zero combined with a "balance to compete" convey's information about the project not getting finished in the current TIP window.

See above responses regarding nomenclature consistency.

The project listings looks similar to what one would get from the VDOT SYIP Database if they keyed the "report" option then downloaded the Fredericksburg PDF - except the (attached) VDOT Report uses a very consistent style and nomenclature for most all projects that makes it easy for folks to scan down the list and see the status for each project using the same template which I would consider superior.

General comment, no response provided.

Thanks for receiving my comments and putting up with the duplicative and sometimes incorrect statements.

My primary motivation for my comments is to encourage and motivate the production of a more user-friendly and intuitive TIP that is accurate and up-to-date and becomes a valuable source of information for people in our Region who are interested in area transportation planning and projects.