



**Federal Transit Administration –
Region IV**

**State Programs Meeting
Coordinated Planning – Part II**

**Doug Frate
Chief Transit Planner
South Carolina DOT
March 20, 2008**

Coordination Planning Process

- SCDOT, in partnership with South Carolina's ten COGs, developed regional coordination plans that meet the requirements of SAFETEA-LU.
- The coordination plan format is the same across the state, while content is specific to the COG's.
- In the future, concurrent with regional LRTP updates, COG's will retain responsibility for regional coordination plan updates.
- Coordination plan updates may occur more frequently as the need may dictate.

Coordination Selection Process

- SCDOT developed a uniform application and selection process for non-TMA's.
 - COGs were responsible for accepting, reviewing and ranking projects based on identified selection criteria.
 - SCDOT selected projects statewide from the regional COG submittals based on funding availability and level of priority.
- By Commission action in December 2006, SCDOT identified the regional Councils of Governments as partners in administering and conducting the competitive selection process at the local level.
- COG's in TMA's selected projects based on their large UZA apportionments separately under sections 5316 and 5317.

Core Project Selection Criteria

The following criteria were used in selecting and prioritizing projects under the Sections 5316 and 5317 programs. COGs were afforded some discretion to address specific needs within their regions.

- Statement of Need and Organizational Capacity
- Implementation Plan
- Project Budget and Cost Effectiveness
- Customer Service and Accessibility
- Coordination and Program Outreach

Common Project Selection Criteria

- Correlates with Plan implementation strategies
- Addresses gaps in current service provisions for targeted communities
- Makes use of available resources and leverages resources to the extent possible
- Facilitates coordination across public-private, inter-agency and geographic boundaries
- Coordinated with other Federal and/or state programs
- Ability to be replicated
- Geographic distribution

Funding

In the interest of fairness and equitability, funding guidelines for each program were based on regional demographics, consistent with program eligibility, and developed based on a formula that mirrors FTA's allocation formula to states. The demographics were based on Census 2000 data, and the guidelines will be used on an annual basis as federal apportionments are published.

Project Funding

Because there was more available funding than requested, only FY06 and 07 funding is being utilized.

- Section 5316
 - 14 projects submitted statewide
 - \$2,329,617 in Federal funding available under state discretion
 - \$2,106,255 recommended
 - Some FY07 and all FY08 funding remains available

- Section 5317
 - 14 projects submitted statewide
 - \$1,552,041 in Federal funding available under state discretion
 - \$1,049,230 recommended
 - Some FY07 and all FY08 funding remains available

Types of Project Requests

- Mobility Management
- Capital/Technology
- JARC Service (including vanpooling)
- New Service
- Marketing & Administration
- Few private projects
- Overall split is roughly 50% service and 50% other

Project Selection Issues

- Overall lack of understanding of the programs and what is actually allowable – more requests would have been submitted had agencies better understood what was allowable.
- Not all regions submitted requests for funding, especially those new to the concept.
- JARC more common than New Freedom, which is still unknown.
- Some areas/agencies couldn't get past traditional ways of operating, or had a limited history of coordination.
- PMP requirements caught TMA's off-guard mid-stream.

Implementation Lessons Learned

- Better communication between and among partners
- Greater education/outreach efforts on program availability and eligibility
- Allow for timely outreach, solicitation, application, and selection processes