



**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
Adoption of 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program**

**Resolution No. G-98-08**

- 1.1 WHEREAS Chapter 622 of the Statutes of 1997 (SB 45, Kopp) made major changes in the State's transportation programming process, including reducing the period of the biennial State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) from seven years to four years and calling for a six-year transitional 1998 STIP, and
- 1.2 WHEREAS Government Code Section 14529, as amended by SB 45, requires the California Transportation Commission to adopt and submit the 1998 STIP to the Legislature and the Governor by June 1, 1998, and
- 1.3 WHEREAS Government Code Section 14529.15, as added by SB 45, includes a statement of Legislative intent that the 1998 STIP conform with the requirements of SB 45 to the maximum degree feasible, taking into account the limited time allowed between enactment of the bill and adoption of the 1998 STIP, and
- 1.4 WHEREAS Streets and Highways Code Section 182.5, as added by SB 45, requires the Commission to adopt interim guidelines and procedures relative to fund estimates and project selection for the 1998 STIP, and
- 1.5 WHEREAS the Commission adopted the 1998 STIP Guidelines on January 15, 1998 (Resolution No. G-98-01), calling for STIP adoption at the Commission's June 2, 1998 meeting, and
- 1.6 WHEREAS the statutes define the STIP as a resource management document to assist the state and local entities to plan and implement transportation improvements and to utilize resources in a cost effective manner, and
- 1.7 WHEREAS the statutes, as revised by SB 45, make 75% of all new STIP funds available for the regional improvement program, subdivided by formula into county shares, with projects to be selected by each regional agency in its regional transportation improvement program (RTIP), and

- 1.8 WHEREAS the Commission is required to incorporate into the STIP all RTIP projects to be funded with regional improvement funds, unless the Commission finds that the RTIP is not consistent with the Commission's STIP Guidelines or is not a cost effective expenditure of State funds, in which case the Commission may reject the RTIP in its entirety, and
- 1.9 WHEREAS the Commission may not reject an RTIP unless it provides notice to the regional agency within 60 days after the RTIP is received, and that notice was provided for the Counties of Glenn, Inyo, Los Angeles, Mono, and San Diego,
- 1.10 WHEREAS the statutes make the remaining 25% of all new STIP funds available for the interregional improvement program, with projects to be nominated by Caltrans in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP) or, under limited circumstances, by a regional agency in its RTIP, and
- 1.11 WHEREAS all STIP project costs, including Caltrans support costs, are now programmed from county shares or the interregional share, and share balances will be adjusted for actual Caltrans right-of-way and project development costs when, and only when, they differ from programmed costs by more than specified threshold percentages, and
- 1.12 WHEREAS the Commission adopted the 1998 STIP Fund Estimate on January 15, 1998, with a new project capacity of \$4.623 billion, including \$3.467 billion for the regional improvement program and \$1.156 billion for the interregional improvement program, and
- 1.13 WHEREAS the Commission has received and reviewed the RTIPs submitted on or about March 2, as well as various amendments and corrections to the RTIPs submitted subsequently, and
- 1.14 WHEREAS the Commission has received and reviewed the ITIP submitted by Caltrans on March 2, which proposed programming for \$903 million in interregional State highway projects and deferred \$184 million for intercity rail proposals (4% of new STIP capacity, as compared with the statutory 2.25% minimum) pending further consultation with the Commission's Committees on Public Transit and Interregional Improvement Project Review, and
- 1.15 WHEREAS the Commission held two public hearings, one in San Francisco on March 31 and the other in Los Angeles on April 7, for the purpose of reconciling any objections by any county or regional agency to the ITIP or Caltrans' objections to any RTIP, and has considered the testimony heard at those hearings along with further written and oral comments, and
- 1.16 WHEREAS the Commission received a draft rail element of the ITIP on April 21 and on May 6, the Commission's Public Transit Committee reviewed and heard testimony on the

draft from interested parties, including members of the Legislature, regional and local agencies, and Caltrans, and the Commission has considered that testimony along with further written and oral comments on the ITIP rail element received to date, and

- 1.17 WHEREAS the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) identified a proposal for the BART extension to the San Francisco Airport for \$57.5 million, which is derived from some measure of uncertainty facing the project in regard to contingencies, and this uncertainty and restrictions on programming speculative contingencies preclude programming the entire \$57.5 million, and
- 1.18 WHEREAS the Commission regards the BART project as vital to the State and regional economy and recognizes that the project could be jeopardized without a demonstration of the Commission's readiness to participate in contingencies should they become manifest, and
- 1.19 WHEREAS the statutes and the Guidelines permit regions to reserve all or a portion of their county shares for programming in a future STIP and permit regions with a population under 1 million to request an advance of a future county share, and
- 1.20 WHEREAS the sum of all county shares reserved for programming in a future STIP exceeds the sum of all requested county share advances by more than \$180 million, and
- 1.21 WHEREAS Caltrans, with the advice of the Commission, has identified projects in its revised ITIP, submitted May 11, that can be programmed by using these funds freed up by county share reserves to advance the interregional program share, with repayment in the next STIP, and
- 1.22 WHEREAS the Commission Staff Recommendations were published and made available to Commissioners, Caltrans, regional transportation agencies, and county transportation commissions on May 13, and
- 1.23 WHEREAS the United State Congress approved the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) on May 22 and the President has announced that he will sign the bill, and
- 1.24 WHEREAS the Commission has received and considered a report from staff comparing RTIP and ITIP proposal with the Fund Estimate, which found that the proposed programming exceeds the Fund Estimate spread for the first two years and, at the same time, noted that any risk involved in front-loading the STIP's first two years is minimized by the fact that the balance in the State Highway Account is \$1.6 billion and growing faster than forecast and the fact that TEA-21 will provide far more Federal revenue that was forecast in the Fund Estimate, and

- 1.25 WHEREAS Caltrans has identified over \$450 million in new STIP projects for which State-only funding is requested and has expressed concern that, with the need to match increased Federal funding levels, there may not be sufficient State funds available over the STIP period to meet all requests for State-only funding, and
- 1.26 WHEREAS both former Federal law and TEA-21 restrict a portion of Federal transportation funds to the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program and the manner of programming projects eligible for these funds may affect overall funding flexibility, and
- 1.27 WHEREAS Caltrans and most regional agencies, with the encouragement of the Commission, have refrained from proposing new TEA projects pending the determination of TEA funding levels and eligibility requirements in the new Federal transportation act, and
- 1.28 WHEREAS \$1,549,000 is included in the Kings County RTIP to fund environmental work on Route 198 from Hanford to Route 99 near Visalia and, on May 27, the Tulare County Association of Governments amended its RTIP to program \$800,000 toward design work from its reserve for the 2000 STIP contingent upon the programming of the remainder of the design cost from the interregional program,
- 2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission hereby adopts the 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program to include the program described in the Staff Recommendations, including Attachments A and B to this resolution, with the following additional clarifications, changes, and adjustments:
  - (a) Glenn County. The Commission approves the Glenn County RTIP, as amended by the LTC on May 21, 1998. This amendment deletes three projects in the City of Willows totaling \$839,000, and adds this amount to the short term reserve. The deleted projects are for a left turn lane and signals at Route 162 and Tehama Street, \$200,000; landscape, turn lane, and overlay on Route 162, \$600,000; and a soundwall feasibility study on Route 5, \$39,000.
  - (b) Inyo County. The Commission approves the Inyo County RTIP, as amended by the LTC on May 20, 1998. This amendment deletes the \$2,028,000 originally proposed for the Olancha and Cartago project and adds that funding to the County's reserve for the 2000 STIP.
  - (c) Los Angeles County. The Commission approves the RTIP for Los Angeles County, as amended for the Route 2 Roadway Reconfiguration project in the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's letter of June 29, 1998, and subject to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Commission and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority executed on June 2, 1998.

- (d) Mono County. The Commission approves the Mono County RTIP, with the understanding that TEA-eligible work will be funded using TEA funds and the non-TEA balance that is freed up by using TEA funds will be placed in an undesignated short term reserve, as proposed in the Mono County Local Transportation Commission letter of June 1, 1998.
- (e) San Diego County. The Commission approves the San Diego County RTIP, as amended by SANDAG on May 22, 1998. This amendment redesignates the amounts programmed for the MTDB Mission Valley East LRT project (\$57,869,000) and the MTDB Mid-Coast LRT project (\$5,032,000) as reserves for the 2000 STIP for those projects. From the \$16,794,000 previously programmed for the NSDCTDB Oceanside-Escondido rail project, \$10,194,000 is redesignated as a reserve for the 2000 STIP for that project and the remaining \$6,600,000 is retained as specific project programming, with \$3,300,000 programmed in FY 1999 and \$3,300,000 programmed in FY 2000. This amendment will not affect county share calculations under SB 45.
- (f) Kings and Tulare Counties. The Commission adds \$2,400,000 for the design of Route 198 from Hanford to Route 99, including \$1,600,000 from the interregional program and \$800,000 from the regional program for Tulare County.

and,

- 2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, except as otherwise noted in the Staff Recommendations or this resolution, the 1998 STIP includes all projects remaining from the 1996 STIP, as currently amended, for which funding has not yet been allocated, including all unexpended portions of the 1997-98 right-of-way allocation plan and including the project support costs associated with capital outlay costs programmed in the 1996 STIP, and
- 2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission is not respreading RTIP and ITIP proposals by fiscal year to match the spread in the Fund Estimate, given the present assurance of fund availability for the first two years and the assurance of additional program capacity the 1998 STIP's last four years, to be added in the 2000 STIP, and
- 2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission is committed to participate in up to \$46.6 million in capital costs beyond those programmed in the 1998 STIP, should BART's identified contingency costs become manifest, contingent on local participation and with the stipulation that State-controlled funds are not available for debt service, with the means of Commission and local participation defined through a Memorandum of Understanding executed between BART, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and the California Transportation Commission concurrent with the adoption of the 1998 STIP, and

- 2.5 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the funding of the Route 905 project at Otay Mesa in San Diego County is part of the Commission's commitment, originally made in the 1996 STIP, to fund a series of NAFTA-related projects, and that it is the Commission's intent to encourage future funding progress on these NAFTA-related projects, including Route 905, utilizing either special funding from the Federal TEA-21 coordinated border infrastructure program or STIP funding from either the regional or interregional program, and
- 2.6 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends to work closely with Caltrans, the Sacramento Area Council of Governments, the Butte County Association of Governments, and Sutter and Yuba Counties to develop a framework for future STIP programming of freeway and expressway improvements in the Route 99/70 Corridor, including the Third Feather River Bridge, through both the regional and interregional programs, and
- 2.7 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends to work closely with Caltrans and the Kern County Council of Governments to develop a framework for future STIP programming of the Route 58 Freeway, including both the regional and interregional programs, and
- 2.8 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission encourages future STIP programming, from both the regional and interregional programs, for projects having unique strategic importance for stimulating economic development, citing as examples:
- the Route 905 project in San Diego County, the Route 7 project in Imperial County, and other NAFTA-related improvement projects,
  - a further improvement project related to the multimedia and entertainment industry on Route 5 at Empire Avenue in Burbank,
  - the Sunol Grade improvement project on Route 680 in Alameda and Santa Clara Counties,
  - the Alameda Corridor East, including the Colton Crossing rail project, and
- 2.9 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission finds that there is a need for a broader strategic planning effort for the interregional program, including intercity rail, to help guide programming decisions for the 2000 STIP and subsequent STIPs, and
- 2.10 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends, in consultation with Caltrans and regional agencies, to review State policy for State-only funding considering the number and types of projects identified in the RTIPs and ITIP for State-only funding and considering the States ability to provide State-only funding while matching all Federal funds made available under the recently enacted Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21), and

- 2.11 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the identification of a project for State-only funding in either the RTIP or in the CTC Staff Recommendations is not a commitment that State-only funds will be available to allocate to the project, and
- 2.12 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that it is Commission policy that all STIP projects that are eligible for funding from the Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program be funded from the State's apportionment of Federal TEA funds, and
- 2.13 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission, in consultation with Caltrans and regional agencies, intends to survey and identify all projects in the 1998 STIP that may qualify for TEA funding (regardless of whether the projects were originally identified as TEA projects) prior to the 2000 STIP Fund Estimate in order to determine the amounts of future TEA and non-TEA programming, and
- 2.14 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Commission staff, in consultation with Caltrans and regional agencies, is authorized to make further technical changes in cost, schedules, and descriptions for projects in the 1998 STIP, including right-of-way and project development costs and schedules for Caltrans projects carried forward from the 1996 STIP and including the identification of STIP project component costs and schedules for interregional program projects, in order to reflect the most current information or to clarify the Commission's programming commitments, with report of any substantive changes back to the Commission for formal approval by September 1998.

Attachment A

1998 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS  
ERRATA

Main text:

- San Bernardino. The sentence at the bottom of page 15 and the top of page 16 should read, “This additional interregional funding would complement ~~\$36,100,000~~ \$31,100,000 in county share funding that San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) has agreed to amend into its RTIP (thereby reducing its reserve for the 2000 STIP from \$95.6 million to ~~\$59.5~~ \$64.5 million), and \$5,000,000 in Regional Surface Transportation Program funds.” Other references to reserve totals and the San Bernardino RTIP Summary would be changed accordingly.

RTIP Summaries (all costs in \$1,000’s):

- Monterey. The first line in the RTIP Summary notes should read, “1996 STIP includes ~~\$45,000~~ \$44,554 in reserve for Prunedale Bypass capital outlay, plus \$10,959 for project support.”
- San Benito. The county share shown in the RTIP Summary is \$9 too low because it was inadvertently taken from the Draft Fund Estimate rather than the Final Fund Estimate. The total county share is \$7,675; the unrestricted county share is \$7,222; and the county’s unprogrammed non-TEA county share balance is \$9. The TEA restriction and the county shares for all other counties are correct.
- Stanislaus. The first line in the RTIP Summary notes should read, “SAAG is loaning long term reserve of \$10,000 to MTC, with return of ~~\$11,800~~ \$11,400 in the next county share period.”
- Ventura. The first and last lines in the RTIP Summary notes, concerning split funding of the Route 23 widening and the balance in unprogrammed county share, should be deleted. These lines were superseded by the proposal to advance the county share for the project, which is otherwise correctly displayed in the summary.

**Attachment B**

**1998 STIP STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS  
LATE RTIP CHANGES AND CLARIFICATIONS**

(All costs listed in \$1,000's)

- Alpine/Amador/Calaveras. Reduces project costs by \$216 for 2 projects, based on revised Caltrans estimates. For the Angels Camp Bypass (which is programmed through right-of-way), RTIP costs are reduced from \$11,183 to \$11,151. For the Route 4 passing lane, costs are reduced from \$2,967 to \$2,783.
- El Dorado. The project limits for the Route 50 HOV lane project are: westbound, Sunrise Blvd to El Dorado Hills Blvd; eastbound, Scott Rd to Sunrise Blvd.
- Mariposa. Reduces programmed cost for Route 140 passing lanes, programmed for environmental work only, based on revised Caltrans estimate. Cost reduced from \$804 to \$570. Savings is added to the county's reserve for the 2000 STIP.
- San Joaquin. Reduces project costs by a net of \$1,394 for 4 projects, based on revised Caltrans estimates. Costs are reduced from \$19,285 to \$17,940 for the Route 12 passing lane project; decreased from \$899 to \$872 for the Route 5 soundwall (Mt Diablo-Smith Canal); increased from \$693 to \$699 for the Route 99 soundwall; and decreased from \$1,053 to \$1,025 for the Route 5 soundwall (14-Mile Slough-Ben Holt). The savings are added to the county's reserve for the 2000 STIP.
- San Luis Obispo. Short term transit reserve of \$600 (FY 1999) is reprogrammed to San Luis Obispo Regional Transit Authority (SLORTA) to acquire 3 transit coaches. Local match is \$150.
- Stanislaus. Reduces cost of Route 132 expressway project by \$353 and increases cost of Route 219 expressway by the same amount; no net change in total project costs. Change is based on revised Caltrans project support cost estimates, as reported in May 13 letter from Stanislaus Area Association of Governments.
- Yolo. Limits the Harbor Blvd. interchange project to environmental work only and shifts the \$450 previously programmed for PS&E to the reserve for the 2000 STIP. Change is based on Caltrans advice that PS&E was underfunded. The 3 State highway interchange and connector projects are to be delivered by Caltrans rather than by the Cities of West Sacramento and Woodland. For the Enterprise project, costs are shifted between components, to include \$3,524 for right-of-way, \$5,355 for construction, \$145 for right-of-way engineering, and \$1,026 for construction engineering; the local contribution is limited to \$300 for design. For the Route 5/113 connector, \$450 of the amount for right-of-way is Caltrans right-of-way engineering and \$150 of the amount for construction is Caltrans construction engineering.