

The Connections 2040 Regional Mobility Plan has been prepared to satisfy federal, state, and local needs. In order to demonstrate how the RMP addresses state and federal legislation and guidance, the following checklist was developed. Its intended use is for documenting, in one place, where and how the 2040 RMP does the following: (1) meets requirements in federal code and regulation and state statute, and (2) addresses expectations and guidelines from the federal agencies and the MPOAC.

- The “A” items relate to MAP-21 metropolitan transportation planning requirements in 23 U.S.C. 134 and 49 U.S.C. 5303.
- The “B” items relate to the regulations on metropolitan transportation plans and on interested parties, participation, and consultation codified in the C.F.R. following passage of SAFETEA-LU. The process for codifying regulations to administer MAP-21 is under way.
- The “C” items are state statutory requirements for long-range transportation plans not otherwise addressed in federal code or regulation.
- The “D” items relate to *Federal Strategies for Implementing Requirements for LRTP Update for the Florida MPOs* (November 2012). FHWA and FTA distributed this document to highlight notable areas for improvement and assist MPOs in meeting federal planning requirements.
 - The unnumbered items allow for reporting on topics in the Emerging Issues and Proactive Improvements sections. The MPO has the option of deleting them since MPOs are not required to include consideration of these topics in their current planning processes and plans.
- The “E” items are from the MPOAC-adopted Financial Guidelines for MPO 2040 Long Range Plans (January 2013). The MPO is encouraged to report on these items but has the option of deleting them since guidelines rather than requirements in code, regulation, or statute are involved.

Given the recent passage of the FAST Act (December 2015), there is no separate guidance currently in place for that legislation.

To the extent there is overlap among items, references to responses to other items can be made instead of repeating information.

Regionally significant project, as defined in 23 CRF 450.104 and this checklist, 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) 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.

- BRT – Bus Rapid Transit
- CFP – Cost Feasible Plan
- C.F.R. – Code of Federal Regulations
- CRT – Commuter Rail Transit
- CRTPA – Capital Region Transportation Planning Agency
- FAST Act – Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act
- FHWA – Federal Highway Administration
- F.S. – Florida Statutes
- FTA – Federal Transit Administration
- HRT – Heavy Rail Transit
- LRT – Light Rail Transit
- LRTP – Long Range Transportation Plan
- MAP-21 – Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century
- MPOAC – Metropolitan Planning Organization Advisory Council
- O&M – Operations and Maintenance
- RMP – Regional Mobility Plan
- SAFETEA-LU – Safe, Affordable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – A Legacy for Users
- SIS – Strategic Intermodal System
- STIP – State Transportation Improvement Program
- TIP – Transportation Improvement Program
- TRIP – Transportation Regional Incentive Program
- U.S.C. – United States Code

RMP Checklist – A

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2013-title23/pdf/USCODE-2013-title23-chap1-sec134.pdf>

<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/USCODE-2013-title49/pdf/USCODE-2013-title49-subtitleIII-chap53-sec5303.pdf>

Requirements in U.S.C		When and How Addressed
A-1	<p>Is the plan performance-driven and outcome-based, including to support national goals for the Federal-aid highway program (23 U.S.C. 150) and general purposes for public transportation systems (49 U.S.C. 5301)?</p> <p>23 U.S.C 134(c)(1)&(h)(2)(A), 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(1) &(h)(2)(A)</p>	<p>The guiding statements of the plan are laid out in Chapter 1 (1.7-1.8) reflect the community's vision for the plan as well as the performance-driven baseline. Taken as a whole, the statements outline outcome-based strategies that aim to guide regional growth of CRTPA.</p>
A-2	<p>Does the plan provide for the development and integrated management and operation of a transportation system and facilities (including accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities) that will function as an intermodal transportation system for the MPO's metropolitan planning area and as an integral part of an intermodal transportation system for the State and the nation?</p> <p>23 U.S.C 134(c)(2), 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(2)</p>	<p>Chapter 3 serves as the Multimodal Needs assessment for the RMP. Chapter 3 (3.10) describes the process used to create a final list of cost-feasible intermodal transportation projects. Chapter 4 is categorized by modal characteristics and highlights how the project prioritization process ranked all projects.</p>
A-3	<p>Did the process for developing the plan consider all modes of transportation and is it a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive process?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(c)(3), 49 U.S.C. 5303(c)(3)</p>	<p>Chapter 7 illustrates the continued coordination opportunities and roles that agencies/stakeholders can provide in ensuring all modes of transportation are addressed in a continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive process.</p>
A-4	<p>Did the MPO coordinate its plan with the plans of other MPOs for the same metropolitan (urbanized) area, including any transportation improvements/projects located within the boundaries of more than one MPO metropolitan planning area?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (g)(1)&(2), 49 U.S.C. 5303(g)(1)&(2)</p>	<p>Coordination on projects within more than one MPO area was not required since CRTPA does not share borders with any other areas. Other LRTPs around the state were consulted to inform best practices for the development of the RMP.</p>
A-5	<p>Were other related planning activities within the metropolitan area considered in developing the plan (including State and local planned growth, economic development, environmental protection, airport operations, and freight movements)?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(g)(3), 49 U.S.C., 5303(g)(3)</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (1.4-1.6) provided a master reference sheet of other planning activities that were considered in the RMP's development.</p>
A-6	<p>Were the eight planning factors considered as they relate to a 20-year forecast period?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(h)(1)&(i)(2)(A)(ii), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(1)&(i)(2)(A)(ii)</p>	<p>The guiding statements laid out in Chapter 1(1.7-1.8) reflect these MAP-21 planning factors.</p>

Requirements in U.S.C		When and How Addressed
A-7	<p>Was the requirement to update the plan at least every five years met?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(i)(1)(B)(ii), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(1)(B)(ii)</p>	<p>The Connections 2040 RMP was adopted on November 16, 2015. The MPO's 2035 plan was adopted in 2010.</p>
A-8	<p>Does the plan identify transportation facilities (including major roadways, transit, multimodal and intermodal facilities, non-motorized transportation facilities, and intermodal connectors) that should function as an integrated metropolitan transportation system, giving emphasis to those facilities that serve important national and regional transportation functions?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(A)(i), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(A)(i)</p>	<p>Recommendations are identified for transportation improvements across all modes. Chapter 6 displays the Cost Feasible Plan recommendations, with the various travel modes served by each recommendation noted. Projects that are part of the Strategic Intermodal System were identified and financially constrained as a part of the financial analysis documented in Chapter 5.</p>
A-9	<p>Does the plan include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and potential areas to carry them out, including activities that may have the greatest potential to restore and maintain the environmental functions affected by the plan? Was this discussion developed in consultation with Federal, State, and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(i)(2)(D), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(D)</p>	<p>The list of agencies that the MPO coordinated with is included in Chapter 7 (7.1).</p>
A-10	<p>Does the plan include a financial plan that demonstrates how the adopted transportation plan can be implemented, indicates public and private resources reasonably expected to be made available to carry out the plan, and recommends any additional financing strategies for needed projects and programs?</p> <p>Does the financial plan include any additional projects for illustrative purposes?</p> <p>Did the MPO, the transit operator(s), and the State cooperatively develop estimates of funds that will be available to support plan implementation?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(E), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(E)</p>	<p>Chapter 5 provides the financial analysis that demonstrates how each of the transportation projects can be implemented and indicates how resources that are reasonable expected to be made available during that time. Appendix 4 includes the projects in the cost feasible plan along with unfunded needs and project opportunities.</p> <p>The committees who consulted in the development of the plan are the Technical Advisory Committee and the Citizens Multimodal Advisory Committee. The MPO also consulted with transit operators and state agencies throughout the CRTPA process as part of the StarMetro Transit Development Plan (final draft dated October 2015).</p>
A-11	<p>Does the plan include operational and management strategies to improve the performance of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(F), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(F)</p>	<p>The plan includes Systems Management measures that have taken place in the CRTPA region to better coordinate traffic congestion and safety improvement measures in Chapter 3 (3.6).</p>

Requirements in U.S.C		When and How Addressed
A-12	<p>Does the plan include capital investment and other strategies to preserve the existing and projected future metropolitan transportation infrastructure and provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(G), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(G)</p>	<p>Chapter 4 (4.2) includes evaluation criteria of projects that gave higher ranking to projects that provided for improvement of other modal priorities and/or were identified in the Congestion Management Plan for both existing and future conditions.</p>
A-13	<p>Does the plan include proposed transportation and transit enhancement activities?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(H), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(H)</p>	<p>Chapter 4 (4.2) prioritizes improvements that are transit enhancement activities.</p>
A-14	<p>In developing the plan, did the MPO consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(i)(5), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(5)</p>	<p>The list of agencies that the MPO coordinated with is included in Chapter 7 (7.1).</p>
A-15	<p>Were citizens, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties provided with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the plan?</p> <p>Was a participation plan developed in consultation with all interested parties? Did this plan provide that all interested parties have reasonable opportunities to comment on the contents of the plan?</p> <p>Did the MPO hold any public meetings at convenient and accessible locations and times, employ visualization techniques, and make public information available in electronically accessible formats and means?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134(i)(6), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(6)</p>	<p>The Public Outreach Compendium (Appendix 1) summarizes the activities and results of all public outreach efforts. The Compendium also includes lists of attendees as well as copies of surveys taken by citizens in the CRTPA region. The list of agencies that the MPO coordinated with is included in Chapter 7 (7.1).</p> <p>At the outset of the planning process, a public involvement plan (PIP) was developed in consultation with interested parties. The PIP was consulted throughout the plan development process. When scheduling outreach activities, consideration was given to ADA accessibility and access to public transit. A range of visualization techniques, including mapping, keypad polling, and tablet-based surveys were used at public events. An online MetroQuest survey was promoted as a complement to in-person outreach activities. In addition, materials from the planning process were made available on the plan's website, connections2040rmp.com. Results from these activities are included in Appendix 1.</p>
A-16	<p>Was the approved plan published or otherwise made readily available for public review including, to the maximum extent practicable, in electronically accessible formats and means?</p> <p>23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(7), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(7)</p>	<p>Yes. The plan is found in its entirety on the CRTPA's website as well as the plan's website, connections2040rmp.com. All public input that was received is compiled in the Public Outreach Compendium (Appendix 1).</p>

RMP Checklist – B

<http://www.e.C.F.R..gov/cgi-bin/retrieveEC.F.R.?gp=&SID=5fc7946b772f5f6b1177c7eeebb0fc39&r=PART&n=23y1.0.1.5.11>

Requirements in Federal Regulations (SAFETEA-LU)		When and How Addressed
B-1	<p>Does the plan cover a 20-year horizon from the date of adoption?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(a)</p>	<p>Chapter 6 includes county-by-county cost feasible plans that lay out projects in 4 tiers—totaling 25 years of improvements. The RMP also includes Beyond 2040 projects which represent vision projects.</p>
B-2	<p>Does the plan include both long-range and short-range strategies/ actions?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(b)</p>	<p>Chapter 5 provides cost feasible plans for the CRTPA region and is divided into timeframes (4 tiers). The 4 tiers include 25 years of improvements (short-term and long-term strategies/actions)</p>
B-3	<p>Was the plan updated based on the latest available estimates and assumptions for population, land use, travel, employment, congestion, and economic activity?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(e)</p>	<p>Appendix 2 includes an extensive existing conditions report, which includes population and travel estimates used in the assessments. Chapter 2 of the plan represents a summary of Appendix 2.</p>
B-4	<p>Does the plan identify the projected transportation demand of persons and goods in the metropolitan planning area over the period of the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(1)</p>	<p>Appendix 6 goes in depth about the travel demand model and how it was used to prepare the RMP. This included a projected transportation demand of people and goods in the MPO through the year 2040.</p>
B-5	<p>Are the results of the congestion management process considered in the plan and how?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(4), see also 23 U.S.C. 134(k)(3)(A), 49 U.S.C. 5303(k)(3)(A)</p>	<p>The Congestion Management Plan was reviewed in concert with the RMP development to ensure consistency. The project prioritization process detailed in Chapter 4 used the presence of a facility in the CMP as one of its evaluation criteria, thereby incorporating the CMP directly into the project ranking for the RMP.</p>
B-6	<p>Does the plan describe proposed improvements in sufficient detail to develop cost estimates?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(6)</p>	<p>Chapter 4 includes background on the performance-based project evaluation process whereby prioritization processes were tailored to specific modes. To properly prioritize each modal project, the plan included details that allowed extensive prioritization efforts. The projects that are included in Chapter 4 describe the improvements in detail and also include cost estimates.</p>

Requirements in Federal Regulations (SAFETEA-LU)		When and How Addressed
B-7	<p>Does the plan identify pedestrian walkway and bicycle transportation facilities in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 217(g) and transportation and transit enhancement activities as appropriate?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(8)&(9)</p>	Chapter 4 (4.1) describes how bicycle and pedestrian projects were prioritized and funded as well as how roadway projects were evaluated based on their support of multimodal mobility and accessibility.
B-8	<p>Does the plan include system-level estimates of costs and revenue sources to adequately operate and maintain Federal-aid highways and public transportation?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(10)(i)</p>	Appendix 5 includes the 2040 Revenue Forecast for FDOT. The estimated operations and maintenance funding were used to extrapolate systems-level estimates of O&M funds for the CRTPA area.
B-9	<p>Are the plan's revenues and project costs reflected in year of expenditure dollars?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(f)(10)(iv)</p>	Chapter 5, the Financial Analysis, includes project costs in the cost feasible plans that are reflected in year of expenditure dollars (5.13-end of chapter).
B-10	<p>Was the plan developed in consultation, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation?</p> <p>Did the consultation involve, as appropriate, a comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, or a comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(g)</p>	The list of agencies that the MPO coordinated with is included in Chapter 7 (7.1). Appendix 2 included an extensive existing conditions report which took into account conservation concerns as well as natural and historic resources.
B-11	<p>Does the plan include a safety element consistent with the State's Strategic Highway Safety Plan, and (as appropriate) emergency relief and disaster preparedness plans and strategies and policies that support homeland security?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(h)</p>	Safety and security issues were identified through the development of Chapter 2 and Appendix 2. These issues contributed to recommendations identification displayed throughout the rest of the plan. Chapter 7 (7.3) also includes federal initiatives that create opportunities to compete for existing and future funding for disaster recovery purposes.
B-12	<p>Did the MPO use its participation plan developed under 23 C.F.R. 450.316(a) to provide a reasonable opportunity for interested parties to comment on the plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.322(i)</p>	Appendix 1, the Public Outreach Compendium includes all results of public outreach efforts, including activities and public comments.

Requirements in Federal Regulations (SAFETEA-LU)		When and How Addressed
B-13	<p>In developing the plan, did the MPO seek out and consider the needs of those traditionally underserved by existing transportation systems such as low-income and minority households?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(vii)</p>	<p>Appendix 2, the Existing Conditions Report, included extensive research about where traditionally underserved populations live. These populations and subsequent areas were considered when coming up with public outreach venues for workshops.</p>
B-14	<p>Has the MPO demonstrated explicit consideration of and response to public input received during development of the plan? If significant written and oral comments were received on the draft plan, is a summary, analysis, and report on the disposition of the comments part of the final plan?</p> <p>23 C.F.R. 450.316(a)(1)(vi)&(2)</p>	<p>Appendix 1, the Public Outreach Compendium, contains all comments that were received throughout the outreach process. The comments received on the draft plan is included in this Appendix as well.</p>
B-15	<p>Did the MPO provide an additional opportunity for public comment if the final plan differs significantly from the version that was made available for public comment and raises new material issues which interested parties could not reasonably have foreseen from the public involvement efforts?</p> <p>23 C.F.R 450.316(a)(1)(viii)</p>	<p>There have not been any significant changes to the plan following the last public outreach opportunities.</p>

RMP Checklist – C

http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=0300-0399/0339/Sections/0339.175.html

State Statutory Requirements Not Otherwise Addressed in Federal Code or Regulation		When and How Addressed
C-1	<p>Are the prevailing principles in ss. 334.046(1), F.S. – preserving the existing transportation infrastructure, enhancing Florida’s economic competitiveness, and improving travel choices to ensure mobility – reflected in the plan?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(1), (5)&(7), F.S.</p>	Chapter 1 (1.7-1.8) includes the guiding principles of the plan which altogether, support Florida’s prevailing principles.
C-2	<p>Does the plan give emphasis to facilities that serve important national, state, and regional transportation functions, including SIS and TRIP facilities?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(1)&(7)(a), F.S.</p>	Chapter 5 includes a description and breakout of funding available for SIS projects. Available revenues for these funding sources are discussed in Appendix 5 (FDOT 2040 Revenue Forecast) and are used as a basis for the Cost Feasible Plan developed in Chapter 5.
C-3	<p>Is the plan consistent, to the maximum extent feasible, with future land use elements and the goals, objectives, and policies of the approved comprehensive plans for local governments in the MPO’s metropolitan planning area?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(5)&(7), F.S.</p>	Appendix 2, the Existing Conditions Report, as well as portions of Chapter 1 include a review of previous plans and references socioeconomic data that was used in order to develop the plan.
C-4	<p>Did the MPO consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(1) & (7) F.S.</p>	Appendix 8 includes an in-depth review of air quality in the CRTPA area and includes strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning to reduce overall greenhouse gases.
C-5	<p>Were the goals and objectives identified in the Florida Transportation Plan considered?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(7)(a), F.S.</p>	Chapter 1 (1.7-1.8) includes the guiding principles of the plan are compatible with the Florida Transportation Plan.

State Statutory Requirements Not Otherwise Addressed in Federal Code or Regulation		When and How Addressed
C-6	<p>Does the plan assess capital investment and other measures necessary to (1) ensure the preservation of the existing metropolitan transportation system including requirements for the operation, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation of major roadways and requirements for the operation, maintenance, modernization, and rehabilitation of public transportation facilities; and (2) make the most efficient use of existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the mobility of people and goods?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(7)(c), F.S.</p>	<p>Appendix 5 includes the assessment of revenue forecasts for FDOT. This included assessments of capital investment and other measures for the CRTPA area.</p> <p>Chapter 4 (4.1) describes how pedestrian, bicycle, and multimodal projects were ranked and thereby funded to enhance existing transportation facilities in order to relieve congestion and maximize mobility of people and goods.</p>
C-7	<p>Was the plan approved on a recorded roll call vote or hand-counted vote of the majority of the membership present?</p> <p>Subsection 339.175(13) F.S.</p>	<p>The Connections 2040 RMP was adopted at the CRTPA Policy Board meeting held on November 16, 2015. A quorum was reached for the meeting and the RMP was approved unanimously.</p>

RMP Checklist – D

<http://www.dot.state.fl.us/planning/policy/metrosupport/lrtp/LRTPExpectations2012.pdf>

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)		When and How Addressed
D-1	<p>Were the requirements for inclusion of projects in the MPO's transportation improvement program (TIP) considered when developing the LRTP?</p>	<p>The projects that are included in the TIP were included in Tier 1 in the plan, as shown in Chapter 5. These plans are existing and committed projects.</p>
D-2	<p>Projects in the LRTP: Does the plan include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Projected transportation demand in the planning area, ● Existing (E+C) and proposed transportation facilities that function as an integrated system, ● Operational and management strategies, ● Consideration of results of the Congestion Management Plan, ● Strategies to preserve existing and projected future transportation infrastructure, ● Pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and ● Transportation and transit enhancement activities? <p>Are projects that meet the definition of regionally significant in 23 CRF 450.104 included in the Cost Feasible LRTP?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Appendix 6 includes the projected transportation demand in the CRTPA area. ● The plan included projects from the TIP, which comprise the E+C integrated system. ● The plan includes Systems Management measures that have taken place in the CRTPA region to better coordinate traffic congestion and safety improvement measures in Chapter 3 (3.6) ● Facilities identified in the Congestion Management Plan were considered as part of the project prioritization process in Chapter 4. ● Chapter 1 includes plans and projects that are related and considered in development. ● Chapter 3, the multimodal assessment, as well as Chapter 4, the prioritization chapter, includes consideration for pedestrian and bicycle facilities as well as how these facilities were ranked in modal-specific prioritization processes. ● Chapter 4 includes how projects were evaluated in the plan and includes consideration for transit enhancement activities. ● All identified regionally significant projects were considered as part of the Cost Feasible Plan development, detailed in Chapter 5.

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)		When and How Addressed
D-3	Grouped Projects in the LRTP: If non-regionally significant projects have been grouped in the LRTP, are the groups specific enough to determine consistency between the LRTP and the TIP? Are the grouped projects similar in function, work type, and/or geographic area?	Non-regionally significant projects such as minor sidewalk additions or striped bicycle lanes have been identified as part of the opportunities plan, included in Appendix 4. All regionally significant projects are included either as part of the Cost Feasible Plan or the unfunded needs list, shown in Appendix 4.
D-4	Fiscal Constraint/Operations and Maintenance: Does the LRTP provide system level cost estimates for O&M activities using each of the five-year cost bands or as a total estimate for the entire timeframe of the LRTP? Are O&M cost estimates included for state- and locally-maintained facilities covered in the LRTP? Is the general source of funding for O&M activities identified? Is there a clear separation of costs for O&M activities and for capital investment projects?	Appendix 5 includes the assessment of revenue forecasts for FDOT. This included assessments of O&M and capital improvements funds. Operations and maintenance costs for transit are detailed in Chapter 5.
D-5	Fiscal Constraint/Total Project Costs: For each capacity expansion and regionally significant project, are all phases described in sufficient detail to estimate and provide an estimated total project cost and explain how the project is expected to be implemented? For any projects that will go beyond the horizon year, does the LRTP explain what and when phases/work will be performed beyond the horizon year with costs estimated using year of expenditure methodologies?	Chapter 5, Financial Analysis (5.14 to end) includes projects and are described in detail to estimate and provide a total project cost as well as explain how/when the project is expected to be implemented. At this time, there are no projects expected to span between the CFP and the unfunded plan. A listing of additional unfunded needs is included in Appendix 4.
D-6	Fiscal Constraint/Cost Feasible Plan: Has an estimate of the cost and source of funding for each phase been provided for projects included in the CFP? (Phases are PD&E and Design or Preliminary Engineering, ROW, and Construction.) If boxed funds are utilized, are individual projects that will utilize them listed or described in bulk in the LRTP?	Chapter 5, Financial Analysis (5.14 to end) includes the estimate of costs and sources of funding for each phase where the projects are broken down by mode type. Individual projects are described including information about location, the strategy (improvement type), and then by which jurisdiction the project falls in.

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)		When and How Addressed
D-7	<p>Fiscal Constraint/New Revenue Sources: If any new revenue source is assumed as part of the CFP, is it clearly explained? Also, is the following covered: why the new revenue source is considered to be reasonably available, when it will be available, what actions would need to be taken for it to be available, and what would happen if it does not become available?</p>	<p>There are no new revenue sources assumed as a part of the RMP. An estimate of the Tallahassee/Leon County Blueprint 2000 funds is included as part of the fiscal constraint.</p>
D-8	<p>Fiscal Constraint/Federal Revenue Sources: Are projects within the first 10 years planned to be implemented with federal funds notated or flagged? Beyond the first 10 years, is project funding clearly labeled as a combined Federal/State source in the CFP?</p>	<p>Projects noted for federal or state funding have been noted as CRTPA funds. Projects being funded outside of state and federal funds have been noted accordingly in Chapters 5 and 6.</p>
D-9	<p>Full Time Span of the LRTP: As a planning document, does the LRTP show all the projects and project funding for the entire period covered by the LRTP (base year to horizon year)?</p>	<p>Yes, the plan includes projects for all years ending in horizon year 2040 (Chapter 5).</p>
D-10	<p>Environmental Mitigation: For highway projects, does the LRTP include a discussion of types of potential environmental mitigation activities and opportunities at a system-wide level developed in consultation with Federal, State and tribal wildlife, land management, and regulatory agencies (beyond project-specific ETDM screenings)? Does the MPO maintain documentation of the consultation with the relevant agencies?</p> <p>Was there a need to state transit environmental benefits, such as reduction in single occupant vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled, reduction in greenhouse gases, pedestrian and bicycle linkages and transit oriented/compact development, within the broad parameters in the LRTP?</p> <p>Are phases for transit capital projects listed in the LRTP?</p>	<p>Social and environmental considerations outlined in Chapter 2 and Appendix 2 were considered as a part of recommendations development. Social and environmental considerations were also included as part of the project prioritization process detailed in Chapter 4. Chapter 7 contains a list of agencies associated with the planning process.</p> <p>In addition to the content provided in the body of the RMP, the StarMetro Transit Development Plan (Appendix 3) provides additional details specific to the transit needs being addressed through the identified projects. Project phasing for transit has been addressed through the identification of separate projects to fit within the available funding tiers.</p>
D-11	<p>LRTP Documentation/Final Board Approval: Was a substantial amount of the LRTP analysis and documentation completed at the time of MPO board adoption? Will all final documentation/documents be posted online and available through the MPO office no later than 90 days after plan adoption?</p>	<p>Yes, the document and materials were posted online at the time the Board adopted the plan. A final version of the plan has been made available within the 90 days following adoption.</p>

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)		When and How Addressed
D-12	<p>Documented LRTP Modification Procedures: Does the MPO have procedures that document how modifications to the adopted LRTP are to be addressed? These procedures can be included as part of the LRTP, the public participation plan, or provided elsewhere as appropriate.</p>	<p>A memorandum was developed as a companion to the RMP process to document future RMP modification and amendment strategies. In addition, the PIPP provides a thorough discussion of these processes.</p>
Transit Projects and Studies		
D-13	<p>Major Transit Capital Projects</p> <p>In order to plan for a transit “New Start” in the LRTP, the MPO must assume it will be successful in competing for discretionary FTA New Starts program dollars. Grantees may be proposing use of a Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loan or other loan to help bridge the gap in capital financing for a New Start.</p> <p>With regard to planning of a major capital facility other than a New Start, the MPO must assume that FTA program funds such as “State of Good Repair” and “Bus and Bus Facilities” will be awarded to the transit system based on formula.</p>	<p>The plan did not assume the MPO would be competing for New Starts funds. However, it is assumed that FTA program funds would be based on formula distributions.</p>
D-14	<p>Transit Facility</p> <p>Transit facilities eligible for FTA 5307, 5309, 5337, and 5339 funds or FLEX funds from FHWA should be contained within the TIP and the STIP and be consistent with the LRTP. For example, consistent with the LRTP might mean a general statement, paragraph, line item or section on the specific facilities and their general location if known. Inclusion might also mention feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, appraisals, final design, property acquisition and relocation and NEPA documents, and perhaps the intent to seek local, state, or federal funding for same. The award of such funds may require an LRTP amendment to show such funds in the constrained LRTP.</p>	<p>It is understood that new transit or roadway projects that would be affordable due to FTA formula funds or FLEX funds would require amending the RMP.</p>

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)		When and How Addressed
D-15	<p>Transit Service Including Fixed Route Bus, Deviated Route, Para-transit, Enhanced or Express Bus</p> <p>Specific new transit service proposed by a transit grantee for a new area or corridor should, at a minimum, be consistent with the LRTP. For example, that might mean a general statement, paragraph, line item or section on the specific service improvements to be undertaken (and the general location if known). Inclusion might also mention feasibility studies, operational plans, strategic plans, and perhaps the intent to seek local, state, or federal funding for same. The award of such funds may require an LRTP amendment to show such funds.</p>	<p>It is understood that new transit or roadway projects that would be affordable due to FTA formula funds or FLEX funds would require amending the RMP.</p>
D-16	<p>Transit Service Including BRT, LRT, HRT, CRT, Streetcar Through New Starts/Small Starts Program</p> <p>Specific new fixed guideway transit service proposed by a transit grantee to serve a new area or corridor as part of the FTA New Starts/Small Starts or Core Capacity Program should, at a minimum, be consistent with the LRTP. As such service may be a large capital expenditure, the project, termini, and cost would need to be specified in the constrained LRTP. Inclusion might also mention feasibility studies, NEPA studies, preliminary engineering and final design, right of way acquisition, operational plans, modeling improvements, strategic plans, and perhaps the intent to seek local, state, or federal funding for same. The award of such funds would require an LRTP amendment to show such funds in the constrained LRTP.</p>	<p>It is understood that new transit or roadway projects that would be affordable due to FTA formula funds or FLEX funds would require amending the RMP.</p>
Emerging Issues – Not Current Required/New Requirements May Have Short Timeframe for Compliance		
	<p>Safety and Transit Asset Management: MAP-21 includes significant additions to safety planning and transit asset management on the part of transit grantees and the States.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)

When and How Addressed

Emerging Issues – Not Currently Required/New Requirements May Have Short Timeframe for Compliance

Performance Measurement: MPOs are encouraged to consider ways to incorporate performance measures/metrics for system- wide operation as well as more localized measures/metrics in their LRTPs. Measures to assess the plan’s effectiveness in increasing transportation system performance will be needed. State and MPO target setting will follow establishment of performance measures under MAP-21 by USDOT.

Related but not yet codified provisions in MAP-21:

- Each MPO shall establish performance targets that address the performance measures described in 23 U.S.C. 150(c), where applicable, to use in tracking progress towards attainment of critical outcomes for the region of the MPO. [23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(B)(i)(I), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(B)(i)(I)]
- Selection of performance targets by an MPO shall be coordinated with the State to ensure consistency, to the maximum extent practicable. [23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(B)(i)(II), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(B)(i)(II)]
- Selection of performance targets by an MPO shall be coordinated, to the maximum extent practicable, with providers of public transportation to ensure consistency with 49 U.S.C. 5326(c) and 5329(d). [23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(B)(ii), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(B)(ii)]
- Each MPO shall establish performance targets under 23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(B) and 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(B) not later than 180 days after the date on which the State or provider of public transportation establishes performance targets. [23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(C), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(C)]
- An MPO shall integrate in the metropolitan transportation planning process, directly or by reference, the goals, objectives, performance measures, and targets described in other State transportation plans and transportation processes, as well as plans developed by providers of public transportation, required as part of a performance-based program. [23 U.S.C. 134(h)(2)(D), 49 U.S.C. 5303(h)(2)(D)]
- In the transportation plan for the MPO’s metropolitan planning area, describe the performance measures and performance targets used in assessing the performance of the transportation system and include a system performance report and subsequent updates evaluating the condition and performance of the transportation system with respect to the performance targets. [23 U.S.C. 134 (i)(2)(B)&(C), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(B)&(C)]

CRTPA has taken a proactive approach to addressing performance requirements anticipated as part of emerging MAP-21 guidance. At the outset of the RMP development, a series of goals and objectives were identified to help guide the identification and prioritization of recommendations. MAP-21 planning factors as well as performance measure target areas were considered and incorporated into these goals. These goals are identified in Chapter 1 (1.8).

Following the identification of project recommendations, a performance-based prioritization process was developed and applied. This process was directly tied to the RMP goals and objectives, ensuring continuity between all portions of the planning process, as well as the continued consideration of federal planning factors and performance measures. Prioritization criteria were identified and refined with guidance from the CRTPA Policy Board, Technical Advisory Committee, and Citizens Multimodal Advisory Committee, as well as FHWA and FDOT. The prioritization process is detailed in Chapter 4.

FHWA/FTA 2040 LRTP Expectations (November 2012)	When and How Addressed
<p>Freight: Careful consideration should be given on how to address the eight planning factors (see A-6). Special emphasis should be given to the freight factor as it is anticipated to play a more prominent role in future planning requirements.</p>	<p>Freight was not explicitly called out as one of the guiding principles but is included in several: Connectivity; Access; Economic Development; and Multimodalism.</p>
<p>Sustainable Transportation and Context Sensitive Solutions: MPOs are encouraged to identify and suggest contextual solutions for appropriate transportation corridors and promote livability.</p>	<p>The RMP included a review of current land use plans within the region, as shown in Chapter 2 and Appendix 2. Transportation recommendations detailed in Chapter 6 were developed using context sensitive design principles.</p>
<p>Proactive Improvements – Not Currently Required/Positive Strides in Long Range Planning</p>	
<p>Linking Planning and NEPA: MPOs should strongly consider including purpose and need statements for regionally significant projects in their LRTP cost feasible plans.</p>	<p>The project sheets in Chapter 6 contain a brief project description. Elements considered in the ETDM process were incorporated where appropriate into the project descriptions.</p>
<p>Climate Change: MPOs may wish to consider climate change and strategies which minimize impacts to the transportation system. State legislation encourages MPOs to consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning in their LRTPs to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as well as include energy considerations in all state, regional, and local planning</p>	<p>The study includes a consideration for air quality in Appendix 8. The Quality Growth Plus scenario, described below and in Chapter 3 of the RMP, advocates for a series of concentrated growth areas. The compact development patterns advocated in this scenario support sustainable development concepts and reduction in the transportation system's carbon footprint.</p>
<p>Scenario Planning: If an MPO elects to do scenario planning as part of development of its LRTP, it is encouraged to consider a number of factors including potential regional investment strategies, assumed distribution of population and employment, a scenario that maintains baseline conditions for identified performance measures, revenue constrained scenarios, and estimated costs and potential revenue available to support each scenario.</p> <p>Related but not yet codified provisions in MAP-21: An MPO may voluntarily elect to develop and evaluate multiple scenarios for consideration as part of development of its transportation plan. [23 U.S.C. 134(i)(4), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(4)] For an MPO that voluntarily elects to develop multiple scenarios, its system performance report and subsequent updates are to include an analysis of how the preferred scenario has improved the conditions and performance of the transportation system and how changes in local policies and investments have impacted the costs necessary to achieve the identified performance targets. [23 U.S.C. 134(i)(2)(C)(ii), 49 U.S.C. 5303(i)(2)(C)(ii)]</p>	<p>CRTPA chose to continue the application of a scenario planning process developed for use in the 2035 RMP. Named the Quality Growth Plus scenario, this land use scenario identifies a series of proposed growth areas across the region where increases in density and intensity may be considered. Results from this exercise were carried into the socioeconomic projects in the travel demand model, and also into the type of transportation solutions identified for these growth areas. More information on the Quality Growth Plus scenario can be found in Chapter 3.</p>

RMP Checklist – E

<http://www.mpoac.org/documents/AdoptedGuidelines.pdf>

MPOAC Financial Guidelines for MPO 2040 LRTPs (January 2013)		When and How Addressed
E-1	Does the plan include a cost estimate of needs in base year dollars and report estimated needs by mode? Does the needs estimate include all costs associated with all modes?	Yes (Chapter 5; 5.14 to end)
E-2	Does the plan include only transportation projects that are necessary to meet identified future transportation demand or advance the goals, objectives, and policies of the MPO, the region, and the State?	Yes. Chapter 6 and Appendix 4 detail the identification of the Needs Plan.
E-3	Does the plan exclude projects that are extremely unlikely to be implemented and unnecessarily inflate the estimated transportation needs in the metropolitan area?	Yes. The Needs Plan only includes financially feasible projects that have gone through extensive prioritize processes.
E-4	Does the plan include an estimate of unfunded project costs in base year dollars?	Yes (Appendix 4)
E-5	Is reasonably available revenue reported in year of expenditure (YOE) dollars?	Yes (Appendix 5)
E-6	Is an estimate of the cost of all projects and all phases, regardless of mode, included in the cost feasible plan?	Yes (Chapter 5; 5.14 to end)
E-7	Are the costs of operating and maintaining the existing and future transportation system clearly stated in the cost feasible plan?	Yes (Chapter 5 and Appendix 5)
E-8	Did the MPO include full financial information for all years covered by the LRTP, including information from its transportation improvement program?	Yes (Chapter 5; 5.14 to end)

MPOAC Financial Guidelines for MPO 2040 LRTPs (January 2013)		When and How Addressed
E-9	Did the MPO use State FY 2013/2014 as the base year and State FY 2039/2040 as the horizon year for its plan (for financial reporting purposes)?	The plan uses FY 2015-2016 as the base year, and FY 2039-2040 for the horizon year.
E-10	Has the MPO presented revenue estimates and project costs using five-year periods to the year 2030 and a 10- year period for the remaining years of the plan (2031- 2040)?	Yes (Appendix 5)
E-11	Has the MPO included FDOT's revenue estimates for operating and maintaining the State Highway System at the district level in its plan documentation?	Yes (Appendix 5)
E-12	Does the plan adjust project cost estimates expressed in Present Day Cost dollars to YOY using FDOT inflation factors? If alternative inflation factors were used, has an explanation of assumptions used to develop them been provided?	Yes, the RMP uses FDOT inflation factors.
E-13	Does the plan incorporate 2040 SIS Cost Feasible Plan projects as provided by FDOT?	Yes (Chapter 5; 5.14 to end)