

DATE: September 29, 2011

SUBJECT: 2011 ARLE Funding Program

TO: District Executives

FROM: Daryl R. St.Clair, P.E., Acting Director /s/
Bureau of Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering

The subject Strike-off Letter (SOL) will replace the previous SOL# 470-11-6, issued May 25, 2011, establishing the funding management policy for PennDOT's Automated Red light Running Enforcement (ARLE) program. The program in and of itself is resource increasing.

Planning and Programming

- The program is 100% state funded (Appropriation 244) utilizing a separate restricted motor license account. Only approved ARLE Funding Program Projects should be contained within Appropriation 244
- For expenditure tracking purposes, Districts must create separate MPMS numbers for each project. As projects are completed, the encumbrance should equal the actual project cost so excess funds are no longer encumbered for each project. These projects should be closed through SAP (WBS element) in the same manner as any other 100% state funded project.
 - **The WBS element should be established as follows:**
 - **P-BAAAAFYARLE-XXXX-PRG**
 - **“P” – Indicates WBS was created in MPMS. This character will not be entered in MPMS; it is added in the interface with SAP.**
 - **User supplied info:**
 - **“B” – bidding procedure**
 - **1 – Liquid Fuels Procedures**
 - **2 – Local Bidding Procedures**
 - **3 – ECMS Bidding Procedures**
 - **4 – Other**
 - **“AAAA” – State route or municipal identifier; use leading zeroes if identifier is less than 4 characters.**
 - **“FY” – State Fiscal Year (11) funds were awarded. The FY will take the last character of the SR field in a WBS element and spill over into the single digit of the sub-project number.**
 - **“ARLE” – Denotes an automated red light enforcement project (do not change). “ARLE” will encompass the phase and section fields of the WBS.**

- “XXXX” – County organization number
- “PRG” – program code that indicates the source of funding:
 - Use 001 for funds from state-wide funding pool;
 - Use 002 for funds from the Philadelphia funding pool;
 - Use 613 for Department inspection costs.
- For the master data, program codes 001 and 002 are associated with approp 60244 and program 613 is associated with approp 10581
- For non-sign- or equipment-purchasing projects greater than \$100,000, the Program Center will work with District Planning staff and Metropolitan/Rural Planning Organizations (MPOs/RPOs) to have project(s) included on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
- The use of dotGrants will not be permitted under this program due to lack of familiarity, registered municipal partners enrolled, staff to train municipal partners, and automated accounting needs, combined with the need to track the projects within one location.

Funding Coding

- As previously indicated, appropriation 244 (specifically 60244) is a restricted revenue account that was established to hold the automated red light enforcement fines remitted by the City of Philadelphia. Law states that PennDOT is required to use this money for a “Transportation Enhancement Program”. Fifty percent of these fines are deposited into a sub-fund (6024400001) that we designated as the state-wide fund pool; the other fifty percent is deposited into a fund pool that is available to the City of Philadelphia only (fund 6024400002). Funding applications are received and reviewed each year by BHSTE and a determination of the fund awards is made through PMC. WBS elements will be set up using the District org, and since this is a fund situation the 66* GLs will be used. The appropriate coding information is as follows:

Account Coding	ARLE Statewide Funding Program	ARLE City of Philadelphia Funding Program
Cost Center	County org code	7840650000
Fund Center	6024400001	6024400002
GL (State)	6600400	6600400
GL (Federal)	6600300	6600300
WBS	Create by District	Create by District

Program Management

- You as the District Executive shall make the determination of which staff should manage the projects. A recommendation is as follows: Municipal Services – small projects, including sign and signal equipment installation and work that the municipality can construct themselves; Traffic – traffic signal projects on state routes; and Design – larger intersection improvement projects on state routes.

470-11-10

September 29, 2011

Page 3

- All Project Managers should review the ARLE Policy, Chapter 4 (District Project Management) located at: [P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement \(ARLE\) Funding Program\ARLE Funding Program Policy.pdf](P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Funding Program\ARLE Funding Program Policy.pdf). In addition to the materials contained within that publication, all appropriate project managers should populate the ARLE Funding project management spreadsheet ([P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement \(ARLE\) Funding Program\ARLE Project Managers.xls](P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Funding Program\ARLE Project Managers.xls)). The field definitions are as follows:
 - MPMS# -- number used as identifier in ECMS
 - District Project Manager – assigned by District Executive
 - Procurement Method – type of procurement procedure (i.e. Liquid Fuels Procedures, etc.)
 - Correspondence with Municipality – note via letter, e-mail, or phone call
 - Reimbursement Agreement status – in process, out for review, completed, etc.
 - Reimbursement Agreement Execution Date – provide the executed reimbursement agreement date; leave blank until executed.
 - ARLE Funding Reimbursement Agreement Amount – amount on the reimbursement agreement
 - Amount Reimbursed to Date – the amount currently reimbursed to the municipality
 - % Complete – current level of project completion
 - Other Information – scope modifications, unique circumstances, etc.
- Except for the City of Philadelphia, being the recipient of ongoing funds, the reimbursement agreement time of completion shall not exceed three years from execution.
- For liquid fuels-like projects that municipal services staff can manage, and for ease of project delivery, follow Appendix D, Chapter 449 of Publication 9.
- Unlike the liquid fuels program, invoices must be sent to the Comptroller's Office for local reimbursement: P.O. Box 69183, Harrisburg, PA 17106-9183.
- It is the Districts discretion whether or not to bid larger, more complex projects through ECMS, or to allow local bids.
- Approved ARLE projects consist of all phases (design, right-of-way, utilities and construction inspection).
- Should the District and local government/MPO not be able to deliver the project due to an underestimate by the sponsor, you as the District Executive have the authority to change the scope of work in cooperation with the project sponsor. **No extra funds will be available for cost overruns.** The BHSTE Director must be notified of any project scope modifications.
- Proprietary item approval requests shall be submitted to the appropriate Central Office Bureau Director.
- The appropriate ADA policies must be incorporated into all projects. All applicants have been notified that all Department policies and procedures need to be followed.
- The reimbursement agreement is the municipality's permit; an additional HOP is not needed for work along state routes.

470-11-10
September 29, 2011
Page 4

ARLE Reimbursement Agreement

- Standard ARLE reimbursement agreement and resolution templates are located at: [P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement \(ARLE\) Funding Program\ARLE Reimbursement Agreement](P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Funding Program\ARLE Reimbursement Agreement).

Inspection

- Municipalities can inspect their own work for projects on 100% local roadways.
- For work on state highways, PennDOT shall charge the sponsor for its inspection costs. Personnel assigned inspection duties should charge on their timesheet the WBS established for inspection costs for the project. (PennDOT project administration costs are not reimbursable, including design project management)

Additional ARLE program guidance has been included within the following link ([P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement \(ARLE\) Funding Program\2010 ARLE Funding Awards\ARLE Funding Program Policy.pdf](P:\penndot shared\Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Funding Program\2010 ARLE Funding Awards\ARLE Funding Program Policy.pdf)).

Expenditures will be reviewed during future District Executive meetings. Should you have any questions, please contact Daryl St.Clair, P.E., Acting Director, Bureau of Highway Safety and Traffic Engineering, at 717-787-7350.

4700/DRS/hmq

CC: James Ritzman, P.E., Deputy Secretary for Planning
Larry Shifflet, Director, Program Center
Christine Reilly, P.E., Manager, BLASO
Gavin Gray, Special Assistant, Highway Administration
David Margolis, Director, BFM
Tom Colaizzi, Chief, Highway and Bridge Division, BFM
Natasha Fackler, Director, Policy Office
Brian Thompson, P.E., Director, BOPD
Charles C. Goodhart, Director, BOMO
Daryl St.Clair, P.E., Acting Director, BHSTE
Rebecca Burns, P.E., Acting Director, BOCM
District Fiscal Officers
Bruce Karper, Budget Analyst 3, BLASO
Dan Farley, Manager, Traffic Signals and Operational Analysis Section, BHSTE
Bruce Montgomery, P.E., BHSTE

2010 Automated Red Light Enforcement (ARLE) Funding Program

Statewide ARLE Grant Program Metrics by District

District	# of Applications	# of Suggested Projects	Total Project Cost for Suggested Projects	Total Project Costs	% of the Applications	% of the Funding Requests	% of Statewide Projects	% of Statewide Funding
District 1	15	6	\$139,669	\$861,815	5.14%	1.45%	5.00%	1.66%
District 2	9	3	\$60,166	\$2,157,108	3.08%	3.62%	2.50%	0.71%
District 3	11	3	\$35,696	\$711,506	3.77%	1.19%	2.50%	0.42%
District 4	14	1	\$75,000	\$1,575,000	4.79%	2.64%	0.83%	0.89%
District 5	34	12	\$464,477	\$3,253,369	11.64%	5.46%	10.00%	5.52%
District 6	79	32	\$3,449,986	\$14,447,286	27.05%	24.23%	26.67%	41.00%
District 8	47	26	\$1,859,270	\$8,717,141	16.10%	14.62%	21.67%	22.09%
District 9	9	5	\$451,381	\$2,168,222	3.08%	3.64%	4.17%	5.36%
District 10	23	12	\$276,538	\$3,775,032	7.88%	6.33%	10.00%	3.29%
District 11	23	10	\$545,269	\$3,703,261	7.88%	6.21%	8.33%	6.48%
District 12	22	9	\$199,416	\$8,467,816	7.53%	14.20%	7.50%	2.37%
City of Philadelphia	4	0	\$0	\$7,420,000	1.37%	12.45%	0.00%	0.00%
Southwestern Pennsylvania Commission	2	1	\$858,133	\$2,358,133	0.68%	3.96%	0.83%	10.20%
Totals:	292	120	\$8,414,999					

Note : City of Philadelphia was broken out of District 6 since 12 applications were received. Additionally, Southwestern Pennsylvania was separated because it spans over Districts 10, 11, and 12.

Statewide ARLE Grant Program Metrics by Category Description

Category	# of Applications	# of Suggested Projects	Total Project Cost for Suggested Projects	Total Project Costs	% of the Applications	% of the Funding Requests	% of Statewide Projects	% of Statewide Funding
Safety Imp. - Various	56	13	\$2,470,110	\$22,913,405	19.18%	38.44%	10.83%	29.35%
Safety Imp. - Signal Systems	21	12	\$2,392,603	\$10,018,933	7.19%	16.81%	10.00%	28.43%
Safety Imp. - Isolated Signal	80	29	\$1,979,167	\$13,987,245	27.40%	23.46%	24.17%	23.52%
Safety Imp. - Geometrics	16	3	\$214,977	\$5,702,868	5.48%	9.57%	2.50%	2.55%
Sign Replacement	29	27	\$605,347	\$3,350,015	9.93%	5.62%	22.50%	7.19%
LED Upgrade	20	17	\$259,433	\$1,759,433	6.85%	2.95%	14.17%	3.08%
Pedestrian Imp.	12	2	\$147,760	\$3,747,161	4.11%	6.29%	1.67%	1.76%
Safety Imp. - Sign (New)	14	9	\$138,317	\$47,589	4.79%	0.08%	7.50%	1.64%
Signal Retiming	5	4	\$122,250	\$1,622,250	1.71%	2.72%	3.33%	1.45%
Emergency Preemption	6	4	\$85,037	\$496,037	2.05%	0.85%	3.33%	1.01%
Mis.	5	0	\$0	\$939,050	1.71%	1.58%	0.00%	0.00%
Safety Imp. - Pavement Markings	6	0	\$0	\$434,222	2.05%	0.73%	0.00%	0.00%
ARLE	3	0	\$0	\$720,000	1.03%	1.21%	0.00%	0.00%
Safety Imp. - Railroad	2	0	\$0	\$11,250	0.68%	0.02%	0.00%	0.00%
Guiderail	19	0	\$0	\$1,171,165	6.51%	1.96%	0.00%	0.00%
Drainage	5	0	\$0	\$1,041,461	1.71%	1.75%	0.00%	0.00%
Safety Study	1	0	\$0	\$75,000	0.34%	0.13%	0.00%	0.00%