Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridor Designation Process

Background

In response to FAST Act requirement, Caltrans and MPOs need to collaborate and submit nominations to FHWA for the designation of Critical Urban/Rural Freight Corridors (CUFC/CRFC), which will be part of the National Highway Freight Network (NHFN). This NHFN is the focus of funding under the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) and for federal grant programs such as FASTLANE and now INFRA, that support national goals identified in 23 U.S.C. 167(b) and 23 U.S.C. 117(a)(2). The portion of NHFN already designated by congress is called Primary Highway Freight System (PHFS) (https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/freight/infrastructure/ismt/state_maps/states/california.htm), and the CRFCs and CUFCs are important freight corridors that provide critical connectivity to the NHFN. The purpose and intent of these CUFC/CRFC is provided in detail in the federal websites.

The federal guidance on the process is listed here (https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/fastact/crfc/sec_1116_gdnce.htm). As noted in Q9 and Q10, there is no deadline for designating the CUFC/CRFC and these designations and de-designations (removal) will be on a rolling basis, based on needs. At any given time California can have up to a maximum of 311 miles designated as CUFC and 623 miles as CRFC. FHWA recommends that Caltrans and MPOs work with the FHWA Division to develop an approach and timeline for identifying, tracking changes to, updating information on, and verifying the status of CRFC and CUFC roadways as part of the certification process.

This document describes the initial corridor designation process, assumptions applied for calculating miles, the rolling designation (or “on/off”) process, and mileage methodology assumptions.

Per the FAST Act:

- States are responsible for designating public roads in their state as CRFCs. In accordance with 23 U.S.C. 167(e), a State may designate a public road within the borders of the State as a CRFC if the public road is not in an urbanized area.
- In an urbanized area (UZA) with a population of 500,000 or more, the metropolitan planning organization (MPO), in consultation with the State, is responsible for designating the CUFCs.
- In an urbanized area with a population of less than 500,000, the State, in consultation with the MPO, is responsible for designating the CUFCs.

Note that if a project is on the PHFS, no CUFC/CRFC designation is required. For others the following CUFC/CRFC nominating process will apply.
Process for CUFC/CRFC Designation in California

To initiate the complex coordination process Caltrans reached out to all regional partners in Oct 2016, first to form a Technical Working Group (TWG), who then met over several months to agree upon a process for the ongoing/rolling designations. The TWG reached a statewide consensus that each MPO be provided a certain “initial target allocation” out of the 311 CUFC miles, with the flexibility of temporarily increasing their target allocation by “trading miles” with donor agencies, based on needs and facilitated by Caltrans. There is no regional “target allocation” for CRFCs and Caltrans will oversee statewide distribution of CRFCs working with all regional agencies. We anticipate this process to continue for multiple years. For the target allocations for CUFC, after reviewing several potential options, the MPO subcommittee developed a formula based on a 75% weight for the urbanized area populations and 25% weight on the Proportion of PHFS (see Table 1).

Table 1. CUFC Target Miles and Caltrans Role in Managing the CUFC Target Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPO</th>
<th>Target Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMBAG</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAG</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCOG</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCAG</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCOG</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCAG</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCTC</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>65.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG</td>
<td>18.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANDAG</td>
<td>28.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCAG</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>160.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td>7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOCOG</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRTA</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StanCOG</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TCAG</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Total</td>
<td>311.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caltrans Office of Freight Planning will develop a statewide critical freight corridors inventory (Scoreboard) which will include:
- A publicly available GIS mapping and a database of all critical freight corridor mileage
- A historical record of designated and de-designated miles will be maintained in GIS
After the initial CUFC designation cycle, the Technical Working Group (TWG) will reconvene every quarter to review the status of the freight network, and may also update this guide as needed.

The initial CUFC allocation in Table 1 is more of a target for the purposes of soliciting CUFC mileage nominations. There will likely need to be a trading process between regions that Caltrans should oversee.

**GIS Process**
Refer to this web page for detailed instruction on the GIS process
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ogm/gisdata.html

**CUFC “ON” Process**
- The MPOs identify needed CUFC miles based upon available target miles for each region and the need to apply those miles to a project for funding allocation or FASTLANE/INFRA grant eligibility.
- The MPOs assign miles to a Project when CTC approves of a project and has approved obligation of funds (funds approved) or as needed for FASTLANE/INFRA grant eligibility; the MPO’s advise Caltrans of this and request concurrence.
- Upon receipt of concurrence letter (within 15 days of request), MPOs submit nominations directly to FHWA for UZAs with population of 500,000 or more within MPO boundaries. For UZAs with population under 500,000, MPOs submit nominations to Caltrans for official submittal to FHWA.
- Caltrans adjusts CUFC target miles on the scoreboard.

**NOTE:** Although large MPOs are technically only responsible for designating miles within the UZAs with population of 500,000 or more, they will nominate ALL urban miles within MPO boundaries, and seek concurrence from Caltrans. Caltrans will provide concurrence based on statewide and interregional plans and policies, for both CUFC and CRFC nominations.

**CUFC “OFF” Process**
- When project funding has been obligated (funds transferred), the MPOs can then de-designate those miles from its respective CUFC target allocation for the region.
- Caltrans adjusts the CUFC scoreboard accordingly.

**CUFC “Swap” Process**
- When a loan of CUFC miles is negotiated from one region to another, CALTRANS shall approve of the swap and also indicate this swap on the publicly posted CUFC scoreboard.
- An official letter requesting the swap will be submitted to Caltrans, followed by an official response from Caltrans.

**CRFC Process**
- Statewide, the 623 CRFC miles will be managed by Caltrans as part of the assignment process.
The “need” for CRFC designations -- based on an initial call for shovel-ready projects –is estimated to be much less than the miles allocated to California. Therefore, Caltrans has proposed a list of criteria to prioritize corridors (if CRFC mileage needs are more than the federally allocated 623 miles). See Appendix for CRFC criteria.

CRFC Assignment
1. The large MPOs and the smaller MPOs similarly submit their CRFC mile request to Caltrans
2. Caltrans then submits requests to FHWA California Division Office
3. Caltrans maintains a CRFC scoreboard similar to the CUFC Scoreboard

Mileage Methodology and Assumptions

Interchanges
- If one of the interchange roads is on the PHFS, no additional miles are required for this interchange project. This includes reconfiguring ramps, widening an overcrossing, signalizing ramps, and/or adding connections to reduce weaving which will improve operations for the mainline particularly if congestion on the ramps/non-PHFS crossing causes queues to extend onto the PHFS. This is consistent with clarification that FHWA provided at the April 3, 2017 meeting of the Technical Working Group.
- If neither of the roads is on the PHFS, project sponsor should measure the distance on the mainline segment that corresponds to the largest project “footprint.” For example, if the interchange project includes adding a new lane on one of the highways in addition to ramp modifications, the CUFC/CRFC would correspond to the distance of the widening component of the project. Per the logic for an interchange on the PHFS, only one of the intersecting roads needs to be designated as a CUFC/CRFC.
- If an interchange project includes significant mainline widening, the portion of the widening beyond the extent of the interchange would need to be designated as a CRFC/CUFC. If the interchange is on the PHFS, then the interchange would be exempt and mileage would only be assigned to the widening portion of the project beyond the interchange extents on a non-PHFS route.
- See Appendix Item 1 for examples of CUFC/CRFC designations for interchange projects.

New Roadway Alignment Projects
Projects that would construct new alignments should use the mileage of the new alignment for the purpose of designating a CUFC/CRFC. If the new alignment is planned to replace a route currently designated as part of the PHFS, no mileage is needed to be assigned to this project.

Roadway Projects Crossing Urban/Rural Boundaries
The urban portion of the project would be assigned CUFC and the rural portion of the project would be assigned CRFC mileage.
**ITS Projects/Non-Traditional Projects/Emission Reduction Projects**
Intangible operational improvements such as ITS projects, incentives for near-zero emission technology or upgrading truck scales require no CUFC/CRFC miles.

**Port Projects**
Statewide, Port Projects (seaport, airport, land port) cannot amount to more than 10% of the State’s entire FAST Act Formula funds. **No CUFC miles should be assigned.**

**Grade Crossing Improvements**
Grade crossing improvements like safety measures associated with implementing rail quiet zones and multimodal infrastructure at rail crossings are not roadway projects. **No CUFC/CRFC miles should be assigned.**

**Grade Separation Projects**
- If the project would separate rail from a roadway that is already the PHFS, **no CUFC/CRFC miles should be assigned.** This is consistent with clarification that FHWA provided at the April 3, 2017 meeting of the Technical Working Group.
- If the project would separate rail from a roadway off of the PHFS, the non-PHFS roadway would need to be designated as CUFC/CRFC and mileage should be measured along the length of the project footprint.
- In both cases, rail grade separation need no CUFC/CRFC.

**Draft Schedule**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Lead Agency</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CUFC/CRFC Guidance Cleared</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>End of April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPOs send nominations for CUFCs for Caltrans concurrence</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans concurrence within 15 days; MPOs submit CUFC nominations to FHWA (directly or via Caltrans per UZA requirement)</td>
<td>Caltrans, MPOs</td>
<td>Rolling – May through TCEP Allocation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans updates online web portal</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPOs/RTPAs send nominations to Caltrans for CRFCs</td>
<td>MPOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans sends CRFC nominations to FHWA; Caltrans sends CUFC nominations to FHWA for UZAs with pop between 50K and 500K</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG meets quarterly for subsequent rolling designations</td>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Jan 2018 - beyond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*TCEP allocation date dependent on CTC schedule

**Appendix Materials**
- Example of Interchange Application
- Caltrans Concurrence Criteria
- Caltrans Concurrence Letter (sample)
- Caltrans Nomination Form to FHWA (sample)
Example of Interchange Application

Figure 1 Example of Interchange Project on the PHFS - No Additional Miles Needed

Figure 2 Example Interchange Project not on the PHFS and includes mainline widening - Only One Mainline Segment Required for Designation, corresponding to the distance of the widening
Caltrans Concurrence Criteria

CALTRANS’ PROPOSED PRIORITIZATION CRITERIA FOR CRFC (IF CRFC DESIGNATION NEEDS ARE MORE THAN THE FEDERALLY ALLOCATED 623 MILES)

FROM EXISTING PLANS/PROGRAMS, SUCH AS:
  a) FAST Act, NMFN factors, and NHFP eligible project types
  b) MAP-21: Performance Measures
  c) CFMP 2014 Tiers
  d) ITSP 2015 Corridors
  e) CSFAP 2016 Goals

EXPLORE TECHNICAL CRITERIA, SUCH AS:
  a) Truck volume ADT
  b) Truck Hours of Delay
  c) Freight: tonnage, value, volume, expediency, etc.
  d) Route Asset Conditions: bridges, pavement, and design geometrics
  e) Others: regions with high production, equity, air quality, VMT, safety, etc.
STATEMENT: As required by 23 U.S.C 167(g), and other pertinent Federal regulations, this submittal identifies critical freight corridors in accordance with the current FHWA guidance covering the designation and certification requirements.

CRITICAL URBAN FREIGHT CORRIDOR (CUFC) CALTRANS CONSULTATION

I hereby acknowledge that the public roads submitted meet the requirements of 23 U.S.C. 167(f) as designated CUFC routes and connectors.

The applicable consultation requirements under 23 U.S.C. 167(f) (1) or (2) have been satisfied, and the length in centerline mileage is accurate and does not exceed the maximum mileage limit, the designated freight corridors have been identified, and that the appropriate stakeholder groups have been consulted, and (as of December 4, 2017) that the freight corridors have been, or will be incorporated into the State Freight Plan prior to FHWA authorizing the use of Federal funds.

Caltrans supports the CUFC submittal to FHWA by (MPO).

Dated at , this day of , 2

Sincerely,
Figure 2

Designated CRFC and CUFC Routes and Connectors
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