

Federal Strategies for Implementing Requirements for LRTP Update for the Florida MPOs

November 2012

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), developed the following summary to provide clarification to the Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) and Florida's Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) regarding our expectations for meeting some of the requirements to be addressed in the next cycle of Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) updates. 23 CFR 450.306, 316 and 322 describe the basic requirements of the metropolitan transportation planning process, including a documented public participation plan and development and content of the metropolitan transportation plans respectively. The following information is presented to highlight notable areas for improvement, as well as those of potential concern, and to assist the MPOs in meeting federal planning requirements. Additional areas may be addressed on an individual MPO basis as needed throughout the LRTP development process.

Because projects in a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are required to demonstrate planning consistency with the LRTP, the requirements for project inclusion in a TIP must also be considered when developing the LRTP. As a reminder, projects that need to be included in the TIP are: all projects using FHWA and/or FTA funds; all regionally significant projects requiring an FHWA or FTA action regardless of funding source; and regionally significant projects to be funded with Federal funds other than those administered by FHWA or FTA or regionally significant projects funded with non-federal funds (23 CFR 450.324(d)). There are exceptions for certain projects such as emergency relief and state planning and research projects. All of the exempt project categories can be found in 23 CFR 450.324(c). The reference to regionally significant projects applies to capacity and non-capacity projects. Capacity projects are projects that expand the capacity of existing transportation systems, such as adding lanes to roadways, new/expanded rail service and intermodal facilities. Non-capacity projects are activities that are designed to support, operate and maintain the state transportation system (See Appendix 1 for a list of capacity and non-capacity programs/activities).

Projects in the LRTP: Recently we have been responding to several questions regarding types of projects that need to be included in the LRTP. As stated in 23 CFR 450.322(f), the LRTP is required to include the projected transportation demand in the planning area, the existing and proposed transportation facilities that function as an integrated system, operational and management strategies, consideration of the results of the Congestion Management Plan, strategies to preserve the existing and projected future transportation infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and transportation and transit enhancement activities.

As noted in 23 CFR 450.104, a 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 93.126, 127 and 128)) 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 a project meets the definition of regionally significant, then the project must be included in the Cost Feasible LRTP regardless of the project's activities (i.e. construction, facility widening, ITS installations, etc.).

Grouped Projects in the LRTP: Federal regulations allow a specifically defined type of project(s) to be grouped in the TIP. Similar groupings in the LRTP would be permissible. However, the ability to group project(s) depends on the regional significance of the project(s). Grouped projects in the TIP are typically ones that are not of an appropriate scale to be individually identified and can be combined with other projects which are similar in function, work type, and/or geographic area. Classifications of these grouped project types are listed under 23 CFR 771.117(c) and (d) and/or 40 CFR part 93. Examples are: activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction (such as planning and technical studies or grants for training and research programs); construction of non-regionally significant bicycle and

pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities; landscaping; installation of fencing, signs, pavement markings, small passenger shelters, traffic signals, and railroad warning devices where no substantial land acquisition or traffic disruption will occur; rest areas and truck weigh stations; ridesharing activities; and highway safety or traffic operations improvement projects. Therefore, if grouping projects in the LRTP, the groups need to be specific enough to determine consistency between the LRTP and the TIP.

Fiscal Constraint

Operations & Maintenance: LRTP cost estimates need to be provided for the Operations and Maintenance (O&M) activities for the entire timeframe of the LRTP. System level estimates for O&M costs may be shown for each of the five-year cost bands or may be provided as a total estimate for the full LRTP timeframe. System level is interpreted to mean the system within the MPO planning boundaries. Local agencies, working with the MPO, need to provide cost estimates for locally-maintained facilities covered in the Plan. FDOT, working with the MPO, needs to provide cost estimates for the state-maintained facilities covered in the Plan. System level estimates at the FDOT District level are acceptable for the state-maintained facilities. The LRTP will also need to identify the general source of funding for the O&M activities. Since O&M costs and related revenues are not available to balance the fiscal constraint of capital investment projects, a clear separation of costs for operations and maintenance activities from other grouped and/or regionally significant projects will need to be shown in order to demonstrate fiscal constraint. (23 CFR 450.322(f)(10)(i)).

Total Project Costs: For total project costs, all phases of a project must be described in sufficient detail to estimate and provide an estimated total project cost and explain how the project is expected to be implemented. Any project which will go beyond the horizon year of the LRTP must include an explanation of the project elements beyond the horizon year and what phases/work will be performed beyond the horizon year of the plan. The costs of work and phases beyond the horizon year of the plan must be estimated using Year of Expenditure (YOE) methodologies and the estimated completion date may be described as a band (i.e. Construction expected 2040-2050, \$40M). If there is more than one phase remaining to be funded, these may be shown as a combined line item for the project (i.e. ROW/Construction expected 2040-2050,

\$50M). FHWA does not expect that this paragraph will apply to routine system preservation or maintenance activities. Total project costs will be shown for capacity expansion projects and for regionally significant projects. (23 CFR 450.322(f)).

Cost Feasible Plan: Revenues to support the costs associated with the work/phase must be demonstrated. For a project to be included in the cost feasible plan, an estimate of the cost and source of funding for each phase of the project being funded (including the Project Development and Environment (PD&E) phase) must be included. The phases to be shown in LRTPs include Preliminary Engineering, ROW and Construction (FHWA and FTA support the option of combining PD&E and Design phases into “Preliminary Engineering”). Boxed funds can be utilized as appropriate to finance projects. However, the individual projects utilizing the box need to be listed, or at a minimum, described in bulk in the LRTP (i.e. PD&E for projects in Years 2016-2020). (23 CFR 450.322(f)(10)).

New Revenue Sources: If the LRTP assumes a new revenue source as part of the cost feasible plan, the source must be clearly explained, why it is considered to be reasonably available, when it will be available, what actions would need to be taken for the revenue to be available, and what would happen with projects if the revenue source was not available. If, for example, the most recent action of a governing body or a referendum of the public defeated a similar revenue source, then the new revenue source may not be included in the Cost Feasible LRTP unless the MPO can justify the revenue source and explain the difference between the action that failed and the action being proposed (for further details, please see FHWA Guidance Financial Planning and Fiscal Constraint for Transportation Plans and Programs issued by Gloria Shepherd, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment and Realty on April 17, 2009). This applies to all revenue sources in the LRTP (i.e. federal, state, local, private, etc.)

Federal Revenue Sources: Federal and state participation on projects in the Cost Feasible LRTP can be shown as a combined source for the cost feasible projects. Projects within the first ten years of the Plan must be notated or flagged to identify which projects are planned to be implemented with federal funds. Beyond the first ten year period, the specific federal funding notation is not expected. The project funding, however, must be clearly labeled as a combined Federal/State source in the Cost Feasible LRTP. (23 CFR 450.322(10)f(iii))

For FTA funded projects, MAP-21 has repealed eight programs from SAFETEA-LU and shifted many of the eligible activities to formula programs. Repealed programs (or uses consolidated in other formula programs) include Clean Fuels (5308), Fixed Guideway Modernization (5309), Bus and Bus Facilities (5309), JARC (5316), New Freedom (5317), Paul Sarbanes Transit in the Parks (5320), Alternatives Analysis (5339) and Over the Road Bus (3038). Formula programs now include Metropolitan Planning and State Planning (5305); Urbanized Area Formula (5307); Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Persons with Disability (5310); Rural Area Formula (5311) and RTAP (5311); Formula Grants for Public Transportation on Indian Reservations (5311); Research and Development, Demonstration and Deployment (5312), State of Good Repair (5337), Bus and Bus Facilities Formula Grants (5339). Eligible new uses which are notable include Safety Programs and Transit Asset Management, Operations in areas with 200,000 or more population with up to 100 buses; Transit Oriented Development Planning and Bus Rapid Transit demonstration projects; Core Capacity Improvements and several others.

Discretionary awards that have been repealed under MAP-21 however, may have unspent funds awarded under SAFETEA-LU in the repealed programs that still must be shown in the LRTP, TIP and STIP to obligate the funds in FTA's TEAM system. Hence, project categories such as Bus Livability, Clean Fuels, Alternatives Analysis, Transit in the Parks, etc.) may still need to be described and/or pursued by the transit grantee within the LRTP for FFY 2011 and FFY 2012 funds remaining. However, MAP-21 greatly reduced the number and type of discretionary awards through FTA. As such, the MPO and the transit grantee may no longer need to consider how to account for the possibility of placing a discretionary transit project through a competitive award (as well as formula funds) as part of the cost feasible LRTP except for New Starts, Small Starts, Core Capacity, Bus Rapid Transit Demonstration or Transit Oriented Development Demonstration Planning programs.

The purpose, need and perceived benefit of the transit project as well as geographic distribution of funds may play a role in project selection. As such, a transit needs plan with projects which may be unfunded when the LRTP is prepared may need to be considered, especially for major New Start/Small Start and other capital projects like the new Core Capacity program which must

eventually be placed within the cost feasible LRTP to have funds awarded. Regardless, discretionary awards if any must also be eventually listed within the cost feasible LRTP for FTA to obligate the awarded funds in a grant to a transit grantee.

Full Timespan of the LRTP: The LRTP is a document that has a planning horizon of at least 20 years. The LRTP is based upon the region's visioning of the future within the bounds of the financial resources that are available to the region during that timeframe. The LRTP is not a programming document, but rather a planning document that describes how the implementation of projects will help achieve the vision. Therefore, the MPOs will need to show all the projects and project funding for the entire time period covered by the LRTP, from the base year to the horizon year. (23 CFR 450.322(a))

Environmental Mitigation: For highway projects, the LRTP must include a discussion on the types of potential environmental mitigation activities and opportunities which are developed in consultation with Federal, State and Tribal wildlife, land management and regulatory agencies. This discussion should occur at more of a system-wide level to identify areas where mitigation may be undertaken (perhaps illustrated on a map) and what kinds of mitigation strategies, policies and/or programs may be used. This discussion in the LRTP would identify broader environmental mitigation needs and opportunities that individual transportation projects might later take advantage of. MPOs should be aware that the use of ETDM alone is not environmental mitigation. That effort would be considered project screening and is not a system-wide review. Documentation of the consultation with the relevant agencies should be maintained by the MPO. (23 CFR 450.322(f)(7) and (g))

For transit capital projects, the environmental class of action is usually considered by FTA regional offices in concert with transit grantees as the projects are analyzed and developed. Transit maintenance and transfer facilities and major capacity projects like light, heavy or commuter rail, BRT, etc. may require a separate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document while acquisition of vehicles, provision of repairs, planning studies, engineering, etc, would not require a document. As such, environmental mitigation issues would tend to be developed as part of the NEPA document for specific projects with a NEPA decision made prior

to the award of FTA funds. Likewise, transit environmental benefits like reduction in SOV trips and VMT, reduction in greenhouse gases, pedestrian and bicycle linkages, transit oriented/compact development (which is more walkable) may need to be stated within the broad parameters in the LRTP. Most FTA planning studies are required to be listed in the Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP) and not necessarily the TIP and STIP (although many MPO's still list the studies in the TIP and STIP). Preliminary engineering, final design, right of way, utility relocation, construction, etc. for transit capital projects would need to be listed in the LRTP, TIP and STIP.

Linking Planning and NEPA: Since 2008, prior to FHWA approving an environmental document (Type-2 Categorical Exclusion, Finding of No Significant Impact, or Record of Decision) and thereby granting location design concept approval, the project must be determined to be consistent within the LRTP, the TIP and Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The project consistency refers to the description (for example project name, termini and work activity) between the LRTP, the TIP and the STIP (23 CFR 450.216(k), 450.324(g) and 450.216(b)). The NEPA document must also describe how the project is going to be implemented and funded. The project implementation description in the NEPA document needs to be consistent with the implementation schedule in the LRTP and TIP/STIP as well.

LRTP Documentation/Final Board Approval: FHWA and FTA expect that at the time the MPO board adopts the LRTP, a substantial amount of LRTP analysis and documentation will have been completed, and all final documentation will be available for distribution no later than 90 days after the plan's adoption. The Board and its advisory committees, as well as the public should have periodically reviewed and commented on products from interim tasks and reports that culminate into the final Plan. Finalizing the LRTP and its supporting documentation should be the last activity in a lengthy process. All final documents should be posted online and available through the MPO office no later than 90 days after adoption. The MPOs' schedules for this round of LRTP development are expected to allow for the Board to adopt the final LRTP no later than 5 years from the MPOs' adoption of the previous LRTP.

Documented LRTP Modification Procedures: If not already in place, MPOs need established written and Board approved procedures that document how modifications to the LRTP are addressed after Board adoption. The procedures should specifically explain what qualifies as a modification as opposed to an amendment as defined in 23 CFR 450.104. These procedures can be included as part of the LRTP, the PPP, or provided elsewhere as appropriate. FHWA is currently beginning work with FDOT and the MPOs on an LRTP amendment process which will include statewide procedures and thresholds, similar to the STIP amendment process. This effort will assist the MPOs in determining when LRTP amendments are required.

LRTP & STIP/TIP Amendment Consistency: The STIP and TIPs must be consistent with the relevant LRTPs. When amendments to the STIP/TIP are made, the projects must also be consistent with the LRTP from which they are derived. FHWA and FTA staff will be checking for this consistency. Projects with inconsistencies between the STIP/TIP and the respective LRTP will not be approved for use of federal funds or federal action until the issue is addressed. (23 CFR 450.328 and 23 CFR 450.216(b))

FHWA and FTA understand that when developing project cost estimates in an LRTP, the cost is an estimate which becomes more refined as a project advances. Projects being refined between plans will not be required to update their costs in the existing LRTP if new, more accurate information regarding project cost becomes available. However, it is expected that upon the next scheduled adoption of the LRTP, the latest project cost estimates shall be used.

Transit Projects and Studies

Major Transit Capital Projects: For LRTP development purposes, federal funding sources for major transit capital projects must be proposed and may not currently be identifiable (or currently allocated) for use in the urbanized area. The Federal Transit Administration funds projects such as New Start rail and BRT, as well as major capital facilities such as administrative buildings or maintenance facilities with formula and/or discretionary program dollars allocated on an annual basis. As mentioned, MAP-21 made changes to and reductions in transit discretionary programs. Therefore in order to plan for a transit “New Start” in the LRTP, the MPO must assume they will be successful in competing for discretionary FTA New Starts

program dollars. A reasonable funding mix might be to assume 50% FTA/25% Local/25% State funding, as is currently the norm in Florida. Also, MAP-21 greatly expands the use of TIFIA loans. Grantees may be proposing use of a TIFIA loan or other loan to help bridge the gap in capital financing for a New Start which in some cases for large projects in multiple phases may take up to five years to design and build (per phase).

With regard to the planning of a major capital transit facility other than a New Start, the assumption must be made that FTA program funds such as “State of Good Repair” or “Bus and Bus Facilities” will be awarded to the transit system based on formula. As mentioned, large discretionary awards will be fewer under MAP-21. In most cases, a likely funding mix for State of Good Repair or Bus and Bus Facilities might be 80% FTA/20% local, or up to 100% FTA matched with toll revenue credits.

Transit Facility: The transit grantee may propose a specific transit maintenance facility, transfer facility, multi-modal station, park n ride lot with transit service or other transit facility for rehabilitation, renovation or new construction. Generally, such facility improvements remain eligible for FTA 5307, 5309, 5337 (new State of Good Repair formula program), 5339 (new bus and bus facility formula program) funds from FTA, or for FLEX funds from FHWA flexed to FTA for the transit use by the transit grantee. At a minimum, such facilities should be contained within the TIP, 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 (if any) 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.

Transit Service including Fixed Route Bus, Deviated Route, Para-transit, Enhanced or Express Bus: The transit grantee may propose a specific new transit service for a new area or corridor. Generally, such new service is eligible for 5307 or 5310 funds from FTA, or for L230 FLEX funds from FHWA to the transit grantee. At a minimum, such new service should be “consistent with” the LRTP. For example, consistent with the LRTP 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.

Transit Service Including Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), Light Rail Transit (LRT) Heavy Rail Transit (HRT), Commuter Rail Transit (CRT), Streetcar through the New Starts/Small Starts Program:

The transit grantee may propose a specific new fixed guideway transit service (like BRT, LRT, HRT, CRT or Streetcar) to serve a new area or corridor as part of FTA's New Starts/Small Starts or Core Capacity Program. Generally, such new service is eligible for 5307 or 5309 funds from FTA, or for FLEX funds from FHWA to the transit grantee. At a minimum, such new service should 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.

Emerging Issues

This section describes topics that may not currently be required by federal laws and rules to be addressed in LRTPs. As such, MPOs are not required to include these considerations in their current planning processes and plans. However, these issues are receiving considerable attention in discussions related to the passage of Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). Each MPO has the discretion to determine whether or not to address these topics in their LRTP at this time, and the appropriate level of detail. Depending upon when MAP-21 implementing guidance is released, the new requirements may have to be addressed within a short timeframe. So beginning to address these issues early on may potentially minimize the level of effort needed to achieve future compliance.

Safety and Transit Asset Management: MAP-21 also includes significant additions to safety planning and transit asset management on the part of transit grantees and the states. Federal Register guidance is expected on transit safety and transit asset management within the near future.

Performance Measurement: FHWA and FTA encourage the MPOs to consider ways to incorporate performance measures/metrics for system-wide operation, as well as more localized measures/metrics into their LRTPs. As funding for transportation capacity projects becomes more limited, increasing emphasis will be placed on maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of our current transportation system. Consequently, measures to assess the LRTP's effectiveness in increasing system performance will be needed. Per the recent passage of MAP-21, USDOT will establish performance measures in consultation with State DOTs, MPOs and other stakeholders within 18 months of MAP-21's enactment. Once performance measures are identified, the States will have up to one year to set state level targets. Once state level targets have been set, MPOs will have up to six-month to set local level targets that support the state targets. The process and schedule for performance measure implementation and LRTP documentation is expected to evolve over the next two years.

Freight: The planning process is required to address the eight planning factors as described in 23 CFR 450.306(a). The degree to which each factor is addressed will vary depending upon the unique conditions of the MPO areas, but efforts should be made to think through and carefully consider how to address each factor. The importance of freight to the nation's economic well-being and global competitiveness, as well as its support and promotion of job creation and retention has heightened its status at the national and regional level. MPOs should be aware that discussions in MAP-21 have largely included a reference to the increasing importance of freight, including the development of Statewide Freight Plans. While this is part of one of the eight planning factors, special emphasis should be given to the freight factor, as it is anticipated to play a more prominent role in future planning requirements.

Sustainable Transportation and Context Sensitive Solutions: The MPOs are encouraged to identify and suggest contextual solutions for appropriate transportation corridors. For example, Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) may be appropriate for historic parkways, historic districts, town centers, dense "walkable" neighborhood areas, arterial "gateways", greenway trails and pedestrian ways, environmentally sensitive areas or simply where right of way is not readily available. Under MAP-21, Transportation Alternatives like bicycle and pedestrian

improvements and trails remain eligible under the formula programs while transportation enhancement set-asides have been removed and some uses like historic building renovation and scenic easements may be more restrictive. The value of the resources present may suggest the need for alternative or special treatments (or even accepting a level of congestion and lower speeds that respects the resources). In these instances, specific livability principles adopted by the MPO might be employed for improved pedestrian and transit access – especially to schools and even traffic calming.

Also, spatial relationships that support public transit like transit oriented development and the “trip not taken” while reducing greenhouse gases might be recognized as characteristics of a town center or mixed use area with public transit access. Other livability planning goals might also need to be recognized like preserving affordable housing, improving/preserving special resources like parks, monuments and tourism areas, increasing floor area ratios and reducing parking minimums in select corridors to encourage walking trips and public transit, transportation demand management, etc.

Proactive Improvements

This section describes topics that are not currently required by federal laws and rules to be addressed in LRTPs. As such, MPOs are not required to include these considerations in their current planning processes and plans. These areas are intended to be a proactive change in the LRTPs to help Florida continue to make positive strides in long range planning.

Linking Planning and NEPA: For highway projects, we are continually looking for strategies that improve the linkage between planning and environmental processes. For the inclusion of regionally significant projects in the Cost Feasible Plan of the LRTP, MPOs should strongly consider including a purpose and need statement for the project in the LRTP. This purpose and need statement will be carried into the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and will be one way to enhance the linkage between planning and NEPA. For example, this purpose and need statement could briefly provide the rationale as to why the project warranted inclusion in the LRTP. (450.324 (d); 450 Appendix A to Part 450, Section II Substantive Issues, 8)

Climate Change: MPOs may also wish to give consideration to climate change and strategies which minimize impacts from the transportation system. FHWA supports and recognizes the importance of exploring the effects of climate change on transportation, as well as the limited environmental resources and fuel alternatives. State legislation now encourages each MPO to consider strategies that integrate transportation and land use planning in their LRTP to provide for sustainable development and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as well as include energy considerations in all state, regional and local planning. As a result, MPO LRTP Updates are encouraged to include discussions and strategies aimed at addressing this issue.

Scenario Planning: Pursuant to MAP-21, MPOs may elect to develop multiple scenarios for consideration in the development of the LRTP. If the MPO chooses to develop these scenarios, 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.

Appendix 1

Description of the Major Programs Included in the 2035 Revenue Forecast

Capacity Programs	Non-Capacity Programs
<u>SIS Highways/ FIHS Construction & ROW</u> - Construction, improvements, and associated right of way on SIS highways and the FIHS (i.e., Interstate, the Turnpike, other toll roads, and other facilities designed to serve interstate and regional commerce including SIS Connectors).	<u>Safety</u> - Includes the Highway Safety Improvement Program, the Traffic Safety Grant Program, Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety activities, the Industrial Safety Program, and general safety issues on a Department-wide basis.
<u>Aviation</u> - Financial and technical assistance to Florida's airports in the areas of safety, capacity improvements, land acquisition, planning, economic development, and preservation.	<u>Resurfacing</u> - Resurfacing of pavements on the State Highway System and local roads as provided by state law.
<u>Rail</u> - Rail safety inspections, rail-highway grade crossing safety, acquisition of rail corridors, assistance in developing intercity and commuter rail service, and rehabilitation of rail facilities.	<u>Bridge</u> - Repair and replace deficient bridges on the state highway system. In addition, 15% of federal bridge funds must be expended off the federal highway system (e.g., on local bridges not on the State Highway System).
<u>Intermodal Access</u> - Improving access to intermodal facilities and acquisition of associated rights of way.	<u>Product Support</u> - Planning and engineering required to "produce" FDOT products and services (i.e., each capacity program; Safety, Resurfacing, and Bridge Programs).
<u>Seaport Development</u> - Funding for the development of eligible ports, including projects such as land acquisition, dredging, construction of storage facilities and terminals, and acquisition of container cranes and other equipment used in moving cargo and passengers.	<u>Operations & Maintenance</u> - Activities to support and maintain transportation infrastructure once it is constructed and in place.
<u>Other Arterial Construction/ROW</u> - Construction, improvements, and associated right of way on State Highway System roadways not designated as part of the SIS or FIHS. Also includes funding for the Economic Development Program, the County Incentive Grant Program., and the Small County Outreach Program.	<u>Administration</u> - Resources required to perform the fiscal, budget, personnel, executive direction, document reproduction, and contract functions. Also includes the Fixed Capital Outlay Program, which provides for the purchase, construction, and improvement of non-highway fixed assets (e.g., offices, maintenance yards).
<u>Transit</u> - Technical and operating/capital assistance to transit, paratransit, and ridesharing systems.	<u>Other</u> - Technically, this category is not a "program." It primarily represents FDOT financial commitments such as debt service and reimbursements to local governments.