



Local Programs Procedures

LPP 04-04 Manual Update **Subject: Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)**

Reference: *Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG)*, Chapter 12, “Other Federal Programs”; *Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM)*, Chapters, 2 “ Roles and Responsibilities,” Chapter 3 “Project Authorization,” Chapter 7 “Field Review,”, and Chapter 11 “Design Standards”

Effective Date: March 19, 2004

Approved: _____

Original Signed By

TERRY L. ABBOTT, Chief
Division of Local Assistance

WHAT IS AN LPP?

LPPs are Local Programs Procedures. These documents are used for the rapid deployment of new procedures and policies between updates of Local Assistance manuals, guidelines and programs. They are numbered according to calendar year and order in which released. This is the fourth LPP issued in 2004, hence it is LPP 04-04.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this LPP is to update the LAPM to include ITS considerations and requirements. This LPP also adds a new subchapter (Chapter 12.6, Intelligent Transportation Systems) to Chapter 12 of the LAPG, to provide basics for ITS, address ITS regulations and requirements, and establish roles, responsibilities and procedures for ITS projects. The procedures for the Discretionary Programs: Demonstration Program, Public Lands Highways, Scenic Byways, Discretionary Bridges and Defense Access Roads as a result of Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), is basically the same as Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). The rest of the chapter had been rewritten for simplification and consolidation; and other minor administrative changes have been made as well.

BACKGROUND

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued new regulations entitled “Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Standards” effective April 8, 2001, which applies to all federal-aid ITS projects. Written guidelines with procedures were necessary for assuring compliance with the regulations.

PREVIOUS PROCEDURE

No previous procedures were established or published for ITS projects in the LAPM or LAPG.

NEW PROCEDURE

The procedures for ITS projects will be essentially the same as the procedures for traditional federal-aid highway projects, with the exception of a 2-phased Preliminary Engineering (PE) obligation and authorization for Major ITS projects. The second phase is an E-76 submission for PE prior to final or detailed design. The additional documentations required are: a Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF) to be filled out, and the preparation of a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP). For Minor ITS projects, only the SERF needs to be filled out. For Major ITS projects, both the above documents need to be prepared and approved by FHWA prior to the respective PE authorizations.

USER FRIENDLY FEATURES

- These new procedures are incorporated in the electronic version of the *Local Assistance* LAPG and LAPM that are available at the Division of Local Assistance (DLA) Home page on the Internet at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/> Once there, click on “Publications” and then click on File/Link: lapg.htm. for “*Local Assistance Program Guidelines*” or lapm.htm. for “*Local Assistance Procedures Manual*.” You may also purchase a Compact Disc (CD), which acts as a one-stop shop for information and promotes flexible access to helpful information for local project delivery.
- This LPP releases an entire new Chapter 12 that you will need to replace in your current LAPG. The affected pages of the LAPM, Chapter 2, 3, 7, and 11 and are included in this LPP and can be easily inserted into existing hard copies of the LAPM.
- To receive an electronic notification when new information is posted on the DLA website, please subscribe to the DLA list server at:
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/sub.htm>

SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN LAPG AND LAPM

- The changes in the LAPG include, but are not limited to, addressing TEA-21 and changes in procedures.
- A new Section 12.6, “Intelligent Transportation Systems,” is added to Local Assistance Program Guidelines, Chapter 12 “Other Federal Programs.” Section 12.6 provides a basic understanding of ITS, the ITS regulations, some unusual characteristics of ITS projects, and step-by-step federal aid ITS project delivery procedures.

LPP 04-04, Intelligent Transportation Systems

Page 2

LAPG Item	Change
Chapter 12 Table of Contents,	Deleted “Matching Fund Policy”, “Underfunded Demonstration Projects”, “Advance Construction”, “Other Considerations”, and “Project Development”; Replaced “Final Accounting” with “Invoicing”; Added “Definitions” and “Strategic Highway Network” (STRAHNET).
Section 12.2, (Public Land Highways) page 12-4	Under Introduction: inserted a breakdown of elements of the Federal Lands Highways Program.
page 12-5	Under Administration: replaced “Office of Highway Systems in Transportation Systems Information Program” with “Caltrans Districts”; added “Federal Lands Division of” to the last sentence. Under Funding Levels, replaced reference to ISTEA with TEA-21 and showed increased funding.
page 12-6	Under Funding Levels: added a paragraph to indicate 100% Federal share, at 100% OA for selected projects. Unobligated funds become STP funds; added paragraph to indicate RABA funds may be available. Under Project Eligibility: added paragraph to indicate PLH funds eligible for administrative and planning activities by a Federal Land Management Agency. Under Selection Process For Forest Highway Funds: changed Caltrans Director of Transportation Engineering Projects with Caltrans Deputy Director of Project Delivery.
page 12-7	Under Selection Process for Discretionary Funds: added paragraph to indicate that the selection process has been by Congressional earmarks in lieu of solicitation, lately; added paragraph to indicate that the submission of candidate projects must be by the State DOT; added paragraph to provide a web site address for the solicitation and application process; deleted paragraph with past instructions for applications; deleted paragraph suggesting use of other Federal or State funds to promptly construct a useable segment of highway.
Section 12.3 (Scenic Byways), page 7-8	Updated Scenic Byways section to reflect TEA-21 and expanded Scenic Byways section.
Section 12.4 (Discretionary Bridge Program), page 10	Updated Discretionary Bridge Program to reflect TEA-21 and expanded this section.
Section 12.5 (Defense Access Roads) page 12-11	Updated Discretionary Bridge Program to reflect TEA-21 and expanded this section.
Section 12.5 (Defense Access Roads) page 12-12	Under Definitions: added STRAHNET Connector definition.

LPP 04-04, Intelligent Transportation Systems

Page 4

LAPM Item	Change
Chapter 2, Section 2-7, (FHWA Responsibilities), page 2- 6a	Added statement requiring submission of a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) for each major federal aid ITS project to FHWA for review and approval prior to final design.
Section 3.1 (Project Authorization), page 3-6	Under “Preliminary Engineering (PE) Phase”: added eligible ITS items for PE.
page 3-7a	Under “Preliminary Engineering (PE) Phase”: deleted the need for authorization of final design after environmental clearance. Local agencies normally police themselves for this step on routine federal-aid projects; also added statement to PE section requiring two SERF and SEMP review and approval by FHWA before proceeding with each PE phase respectively Under “Construction”: added statement indicating that some ITS projects can be deployed without ever advancing to construction.
Exhibit 3-A, page 3-17	Added check spaces for Phase 1 PE or Phase 2 PE if major ITS project. Added checkbox to PE request form for submitting a Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF), if project is an ITS project. Also included a reference to a SERF template in Chapter 7, <i>LAPM</i> , Exhibit 7-B.
Exhibit 3-A, page 3-18	Added a certification that, if it is an ITS project, it will meet all federal regulations on ITS projects. Added a second certification that the SEMP will be submitted for FHWA review and approval prior to final or detailed design.
Exhibit 3-E, page 3-25	Added ITS to the Project Prefix Checklist.
Chapter 7, Table of Contents	Added under Exhibits: Systems Engineering Review Form
Section 7-1 (Introduction), page 7-3	Added statement to Field Review directions to determine if project is ITS and if it is a major, minor, or earmark ITS project.
Exhibit 7-B, page 7-13	Added couple lines to Field Review form to determine if it is an ITS project and if it is a major, minor, or earmark ITS project. Added another line to make a yes/no determination for FHWA oversight. Added cost item for Systems Manager or Systems Integrator activity to Field Review Form.
Exhibit 7-B,page 7-14	Added cost item for Systems Manager or Systems Integrator activity to Field Review Form; added a check box for the party responsible for the Systems Manager or System Integrator activity.

LPP 04-04, Intelligent Transportation Systems

Page 5

Exhibit 7-I, page 7-14a	Added SERF as an attachment form to be filled out as part of the Field Review form for all ITS projects.
Exhibit 7-I, page 7-29	Added a full page for SERF, which itemizes all seven Systems Engineering requirements. Each requirement has 4 lines under it to be filled out by the local agency.
Exhibit 7-I, page 7-30	Added an explanation sheet for the above SERF items.
Chapter 11, Table of Contents	Changed title of “Traffic Signal Controller” to “Intelligent Transportation Systems/Traffic Signals” in the table of contents.
Section 11-2 (Statewide Design Standards for Local Assistance Projects)- Page 11-7	Added paragraph requiring adherence to ITS Standards.

REFERENCES

- Code of Federal Regulations 23 CFR 940
- Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)
- Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (ISTEA)
- Federal Register, Final Rule, dated January 8, 2001
- FHWA ITS Deployment Program Guideline
- National ITS Architecture (NA)
- Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Act of 1987 (STURA)
- Section 204 of Title 23, United States Code (U.S.C.)

CHAPTER 12 OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS**CONTENTS**

Section	Subject	Page Number
12.1	DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM	12-1
	Introduction	12-1
	Initiation of Demonstration Projects	12-1
	Eligibility	12-1
	Funding	12-2
	Planning and Programming the Funds	12-3
	Matching Fund Policy	12-4
	Construction and Invoicing	12-4
12.2	PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS	12-4
	Introduction	12-4
	Planning	12-5
	Administration	12-5
	Funding Levels	12-5
	Project Eligibility	12-6
	Selection Process for Forest Highway Funds	12-6
	Selection Process for Discretionary Funds	12-7
12.3	SCENIC BYWAYS	12-7
	Introduction	12-7
	Administration	12-8
	Funding Levels	12-8
	Project Implementation	12-8
	Project Eligibility	12-8
	Selection Process	12-9
12.4	DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE	12-10
12.5	DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS (DAR)	12-11
	Introduction	12-11
	Federal Policy	12-12
	Eligibility	12-13
	Design Standards	12-13
	Project Administration	12-14
	Maneuver Area Roads	12-14
	Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)	12-14
12.6	INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS	12-15
	Introduction	12-15
	National ITS Architecture	12-17
	Regional ITS Architecture	12-24
	Federal Laws and Regulations	12-25
	Federal-aid ITS Program	12-27

FSTIP	12-28
Preliminary Engineering	12-28
Environmental	12-30
Right-of-Way	12-30
Systems Engineering	12-31
Procurement (Contracting)	12-33
Construction	12-34
Record Keeping	12-35
Procedures	12-35
Definitions	12-38
Acronyms	12-43
References	12-47

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page Number
12-A	DAR Evaluation Report	12-49
12-B	MTMC Eligibility Criteria	12-51
12-C	ITS Architecture Matrix	12-53
12-D1	Major ITS Projects	12-55
12-D2	Minor ITS Projects	12-57
12-E	Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) Guidelines	12-59
12-F	ITS Websites	12-83

CHAPTER 12 OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

12.1 DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

INTRODUCTION

A Demonstration project is a project that has been specifically established and funded through federal law. Demonstration projects are generally provided as part of the annual transportation appropriation acts or the six-year transportation authorization acts. Both acts provide general project description and fund amount.

Demonstration projects are not restricted to any specific project type. Interchange improvements, grade crossing improvements, safety projects, bridges, and park and ride projects are all examples of projects funded with Demonstration funds. Over the life of the Demonstration Program in California, there have been approximately 250 Demonstration projects set forth by legislation including the Transportation Authorization Act of 1982, the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Act of 1987 (STURA), the Intermodal Surface Transportation Act of 1991 (ISTEA), the Transportation Equity Act for the Twenty-First Century (TEA-21), and Annual Appropriation Acts. These projects account for approximately \$1.54 billion in federal funds in California.

INITIATION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

Demonstration projects are initiated by Congress at the request of constituents within a given congressperson's district. The agency, special interest group or individual that requests the project through a Congressperson is known as the project sponsor. Once a project has been earmarked, the project sponsor should notify and provide the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) with a copy of the application that was sent to their Congressperson. A copy is then forwarded to the Caltrans Demonstration Program Coordinator in the HQ Division of Local Assistance.

Caltrans management has adopted a position of neutrality toward initiation of Demonstration projects. Caltrans' current policy is to cooperate with local interests seeking to establish meaningful Demonstration projects both on the State Highway System (SHS) and on the local system. Caltrans will support the local agencies during the planning process for cost-effective projects.

ELIGIBILITY

Demonstration funds are allocated to specific projects by law. The proposed project must therefore, match the legislated project description and fund amount. It is therefore, the responsibility of the project sponsor to assure the accuracy of the project description and fund amount. These funds can only be used for the project to which they were assigned by law. Any changes to the legislated project description or funding must be approved by Congressional action.

If the legislated project description has a typographical or technical error, the local agency or district should forward the correct information to the Demonstration Program Coordinator through the DLAE. The Demonstration Program Coordinator will then coordinate with the FHWA (Federal Highway Administration) Division Office to make the appropriate changes.

All funds dedicated to a specific Demonstration project may be used on any project with a scope consistent with the original legislated description. The funds may be used for one project or several separate projects adding up to the available funding limit. If the project sponsor wishes to modify the legislated project description, the sponsor must coordinate with the appropriate Congressperson to pursue Congressional action. A copy of any formal request to change the project legislation should be transmitted to the DLAE and the Demonstration Program Coordinator.

FUNDING

The yearly allocations for Demonstration projects are only available after passage of the respective annual acts. The yearly allocations are subject to the annual limits set by Congress in the appropriations act. This means that even though a certain amount of funds are allocated, the appropriations act sets limits on how much can actually be spent.

Local agencies may request “Advanced Construction” authorization for a Demonstration project. This authorizes them to begin the work, using their own funds in advance to pay for the work before federal funds become available. The local agency must recognize that federal reimbursement in this case is not guaranteed. In addition, Advanced Construction may not be used for right-of-way acquisition except in the case of hardship or protection. The DLAE, Area Engineer, and Demonstration Program Coordinator will approve advanced construction on a project-by-project basis.

Obligational Authority (OA) is the federal limitation placed on the amount of allocated federal funds, which a state can obligate within a fiscal year. The Demonstration Program has its own special OA, which cannot be used for any other program. This special OA does not expire if not used by the end of the fiscal year, but is available until expended or rescinded by legislation. However, it is subject to annual limits set by Congress in each annual appropriations act. The Demonstration Program Coordinator can be contacted for specific OA information.

TEA-21 High Priority Projects

One hundred and fifty-six projects are identified in TEA-21 and are known as High Priority Projects (HPP). Like all Demonstration projects, the funds allocated under TEA-21 are available until expended or rescinded by legislation. TEA-21 allocates funds incrementally on a yearly basis over the life of the Act. These allocations, which total \$877.3 million over 6 years were made available as follows:

Year:	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Allocation:	11%	15%	18%	18%	19%	19%
Accumulative Allocation:	11%	26%	44%	62%	81%	100%
OA Limit:	89.1%	88.3%	87.1%	87.9%	90.4%	103.1%

The federal share for TEA-21 HPP projects is 80%. The local agency is responsible for the 20% nonfederal match and any additional funds necessary to fully fund the project. The appropriation code for TEA-21 HPP projects is Q920.

Revenue Aligned Budget Authority (RABA) funds are also provided for the TEA-21 HPP projects. RABA funds reflect revised receipt estimates to the Federal Highway Trust Fund and can be zero, positive or negative. RABA funds, which were provided for FY 2000 and 2001 totalled approximately 2.6% of the six-year HPP allocation. RABA funds come with its own OA at 100% and uses appropriation code Q920.

The total OA limit for TEA-21 projects including RABA, is approximately 93.8%. This means that local agencies can calculate the approximate amount of federal funds available to their project by multiplying the total funds by 93.8%. Contact the Demonstration Program Coordinator for the exact amount of funds available for each project.

Since the special OA for this program is less than 100% of the allocations, in order to fully utilize the allocations, regular OA available from other federal-aid highway programs may be used to make up the short fall. This may require approval from the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), or the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), the Department, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Upon approval, the project sponsor should notify the DLAE in writing. After the information is received from the DLAE, the Demonstration Program Coordinator will then request that FHWA transfer the shortfall amount in appropriation code Q920 funds to the Q930 account. Upon transfer of funds, the Q930 funds are available for obligation.

For non-TEA-21 project information, please contact the DLAE or the Demonstration Program Coordinator.

PLANNING AND PROGRAMMING THE FUNDS

The local agencies are responsible for submitting their projects to the MPO/RTPA for inclusion in the Federal Approved State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP). The FHWA will not obligate federal funds for the project unless the project is included in the FSTIP.

The process for obtaining federal authorization to proceed and placing the project under agreement is the same as for other federal-aid projects. Caltrans and local agency staff are advised to work closely with their FHWA representatives to ensure agreement as to the degree of FHWA involvement. See Chapter 3 “Project Authorization” in the *Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM)*.

Federal Fund Requests

Most Demonstration projects are processed (as outlined in Chapter 3, “Project Authorization” in the *Local Assistance Procedures Manual [LAPM]*) through the Division of Local Assistance (DLA). Project Managers handling Demonstration projects where the Department is the lead agency must also work with the DLA to obligate Demonstration funds for their project.

The local agency must request federal funds from the DLAE. The DLAE will assure that the project for which the local agency is requesting funds fits the legislated project description. The DLAE then completes the E-76 and forwards it to the Implementation Engineer in Caltrans HQ DLA. When the DLAE fills out the E-76, the Public Law Section, and Legislated Project Number should be noted in the "State Remarks" section. The Demo ID field must also be populated. The Implementation Engineer approves the E-76 and forwards it to FHWA.

For Demonstration projects on the SHS, if a local agency has stepped forward with a contribution of its Federal-aid Demonstration funds, a "Local Assistance Contribution Authorization Agreement" (Contribution Agreement) needs to be processed. If a local agency will be doing any work, contributing its own funds, or requesting the state to perform the work for them, a Cooperative Agreement will need to be processed. The Contribution Agreement can be combined with the Cooperative Agreement.

Demonstration funds for projects on the SHS require a CTC vote. When Caltrans is the administering agency of a local sponsored Demonstration project from TEA-21 and post 1998 Appropriation Acts, Demonstration funds are set up for subvention reimbursement through Local Program Accounting. This allows Caltrans to be directly reimbursed by FHWA rather than having the funds pass through the local agency.

MATCHING FUND POLICY

Because of many factors impacting each project, matching fund programming must be considered on a project-by-project basis.

State funds used to match federal Demonstration project allocations, may be provided through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). For local agency demonstration projects that Caltrans considers beneficial to the SHS, Caltrans may support it by seeking state-matching funds through the STIP development process.

CONSTRUCTION AND INVOICING

For construction and invoicing procedures follow the standard procedure for federal-aid projects as covered in Chapters 5,"Accounting/Invoices," Chapter 15, "Advertise and Award Project," Chapter 16, "Administer Construction Contracts," Chapter 17, "Project Completion," of the *LAPM*.

12.2 PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Section 204 of Title 23, United States Code (U.S.C.) establishes a Federal Lands Highways Program (FLHP), which consists of projects on Public Lands Highways, park roads, parkways, Indian Reservation roads and refuge roads. Caltrans involvement is limited to the Public Lands Highways (PLH) element of the FLHP.

To put this in perspective, the following is a breakdown of the elements in the FLHP:

Federal Lands Highways Program:

- Park Road & Parkways
- Indian Reservation Roads
- Public Lands Highways
 - a) Discretionary
 - b) Forest Highways
- Refuge Roads

The term PLH is not limited to highways on the federal-aid system. The term also includes: forest roads under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public authority and open to public travel, any highway through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, and other federal reservations under the jurisdiction of and maintained by a public which is open to public travel. Projects need not be bordered on both sides by federal lands to qualify for funding from the PLH program.

PLANNING

All PLH projects must be listed in the approved Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Programs (FSTIP). Local agencies are urged to coordinate with their transportation planning agency and obtain their concurrence prior to project proposal submittal.

ADMINISTRATION

The administration of projects in the PLH Program is a cooperative effort between Caltrans and various federal agencies including the FHWA, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), etc. Within Caltrans, the PLH Program Coordinator of the HQ DLA is responsible for coordinating and tracking the local element for PLH projects, and the Caltrans Districts are responsible for the state element. The state must concur in project selection and planning of PLH projects. After a project is selected and programmed, the Federal Lands Division of FHWA normally administers all phases of work.

FUNDING LEVELS

Under TEA-21, \$196 million was authorized nationwide for the 1998 FY and \$246 million annually nationwide thereafter for the PLH Program. Of this amount, 66 percent is allocated to the Forest Highways portion of the PLH, and the remaining 34 percent are allocated to the Discretionary portion of the PLH. After administrative and engineering costs are deducted, California's average allocation for construction under the Forest Highways portion of the PLH is approximately \$19 million per year. Typically, one to four projects per year are programmed in California with PLH Discretionary funds

The federal share of the costs for any project eligible under this program is 100%. All FLHP funds are subject to obligation limitations under TEA-21 Section 1102(f). However, 100% OA is provided with the allocation of funds for the selected projects. Authorized funds (contract authority), which exceed the obligation limitation for fiscal years 1998-2003 is to be distributed to states as STIP funds. These STIP funds lose their identity as FLHP funds and are no longer available for obligation by Federal Land Management Agencies.

Under the RABA provisions in TEA-21, this available funding may also increase or decrease each year depending on the estimated receipts for the Highway Trust Fund. However, for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, Congress modified the TEA-21 provisions in the appropriations acts for those years and the RABA increases were not available for the PLH Program.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

PLH funds are available for planning, research, engineering and construction of any kind of eligible transportation project that is within, adjacent to, or provides access to public lands. The program emphasis is on reconstruction of substandard sections of road, which have a high percentage of use by traffic accessing Forest Service or BLM lands, to the appropriate standards. In addition to highway improvement and construction projects, other eligible project types include:

- Transportation planning for tourism and recreational travel including the National Forest Scenic Byways Program, BLM Back Country Byways Program, National Trail System Program, and other similar federal programs that benefit recreational development.
- Adjacent vehicular parking areas.
- Interpretive signing.
- Acquisition of necessary scenic easements and scenic or historic sites.
- Provision for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Construction and reconstruction of roadside rest areas including sanitary and water facilities.
- Other appropriate public road facilities such as visitor centers.

In accordance with 23 USC Sec 204(i), PLH funds are also available for administrative expenses and transportation planning costs of Federal Land Management Agencies.

SELECTION PROCESS FOR FOREST HIGHWAY FUNDS

Overall the USDA Forest Service Director of Engineering and the Caltrans Deputy Director of Project Delivery establish program direction for Forest Highway funds. Projects meeting the program direction are developed by the local agency in cooperation with the USDA Forest Service Engineer and the DLAE.

Local agencies must submit applications to the USDA Forest Service Engineer no later than October 30 for programming consideration for the following year. The USDA Forest Service Regional Transportation Engineer in conformance with FHWA eligibility requirements forwards the applications for review.

The Caltrans Chief, Office of Project Development Procedures and Quality Improvement FHWA Program Coordinator, and local agencies arrange a tour of candidate project sites, usually conducted each June. This tour facilitates discussion of project details among involved representatives. Following the tour, the representatives review and consider impacts of the candidate projects on the existing priority list. The list is reviewed and updated through the joint efforts of the USDA Forest Service, Caltrans, and the FHWA. Following Caltrans' concurrence with the list, this list is forwarded to FHWA for approval and implementation.

For project development, the FHWA uses procedures included in the Nationwide Action Plan written for Federal Highway projects. These procedures require that a Social, Economic, and Environmental (SEE) study team be established to provide guidance in the pertinent areas during project development process. The SEE team may include the DLAE and other members having decision authority in the project development process.

SELECTION PROCESS FOR DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

With the significant Congressional designation of PLH Discretionary funding in the annual appropriations act in the past few years, FHWA will not solicit candidate projects for funding until after passage of the annual appropriation act. FHWA will know the extent of the Congressional designating of funds and solicit applications for these designated projects and candidate projects for any discretionary funding that remains afterward.

The FHWA Division Office will solicit from Caltrans, who is the only agency that can submit candidates from California for this program under the provisions of 23 USC 202(b). Caltrans will coordinate with the local and federal agencies to develop viable candidate projects before submitting the candidate projects to the FHWA Division Office. After the FHWA Division Office has reviewed the submission and ensured that the submission is complete and all requirements are met, the application is forwarded to FHWA HQ, Office of Program Administration.

The solicitation memorandum is also posted on the FHWA web site at: www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary. The solicitation memorandum shows funding information, describes FHWA criteria for the selection of projects, format and content of required application and specifies the timetable for the solicitation process for a particular year.

12.3 SCENIC BYWAYS

INTRODUCTION

Section 1219 of TEA-21, enacted in 1998, continues the National Scenic Byways (NSB) Program, which was originally created by Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991. The NSB grant program provides funding each year for projects on National Scenic Byways, All-American Roads, or state designated scenic byways.

The program also recognizes highways that are outstanding examples of scenic, historic, recreational, cultural, archeological, and/or natural qualities, by designating them as either National Scenic Byways or All-American Roads. To be considered for national designation, a road must be either a state designated scenic highway or Federal Land Management scenic byway. The US Secretary of Transportation makes national designations.

ADMINISTRATION

The administration of projects in the NSB Program is a cooperative effort between Caltrans, federal agencies, FHWA, USDA Forest Service, local transportation agencies, and byway organizations. Within Caltrans, the Division of Landscape rather than the DLA, is responsible for coordinating and tracking the local element for scenic byway projects. The appropriate Caltrans district is responsible for coordinating and tracking the state element for scenic byway projects.

FUNDING LEVELS

Discretionary funds totaling \$148 million nationwide are authorized for the NSB Program. Previously under ISTEA, federal funding for this program affected the state's minimum allocation. Under TEA-21 this is no longer the case.

FHWA will fund up to 80 percent of the project cost. There must be a minimum 20 percent in matching funds available for the project when the grant application is submitted. This matching requirement can be satisfied in whole or in part with state, local government, private sector, or Federal Land Management Agency funds. Additionally, third party in-kind donations can be credited toward the matching share of the project cost. Third party in-kind donations can include services, property, materials, and equipment.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Once Scenic Byway grant projects are selected, they must be listed in FSTIP. Project sponsors are urged to coordinate with their local or regional transportation agency and obtain their concurrence prior to submittal of grant applications. Projects become eligible for reimbursement through the FHWA authorization and obligation process. Expenses incurred prior to authorization are not eligible for reimbursement (see Chapter 3, "Project Authorization," in the *LAPM*).

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

National Scenic Byways, All-American Roads and Designated State Scenic Highways are eligible for funding. Federal Land Management Agency Byways (i.e., Forest Service Scenic Byways) are not eligible for funding until they receive state or national designation. Categories for funding projects under this program include:

1. Activity related to the planning, design, or development of a State Scenic Highway Program.

2. Development and implementation of a corridor management plan to maintain the scenic, historical, recreational, cultural, natural, and archeological characteristics of a byway corridor.
3. Safety improvements to a State Scenic Byway, National Scenic Byway, or All-American Road to the extent the improvements are necessary to accommodate increased traffic as a result of designation.
4. Construction along a scenic byway of a facility for pedestrians and bicyclists, rest area, turnout, overlook, or interpretive facility.
5. An improvement to a scenic byway that will enhance access to an area for the purpose of recreation, including water-related recreation.
6. Protection of scenic, historical, recreational, cultural, natural, and archeological resources in an area adjacent to a scenic byway.
7. Development and provision of tourist information to the public, including interpretive information about a scenic byway.
8. Development and implementation of a scenic byway-marketing program.

In addition, project sponsors must provide assurances for the 20 percent matching funds requirement and the ability to implement the proposal.

SELECTION PROCESS

Caltrans districts, federal and local agencies, and scenic byway groups must complete grant applications for each project by the using the electronic form on the National Scenic Byways web site at: <http://www.byways.org/>. Applicants should coordinate proposals with the State Scenic Highway Coordinator to develop viable grant projects. The State Scenic Highway Coordinator shall ensure that all projects meet eligibility requirements and assign priority numbers to each project according to the FHWA funding criteria, quality of proposals, and level of local support. Applications are due to the State Scenic Highway Coordinator one month prior to the submission deadline to the FHWA Division Office (usually occurring in July/August).

In accordance with TEA-21, priority for funding will be given to:

- Eligible projects that are associated with highways designated as NSB or All-American Road and that are consistent with the corridor management plans for the byway.
- Projects along a State-designated scenic highway that are consistent with the corridor protection program for the highway or are intended to make the highway eligible or designation as a NSB or All-American Road.
- Eligible projects associated with the development of a State Scenic Highway Program

These three priorities are treated equally, they are not considered to be listed in priority order.

FHWA will select projects and give preference to project types in the following order:

- Development of state programs, development and implementation of corridor management plans and marketing plans, and interpretative information.
- Development of interpretive facilities, turnouts and overlooks, and scenic byway resource protection.
- Construction of rest areas, pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Improvements to a highway for safety, passing lanes, highway shoulders, or to enhance access to recreational facilities.

FHWA will consider the timely use of scenic byways funds as to how successful a state has been in meeting its project work plan. States showing greater progress toward the completion of prior approved projects are better positioned to initiate new projects and will increase their chances to receive additional scenic byway grant funds.

Because the annual request for funding far exceeds the available scenic byway funds, commitment of other funding sources to complement the requested funding is an important factor.

12.4 DISCRETIONARY BRIDGE PROGRAM

The Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978 established the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program (HBRRP) to help the states improve the condition of the nation's bridges. The program is divided into two distinct categories: (1) Apportioned funds distributed according to relative state's needs (normally referred to as the HBRRP), and (2) Discretionary funds set-aside for use by the Secretary of Transportation to replace or rehabilitate deficient, high-cost highway bridges on federal-aid highways.

Appropriations for the Discretionary Bridge Program (DBP) fit into this second category and are described in Section 144(g) of 23 U.S.C. The program has been continued with each highway or transportation act since 1978. TEA-21 continued the program through 2003.

The annual appropriations nationwide are about \$100 million. DBP funds are not allocated to a state that has in a preceding year transferred HBRRP funds to other fund categories such as Surface Transportation Program (STP). In California, these transfers are used to fund the seismic retrofit of bridges not eligible under the HBRRP, the Bridge Barrier Railing Replacement Program, and the painting of bridges not on the HBRRP Eligible Bridge List.

When California is eligible to compete for Bridge Discretionary Funds, FHWA circulates an application package that collects information to determine rating factors to prioritize candidate projects. The rating factor formula is described in 23 CFR 650 Subpart (G).

Eligible projects under the DBP must meet the same requirements of the HBRRP and must cost more than \$10 million. Preliminary Engineering is not eligible for reimbursement using DBP funds.

Per FHWA requirements, only states' transportation departments may make application for funds. Caltrans reviews currently programmed state and local projects to determine which projects would be ready to advertise in the FY the funds will be available. Based on this review, Caltrans develops the applications and submits the packages to FHWA for consideration.

The federal share of the costs for projects funded under the DBP is 80%. OA is provided at 100%. All DBP funds may be obligated in the year allocated.

For local assistance, the DLAEs and the HBRR Program Coordinator will provide the coordination.

12.5 DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS (DAR)

INTRODUCTION

Defense Access Roads (DAR) program provides a means by which the federal government may pay its fair share of costs for:

- Highway improvement needed for adequate service to defense and defense-related installations.
- New transportation facilities to replace those, which must be closed to permit expansion of existing or establishment of a new defense installation.
- Repair of damage to roadways caused by major military maneuvers.
- Repair of damages due to the activities of contractors engaged in the construction of missile sites
- Missile-route to ensure their continued ability to support the missile-erector (TE) vehicle.

Definitions

Access Roads: An existing or proposed public highway, which is needed to provide essential highway transportation services to a defense installation. (This definition may include public highways through military installations only when right-of-way for such roads is dedicated to public use and the roads are maintained by a local agency.

Certification: The statement to the Secretary of Transportation by Secretary of Defense (or such other official as the President may designate) that certain roads are important to the national defense.

Defense Installation: A military reservation or installation, or defense-related industry, or source of raw materials.

Major Strategic Highway Network Connectors: These are highways, which provide access between major military installations, and part of the STRAHNET.

Maneuver Area Road: A public road in an area delineated by official orders for field maneuvers or exercises of military forces.

Military Traffic Management Command (MTMC): The military transportation agency with responsibilities assigned by the Secretary of Defense for maintaining liaison between FHWA and other agencies for the integration of defense needs into the nation's highway program.

National Highway System (NHS): It is approximately 160,000 miles of roadway important to the nation's economy, defense, and mobility. It includes all of the Interstate System, selected principal arterials, Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET), major STRAHNET connectors and intermodal connectors. Congress approved the NHS in 1995. Since that time federal-aid funds have been specifically provided for it annually including the TEA-21 period. Federal-aid projects on the NHS must meet AASHTO design standards.

Replacement Road: A public road constructed to replace one closed by establishment of a new, or the expansion of an old defense installation.

Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET): This is a network of highways, which are important to the United States' strategic defense policy and which provide access, continuity and emergency capabilities for defense purposes.

Transporter-erector route: A public road specifically designated for use by the TE vehicle for access to missile sites.

FEDERAL POLICY

- a) Federal government expects states and local agencies to assume the same responsibility for developing and maintaining adequate highways to permanent defense installations as they do for highways serving private industrial establishments or any other permanent traffic generators.

It is expected that highway improvements in the vicinity of defense installations will receive due consideration and treatment as states and local agencies develop their programs of improvements.

FHWA will provide assistance as requested by MTMC, to ascertain states' program plans for improvements to roads serving as access to defense installations.

Roads which serve permanent defense installations and which qualify under established criteria as federal-aid routes should be included in the appropriate federal-aid system.

- b) It is recognized that problems may arise in connection with the establishment, expansion, or operation of defense installations, which create an unanticipated impact upon the long-range requirements for the development of highways in the vicinity.

These problems can be resolved equitably only by federal assistance from other than normal federal-aid highway programs for part or all of the cost of improvements necessary for the functioning of the installation.

ELIGIBILITY

Local agencies that think their highways would be eligible for DAR funds should contact the base commander of the defense installation that will impact their highways. Sometimes base commanders will contact the local agency when they are planning modifications of their facilities. If after meeting with the local agency the base commander believes that access highway deficiencies are of such character as to justify relief through an improvement, the base commander will report the deficiencies to MTMC.

MTMC has the responsibility for determining the eligibility of proposed improvements for financing with DAR funds. MTMC will request the FHWA, California Division Office, to make an evaluation report of the access road needs of the installation. The evaluation report will include comments and recommendations by the base commander and the local agency. See Exhibit 12-A, "DAR Evaluation Report" in this chapter for information that is included in the report.

The evaluation report will be furnished to MTMC for its use in making the determination of eligibility and certification of importance to the national defense. The criteria upon which MTMC will base its determination of eligibility are included in Exhibit 12-B, "MTMC Eligibility Criteria" in this chapter.

If MTMC determines a project to be eligible for financing either in whole or in part with defense access road funds. MTMC will certify the project as important to the national defense and will authorize DAR funds for the project. The certification will indicate to FHWA the eligible project scope, funding amounts and appropriation code.

DESIGN STANDARDS

- a) Access roads to permanent defense installations and replacement roads shall be designed to conform to the same standards as the agency having jurisdiction is currently using for other comparable highways under similar conditions in the area, and in accordance with Chapter 11, "Design Standards" of the *LAPM*. Should local agencies desire higher standards than they are currently using for other comparable highways under similar conditions in the area, the local agencies shall finance the increases in cost.
- b) Access roads to temporary military establishments or for service to workers temporarily engaged in construction of defense installations should be designed to the minimum standards necessary to provide services for a limited period without intolerable congestion and hazard. As a guide, widening to more than two lanes generally will not be undertaken to accommodate anticipated one-way, or traffic of less than 1,200 vehicles per hour. The resurfacing or strengthening of existing pavements will be held to a minimum type having structural integrity to carry traffic for the short period of anticipated use.

PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

- a) Determination of the agency best able to accomplish the location, design, and construction of the DAR projects will be made by the FHWA California Division Office after consultation with Caltrans and/or local agency within whose jurisdiction the highway lies. When an agency other than Caltrans or the local agency (sometimes another federal agency has jurisdiction over the project area) is selected to administer the project, the FHWA Division Office will be responsible for any necessary coordination between this agency and the other parties during the life of the project.
- b) DAR projects under the supervision of a local agency, whether “on” or “off” the federal-aid system, shall be administered in accordance with the procedures in the *LAPM*, as modified specifically, unless approval of other procedures has been obtained from Washington Headquarters Federal Lands Highway Office. DAR funds must be included in the FSTIP and project phases authorized by Caltrans prior to beginning work for which reimbursement will be sought, see Chapter 3 “Project Authorization,” of the *LAPM*.
- c) The FHWA Division Office shall have a firm commitment from Caltrans or local agency within whose jurisdiction the access road lies, that they will accept responsibility for the maintenance of the completed facility before authorization of acquisition of right-of-way or construction of the project.
- d) When DAR funds are available for a pro-rata portion of the total project cost, the remaining portion of the project may be funded as a federal-aid project if on a federal-aid route. DAR funds shall not be substituted for matching share of the federal-aid portion of a project.

MANEUVER AREA ROADS

- a) Claims by a local agency for costs incurred to restore to their former condition, roads damaged by maneuvers involving a military force at least equal in strength to a ground division or air wing will be paid from funds appropriated for the maneuver and transferred to FHWA by the Department of Defense (DOD) agency. DAR funds may be used to reimburse the local agency pending transfer of funds by the DOD agency.
- b) Cost incurred by the local agency while conducting a pre-or post-condition survey may be included in the claim to DOD for direct settlement or in the damage repair project as appropriate.

STRATEGIC HIGHWAY NETWORK (STRAHNET)

The STRAHNET system of public highways provides access, continuity, and emergency transportation of personnel and equipment in times of peace and war. The 61,000-mile system designated by the FHWA in partnership with the DOD, comprises about 45,000 miles of interstate and defense highways and 15,600 other public highways.

The STRAHNET is complimented by another 1,700 miles of connectors (additional highway routes) that link more than 200 military installations and ports to the network. While installations may have multiple access/egress routes, the STRAHNET connector is generally the most direct and highest functional class roadway.

As the designated agent for public highway matters, the DOD's MTMC is the proponent for STRAHNET and STRAHNET Connectors. The MTMC identifies STRAHNET and STRAHNET Connectors in coordination with the FHWA, the states' transportation departments, the military services and installations, and the ports.

The ISTEA of 1991 and the National Highway System Designation Act of 1995, provided for inclusion of STRAHNET and STRAHNET Connectors in the 160,955-mile NHS. Federal oversight will ensure optimum maintenance levels for the NHS, thus assuring that the roads can support an emergency deployment.

In addition, the MTMC is also concerned about the traffic safety issues associated with the STRAHNET and STRAHNET Connectors. It is imperative that the number of fatalities, injuries and personal property accidents affecting military personnel are reduced. Therefore, the local agencies, states and FHWA should be cognizant of the need to identify traffic safety issues on this system and program, and appropriate corrective measures.

For official STRAHNET and Update Procedures website:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/hep10/nhs>

12.6 INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS (ITS)

INTRODUCTION

This guideline focuses on federal-aid Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) project procedures to assure compliance with the federal ITS regulations, per Code of Federal Regulations, Chapter 23, Section 940 (23 CFR 940) entitled "Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Standards." In addition, these procedures establish the roles and responsibilities for all parties who are involved in the federal-aid ITS process. However, there is a need for the basic understanding of ITS and ITS regulations in order to understand the ITS project procedures. Therefore, this guideline is set up with basics on ITS, a summary of the ITS regulations, followed by the federal-aid ITS procedures.

The target audience for this guideline is primarily federal, state and local agency project management personnel. Some of these managers may have little or no expertise in ITS, therefore, every effort was made to simplify the definitions and language in this guideline. Hopefully, this simplification will not cause any misunderstanding. A point to make is that one should not be expected to understand everything there is to know about systems, telecommunications, electronics, etc., in order to manage ITS projects.

For most public transportation managers, ITS represents a relatively new field that will require a certain amount of training to comprehend terminology and assure compliance with ITS regulations. Periodic training may also be necessary in order to keep up with technological changes in ITS.

Designing and developing ITS projects also represent a paradigm shift in the engineering mindset, compared to traditional highway projects. For example, ITS projects may not have a clear break between the preliminary engineering phase and construction phase. Furthermore, some ITS projects may not include a construction phase and may not be suitable for “low-bid” construction contracts. The iterative nature of Systems Engineering for ITS projects also implies a greater risk and uncertainties to successful completion of an ITS project. There are also other factors that appeared to be more critical to ITS projects than the traditional highway projects. Such factors are verification, validation, compatibility, reliability, usability, supportability, and maintainability.

WHAT ARE ITS?

Intelligent Transportation Systems are the electronics, communications, or information technology (IT) processing, applied to transportation operations that result in improved transportation efficiency and safety. In simple terms, it is primarily any electronic transportation system that communicates to the traveler to provide transportation safety and efficiency. The traveler as well as the system planner or operator is provided with better travel information and improved services. A more precise definition of ITS can be found in the “Definitions” section of this guideline. ITS follows a logical process of data collection, processing, and acting on the processed information.

Examples of ITS components are traffic signals, surveillance cameras, changeable message signs, ramp meters, weigh-in-motion devices, roadway service patrols, and transportation management centers. Examples of ITS are: centralized control from traffic or transit management centers of many of these components, traveler information broadcast systems, traffic signal priority for emergency or transit vehicles, ITS data archive management, and vehicle safety warning systems.

An ITS project is any project that in whole or in part, funds the deployment of ITS component and/or systems that provide or significantly contribute to one or more ITS user services as defined in the National ITS Architecture (NA). An example of a relatively small ITS project would be the installation of traffic signal hardware (traffic controller, detectors, etc) at an intersection. An example of a relatively large ITS project is the installation of a network of traffic signals that is controlled from a traffic management center.

A traditional highway project, which has an ITS element, such as a traffic signal or a ramp meter, meets the definition of an ITS project. However, it is our intent to apply ITS regulations only to the ITS portion of a project. The amount of Systems Engineering applied to an ITS project should also be commensurate with its complexity. ITS projects are unlike traditional highway projects in a number of ways. Some of the differences are as follows:

- Traditional highway projects involve mostly civil engineering, whereas ITS projects involve significant amounts of electronic engineering as well as other engineering disciplines.

- Due to the complexity of electronics in ITS projects, user and functional requirements need to be defined and testing plans formalized before detailed design begins.
- Highway projects are usually in segments affecting only a corridor, whereas ITS projects can ultimately have regional impacts.
- A completed highway project is normally owned, operated and maintained by one public agency, whereas a completed ITS project could be owned, operated and maintained by more than one public agency.
- Procurement procedures for ITS projects are not as clear-cut as traditional highway improvements. In addition to construction contracts that are based on competitive bidding, consideration should be given to engineering and design services contracts on the basis of qualifications-based selection, followed by competitive negotiations.

NATIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE (NA)

The National ITS Architecture (NA) provides a nationwide common framework and template for planning and designing ITS projects for interoperability. It can save the planner and designer a significant amount of study and research time when it is used for planning and designing ITS projects. It helps to identify the ITS subsystems or components that are needed in a region.

The key components of the NA are:

- User Services
- Logical Architecture
- Physical Architecture
- Market Packages
- Equipment Packages
- ITS Standards

Successful ITS integration and interoperability require two different fundamental activities: *Technical*, and *Institutional Integration*. *Technical Integration* of electronic systems enable information to be received, processed, stored and accessed by various parts of the system. It requires interconnectivity, compatibility and standardization. *Institutional Integration* requires coordination between various agencies and jurisdictions to achieve seamless operations and interoperability. In order to achieve effective *Institutional Integration* of systems, the stakeholder agencies and jurisdictions must agree on the benefits of an ITS, and the value of being part of an integrated system. They must agree on roles, responsibilities, and shared operational strategies. They must also agree on standards, technologies, and operational procedures in order to ensure interoperability. The transportation agencies must also coordinate with other ITS users, such as emergency services and law enforcement agencies where transportation is not a key part of their business.

Successful dealing with both the technical and institutional issues requires a high-level conceptual view of the future system and careful comprehensive planning. The framework for this system is referred to as the architecture. Architecture defines the key functions, system components, the organizations involved, and the type of information shared between organizations and various parts of the system. Architecture, therefore, is fundamental to the success of system implementation, integration and interoperability. The NA is therefore, developed to assure this success.

The NA is now available and maintained by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) at the Internet web site <http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch>. The most current version of the NA is also available on CD-ROM from FHWA. The Internet and CD versions include useful traceability features, which will guide the developer or designer to the appropriate or applicable elements of the NA, such as relating the functions with the correct market packages and standards. It will continue to evolve as new applications and as new needs will occur over time.

The graphical view below provides an interconnected presentation of the logical architecture, physical architecture, implementation, and standard-oriented components of the NA. These will be further described in the following text.




Figure 12-1 National ITS Architecture Relationships

DETAILS OF KEY COMPONENTS OF THE NATIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE

A. USER SERVICES AND USER SERVICE REQUIREMENTS

User services provide improvements in transportation safety and efficiency. After a thorough study by the NA task force, the following user services have been identified as ITS activities. New or updated user services may be added to the NA over time.

The ITS Users Services (33 to date) are as follow:

Pre-trip travel information	Ride matching and reservation
Route guidance	Traffic control
Traveler services information	Travel demand management
Incident management	Highway-rail crossings
Emissions testing and mitigation	En-route transit information
Public transportation management	Public travel security
Personalized public transit	Commercial vehicle electronic clearances
Electronic payment services	On board safety and security monitoring
Automated roadside safety inspection	Hazardous material security and incident response
Commercial vehicle administrative processes	Emergency notification and personal security
Freight mobility	Disaster response and Evacuation
Emergency vehicle management	Longitudinal collision avoidance
Lateral collision avoidance	Vision enhancement for crash avoidance
Safety readiness	Intersection collision avoidance
Automated vehicle operation	Pre-crash restraint deployment
Maintenance and construction operations	Archived data function
En route driver information	

Benefits from the user services include: improving safety, increasing highway capacity, reducing traffic congestion, reducing travel time for travelers and goods movement, improving the economy, reducing driving stress, reducing fuel consumption and emissions, and smoother traffic flows.

A number of functions are required to accomplish each user service. To reflect this, each of the user services is broken down into successively more detailed functional statements, called User Service Requirements. Examples of the “traffic control” user service functions are traffic flow optimization, traffic surveillance, control function, and provide information. These functions are found under each user service heading in the NA.

B. LOGICAL ARCHITECTURE

This component represents the unseen or software part of the system that depicts the functional processes and information flows of ITS. It is depicted in the form of data flow diagrams (often called “Bubble” diagrams) as shown on the next page. It guides the development of functional requirements for new systems and improvements. It is the conceptualized computer equivalent of how the human brain observes something, analyzes and acts on it, but in a more formalized format. An interesting observation here is that a human can act on fragmentary information known as “intuition” or “gut feeling,” whereas ITS needs very specific supporting information before it can act on it.




Figure 12-2 Example of Logical Architecture

The lines drawn between the functions and between the functions and the terminators represent the data flows. In order to understand this “Bubble” diagram, one must visualize a scenario. For example, the “Provide Vehicle Monitoring & Control” function will notify the “Manage Traffic” function of an accident. The “Manage Traffic” function will respond by notifying: the “Provide Driver & Traveler Services” function with alert or detour information, the “Manage Maintenance & Construction” function for traffic control devices, and the “Manage Emergency Services” function for emergency services that are needed.

C. PHYSICAL ARCHITECTURE

This component is a physical (hardware/software) representation of how the system should provide the required functions. The Physical Architecture takes the processes identified in the logical architecture and assigns them to physical entities known as subsystems in the NA. For example, the Physical Architecture includes types of communication modes for transfer of information and data to transportation entities, information providers, emergency service providers, and tow and recovery providers. The Physical Architecture also determines who should communicate with whom and mode of communication. This varies on a regional level based on the unique needs and characteristics of the region.

The diagram next page illustrates the Physical Architecture of the NA and also represents the entire physical ITS universe. It shows 4 types of subsystems: travelers, centers, vehicles and field. It also shows 4 modes of communications between the subsystems: fixed-point to fixed-point, wireless, vehicle-to-vehicle and dedicated short range. This Subsystem or Interconnect Diagram is often referred to as the “Sausage” diagram.

Physical Architecture
(Subsystem or Interconnect Diagram)




FIGURE 12-3 PHYSICAL ARCHITECTURE

D. MARKET PACKAGES

A Market Package is a service-oriented perspective of applications that are tailored to fit real world transportation problems and needs. In other words, they identify the pieces of the Physical Architecture that are required to implement a particular transportation service. When a Market Package is set up, it can perform one or more of the user services.

The Market packages are listed below and grouped to show how they relate to eight major types of activities:

<p>1. Traffic Management:</p>	<p>Network Surveillance Probe Surveillance Surface Street Control Freeway Control HOV Lane Management Traffic Information Dissemination Regional Traffic Control Traffic Incident Management System Traffic Forecast and Demand Management Electronic Toll Collection Emissions Monitoring and Management Virtual TMC and Smart Probe Data Standard Railroad Grade Crossing Advanced Railroad Grade Crossing Railroad Operations Coordination Parking Facility Management Regional Parking Management Reversible Lane Management Speed Monitoring Drawbridge Management Roadway Closure Management</p>
<p>2. Public Transportation:</p>	<p>Transit Vehicle Tracking Transit Fixed-Route Operations Demand Response Transit Operations Transit Passenger and Fare Management Transit Security Transit Maintenance Multi-Modal Coordination Transit Traveler Information</p>
<p>3. Traveler Information:</p>	<p>Broadcast Traveler Information Interactive Traveler Information Autonomous Route Guidance Dynamic Route Guidance Information Service Provider Based Route Guidance Integrated Transportation Management/Route Guidance Yellow Pages and Reservation Dynamic Ridesharing In-Vehicle Signing</p>
<p>4. Vehicle Safety:</p>	<p>Vehicle Safety Monitoring Driver Safety Monitoring Longitudinal Safety Warning Lateral Safety Warning Intersection Safety Warning Pre-crash Restraint Deployment Driver Visibility Improvement Advanced Vehicle Longitudinal Control Advanced Vehicle Lateral Control Intersection Collision Avoidance Automated Highway System</p>

5. Commercial Vehicles:	Fleet Administration Freight Administration Electronic Clearance Commercial Vehicle Administrative Processes International Border Electronic Clearance Weigh-In-Motion Roadside CVO Safety Onboard CVO Safety CVO Fleet Maintenance HAZMAT Management Roadside HAZMAT Security Detection and Mitigation CV Diver Security Authentication Freight Assignment Tracking
6. Emergency Management:	Emergency Response Call-Taking Emergency Routing MAYDAY Support Roadway Service Patrols Transportation Infrastructure Protection Wide-Area Alert Early Warning System Disaster Response and Recovery Evacuation and Reentry Management Disaster Traveler Information
7. Archived Data Management:	ITS Data Mart ITS Data Warehouse ITS Virtual Data Warehouse
8. Maintenance and Construction Management	Maintenance and Construction Vehicle and Equipment Tracking Maintenance and Construction Vehicle Maintenance Road Weather Information Processing and Distribution Roadway Automated Treatment Winter Treatment Roadway Maintenance and Construction Work Zone Management Work Zone Safety Monitoring Maintenance and Construction Activity Coordination

A description of each Market Package can be found using the NA at the website <http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch> or on the CD-ROM, which is available at the FHWA.

E. EQUIPMENT PACKAGES

Equipment Packages are the building blocks of the Physical Architecture. They grouped similar data processes together into an “implementable” Market Package. The grouping takes into account the user services, and the need to accommodate various levels of functionality.

A description of each Equipment Package can be found using the NA at the website <http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch> or on a CD-ROM, which is available at the FHWA.

F. STANDARDS

Standards identify and specify the way information will be exchanged between logical components of transportation systems. The ITS standards are being developed by Standards Development Organizations (SDOs). These standards are developed in order to assure interoperability, interconnectivity, compatibility, interchangeability and expandability. The standards are sets of rules on how messages are coded and transmitted between electronic equipment in order to communicate in the same language or format. They are somewhat like human languages that has an alphabet, vocabulary, and grammar rules that are used by everyone who speaks a particular language.

The standards will facilitate deployment of interoperable systems without impeding innovation as technology advances and new approaches evolve.

The following is a list of SDOs:

- **AASHTO** (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials)
- **ANSI** (American National Standards Institute)
- **ASTM** (American Society for Testing and Materials)
- **IEEE** (Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers)
- **ITE** (Institute of Transportation Engineers)
- **NEMA** (National Electrical Manufacturers Association)
- **SAE** (Society of Automotive Engineers)

REGIONAL ITS ARCHITECTURE (RA)

According to 23 CFR 940, federally funded ITS projects should conform to the NA. The federal definition of conformance with the NA is the development of a Regional ITS Architecture (RA). The RA is a regional level framework and template for ensuring institutional agreement and technical integration for the implementation of ITS projects or groups of projects. It defines the pieces of the system, how they are linked to each other, and what information is exchanged between them.

The RA is a tailored version of the NA to meet regional needs. It specifically describes the region, identifies user services to be provided, ownership of ITS subsystems, all of the stakeholders, the users in the region, and their roles and responsibilities. See Exhibit 12-C "ITS Architecture Matrix" in this chapter for a visual comparison of the difference between the NA and the RA.

A region is defined as an area no less than the boundaries of a metropolitan planning area. It can be the entire state. The regions are allowed until April 8, 2005, to have RA developed. Their architecture must be consistent and should be an integral part of the regional or metropolitan transportation planning process.

Although, the regulations did not specify who is responsible for creating and maintaining the RA, it would be logical for the MPO or RTPA to assume the responsibility. Most of California's MPOs have taken on that responsibility. In at least one rural area, the Caltrans district has accepted the RA responsibility for that region. Caltrans is currently developing the Statewide ITS Architecture to assure consistency on a statewide level. For the time being, FHWA will only rely on the RAs developed by the MPOs and RTPAs for conformity within the regions.

Development of a Regional ITS Architecture depends on addressing the following eight items:

1. Description of the region.
2. Identification of the participating agencies and stakeholders.
3. Preparation of an operational concept that identifies roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
4. Definition of high-level system functional requirements.
5. Determination of interface requirements and information exchanges with planned and existing systems and subsystems.
6. Definition of sequence of projects required for implementation.
7. Development of list of agency agreements required for operations.
8. Identification of ITS Standards supporting regional and national interoperability.

FEDERAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS

The federal laws and regulations, shown below, apply to all ITS projects. It is important to note that even though the federal regulations allows until April 8, 2005, for the development of a RA, other parts of the regulations such as ITS Standards and Systems Engineering are effective as of April 8, 2001.

Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA)

- Created the ITS Program.
- Provided funding for ITS research.
- Provided for the development of the NA.

Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) of 1998

- Established the requirement for conformity with NA.
- Provided \$101 million to \$122 million per year nationwide for the ITS Deployment Program. These program funds are limited to earmark by Congress in TEA-21 and the annual Appropriation Acts during the life of TEA-21 (6 years).
- Clarified ITS project eligibility for funds from the National Highway System (NHS) Program, the Surface Transportation Program (STP), and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Program.

23 CFR 940, Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Standards

Applicability - The National ITS Architecture regulations, per 23 CFR 940, applies to all ITS projects that are funded in whole or in part with Federal-aid Highway Funds as of April 8, 2001.

- Required that all ITS projects funded from the Highway Trust Fund should be in conformity with the NA and applicable standards.
- Conformity with the NA is defined as:
 - a) Developing RA by April 8, 2005, for those regions currently implementing ITS projects, or
 - b) Developing RA within four years of final design of their first ITS project for those regions which have not had an ITS project yet,
 - c) Using the NA as a resource in developing the RA,
 - d) Developing RA that contains the 8 items described in the section above on *Regional ITS Architecture*,
 - e) Subsequent adherence of ITS projects to the RA, and
 - f) Prior to development of RA, a major ITS project must have a Project Level ITS Architecture (PA) developed that is coordinated with the development of RA.
- The agencies and other stakeholders participating in the development of RA shall develop and implement procedures and responsibilities for maintaining the RA, as needs evolve in the region.
- Requires that all ITS projects be developed and designed using a Systems Engineering Analysis, and
- Requires that all ITS projects use ITS Standards and interoperability tests that were officially adopted by the USDOT.

Exceptions:

The FHWA may, however, authorize exceptions to the National ITS Architecture and ITS Standards for:

- Certain research projects outlined in 23 CFR 940.7, and

- The upgrade or expansion of an ITS system in existence on the date of the enactment of TEA-21; if it would not adversely affect the goals or purposes of ITS under TEA-21, is carried out before the end of the useful life of such system, and is cost-effective as compared to alternatives that would meet the conformity requirements of this rule.

FEDERAL-AID ITS PROGRAMS

There is actually only one funded ITS program, known as the ITS Deployment Program. ITS projects which are not part of the ITS Deployment Program can however, be funded from other normal federal-aid programs. To distinguish regular ITS projects from ITS Deployment projects in this guideline, a regular ITS project is any ITS project that is not funded by the ITS Deployment Program.

A. REGULAR FEDERAL-AID ITS PROJECTS

Even though there are no specific programs or budget for regular federal-aid ITS projects, such projects are eligible for federal-aid funds from the NHS Program, STP Program and CMAQ Program. Some ITS Projects such as Traffic Signal Projects can be funded from the Hazard Elimination Safety (HES) Program. The funding pro-rata depends on each program respectively. Furthermore, TEA-21 clarified the eligibility of operation and management of ITS for NHS, STP and CMAQ funds. These projects follow normal federal-aid regulations and procedures for project development with the exception of some extra steps for compliance with Systems Engineering requirements as shown in the Project Procedures section in this subchapter.

B. ITS DEPLOYMENT PROGRAM

This program is limited to Congressional earmarks. Congress selects projects for this program via applications from the state or local agency sponsors. The successful state or local transportation agency sponsors and their projects are then listed and identified in either an Authorization Act or an annual Transportation Appropriation Bill. ITS Deployment Projects must be for integration purposes. Integration is defined as combining or interconnecting two or more ITS systems for a sharing of information and interoperability between systems, subsystems or jurisdictions.

The requirements for projects in this program are subject to changes by Congress or FHWA each year. For the most current requirements, the local agency must rely on the latest annual *FHWA ITS Deployment Program Guideline*. The FHWA guidelines are normally issued every January and are available on the FHWA Discretionary Program website at: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/proginfo.htm>

Even after the Authorization Act or Appropriations Bill is passed, local agency sponsors with successful earmarks must submit a project description for review and approval by FHWA prior to authorization to proceed with project. FHWA reviews the project description for integration, eligibility, funding match, ITS architecture, standards, reporting requirements, etc.

Upon FHWA approval of the project description, the project follows the normal federal-aid procedures for clearances, obligation, authorization and construction. This program however, has a couple more requirements during and after construction. They are the quarterly status reporting and project evaluation.

FEDERAL APPROVED STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FSTIP)

All ITS projects must be listed on the FSTIP prior to obligation of funds. However, many ITS projects are not required to be listed individually, since they are classed as air quality exempt. Such projects may be lumped together in the FSTIP. If a traditional highway project contains an ITS element, the requirement for FSTIP listing would be dependent on the overall project. Earmarked ITS Deployment Projects must however, be individually listed in the FSTIP regardless of air quality status.

The FHWA has requested that the regional or metropolitan transportation planning agencies (e.g., MPOs, RTPAs), set up a system that would require Caltrans and the local agencies to “flag” major ITS projects in their FTIP submittal. This could be a symbol designation within the current FTIP format, a separate page listing, or any other means. This will be useful in allowing the regional planning agency responsible for maintaining the RA, to perform a preliminary screening of the project for inclusion within the RA. At the same time, it assures that the local agency is aware that it must consider integration when developing and designing an ITS project. It will also facilitate early education and technical assistance from FHWA and/or Caltrans for project sponsors in the application of the Systems Engineering process and avoid unnecessary delays to project delivery.

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING (PE)

Preliminary Engineering (PE) activities for ITS projects may include traditional roadway design, environmental process, and ITS system (software and hardware) design using a formal Systems Engineering process.

Both the Field Review form and PE checklist include ITS requirements to be addressed when applicable. See Chapters 3, “Project Authorization” and Chapter 7, “Field Review,” of the *LAPM*.

For major ITS projects, a 2-phased PE obligation and authorization process will be followed. Phase 1 work will include all activities of the Systems Engineering process leading up to software/hardware component detailed design (see Systems Engineering Methodology diagram on page 31 in this chapter). Phase 2 work, which continues Systems Engineering, includes software specification, coding, computer hardware component purchase and installation, component (software/hardware) integration, system implementation, and testing. A separate construction obligation and authorization will be needed for traditional roadway improvements and equipment installations that accompany system implementation.

Time will be allowed in the 2-phased PE obligation and authorization process for adequate FHWA oversight and approval of Systems Engineering activities. After Phase 1 is obligated and authorized, the Field Review form, which includes the Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF), is filled out by the local agency and submitted for review by FHWA. The completed Field Review package should be submitted as soon as possible to FHWA for SERF review comments in order to assure adequate guidance for preparing an acceptable Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP), thus avoiding unnecessary project delays.

Phase 2 will be obligated and authorized after environmental clearance and SEMP is completed and approved by FHWA. Based on 23 CFR 940, all ITS projects shall undergo Systems Engineering Analysis. The SEMP provides for management of the Systems Engineering Analysis. See the Systems Engineering section and Exhibit 12-E in this chapter for additional details.

Since software development in ITS projects involve a certain amount of iterative development and uncertainty, such projects are not suitable for low-bid type contracts. Therefore, flexibility is allowed for non-construction ITS projects or Phase 2 software/hardware component developments, to be procured by consultant services contracts. See Procurement Section of this guideline for the definition of non-construction.

If an ITS project includes minor amounts of construction, say 5% to 10% of project, compared to the nonconstruction portion, flexibility is allowed to have the entire project deployed in the PE phase.

If the construction portion is significant, and a significant amount of software development is involved, care should be taken to coordinate closely the completion of the software and electronic equipment portion with the construction portion to avoid any contract delays. This will be typically performed by different procurement methods, software by consultant services and construction by low-bid contract.

Many ITS projects are relatively complex requiring the need for most local agencies to obtain consultants for engineering and design services to develop and design an ITS project. For these types of services, the Consultant Selection procedures (qualifications-based) in Chapter 10 of the *LAPM* must be followed. These ITS consultant contracts could involve traditional planning, research, design, system integration, traffic management, software development, operations, maintenance and project evaluation services.

The special skills of a system integrator and/or a system manager may also be needed to assure successful development and deployment of ITS projects. The system integrator's role is to establish solid requirements, assure successful integration of ITS components, subsystems and systems, and possibly perform the subsystem and system testing. The system manager will work on behalf of and in coordination with the local agency to complete the overall implementation of the ITS projects.

By the nature of this activity, consultant contracts for ITS system integrators and system managers normally extend through the PE, construction, and testing phases. For complex ITS projects, it is strongly advised that such services be obtained in order to assure a successful project.

Per Federal Laws and Regulations section in this guideline, the FHWA may authorize exceptions to ITS Standards for the upgrade, or expansion of existing ITS systems under certain conditions. Therefore, for minor ITS projects, the local agencies are delegated the authority to make the exception determination based on 23 CFR 940.7 and document the determination. For major ITS projects, the FHWA will make the exception determination based on 23 CFR 940.7.

ITS projects that include a state contribution of funds (STIP funds) have relatively short PE and construction deadlines. These state-mandated deadlines are too short to account for the services of a systems integrator or systems manager. Therefore, the local agencies must be aware of the need to request time extensions in advance of the deadline in order to be reimbursed for these services, or classify the construction phase of the consultant's activities as construction engineering. See Chapter 23. 2.1, "Timely Use of Funds" of the *LAPG* for information on STIP deadlines and time extension.

ENVIRONMENTAL

The environmental process and environmental clearances for ITS projects are processed under normal federal-aid regulations and procedures. For environmental guidance, see Chapter 6 "Environmental Procedures" of the *LAPM*. Generally, the only ground disturbance that normally occurs on ITS projects is the excavation of long narrow trenches on existing public roads for fiber optics. Existing utility poles are often used for mounting surveillance equipment. Occasionally, ITS projects involve the construction of transportation management centers or information kiosks. These types of projects create relatively small "footprints." Such projects are not likely to cause any negative environmental impacts, except in rare cases where they might encounter an archaeological site, a historic site or an endangered species habitat.

With few exceptions, most ITS projects can be classed as either Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) or Categorical Exclusion (CE). CE approvals remain with FHWA, whereas the PCE approvals are delegated to Caltrans. CE projects are normally projects that do not have any significant impacts. The following are examples of ITS projects which are normally CE:

- Traffic operations improvement projects, which include: *installation of ramp metering, deployment or construction of a transportation management center and interconnect of traffic signals along a corridor.*
- Construction of bus transfer facilities (an open area consisting of passenger shelters, boarding areas, kiosks) when located in a commercial area or other high activity center in which there is adequate street capacity for projected bus traffic. *Traveler information kiosks are in this category.*

PCE projects are normally CE projects that do not have any unusual circumstances or require any special studies. Normally, projects that do not involve any ground disturbance fit the PCE category. For example, ITS projects consisting only of electronic equipment installation in an office and /or software development activities fit the PCE category. See Exhibit 6-D, Chapter 6, "Environmental Procedures" of the *LAPM* for more specific rules on meeting the PCE criteria.

RIGHT-OF-WAY

Generally, the amount of right-of-way needed for ITS projects are minor, since the right-of-way is primarily used for the placement of fiber optics under existing city streets or county roads. The only right-of-way that maybe needed is easements for fiber optics. Occasionally, an ITS project may involve utility relocations or the purchase of right-of-way for construction of a traffic management center, information kiosk, etc. For guidance on right-of-way procedures, see Chapter 13, "Right-of Way" of the *LAPM*.

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

Systems Engineering is required for all federal-aid ITS projects per 23 CFR 940, regardless of size or complexity. However, the amount of Systems Engineering should be commensurate with the project scope and complexity.

Systems Engineering is a way of thinking about developing and completing a project. It is a process, not a checklist. The figure below shows the Systems Engineering process. The process covers the entire life cycle of a project, from planning (concept of operations, stakeholder and user needs identification) to design, operations and maintenance. The process transforms user needs into system requirements and then into a system design. As a result Systems Engineering ensures a successful and long-lasting system by (1) reducing long-term system costs, (2) reducing risk, (3) satisfying user’s needs, and (4) improving system quality.

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING METHODOLOGY (Vee Technical Development Model)




Figure 12-4 Systems Engineering Methodology

Systems Engineering is an iterative process of technical management, system design, acquisition, product realization, and technical evaluation. Similarities exist between the Systems Engineering process as used for ITS project and the structured Caltrans Project Study Report (PSR) process. Systems Engineering transforms user needs and/or operational requirements into system scope and design, whereas the PSR process transforms highway needs into project scope and design.

Systems Engineering spans the entire life cycle from systems analysis, requirements definition and conceptual design at the outset of a development through integration, testing, and operational support, to ultimately planning for replacement, and eventual retirement and disposal at the end of a program. In accordance with the 23 CFR 940, the Systems Engineering process will address at a minimum for all ITS projects the following:

- Identification of portions of the RA being implemented or if a RA does not exist, the applicable portions of the National ITS Architecture.
- Identification of participating agencies and their roles and responsibilities.
- Requirements definitions.
- Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements.
- Procurement options.
- Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures.
- Procedures and resources necessary for operation and management of the system




Figure 12-5 Relationship of Systems Engineering Management Plan with Project Requirements

The SEMP is the primary, top-level technical management document that defines and describes the Systems Engineering Management, the tailored Systems Engineering process, and how the technical disciplines will be integrated for the life of a transportation project. SEMP establishes the technical program organization, direction, and control mechanisms for the project to meet its cost, schedule, and performance objectives. It is the foundation for all engineering activities during the entire project.

The SEMP applies to all team personnel and all technical activities conducted in the fulfillment of the project. It applies to all processes and products that are deemed necessary for accomplishing the project, whether or not they are required under contract.

A SEMP should be developed for every project that includes software/hardware integration. It should be tailored to project size, complexity, and cover all development phases. The SEMP is not necessarily a long document but for some projects, it could be a page long, for others it could be hundreds of pages long. The plan needs to be specific to the needs of the project.

The SEMP, therefore, is a living document and as a result, additions, deletions, and modifications will occur as it is utilized. It will be updated as the development work proceeds, and Systems Engineering process products are produced. All updates must be reviewed and approved by the local transportation agency project manager.

For details on SEMP submittal, review, and approval, please refer to the “Procedures” section in this chapter as well as Exhibit 12-E “Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) Guidelines.”

PROCUREMENT (CONTRACTING)

The federal-aid procurement regulations as set forth in 23 CFR 172, 635, 655, and 49 CFR 18, define the requirements that state and local agencies must adhere to when procuring projects with federal-aid highway funds. These procurement regulations identify possible contracting options available for designing and constructing projects including such contracts as “engineering and design related services,” “construction,” and “non-engineering/non-architectural.” Procurement regulations require the use of competitive contract award procedures for any federal-aid highway project and award as follows:

- Construction contracts on the basis of competitive bidding,
- Engineering and Design services contracts on the basis of qualifications-based selection, and
- Non-engineering/non-architectural contracts use state approved procurement procedures in accordance with 49 CFR 18.

Construction Versus NonConstruction

Understanding the definition of “construction” is necessary for determining the most cost-effective method of procurement. Provided next page are examples of construction and non-construction:

Improvements that typically meet the definition of Construction:

- Physical installation of field hardware and devices for freeway management and traffic signal control systems including changeable message signs, ramp meters, new traffic signals, new controller cabinets, lane use control signs and vehicle detectors.
- Erection of towers to support wireless communication, direct-bury conduit and hardware interconnect between signals and field devices or systems.
- Installation of field hardware and devices to provide detection and verification capabilities.

Improvements that individually may not meet the definition of construction (Non-Construction):

- Procurement of portable message signs, electronic devices and communication interfaces within traffic signal controllers and cabinets, computer hardware, and software development.
- Communication devices, which are wireless or require only limited installation (e.g. on existing poles or towers)

Miscellaneous Contract Conditions

ITS deployment contracts should include documentation and training. Documentation and training are necessary to assure successful operation and maintenance of any electronic system. Documentation is in the form of logistical support manuals, which will provide the new ITS operators/owners with information necessary for operation and maintenance of the system including sources for technical support and replacement parts.

It is also advisable to consider maintainability and supportability of the system in the contract for such items as: the supply support network (i.e., spares, repair parts, operating inventories), test and support equipment, transportation and handling equipment, computer resources (i.e., software), personnel and training, facilities and technical data. Other considerations are repair policies and contract warranty provisions.

CONSTRUCTION

As noted in the PE Section in this guideline, ITS projects, which involve software development, are not suitable for low-bid construction contracts. Therefore, all ITS projects should be carefully examined to determine the appropriate contracting method(s), or contracting combinations to use in accordance with the federal procurement regulations. For guidance see the Preliminary Engineering and Procurement sections in this guideline.

RECORD KEEPING

The U.S. DOT and the Comptroller General of the United States have the right to access to all documents pertaining to federal-aid projects. Nonfederal partners must maintain sufficient documentation to substantiate the costs. Such items as: direct labor, fringe benefits, material costs, consultant costs, public involvement costs, subcontract costs, and travel costs should be included in that documentation. These project records must be kept on file for a minimum of three (3) years beyond the date the final voucher is paid for each project.

PROCEDURES

A. MAJOR ITS PROJECTS - PROCEDURES

Major federal-aid ITS projects shall follow the regular federal-aid procedures outlined in the *LAPM*, except for the addition of a 2-phased PE obligation and authorization procedure to assure conformity with the NA regulations. Application and control of the Systems Engineering process is a key reason for the 2-phased PE process as shown below.

Transportation Planning:

1. The local agency submits project to the regional planning agency for inclusion in the Federal Approved State Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP).

The FHWA requests that regional or metropolitan planning agencies (e.g., MPOs, RTPAs) obtain from the local agencies an indication (flag) of major ITS projects along with the FTIP submittal. This could be a symbol designation within the current FTIP format, a separate page listing, or any other means. This will be useful for allowing the agency responsible for maintaining the RA to perform a preliminary screening of the project for inclusion with the RA. At the same time, it assures that the local agency is aware that it must consider integration when developing and designing an ITS project. This will also facilitate early education and technical assistance from FHWA and/or Caltrans to project sponsors in application of the Systems Engineering process and avoid unnecessary delay to project delivery.

In California, the owner of the RA is in general a regional planning organization, which could be a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), a Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA), a Local Transportation Commission (LTC), a county, and a Caltrans District Office or Caltrans HQ.

2. The regional planning organization reviews the project for consistency with the transportation planning process before submitting the FTIP to Caltrans HQ.
3. Caltrans HQ incorporates the FTIP in the FSTIP, and submits the FSTIP to the FHWA Division for review and approval.
4. The FHWA Division reviews and approves the FSTIP.

Project Development:

5. The local agency verifies that the project is listed in the FSTIP, and then submits a Phase 1 Preliminary Engineering (PE) request package to the DLAE.
6. When the PE package is satisfactory, the DLAE forwards the package, and submits E-76 for Phase 1 PE to DLA Implementation.
7. When the PE package is satisfactory, DLA Implementation executes the E-76, and submits it to the FHWA for obligation.
8. The DLAE verifies from the E-76 system that FHWA has obligated the funds before issuing authorization to proceed with Phase 1 PE.
9. Soon after Phase 1 PE begins, the local agency submits the completed Field Review form to the DLAE.

The completed Field Review form includes an ITS Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF). In the SERF, the local agency must provide as much as possible information for each of the following ITS requirements, and include a commitment to address them in detail during system design.

- a) *Identification of portions of the RA being implemented.*
 - b) *Identification of participating agencies roles and responsibilities.*
 - c) *Requirements definitions.*
 - d) *Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements.*
 - e) *Procurement options.*
 - f) *Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures.*
 - g) *Procedures and resources necessary for operations and management of the system.*
10. The DLAE forwards the field review package to DLA Implementation with a copy to the DLA ITS Coordinator.
 11. The DLA ITS Coordinator forwards the package to FHWA.
 12. FHWA reviews the SERF for FHWA oversight determination, comments on the SERF, and sends the information back to the DLA ITS Coordinator.

FHWA oversight can consist of approval of the Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP); products from each step of the Systems Engineering process, or portions thereof, or merely participate in scheduled process technical review points. FHWA is also available to provide the local agencies with additional ITS technical assistance and guidance as needed.

13. The DLA ITS Coordinator relays the information to the DLAE, who relays it to the local agency.
14. Upon receipt of the Field Review package, the DLA Implementation Engineer prepares a Program Supplement, with ITS covenants added. After approval by Caltrans Local Program Accounting, the Program Supplement is transmitted directly to the local agency for signature.
15. The local agency signs the Program Supplement and returns it to DLA Implementation.
16. Prior to component detailed design, the local agency submits the completed SEMP as well as the Systems Engineering process products(s) mentioned in Step #12 above, through the DLAE and DLA ITS Coordinator for FHWA's review and approval.
17. FHWA notifies the DLA ITS Coordinator that they approved the SEMP and specified process product(s).
18. The DLA ITS Coordinator relays the approval to the local agency through the DLAE with a copy to the DLA Implementation Engineer.
19. Upon receiving final SEMP and process product(s) approval, the local agency may proceed with a request for Phase 2 PE (component detailed design).
20. The DLAE checks for environmental clearance before preparing and submitting an E-76 for Phase 2 PE to the DLA Implementation Engineer.
21. The DLA Implementation Engineer reviews for completeness and accuracy before transmitting the E-76 to FHWA.
22. The DLAE verifies FHWA obligation of funds on the E-76 before issuing the Authorization to Proceed with Phase 2 PE.
23. The local agency proceeds with component detailed design.

Construction:

24. If the ITS project includes activities defined as construction; the local agency must submit a PS&E package requesting construction authorization. The request includes the necessary federal-aid paperwork and clearances.
25. Beyond this point, normal federal-aid procedures apply for completing the project. Use Final Inspection Form 17 C to finalize the project.

B. MINOR ITS PROJECTS - PROCEDURES

The procedures for minor ITS projects will follow the traditional 1-Phased federal-aid PE procedures. ITS documentation remains a requirement. However, no SERF review and SEMP review and approval by FHWA are required.

DEFINITIONS

Architecture - A framework within which a system can be built. Architecture functionally defines the pieces of the system and the information that is exchanged between them.

Architecture Baseline - The clear identification of the architecture products that will be maintained, including specific format and version information. Changes to the architecture baseline must follow an approved change management process typically documented in a maintenance plan. The architecture baseline will change over time as the architecture is revised.

Architecture Flow - Information that is exchanged or interfaced between subsystems and between subsystems and terminators in the physical architecture view of the NA. The terms “information flow” and “architecture flow” can be used interchangeably.

Architecture Interconnect - Communication paths that carry information between subsystems and terminators in the physical architecture view of the NA. Four different types of communication links are identified: wireline, wide area wireless, dedicated short-range communications and vehicle-to-vehicle communications.

Configuration Management - A process developed to control change in complex information technology based systems.

Center Subsystems - Subsystems that provide management, administrative and support functions for the transportation system. One of four general subsystems defined in the NA.

Concept of Operations - It is the stakeholders’ vision of how the system will operate in actual practice (standard operating procedure). The concept of operation is a document that defines, in sequence, how the subsystems and institutions will operate with each other for each incident or situation. It identifies and defines the roles and responsibilities of the systems and subsystems of each agency, and the physical environment. It is very useful as a starting point for the development of RA, PIA or an ITS project. The concept of operations is normally drawn up as a flow diagram.

Data Dictionary Entry (DDE) - Contains definitions and description of every data flow included in the logical architecture view of the NA as well as identification of lower level data elements that make up the data flow.

Data Flows - They represent data flowing between processes or between processes and a terminator. A data flow is shown as an arrow on a data flow diagram and is defined in a data dictionary entry. Data flows are aggregated together to form high-level architecture flows in the physical architecture view of the NA. See Data Flow diagram.

Data Flow Diagram - The diagrams in the logical architecture view of the NA that show the functions that are required for ITS and the data that moves between these functions.

Data Store - Represents data depositories that are required to support data aggregation or archival functions in the logical architecture. A data store represents “data at rest” in a data flow diagram.

Dedicated Short Range Communications (DSRC)- A wireless communications channel used for close-proximity communications between vehicles and the immediate infrastructure. It supports location-specific communications for ITS services such as toll collection, transit vehicle management, driver information, and automated commercial vehicle operations. One of four types of interconnects defined in the NA.

Deployment - An act of placing strategically.

Element - The basic building block of an ITS architecture. The name used by stakeholders to describe a system or piece of a system.

Equipment Packages - They are electronic equipment that has already been developed by manufacturers, which are ready for interconnection. A number of them need to be grouped and interconnected before the system can perform one or more user services. Such group is known as market package.

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)- An agency of the United States Department of Transportation that funds and regulates federal funded highway projects.

Federal Transit Administration (FTA) - An agency of the United States Department of Transportation the funds and regulates federal funded transit projects.

Functional Requirements - What a system must do to address the needs or provide the services that have been identified for the region. In a regional ITS architecture, the functional requirements focus on the high-level requirements for providing desired service to the user.

Information Flow - Information that is exchanged between subsystems and terminators in the physical architecture view of the National ITS Architecture. The terms “information flow” and “architecture flow” are used interchangeably.

Infrastructure - The underlying foundation or basic framework of a system or an organization.

Institutional Integration- Represents the process of combining existing and emerging institutional constraints and arrangements.

Integrate - To incorporate into a larger system. Includes combining, interconnecting, or interfacing different systems and jurisdictions.

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)- Electronics, communications, or information processing used singly or in combination to improve the efficiency or safety of a surface transportation system.

Interchangeability - The capability to exchange devices of the same type from any vendor without changing the software.

Interconnect - See architecture interconnect. Also applies to traffic signal interconnect.

Interface - The place at which independent systems meet and act on or communicate with each other. The means by which interaction or communication is effected. In the RA, an interface is described by the architecture interconnect.

Interoperability - The capability to operate devices from different manufacturers or different device types (e.g., signal controllers and dynamic message signs on the same communication channel).

ITS Architecture - Defines how systems functionally operate and the interconnection of information exchanges that must take place between these systems to accomplish transportation services.

ITS Project - Any project that in whole or in part funds the acquisition of technologies or systems of technologies that provide or significantly contribute to the provision of one or more ITS user services as defined in the National ITS Architecture.

ITS Strategic Plan - A guide for long-term implementation of ITS in the state, metropolitan area or region. It normally includes identifying regional transportation needs and then defining ITS elements to be implemented over time, aimed at meeting those needs. RA is typically a core component of an ITS strategic plan.

Legacy System - Existing transportation systems, communication systems or institutional systems.

Life cycle - Denotes the strategic cycle or sequencing of a specific process.

Logical Architecture - This is primarily the software part of the system. It defines the thought or logic processes that perform ITS functions and the information or data flows that are shared between these processes.

Maintenance Plan - A description of configuration control and update guidelines for regional and/or project ITS architectures. The primary purpose of the maintenance plan is to maintain an architecture baseline.

Major ITS Project - An ITS project that implements part of a regional ITS initiative that is multi-jurisdictional, multi-modal, or otherwise affects regional integration of ITS systems.

Market Packages - They are groups of electronic equipment that are already manufactured and ready to be interconnected to perform one or more user services.

National ITS Architecture (NA)- A common established national framework for ITS interconnectivity and interoperability. It comprises the logical architecture and physical architecture that satisfy a defined set of user services. Maintained by the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT), under contract at:
<http://itsarch.iteris.com/itsarch>.

National Program Plan - A plan jointly prepared by the USDOT and ITS America with substantial involvement from the broader ITS community. The purpose of the plan was to guide the development and deployment of ITS. It defined the first 28 user services that were the basis for the National ITS Architecture development effort. This plan is updated periodically.

Operational Concept - Describes how the system will work by identifying in sequence the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies and stakeholders for a given scenario(s).

Physical Architecture - This is primarily the hardware part of the system. The part of the NA that provides a physical representation of the important ITS interfaces and major system components. The principal elements of the physical architecture are the subsystems, terminators and the communication interface between them.

Process - A function or activity identified in the logical architecture view of the NA that is required to support the ITS user services.

Process Specification (PSpec) - The textual definition of the most detailed process identified in the logical architecture view of the NA. The PSpec includes an overview, a set of functional requirements, a complete set of inputs and outputs, and a list of user service requirements that are satisfied by the PSpec.

Project ITS Architecture (PIA) - A framework that identifies the institutional agreement and technical integration necessary to define an ITS project and its interface with other ITS projects and systems.

Project Sequencing - The order in which projects are deployed. An efficient sequencing can allow projects to incrementally build on each other.

Protocol Communications - A set of rules for how messages are coded and transmitted between electronic devices. The equipment at each end of a data transmission must use the same protocol to successfully communicate. It is like human language that has an alphabet, vocabulary, and grammar rules used by everyone who speaks that language.

Region - The geographical area that identifies the boundaries of the RA based on the needs of the participating agencies and stakeholders. In metropolitan areas, a region should be no less than the boundaries of the metropolitan planning area.

Regional ITS Architecture (RA) - A regional or state level framework for ensuring institutional agreement and technical integration for the implementation of ITS projects or groups of projects. It defines what pieces of the system are linked to others and what information is exchanged between them.

Requirements Definitions - A total set of considerations that govern what is to be accomplished, how well and under what conditions.

Roadside Subsystems - One of four general classes of subsystems defined in the NA. This class is distributed along the transportation network, which performs surveillance, information provision, and control functions. Located on roadway facilities, parking facilities, toll systems, and commercial vehicle check systems that are at or near the roadside.

Rural Areas - For the purposes of this guideline, they are areas not under any MPO jurisdiction.

Sausage Diagram - A top-level diagram, which depicts all subsystems in the NA and the basic communication, interconnects between the subsystems. It can be used as a template for the physical architecture portion of a RA.

Service Boundaries - The geographic boundary of a specific service or agency that provides a service. An example is the service area of a transit agency. The transit agency provides services within a defined boundary.

Stakeholders - Anyone with a vested interest or “stake” in the regional ITS architecture. This includes public agencies, private organizations, special interest groups and traveling public.

Standards - Established and documented technical specifications sponsored by a Standards Development Organization (SDO) to be used consistently by industries or government for interoperability, compatibility, interconnect ability, interchangeability and expandability. Already developed ITS standards can be found in the NA web site by selecting an Architecture Flow.

Subsystem - The principal structural elements of the physical architecture view of the NA. Subsystems are grouped in four classes: centers, roadside, vehicles and travelers.

System Inventory - The collection of all ITS related elements in a RA.

Systems Engineering Analysis - Is a structured process for arriving at a final design of a system. The final design is selected from a number of alternatives that would accomplish the same objectives and considers the total life-cycle of the project including not only the technical merits of potential solutions but also the costs and relative value of alternatives.

Terminator - Terminators define the boundary of architecture. They represent people, systems, and general environment that interface with ITS. Since they are in essence, “external”, the interfaces are defined but no functional requirements are allocated to them. Both the logical and physical architectures have exactly the same terminators.

Traveler Subsystems - Equipment used by travelers to access ITS services pre-trip and en route. This includes services owned and operated by the traveler as well as services that are owned by transportation and information providers. One of four general subsystem classes defined in the NA.

Turbo Architecture - An automated software tool used to input and manage system inventory, market packages, interconnects and architecture flows with regards to RA. The Turbo Architecture is an excellent software tool for developing RA, PIA, development and design of an ITS project. However, the Turbo Architecture must be purchased since it is not a public domain.

User Services - They are services that ITS provide the user from the user’s perspective. User Services form the basis for the National ITS Architecture development effort. Currently, 33 user services are defined in the NA.

User Service Requirements - Specific statements specifying what must be done to support the ITS user services. The user services requirements were developed specifically to serve as a baseline to drive NA development. The user service requirements are not requirements to system/architecture implementers, but rather are directions to the NA development team.

Vehicle Subsystems - They are subsystems located in vehicles, which include driver information and safety systems. One of four general subsystem classes defined in the NA.

Vehicle-to-Vehicle Communications - Dedicated wireless system handling high data rate, low probability of error, line-of-sight communications between vehicles. Advanced vehicle services may use this link in the future to support advanced collision avoidance implementations, road condition information sharing, and active coordination to advanced control systems. One of four types of architecture interconnects defined in the NA.

Wide-Area Wireless communications - A communications link that provides communications via a wireless device between the user and an infrastructure based system. These links support a range of services including real time traveler information and various forms of fleet communications. One of four types of architecture interconnects defined in the NA.

Wireline Communications - A communications link serving fixed locations. It uses a variety of public or private communications networks that may physically include wireless (e.g. microwave) as well as wireline infrastructure. One of four types of architecture interconnects defined in the NA.

ACRONYMS

AASHTO - American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials

ADMS - Archived Data Management Subsystem

ADUS - Archived Data User Service

AFD - Architecture Flow Diagram

AID - Architecture Interconnect Diagram

AHS - Automated Highway System

AMPS - Advanced Mobile Phone System

ANSI - American National Standards Institute

APTS - Advanced Public Transportation System

ASTM - American Society for Testing and Materials

AVCS - Advanced Vehicle Control Systems

AVI - Automated Vehicle Identification

AVL - Automated Vehicle Location

AVO - Automated Vehicle Operation

BNF - Backus-Naur Form

BRT - Bus Rapid Transit

CASE - Computer Aided Systems Engineering

CCTV - Closed Circuit TV

CD - Compact Disk

CDMA - Code Division Multiple Access

CDPD - Cellular Digital Packet Data

CD-ROM - CD Read-only Memory

CMA - Congestion Management Agency

CMS - Changeable Message Sign

CORBA - Common Object Request Broker Architecture

COTR - Contracting Officer Technical Representative

COTS – Commercial of-the-Shelf products	CSP - Communication Service Provider
CV - Commercial Vehicle	CVAS - Commercial Vehicle Administration Subsystem
CVCS - Commercial Vehicle Check Subsystem	CVISN - Commercial Vehicle Information Systems and Networks
CVO - Commercial Vehicle Operations	CVS - Commercial Vehicle Subsystem
CWD - Corridor Wide Display System	DAB - Digital Audio Broadcast
DD - Data Dictionary	DDE - Data Dictionary Element
DEN - Data Exchange Network Display System	DFD - Data Flow Diagram
DGPS - Differential Global Positioning System	DLA - Division of Local Assistance
DLAE - District Local Assistance Engineer	DMS - Dynamic Message Sign
DMV - Department of Motor Vehicle	DOT - Department of Transportation
DR&I - Caltrans Headquarters Division of Research & Innovation	DSRC - Dedicated Short Range Communications
DTA - Dynamic Traffic Assignment	911 - Emergency 9-1-1
ECPA - Electronic Communications Privacy Act	EDI - Electronic Data Interchange
EDP - Early Deployment Plan	EM - Emergency Management Subsystem
EMC - Emergency Management Center	EMMS - Emissions Management Subsystem
ESMR - Enhanced Specialized Mobile Radio	ETA - Expected Time of Arrival
ETTM - Electronic Toll and Traffic Management	ETS - Emergency Telephone Services
FARS - Fatal Accident Reporting System	FCC - Federal Communications Commission
FHWA - Federal Highway Administration	FIPS - Federal Information Processing Standard
FMC - Freeway Management Center	FMCSA - Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration

FMS - Fleet Management Subsystem	FOT - Field Operational Test
FPR - Final Program Review	FSTIP - Federal State Transportation Improvement Program
FTA - Federal Transit Administration	GIS - Geographic Information System
GPS - Global Positioning System	GUI - Graphical User Interface
HAR - Highway Advisory Radio	HAZMAT - Hazardous Material
HOV - High Occupancy Vehicle	HRI - Highway Rail Intersection
HSR - High Speed Rail	HUD - Head Up Display
IDL - Interface Definition Language	IEEE - Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc.
IEN - Information Exchange Network	IP - Internet Protocol
IPR - Interim Program Review	ISO - International Standards Organization
ISP - Information Service Provider	ISTEA - Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act
ITE - Institute of Transportation Engineers	ITI - Intelligent Transportation Infrastructure
ITS - Intelligent Transportation Systems*	ITS America - Intelligent Transportation Society of America
IVIS - In Vehicle Information System	LAN - Local Area Network
LCD - Liquid Crystal Display	LED - Light Emitting Diode
LEO - Low-Earth Orbit Satellite System	LRMS - Location Reference Messaging Standard
LRT - Light Rail Transit	MAN - Metropolitan Area Network
MDI - Model Deployment Initiative	MMDI - Metropolitan MDI
MMI - Man-Machine Interface	MOE - Measure of Effectiveness
MPO - Metropolitan Planning Organization	MPH - Miles per Hour
NA - National ITS Architecture	NAR - National Architecture Review
NAV - Navigation	NEMA - National Electrical Manufacturers Association
NHPN - National Highway Planning Network	NHTSA - National Highway Traffic Safety Administration

NII - National Information Infrastructure	NPRM - Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
NTCIP - National Transportation Communications for ITS Protocol	OEM - Original Equipment Manufacturer
OSI - Open Systems Interconnection	OTP - Operational Test Plan
PC - Personal Computer	PCS - Personal Communications System
PD - Police Department	PDA - Personal Digital Assistant
PE - Preliminary Engineering	PIA - Project ITS Architecture
PIAS - Personal Information Access Subsystem	PMS - Parking Management System
PS - Planning Subsystem	PSA - Precursor System Architecture
PS&E - Plans, Specifications and Estimate	PSPEC - Process Specification
PSTN - Public Switched Telephone Network	PTS - Positive Train Separation
R & D - Research and Development	RDS - Radio Data Systems
RDSTMC - RDS incorporating a Traffic Message Channel	RFP - Request for Proposal
RA - Regional ITS Architecture	RS - Roadway Subsystem
RTA - Regional Transit Authority	RTPA - Regional Transportation Planning Agency
RTS - Remote Traveler Support Subsystem	SAE - Society of Automotive Engineers
SC - Single Click	SDO - Standards Development Organization
SEMP - System Engineering Management Plan	SERF -System Engineering Review Form
SMR - Specialized Mobile Radio	SNMP - Simple Network Management Protocol
SONET - Synchronous Optical Network	SOV - Single Occupancy Vehicle
SOW - Statement of Work	STMF - Simple Transportation Management Framework
STMP - Simple Transportation Management Protocol	SQL - Standard Query Language

SSR - Standard Speed Rail, also Spread Spectrum Radio	TAS - Toll Administration Subsystem
TCIP - Transit Communications Interface Profiles	TCS - Toll Collection Subsystem
TDM - Travel Demand Management	TDMA - Time Division Multiple Access
TM - Transportation Management	TMC - Transportation Management Center
TMDD - Traffic Management Data Dictionary	TMS - Traffic Management Subsystem
TOC - Traffic Operations Center	TRB - Transportation Research Board
TRMC - Transit Management Center	TRMS - Transit Management Subsystem
TRT - Technical Review Team	TRVS - Transit Vehicle Subsystem
USDOT - United States Department of Transportation	USR - User Service Requirement
VMS - Variable Message Sign	VRC - Vehicle/Roadside Communications
VS - Vehicle Subsystem	WAN - Wide Area Network
WIM - Weigh-in-Motion	WWW - World Wide Web

REFERENCES

- 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA)
- 1998 Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21), Section 5206(e)
- Title 23 USC 103(b)(6), Eligibility for NHS Program
- Title 23 USC 133(b), Eligibility for STP Program
- Title 23 CFR 655, Traffic Surveillance and Control
- Title 23 CFR 940, National ITS Architecture
- Title 49 CFR 18, Common Rule
- FHWA Memorandum dated March 22, 2002, Guidance on Federal-aid Eligibility of Operating Costs for Transportation Management Systems
- 2002 Project Approval and Oversight Letter of Agreement (Stewardship Agreement) between the Federal Highway Administration and the California Department of Transportation
- January, 2002 Using the National ITS Architecture for Deployment, NHI training course
- *LAPM*, Chapter 2, Roles and Responsibilities
- *LAPM*, Chapter 3, Project Authorizations
- *LAPM*, Chapter 6, Environmental Procedures
- *LAPM*, Chapter 7, Field Review
- *LAPM* Chapter 10, Consultant Selection Procedures
- *LAPM*, Chapter 11, Design Standards

- *LAPM*, Chapter 12, Plans, Specifications & Estimate
- *LAPM*, Chapter 15, Advertise and Award Project
- *LAPM*, Chapter 16, Administer Construction Contracts
- *LAPM*, Chapter 17, Project Completion
- *LAPM*, Chapter 13, Right-of-Way
- June 2000 Intelligent Transportation Systems Procurement, NHI training course

Exhibit 12-A**DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS EVALUATION REPORT**

- a. The narrative report should include as appropriate, but not be restricted to information on:
- (1) volume and character of present and future traffic anticipated on the recommended project, as well as a peak-hour turning movement diagram for any major intersection involved,
 - (2) the percentage of installation traffic compared to total traffic,
 - (3) personnel strength,
 - (4) number of shifts worked or to be worked,
 - (5) a recommended project if warranted or, if no project is warranted, the report should so indicate,
 - (6) a description of the recommended improvement including a sketch map showing location,
 - (7) a realistic cost estimate updated to the year of anticipated construction,
 - (8) a statement to indicate whether similar designs are being used under similar conditions on regular federal-aid, state or local projects in the area. Highway engineering economic analysis should be used as appropriate in evaluating alternatives and justification of the recommended improvements,
 - (9) discussion of state and/or local plans for improvements in the area including:
 - (a) priority that the state or local agency has placed on a proposed improvement,
 - (b) appropriate comments relative to the priority rating furnished by the state or local highway agency,
 - (c) extent of state or local commitment for participation in need improvements,
 - (d) an estimate of the date when the work could be accomplished, providing funds were available, and
 - (e) an estimate of the time (in months) that may be required to accomplish each of the following phases of the recommended project: preliminary engineering, environmental clearance, final design, right-of-way acquisition, and construction including advertisement and award, and
 - (10) need for control of access to protect the project from obsolescence, especially where a four-lane facility is proposed or will be required at a later date. A determination should be based primarily on the economic justification and desirability of this type of design.
- b. Three copies of the narrative report and sketch map are to be submitted to MTMC. If the decision has been made that the project is to be handled by a Federal Lands Highway Division, two additional copies of the report should be furnished to the Federal Lands Highway Division.

This page intentionally left blank

Exhibit 12-B**MILITARY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT COMMAND
ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA**1. Defense Access Roads

- a. Military Installations. The Department of Defense has the responsibility for determining the eligibility of proposed improvements for financing with defense access road funds. Generally, projects meeting the following requirements will be considered appropriate for such financing.
- (1) Access roads providing new connections between either old or new military installations and main highways may be considered eligible for 100 percent financing with defense access road funds, providing that in urban areas where a new entrance is established and access to a main thoroughfare is via existing city streets, the 100 percent defense access financing extends outward from the reservation only so far as the traffic generated by the installation is greater than other traffic.
 - (2) Urgently needed improvements of existing highways that are neither a part of nor qualified for inclusion in the federal-aid urban system, but upon which traffic is suddenly doubled (or more than doubled) by reason of the establishment or expansion of a permanent military installation may be considered eligible for financing in whole or in part with defense access road funds. One hundred percent defense access road financing will be considered only on the lightly traveled portion of these highways which are a part of the federal-aid rural system, or which are of insufficient importance to qualify for such designation. The more heavily traveled federal-aid rural highways (upon which traffic is suddenly doubled or more than doubled), generally regarded as being self-supporting from their earnings of road-user revenues, are eligible for only partial defense access road financing.
 - (3) Urgent improvements needed to avoid intolerable congestion or critical structural failure of any highway serving a temporary surge of defense-generated traffic (such as that which results from the establishment and operation of a temporary military installation, or from large-scale construction activity) may be considered eligible for financing to the extent necessary to provide the minimum essential facility to accommodate the temporary surge of traffic. A temporary surge of traffic is defined as one of several months duration, at least, but very short in duration as compared to the total life of a normal highway improvement.
 - (4) Alteration of a public road in the immediate vicinity of a military installation to accommodate regular and frequent movements of special military vehicles such as tank transporters or heavy ammunition carriers may be financed with defense access road funds, provided it is impractical or uneconomical to acquire right-of-way and develop such roads for exclusive military use. However, highway funds from other sources should finance any improvement that may be needed to bring the highway to a stage satisfactory for accommodation of all traffic except the special military vehicles.


- (5) Access roads serving State National Guard facilities which are federally owned are eligible under paragraphs 1a (2) and (4). Roads serving federally owned National Guard facilities, which are of appreciable non-military local benefit, are eligible for only partial defense access road financing. Roads serving state-owned National Guard facilities are ineligible.
 - (6) No highway located within the boundaries of a military reservation is eligible for financing from defense access road funds. This prohibition does not apply to a highway through a military reservation on public rights-of-way open to free use of the public with no military restrictions or to a highway located along and partly within the installation boundaries but not subject to closure by military authorities.
 - (7) Projects on the NHS are not generally considered eligible for financing with defense access road funds.
 - (8) Traffic signal installations when justified may be financed as part of a new construction project.
- b. Defense Industries. Criteria governing eligibility of access roads for military installations also apply to any defense industry as defined in current joint Army-Navy-Air Force regulations.
2. Replacement Roads (Military). Highways constructed to replace those closed by establishment of new military installations or the expansion of old ones are considered eligible for financing with defense access road funds to the extent of 100 percent of the cost of constructing the replacement road to current standards for current traffic.

EXHIBIT 12-C
ITS ARCHITECTURE MATRIX

	Regional ITS Architecture
User Services & User Services Requirements	<p>Description of the Region</p> <p>Identification of participating agencies and other stakeholders</p> <p>An Operational Concept that identifies the roles and responsibilities of participating agencies and stakeholders in the operation and implementation of the systems included in the RIA</p> <p>Any agreements for ITS operation, interoperability, use of ITS Standards and operation of ITS projects in the RIA</p>
Logical Architecture	System functional requirements
Physical Architecture	<p>Interface requirements and information exchanges with planned and existing systems and subsystems</p> <p>The sequence of projects required for implementation</p>
ITS Standards	Identification of ITS Standards supporting regional and national interoperability
Equipment Packages Market Packages	ITS inventory
	Develop and implement procedures and responsibilities for maintaining the RIA as needs evolve in the region

This page intentionally left blank

Exhibit 12-D1
MAJOR ITS PROJECTS
(Non-Exempt Projects)




Note:

- This flow chart process does not apply to the earmarked ITS Deployment Projects (QT80 projects).
- This 2-phased PE procedure requires FHWA review of the SERF and approval of the SEMP.
- Full FHWA oversight for PE phases on all major ITS projects.
- Non-exempt for E-76 purposes.
- For simplicity, the right-of-way phase is not shown in this chart. If right-of-way is involved, refer to Chapter 13, "Right-of-Way," of the *LAPM* for information and procedures.

This page intentionally left blank

Exhibit 12-D2
MINOR ITS PROJECTS
(Exempt Projects)



Note:


- This flow chart process does not apply to the earmarked ITS Deployment Projects (QT80 projects).
- Minor ITS projects will follow the above traditional single phased PE procedures.
- No FHWA oversight for procedure shown on this flowchart (SERF review and SEMP approval not required).
- Exempt for E-76.
- For simplicity, the right-of-way phase is not shown in this chart. If right-of-way is involved, refer to Chapter 13, "Right-of-Way," of the *LAPM* for information and procedures.

This page intentionally left blank

Exhibit 12-E Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) Guidelines

INTRODUCTION

The Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) is the primary, top-level technical management document that defines and describes the systems engineering management, the tailored systems engineering process, and how the technical disciplines will be integrated for the life of a transportation project. This document establishes the technical program organization, direction, and control mechanisms for the project to meet its cost, schedule, and performance objectives. The SEMP is the foundation for all engineering activities during the entire project.



The SEMP applies to all team personnel and all technical activities conducted in the fulfillment of the project. It applies to all processes and products that are deemed necessary for accomplishing the project, whether or not they are required under contract.

A SEMP should be developed for every project that includes software development or software/hardware integration. The SEMP should be tailored to project size and complexity, yet cover all development phases. The SEMP is not necessarily a long document. For some projects, it could be few pages long and for others it could be hundreds of pages long. The plan needs to be specific to the needs of the particular project.

The SEMP is a living document and as a result additions, deletions, and modifications will occur as it is utilized. It will be updated as the development work proceeds and systems engineering process products are produced. All updates must be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Agency project manager.

The SEMP will be prepared in two stages. The first stage is a framework (or scope) for the SEMP established by the Transportation Agency. The second stage is the completion of the SEMP by the Developer (system manager and/or integrator) before software detailed design and software/hardware integration begin.

The Transportation Agency, in conjunction with any directed systems engineering management working group(s), establishes a framework for the SEMP by stating project goals and organizational management and establishing requirements for what should be in it. This takes the form of a *Draft Scope* (typically the first section of the SEMP) and can be useful for project management decisions and contract RFP scope developments.

The Developer will provide complete SEMP content in the second stage. This content will be addressed as a part of the contract proposal and finalized in technical documents that are approved before software component detailed design begins. With the Developer's input, the SEMP becomes the control document for work to be performed for the life of the project.

In the sections that follow, an example format and description of the SEMP is presented.

Format and Description of SEMP:

Title Page

The title page should follow the Transportation Agency procedures or style guide as applicable. It shall contain the following information (not in order):

- SYSTEMS ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE *Name of Project*,
AND *Transportation Agency*
- Contract Number
- Date the document was formally approved
- The organization responsible for 'preparing' the document
- Internal Document Control Number, if available
- Revision version

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Contents

	Page Number
1 SCOPE	
2 TECHNICAL PLANNING AND CONTROL.....	
3 SYSTEMS ENGINEERING PROCESS	
4 TRANSITIONAL CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES	
5 INTEGRATION OF THE SYSTEMS ENGINEERING EFFORT.....	
6 APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS	

This page intentionally left blank

1. SCOPE

Transportation Agency - “*What is the project goal and what is expected from the Developer?*”

Developer - “*What is proposed and how will it be delivered?*”

The *Scope* shall identify the specific project and its purpose, to include complexities and challenges that will be addressed by the technical development effort. It will specify the systems engineering process (see Fig. 1 next page) to be used for the system’s design, development, test, and evaluation. Overall organizational structure and technical, direction and control for the project should be summarized. This includes management work groups and multi-disciplinary technical teams that are critical to reaching successful system deployment.

The *Scope* will summarize all associated planning, technical, and management activities described in the SEMF sections that follow. This information will be provided from two perspectives, the Transportation Agency in the form of a *Draft Scope*, and the Developer as a part of the contract proposal and completed in the final SEMF delivered for approval.

From the perspective of the Transportation Agency, the *Draft Scope* will state project goals and organizational management and summarize the minimum requirements expected of the Developer. Drawing upon the details presented in the following Sections of this SEMF guidance, these agency expectations can be documented. This will be useful for project management decisions and contract RFP scope developments.

The Developer completes the *Scope* content in stages, as a part of the contract proposal and as technical documents are finalized and approved before the Component Detailed Design phase begins (see Figure 1). The Developer will provide the necessary details in the other sections of this SEMF guidance. The content of the *Scope* has similarity to an Executive Summary.

The VEE life-cycle technical development model should be specified by the Transportation Agency in the *Draft Scope* to represent the overlying systems engineering process for analysis. See Figure 1. Other models may be used to supplement the analysis.




Figure 1. VEE Systems Engineering Technical Model

The level of detail at each of the phases of the analysis should be on a scale commensurate with the project scope. The details of this tailoring will be summarized in the *Scope* by the Developer and described in full in SEMP Section 3 entitled *Systems Engineering Process*.

The Transportation Agency shall state in the *Scope* that the Federal Regulation 23 CFR 940, *Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture and Standards, Final Rule* will be satisfied. 23 CFR 940 states, “All ITS projects funded with highway trust funds shall be based on a systems engineering analysis.” The project implementation requirements specified in 23 CFR 940.11 are as follows:

- Identification of portions of the Regional ITS Architecture being implemented or if a Regional ITS Architecture does not exist, the applicable portions of the National ITS Architecture,
- Identification of participating agencies and their roles and responsibilities,
- Requirements definitions,
- Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements,
- Procurement options,
- Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures, and
- Procedures and resources necessary for operation and management of the system.

The relationships of these seven bullets from 23 CFR 940 to the recommended VEE technical model phases are depicted in Figure 2. In the process phases leading up to Component Detailed Design, these seven regulatory requirements will be addressed. The Developer shall acknowledge in the *Scope*, as a part of the contract proposal that these will be addressed in the systems engineering analysis and any associated process tailoring detailed in Section 3, *Systems Engineering Process*.




Figure 2. Relationship between 23 CFR 940.11 and the VEE

This page intentionally left blank

2. TECHNICAL PLANNING AND CONTROL

“What needs to be documented, and how will the development be managed?”

Technical Planning and Control contains the core systems engineering planning information that the Developer will convey within a contract proposal and provide during the system design development. *Technical Planning and Control* identifies overall organizational structure and responsibilities for systems engineering activities during the total system life cycle. The section will detail the technical direction and control of contracted, and subcontracted engineering tasks. It applies to all technical activities conducted, and to all processes and products that are deemed necessary for accomplishing the project.

Technical Planning and Control defines the project’s interaction with all internal and external organizations involved in performing technical work (i.e., teammates, subcontractors, and vendors). Multi-disciplinary teams that are critical to reaching successful system deployment will be formed. Multi-disciplinary teams will be discussed in detail in Section 4, *Integration of the Systems Engineering Effort*.

The Transportation Agency should specify in the *Draft Scope* the planning activities important to the success of the project. A final decision will be made through consultation with the Developer at time of contract proposal approval. The planning activities important to most system developments consist of the following:

- Major decision deliverables – produce the requirements databases, specifications, and baselines.
- Process inputs - identify source material for the deliverables noted above, which includes the SOW and the specification from the RFP, and previously developed specifications for similar systems.

- Technical objectives – include success criteria defining when the design is done. May be a source document for deliverables noted above. Could be part of a Concept of Operations.
- Contract Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) - defines the tasks in the Systems Engineering Master Schedule and the milestones of the Systems Engineering Detailed Schedule. The Detailed Schedule may or may not be an expectation at the contract proposal phase.
- Training – planned for agency staff to operate the system and for contract staff on the basis of the requirements of the RFP/SOW, with associated scheduling.
- Standards and procedures – identify within the Developer company those that are applicable, such as workmanship, quality assurance, engineering policies and procedures, and time charging practices, etc.
- Resource allocation – identifies resource requirements (capital equipment, software, personnel, agency-furnished equipment and information, and time-phased needs), procedures for resource control, and reallocation procedures (workarounds).
- Constraints - identify source, e.g., RFP, system concept, technology availability, availability of required resources, funding, facilities, etc.
- Work authorization – describes process for handling requests for work (e.g., task orders), or changes to existing tasking; especially important with subcontractors.
- Test and Evaluation – acknowledge that a Testability Plan be prepared. See description of Testability Plan below.

As part of *Technical Planning and Control*, (1) technical documents, and (2) related project management plans applicable to the project, are identified. The Transportation Agency will give initial indication in the *Draft Scope* of those technical documents they desire to see developed, and specify project management plan requirements that relate to this development that they already have in place. A final decision will be made through consultation with the Developer at time of contract proposal approval. The Developer will describe the associated technical management aspects for this development in the final SEMF.

The technical documents include both schedules and plans. Each schedule and plan is designed to interact with other project plans to provide complete coverage of the engineering effort and ensure continuity of management control. Typical technical documents (schedules and plans) include:

- Systems Engineering Master Schedule – top-level process control and progress measurement tool to ensure completion of identified accomplishments.
- Systems Engineering Detailed Schedule – reflects the detailed work efforts required to support critical events and tasks. May be required by the RFP.
- Software Development Plan – describes organizational structure of the effort, facilities and engineering environment, management techniques to maintain control over development activities.
- Hardware Development Plan – describes organizational structure of the effort, procedures, facilities and engineering environment, management techniques to maintain control over development activities.

- Interface Control Plan – Identifies and defines physical, electronic, content characteristics of all system internal and external interfaces, and communications links. Includes interfaces with people as well as hardware and software.
- System Installation Plan – describes in detail planned step-by-step activities on site-by-site basis for the release, both physical installation as well as electronic updating, also organizational structure.
- System Integration Plan – identifies organizational structure, optimal sequence for incremental delivery, assembly, and activation of the various components into operational system. Addresses factors to minimize assembly difficulties and cost/schedule impact.
- Testability Plan – basic tool to establish and execute a test program. Emphasizes: integration with other design requirements, consistency with end product requirements, identifies guides, analysis models, and procedures, planning for review and use of data submissions, how/when tasks to be done and how results are to be used, physical and personnel resources and overall testing schedule.
- Technical Review Plan – lists technical reviews to be conducted and describes associated tasks for each contract phase, methods to solve problems during reviews, information needed as prerequisite, and schedule. A listing of life cycle phase technical reviews can be found in EIA/IS 632, Annex E.
- Technology Plan – describes evolution to identify, assess, and applies emerging technology, activities and criteria for transitioning from development and demonstration, addresses selection criteria for alternative technologies.

The above list is not meant to be exhaustive. Other test plans will be called for in transportation projects, such as Verification Plans, Validation Plans, and Test Plans for which much of the information in the Testability Plan would be included. Other technical plans that may be appropriate include: Quality Assurance Plan, Maintenance Plan, and Human Factors Plan. For smaller, less complex projects, several of these plans could be combined and some may not be necessary at all.

In addition to the technical plans, certain project management plans will be prescribed for the development. Project management plans include at a minimum

Configuration Management Plan – describes Developer approach and methods to manage configuration of system products and processes. Describes change control procedures and baseline management.

- Data Management Plan – describe how and which data will be controlled, method of documentation, and responsibilities. Describes control systems in place, company procedures, and recent practices on similar programs.
- Risk Management Plan – addresses risk identification, assessment, mitigation, and monitoring activities associated with development, test and evaluation requirements. Also addresses roles and responsibilities of all organizations.

For small, less complex projects, the configuration and data management plans could be combined. Other management plans that may be appropriate include: System Safety Plan, System Security Plan, and Resource Management Plan.

A complete list of enabling content that the Developer should consider for these plans, which are applicable, follows:

- Statement of Work
- Work Breakdown Structure
- Activity Breakdown Structure
- Computerized Resource Tracking (Resources Loaded Network)
- Glossary of terms
- Schedule
- Technical milestones
- Project team organization
- Project control method
- Process models
- Management plans (configuration management, interface, risk, training, etc)
- List all deliverables
- Technical metrics
- Systems Engineering life cycle model
- Gate and exit criteria (decision points)
- Technical plans (integration, installation, etc.)
- System description
- Specification tree
- Trade studies

A final decision by the Transportation Agency project manager on selected documentation will occur with contract proposal approval. Plans, as they are completed during development, must be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Agency project manager.

3. SYSTEMS ENGINEERING PROCESS

How will the development be done?"

Systems Engineering Process will convey how the Developer executes the development of the system. The VEE life-cycle technical development model will be specified by the Transportation Agency in the *Draft Scope* to represent the overlying systems engineering process for analysis. See Figure 1. Other models may be used to supplement the analysis, e.g., the Spiral risk-mitigation model.

Systems Engineering Process will describe all tailoring of the systems engineering process requirements. Tailoring is the modification of any process requirements – managerial or technical. The details of this tailoring will be summarized in the *Scope* by the Developer and described in full in this Section. To further describe these tailoring activities, they are categorized as:

- System Requirements Analysis
- Sub-System (Functional) Analysis
- Design Synthesis
- System Analysis

System Requirements Analysis

Describes approach and methods for analyzing and defining the concept of operation and top-level system requirements. These evolve iteratively. The concept of operations approval results from peer reviews, working groups, scenario studies, simulation, and/or demonstrations, as necessary. Requirements are analyzed for development, deployment, verification, operations, support, and training.

Sub-System (Functional) Analysis

Describes approach and methods to allocate requirements to lower-level functions; defines functional interfaces; and defines the functional architecture. This is not practical during a proposal effort for each and every system requirement. This can be managed through the use of risk analysis, with high-risk requirements in terms of likelihood and severity being defined in some detail, while low-risk requirements are included in an overall general scope of analysis. For items defined in detail, the SEMB should include consideration of type of analysis, tools, schedule and budget constraints, and the completion criterion. From the systems engineering perspective, address the “illities”.

Design Synthesis

Describe approach and methods to transform the functional architecture into a physical architecture; to define alternative system concepts; to define physical interfaces, and to select preferred product and process solutions. Also describe how requirements are transformed into detailed system design specifications.

System Analysis

Describe approach and methods to undertake trade-off studies, system/cost effectiveness analysis, and risk analysis. The results of these analyses should provide: (1) rigorous basis for technical decision-making, (2) quantifiable basis for decision-making ensuring that cost, schedule, and performance are addressed, and (3) support for risk strategy development and management.

Developers (systems managers and integrators) are accustomed to these processes and should be able to scale the tailoring for small, less complex, projects. Each process of the VEE technical model should be addressed, though, whether categorized as above or in another format.

As a part of the tailoring discussion, the Developer should explain the established relationship of the requirements from 23 CFR 940 with the tailored processes of the VEE technical model. The project implementation requirements specified in 23 CFR 940.11 are as follows: (See also Figure 2)

- Identification of portions of the Regional ITS Architecture being implemented or if a Regional ITS Architecture does not exist, the applicable portions of the National ITS Architecture,
- Identification of participating agencies and their roles and responsibilities,
- Requirements definitions,
- Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements,
- Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures, and
- Procedures and resources necessary for operation and management of the system.

4. Transitional Critical Technologies

“How do I avoid obsolescence?”

This section describes key technologies, the approach for transitioning those technologies into the project system development, and their associated risk. This includes the activities and criteria for assessing and transitioning critical technologies from their development and demonstration programs into the project system development.

Transitioning critical technologies should be done as a part of the risk management. It is called separately here for special emphasis. Identify what technologies are critical and follow the steps outlined for risk management. This will establish which alternative and when an alternative is incorporated into the project to meet performance and functional requirements. As a separate section of the SEMP, reference to the work that will be done to address critical technologies will be incorporated here as a part of the proposal submittal.

The ability to evolve the technologies employed in a system hinges on several factors: knowledge of the technologies, knowledge of technology status (e.g., mature, leading edge, bleeding edge, etc.), and use of an open architecture strategy in the system design. A system design based upon an open architecture is necessary to be able to easily take advantage of newer and better technologies.

The result of this activity is to establish and maintain a viable technological baseline during project development.

This page intentionally left blank

5. Integration of the Systems Engineering Effort

“How will the process activities be brought together to assure an operational system?”

This section describes the planned integration activities leading to final project implementation. In illustration, this Section concentrates on what is needed to climb the right side of the VEE methodology (See Figure 1).

Integration is planned for and supported from the early concept phase of the systems engineering process with the formation of multi-disciplinary teams, described below. Application of the schedules and integration technical plans described in 2. *Technical Planning and Control* will be described here.

An integrated team approach is critical to successful integration of products and other inputs (e.g., test plans) into a coordinated systems engineering effort that meets cost, schedule, and performance objectives. The steps toward ultimate system implementation include:

- Multi-disciplinary team organization
- Technology verifications
- Development test and evaluation
- Implementation of software designs for system end items
- Operations & maintenance sustainability and user training development

Multi-disciplinary team organization

Teamwork is the key! Multi-disciplinary teams are an integrated set of cross-functional teams (an overall team comprised of many smaller teams) given the appropriate resources and charged with the responsibility to define, develop, produce, and support a product and/or service. A basic principle is to get all disciplines involved at the beginning of the development process to ensure that requirements are completely stated and understood for the full life cycle. By using multi-disciplinary teams, the systems engineers still lead the requirements development process, but now more (all) disciplines participate in it. This includes the software designers and software/hardware component integrators if contracted separately by the Transportation Agency.

The Developer will describe how their organizational structure will support team formation, the composition of functional and subsystem teams, and the products each subsystem and higher-level team will support (e.g., teams organized to support a specific product in the Work Breakdown Structure). This team approach will address assessment and review of progress, traceability of technical changes, integration of data, configuration management, and risk management. Depending on the complexity of the project, this can mean a hierarchy of teams to address product development, product integration, and umbrella system integration and program issues.

The multi-disciplinary teams are partnerships between the agency stakeholders, the Developer and any sub-contractors or other contractors, and key areas of experts. They should be end-item oriented. In other words team members must focus on the overall project performance as well as the performance of their particular team.

For small, less complex projects, the entire staff constitutes a single team. In such cases, tailor this section to reflect that there is only one team for the project. The Developer's organizational structure should be able to bring together representatives from all relevant disciplines to one or more teams for the duration of their need.

Technology verifications

Technology solutions are verified using design analysis, design simulation, inspection, demonstration, and/or test. Required performance of all critical characteristics is verified by demonstration and test. Design analysis and simulation are used to complement, not replace demonstration and test.

Development test and evaluation

After completion of the total system, a formal system verification review is held by the agency stakeholders. The purpose of this review is to demonstrate that the total system has been verified to be compliant with the requirements in the configuration baselines. System verification testing is conducted following completion of integration testing.

Operations & maintenance sustainability and user training development

Consideration should be given to ongoing support to an existing system, preplanned system improvement, evolutionary development, or to support the developed system after it has been fielded. Describe how system faults will be addressed, user requests for support, and the level of support and resources to be provided.

6. Applicable Documents

This section will identify all the applicable and referenced documents that are required for the specific project. Referenced documents are those standards, specifications, and technical documents that are external to the project statement of work.

List by title, version number, and issue date. The order of precedence and availability of the documents should be stated. For example:

- *EIA Standard 632, Processes for Engineering a System, Version 1.0, April 28, 1998.*
- *In the event of conflict between this document and the contents of the project SOW, SOW shall be considered a superseding requirement. The document is available for purchase on the Internet at <http://www.global.ihs.com>.*

This will include the list of documents from the Request for Proposal. Identify any contractual and noncontractual provisions. This includes any international or American national standards, and government and industry directive documents applicable to the conduct of the tasks within the SEM. P.

When the rest of the SEM. P. has been completed, go back to this section and cross off the documents that are not referenced in your SEM. P., and add any documents referenced in your SEM. P. that weren't already on the list.

This page intentionally left blank

7. Notes

(Background Information, Acronyms, abbreviations, glossary)

This page intentionally left blank

Exhibit 12-F
ITS WEBSITES

AASHTO:	http://www.aashto.org
ANSI:	http://www.ansi.org
ASTM:	http://www.astm.org/
CALTRANS:	http://www.dot.ca.gov/
CVISN:	http://www.jhuapl.edu/cvisn/index.html
FHWA:	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov
FRA:	http://www.fra.dot.gov/
FTA:	http://www.fta.dot.gov/index.html
IEEE:	http://www.ieee.org/index.html
ITE:	http://www.ite.org
ITS Conformity Rule	http://www.its.dot.gov/aconform/aconform.htm
ITS Integration Program	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/discretionary/
ITS Standards:	http://www.its-standards.net
ITS Standards Training:	http://www.its-standards.net/train.htm
ITS Training Site:	http://www.pcb.its.dot.gov/
McTrans:	http://www-mctrans.ce.ufl.edu
NTCIP:	http://www.ntcip.org
National ITS Architecture:	http://www.iteris.com/itsarch
SAE:	http://www.sae.org/servlets/index
EDL:	http://www.its.dot.gov/welcome.htm
JPO:	http://www.its.dot.gov/home.htm
NHI:	http://nhi.fhwa.dot.gov/index.html

This page intentionally left blank

Major ITS Projects (both NHS and non-NHS). The local agencies must submit a Systems Engineering management Plan (SEMP) for all major ITS projects to FHWA for approval prior to authorization (E-76) for final design. A major ITS project is an ITS project, which implements part of a regional ITS initiative that is multi-jurisdictional, multi-modal, or otherwise affects regional integration of ITS systems. See Chapter 12.6, “Intelligent Transportation Systems” of the *Local Assistance Program Guidelines* for details.

While it is the FHWA’s policy to rely primarily on their Program Review/Product Evaluation Program to carry out these responsibilities, other process review techniques, including project-specific activities may be used when appropriate.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 3 PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

3.1 PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

Prior to beginning reimbursable work, the project (or project phase) eligible for reimbursement from federal funds must be formally authorized (approved) by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). For projects exempt from FHWA oversight and review (per the stewardship agreements), the FHWA has delegated this authority to Caltrans. However, the FHWA still obligates the Federal funds and signs the Authorization document for all Federal-aid projects.

The stewardship agreements provide delegations to Caltrans (and those to the local agencies) based on the categorizations of projects on Figure 2-1. Projects will be exempt (E) or nonexempt (N), from FHWA oversight. These codes (E or N) will be carried to the particular Federal-aid project number (see Exhibit 3-H, number 6).

After a project is selected and programmed in a Federal Highway Administration/ Federal Transit Administration (FHWA/FTA) approved Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP) for Federal funds, the local agency should contact the District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) to discuss when and how they wish to proceed with project implementation. The discussion should cover the timing and process for authorization and obligation of funds for each federally funded phase and allocation of funds by the California Transportation Commission, if required. If the project is on the NHS, the DLAE will also determine if a Field Review will be required (see Chapter 7).

The State's "Federal-Aid Data System" (FADS) database and the "Federal Management Information System" (FMIS) are integral systems used in the authorization process. The State must provide certain detailed information to the FMIS database in order to successfully obligate the federal funds. The obligation of funds is automatic upon authorization if the data is correct and if the State has remaining fund apportionment appropriate for the project and obligation authority in the Federal fiscal year (likewise, local agencies may be competing with other local agencies for Federal funds). See "Advance Construction Authorization" topic below for procedures when no obligation authority remains. The "Authorization to Proceed," a report printed from the FADS system, shows the dates of authorization and obligation along with summary data about the project.

For declared emergencies approved by the FHWA for Emergency Relief (ER) funding, emergency repair work and preliminary engineering work may be initiated without prior authorization (see Chapter 11, "Disaster Assistance," of the *Local Assistance Program Guidelines*).

RESPONSIBILITIES

The local agency is responsible for initiating the request for authorization and CTC vote, if necessary, in a timely manner. If all the prerequisite requirements are satisfied, two weeks processing time should be allowed for Federal authorization for exempt projects. Another week or more may be required for nonexempt projects that require the FHWA to approve the "Request for Authorization to Proceed". Additional time may also be required near the beginning or end of the Federal fiscal year.

Before any authorization can be initiated, all projects (except ER) must be in a federally approved FTIP/FSTIP. ER projects must be included in the FTIP/FSTIP only if they involve substantial functional, location or capacity changes.

The following projects must also be included on the eligibility lists noted:

- Grade Crossing Improvement funds - California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) approved list
- Transportation Enhancement Activity (TEA) funds - California Transportation Commission (CTC) approved list
- Flexible Congestion Relief funds - CTC approved STIP (if over \$300,000)
- Highway Bridge Replacement & Rehabilitation (HBRR) funds - Caltrans' approved list for funding eligibility
- Hazard Elimination Safety (HES) funds - Caltrans' approved list
- Transportation System Management (TSM) - Caltrans' approved list
- Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) - CTC approval list

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION

Separate work authorizations and fund obligations are normally made for the Preliminary Engineering (PE), right-of-way, utility relocation, and construction phases if federal funds are to be used in that phase of work. Authorization to proceed and obligation of funds within the phases is sometimes subdivided as well. The authorization and transfer of funds to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) is also made with a Request for Authorization.

To initiate a federal project authorization/obligation and add authorization/obligation for additional phases, each local agency must prepare the "Request for Authorization" package that provides the information needed by Caltrans and FHWA to process the request. The package includes the appropriate "Request for Authorization," Exhibits 3-A, B, C or D; the "Request for Authorization - Project Prefix Checklist," Exhibit 3-E; the "Finance Letter," Exhibit F; and the "Request for Authorization - Data Sheets," Exhibit 3-G. Information in this format can be input directly into the FADS computer files by Caltrans. The request package should be submitted directly to the appropriate Caltrans DLAE. If the package is complete, Caltrans will initiate the authorization process. The form will be returned to the local agency if there is missing data that cannot be quickly obtained by FAX, telephone, or other source.

"Authorization to Proceed" must be obtained prior to starting an item of work for which an agency wishes to be federally reimbursed. Emergency Relief work is the exception (for restoration, as part of the emergency relief work, Authorization is required before advertising). In other words, work prior to Authorization is ineligible for reimbursement.

PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING (PE) PHASE

Eligible Preliminary Engineering (PE) includes all location, design, and related work preparatory to the advancement of a project to physical construction. Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects include Systems Engineering, equipment and software development, and use of System Manager or Systems Integrator. See *LAPG* Chapter 12.6 "Intelligent Transportation Systems" for details on Systems Engineering and use of System Manager or Systems Integrator. Preliminary right-of-way studies related to the environmental process, as described in Chapter 13, "Right-of-Way," are considered part of the eligible preliminary studies and authorized as part of the PE Authorization to Proceed (E-76).

Only eligible work performed after the authorization date for PE may be reimbursed. The preliminary studies portion of PE may be authorized prior to an optional or mandatory field review (see Chapter 7). This will allow reimbursement for consultants or other specialists who may be needed to obtain information required to complete the field review form.

The project must have a completed field review form (see Chapter 7) and a federally approved environmental document before proceeding to the final design and right-of-way phases of work.

Major ITS projects will require two PE authorization phases and are dependent on FHWA approval of the Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF) and Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) respectively prior to each authorization. The second PE authorization occurs prior to final or detailed design. See the *LAPG*, Chapter 12.6, Procedures section for further details.

Preliminary Engineering must lead to a construction project in a timely manner. If construction is not started in ten years, any funds expended must be returned to the Federal government.

RIGHT-OF-WAY

Eligible right-of-way work includes the preparation of right of way plans, making economic studies and other related preliminary work, appraisal for parcel acquisition: review of appraisals; payments for real property acquired; preparation for and trial of condemnation cases; management of properties acquired; furnishing of relocation assistance; and other related labor expenses (see 23 CFR 710.303 for details).

As noted above, some preliminary right-of-way activities may be performed in advance of approval of the environmental document and are authorized as part of PE. This is not true for the majority of right-of-way activities, e.g., negotiating with property owners, acquisition and relocation assistance (see Chapter 13, “Right-of-Way” of this manual). This work is included in the local agency’s “Request of Authorization to Proceed with Right-of-Way.”

Only eligible work performed after the authorization date for right-of-way may be reimbursed. A request for right-of-way must include the field review form and the FHWA-approved environmental document. If reimbursement for utility relocation will be requested, a separate “Request for Authorization to Proceed with Utility Relocation” for utility relocation under the Alternate Procedure must also be included (see Chapter 14, “Utility Facilities” of this manual).

If federal-aid reimbursement is sought for any phase of the project, all right-of-way activities must conform to Federal requirements. Failure to conform will jeopardize the federal funding.

CONSTRUCTION

Eligible construction costs include: construction engineering, the actual cost to construct the highway itself including its appurtenant facilities and any removal, adjustment or demolition of buildings or major obstruction, and utility or railroad work that is a part of the physical construction of the project, and administrative settlement cost-contract claims. Construction engineering includes: the supervision and inspection of construction

activities, additional staking functions considered necessary for effective control of the construction operations, testing materials incorporated into construction, checking shop drawings, and measurements needed for the preparation of pay estimates. Construction engineering costs shall be itemized on the finance letter to be eligible for reimbursement.

Some ITS projects can be fully deployed without ever advancing to construction. There are also some ITS projects with non-construction activities, which could be handled as PE, construction or service contracts. See the PE and or Procurement sections of *LAPG*, Chapter 12.6, "Intelligent Transportation Systems" for guidance.

**REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION
TO PROCEED WITH PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING (PE)**

Local Agency Letterhead

To: (DLAE Name)
District Local Assistance Engineer
Caltrans, Office of Local Assistance
(District Address)

Date: _____
(Federal Number)
(Project Description)

Phase 1 ___ or Phase 2 PE ___ (Major ITS Projects only)

Dear (DLAE Name):

In order to begin reimbursable preliminary engineering for the above project, we request that you secure Federal authorization and obligate funds for this work. The amounts requested do not exceed the Federal funds provided to this agency in the approved Federal TIP/Federal Statewide TIP (FSTIP).

Attached are the following documents that are required to authorize this phase of work:

Request for Authorization Package

- Completed Project Prefix Checklist (Exhibit 3-E)
- Completed Finance Letter (Exhibit 3-F)
- Completed Data Sheets (Exhibit 3-G)
- Copy of the FTIP/FSTIP sheet
- For ITS projects only: Completed (SERF). See Chapter 7, Exhibit 7-B, LAPM

Field Review Form (Exhibit 7-B)

- Completed Field Review form, or
- I will not be preparing the final design at this time. I will transmit the Field Review Form at a later date.

Environmental Document

- Approved Environmental Document
Type of Document _____
Approval Date _____
- I have not completed the environmental process and will not be preparing the final design at this time. I will transmit the Environmental Document at a later date.

Pre-Award Audit

- Completed Audit Disposition (Exhibit 10-K), or
- Audit Disposition was not completed because Federal-aid or State highway funding will not participate in a consultant contract, or
- Pre-award audit was not done because the consultant contract is for \$250,000 or less, or
- I will not submit the Audit Disposition at this time. I will submit it to the DLAE prior to entering into a contract with the consultant(s).

I understand that invoice requests for payment will not be processed until an Authorization to Proceed (E-76) and a Program Supplement Agreement have been executed.

(Check which of the following applies)

- I plan to request reimbursement for costs as incurred. As indicated above, I have included a completed Field Review Form. I am also including the "Agreements Checklist" (Exhibit 4-A) request forms with this transmittal and request that the agreements be prepared now.
- I have not submitted the Field Review Form and "Agreements Checklist." I am aware that I will not be able to resubmit progress invoice until these documents are submitted and a Program Supplement Agreement is fully executed.

I will not submit any invoice request until I receive notification that an Authorization to Proceed E-76 and a Program Supplement Agreement have been executed.

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the facts and statements in this "Request for Authorization Package" are accurate and correct. This Agency agrees to comply with the applicable terms and conditions set forth in Title 23, U.S. Code, Highways, and the policies and procedures promulgated by the Federal Highway Administrator and the California Department of Transportation relative to the above designated project.

I understand that each succeeding phase of the project will require a separate authorization to be eligible for Federal reimbursement. I further understand that this Agency is responsible for costs in excess of the Federal funds obligated and all costs incurred before it has received FHWA "Authorization to Proceed" for that phase of the project.

Federal-aid ITS projects: I understand that our project must be in compliance with the National ITS Architecture, adhere to ITS Standards and undergo Systems Engineering.

Major federal-aid ITS projects: I understand that my agency must not proceed with final or detailed design until after FHWA 's approval of the SEMP and Authorization to Proceed is issued.

Please advise us as soon as the authorization has been received. You may direct any questions to (Name _____) at (phone number _____).

Signed _____
Title _____
Agency _____

Attachments

REQUEST FOR AUTHORIZATION**Project Prefix Checklist**

Federal Programs: Identify each fund type to be used for this project

- | Prefix | Program |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (STP) Surface Transportation Program |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (MA) Minimum Allocation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (DB) Donor Bonus |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (BH) Bridge Rehabilitation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (BR) Bridge Replacement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (CM) Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (AHL) Access Hwys to Public Recreation Areas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (ER) Emergency Relief |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (PLH) Public Lands Highway |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Demonstration Project; varies, specify if known _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Intelligent Transportation System (varies, specify if known) _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: Specify _____ |

Sub-Programs

(Check all that Apply)

- | | |
|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (L) Local (Fund appropriation management) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (S) State (State approp. management) not normally handled in DLA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (N) On National Highway System |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (R) Safety - Railroad |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (H) Safety - HES Program List Number _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (G) 100% Federal Funding (for Safety) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (P) Bridge Painting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (X) Bridge Rail replacement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (Z) Seismic Retrofit - State Mandatory Pgm. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (V) Seismic Retrofit - Voluntary Pgm. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (E) TEA - Transportation Enhancement Activities |
| | Second vote request _____ or Vote date _____ |

Bridge (HBRR) only Sub-Programs

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (S) On System | (Functional classification greater than below) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | (O) Off System | (Local Street/Road or Rural minor collector) |

Additional State Funds involved (info only - does not affect prefix)

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | TSM - Traffic System Management - Match ___ Other ___ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | SLTPP - St. & Loc. Trans. Partnership Prog. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | FCR - Flexible Congestion Relief |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Other: Specify _____ |

The prefix provides a quick summary of the funding programs and sub-programs.

This page intentionally left blank

CHAPTER 7 FIELD REVIEW**CONTENTS**

Section	Subject	Page Number
7.1	INTRODUCTION	7-3
7.2	TYPE AND REQUIREMENT FOR FIELD REVIEW	7-3
	Formal Field Review	7-4
	Informal Field Review	7-4
	Required Review	7-4
	PS&E and Construction Administration Procedures	7-5
	Optional Review	7-5
7.3	NOTIFICATION	7-5
	Required Reviews	7-5
	Optional Field Reviews	7-6
7.4	TENTATIVE PLANS	7-6
7.5	PREPARATION OF FIELD REVIEW FORM	7-6
	Field Reviews Attended by Caltrans and the FHWA	7-7
	Optional Field Reviews Not Attended by Caltrans or the FHWA ..	7-7
7.6	FIELD REVIEW DATA	7-7
	Scope	7-7
	Environmental Process	7-8
	Right of Way	7-8
	Project Cost	7-8
	Project Administration	7-8
	Project Schedule	7-9
7.7	SUBMITTAL OF FIELD REVIEW FORM	7-9

FLOW CHARTS

Chart	Description	Page Number
7-1	FIELD REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR DEVELOPING FEDERAL-AID PROJECTS .	7-1

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page Number
7-A	INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIELD REVIEW FORM	7-11
7-B	FIELD REVIEW FORM	7-13
7-C	ROADWAY DATA	7-15

EXHIBITS CONTINUED

Exhibit	Description	Page Number
7-D	MAJOR STRUCTURE DATA	7-17
7-E	RAILROAD GRADE CROSSING DATA	7-19
7-F	AIRPORT DATA	7-21
7-G	FIELD REVIEW ATTENDANCE ROSTER	7-23
7-H	STATE TSM MATCH	7-25
	Article XIX Funding Eligibility	7-27
7-I	SYSTEMS ENGINEERING REVIEW FORM	7-29

CHAPTER 7 FIELD REVIEW

7.1 INTRODUCTION

In conjunction with the preliminary environmental investigation, an important early action in developing a local transportation project financed with federal-aid funds is the methodical and systematic collection of initial engineering and related project data and information. For this manual, this data gathering project-scoping step is called the “Field Review.”

Each agency should establish a process for clearly defining the location, scope, cost, and the other parameters considered when developing a project. This step is very important in guiding the project development team to the successful production of the Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E).

The field review for local transportation projects serves the same purpose as the Project Study Report serves for State highway projects. It is intended to bring together all interested parties and come to an agreement on the project requirements necessary to comply with federal and State laws and regulations.

The field review process considers and documents the following actions:

- Assign a project manager to oversee the project studies, PS&E development and/or construction
- Bring together representatives from various involved or interested agencies, including, but not limited to, the agency, Caltrans, other regional and local agencies, transit districts, other State or federal permitting agencies, public utilities, and railroads. FHWA may also be represented.
- Afford an opportunity for discussions of alternative proposals
- Secure agreement on general design features and exceptions to AASHTO or 3R or local standards selected for the project
- Determine if project is a federal-aid ITS project. If it is, determine if it is a major or minor or earmark ITS project.
- Determine timing and costs associated with preparing and processing required technical studies and the NEPA document (see “Environmental Procedures” included in Chapters 6 of this manual and the *Local Assistance Environmental Manual*.)
- Determine right-of-way and relocation assistance requirements
- Discuss and evaluate proposed funding, eligibility requirements and federal or State participation
- Determine who advertises, awards, administers, and maintains the proposed project
- Define the project schedule and target advertising date
- Discuss value analysis if appropriate (required for NHS projects with an estimated cost of \$25 million or more. For more information on this subject, please see Section 12.5 “Value Analysis” of this manual.)

7.2 TYPE AND REQUIREMENT FOR FIELD REVIEW

The type of field review chosen for a project depends on many factors including: highway system, project type, project complexity, total cost and type of funds. The two types of field reviews are formal and informal.

FORMAL FIELD REVIEW

A formal field review can be accomplished by:

- A site (field) inspection, or
- An office meeting, or both

All parties involved in the project development decisions should be invited to a formal field review. The DLAE should take the lead in the field reviews, take Minutes of the Field Review and circulate the notes to all affected parties afterward.

INFORMAL FIELD REVIEW

Informal field reviews can be accomplished by:

- Small group meetings
- Interagency correspondence
- Phone discussions
- Individual research and data gathering

Exception: Emergency Relief (ER) projects use the FHWA Damage Assessment Form (DAF) in lieu of any other field review form. An on-site field assessment is required for all these projects.

REQUIRED REVIEW

Caltrans will determine if a field review is required for all projects on the National Highway System (NHS). Generally, a field review will only be required for major NHS projects. A project will be considered to be major if:

- The total cost is over \$10 million, or
- It involves an unusual structure (see definitions in Section 2.4 of this manual), or
- It involves multiple projects on a corridor involving more than one agency, or
- Any other complicating factors require a field review.

All required reviews will be formal. In consultation with the local agency, the Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) determines how the formal field review will be accomplished.

Exceptions to the above are as follows:

- A site visit, or “early coordination meeting” may be required, on the grounds of environmental sensitivity for protected resources, controversy, or consequences (impacts) of the proposed action (see Chapter 6, “Environmental Procedures”). This meeting may be part of the formal or informal field review discussed in this chapter or held separately.
- For seismic safety retrofit projects, a field review is mandatory as described in Section 7.8 of the *Local Assistance Program Guidelines*.

FIELD REVIEW FORM

Local Agency _____ Field Review Date _____
 Project Number _____ Locator _____
 (Dst/Co/Rte/PM/Agency)
 Project Name _____ Bridge No.(s) _____

1. PROJECT LIMITS (see attached list for various locations) _____

 _____ Net Length _____ (km) or (mi)

2. WORK DESCRIPTION _____
 ITS project or element: Yes ___ No ___ Major ITS ___ Minor ITS ___ or Earmark ITS? ___

3. PROGRAMMING DATA FTIP (MPO/RTPA) _____ FY _____ Page _____
 Amendment No. _____ FTIP PPNO _____ FHWA/FTA Approval Date _____
 Federal Funds \$ _____ Phases PE _____ R/W _____ Const _____
 Air Basin _____ (CMAQ only)

4. FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION:
 Urban ___ Principal Arterial Rural ___ Principal Arterial
 ___ Minor Arterial ___ Minor Arterial
 ___ Collector Street ___ Major Collector
 ___ Local Street ___ Minor Collector
 ___ Local Road

5. STEWARDSHIP CATEGORY
 On NHS: Yes ___ No ___ Exempt (Per Stewardship): Yes ___ No ___
 If not exempt, Certification Acceptance: Yes ___ No ___
 Major ITS project or element requiring FHWA oversight per stewardship: Yes ___ No ___

6. CALTRANS ENCROACHMENT PERMIT Is it required?: Yes ___ No ___

7. COST ESTIMATE BREAKDOWN \$1,000's Fed. Participation?
 (Including Structures)

PE	Environmental Process	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	Design	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	System Manager/Integrator	_____	___	Yes	___	No
CONSTR	Constr. Contract	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	Constr. Engineer.	_____	___	Yes	___	No
R/W	Preliminary R/W Work	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	Acquisition:		___	Yes	___	No
	(No. of Parcels _____)	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	(Easements _____)	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	(Right of Entry _____)	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	RAP (No. Families _____)	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	RAP (No. Bus. _____)	_____	___	Yes	___	No
	Utilities (Exclude if included in contract items)	_____	___	Yes	___	No

GRAND TOTAL COST \$ _____

8. PROPOSED FUNDING Total Cost Cost Share

Grand Total \$ _____
 Federal Program #1 _____ \$ _____ Fed. \$ _____ Reimb. Ratio _____
 (Name/App. Code) #2 _____ \$ _____ Fed. \$ _____ Reimb. Ratio _____
 Matching Funds Breakdown Local: Loc. \$ _____ %
 State: St. \$ _____ %
 Other: Oth. \$ _____ %

State Highway Funds? Yes _____ Source _____ No _____
 State CMAQ/RSTP (TSM) Match Eligible Yes _____ No _____ Partial _____

(If yes or partial, attach Minimum Information Requirements Sheet*)

Is the Project Underfunded? (Fed \$ < Allowed Reimb.) Yes _____ No _____

9. PROJECT ADMINISTRATION

		Agency	Consultant	State
PE	Environ Process	_____	_____	_____
	Design	_____	_____	_____
	System Man./Integ.	_____	_____	_____
R/W	All Work	_____	_____	_____
CONST ENGIN	Contract	_____	_____	_____
CONSTRUCTION	Contract	_____	_____	_____
MAINTENANCE		_____	_____	_____

Will Caltrans be requested to review PS&E? _____ Yes _____ No

10. SCHEDULES: PROPOSED ADVERTISEMENT DATE _____

Other critical dates: _____

11. PROJECT MANAGER'S CONCURRENCE

Local Entity _____ Date: _____

Title _____ Phone No. _____

 Is field review required? Yes _____ No _____

Caltrans (District) _____ Date _____

Title _____

12. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS (Include all appropriate attachments if field review is required, see the "[]" notation for minimum required attachments for non NHS projects)

- _____ Field Review Attendance Roster or Contacts Roster
- _____ Vicinity Map [Required for Construction Type Projects]

IF APPLICABLE (Complete as required depending on type of work involved)

- _____ Roadway Data Sheets [Req'd for Roadway projects]
- _____ Typical Roadway Geometric Section(s) [Req'd for Roadway projects]
- _____ Major Structure Data Sheet [Req'd for HBRR] _____ Signal Warrants
- _____ Railroad Grade Crossing Data Sheet _____ Collision Diagram
- _____ Airport Data Sheet (if within 3 kilometers) _____ Protection of Wetlands Statement
- _____ Sketch of Each Proposal Alternate Improvement _____ *CMAQ/RSTP State TSM
- _____ TEA Application Document _____ Systems Engineering Review Form (SERF)

* Match Sheet [Req'd for match]

13. DLAE FIELD REVIEW NOTES:

This page intentionally left blank

SYSTEMS ENGINEERING REVIEW FORM

This form needs to be filled out for all ITS projects. For all major ITS projects, this completed form needs to be submitted to FHWA for review and approval prior to PE authorization (Phase 1 PE authorization).

For all major ITS projects, a Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP), which includes the seven items below, must be submitted to FHWA for review and approval, prior to PE authorization for final or detailed design (Phase 2 PE authorization). The 2-phased PE authorization only applies to major ITS projects.

For guidance in filling out the seven items below, see last part of this exhibit.

- 1. Identification of portions of the Regional ITS Architecture being implemented:

- 2. Identification of participating agencies roles and responsibilities:

- 3. Requirements definitions:

- 4. Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements:

- 5. Procurement options:

- 6. Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures:

- 7. Procedures and resources necessary for operations and management of the system:

Address the above items to the degree possible at Field Review stage and acknowledge commitment to address during system design in the early stages of the SE process.

1. Identification of portions of the RA being implemented:

[Identify which user services, physical subsystems, information flows, and market packages are being completed as part of the project and how these pieces are part of the RA.]

2. Identification of participating agencies roles and responsibilities (concept of operations):

[For the user services to be implemented, define the high-level operations of the system, including where the system will be used, functions of the system capabilities, performance parameters, the life cycle of the system, and who will operate and maintain the system. Establish requirements or agreements on information sharing and traffic device control responsibilities. The RA Operational Concept is a good starting point for discussion.]

3. Requirements definitions:

[Based on the concept of operations in 2. above, define the “what” and not “how” of the system. During early stages of the Systems Engineering (SE) process, they will be broken down into detailed requirements for eventual detailed design. The applicable high-level functional requirements from the RA are a good starting point for discussion. A review of the requirements by the project stakeholders is recommended]

4. Analysis of alternative system configurations and technology options to meet requirements:

[The analysis of system alternatives should outline the strengths and weaknesses, technical feasibility, institutional compatibility, and life cycle costs of each alternative. The project stakeholders should have input in choosing the preferred solution.]

5. Procurement options:

[Some procurement (contracting) options to consider include: consultant design/low bid contractor, systems manager, systems integrator, task order, and design/build. Deciding on the best procurement option should consider the level of agency participation, compatibility with existing procurement methods, role of system integrator, and life cycle costs.]

6. Identification of applicable ITS standards and testing procedures:

[Include documentation on which standards will be incorporated into the system design and justification for any applicable standards not incorporated. The standards report from the RA is a good starting point for discussion.]

7. Procedures and resources necessary for operations and management of the system:

[In addition to the concept of operations in 2. above, document any internal policies or procedures necessary to recognize and incorporate the new system into their current operations and decision processes. Resources necessary to support continued operations, including staffing and training must also be recognized early and be provided. Such resources must also be provided to support necessary maintenance and upkeep to ensure continued system viability.]

CHAPTER 11 DESIGN STANDARDS**CONTENTS**

Section	Subject	Page Number
11.1	INTRODUCTION	11-1
	General	11-1
	Definitions	11-1
11.2	STATEWIDE DESIGN STANDARDS FOR LOCAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS	11-3
	Roadway and Appurtenances	11-3
	Geometric Standards for New and Reconstruction Projects	11-3
	Geometric Standards for 3R Projects	11-3
	Pavement Structural Section	11-6
	Signs and Markings	11-6
	Intelligent Transportation Systems/Traffic Signal Controllers	11-7
	Safety	11-7
	Bikeway Standards	11-7
	Pedestrian Facilities	11-8
	Accessibility	11-8
	General Policy	11-9
	Accessible Route	11-9
	Sidewalks and Walks	11-9
	Curb Ramps (Wheelchair Ramps)	11-10
	Pedestrian Ramps	11-13
	Drainage Inlet Grates	11-14
	Driveway Design	11-15
	Width Criteria for Wheelchair Passage	11-15
	Bridges	11-15
	Definitions	11-15
	Bridge Design Procedures	11-16
	Seismic Design	11-16
	Railroad Bridges	11-17
	Bridge Railing	11-17
	Bridges to Remain in Place	11-17
	Design of Large Culverts	11-18
	Foundation Investigation for Design	11-18
	Drainage	11-19
	General	11-19
	Definitions	11-19
	Hydraulic Design Criteria	11-21
	Flood Plain Encroachments	11-22
	Level of Evaluations	11-23
	Scour Evaluations	11-23
	General Design Considerations for Bridges and Culverts	11-24
	Documentation	11-24
	Standard Plans	11-24
	Standard Specifications	11-25

CONTENTS CONTINUED

Section	Subject	Page Number
11.3	LOCALLY DEVELOPED DESIGN STANDARDS	11-25
	Local Geometric Standards	11-25
	Local Pavement Structural Section	11-26
11.4	DESIGN EXCEPTIONS	11-26
	Standards for Which Deviations are Permitted	11-26
	Standards for Which Deviations are <u>Not</u> Permitted	11-27
	Design Exception Approval Procedures	11-27
	Local Projects on the State Highway System	11-27
	Local Projects not on the State Highway System	11-27
	Design Exception Fact Sheet	11-28
	Tracking Design Exceptions	11-28
11.5	REFERENCES	11-28

EXHIBITS

Exhibit	Description	Page Number
11-A	Geometric Design Standards for Local 3R Projects	11-31
11-B	AASHTO Publications Order Form	11-35
11-C	Foundation Investigations For Design	11-37
11-D	Preliminary Hydrologic/Hydraulic Review Summary	11-41
11-E	Checklist for Drainage Studies and Reports	11-43
11-F	Design Exception Fact Sheet	11-51
11-G	Alternative Curb Ramp Shape	11-53
11-H	Built-Up Curb Ramp	11-55
11-I	Curb Ramp with Vertical Sides	11-57
11-J	Center Island with Slot for Accessibility	11-59
11-K	Slots Through Island at Right-Turn Lane	11-61
11-L	Center Island with Curb Ramps	11-63
11-M	Straight Ramp Run	11-65
11-N	Ramp with Intermediate Switch-Back Platform	11-67
11-O	Ramp with Turning Platform	11-69

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS/TRAFFIC SIGNAL CONTROLLERS

Per 23 CFR 940, "Intelligent Transportation System Architecture and Standards," effective April 8, 2001, all Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) projects must adhere to ITS Standards. The choice of ITS Standards hinges on the development of a Regional ITS Architecture. See *LAPG*, Chapter 12.6 "Intelligent Transportation Systems," Standards section for details on ITS Standards.

Assembly Bill 3418 (1995) which amended Section 21401 of the California Vehicle Code requires "any traffic signal controller that is newly installed or upgraded by the Department of Transportation or a local authority after January 1, 1996, shall be of a standard traffic signal communication protocol capable of two-way communications." Communication standards for traffic signal controllers are available from the National Transportation Communications for ITS Protocol. This information may be accessed through the Internet at <http://www.ntcip.org/>.

SAFETY

The following publications have also been developed to aid the designer in improving highway safety:

- Caltrans *Traffic Manual* (deviations from mandatory standards for signs and markings are not permitted)
- *Designing Safer Roads*, Special Report 214, Transportation Research Board
- *Roadside Design Guide*, 1995 (available through AASHTO)

These publications are primarily informational or guidance in nature and serve to assist local agencies in knowing the information valuable to attaining good designs. All designers should be familiar with these documents. Although the principles contained are written primarily for high-speed highway facilities, consideration should be given to their application on other types of projects regardless of traffic volumes and design speed. Project-by-project deviations from the criteria in these publications do not require handling in accordance with design exception approval procedures cited in Section 11.4 of this chapter. However, any deviations should be justified and documented in the project files.

Evaluating accident records is an integral step in developing highway projects and often reveals problems requiring special attention and corrective action. Accident records are available from the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) for analysis. Relative accident rates can influence the priorities of projects and ensure that project objectives and the scope of design are related to accident causes. In addition, it may be necessary to use a cost/benefit study and an investigation of accident experience to determine if the correction of an identified safety problem is cost effective. Significant safety problems, such as narrow bridges or culverts, railroad crossings or fixed objects which are not cost effective to correct, must be provided with suitable warning and traffic control devices. For example, no bridges may be left in place, which have a width narrower than the surfaced approach roadway unless suitable signing, marking and parapet protection are provided.

On many local agency projects, right of way considerations may limit the extent to which side slopes may be flattened and roadside clearances obtained. In such situations it is expected that the desired smooth and obstacle-free roadside will be obtained to the extent feasible.

BIKEWAY STANDARDS

The standards for bikeway projects shall conform to Chapter 1000 of the Caltrans *Highway Design Manual*. Deviations from the “mandatory” bikeway standards stated therein require approval in accordance with the design exception approval procedures described in Section 11.4 of this chapter.