

# CALIFORNIA'S REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES

---

**June 14, 2000  
10:00 am to 12:00 noon  
151 West Mission St.  
Room 202A  
San Jose, California**

## AGENDA

- |     |  |                |
|-----|--|----------------|
| 1.  | Call to Order and Self-Introductions                                     | Victor Kamhi   |
| 2.  | Minutes from May 2000 Meeting  | Debra Hale     |
| 3.  | Report on New Legislation (ITEM 4.1)                                     | Chuck Oldham   |
| 4.  | Adoption of the 2000 STIP Schedule (ITEM 4.3a)                           | David Brewer   |
| 5.  | Proposed Amendments to the STIP Guidelines (ITEM 4.3b)                   | David Brewer   |
| 6.  | Report on Revised Fund Estimate (ITEM 4.3c)                              | Ileen Jellison |
| 7.  | Governor's Transportation Initiative (ITEM 4.2) and Budget               | All            |
| 8.  | Policy for Programming SHOPP Project Costs (ITEM 4.4a)                   | Jim Nicholas   |
| 9.  | Report by SCAG on the New Conformity Challenge (ITEM 4.10)               | David Stein    |
| 10. | Roadside Rests Master Plan (ITEM 4, HIMC)                                | Gary Bush      |
| 11. | Enhanced Services Program (Report Attached)                              | Norma Ortega   |
| 12. | For Discussion Only: Commissioner Wolf's Proposal to Advance Programming | All            |
| 13. | Other Business/Information Sharing                                       | All            |

*Apologies for the early starting time, however it is necessary to allow staff to attend the Transit Committee at 11:00 am and Highway/Interregional Committee at 1:30 p.m.*

# CALIFORNIA'S REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES

May 10, 2000

State Food and Agriculture Building Auditorium  
1220 "N" Street, First Floor  
Sacramento, CA

## ***DRAFT*** MEETING MINUTES

\*\*\*\***DRAFT: Please call or e-mail Debbie Hale, (831) 460-3209, debbie.hale@co.santa-cruz.ca.us with any corrections.**\*\*\*\*

1. **Call to order and self-introductions.** RTPA Moderator Vic Kamhi (Los Angeles County MTA) called the meeting to order at 9:15 am.
2. **Minutes from March 2000 Meeting.** Minutes were accepted by consensus.

**Announcements:** Mr. Kamhi announced that the CTC agenda and items are now available on the web. Caltrans expects to have the agenda packet posted about the same time that Commissioners receive their agendas. Allocations and amendments are currently listed in the "other items" section. SACOG agreed to wait a couple of months to see how the Internet access works before discontinuing copies of the "book" of agenda items for other RTPAs.

3. **Report on New Legislation.** Pete Hathaway, CTC staff, reported on transportation-related legislation. He noted that the CTC has taken a position on only one bill: SCA 3, which it supports in concept. Future positions on legislation likely will occur after the Governor's initiative package is finalized. In response to a question from Phil Dow, Mendocino and Lake County transportation agencies, it was clarified that AB 2604 (Zettel) would result in general funds allocated via the Governor's initiative being counted against regional share STIP funds. Mr. Kamhi asked if any agencies had taken a position on the CELSOC initiative [constitutional amendment to remove restrictions on contracting out for transportation engineering services]. Santa Cruz County RTC has taken a support position and MTC supports in concept.

Mr. Hathaway reviewed SB 1809 (Johnston). He stated that this bill as currently written would shift the statewide Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) funds into a single category of statewide transportation enhancements, deleting the Conservation Lands and Caltrans programs. The bill would also shift 10% of the minimum guarantee funds from the STIP into the TEA program. Rails to Trails Conservancy has indicated that the bill is a placeholder for increasing funds for the TEA program.

Mr. Kamhi announced that the California Transit Association is having its annual spring legislative conference on May 22 and 23.

4. **Project Delivery: FTA Transfer and Grant Approval Issues.** David Cabrera, Caltrans Mass Transportation, reported on the Multistate Technical Assistance Program (MTAP) April conference call on various transit funding and delivery issues. Key concerns raised at that meeting included how to credit project savings to the correct state/region, getting funds

after transfer into the FTA grant application, long wait time that results from the annual cycle for Section 5311 grant applications, and timeliness of FTA in response to issues raised by states. FTA responded to these concerns by reporting that there is a Transportation Research Board study on improving the FTA process, there is also a TEAM [grant funding software] work group that FTA has formed. MTAP gave additional suggestions to FTA, including formation of a multiagency working group and creation of a web site for posting concerns, and plans a formal letter of recommendations to FTA and FHWA. MTAP also plans to conduct a survey regarding issues and problems relating to flexing of funds.

Dick Petrie, Caltrans, reported that FTA has elevated the issues raised by Caltrans on the difficulties of flexing funds and accrual of project savings to the national level and plans a response soon. He clarified that obligation of funding occurs when FHWA completes the transfer, not when the FTA grant agreement is approved. He noted that it takes longer than in the past to transfer the funds, due to additional FHWA and Treasury review. However, of the \$375 million of backlogged funds, \$360 million has now been provided to FTA Region 9 and the additional \$15 million should be distributed very soon. Therese McMillan, San Francisco Bay Area MTC, asked if there are still substantive issues to resolve with the flexing of transit funds. Mr. Petrie responded that there is now a process in place, but there are still issues, such as how to credit savings to the state in which they occur, which have yet to be addressed. Debbie Whitmore, Stanislaus Area Association of Governments, asked if FTA expressed an interest in allowing more frequent grant applications than annually for the Section 5311 program. Mr. Cabrera responded that there is no specific commitment but he expects the TRB study to look at this issue. Mr. Herron encouraged Caltrans to work with FTA to remove this restriction, noting that it slows down project delivery considerably.

Mr. Kamhi reminded regional agencies to fill out the Local Transit Project Delivery surveys and turn them in to Caltrans as soon as possible so that Caltrans can help resolve any further delivery issues.

5. **Review of Project Delays in the STIP.** Stephen Maller, CTC staff, reported on the delivery of projects in the STIP. He noted that 86% of local projects and 55% of Caltrans projects are expected to be delivered through the May CTC meeting. Based on extension, amendment and allocation requests to date, \$1 billion in STIP programming is expected to slip in the 1999/00 fiscal year (about 85% for Caltrans projects and 15% for local projects). Most extensions are asking for the full 20 months allowed. This slippage may result in additional STIP capacity of about \$170 million for programming in the earlier years, as other projects slip into the out years. Ms. McMillan noted that this extra programming capacity may be used up in a future STIP to cover the increase in costs that usually results from delaying projects. Any "new" money is actually borrowed from future years. CTC staff is recommending approval of all STIP amendments and extensions in May except one. Wayne Lewis, Caltrans, noted that project sponsors are still expected to be present at the CTC meeting to answer questions. He added that more extension requests are expected in June, and Caltrans needs to request allocations for about 50% of its program in June. Ms. McMillan noted that in some cases it may make strategic sense for a region to let funds lapse rather than ask for an extension.

6. **Revised 2000 Draft Fund Estimate.** Isleen Jellison, Caltrans, reported that the revised draft 2000 Fund Estimate shows \$1.415 billion available for programming to STIP and/or SHOPP projects. Much of this new money is due to additional federal revenues. Mr. Hathaway noted that Caltrans will ask for an additional \$270 million for the 2000 SHOPP program.

Charles Field, Amador County Transportation Commission/Rural Counties Task Force, asked if and when there will be a call for projects. Pete Hathaway responded that there will probably be a call for projects but the schedule remains unknown at this time, due to uncertainties with the Governor's initiative. He stated that there will probably be at least 3 to 4 months for agencies to respond if call for projects is issued.

Mr. Kamhi noted that there is now an adopted STIP on the Caltrans web site. It is current as of January, 2000. Caltrans plans to have it updated every two months.

There was some discussion of whether to support a 2000 STIP call for projects or to request that the CTC wait until the 2002 STIP and allow regions to propose amendments in the meantime. It was agreed that until the Governor's transportation plan is finalized and adopted by the Legislature, there will probably be too many unknowns to determine the best course of action. Issues such as whether the STIP will be extended to 7 years are also unknown. Gary Keill, consultant, pointed out that Caltrans could "use up" extra funds if regions wait to act. Mr. Kamhi pointed out that if bonds are a part of the package, the final funding will not be known until after the election in November. The group agreed to raise the following concerns with the CTC: 1) there needs to be enough time to respond to a call for projects when/if one is issued; 2) some agencies will need funds sooner while some agencies will need need time to prepare PSRs; and, 3) regional agencies are willing to work with the CTC to develop a process that meets all of our needs.

7. **Governor's Transportation Initiative.** Pete Hathaway noted that there is not a formula decided upon for distribution of the proposed \$400 million in General Funds for road maintenance, but discussions are to focus the money on smaller counties. Celia McAdam, Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, pointed out that \$400 million will not meet the backlog of maintenance needs, but including it in the package may lead to the conclusion that the problem has been solved. Mr. Field argued that a dedicated source of road maintenance funds is needed. Mr. Kamhi pointed out that overall the package does not meet the unfunded transportation need statewide, and it is focused on high congestion areas. It was noted that SanBAG had prepared a list of how \$5 billion in funding would be distributed if STIP formulas were used, in essence showing winners and losers under the Governor's initiative. Mr. Kamhi responded that in any case the STIP formulas favor rural areas when compared to a population distribution formula.
8. **2000 SHOPP and Ten-Year Plan.** Caltrans is likely to propose adding \$270 million to the 2000 SHOPP to cover increased safety and operations needs. Mr. Hathaway noted that the CTC is emphasizing meeting the pavement rehabilitation goals. Mr. Kamhi and others expressed concerns regarding the lack of dialog between Caltrans and the local agencies on the projects that are placed into the SHOPP; for instance, regions would be interested to now what projects the additional \$270 million would fund.

Debbie Hale, Santa Cruz County RTC, asked for clarification on the "corridor concept" discussed in the 10-year plan. Mr. Hathaway responded that it is a way to group projects together in a given location to minimize construction delays as compared with constructing projects separately at different times. Ms. Hale asked if there was an opportunity to coordinate related SHOPP and STIP projects, noting that a separation of funding is required. Mr. Hathaway and Mr. Maller responded that funding can be combined at the construction phase and some districts may be more receptive to this coordination than others. Mr. Kamhi voiced a concern with regional differences between SHOPP administration and expressed a need to standardize the process.

9. **Local Assistance Manual Update.** Mr. Kevin Pokrajac reported on the status of the update of the Local Assistance Manual. The Local Assistance Manual and Local Programs Procedures updates are now on the Internet. There is a focus group looking to streamline the manual. Guidebooks are being prepared on topics of special interest and should be available in 6 months. The target date for completion of the manual update is 18 months from now. Mr. Keill asked if there is a contact person who can provide answers to questions that the District Local Assistance Engineers cannot answer; Mr. Pokrajac responded that regional agencies should continue to work through the district representatives, who will contact headquarters if they need further information. Norma Ortega, Caltrans, noted that Caltrans is increasing training for the new district local assistance hires.
10. **Accounting of AB 1012 Unobligated STP/CMAQ Balances.** Ms. Ortega reported on the status of the unobligated balances. She noted that the balances have been reduced since the initial tracking started and expects all balances to be fully obligated by January, 2001. Obligation plans are due from the regions to Caltrans by June 30, 2000. Forms can be obtained from Ms. Ann Evans, Caltrans. Projects that are already in the pipeline for obligation do not need to be listed in the report. Ms. McMillan noted that some shift in statewide bookkeeping between STP and CMAQ funds could result in the need for TIP amendments and could be difficult to administer. She suggested that the state keep two sets of books on STP and CMAQ to minimize the need for amendments. Mr. DeHaan asked how the state is doing with regards the need to obligate funding this year. Mr. Petrie responded that the state appears to be on target now that the FTA transfers have been processed; there will be no need for the state to backfill for local projects. Ms. Ortega promised that by June the balance sheets would reflect the applicable obligations.
11. **Federal TEA: Conservation Lands, Statewide and SHOPP TEA Programs.** Mr. Hathaway reported on the status of these programs. \$50 million in projects were submitted for Conservation Lands funding and \$15 million is likely to be programmed, with a potential reserve list of \$9 million in projects. CTC staff is recommending programming the projects that can be delivered earliest. The TEA unobligated balance has shrunk from \$33 million to around \$12 million; therefore funds probably won't be lapsing. Ms. Hale asked whether there will be excess funds that need to be obligated next year. Mr. Hathaway responded that there will likely be a need for about \$25 million to \$30 million in regional project obligations. Mr. Hathaway does not expect that the state will have a problem obligating the 10% requirement for TEA funds. He added that the AB 1012 deadlines apply

to TEA projects as of next year, and if funds lapse they will be programmed to the state TEA programs.

The Statewide Transportation Enhancements program was undersubscribed this round. Twenty-one projects applied for funding for a total of approximately \$15 million. Seven projects were carried as partners with Caltrans. The question facing the CTC is whether to program all the projects that applied for funds or rank and underprogram funding. The next cycle for statewide TEA funds is Fall 2001, which will have \$25 million available. Projects must be sponsored by a state or federal agency, not Caltrans, or a local agency can partner with a state or federal agency, including Caltrans.

The SHOPP TEA program has \$41 million for Caltrans' own projects. The CTC is encouraging Caltrans not to solicit projects from outside agencies, but rather to have Caltrans develop the projects. The second round of programming will take place soon. Mr. Hathaway encourages Caltrans to use the funds to address environmental challenges associated with highway projects in a manner that can streamline the permit and agency review process.

12. **Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation program.** No presentation/discussion due to time constraints.
13. **Federal Discretionary Programs.** Expectations are that California will get 8% of this funding.
14. **Other Business/Information Sharing.** Mr. Kamhi raised two issues. First, he stated that he will ask the CTC staff in June to assist in streamlining the manner in which rideshare activities are funded in the STIP. Second, he suggested agencies look at the new Inspection and Maintenance Report by the Air Resources Board and determine its impact on their federal TIP conformity. Ty Schuiling, San Bernardino Association of Governments, noted that this issue could affect a region's ability to deliver projects under use it or lose it requirements.

Mr. Schuiling inquired as to the status of the strategic plan for the Interregional Improvement Program funds. Mr. Hathaway responded that Caltrans Planning has a task force on this issue, but the external committee has not met recently. The progress on the document has been slowed by the Governor's initiative. The next draft plan is due in June but it is likely to be released later.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Debbie Hale, Vice Moderator