M e m o r a n d u m

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS

CTC Meeting: August 27, 2015

Reference No.: 4.7
Action

From: WILL KEMPTON
Executive Director

Subject: **ADOPTION OF THE 2016 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) GUIDELINES**
RESOLUTION G-15-18

ISSUE:

The Commission is required to adopt guidelines for the development of the STIP.

RECOMMENDATION:

Commission staff recommends that the Commission adopt the attached 2016 STIP Guidelines presented at the 2016 STIP Guidelines Hearing (reference number 4.x). These guidelines include both guidelines specific to the 2016 STIP cycle and amendments to the permanent guidelines.

BACKGROUND:

Statute (Senate Bill 45, 1997) calls for the Commission to adopt STIP guidelines to serve as "the complete and full statement of the policy, standards and criteria that the Commission intends to use in selecting projects to be included in the state transportation improvement program." The guidelines are developed in cooperation with the Department of Transportation (Caltrans), regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions and local agencies in accordance with Government Code 14530.1.

The statutes further authorize the Commission to amend the adopted guidelines after conducting at least one public hearing. The STIP Guidelines were most recently amended on August 6, 2013. The statutes call for the Commission to make a reasonable effort to adopt guidelines amendments prior to the adoption of the fund estimate. In no event may the Commission change its guidelines during the period between 30 days after the fund estimate adoption and the STIP adoption.

The Draft 2016 STIP Guidelines were presented at the June 25, 2015 Commission meeting. Commission staff held a workshop on the proposed guidelines on July 23, 2015, and a hearing on August 27, 2015.

Attachment

August 27, 2015

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Amendment of STIP Guidelines

RESOLUTION G-15-18
Amending Resolution G-13-17

1.1 WHEREAS Government Code Section 14530.1 requires the California Transportation Commission to adopt guidelines for the development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and permits the Commission to amend the guidelines after conducting a public hearing, and

1.2 WHEREAS the Commission last amended the STIP Guidelines on August 6, 2013 (Resolution G-13-17), and

1.3 WHEREAS Section 14530.1 requires the Commission to make a reasonable effort to adopt the amended guidelines prior to its adoption of the fund estimate pursuant to Section 14525 and, in no event, to amend the guidelines during the period commencing 30 days after the fund estimate and before the adoption of the STIP, and

1.4 WHEREAS the Commission intends to adopt the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate on August 27, 2015, and

1.5 WHEREAS the draft STIP Guidelines were presented at the June 25, 2015 Commission meeting and the July 23, 2015 workshop, and the Commission held hearings on the draft Guidelines on August 27, 2015, and

1.6 WHEREAS Senate Bill 486, signed by the Governor on September 30, 2014, gave the Commission responsibility for adopting the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), and

1.7 WHEREAS Executive Order B-30-15, issued by the Governor on April 29, 2015, requires state agencies to implement measures, pursuant to statutory authority, to achieve reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to meet the 2030 and 2050 greenhouse gas emissions reductions targets,

2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the amendments to the STIP Guidelines, as presented by Commission staff on August 27, 2015, and

2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the attached amendments to the policies and procedures specific to the 2016 STIP, and

2.3 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends to apply these amended guidelines, as appropriate, when programming and allocating SHOPP projects, and

2.4 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission intends to work with the Department and regional agencies to develop tools, such as benefit/cost models, for use in evaluating proposed projects consistent with Executive Order B-30-15, and

2.5 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission requests that the Department, in cooperation with Commission staff, distribute copies of the STIP Guidelines, as amended, together with the policies and procedures specific to the 2016 STIP, to regional agencies, county transportation commissions, and representatives of local agencies and transit agencies.

Attachment

Attachment to Resolution G-15-18

STIP Guidelines
Policies and Procedures Specific to the 2016 STIP

The following specific policies and procedures address the particular circumstances of the 2016 STIP:

- Schedule. The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2016 STIP:

Caltrans presents draft Fund Estimate	June 25, 2015
STIP Guidelines & Fund Estimate Workshop	July 23, 2015
CTC adopts Fund Estimate & Guidelines	August 27, 2015
Caltrans identifies State highway needs	September 15, 2015
Caltrans submits draft ITIP	October 15, 2015
CTC ITIP hearing, North	October 28, 2015
CTC ITIP hearing, South	November 4, 2015
Regions submit RTIPs	December 15, 2015
Caltrans submits final ITIP	December 15, 2015
CTC STIP hearing, North	January 21, 2016
CTC STIP hearing, South	January 26, 2016
CTC publishes staff recommendations	February 19, 2016
CTC adopts STIP	March 16-17, 2016

- Statewide Fund Estimate. The statewide capacity for the 2016 STIP Fund Estimate identifies net new capacity only in the two years added to the STIP, 2019-20 and 2020-21, with decreases in capacity in earlier years. The decreases in capacity are due mainly to the decrease in the price based excise tax. The estimate incorporates the 2015-16 Budget Act and other 2015 legislation enacted prior to the Fund Estimate adoption. Programming in the 2016 STIP will be constrained by fiscal year, with most new programming in the two years added to the STIP, 2019-20 and 2020-21.

- County shares and targets. **The 2016 Fund Estimate indicates that the STIP is already fully programmed for the entire 5 years of the 2016 STIP (there is about $46 million of capacity available in the last year of the STIP period). This is due primarily to the decrease in the price based excise tax. Projects currently programmed in the STIP will need to be reprogrammed into later years.**

  ~~The Fund Estimate tables of county shares and targets take into account all county and interregional share balances on June 30, 2015. For each county and the interregional share, the table identifies the following amounts:~~

  - ~~Base (minimum). This is the share for each county and the interregional program through 2019-20, the end of the county share period that falls within the 2016 STIP period. The base is calculated as the sum of the share balance through the June 2015 Commission meeting and the STIP formula share of the statewide new capacity available through 2019-20. In accordance with statute and the STIP Guidelines, the Commission will program all RTIP proposals that fall within this amount unless it rejects the RTIP in its entirety.~~

- ~~Total Target. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of all new capacity through 2020-21. The Total Target is not a minimum, guarantee, or limit on project nominations or on project selection in any county or region for the 2016 STIP.~~
- ~~Maximum. This target is determined by estimating the STIP formula share of all available new capacity through the end of the county share period in 2023-24. This represents the maximum amount that the Commission may program in a county, other than advancing future shares, pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 188.8(j), to a county with a population of under 1 million.~~

- **Reprogramming of current year projects**. **In a departure from the general rule in the STIP Guidelines, projects programmed in 2015-16, including projects from prior years that have allocation extensions, may be reprogrammed to a later fiscal year if they are on the list of delivered projects or if they have been granted, prior to adoption of the Fund Estimate, an extension of the allocation period that expires after the adoption of the 2016 STIP. In addition, projects programmed in 2015-16 may be proposed for delay in the RTIP or ITIP submitted by December 15, 2015.**

- **Submittal of RTIPS. The Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) Group has voluntarily developed a template for submittal of RTIPs, and encourages its use by regions for the 2016 STIP. The purpose of the template is to make RTIP submittals more consistent statewide and to present a visualization tool ~~which~~ that provides information in an organized and transparent manner. The RTIP template includes, but is not limited to, the following: contact information, a summary of previously completed RTIP projects, information on how regions are delivering projects and meeting state and federal goals, a public participation summary, a description of the relationship between the RTIP and the adopted RTP/SCS, and a description of the performance and effectiveness of the RTIP. ~~The template will be available for download prior to August 27, 2015 at http://calrtpa.wordpress.com.~~**

- Transit and Rail Projects. ~~While PTA program capacity has been eliminated, a~~ **A** region may ~~still~~ nominate transit and rail projects in its RTIP within State Highway Account (SHA) and Federal funding constraints **(rolling stock may only be funded with Federal funds)**. **As indicated in the fund estimate, a small amount of PTA funds is available to fund transit and rail projects. A region nominating a project that requires PTA funding because it does not meet SHA or Federal requirements must clearly explain this requirement in its RTIP.**

- Bicycle and Pedestrian projects. Existing bicycle and pedestrian projects may remain in the STIP so long as they are eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds.

- Limitations on planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM). The fund estimate includes a table of PPM limitations that identifies the 5% limit for county shares for 2016-17 through 2020-21, based upon the 2012, 2014, and 2016 Fund Estimates. These are the amounts against which the 5% is applied. The PPM limitation is a limit to the amount that can be programmed in any region and is not in addition to amounts already programmed.

- Advance Project Development Element (APDE). There is no APDE identified for the 2016 STIP.

- GARVEE bonding and AB 3090 commitments. The Commission will not consider proposals for either GARVEE bonding or new AB 3090 commitments as part of the 2016 STIP. The Commission will consider AB 3090 or GARVEE bonding proposals as amendments to the STIP after the initial adoption. Commission staff will maintain an "AB 3090 Plan" which will include projects for which regions intend to request an AB 3090 reimbursement in order to advance the project into 2016-17, 2017-18, or 2018-19. The inclusion of a project on the list is not a commitment by the regional agency to request an AB 3090 reimbursement, an endorsement or recommendation by Commission staff, or an approval by the Commission.

- Caltrans Benefit/Cost Model. The 2016 STIP Guidelines continue the requirement for project-level evaluations including use of Caltrans' Benefit/Cost Model. Caltrans has developed a model for bicycle and pedestrian projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the regional and state level.

- Commission expectations and priorities. The 2016 Fund Estimate indicates that the 2014 STIP is over-programmed in the early years. Some of this over-programming will likely be resolved through the schedule updates which occur each STIP cycle. However, some projects currently programmed in the STIP may need to be delayed (reprogrammed into a later year).

  For the 2016 STIP, the Commission expects to give first priority to the reprogramming of projects from the 2014 STIP, as amended.

  The selection of projects for additional programming will be consistent with the standards and criteria in section 61 of the STIP guidelines. In particular, the Commission intends to focus on RTIP proposals that meet State highway improvement and intercity rail needs as described in section 20 of the guidelines. The Department should provide a list of the identified state highway and intercity rail needs to regional agencies and to the Commission by September 15, 2015. Should the Department fail to provide a region and the Commission with this information, the Commission intends to assume there are no unmet state highway or intercity rail needs in that region.

  California has been in a historic drought and Governor Brown proclaimed a state of emergency on January 17, 2014. In addition, the Governor issued statewide mandatory water reductions on April 1, 2015. Therefore, it is the intent of the Commission that any landscape projects currently programmed but not yet allocated and awarded, or any new landscape projects, will include drought tolerant plants and irrigation consistent with the Governor's actions.

  Governor Brown issued Executive Order B-30-15 on April 29, 2015, related to climate change and ordering that a new interim statewide greenhouse gas emission reduction target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 is established. The order states that State agencies shall take climate change into account in their planning and investment decisions, and employ full life-cycle cost accounting to evaluate and compare infrastructure investments and alternatives. In addition, State agencies' planning and investment shall be guided by the following principles:

- **Priority should be given to actions that both build climate preparedness and reduce greenhouse gas emissions;**
- **Where possible, flexible and adaptive approaches should be taken to prepare for uncertain climate impacts;**
- **Actions should protect the state's most vulnerable populations; and**
- **Natural infrastructure solutions should be prioritized.**

Executive Order B-30-15 must be considered by the Department and Regional Agencies when proposing new programming for the 2016 STIP. The Commission intends to consider Executive Order B-30-15 when approving programming recommendations in the event that programming requests exceed programming capacity.

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

STIP GUIDELINES
August 27, 2015

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STIP GUIDELINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

Section 1. Purpose and Authority 1
Section 2. Biennial Fund Estimate 1
Section 3. STIP Adoption 1
Section 4. Amendments to STIP Guidelines 2
Section 5. Federal TIPs and Federal STIP 2

II. STIP Contents

Section 6. General 2
Section 7. County and Interregional Shares 2
Section 8. Joint Funding 2
Section 9. Prior Year Projects 3
Section 10. 1996 STIP Projects 3
Section 11. Multi-Modal Corridors 3
Section **12**. Transportation Management System Improvements 3
Section **13A**. Capacity Increasing Highway Operational Improvements 4
Section **13B**. Non-Capacity Increasing Highway Operational Improvements 4

III. STIP Requirements for All Projects

Section 14. Project Study Reports (PSRs) 5
Section 15. Programming Project Components Sequentially 5
Section 16. Completion of Environmental Process 6
Section 17. Caltrans/Regional Consultations 6
Section 18. Minor Projects 7
Section 19. Criteria for Measuring Performance and Cost-Effectiveness 7

IV. Regional Improvement Program

Section 20. Submittal of RTIPs 13
Section 21. Project Planning, Programming, and Monitoring 14
Section 22. ~~Transportation Enhancement (TE)~~ **Bicycle and Pedestrian** Projects in the RTIP 14
Section 23. County Shares, Advances and Reserves 14
Section 24. Federal Match 15
~~Section 24A. Transportation Enhancement (TE) Reserve ..... 12~~
Section 25. Regional Improvement Program Project Eligibility 15
Section 26. Federalizing Transit Projects 17
Section 27. Increased STIP Funding Participation 17
Section 28. Pooling of County Shares 17
Section 29. Consistency with Land Use Plans and CMP 18

V. Interregional Improvement Program
Section 30. General 18
Section 31. Submittal of Caltrans ITIP 19
Section 32. Regional Recommendations for the Interregional Program 20
Section 33. Regional Transportation Plan 20
Section 34. Interregional Program Objectives 21
Section 35. ~~Transportation Enhancement (TE)~~ **Bicycle and Pedestrian** Projects in the ITIP 23
Section 36. Projects and Reserves 24

VI. Advance Project Development Element
Section 37. Fund Estimate for Advance Project Development Element 24
Section 38. Programming of APDE County and Interregional Shares 24
Section 39. Program Year 24
Section 40. Program Amendments 24
Section 41. Effect on Regular County and Interregional Shares 24
Section 42. APDE Shares May Not Be Exceeded 25

VII. Display of Project Descriptions and Costs
Section 43. Project Description 25
Section 44. State-only Funding 25
Section 45. Project Fact Sheets 26
Section 46. STIP Database 26
Section 47. Cost Estimates for Project Components 26
Section 48. Authority and Responsibility 27
Section 49. Basis for Cost Sharing 27
Section 50. Program Year for Cost Components 27
Section 51. Escalation Adjustments 28
Section 52. Prior Costs for 1996 STIP Projects 28

VIII. Share Balances and Adjustments
Section 53. Long-term Balances 28
Section 54. Local Grant Projects 28
Section 55. Construction 29
Section ~~55A~~**56**. Construction Support 29
Section ~~56~~**57**. Right-of-Way 29
Section ~~57~~**58**. Project Development 30
~~Section 58. Corridor Projects ....26~~
Section 59. Federal Demonstration Projects 30

IX. Commission Action and Adoption
Section 60. Commission Action on RTIP Proposals 31
Section 61. Commission Action on Advances and Reserves 32
Section 62. Commission Action on Interregional Program 33
Section 63. STIP Respreading of Projects 33

X. STIP Management
Section 64. Allocation of Funds 33
Section 64A. Reimbursement Allocations 35
Section 65. Timely Use of Funds 36
Section 66. Delivery Deadline Extensions 38
Section 67. STIP Amendments 38
Section 67A. Approval of AB 3090 Arrangements 39
Section 67B. Selection of Projects for GARVEE Bonding 41
Section 68. Project Delivery 42

XI. STIP Development Schedule and Procedures
Section 69. STIP Development Schedule 43
Section 70. ITIP Hearings 43
Section 71. STIP Hearings 43
Section ~~71~~**72. Transmittal of RTIPs** 43
Section ~~72~~**73. Commission Staff recommendations** 44

XII. Appendices
Appendix A. Project Fact Sheet 45
Appendix B Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions 46
Appendix C. Addendum for Local Alternative Transportation Improvement Programs 54

I. Introduction:

1. Purpose and Authority. These guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the state transportation improvement program (STIP). They were developed and adopted in cooperation with Caltrans, regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions and local agencies in accordance with Government Code Section 14530.1. The guidelines were developed and adopted with the following basic objectives:

   - Develop and manage the STIP as a resource management document.
   - Facilitate transportation decision making by those who are closest to the transportation problems.
   - Recognize that although Caltrans is owner-operator of the State highway system, the regional agencies have the lead responsibility for resolving urban congestion problems, including those on state highways.
   - Provide incentives for regional accountability for the timely use of funds.
   - Facilitate the California Transportation Commission, and Caltrans role as guardian of State capital dollars, with responsibility for determining how best to manage those dollars in a wise and cost-effective manner.
   - Facilitate cooperative programming and funding ventures between regions and between Caltrans and regions.
   - **Recognize regional and statewide goals and objectives in the improvements of the state's multi-modal transportation system.**
   - **Emphasize partnerships between Caltrans and regional agencies in making investment decisions addressing the most critical corridor needs, regardless of mode choice or system condition.**

   The Commission intends to carry out these objectives through its guidelines, stressing accountability, flexibility, and simplicity.

2. Biennial Fund Estimate. By July 15 of each odd numbered year Caltrans shall submit to the Commission a proposed fund estimate for the following five-year STIP period. The Commission shall adopt the fund estimate by August 15 of that same year. The assumptions on which the fund estimate is based shall be determined by the Commission in consultation with Caltrans, regional agencies and county transportation commissions.

3. STIP Adoption. Not later than April 1 of each even numbered year the Commission shall adopt a five-year STIP and submit it to the legislature and to the Governor. The STIP shall be a statement of the Commission's intent for allocation and expenditure of funds for the following five years as well as a resource management document to assist in the planning and utilization of transportation resources in a cost-effective manner. The STIP shall be developed consistent with the fund estimate and the total amount programmed in each fiscal year of the STIP shall not exceed the amount specified in the fund estimate. The adopted STIP shall remain in effect until a new STIP is adopted for the next two year STIP cycle.

4. Amendments to STIP Guidelines. The Commission may amend the adopted STIP guidelines after first giving notice of the proposed amendment and conducting at least one public hearing. The guidelines may not be amended or modified during the period between thirty days following the adoption of the fund estimate and the adoption of the STIP.

5. Federal TIPs and Federal STIP. These guidelines apply only to the transportation programming requirements specified in state statutes. They do not apply to transportation programming requirements specified in federal statutes. Generally, all projects receiving federal transportation funds must be programmed in a federal TIP (for projects in urbanized regions) and also in a federal STIP. Metropolitan Planning Organizations are responsible for developing and adopting federal TIPs and Caltrans is responsible for preparing the federal STIP. The requirements for federal TIPs and the federal STIP are specified in federal statutes (Title 23 USC) and federal regulations (23 CFR part 450).

II. STIP Contents:

6. General. The STIP is a biennial document adopted no later than April 1 of each even numbered year. Each STIP will cover a five year period and add two new years of programming capacity. Each new STIP will include projects carried forward from the previous STIP plus new projects and reserves from among those proposed by regional agencies in their regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs) and by Caltrans in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP). State highway project costs in the STIP will include all Caltrans project support costs and all project listings will specify costs for each of the following four components: (1) completion of all permits and environmental studies; (2) preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates; (3) right-of-way acquisition; and (4) construction and construction management and engineering, including surveys and inspection. (See Sections 47 and 50 of these guidelines for guidance on the display of project components and their costs.)

7. County and Interregional Shares. The STIP consists of two broad programs, the regional program funded from 75% of new STIP funding and the interregional program funded from 25% of new STIP funding. The 75% regional program is further subdivided by formula into county shares. County shares are available solely for projects nominated by regions in their RTIPs. The Caltrans ITIP will nominate only projects for the interregional program. Under restricted circumstances, an RTIP may also recommend a project for funding from the interregional share (see Section 32 of these guidelines).

   The 1998 STIP period constituted a single county share period ending 2003-04; later county share periods are discrete 4-year periods, ending 2007-08, 2011-12, 2015-16, etc. Both surpluses and deficits of county shares and interregional shares carry forward from one period to the next. The Commission will program each new project, including Caltrans support costs, either from a county share or from the interregional share. (See Sections 53-59 of these guidelines for the method of counting cost changes after initial programming.)

8. Joint Funding from Regional and Interregional Shares. If Caltrans and a regional agency agree, they may recommend that a new project or a project cost increase be jointly funded

from county and interregional shares. In that case, the region will nominate the county share in the RTIP and Caltrans will nominate the interregional share in the ITIP.

9. Prior Year Projects. The STIP shall include projects from the prior STIP that are expected to be advertised prior to July 1 of the year of adoption, but for which the Commission has not yet allocated funds.

10. 1996 STIP Projects. All 1996 STIP project costs will be funded off the top prior to the division of new funds between the regional and interregional programs. This grandfathered funding will include Caltrans support costs, and the project cost display for 1996 STIP projects will conform to the same standards used for new STIP projects. Any cost changes to construction or right-of-way capital costs for 1996 STIP projects will be drawn from or credited to county and interregional shares the same as if they were cost changes to new STIP projects. Caltrans support costs for 1996 STIP projects will be drawn from county and interregional shares only to the extent that they are attributable to a change in project scope since the 1996 STIP. Except where there is a proposal for jointly funding a cost increase from county and interregional shares, cost changes that Caltrans requests for projects originally programmed under the former intercity rail, interregional road system, or retrofit soundwall programs or for NAFTA projects programmed in the 1996 STIP will be drawn from or credited to the new interregional share. All other cost changes will be drawn from or credited to the appropriate regional share. Caltrans, in the ITIP, shall report on the budgets for all ongoing grandfathered 1996 STIP projects. This reporting shall include a comparison of actual expenditures compared to project budgets as reported in the ~~2010~~ **2014** ITIP.

11. **Multi-Modal Corridor. A corridor is defined as a largely linear geographic band defined by existing and forecasted travel patterns involving both people and goods. The corridor serves a particular travel market or markets affected by similar transportation needs and mobility issues. It includes various modes that provide similar or complementary transportation functions, including cross-mode connections.**

12. Transportation Management System Improvements. The Commission supports implementation and application of transportation management systems (TMS) improvements to address highway congestion and to manage transportation systems. Under current statutes Caltrans is owner operator of the state highway system and is responsible for overall management of the state highway system. The regional transportation agencies are responsible for planning and programming transportation strategies, facilities and improvements which address regional transportation issues and system wide congestion. The Commission encourages the regions and Caltrans to work cooperatively together to plan, program, implement, operate and manage transportation facilities as an integrated system with the objective of maximizing available transportation resources and overall transportation system performance.

    Considering this objective and the respective responsibilities of Caltrans and the regional agencies, it is the Commission's policy that TMS improvements for state highways may be programmed in the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) by Caltrans in consultation with regional agencies if such improvements are part of a region's adopted strategy for addressing system wide congestion. The regions are encouraged to program

TMS improvements in their RTIP for STIP programming if timely programming through the SHOPP is not possible because of funding limitations in the SHOPP. TMS improvements include the following types of projects:

- Transportation Management Centers (TMCs) including necessary computer software and hardware.
- TMC interconnect projects which allow a TMC to substitute for another TMC during an emergency.
- TMC field elements such as, but not limited to, traffic sensors, message signs, cameras and ramp meters, which upgrade the existing facilities and are necessary to facilitate the operation of the TMC.

The application of TMS improvements should be coordinated with other operational improvements such as freeway ramp/local street access modifications and auxiliary lanes in order to maximize the TMS benefits. Prior to programming a new highway facility for construction, reconstruction or rehabilitation in the STIP or in the SHOPP, regions and Caltrans should fully consider transportation systems management plans and needs and include any necessary TMC field elements to support operation of existing or planned TMCs**.**

13A. Capacity Increasing Highway Operational Improvements. State highway operational improvements which expand the design capacity of the system such as those listed below are not eligible for the SHOPP. To the extent such projects address regional issues, the regional agency is responsible for nominating them for STIP programming through the RTIP process. To the extent such projects address interregional issues, Caltrans is responsible for nominating them for STIP programming through the ITIP process.

1. High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes and HOV interchanges.
2. Interchange design modifications and upgrades to accommodate traffic volumes that are significantly larger than the existing facility was designed for.
3. Truck or slow vehicle lanes on freeways of six or more mixed flow lanes.

13B. Non-Capacity Increasing Highway Operational Improvements. State highway operational improvements which do not expand the design capacity of the system and which are intended to address spot congestion and are not directly related to TMCs or TMC field elements are eligible for the SHOPP. Regions may nominate these types of projects for STIP programming through the RTIP process if timely implementation through the SHOPP is not possible. Examples of such projects include:

1. Auxiliary lanes for merging or weaving between adjacent interchanges.
2. Intersection modifications including traffic signals.
3. Slow vehicle lanes on conventional highways and four lane freeways.
4. Curve and vertical alignment corrections.
5. Two-way left turn lanes.
6. Channelization.
7. Turnouts.
8. Chain control and truck brake inspection sites.
9. Shoulder widening.

III. STIP Requirements for All Projects:

14. Project Study Reports. A new project may not be included in either an RTIP or the ITIP without a complete project study report (PSR) or, for a project that is not on a State highway, a PSR equivalent. This requirement applies to the programming of project development components as well as to right-of-way and construction. This requirement does not apply to the programming of project planning, programming, and monitoring funds. A PSR is a report that meets the standards of the Commission's PSR guidelines. For a Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) project, a TCRP project application is a PSR for the phases of work included in the application. For a transit project, the Commission's Uniform Transit Application is a PSR equivalent. A project study report equivalent will, at a minimum, be adequate to define and justify the project scope, cost and schedule to the satisfaction of the regional agency. Though a PSR or equivalent may focus on the project components proposed for programming, it must provide at least a preliminary estimate of costs for all components. The PSR, ~~or~~ PSR equivalent, **or Project Report** ~~need not~~ **must** be submitted with the RTIP or ITIP, **or a link may be provided to view the document electronically**. ~~However, the Commission or its staff may request copies of a project's report to document the project's cost or deliverability.~~

15. Programming Project Components Sequentially. Project components may be programmed sequentially. That is, a project may be programmed for environmental work only without being programmed for plans, specifications, and estimates (design). A project may be programmed for design without being programmed for right-of-way or construction. A project may be programmed for right-of-way without being programmed for construction. The Commission recognizes a particular benefit in programming projects for environmental work only, since project costs and particularly project scheduling often cannot be determined with meaningful accuracy until environmental studies have been completed. The premature programming of post-environmental components can needlessly tie up STIP programming resources while other transportation needs go unmet.

    The Commission will program a project component only if it finds that the component itself is fully funded, either from STIP funds or from other committed funds. The Commission will regard non-STIP funds as committed when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For Federal formula funds, including RSTP, CMAQ, and Federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by Federal TIP adoption. For **projects where the agency is seeking f**ederal discretionary funds such as New Starts or Small Starts **for construction**, the commitment may **take the form of federal acceptance into Accelerated Project Delivery and Development (in the case of Small Starts) with the expectation of federal approval of an Expedited Grant Agreement, or federal approval of a project to enter Engineering (in the case of New Starts) with the expectation of federal approval of a Full Funding Grant Agreement, as long as all funding, excluding STIP funding, is committed to the project.**~~, the commitment may be by Federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval~~. **A project that is programmed prior to receiving federal approval for construction must receive the federal approval for construction prior to construction**

allocation and no later than the end of the first full federal fiscal year after adoption of the STIP or STIP amendment, or the project will be deleted from the STIP.

When proposing to program only preconstruction components for a project, Caltrans or the regional agency should demonstrate the means by which it intends to fund the construction of a useable segment, consistent with the regional transportation plan or the Caltrans interregional transportation strategic plan.

All regional agencies with rail transit projects shall submit full funding plans describing each overall project and/or useable project segment. Each plan shall list Federal, State, and local funding categories by fiscal year over the time-frame that funding is sought, including funding for initial operating costs. Moreover, should the project schedule exceed the funding horizon, then the amount needed beyond what is currently requested shall be indicated. This information may be incorporated in the project fact sheets (see Section 45 of these guidelines).

16. Completion of Environmental Process. The Commission may program funding for project right-of-way or construction only if it finds that the sponsoring agency will complete the environmental process and can proceed with right-of-way acquisition or construction within the five-year period of the STIP. In compliance with Section 21150 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission may not allocate funds to local agencies for design, right-of-way, or construction prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a matter of policy, the Commission will not allocate funds for design, right-of-way, or construction of a federally funded project prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Exceptions to this policy may be made in instances where federal law allows for the acquisition of right-of-way prior to completion of National Environmental Policy Act review.

17. Caltrans/Regional Consultations. Caltrans and regional agencies shall consult with each other in the development of the ITIP and the RTIPs. As a part of this consultation, Caltrans will advise regional agencies, as far in advance as is practicable, of projects that may be or are likely to be included in the ITIP, including the potential for joint funding from county and interregional shares, and will seek the advice of the regional agencies regarding these projects. The consultation should allow regional agencies to consider and to advise Caltrans regarding the potential impact of the ITIP on the programming of projects in the RTIP. The Commission encourages Caltrans to assist the regional agencies that are responsible for preparing a Federal TIP by identifying projects that may be included in the ITIP, recognizing that Federal regulations generally require that a project in a county with an urbanized area be included in the Federal TIP in order to qualify for Federal funding.

As part of this consultation, each regional agency should seek and consider the advice of Caltrans regarding potential regional program funding for State highway and intercity rail projects and should advise Caltrans, as far in advance as is practicable, of staff recommendations or other indications of projects that may be or are likely to be included in the RTIP. The consultation should allow Caltrans to consider and advise the regional agency regarding the potential impact of the RTIP on the programming of projects in the ITIP.

Where the regional agency prepares a Federal TIP, the consultation should provide for the timely inclusion of State highway projects in the Federal TIP.

Nothing in this section is meant to require that Caltrans or a regional agency make final commitments regarding the inclusion of particular projects in the ITIP or RTIP in advance of the December 15 deadline for submission.

18. Minor Projects. There is no minimum size for a STIP project. The minor reserve in the Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) is for SHOPP projects only. The Commission will not allocate funds from the SHOPP minor program for capacity-increasing projects, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, soundwalls, and enhancements and mitigation for STIP projects.

19. Criteria for Measuring Performance and Cost-Effectiveness. **Regions and Caltrans are responsible for developing goals, objectives and priorities that include consideration of the overall performance of the transportation system consistent with federal and state planning requirements. These goals and objectives are incorporated in the region's regional transportation plan (RTP) and are also reflected in the region's RTIP, and similarly in Caltrans' interregional transportation strategic plan (ITSP) and ITIP.** In order to maximize the state's investments in transportation infrastructure, it is the Commission's policy that each RTIP and the ITIP will be evaluated~~, as they are developed,~~ for performance and cost-effectiveness at the **regional** ~~system~~ level and, **where applicable**, at the project level ~~where appropriate~~.

The Commission will evaluate each RTIP and the ITIP based on the following:

A. A performance evaluation at the regional level and how each RTIP furthers the goals of the region's RTP, and if applicable, its Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS), and for Caltrans, how the ITIP furthers the goals of the ~~California Transportation Plan (CTP) and the~~ ITSP.

B. An evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the RTIP at the regional level or ITIP at the statewide level.

C. Project specific data on proposed changes to the built environment. For projects with total cost of $50 million or greater, or STIP programming for right-of-way and/or construction of $15 million or more, a project specific benefit evaluation will be performed to estimate its benefit to the regional system from changes to the built environment. Consistent with Executive Order B-30-15, the project specific benefit evaluation must include a full life-cycle cost evaluation and take climate change impacts into account.

The Commission will consider the evaluations submitted by regions when making decisions on RTIPs as described in Section 60 of these guidelines. The Commission will consider the evaluations submitted by Caltrans when making decisions on the ITIP as described in Section 62 of these guidelines.

The Commission expects that these evaluations will be on a life-cycle basis (full cost through the life of the project, including maintenance and operation).

A. <u>Regional level performance evaluation.</u>

Caltrans and each region that is a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) or within an MPO shall include an evaluation of overall (RTP or CTP/ITSP level) performance using, as a baseline, the regions' or state's existing monitored data. To the extent relevant data and tools are available, the below listed performance measures may be reported:

- **Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.**
- **Percent of congested VMT (at or below 35 mph).**
- **Commute mode share (travel to work or school).**
- **Percent of distressed state highway lane-miles.**
- **Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads).**
- **Percent of highway bridge lane-miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (sufficiency rating of 80 or below).**
- **Percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period.**
- **Highway Buffer Index (the extra time cushion that most travelers add to their average travel time when planning trips to ensure on-time arrival).**
- **Fatalities and serious injuries per capita.**
- **Fatalities and serious injuries per VMT.**
- **Percent of housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service.**
- **Mean commute travel time (to work or school).**
- **Change in acres of agricultural land.**
- **CO_2 emissions reduction per capita.**

Regions outside a MPO shall include any of the above measures that the region currently monitors. A region outside a MPO (or a small MPO) may request, and Caltrans shall provide, data on these measures relative to the state transportation system in that region.

As an alternative, a region outside a MPO (or a small MPO) may use the Performance Monitoring Indicators identified in the Rural Counties Task Force's Rural and Small Urban Transportation Planning study dated June 3, 2015. These include: Total Accident Cost, Total Transit Operating Cost per Revenue Mile, Total Distressed Lane Miles, and Land Use Efficiency (total developed land in acres per population).

The evaluation of overall performance shall include a qualitative or quantitative assessment of how effective the RTIP or the ITIP is in addressing or achieving the goals, objectives and standards which correspond to the relevant horizon years within the region's RTP or Caltrans ITSP that covers the 5-year STIP period. Caltrans' evaluation of the ITIP shall also address ITIP consistency with the RTPs.

In addition, each region with an adopted sustainable communities strategy (SCS) shall include a discussion of how the RTIP relates to its SCS. This will include a quantitative or qualitative assessment of how the RTIP will facilitate implementation of the SCS and also identify any challenges the region is facing in implementing its SCS. In a region served by a multi-county transportation planning organization, the report shall address the portion of the SCS relevant to that region. As part of this discussion, each region shall identify any proposed or current STIP projects that are exempt from SB 375.

B. <u>Evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of the RTIP or ITIP.</u>

Regions shall, if appropriate and to the extent necessary data and tools are available, use the performance measures outlined above to evaluate cost-effectiveness of projects proposed in the STIP on a regional level. Caltrans shall do so at the statewide level.

C. <u>Project-level evaluations.</u>

For each new project proposed, the region or Caltrans shall provide data on the proposed changes to the built environment, including but not limited to the items listed below. Such data shall be included in the PPR.

For state highway projects:

- **New general purpose lane-miles.**
- **New HOV/HOT lane-miles.**
- **Lane-miles rehabilitated.**
- **New bicycle/pedestrian lane/sidewalk miles.**
- **Operation improvements.**
- **New or reconstructed interchanges.**
- **New or reconstructed bridges.**

For intercity rail and rail/transit projects:

- **Additional transit miles or vehicles.**
- **Miles of new track.**
- **Rail crossing improvements.**
- **Station improvements.**

For local street and road projects:

- **New lane-miles.**
- **Lane-miles rehabilitated.**
- **New bicycle/pedestrian lane/sidewalk miles.**
- **Operation improvements.**
- **New or reconstructed bridges.**

A project level benefit evaluation shall be submitted for projects for which construction is proposed, if:

- ~~The proposed STIP programming exceeds 50% of a county's target for new programming (as identified in the fund estimate), or~~

- The total amount of existing and proposed STIP for **right-of-way and/or construction of** the project is $15 million or greater, or
- The total project cost is $50 million or greater.

The project level benefit evaluation shall address the specific benefits of the proposed project using as many of the following measures as are relevant:

- **Change in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per capita.**
- **Change in percent of congested VMT (at or below 35 mph).**
- **Change in commute mode share (travel to work or school).**
- **Change in percent of distressed state highway lane-miles.**
- **Change in Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads).**
- **Change in percent of highway bridge lane-miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below).**
- **Change in percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period.**
- **Change in highway Buffer Index (the extra time cushion that most travelers add to their average travel time when planning trips to ensure on-time arrival).**
- **Change in fatalities and serious injuries per capita.**
- **Change in fatalities and serious injuries per VMT.**
- **Change in percent of housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service.**
- **Change in mean commute travel time (to work or school).**
- **Change in acres of agricultural land.**
- **Change in CO_2 emissions reduction per capita.**

The project level **benefit** evaluation shall include a Caltrans generated benefit/cost estimate, **including life-cycle costs for projects proposed in the ITIP. For the RTIP, the regions may choose between the Caltrans estimate and their own estimate (explain why the Caltrans estimate was not used. The project level evaluation must explain how the project is consistent with Executive Order B-30-15.** ~~and identify the estimated impact the project will have on the annual cost of operating and maintaining the state's transportation system~~. The evaluation ~~should~~ **shall** be conducted by each region and by Caltrans before the RTIPs and the ITIP are submitted to the Commission for incorporation into the STIP. ~~Each RTIP and the ITIP submitted to the Commission will be accompanied by a report on its performance and cost-effectiveness. A project level evaluation shall also be conducted for existing STIP projects with a total project cost of $50 million or greater or a total STIP programmed amount of $15 million or greater if construction is programmed in the STIP and CEQA was completed for the project after a region adopted its 2012 RTIP or, for Caltrans, after submittal of the 2012 ITIP.~~

~~Regional agencies and Caltrans will, as part of the transportation planning and programming process, monitor transportation systems and projects for performance and provide performance forecasts for use in evaluation of RTIPs and the ITIP. As performance measurement concepts and techniques continue to mature, updated guidance may be provided in future STIP guidelines.~~

~~The Commission will consider the evaluations submitted by regions when making decisions on RTIPs as described in Section 60 of these guidelines. The Commission will consider the evaluation submitted by Caltrans when making decisions on the ITIP as described in Section 62 of these guidelines.~~

~~The evaluation report should clearly demonstrate how effective the RTIP or the ITIP is in addressing or achieving the goals, objectives and standards which are established as part of the respective regional transportation plan (RTP) or Caltrans' Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). The purpose of the evaluation report is to assess the performance and cost effectiveness of each RTIP and the ITIP based on its own merits, not to attempt a comparative assessment between individual RTIPs or RTIPs and the ITIP. RTIP evaluations should also address how the RTIP relates to the ITSP at key points of interregional system connectivity. Caltrans' evaluation of the ITIP should address ITIP consistency with the RTPs. Each region is responsible for establishing transportation goals, and the objectives of its RTP that are reflected in its RTIP. However, each region should consider improvements to mobility, accessibility, reliability, safety, and productivity (throughput) as part of the fundamental performance goals of its long-range transportation plan and its RTIP submittal.~~

~~Each region with an adopted sustainable communities strategy shall include a discussion of how the RTIP relates to its sustainable communities strategy. This may include a quantitative or qualitative assessment of how the RTIP will facilitate implementation of the policies and projects in the sustainable communities strategy and should identify any challenges the region is facing in implementing its sustainable communities strategy. In a region served by a multi-county transportation planning organization, the report shall address the portion of the sustainable communities strategy relevant to that region.~~

~~Regions and Caltrans are responsible for developing goals, objectives and priorities that include consideration of system performance. The Commission recognizes that many measures of performance and benefit are difficult to evaluate and may be more subjective rather than measurable in quantifiable units. In order to facilitate statewide consistency, regions and Caltrans should also consider using (when appropriate) values of performance and benefits and evaluation methodologies that are commonly accepted and that represent accepted or standard practice. The Commission encourages regions to consider using (when appropriate) values of time, safety, vehicle operation costs and discount rates that are developed by Caltrans for benefit cost analysis of transportation projects.~~

~~The Commission expects that evaluations of performance and cost-effectiveness will be for a 20-year period or on a life cycle basis. Reports to the Commission on evaluations of performance and cost effectiveness should be presented in a format that is disaggregated to the level of the benefits and measures used.~~

~~The inclusion of specific performance measures in the STIP is to provide regional agencies and Caltrans the opportunity to demonstrate how the goals and objectives contained in each Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) are linked to the program of projects contained in each RTIP and the ITIP. With this in mind, each agency and Caltrans shall provide a quantitative and/or qualitative evaluation of its RTIP or the ITIP, commenting on each of the performance indicators and performance~~

~~measures outlined in Table A. Appendix B was developed to assist agencies with this task. Appendix B will be considered the evaluation report for the STIP cycle and will fulfill the requirement outlined this section of the STIP Guidelines.~~

~~The overarching goal for using performance measures in the STIP is to continue a systematic and reliable process that all agencies can use to guide transportation investment decisions and to demonstrate the benefits of proposed transportation system investments. The information gathered in this STIP cycle will not only provide information on how performance measures are currently applied and reported across the state, but will also provide insight into improving performance measures, data collection and performance reporting procedures and integrating the results to enhance decision making. The information collected in Appendix B may also guide future revisions to the STIP, Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Project Study Report (PSR) guidelines with the objective of strengthening the continuity and consistency from goal and objective setting to project selection and performance reporting.~~

~~In establishing the following criteria the Commission recognizes that it is difficult to develop and utilize criteria that are relevant in both urban and non-urban regions or relevant at both a statewide and regional level. Different criteria may apply depending on the complexity of the region or the functionality of an interregional route. To this end, the regions and Caltrans should use the criteria provided below, and are encouraged to highlight other criteria that are essential for the purposes of program development and project selection. Where applicable, the performance measures listed in Table A should be used to quantitatively evaluate the criteria below. Results of this analysis will not only be used to forecast the impact on the transportation system of projects contained in the RTIPs and the ITIP, but also to indicate current system performance, thereby establishing a baseline from which future performance trends may be observed.~~

~~Regions and Caltrans should use the following criteria for measuring performance of RTIPs and the ITIP:~~

~~1. Change in traveler, freight and goods travel time or delay.~~
~~2. Change in accidents and fatalities.~~
~~3. Change in vehicle and system operating costs.~~
~~4. Change in access to jobs, markets and commerce.~~
~~5. Change in frequency and reliability of rail/transit service.~~
~~6. Change in air pollution emissions including greenhouse gas emissions,~~
~~7. Change in passenger, freight and goods miles carried.~~
~~8. Change in vehicle miles traveled.~~

~~Regions and Caltrans should consider the following criteria for measuring cost-effectiveness of RTIPs and the ITIP:~~

~~1. Decrease in travel, freight and goods time per thousand dollar invested.~~
~~2. Decrease in accidents and fatalities per thousand dollar invested.~~
~~3. Decrease in vehicle and system operating cost per thousand dollar invested.~~
~~4. Improved access to jobs, markets and commerce per thousand dollar invested.~~
~~5. Increased frequency reliability of rail/transit service per thousand dollar invested.~~

~~6. Decrease in air pollution emissions per thousand dollar invested.~~
~~7. Increase in annual passenger, freight and goods miles carried per thousand dollar invested.~~
8. ~~Decrease in vehicle miles traveled per thousand dollar invested~~.

IV. Regional Improvement Program:

20. Submittal of RTIPs. After consulting with Caltrans, each regional agency shall adopt and submit its RTIP to the Commission and to Caltrans no later than December 15 of each odd-numbered year. The RTIP will include and separately identify:

(a) Programming proposals from the county share(s), consistent with the STIP fund estimate and Section 23 of these guidelines. These proposals may include new projects and changes to ~~prior~~ **existing** STIP projects.
(b) Programming proposals from the county Advance Project Development Element (APDE) share, which is treated as an advance of future share (see Sections 37-42).
(c) Any request to advance a future county share for a larger project (permitted only in regions under 1 million population).
(d) Any project recommendations for the interregional share.
(e) A discussion of the proposed project's impact on other projects planned or underway within the corridor;
(f) Information on STIP projects (in the RTIP) completed since the last RTIP submittal (see section 68).

After approval by the regional agency Board, each RTIP will be made available electronically by the regional agency on its website, with the link provided to the Commission.

Each RTIP ~~should~~ **shall** be based on the regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080, and a region wide assessment of transportation needs and deficiencies. Programming in the RTIP should not be based on a formula distribution of county share among agencies or geographic areas.

Caltrans may nominate or recommend State highway improvement projects for inclusion in the RTIP for programming from the county share. Caltrans should also identify any additional State highway and intercity rail improvement needs within the region that could reasonably expect to be programmed within the 3 years beyond the end of the current STIP period using revenue assumptions similar to those adopted for the fund estimate. These programming recommendations and this identification of State highway and intercity rail improvement needs should be provided to the regional agency at least 90 days prior to the due date for submittal of the RTIP or, if a later due date for project nominations is set by the regional agency, prior to that date. The regional agency has sole authority for deciding whether to accept Caltrans' STIP recommendations for programming in the RTIP. Caltrans shall provide a copy or list of its RTIP recommendations and identification of additional State highway and intercity rail needs for each region to the Commission. Each region shall, in its RTIP, include a comparison of the projects in its RTIP and the State highway and intercity

rail improvement needs identified by Caltrans, including a discussion of significant differences.

When Caltrans makes its RTIP recommendation and identification of State highway and intercity rail improvement needs, it should also share with the regional agency its plans for SHOPP projects that may be relevant to the region's consideration of RTIP projects. This is apart from the statutory requirement to make a draft of the SHOPP available for review and comment.

21. Project Planning**,** Programming, and Monitoring. The RTIP may propose to program up to 5 percent of the county share for project planning, programming and monitoring (PPM) by the transportation planning agency or, within the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) area, by a county transportation commission. If the RTIP proposes programming funds for both SCAG and a county transportation commission, the total will not exceed 5 percent of the county share.

    Funds programmed for this purpose should be spread across the years of the STIP. When allocated by the Commission, the funds will be available to cover costs of:

    - Regional transportation planning, including the development and preparation of the regional transportation plan.
    - Project planning, including the development of project study reports or major investment studies, conducted by regional agencies or by local agencies in cooperation with regional agencies.
    - Program development, including the preparation of RTIPs and studies supporting them.
    - Monitoring the implementation of STIP projects, including project delivery, timely use of funds, and compliance with State law and the Commission's guidelines.

    Caltrans expenses for these purposes are included in the Department's annual budget and will not be funded through the STIP except when Caltrans is reimbursed for project study reports by a region using funds allocated to that region for PPM.

22. ~~Transportation Enhancement (TE)~~ **Bicycle and Pedestrian** Projects in the RTIP. ~~MAP-21, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141), was signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012. MAP-21, the first long-term highway authorization enacted since 2005, eliminated the TE program and in its place created the Transportation Alternatives Program. The Transportation Alternatives Program is a competitive program and is not included in the STIP. Existing Transportation Enhancement projects may remain in the STIP so long as they are eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds.~~

    ~~New~~ Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be programmed by a region in its RTIP as these projects ~~may be funded with~~ **are eligible for either** State Highway Account or Federal funds.

23. County Shares, Advances, and Reserves. The fund estimate will identify, for each county, (1) the county share for the share period that ends during the current STIP period, (2) the county's proportionate share for the portion of the new four-year period that falls within the

current STIP period, and (3) the balance of the estimated share for the four-year period that extends beyond the current STIP period. For the **2016** STIP fund estimate, for example, this means (1) the available share for the period ending **2019-20**, (2) the county's proportionate share for the period ending **2020-21**, and (3) an estimated proportionate share for the period ending in **2023-24**.

Any region may, in its RTIP, propose projects or project components during the STIP period from all of these shares, including the share for the period that extends beyond the STIP period. Unless the Commission rejects an RTIP, as described in Section 60, the Commission will include in the STIP, at a minimum, all RTIP projects carried forward from the prior STIP and all new RTIP programming proposed within the level of the county share for the share period that ends during the current STIP (i.e**.,** for the **2016** STIP, the share for the period ending **2019-20**). Beyond that, as described in Section 61, the Commission may include in the STIP either more or less than each region's proportionate share for the new share period. Overall, the Commission may not program more than the available statewide capacity for the STIP period. The RTIP ~~should~~ **shall** identify those projects or project components that it proposes to program within the STIP period from the share for each four-year share period.

As authorized by Streets and Highways Code Section 188.8(j), a region for a county with a population of less than 1 million may also**,** in its RTIP, ask the Commission to advance an amount beyond its county share for a larger project. The requested advance may not exceed 200 percent of the county share for the four-year share period that extends beyond the current STIP period, as identified in the Fund Estimate. The RTIP will separately identify the project or project components it proposes to program with the advance, following the same display format used for other RTIP projects.

Any region may, in its RTIP, ask to leave all or part of its county share unprogrammed, thus reserving that amount to build up a larger share for a higher cost project or otherwise to program projects in the county at a later time. The Commission may use funds freed up by these reserves to advance county shares in other counties. The Commission, with the consent of Caltrans, may also consider advancing county shares by reserving a portion of the interregional share until the next county share period.

24. Federal Match.

A region may, in its RTIP, propose to program State funds to match federal funds committed to a project. Such projects must meet the eligibility restrictions of the available state funds. For example, a transit project may not use State Highway Account funds as a match to federal funds unless the project is eligible under Article XIX of the California Constitution. The match for rail rolling stock and buses purchases can only be programmed in the STIP if PTA capacity is available or if the project is eligible for Toll Credits.

24A. ~~Transportation Enhancement (TE) Reserve. TE reserves will no longer be programmed in the STIP. Existing TE reserves should be deleted.~~

25. Regional Improvement Program Project Eligibility. Except for project planning, programming, and monitoring, all STIP projects will be capital projects (including project

development costs) needed to improve transportation in the region. These projects generally may include, but are not limited to, improving State highways, local roads, public transit (including buses), intercity rail, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, grade separations, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwalls, intermodal facilities, and safety. Non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management may be included where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures. Other non-capital projects (e.g. road and transit maintenance) are not eligible.

In addition to meeting general program standards, all STIP projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to the STIP's funding sources, the State Highway Account (SHA), which includes both State revenues and Federal revenues, and the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Unless the fund estimate specifies otherwise, a region may propose, in its RTIP, projects to be funded from any of these funding sources, or a combination of them. The Commission will provide and calculate STIP county shares without regard to the individual STIP funding sources.

Except for project planning, programming and monitoring, regional program RTIP nominations will be consistent with the following statutory sequence of priorities for programming from the State Highway Account:

- Safety improvements on transportation facilities other than State highways where physical changes, other than adding new capacity, would reduce fatalities and the number and severity of injuries. (Safety projects on State highways are programmed in the SHOPP**, however regions may program safety improvements in their RTIP for STIP programming if timely programming through the SHOPP is not possible because of funding limitations in the SHOPP.**)
- Transportation capital improvements that expand capacity or reduce congestion, or do both. These improvements may include the reconstruction of local roads and transit facilities and non-capital expenditures for transportation systems management and transportation demand management projects that are a cost effective substitute for capital expenditures.
- Environmental enhancement and mitigation, including soundwall projects.

Article XIX of the California Constitution permits the use of State revenues in the SHA only for State highways, local roads, and fixed guideway facilities.

Article XIX of the California Constitution restricts transit and rail projects that can be funded with nearly all SHA revenues to the "research, planning, construction, and improvement of exclusive public mass transit guideways (and their related fixed facilities), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes, and the maintenance of the structures and the immediate right-of-way for the public mass transit guideways, but excluding the maintenance and operating costs for mass transit power systems and mass transit passenger facilities, vehicles, equipment, and services."

Additionally, SHA revenues may not be expended for these purposes "unless such use is approved by a majority of the votes cast on the proposition authorizing such use of such revenues in an election held throughout the county or counties, or a specified area of a county or counties, within which the revenues are to be expended."

This means, for example, that rail rolling stock and buses may be funded only from the Federal revenues in the STIP. For such projects, the non-Federal match (generally a minimum of 11½%) can only be programmed in the STIP if PTA capacity is available. If no PTA capacity is available, the match will have to be provided from a non-STIP source.

It is the continuing intent of the Commission that rehabilitation projects, excluding maintenance, on the local streets and roads system remain eligible for funding in the STIP. Proposed projects on local highways functionally classified as local or as rural minor collector (non federal-aid eligible) are also eligible for STIP funding. However, programming of projects on non federal-aid eligible routes shall be limited to availability of state only funding as determined by the Commission.

26. Federalizing Transit Projects. In accordance with Federal statutes and regulations, federal highway funds programmed for transit projects must be transferred from the Federal Highway Administration to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for administration when the project or project component is ready to be implemented. In order to facilitate the transfer and timely use of funds, the Commission encourages the implementing agency or fund applicant to submit grant applications to FTA requesting a grant number and tentative approval of project eligibility prior to requesting Commission allocation of funds.

    Transit related projects such as parking structures and multi-modal stations should also be transferred to FTA for administration. However, on an exception basis, FHWA will administer the funds and a grant application and fund transfer will not be necessary. Proposed exceptions should be discussed and agreed to with Caltrans and FHWA prior to programming the project in the STIP and documented in the PSR equivalent and project fact sheet.

27. Increased STIP Funding Participation. An RTIP may propose, from the county share, to increase a project's STIP funding to replace local funding already committed, provided that the local funding has not been and will not be expended or encumbered under contract prior to the Commission's allocation of STIP funds. The proposal will include the revised basis for cost sharing, as specified in Section 49 of these guidelines.

    In those instances when any regional agency seeks additional STIP funding for a previously programmed project and the projected funding increase exceeds any increase in the estimated cost of that project, the board of such regional agency, by resolution of a majority of board members, shall declare in writing that the increase in the STIP funding is not for the purpose of "back-filling" other non-STIP funds previously committed to the capital project which have already been, or in the future will be, redirected to non-capital activities and purposes.

28. Pooling of County Shares. Two or more regional agencies may agree to consolidate their county shares for two consecutive county share periods into a single county share for both periods. A pooling agreement will become effective for a county share period if each

regional agency adopts a resolution incorporating the agreement and submits it to the Commission with its RTIP. Similarly, SACOG may pool the shares of any counties in its region by adopting a resolution and submitting it with its RTIP.

As an alternative to pooling, two regional agencies may agree to accomplish the same purpose by agreeing to a loan of a specified dollar amount from one region's county share to the other during a STIP period, with the loaned amount to be returned in the following county share period. A regional agency, in its RTIP, may also propose to contribute all or a portion of its current county share for the programming of a project located in another county.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) may pool its county shares for a STIP period by adopting a resolution and submitting it with its RTIP, provided that the amount of any county share advanced or reserved is not more than 15 percent of the county share identified in the Fund Estimate.

29. Consistency with Land Use Plans and Congestion Management Programs. Projects included in the regional program shall be consistent with the adopted regional transportation plan, which state law requires ~~to~~ **be** consistent with federal planning and programming requirements. The federal requirements (23 U.S.C. 134) include factors to be considered in developing transportation plans and programs, including the likely effect of transportation policy decisions on land use and development and the consistency of transportation plans and programs with the provisions of all applicable short- and long-term land use and development plans.

Congestion Management Programs (CMPs) prepared by counties not electing to be exempted from CMP requirements pursuant to Section 65088.3 of the Government Code shall be incorporated **by the Regional Agency** into the appropriate RTIP prior to its adoption and submittal to the Commission, **pursuant to Government Code Section 65089.2**. Projects included in the adopted RTIP shall be consistent with the capital improvement program of the CMP. Projects not in the approved CMP shall not be included in the RTIP unless **identified and** listed separately**.**

V. Interregional Improvement Program:

30. General. The interregional improvement program consists of STIP projects funded from the interregional program share, which is 25% of new STIP funding. Caltrans will nominate a program of projects for the interregional share in its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP). The interregional program has two parts:

(a) The first, funded from up to 10% of new STIP funding, is nominated solely by Caltrans in the ITIP. It is subject to the north/south 40%/60% split and otherwise may include projects anywhere in the State. The projects may include State highway, intercity passenger rail, mass transit guideway, or grade separation projects. Non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management may be included where Caltrans finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures.

(b) The second part, funded from at least 15% of new STIP funding, is not subject to the north/south split. It is limited to intercity rail projects (**including Amtrak feeder bus**, interregional commuter rail and grade separation projects) and to improvements outside urbanized areas on interregional road system routes (which are specified in statute). At least 15% of the 15% (or at least 2.25% of new STIP funding) must be programmed for intercity rail projects, including interregional commuter rail and grade separation projects.

Under restricted circumstances, an RTIP may also recommend a project for funding from the second part, described in paragraph (b). See Section 32 of these guidelines.

31. Submittal of Caltrans ITIP. After consulting with regional agencies and other local transportation authorities, Caltrans shall submit its **draft** ITIP **to the Commission no later than October 15 of each odd numbered year. Two hearings, one in the south and one in the north, will be held by November 15 to provide opportunity for public input regarding projects proposed in the ITIP. Caltrans shall submit its final ITIP, including a summary of the major comments received at the hearings and responses to those comments,** to the Commission no later than December 15 of each odd numbered year. At the same time, Caltrans will transmit a copy of the ITIP to each regional agency. The ITIP will include programming proposals from the interregional share for the five-year STIP period. These proposals may include new projects, program reserves, changes to prior STIP interregional program projects, and the interregional share of proposals for jointly funding new projects or cost increases from county and interregional shares.

The ITIP ~~should~~ **shall** include, for each proposed project, information (including assumptions and calculations) to support an objective analysis of interregional program priorities. That information, ~~which should be~~ based on the project study report, ~~should~~ **shall** include:

- an estimate of total project costs, including mitigation costs and support costs;
- an estimate of the time of completion of project construction;
- an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to vehicle time savings and vehicle operating costs;
- for road projects, an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to reductions in fatalities and injuries;
- for rail **or Amtrak feeder bus** projects, an estimate of the project's impact on ridership and the need for operating subsidies;
- **a discussion of the proposed project's impact on other projects planned or underway within the corridor;** and
- a description of how the project would implement the interregional strategic plan, including a description of its impact on California's economic growth, the interregional distribution of goods, and the environment.

The ITIP will be posted on the Department's website, with the link provided to the Commission.

32. Regional Recommendations for the Interregional Program. A regional agency may, in its RTIP, recommend improvements outside urbanized areas on interregional road system routes for funding from the interregional share. Interregional road system routes are defined in statute at Streets and Highways Code Sections 164.10 to 164.20, inclusive. By statute, the Commission may program a regional recommendation for the interregional program only if the Commission "makes a finding, based on an objective analysis, that the recommended project is more cost-effective than a project submitted by [Caltrans]." The Commission cautions regions, especially those with priority needs in both urbanized and nonurbanized areas, that nonurbanized area projects of highest regional priority should be proposed in the RTIP from the county share. The interregional program is not a nonurbanized area program, and the Commission does not intend to use the interregional program to meet most State highway needs in nonurbanized areas. The Commission anticipates programming regional recommendations for funding from the interregional program only when a recommended project constitutes a cost-effective means of implementing the interregional transportation strategic plan (see Section 34 of these guidelines).

    Any regional recommendation for the interregional program shall be made in the RTIP and shall be separate and distinct from the RTIP proposal for programming from the county share(s). Each project nominated in this way must constitute a useable segment of highway. The nomination must be to fund the project fully through the interregional program. The nomination may not be part of a proposal for joint funding between the regional and interregional programs. Joint funding proposals may be made only in concert with Caltrans, with the region proposing the county share in its RTIP and Caltrans proposing the interregional share in the ITIP.

    An RTIP proposal for interregional funding should be accompanied by information (including assumptions and calculations) to support the objective analysis that the Commission must make before it can program the project. That information, ~~which should be~~ based on the project study report, ~~should~~ **shall** include:

    - an estimate of total project costs, including mitigation costs and support costs;
    - an estimate of the time of completion of project construction;
    - an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to vehicle time savings and vehicle operating costs;
    - **for road projects**, an estimate of annual project benefits (at project opening) due to reductions in fatalities and injuries;
    - **for rail or Amtrak feeder bus projects, an estimate of the project's impact on ridership and the need for operating subsidies;**
    - **a discussion of the proposed project's impact on other projects planned or underway within the corridor;** and
    - a description of how the project would implement the interregional strategic plan, including a description of its impact on California's economic growth, the interregional distribution of goods, and the environment.

33. Regional Transportation Plan. Projects included in the interregional program shall be consistent with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan(s).

34. Interregional Program Objectives. The Commission envisions an interregional improvement program that works toward achievement of the following six objectives:

- **Provide access for people and goods to and through all regions of California.**
- **Ensure that the interregional transportation system is reliable and efficient for the movement of people, goods, services and emergency response.**
- **Develop and operate a safe interregional transportation system for all travelers.**
- **Optimize multi-modal connectivity throughout the interregional transportation system.**
- **Improve interregional connectivity to enhance California's diverse economy.**
- **Improve and manage California's interregional transportation system in an environmentally sensitive, economical and equitable manner.**
- ~~Completing a trunk system of higher standard State highways (usually expressways and freeways).~~
- ~~Connecting all urbanized areas, major metropolitan centers, and gateways to the freeway and expressway system to ensure a complete statewide system for the highest volume and most critical trip movements.~~
- ~~Ensuring a dependable level of service for movement into and through major gateways of statewide significance and ensuring connectivity to key intermodal transfer facilities, seaports, air cargo terminals, and freight distribution facilities.~~
- ~~Connecting urbanizing centers and high growth areas to the trunk system to ensure future connectivity, mobility, and access for the State's expanding population.~~
- ~~Linking rural and smaller urban centers to the trunk system.~~
- ~~Implementing an intercity passenger rail program (including interregional commuter rail) that complies with Federal and State laws, improves service reliability, decreases running times, reduces the per-passenger operating subsidy, and that compliments the State's planned high-speed rail system.~~

The Caltrans ITIP ~~should~~ **shall** be based on **the** ~~Strategic Plan~~ **ITSP** for implementing the interregional program, **adopted within the prior 5 years**. The **ITSP** ~~Strategic Plan~~ should address development of **multi-modal corridors including** both the interregional road system and intercity rail in California, and it should define a strategy that extends beyond the STIP. The ITIP ~~should~~ **shall** describe how proposed projects relate to the **ITSP** ~~Strategic Plan~~ and how the ~~Strategic Plan~~ **proposed projects** would implement the ~~Commission's~~ objectives **listed above**. The Commission will evaluate the ITIP and any regional recommendations for the interregional program in the light of these ~~above listed~~ objectives and the ~~Strategic Plan~~ **ITSP**.

The interregional improvement program will include both State highway and rail projects (potentially including mass transit guideway and grade separation projects).

For State highways, the interregional program should emphasize ~~the development of a basic trunk system (a subset of the larger interregional road system described in statute, with extensions in urbanized areas)~~ **an interregional transportation system** that provides:

- access to and through or around all regions of California~~'s urbanized areas (over 50,000 population) and the following areas that serve as major economic centers for multicounty areas: Eureka, Susanville, and Bisho~~p; and
- access to California's major interstate and international gateways, including interstate and international border crossings, international airports, and seaports.

~~The Strategic Plan should identify this basic trunk system, with a primary focus on access between these areas and gateways, not on distribution within regions or on access to all counties. The focus should be on interregional commerce rather than on interregional commuting. While the interregional program may include projects on other interregional routes, the Commission expects the development of the basic trunk system to be the focus of near term investment.~~

The Commission expects the identification and selection of State highway projects for the interregional program to be based on consideration of cost in relationship to the following benefits, with higher priority given to projects with greater net benefit for the investment made:

- traffic safety, including the potential for reducing fatalities and injuries;
- reduced travel time and vehicle operating costs for interregional travel;
- economic benefits to California of expanding interregional commerce through faster and more reliable access between markets; and
- economic benefits to California of expanding interstate and international trade and commerce through faster and more reliable access to California's international airports and seaports.

Commerce includes the movement of people and goods for any economic purpose. It may include extractive industries (such as mining, agriculture, or timber) or recreation.

~~A large part of California's interregional road system is adequately developed for the near future, and the SHOPP provides for the protection and preservation of the existing system. The Commission therefore expects that the interregional program will be focused on underdeveloped gaps and corridors in the basic trunk system.~~ There is no expectation that STIP interregional improvements will be evenly spread across the State, and the spreading of funding among regions is <u>not</u> a Commission objective for the interregional program. The Commission does encourage Caltrans and smaller regions (generally with populations less than 250,000) to consider and seek formation of partnerships to jointly fund projects on the interregional road system for the mutual benefit of the region and the state**.**

<u>For rail</u>, the interregional program should emphasize:

- the preservation and improvement of the existing system of State-sponsored intercity passenger rail **and Amtrak feeder bus** routes, including compliance with safety and accessibility standards and protection of the State's investment in equipment;
- the reduction of the system's dependence on State operating subsidies;
- the improvement of other passenger rail access between major urban centers, airports and intercity rail routes;

- the use of rail grade separations to improve service reliability for both intercity passenger rail and interregional goods movement; and
- coordination **and connectivity** with the State's planned high-speed rail system.

The Commission expects the identification and selection of rail capital projects for the interregional program (**including Amtrak feeder bus**, interregional commuter rail and grade separations) to be based on consideration of cost in relationship to the following benefits, with higher priority given to projects with greater net benefit for the investment made:

- reduced intercity rail running times and operating costs (which may increase demand and reduce the need for operating subsidies);
- improved intercity rail schedule frequency and reliability (which may increase demand and reduce the need for operating subsidies); and
- economic benefits to California of promoting trade and commerce by creating faster and more reliable highway or rail access to markets, including access to California's international airports and seaports;

For either highways or rail, Caltrans and the Commission may evaluate a project as part of a series of related projects in the same location or corridor. The evaluation may consider the costs and benefits of the projects as a group. All projects in the group should be **included in the** ~~part of the~~ ~~Strategic Plan~~ **ITSP** for near term funding, whether or not proposed for the STIP.

Where a potential interregional program project may provide substantial local benefits, it is appropriate that costs be divided between the regional and interregional programs. In this case, the evaluation of the project for the interregional program should be based on the interregional program cost share in relationship to the benefits described in this section.

35. ~~Transportation Enhancement (TE)~~ **Bicycle and Pedestrian** Projects in the ITIP. ~~MAP-21, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (P.L. 112-141), was signed into law by President Obama on July 6, 2012. MAP-21, the first long-term highway authorization enacted since 2005, eliminated the TE program and in its place created the Transportation Alternatives Program. The Transportation Alternatives Program is a competitive program and is not included in the STIP. Existing Transportation Enhancement projects may remain in the STIP so long as they are eligible for State Highway Account or Federal funds.~~

~~New~~ Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be programmed by Caltrans in the ITIP as these projects ~~may be funded with~~ **are eligible for** either State Highway Account or Federal funds.

Caltrans may include in the ITIP a bicycle and pedestrian project that relates to the interregional surface transportation of people or goods or that is a capital outlay project of statewide benefit and interest. The project should provide an alternative to travel on a State highway that is part of the interregional road system or provide access to a state or national park or to an interregional surface transportation facility.

36. Projects and Reserves. The ITIP ~~should~~ **shall** include a complete proposal for the programming of the STIP interregional share which complies with the various statutory

restrictions, including: the two parts described in Section 30 of these guidelines (the 10% and 15% parts), the north/south split of the first part, and the 2.25% intercity rail minimum of the second part. Any portion of the interregional share that is not proposed for a specific project may be proposed as a reserve for future programming. This may include reserves of any kind, including a proposal to reserve a portion of the interregional share for the next share period in order to free up funding for county share advances.

VI. Advance Project Development Element:

37. Fund Estimate for Advance Project Development Element. Each fund estimate will identify an amount available pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 14529.01 of the Government Code for the STIP Advance Project Development Element (APDE), with county and interregional shares identified separately. These APDE amounts are independent of the amounts identified as regular programming capacity.

38. Programming of APDE County and Interregional Shares. Regions and Caltrans may propose projects from their respective county and interregional APDE shares in the RTIPs and ITIP, and they may propose joint regional and interregional APDE funding for a project. The proposal and adoption of projects will be the same as for other STIP projects, except that projects to be programmed through the APDE are limited to the two STIP project development components: (1) environmental and permits and (2) plans, specifications, and estimates. Projects may not be programmed through the APDE if they are simultaneously programmed for acquisition of right-of-way (including support) or construction from regular STIP programming capacity. Project development work already programmed in the STIP may not be shifted to the APDE.

39. Program Year. APDE projects will be proposed for programming and adopted into the STIP and allocated in the same manner as other STIP projects. They may be proposed for any of the STIP's five fiscal years. APDE local projects, when programmed, are subject to the STIP's timely use of funds provisions.

40. Program Amendments. APDE projects may be amended into the STIP at any time in the same manner as other STIP amendments. The amendments will identify the county or interregional APDE share from which the projects are to be funded.

41. Effect on Regular County and Interregional Shares. APDE programming will be treated as an advance of regular future county or interregional share, although every county, including a county in a region over 1 million population, is eligible for APDE programming. If all or a portion of any county or interregional APDE share is not programmed, that amount will become available to program for any STIP purpose in the next STIP. Amounts that are programmed in the current STIP from an APDE share will be deducted from the regular county or interregional share for the next STIP. The Fund Estimate for the next STIP will include a new APDE fund estimate with new county and interregional APDE shares.

42. APDE Shares May Not Be Exceeded. The programming of a county or interregional APDE share may not exceed the amount identified in the Fund Estimate. A county or interregional APDE share may not be loaned or advanced. However, regional agencies that have agreed

to pool their regular county shares (Section 28 of these guidelines) may also pool their APDE shares. Any region may choose to program project development work from its regular STIP county share.

VII. Display of project descriptions and costs:

43. Project Description. The STIP will include the following information for each project, which ~~should~~ **shall** be included in the RTIP or ITIP proposing the project:

    (a) The name of the agency responsible for project implementation.

    (b) The project title, ~~which should~~ **including** a brief nontechnical description of the project location and limits (community name, **corridor,** street name, etc.), and a phrase describing the type and scope of the project. By definition, the Commission will regard the limits for a rehabilitation project on local streets and roads as including adjacent or nearby streets and roads, thus providing greater flexibility in project scope.

    (c) A unique project identification number (PPNO) provided by Caltrans.

    (d) For projects on the State highway system, the route number and post-mile (or post-kilometer) limits.

    (e) Any appropriate funding restriction or designation, including projects eligible for Public Transportation Account funding, projects requiring state-only funding, or projects requiring Federal funds. Agencies proposing projects requiring state-only funding (including local street and road projects not eligible for federal-aid) should recognize that the availability of state-only funding may be limited

    (f) **Total project cost, including** the source and amounts of local or other non-STIP funds, if any, committed to the project.

    (g) A map showing the project location **and corridor.**

44. State-only Funding. The Commission will assume that all projects will be qualified for Federal transportation funding unless the RTIP or ITIP designates otherwise. Whenever a region designates a project to be programmed for State-only (non-Federal) funding, the RTIP will explain the reason for this designation. The Commission will not program a State highway project for state-only funding without consulting with Caltrans. Projects programmed without state-only designation and later proposed for state-only funding allocations will be subject to Caltrans recommendation for exception to federal funding prior to Commission approval as described in Section 64 of these guidelines.

45. Project Fact Sheets. For each project proposed for new STIP funding, the RTIP or ITIP will include a project fact sheet that includes the information displayed in the Appendix to these guidelines. All regional agencies proposing funding for rail transit projects will include full funding plans with the RTIP, as described in Section 15 of these guidelines.

46. STIP Database. Caltrans is responsible for developing, upgrading and maintaining an electronic database record of the adopted STIP and Commission actions that amend the STIP. Caltrans will publish the STIP record within 75 days of the STIP adoption and make copies available to the Commission and to the regional agencies. To facilitate development, analysis and management of the STIP, Caltrans will provide the Commission and the regional agencies appropriate access to the STIP database as soon as possible. After a regional agency's access to the database is established, a regional agency will develop its RTIP submittals to the Commission utilizing the STIP database.

47. Cost Estimates for Project Components. For each project proposed for programming, the RTIP or ITIP shall list costs separately for each of the 4 project components: (1) environmental studies and permits; (2) preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates, (3) right-of-way, and (4) construction. For the right-of-way and construction components on Caltrans projects, the RTIP or ITIP shall list separate costs for Caltrans support and for capital outlay. For Caltrans projects, that brings the total to 6 project cost components.

    For each project component, the amount programmed shall be escalated to the year proposed for programming, based on the current cost estimate updated as of November 1 of the year the RTIP or ITIP is submitted. The standard escalation rate for the STIP shall be ~~that~~ **the rate** specified in the fund estimate for the STIP. Caltrans or a region may elect to use alternative escalation factors for right-of-way or other costs as it deems appropriate. STIP costs and non-STIP costs will be displayed separately. For Caltrans implemented projects programmed in an RTIP, Caltrans shall provide the region with cost updates at least 90 days prior to the date RTIPs must be submitted to the Commission.

    When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the sponsoring agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates shall be submitted in the RTIP or ITIP in the STIP cycle following completion of the environmental process. Cost estimates for project components that are programmed and that have not been allocated ~~should~~ **shall** be updated, as needed, based on the most current cost information during every STIP cycle.

    Where a project or project component will be funded from multiple county shares or jointly from the interregional share and a county share, the amounts programmed from the different shares will be displayed separately. Amounts programmed for any component shall be rounded to the nearest $1,000. For jointly funded projects, the county share or ITIP share contribution programmed for a component shall each be rounded to the nearest $1,000.

48. Authority and Responsibility. For projects on the State highway system, only cost estimates approved by the Caltrans Director or by a person authorized by the Director to approve cost estimates for programming will be used. For other projects, only cost estimates approved by the Chief Executive Officer or other authorized officer of the responsible local implementing agency will be used.

49. Basis for Cost Sharing. Where a project or project component is to be funded from both STIP and non-STIP sources, the project fact sheet submitted with the RTIP or ITIP shall

indicate whether the programming commitment is for a particular dollar amount, a particular percentage of total project cost, or a particular element or item of work.

Where a project or project component is to be jointly funded from the interregional share and a county share or funded from multiple county shares, the project fact sheet submitted with the RTIP and/or ITIP shall indicate the basis to be used for apportioning cost increases or decreases between the shares.

In the absence of an alternate cost sharing arrangement approved by the Commission at the time of allocation, project costs, including increases and savings, will be apportioned in the same percentages as programmed.

Where a project is funded from both STIP and non-STIP sources and where the Commission has approved non-proportional spending allowing for the expenditure of STIP funds before other funds (sometimes referred to as sequential spending), the project is not eligible for an increase (supplemental) allocation under the authority delegated to Caltrans by Commission Resolution G-12 until all other funds committed to the project have been expended.

50. Program Year for Cost Components. The cost of each project cost component will be listed in the STIP no earlier than in the State fiscal year in which the particular project component can be delivered, as described below.

(a) Project development.

(1) Local agency project development costs for environmental studies and permits will be programmed in the fiscal year during which environmental studies will begin. The fiscal year during which the draft environmental document is scheduled for circulation will be identified in the STIP**.** Costs for the preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates will be programmed in the fiscal year during which this work will begin. Local agency costs for environmental studies and design may be listed in different fiscal years, where appropriate.

(2) Caltrans project development costs for environmental studies and permits will be programmed in the fiscal year during which the environmental studies begin. The fiscal year during which the draft environmental document is scheduled for circulation will be identified in the STIP. Costs for the preparation of plans, specifications and estimates will be programmed in the fiscal year during which this work will begin. Caltrans will report, outside the STIP, on year by year expenditures for project development components.

(b) Right-of-way. Right-of-way costs, including Caltrans support costs, will be programmed in the fiscal year during which right-of-way acquisition (including utility relocation) contracts will first be executed.

(c) Construction. Construction costs, including Caltrans construction support costs, will be programmed in the fiscal year during which construction contracts will be advertised. All construction costs that are included in or related to a single construction contract should be listed in one fiscal year, regardless of the length of

time over which construction costs will be paid. Projects requiring separate construction contracts should be listed separately for the STIP, even if they are corridor projects grouped for project development and right-of-way programming, as described in Section 58 of these guidelines.

51. Escalation Adjustments. All projects will count against share balances on the basis of their fully escalated (inflated) costs. All project RTIP and ITIP nominations ~~should~~ **shall** therefore be at costs escalated to the year in which project delivery is proposed (see Sections 47 and 50 of these guidelines). Cost estimates for project components that are programmed and that have not been allocated ~~should~~ **shall** be updated, as needed, based on the most current cost information during every STIP cycle. **A revised fact sheet (per appendix A) shall be submitted for every updated project.** Commission staff may make further escalation adjustments, in consultation with Caltrans and regions, in making its staff recommendations and in developing the STIP (see Section 63 of these guidelines). Ordinarily, the Commission will apply escalation adjustments only to Caltrans construction costs, not to right-of-way, project development, or local grant projects.

52. Prior Costs for Grandfathered 1996 STIP Projects. For every Caltrans project that will be carried forward to the 1998 STIP, Caltrans will identify the amount of its expenditures for right-of-way (including support) and for project development through the 1997-98 fiscal year. These amounts, when added to the amounts remaining and programmed for the 1998 STIP period, will form the project component base cost for the purpose of share balance tabulations and adjustments, as described in Sections 53-58 of these guidelines.

VIII. Share Balances and Adjustments:

53. Long-term balances. The Commission, with assistance from Caltrans and regional agencies, will maintain a long-term balance of county shares and the interregional share, as specified in Streets and Highways Code Section 188.11. The Commission will make its calculation of the cumulative share balances, as of the end of the preceding fiscal year, available for review by Caltrans and regional agencies by August 15, each year.

54. Local Grant Projects. For the purpose of share balances, the costs counted for local grant projects (all project work not implemented by Caltrans) will be the amounts actually allocated by the Commission. No adjustment will be made after the allocation vote for any amount not expended by the local agency. In order to provide a degree of flexibility to local agencies in administering projects, allocated funds may be shifted between project components to accommodate cost changes within the following limits:

- Any amount that is allocated to a local agency for environmental studies and permits may also be expended by that agency for plans, specifications, and estimates. Any amount that is allocated to a local agency for plans, specifications, and estimates may also be expended by that agency for environmental studies and permits.
- Additionally, a local agency may expend an amount allocated for project development, right of way, or construction for another project component, provided that the total expenditure shifted to a component in this way is no more than 20 percent of the amount actually allocated for either component. This means that the

amount transferred by a local agency from one component to another may be no more than 20 percent of whichever of the components has received the smaller allocation from the Commission.

Shifting of allocated funds between components will not impact county share balances. County share balances will be based on actual amounts allocated for each component.

55. Construction. For the purpose of share balances, the costs counted for Caltrans construction projects are the engineer's final estimate presented to the Commission for allocation vote.

At the request of Caltrans, and with the approval of the regional agency for the county share, the Commission may approve a downward adjustment of the allocation vote if the construction contract award allotment is less than 80 percent of the engineer's final estimate. The Department should make its request by letter to the Commission no later than 3 months after the construction contract award date.

No other adjustment will be made after the allocation vote for the award amount or for changes in expenditures except where the Commission votes a supplemental allocation during or following construction. No adjustment will be made for supplemental allocations made by Caltrans under the authority delegated by Commission Resolution G-12, except that when a Commission supplemental vote is larger than it otherwise would have been because of a prior G-12 rescission (negative G-12) made by Caltrans, the effect of the negative G-12 will be excluded when counting the Commission's supplemental vote for the purpose of share balances. Where a project has not been voted, the programmed amount will be counted.

56~~55A~~. Construction Support. For the purpose of share balances, the costs counted for Caltrans construction support is the amount identified and presented to the Commission for allocation vote. No other share adjustment will be made for cost differences that are less than 120% of the Commissions original allocation. No adjustment will be made for supplemental allocations made by Caltrans under the authority delegated by Commission Resolution G-12. For costs equal to or greater than 120% of the Commissions original allocation, the Commission shall require a supplemental allocation, the full amount of which shall be counted for purposes of share balances.

57~~56~~. Right-of-Way. For the purpose of share balances, the costs counted for right-of-way on Caltrans projects, including right-of-way support costs, are the amounts programmed for right-of-way in the STIP. No adjustment will be made for cost differences that are within 20 percent of the amount programmed for right-of-way **reported** at time of construction allocation, **and/or at time of contract acceptance**. This flexibility is intended to facilitate the tracking of share balances and is not intended to be permission to overspend a project budget.

For projects that achieve right-of-way certifications 1 or 2 at time of Commission construction allocation, costs will be counted at time of vote. For projects with a right-of-way certification other than 1 or 2, the reporting of the final estimate may be deferred until right of way certification is **updated** ~~upgraded~~. In no case ~~should~~ **shall** this deferral exceed 12 months.

To encourage accurate estimates and minimize the manipulation of share balances, the Commission will consider STIP amendments for project right-of-way costs only in conjunction with the statewide review of right-of-way costs in the annual right-of-way plan.

58~~57~~. Project Development. For the purpose of share balances, the costs counted for Caltrans project development are the amounts programmed for both environmental studies and permits, and preparing plans, specifications, and estimates. No adjustment will be made for cost differences that are within 20 percent of the amount programmed for project development at time of construction allocation. This flexibility is intended to facilitate the tracking of share balances and is not intended to be permission to overspend a project budget. To encourage accurate estimates and minimize the manipulation of share balances, the Commission will consider STIP amendments for project development only when the change in total project development costs is 20 percent or more or when changes in project development costs are the result of STIP amendments to change the scope of the project.

~~58~~. ~~Corridor Projects. For programming purposes, a single project may consist of segments or phases along a route or in a corridor area that the Department will implement under multiple construction contracts. Where construction is scheduled in more than one fiscal year, the individual segments or phases may be identified separately for construction and combined for right-of-way and project development. In either case, when the Commission allocates a portion of the programmed funds for construction of a particular segment or phase, the unallocated balance will remain programmed for the balance of the project. With each construction allocation, however, the Department will identify the amounts attributable to right-of-way and project development for the segment and an updated estimate of the right-of-way and project development amounts required for the entire project, consistent with sections 56 and 57. The Department will also identify an updated estimate of the construction cost of the entire project or a revised scope to stay within the programmed amount. The Commission's intent is that the Department not defer the identification of cost increases for a corridor project until the completion of the entire project.~~

59. Federal Earmark Funds. Federal funds earmarked for specific projects that are not subject to federal obligation authority or are accompanied by their own obligation authority, either individually or by project group (such as those specified in the federal SAFETEA-LU authorization act of 2005), are not included in the Fund Estimate or programmed in the STIP. Because these funds are made available outside the STIP, they do not count against county or interregional shares. If the sponsor or implementing agency for the earmarked project seeks RTIP or ITIP funding to match the federal earmark funds or to complete funding for the project, the project becomes a STIP project and the earmark funds are treated as non-STIP funds.

If federal earmark funds become available for projects already programmed in the STIP, the earmark funds may be used in one of three ways. If the STIP project is not fully funded, the earmark funds may be used to help fully fund the project. If the project is fully funded, the earmark funds may be used to increase the scope of the project or they may be used to supplant the state or local funds already committed to the STIP project. If committed funds are supplanted by earmark funds, the beneficiary of the tradeoff will be as follows: For projects funded with county share or local funds, the county share and or local fund will be

credited with the benefit. For projects funded with interregional share funds, the interregional share will be credited with the benefit. For projects that are jointly funded, the interregional share, the county share and or the local fund will each be credited with the benefit in proportion to their respective funding commitments in the STIP project.

The Commission advises sponsors and implementing agencies for earmark projects that earmark funds are limited in availability for each specified project, or for groups of projects, to annual obligation authority and to annual allocation percentages specified in federal statutes. This means that the full amount of federal earmark funds specified in federal statute may not be available for the project at the time of planned implementation. These limitations shall be taken into account when determining the amounts of earmark funds available for the options described in the previous two paragraphs.

IX. Commission Action and Adoption:

60. Commission Action on RTIP Proposals. The Commission will include all RTIP projects nominated from the county share for the four-year share period that ends during the current STIP (i.e., the period ending **2019-20** for the **2016** STIP) unless the Commission finds that (a) the RTIP is not consistent with these guidelines, (b) there are insufficient funds to implement the RTIP, (c) there are conflicts with other RTIPs or with the ITIP, (d) a project is not in an approved CMP or is not included in a separate listing in the approved RTIP as provided by Government Code 65082**,** or (e) the RTIP is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds. In making its finding, the Commission will consider the cost-effectiveness evaluation of the RTIP submitted by the region as required in Section 19 of these guidelines. The Commission may also make its own evaluation based on the criteria in Section 19 of these guidelines. If the Commission makes one of those findings, it may reject the RTIP in its entirety. For the 6-county SCAG area, the Commission will incorporate or reject each county's RTIP separately. For MTC and SACOG, the Commission will incorporate or reject the multicounty RTIP in its entirety. For any counties that choose to pool county shares, the Commission will incorporate or reject the counties' RTIPs together.

If the Commission proposes to reject an RTIP, it will provide notice to the regional agency not later than 60 days after the date it receives the RTIP. The Commission's Executive Director may provide the notice by letter; the notice does not require formal Commission action. The notice will specify the factual basis for the proposed rejection. The Commission will act on the proposed rejection of an RTIP no later than the adoption of the STIP. No later than 60 days after the Commission rejects an RTIP, it will hold a public hearing on the RTIP in the affected region unless the regional agency proposes to waive the hearing and submit a new RTIP. Whenever the Commission rejects an RTIP, the regional agency may submit a new RTIP. Unless the new RTIP is rejected in the same manner, it will be incorporated into the STIP as a STIP amendment. This amendment will not require a separate 30-day public notice if the new RTIP is limited to projects considered in the STIP hearings or in a public hearing on the proposed RTIP rejection.

The Commission may also program projects proposed in the RTIP for funding from the estimated county share for the four-year share period that extends beyond the current STIP (in the **2016** STIP this is the share period ending **2023-24**) or from advances against future

share periods. A decision by the Commission not to program any of these proposed projects does not constitute or require a rejection of the RTIP. Any portion of the county share for the four-year period that is not programmed in the current STIP will remain available for programming within the same period in the following STIP.

61. Commission Action on Advances and Reserves. In selecting projects for funding beyond the county share for the share period that ends during the current STIP, including advances, the Commission intends to consider regional agency priorities and the extent to which each RTIP includes:

- **projects consistent with Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 (based on documentation submitted in the RTIP);**
- projects that implement a cost-effective RTIP, giving consideration to the evaluation submitted as required by Section 19 of these guidelines;
- projects that complete or fund further components of projects included in the prior STIP;
- grandfathered projects from the 1996 STIP;
- projects **within the corridor that** ~~to~~ meet identified State highway and intercity rail improvement needs as described in Section 20;
- projects that leverage federal discretionary funds
- projects that leverage discretionary local funds that would otherwise not be spent for a transportation related purpose; and
- projects that provide regional funding for interregional partnership projects.

If the Commission approves a region's request to advance an amount beyond its county share for the four-year period to program a larger project, the advance will be deducted from the county share for the following county share period. If the Commission does not approve the advance and does not program the project or project components that the RTIP proposed to program with the advance, the Commission will reserve any portion of the county share that is thereby left unprogrammed until the next STIP. This action will not require a rejection of the entire RTIP.

An RTIP request to reserve part or all of a county share until the next STIP or county share period will free up current period funding that the Commission may use to advance county shares in other counties. The Commission, with the consent of Caltrans, may also consider advancing county shares by reserving a portion of the interregional share until the next county share period.

62. Commission Action on Interregional Program. The Commission will program the interregional share of the STIP from projects nominated by Caltrans in its ITIP or alternative recommendations made by regions in their RTIPs. By statute, the Commission may program a regional recommendation for the interregional program only if the Commission "makes a finding, based on an objective analysis, that the recommended project is more cost-effective than a project submitted by [Caltrans]." The Commission may decline to program any project it finds inconsistent with these guidelines or not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds. In making its finding the Commission will consider the cost-effectiveness evaluation of the ITIP submitted by Caltrans as required in Section 19 of these guidelines. The Commission may also make its own evaluation based on the criteria in Section 19 of these

guidelines. After a review of the nominated projects, the Commission may elect to leave a portion of the interregional share unprogrammed and reserved for later interregional programming or, with the consent of Caltrans, may reserve a portion of the interregional share for the next share period in order to free up funding for county share advances.

63. STIP Respreading of Projects. The Commission may program projects, project components and project reserves in fiscal years later than the fiscal years proposed in the RTIP or ITIP if the Commission finds it necessary to do so to insure the total amount programmed in each fiscal year of the STIP does not exceed the amount specified in the fund estimate as required by Section 14529(e) of the Government code. In that case, the Commission will compare all projects nominated for the year(s) from which projects will be postponed, giving consideration to (1) regional priorities and the leveling of regional shares across the STIP period, (2) the availability of PTA or other restricted funds by fiscal year, and (3) in consultation with Caltrans, the need to balance Caltrans' workload by district and fiscal year.

X. STIP Management:

64. Allocation of Funds. The Commission will consider allocation of funds for a project or project component when it receives an allocation request and recommendation from Caltrans. The Commission will **only** consider ~~the~~ **an** allocation of construction **and/or construction support** funds ~~only~~ to projects that are ready to advertise. ~~and can be awarded within six months of allocation (see Section 65 regarding timely use of funds).~~ **For ready to advertise projects,** the Commission expects Caltrans to ~~ascertain~~ **certify that** ~~whether~~ a project's plans specifications and estimate (PS&E) is complete, environmental and right-of-way clearances are ~~achieved~~ **secured**, and all necessary permits and agreements (including railroad construction and maintenance) **are executed** ~~have been secured when it develops its construction allocation recommendation~~. Projects not ready for **advertisement** ~~an allocation should~~ **will** not be placed on the Commission's agenda for **allocation approval** ~~action~~ **All construction allocations, including rail equipment procurements, are valid for six months from the date of allocation unless the Commission approves an extension (see Section 65 regarding timely use of funds).** .

When requesting an allocation of funds for the right-of-way or construction of a transit or intercity rail project in which the transit or rail operator will not own the improved facility, the request for allocation must be accompanied by a copy of the executed agreement with the facility owner that clearly details the benefits the operator is to receive following the capital improvements.

All allocations will be made in units of $1,000, and all allocation requests ~~should~~ **shall** therefore be in units of $1,000. The request will include a determination of the availability of funding and a recommendation on the source of funding. The recommendation on the source of funding shall include the amounts by fund account, i.e., State Highway Account**,** Public Transportation Account, or Federal Trust Fund, as well as the fund type within the account including type of federal funds. Caltrans' recommendation to the Commission for state only funding of a project will be made in accordance with Caltrans' current policy for exceptions to federal funding. The final determination of fund type available for a project will be made in the Commission's allocation of funds to the project. The Commission will

approve the allocation only if the funds are available and are necessary to implement the project as programmed in the STIP.

In compliance with Section 21150 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission may not allocate funds to local agencies for design, right-of-way, or construction prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a matter of policy, the Commission will not allocate funds to local agencies for design, right-of-way, or construction of a federally funded project prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Exceptions to this policy may be made in instances where federal law allows for the acquisition of right-of-way prior to completion of National Environmental Policy Act review.

All funds allocated are subject to the timely use of funds provision as described in Section 65 of these guidelines.

Projects using design-build or design-sequencing procurement shall be identified at the time of allocation. The allocation may be a combined amount to include design, right-of-way, and construction.

Projects using the Construction Management/General Contractor delivery method should be identified at the time of programming. During the design phase, the Construction Manager/General Contractor contract costs are considered design phase expenditures. Upon award of the construction contract, expenditures will be reported as construction phase expenditures. The project will be programmed and allocated in the same manner as projects utilizing design-bid-build delivery, although flexibility in schedule, scope and cost may be requested and approved consistent with allocation and programming capacity, and timely use of funds rules.

The Commission will consider making an allocation that exceeds the amount programmed in the STIP if a region or the interregional program has an adequate unprogrammed share balance or if the Commission finds it can approve an advance to the county share or to the interregional share. Unallocated amounts are available for allocation until the end of the fiscal year in which they are programmed in the STIP. Funds not allocated are subject to the timely use of funds provision described in Section 65 of these guidelines.

If a project or project component is ready for implementation earlier than the fiscal year that it is programmed in the STIP, the implementing agency may request an allocation in advance of the programmed year. The Commission may make an allocation in advance of the programmed year if it finds that the allocation will not delay availability of funding for other projects.

When a local agency (including a transit agency) is ready to implement a project or project component, the agency will submit a request to Caltrans. Caltrans will review the request, prepare appropriate agreements with the agency and recommend the request to the Commission for action. The typical time required, after receipt of the application, to complete Caltrans review, and recommendation and Commission allocation is 60 days. The specific details and instructions for the allocation, transfer and liquidation of funds allocated

to local agencies are included in the Procedures for Administering Local Grant Projects in the STIP prepared by Caltrans in consultation with the Commission and regional and local agencies.

64A. Reimbursement Allocations. Government Code Section 14529.17, as amended by SB 184 (2007), permits a regional or local agency to expend its own funds for a STIP project, in advance of the Commission's approval of a project allocation, and to be reimbursed for the expenditures subsequent to the Commission's approval of the allocation. However, the statute does not require the Commission to approve an allocation it would not otherwise approve. To qualify for reimbursement of expenditures prior to the Commission's approval of a project allocation, the regional or local agency must submit a project allocation request that includes notice of the agency's intent to expend its own funds for the project prior to the allocation approval. The regional or local agency should submit a copy of the allocation request to the Executive Director of the Commission at the same time it submits the original to Caltrans. The local entity must comply with all legal requirements for the project and any project expenditures, including Federal and State environmental laws. Expenditures for projects programmed for Federal funding still require advance approval of the Federal obligation for the project (E-76). It is important that any local agency intending to take advantage of the reimbursement provisions of Section 14529.17 understand its obligations and the risk that is inherently involved.

Only those expenditures made by or under contract to a regional or local agency for a project that was and is programmed in the STIP are eligible for reimbursement allocations by the Commission. Project expenditures must be in accordance with the STIP at the time of expenditure and at the time of allocation. The following expenditures are not eligible for reimbursement allocations by the Commission:

- expenditures made prior to adoption of the project component in the STIP;
- expenditures made prior to the submittal of the allocation request or prior to the beginning of the fiscal year for which the project is programmed;
- expenditures that exceed the amount that was or is programmed in the STIP for the particular project component;
- expenditures made by Caltrans;
- expenditures made by a regional or local agency for a project component that was or is programmed for Caltrans implementation;
- expenditures made by a regional or local agency on the State highway system, except in accordance with a project-specific cooperative agreement executed between the local agency and Caltrans; and
- expenditures made by a regional or local agency for a project component that was or is programmed for implementation by another regional or local agency, except in accordance with a project-specific agreement between the two agencies.

The Commission will approve reimbursement allocations only if the regional or local agency submits an allocation request prior to the first expenditure and the Commission finds that there was no legal impediment to a Commission allocation, other than lack of State budget authority, at the time of expenditure. If, at the time of the allocation request, the Commission finds that there is a lack of sufficient funding available and that it would otherwise approve

the allocation, then the Commission will approve the project for future allocation when funding becomes available. However, even the inclusion of a project in the STIP, the availability of state budget authority, and the lack of specific legal impediment do not obligate the Commission to approve an allocation where the Commission finds that the allocation is not an effective use of state funds, is inconsistent with the Commission's guidelines or policies, or is inconsistent with state or regional plans.

65. Timely Use of Funds. Funds that are programmed for all components of local grant projects or for Caltrans construction and construction support costs are available for allocation only until the end of the fiscal year identified in the STIP. Whenever programmed funds are not allocated within this deadline, the project programming will be deleted from the STIP. The Commission will not make the funds immediately available to the county share or interregional share for reprogramming. The Commission will, however, adjust the share balance to restore the funds in the next county share period.

Funds allocated for local project development or right of way costs must be expended by the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated. For local grant projects, the local agency must invoice Caltrans for these costs no later than 180 days after the fiscal year in which the final expenditure occurred.

~~Under statute, funds allocated for construction or for purchase of equipment must be encumbered by the award of a contract within twelve months of the date of the allocation of funds.~~ Commission policy~~, however,~~ is that **funds allocated** ~~allocations~~ for construction, including intercity-rail projects, or for purchase of equipment ~~are valid for six months from the date of approval~~ **must be encumbered by the award of a contract within 6 months of the date of allocation** unless the Commission approves an extension as described below.

Federal highway transportation funds programmed and allocated for transit projects are considered obligated and are deducted from the state's federal obligation authority balances as soon as they are transferred to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) as described in Section 26 of these guidelines. Federal funds for such projects will be considered encumbered and expended upon completion of the fund transfer to FTA. State funds allocated to match the federal funds for such projects will be subject to the timely use of funds provisions described in this section (transit projects may not use State Highway Account revenues unless eligible under Article XIX of the California Constitution). Upon completion of such projects, after notification by FTA of final project costs, the FHWA will adjust obligation records accordingly. Any federal funds which were transferred to FTA but not expended will be rescinded as state highway account revenue with no adjustment to county shares. Any state match funds which were allocated but not expended will also be rescinded with no adjustment to county shares.

After the award of the contract, the local agency or Caltrans has up to 36 months to complete (accept) the contract. At the time of fund allocation, the Commission may extend the deadline for completion of work and the liquidation of funds if necessary to accommodate the proposed expenditure plan for the project. For local grant projects, the local agency has 180 days after contract acceptance to make the final payment to the contractor or vendor,

prepare the final Report of Expenditure and submit the final invoice to Caltrans for reimbursement.

The Commission may extend the deadlines for allocation of funds, for award of a contract, for transfer to FTA, for expenditures for project development or right of way, or for contract completion no more than one time and only if it finds that an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred that justifies the extension. The extension will not exceed the period of delay directly attributed to the extraordinary circumstance and will in no event be for more than 20 months.

Whenever allocated funds are not encumbered by the award of a contract or transfer to FTA, or expended within the deadlines specified above, all unencumbered, not transferred, or unexpended funds from the allocation will be rescinded. The Commission will not adjust the county or interregional share for any unencumbered balance of the allocation.

Caltrans will provide monthly reports to the Commission on projects which have not been awarded or transferred to FTA within six months of the date of the Commission's allocation.

These provisions for the timely use of funds do not apply to Caltrans project development costs, which the Commission does not allocate, or to Caltrans right-of-way costs, which the Commission allocates annually on a lump sum basis rather than by project.

The Commission will not amend the STIP to delete or change the program year of the funding for any project component programmed in the current fiscal year or earlier except (1) to reprogram funds from a construction project to later mitigation work required for that project, including landscaping or soundwalls, or (2) to reprogram funds from one project to another **within an identified multi-modal corridor, as defined in Section 11, where the projects are being delivered using the Construction Management/General Contractor delivery method.** ~~within the same group or corridor, as described in Section 58 of these guidelines~~. In either of these two cases, the Commission will consider the amendment only if it is proposed concurrently with an allocation of ~~most of the~~ funds programmed for the project in the current fiscal year. These two types of amendments are adjustments that may be incorporated into the Commission's allocation action. In that case, they do not require the separate notice ordinarily required of STIP amendments.

Where a project or project component will not be ready for allocation as programmed in the current fiscal year, the agency responsible for the project should request an extension of the allocation deadline rather than a STIP amendment.

66. Delivery Deadline Extensions. The Commission may extend a delivery deadline, as described in Section 65, upon the request of the regional agency or the agency responsible for project delivery. No deadline may be extended more than once. However, there are separate deadlines for allocation, for award of a contract, for expenditures for project development or right-of-way, and for project completion, and each project component has its own deadlines. The Commission may consider the extension of each of these deadlines separately.

The Commission may grant a deadline extension only if it finds that an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred that justifies the extension. The extension will not exceed the period of delay directly attributable to the extraordinary circumstance and will in no event be for more than 20 months.

All requests for project delivery deadline extensions ~~should~~ **shall** be submitted directly to the appropriate Caltrans district at least 60 days prior to the specific deadline for which the particular extension is requested (e.g., 60 days prior to June 30 to request the extension of allocation deadlines). The extension request should describe the specific circumstance that justifies the extension and identify the delay directly attributable to that circumstance. Caltrans will review extension requests and forward them to the Commission for action. Unlike proposed STIP amendments, extension requests do not require a 30-day notice period.

For each request to extend the deadline to allocate project construction funds, the agency requesting the extension should submit, in conjunction with the request, a project construction STIP history. The request should also identify any cost increase related to the delay and how the increase would be funded. The STIP history should note the original inclusion of project construction in the STIP and each project construction STIP amendment including, for each, the amendment date, the dollar amount programmed for construction, and the scheduled year of construction delivery. It is the Commission's intent to review this history when considering a construction allocation extension request.

67. STIP Amendments. The Commission may amend the STIP at the request of the entity, either Caltrans or the regional agency that originally nominated the STIP project to be changed or deleted by the amendment. The Commission will amend the STIP only after providing at least 30 days public notice. Projects proposed by amendment will be subject to the same standards and criteria that apply to RTIP and ITIP proposals. Each amendment will designate from which county share(s) or interregional share the project is being funded, and the Commission will adjust share balances accordingly. An amendment may not create or increase a county share surplus unless the Commission finds that it can approve an advance of the county share (see Sections 23 and 61 of these guidelines).

All regional requests for STIP amendments shall be submitted directly to the appropriate Caltrans district. For each amendment that would delay the year of construction, the agency requesting the amendment should submit, in conjunction with the amendment request, a project construction STIP history. The request should also identify any cost increase related to the delay and how the increase would be funded. The STIP history should note the original inclusion of project construction in the STIP and each prior project construction STIP amendment including, for each, the amendment date, the dollar amount programmed for construction, and the scheduled year of construction delivery. It is the Commission's intent to review this history when considering a STIP amendment that would delay the year of construction.

Caltrans will review proposed amendments and forward them to the Commission for public notice and action. The Commission encourages Caltrans, in cooperation with regions and Commission staff, to develop and implement a set of procedures to standardize and

streamline the amendment process and to enhance the accountability of regions for amendments of projects which are not administered by Caltrans.

An amendment may change the scope, cost or program year of any STIP project, except that the Commission will not amend the STIP:

- to change Caltrans right-of-way costs, except in conjunction with the annual right-of-way plan or to make a downward adjustment of more than 20 percent in conjunction with the Commission's allocation of project construction funding;
- to delete or change the program year of the funding for any project component after the beginning of the fiscal year for which it is programmed (except for the adjustments at the time of allocation described in Section 65);
- to change Caltrans **construction support or** project development costs, except when the change in total **construction support or** project development costs is 20 percent or more unless the cost change is the result of a STIP amendment to change the scope of the project; or
- to change the programming of any funds after they have been allocated.

67A. Approval of AB 3090 Arrangements. Under Government Code Section 14529.7, as amended by AB 3090 (1992), the Commission, the Department, a regional agency, and a local agency may enter into either one of two types of arrangements under which a local agency pays for the delivery of a STIP project with its own funds in advance of the year in which the project is programmed. Under the first type of arrangement, the local agency that advances the STIP project has another project or projects of equivalent value programmed in its place, and these arrangements are implemented by a STIP amendment designating the specified dollar amount for an "AB 3090 replacement project" without identifying the specific project to be implemented as the replacement. Under the second type of arrangement, the local agency that advances the STIP project is programmed to receive a direct cash reimbursement, and those arrangements are implemented by a STIP amendment that gives approval to the Department to execute a reimbursement agreement and programs the reimbursement for the fiscal year in which the project was scheduled in the STIP or a later year.

Scheduled project reimbursements have the highest STIP priority among projects programmed within a fiscal year although reimbursements are subject to the availability of the appropriate fund type. In most cases, reimbursement will be programmed over several years. Additionally, the Department may pay the reimbursements quarterly if so specified in the reimbursement agreement.

The Commission has adopted separate AB 3090 Reimbursement Guidelines (Resolution G-02-13) that describe specific procedures for reimbursement arrangements. The following is the Commission's policy for the approval of AB 3090 arrangements for either replacement projects or reimbursements.

1. The Commission intends to encourage local agencies who wish to use local funds to advance the delivery of projects programmed for construction in the STIP when State funds are not sufficient to support direct project allocations. In doing so, the Commission

will consider the approval of either AB 3090 replacement projects or AB 3090 direct reimbursement arrangements, giving preference to the programming of AB 3090 replacement projects where feasible or to AB 3090 reimbursements using federal funds and the local advance construction process.

2. Where a local agency proposes to use its own funds for early delivery of a project component programmed in the STIP for a future fiscal year, the Commission will consider approval of an AB 3090 replacement project under the following conditions:

    a. The regional agency approves the arrangement.

    b. The local agency has identified a local fund source for the project component, and there is a reasonable expectation that the AB 3090 approval will result in the acceleration of construction delivery of a STIP project.

    c. The local agency commits to award a contract or otherwise begin delivery of the project component within 6 months of the Commission's approval, with the understanding that the arrangement may be cancelled if that condition is not met. AB 3090 arrangements for construction or for purchase of equipment are valid for six months from the date of approval unless the Commission approves an extension.

    d. The STIP amendment approving the arrangement will replace the project component with an unidentified replacement project in the same fiscal year.

3. Where a local agency proposes to use its own funds for early delivery of a project component programmed in the STIP for a future fiscal year, the Commission will consider approval of an AB 3090 reimbursement only when the following *additional* conditions are met:

    a. The regional agency explicitly finds the project to be the region's highest priority among STIP projects programmed for that fiscal year. A regional agency unable to make such a finding shall, in its request for an AB 3090 reimbursement explain why it is unable to make the finding and the relative priority of the STIP projects programmed for that fiscal year.

    b. The Commission determines that reimbursement would be consistent with the fund estimate.

    c. The source of local funds to be used to deliver the project could not or would not be made available for an AB 3090 replacement project. The request for AB 3090 reimbursement approval ~~should~~ **shall** identify the source of local funds to be used, why the funds would not be available for the STIP project without an AB 3090 direct reimbursement arrangement, and what the funds would be available for if not used for the STIP project.

    d. Before approving an AB 3090 reimbursement arrangement, the Commission will consider programming the reimbursement in a later fiscal year, consistent with the project's regional and state priority for funding and the projected availability of funds to support other projects. The Commission will not change the programming of the reimbursement after approval.

e. The Commission will not approve AB 3090 reimbursement arrangements intended solely to protect a project from being reprogrammed or to protect a local agency's share of STIP funding.

4. The Commission will also consider approval of an AB 3090 reimbursement arrangement for a project component programmed in the current fiscal year if there are not sufficient funds currently available to approve a direct allocation. In this case, the AB 3090 approval will schedule the reimbursement for the next fiscal year or a later year. In making a current year request for an AB 3090 reimbursement arrangement, the region shall explain why the project cannot be advanced using a reimbursement allocation (as described in section 64A).

5. In considering approval of AB 3090 reimbursement arrangements, the Commission intends to insure that no more than $200 million in reimbursements is scheduled statewide for any one fiscal year and that no more than $50 million in reimbursements is scheduled for the projects of any single agency or county for any one fiscal year. The Commission intends to evaluate the limit on AB 3090 reimbursements arrangements biennially as a part of the STIP fund estimate and STIP guidelines. A local agency may request the approval of an AB 3090 reimbursement arrangement that exceeds the aforementioned limits. The Commission will consider such requests on a case-by-case basis. In evaluating such requests, the Commission will weigh the impact exceeding the limits might have on the allocation of other STIP projects.

67B. Selection of Projects for GARVEE Bonding. If the fund estimate projects the availability of federal funding for the STIP, the Commission may by STIP amendment select STIP projects proposed from either an RTIP or the ITIP for accelerated construction through GARVEE bonding. With the agreement of the agency that proposed the project, the Commission may designate a STIP project for GARVEE bonding even if the original RTIP or ITIP did not specifically propose GARVEE bonding. The Commission may also select projects programmed in the SHOPP for accelerated construction through GARVEE bonding. The Commission will select projects for GARVEE bonding that are major improvements to corridors and gateways for interregional travel and goods movement, especially projects that promote economic development and projects that are too large to be programmed within current county and interregional shares or the SHOPP on a pay-as-you-go basis. The Commission's expectation is that, generally, these will be projects that require bond proceeds exceeding $25 million. Major improvements include projects that increase capacity, reduce travel time, or provide long-life rehabilitation of key bridges or roadways.

Each bond will be structured for debt service payments over a term of not more than 12 years. In designating projects for bonding and scheduling bond sales, the Commission will give consideration to the overall annual debt service limit of 15 percent of Federal revenues.

GARVEE bonds cover only the Federally-funded portion of a project's cost (generally 88½ percent). GARVEE bonding in California is structured so that the State's future Federal transportation apportionments cover all debt service payments. This requires that the entire non-Federal portion of project cost (including costs of issuance and interest) be provided at the time of construction on a pay-as-you-go basis. The Commission's policy is that the non-federal portion of project costs will be programmed within current STIP and SHOPP

capacity. Although local funds may be applied to the non-federal share, the ability of a local agency to contribute non-STIP funding will not be a major criterion in the selection of projects for GARVEE bonding.

68. Project Delivery. It is a Commission policy that all transportation funds allocated through the State be programmed and expended in a timely manner in order to avoid accumulation of excessive fund balances and to avoid lapse of federal funds. It is the Commission's goal that transportation projects programmed against funds allocated through the State be delivered no later than scheduled in the appropriate transportation programming document. For purposes of this goal, delivery means allocation or obligation of funds for the programmed project or project component. For projects delivered by Caltrans, the Commission's delivery goal each fiscal year (FY) is 90% of the projects programmed in each FY and 100% of the funds programmed in each FY. For projects delivered by agencies other than Caltrans the Commission's delivery goal each FY is 90% of the projects programmed in each FY and 95% of the funds programmed in each FY.

Caltrans will provide the Commission with status reports on project delivery in October, January, April and July of each FY for projects to be delivered by Caltrans.

Caltrans and regions will also provide the Commission with a report on completed projects. Caltrans shall report this information at least semiannually. Each regional agency shall, in its RTIP, report on all STIP projects completed between the adoption of the RTIP and the adoption of the previous RTIP. The report shall include a summary, by component and fund type, of the funds programmed, allocated, and expended at the time the construction contract was accepted. For projects with a total project cost of less than $50 million and a total STIP programmed amount **(in right-of-way and/or construction)** of less than $15 million, this information may be aggregated. For projects with a total cost of $50 million or greater or a total STIP programmed amount **(in right-of-way and/or construction)** of $15 million or greater, the reports shall also include a discussion of the project benefits that were anticipated prior to construction compared to an estimate of the actual benefits achieved. Caltrans or a regional agency may elect to defer the reporting of project benefits if it believes such a deferral is needed to better assess the project benefits. If reporting is deferred, Caltrans or the regional agency shall include a list of all the projects for which reporting has been deferred and indicate when it anticipates reporting.

The Commission staff in consultation with Caltrans, regional agencies and county transportation commissions will develop a format and content requirement for the reports.

XI. STIP Development Schedule and Procedures:

69. STIP Development Schedule. The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the STIP:

Caltrans presents Draft Fund Estimate to the CTC.	By July 15 of odd numbered years.
CTC adopts Fund Estimate.	By August 15 of odd numbered years.
Caltrans submits draft ITIP	**By October 15 of odd numbered years.**
CTC ITIP hearing, North	**By November 15 of odd numbered years.**
CTC ITIP hearing, South	**By November 15 of odd numbered years.**
Regions submit RTIPs.	By December 15 of odd numbered years.
Caltrans submits ITIP.	By December 15 of odd numbered years.
CTC STIP hearing, North.	Jan. – Feb. even numbered years.
CTC STIP hearing, South.	Jan. – Feb. even numbered years.
CTC publishes staff recommendations.	At least 20 days prior to adoption of STIP.
CTC adopts STIP.	By April 1 of even numbered years.

70. ITIP Hearings. Prior to Caltrans' adoption and submittal of the final ITIP, the Commission will hold two hearings, one in northern and one in southern California, to provide opportunity for public input regarding projects proposed in the ITIP.

71. STIP Hearings. Prior to the adoption of the STIP, the Commission will hold two STIP hearings for Caltrans and regional agencies, one in northern California and one in southern California. By statute, the hearings are "to reconcile any objections by any county or regional agency to the department's program or the department's objections to any regional program." The Commission will expect any objections to the Caltrans program or to a regional program to be expressed in terms of the undesirable impact that the program would have on the implementation of the respective agency's long range transportation plan(s). **The Commission expects that regional agencies and Caltrans would discuss how the infrastructure projects included in each program help to attain regional and statewide goals, including those in Governor's Executive Orders B-30-15 and B-32-15.**

72. Transmittal of RTIPs. By statute, regional agencies are required to adopt and submit their RTIPs both to the Commission and to Caltrans no later than December 15 of odd numbered years. The Commission requests that each region send two copies of its RTIP, addressed to:

~~Andre Boutros,~~ Executive Director
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Mail Station 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Caltrans requests that each region send at least one copy to the appropriate Caltrans District Director and five copies addressed to:

~~Rachel Falsetti,~~ Chief, Division of Transportation Programming
Attention: ~~Kurt Scherzinger,~~ Office of STIP
Department of Transportation
Mail Station 82
P. O. Box 942874
Sacramento, CA 94274-0001

73~~71~~. Commission Staff Recommendations. Prior to adoption of the STIP, the Commission staff shall prepare recommendations to the Commission for the adoption of the STIP. The staff recommendations will be made available to the Commission, Caltrans and the regional agencies at least twenty days prior to the adoption of the STIP.

XII. APPENDICES

Appendix A:

STIP PROJECT FACT SHEET
PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST

The Caltrans Project Programming Request (PPR) Form will serve as the STIP project fact sheet. A template of this form, in Excel, may be found at:
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/ocip/2016stip.htm.

Appendix B (Tables B1, B2, B3):

Performance Indicators~~,~~ and Measures ~~and Definitions~~

~~**Part A:**~~

~~Complete Part A.~~

Use the following **table B1** to indicate quantitatively **the overall regional level performance** ~~how the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) or the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is consistent with the goals established in your~~ **of your** Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) **or California Transportation Plan and** the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). **For regions outside a MPO, or a small MPO**, **the second table B1(a) may be used in addition or as a replacement to B1. i**~~f any of the performance measures in Part A in table B1 do not reflect the goals contained in an **the** RTP/ITSP or if an **the** RTIP/ITIP does not contain goals that are **not currently being measured,** measurable by the performance measures contained within, simply state "not applicable (na)" for each indicator or each performance measure (where appropriate).~~

If ~~Part A~~ **tables B1 and/or B1(a)** are ~~alone is~~ insufficient in indicating how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured, **include the following information:** ~~complete Part B.~~

~~Include the following information:~~

- List your performance measures.
- Provide a quantitative and/or qualitative analysis (include baseline measurement and projected program or project impact).
- State the reason(s) why selected performance measure or measures are accurate and useful in measuring performance. Please be specific.
- Identify any and all deficiencies encountered in as much detail as possible.

~~Provide a quantitative evaluation and/or qualitative explanation of how the goals and objectives contained in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) are linked **achieved or addressed by** to the program of projects contained in the RTIP and the ITIP.~~

For qualitative explanations, state how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured. ~~If performance indicators and/or performance measures used by an agency are different from those outlined in Table A of the Guidelines and as provided in Appendix B, describe the method(s) used.~~

~~If the quality or quantity of data required to demonstrate the linkage between an RTIP/ITIP and the associated RTP/ITSP quantitatively is in question, describe the quality and quantity of data that are available, being sure to highlight those instances where data are not available. Where data are unavailable, please describe data deficiencies in as much detail as possible.~~

B1 Evaluation – Regional Level Performance Indicators and Measures			
Goal	**Indicator/Measure**	**Current System Performance (Baseline)**	**Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe)**
Congestion Reduction	Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita.		
	Percent of congested Vehicle Miles Traveled (at or below 35 mph).		
	Commute mode share (travel to work or school).		
Infrastructure Condition	Percent of distressed state highway lane-miles.		
	Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads).		
	Percent of highway bridge lane-miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below).		
	Percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period.		
System Reliability	Highway Buffer Index (the extra time cushion that most travelers add to their average travel time when planning trips to ensure on-time arrival).		
Safety	Fatalities and serious injuries per capita.		
	Fatalities and serious injuries per Vehicle Miles Traveled		
Economic Vitality	Percent of housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service		
	Mean commute travel time (to work or school).		
Environmental Sustainability	Change in acres of agricultural land.		
	CO_2 emissions reduction per capita		

B1(a) Evaluation **Rural Specific Regional Level Performance Indicators and Measures**			
Goal	**Indicator/Measure**	**Current System Performance (Baseline)**	**Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe)**
Congestion Reduction	Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita, area, by facility ownership, and/or local vs tourist		
	Peak Volume/Capacity Ratio or Thresholds (threshold volumes based on HCM 2010)		
	Commute mode share (travel to work or school)		
Transit	Total operating cost per revenue mile		
Infrastructure Condition	Distressed lane-miles, total and percent, by jurisdiction.		
	Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads).		
Safety	Total accident cost per capita and VMT.		
Environmental Sustainability	Land Use Efficiency (total developed land in acres per population)		

~~Performance Indicators and Measures~~

~~Indicator~~	~~Relation to STIP Sec 19 Performance Criteria~~	~~Performance Measures~~			~~Current System Performance (Baseline)~~	~~Projected Impact of Projects~~
		~~Mode~~	~~Level*~~	~~Measures~~		
~~Safety~~	~~2~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and per capita~~		
	~~2~~			~~Fatal Collisions per VMT and per capita~~		
	~~2~~			~~Injury Collisions per VMT and per capita~~		
	~~2~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Fatalities / Passenger Miles~~		
~~Mobility~~	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Passenger Hours of Delay / Year~~		
	~~1~~			~~Average Peak Period Travel Time~~		
	~~1~~			~~Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time~~		
~~Accessibility~~	~~4 (also 1,3,6,7)~~	~~Transit~~	~~Region~~	~~Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of a rail station or bus route.~~		
		~~All~~	~~Region~~	~~Average travel time to jobs or school.~~		
~~Reliability~~	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Travel Time Variability (buffer index)~~		
	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita~~		
	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Daily congested highway VMT per capita~~		
	~~5~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Percentage of vehicles that arrive at their scheduled destination no more than 5 minutes late.~~		
~~Productivity (Throughput)~~	~~7~~	~~Roadway - Vehicles~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips~~		
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)~~		
	~~6,7,8~~			~~Daily VMT per capita~~		
	~~7~~	~~Roadway - People~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate~~		
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate~~		
	~~7~~	~~Trucks~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Percentage of ADT that are (5+ axle) Trucks~~		
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks~~		
	~~7~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour~~		
	~~7~~			~~Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile~~		
	~~7~~			~~Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)~~		
	~~7~~			~~Boardings per capita~~		
~~System Preservation~~	~~3~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Total number of Distressed Lane Miles~~		
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of Distressed Lane Miles~~		
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of Roadway at Given IRI Levels~~		
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of highway bridges in need of repair (by number of bridges and by deck area)~~		
~~Environmental Impact~~	~~6~~	~~All~~	~~Region~~	~~Carbon dioxide emissions per capita~~		
				~~Criteria pollutant emissions per capita~~		
~~Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost~~	~~1-7~~	~~All~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Percentage rate of return~~		

~~*Level:~~

~~Corridor - Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.~~

~~Region - Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.~~

~~Mode - One of the following transit types (light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit).~~

Agencies may use the following table B2 to evaluate the cost-effectiveness of the RTIP or ITIP.

B2 Evaluation - Cost-Effectiveness Indicators and Measures			
Goal	**Indicator/Measure (per thousand dollar invested)**	**Current Level of Performance (Baseline)**	**Projected Performance Improvement (indicate time frame)**
Congestion Reduction	**Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled per capita**		
	Reduce percent of congested VMT (at or below 35 mph).		
	Change in commute mode share (travel to work or school).		
Infrastructure Condition	**Reduce percent of distressed state highway lane-miles.**		
	Improve Pavement Condition Index (local streets and roads).		
	Reduce percent of highway bridge lane-miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below).		
	Reduce percent of transit assets that have surpassed the FTA useful life period.		
System Reliability	**Reduce Highway Buffer Index (the time cushion added to average commute travel times to ensure on-time arrival).**		
Safety	**Reduce fatalities and serious injuries per capita.**		
	Reduce fatalities and serious injuries per Vehicle Miles Traveled		
Economic Vitality	**Increase percent of housing and jobs within 0.5 miles of transit stops with frequent transit service**		
	Reduce mean commute travel time (to work or school).		
Environmental Sustainability	**Change in acres of agricultural land.**		
	CO_2 emissions reduction per capita		

Agencies may use the following table B3 to identify by proposed project, or in summary for all proposed projects, changes to the built environment.

B3 Evaluation - Project Changes or Increased Capacity Benefits			
Project Type Or Mode	**Change to Built Environment**	**Indicator/ Measure**	**Benefits or Performance Improvement at Project Completion**
State Highway	**New general purpose lane-miles.**		
	New HOV/HOT lane-miles.		
	Lane-miles rehabilitated.		
	New bicycle lane/sidewalk miles.		
	Operational improvements.		
	New or reconstructed interchanges.		
	New or reconstructed bridges.		
Transit or Intercity Rail	**Additional transit service miles.**		
	Additional transit vehicles.		
	New rail track miles.		
	Rail crossing improvements.		
	Station improvements.		
Local streets and roads	**New lane-miles.**		
	Lane-miles rehabilitated.		
	New bicycle lane/sidewalk miles.		
	Operational improvements.		
	New or reconstructed bridges.		

~~**Part B:**~~

~~**Part C:**~~

~~A project level evaluation shall be submitted for projects for which construction is proposed if:~~

- ~~the proposed STIP programming exceeds 50% of a county's target for new programming (as identified in the fund estimate), or~~
- ~~the total amount of existing and proposed STIP for the project is $15 million or greater, or~~
- ~~the total project cost is $50 million or greater.~~

~~If a project-level evaluation is conducted, Table A should be used for reference. The project level evaluation shall include a Caltrans generated benefit/cost estimate and identify the estimated impact the project will have on the annual cost of operating and maintaining the state's transportation system.~~

~~A project level evaluation shall also be conducted for existing STIP projects with a total project cost of $50 million or greater or a total STIP programmed amount of $15 million or greater if construction is programmed in the STIP and CEQA was completed for the project after a region adopted its 2012 RTIP or, for Caltrans, after submittal of the 2012 ITIP.~~

~~Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions (Page 1 of 3)~~

~~Indicator~~	~~Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria~~	~~Performance Measures~~			~~Definition/Indication~~
		~~Mode~~	~~Level*~~	~~Measures~~	
~~Safety~~	~~2~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Fatalities per Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and per capita~~	~~Indicates the ratio of the number of fatalities to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.~~
	~~2~~			~~Fatal Collisions per VMT and per capita~~	~~Indicates the ratio of the number of fatal collisions to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.~~
	~~2~~			~~Injury Collisions per VMT and per capita~~	~~Indicates the ratio of the number of injury collisions to the number of vehicle miles traveled and per capita.~~
	~~2~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Fatalities / Passenger Miles~~	~~Indicates the ratio of the number of fatalities to the number of passenger miles traveled.~~
~~Mobility~~	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Passenger Hours of Delay / Year~~	~~Indicates the total amount of delay per traveler that exists on a designated area over a selected amount of time.~~
	~~1~~			~~Average Peak Period Travel Time~~	~~Indicates the average travel time for peak period trips taken on regionally significant corridors and between regionally significant origin and destination pairs.~~
	~~1~~			~~Average Non-Peak Period Travel Time~~	~~Indicates the average travel time for non-peak period trips taken on regionally significant corridors and between regionally significant origin and destination pairs.~~
~~Accessibility~~	~~4 (also 1,3,6,7)~~	~~Transit~~	~~Region~~	~~Percentage of population within 1/2 mile of a rail station or bus route.~~	~~Indicates the accessibility of transit service.~~
		~~All~~	~~Region~~	~~Average travel time to jobs or school.~~	~~Indicates the accessibility of jobs and schools.~~

~~*Level~~
~~- Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.~~
~~- Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.~~
~~- Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.~~

~~Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions~~
~~(Page 2 of 3)~~

~~Indicator~~	~~Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria~~	~~Performance Measures~~			~~Indicator~~
		~~Mode~~	~~Level*~~	~~Measures~~	
~~Reliability~~	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Travel Time Variability~~	~~Indicates the difference between expected travel time and actual travel time. Buffer index represents the extra time cushion most travelers add to their average travel time to ensure on-time arrival when planning trips.~~
	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Daily vehicle hours of delay per capita~~	~~Indicate travel time attributable to delay.~~
	~~1~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Daily congested highway VMT per capita~~	
	~~5~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Percentage of vehicles that arrive at their scheduled destination no more than 5 minutes late.~~	~~These measures indicate the ability of transit service operators to meet customers' reliability expectations.~~
~~Productivity (Throughput)~~	~~7~~	~~Roadway - Vehicles~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips~~	~~Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by all vehicles.~~
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips~~	
	~~7,8~~			~~Daily VMT per capita~~	
	~~7~~	~~Roadway - People~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Average Peak Period Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate~~	~~Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by people.~~
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips Multiplied by the Occupancy Rate~~	
	~~7~~	~~Trucks~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Percentage of Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks~~	~~Indicates the utilization of the transportation system by trucks.~~
	~~7~~			~~Average Daily Vehicle Trips that are (5+ axle) Trucks~~	
	~~7~~	~~Transit~~	~~Mode~~	~~Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Hour~~	~~Indicates the effectiveness of mass transportation system operations by measuring the number of passengers carried for every mile of revenue service provided.~~
	~~7~~			~~Passengers per Vehicle Revenue Mile~~	
	~~7~~			~~Passenger Mile per Train Mile (Intercity Rail)~~	
	~~7~~			~~Boardings per capita.~~	~~Indicates transit usage on a per capita basis.~~
~~System Preservation~~	~~3~~	~~Roadway~~	~~Region~~	~~Total number of Distressed Lane Miles~~	~~Indicates the number of lane miles in poor structural condition or with bad ride (pavement condition).~~
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of Distressed Lane Miles~~	
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of Roadway at Given IRI Levels~~	~~Indicates roadway smoothness.~~
	~~3~~			~~Percentage of highway bridges in need of repair (by number of bridges and by deck area)~~	~~Indicates the number of bridges and lane miles in need of rehabilitation or replacement.~~

~~*Level~~
~~- Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.~~
~~- Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.~~
~~- Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.~~

~~Table A: Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions~~

~~(Page 3 of 3)~~

~~Indicator~~	~~Relation to Section 19 Performance Criteria~~	~~Performance Measures~~			~~Indicator~~
		~~Mode~~	~~Level*~~	~~Measures~~	
~~Environmental Impact~~	~~6~~	~~All~~	~~Region~~	~~Carbon dioxide emissions per capita~~ ~~Criteria pollutant emissions per capita~~	~~Indicates air quality impact.~~
~~Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost~~	~~1-7~~	~~All~~	~~Corridor~~	~~Percentage rate of return~~	~~Return on Investment indicates the ratio of resources available to assets utilized. Lifecycle Cost Analysis is Benefit-Cost Analysis that incorporates the time value of money.~~

~~*Level~~
~~- Corridor – Routes or route segments that are identified by regions and Caltrans as being significant to the transportation system.~~
~~- Region – Region or county commission that is responsible for RTIP submittal.~~
~~- Mode – One of the following transit types: light rail, heavy rail, commuter rail, trolley bus, and all forms of bus transit.~~

Appendix C:

ADDENDUM to STIP GUIDELINES
Local Alternative Transportation Improvement Programs
State Routes 84 and 238

Resolution G-10-06 Adopted April 7, 2010
Addendum to Resolution G-09-11

Authority and Scope: Government Code Section 14528.56, added by Chapter 291 (AB 1386) of the Statutes of 2009, authorizes the California Transportation Commission (Commission) to incorporate into the state transportation improvement program guidelines additional guidelines specific to the local alternative transportation improvement program, and to adopt guidelines to establish a process to approve advancing a project, if the project is included in the local alternative transportation improvement program approved pursuant to Section 14528.5 or 14528.55 of the Government Code.

The Commission may amend these guidelines at any time after first giving notice of the proposed amendments.

Development of the Local Alternative Transportation Improvement Program: Sections 14528.5 and 14528.55 of the Government Code authorize the development of a local alternative transportation improvement program (TIP) to address transportation problems which were to be addressed by the planned state transportation facilities on State Highway Route 238 in the City of Hayward and Alameda County, and on State Highway Route 84 in the Cities of Fremont and Union City. The City and/or County will act jointly with the transportation planning agency to develop and file the local alternative TIP. Priorities for funding in the local alternative TIPs shall go to projects in the local voter-approved transportation sales tax measure.

The local alternative TIP must be submitted to the Commission prior to July 1, 2010.

All proceeds from the sale of the excess properties, less any reimbursements due to the federal government and all costs incurred in the sale of those excess properties (properties acquired to construct a new alignment for a freeway or expressway bypass to State Highway Route 238 in the City of Hayward and in the County of Alameda, and State Highway Route 84 in the Cities of Fremont and Union City) shall be allocated by the Commission to fund the approved local alternative TIP.

Administration of the Local Alternative TIP: Project funds programmed in the local alternative TIP shall be allocated and expended in the same manner as state funds made available for capital improvement projects in the state transportation improvement program (STIP) adopted by the Commission pursuant to Section 14529 of the Government Code. These funds shall not be subject to the formula distributions specified in Sections 164, 188 and 188.8 of the Streets and Highways Code.

Advancement of a Project in the Local Alternative TIP: A local agency may, with the concurrence of the appropriate transportation planning agency, the Commission, and the Department of Transportation (Department), advance a project included in the local alternative TIP prior to the availability of sufficient funds from the sale of respective excess properties, through the use of its own funds.

Advancement of a project or projects shall not change the priority for funding and delivery of all projects within each respective approved local alternative TIP.

A local agency may enter into an agreement with the appropriate transportation planning agency, the Department, and the Commission to use its own funds to develop, purchase right-of-way for, and construct a transportation project within its jurisdiction that is included in the respective local alternative TIP.

If the local agency uses local voter-approved sales and use tax revenues to advance a project, any reimbursement made shall be used for the same purposes for which the imposition of the sales and use tax is authorized.

Submittal of Advancement Request: Requests shall be submitted to the Department by the applicant in accordance with established timeframes for project amendments to be placed on the agenda for timely consideration by the Commission.

In order to be considered by the Commission, an advancement request shall:

- Be signed by a duly authorized agent(s) of the applicant agency and implementing agency if different.
- Include all relevant information as described below.
- Indicate that the implementing agency is ready to start work on the project or project component.
- Have a full and committed funding plan for the component covered by the advancement request.
- Indicate anticipated schedule for expenditures and completion of the component.

Content and Format of Advancement Request: The Commission expects a complete request to include, at a minimum, the following information as applicable:

- A letter requesting advancement approval. The request shall include a summary of any concurrent actions needed from the Commission and a discussion of the source(s), amount and commitment of funding to be used to advance the project.
- Alternate local funding source(s) that will be substituted for the local alternative TIP funds and a demonstration of commitment of those funds (e.g., resolution, minute order) from its policy board.
- An expenditure schedule for the component covered by the advancement request.

- If jointly funded with STIP or Proposition 1B funds, a STIP or Proposition 1B allocation request, an AB 3090 request, or a Proposition 1B LONP request must be included.
- Requests to advance right-of-way purchase or construction must include documentation for Commission review of the final environmental document, as appropriate, and approval for consideration of future funding.

Review and Approval of Advancement Requests: The Department will review advancement requests for consistency with these guidelines and place the request on the Commission meeting agenda.

Advancement will only be granted for work consistent with the approved project's scope, schedule and funding.

Upon approval of the advancement, the Department will execute a cooperative agreement or Master Agreement/Program Supplement with the local agency before it can provide reimbursement for eligible project expenditures.

Initiation of Work: The project requested to be advanced ~~should~~ **shall** be ready to proceed upon approval. The local agency shall report to the Department/Commission within four months following advancement approval on progress in executing agreements and third-party contracts needed to execute the work.

Allocations: Funds for the advanced project will be allocated by the Commission when scheduled in the local alternative TIP, contingent on sufficient funds being available in the appropriate Special Deposit Fund. Pursuant to the agreement with the local agency, the Department shall reimburse the local agency for the actual cost of developing and constructing the project, including the acquisition of right-of-way. Reimbursement of project development costs shall not exceed 20 percent of estimated construction costs, or any lesser amount mutually agreed to by the Department, Commission, and local agency. Interest and other debt service costs are not reimbursable.

In no case will an allocation be made that exceeds the amount of funds available in the respective account established in the Special Deposit Fund from the sale of excess properties from Route 84 or Route 238. The agency advancing the project accepts the risk that sufficient funds to fully reimburse all project costs may not be realized from the sale of the excess properties.

August 24, 2015

Ms. Lucetta Dunn, Chair
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Mail Station 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: California Transportation Commission Adoption of 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines

Dear Chair Dunn:

Thank you for the opportunity to work with your staff for the past year on the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines. The regional agencies appreciate the cooperativeness and collaboration among the regions and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) staff in developing an improved, streamlined process for the submittal and approval of the regional agencies' Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) projects to meet state and regional goals and priorities. An example of this work is the development of the RTIP template that will provide CTC staff and the public a more cohesive way of reviewing RTIP submittals.

We understand there have been late additions to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines and that CTC staff has made changes to the guidelines to address some of the issues raised. However, any more changes to the STIP guidelines at this late juncture would not be appropriate as the regional agencies, which are the intended users of the guidelines, would not have adequate time to review changes or new requirements that would directly impact them.

CTC staff included additional language in the guidelines reflecting the Governor's Executive Order B-30-15. It is important to highlight that STIP projects are analyzed at the regional level for air quality conformity, and for meeting greenhouse gas emissions targets established by California Air Resource Board. All projects included in RTIP submittals are consistent with the respective adopted Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires specific analysis at the project level regarding air quality and life cycle costs, and each project proposed for STIP funding is required to submit its CEQA document to the CTC for approval under the "Future Consideration of Funding" agenda item. Therefore, any additional language regarding consistency with Executive Order B-30-15 should be addressed as part of the development of the CTC's guidelines for the Regional Transportation Plan as that is the appropriate document that addresses a comprehensive approach on meeting regional, state, and federal goals related to air quality conformity and emissions targets.

The Chief Executive Officers from the Transportation Agencies within the Southern California Association of Governments region support the CTC staff recommendation to adopt the 2016 STIP Guidelines currently included in the August 27, 2015 CTC agenda with no further changes. Any additional changes should only provide clarification to the guidelines.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. As always, we look forward to our continuing partnership with the CTC.

Sincerely,

Anne Mayer
Executive Director
Riverside County Transportation Commission

Darrell Johnson
Chief Executive Officer
Orange County Transportation Authority

Raymond Wolfe
Executive Director
San Bernardino Association of Governments

Phillip A. Washington
Chief Executive Officer
Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority

Darren Kettle
Executive Director
Ventura County Transportation Commission

Mark Baza
Executive Director
Imperial County Transportation Commission

Hasan Ikhrata,
Executive Director
Southern California Association of Governments

c: Mr. Will Kempton, Executive Director, CTC
Mr. Robert Alvarado, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. Darius Assemi, Commissioner, CTC
Ms. Yvonne B. Burke, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. James Earp, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. Dario Frommer, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. James Ghielmetti, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. Carl Guardino, Commissioner, CTC
Ms. Fran Inman, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. James Madaffer, Commissioner, CTC
Mr. Joe Tavaglione, Commissioner, CTC

AMBAG ASSOCIATION OF MONTEREY BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

August 25, 2015

Lucy Dunn
Chair
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, MS-52
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Adoption of the 2016 STIP Guidelines

Dear Chair Dunn:

Thank you for the opportunity to work with your staff for the past year on the development of the 2016 STIP Guidelines. AMBAG appreciates the cooperativeness and collaboration among the regions and CTC staff in developing an improved, streamlined process for the submittal and approval of our RTIP projects to meet state and regional goals and priorities.

Recent language that the CTC staff has included reflects compliance with the Governor's Executive Order B-30-15. It is important to highlight that STIP projects are analyzed at the regional level for air quality conformity, including meeting greenhouse gas emissions targets established by California Air Resource Board. All projects included in RTIP submittals are consistent with the respective adopted RTP/SCS that undergo extensive public outreach and participation as part of each RTP/SCS's multi-year development. In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also requires specific analysis at the project level regarding air quality and life cycle costs, and each project proposed for STIP funding is required to submit its CEQA document to the CTC for approval under the Future Consideration of Funding agenda item. Finally, STIP funding is one of many sources that regions use to deliver our suite of transportation programs and projects.

AMBAG supports the CTC staff recommendation to adopt the 2016 STIP Guidelines currently included in the August 27, 2015 CTC agenda with no further changes.

If you have any further questions, you may contact me or Heather Adamson, Director of Planning at (831) 264-5086.

Sincerely,

Maura F. Twomey
Executive Director

Cc: Mr. Robert Alvarado, Commissioner
Mr. Darius Assemi, Commissioner
Ms. Yvonne B. Burke, Commissioner
Mr. James Earp, Commissioner
Dario Frommer, Commissioner

P.O.Box 809 Marina, CA 93933-0809 [ph] 831.883.3750 [fax] 831.883.3755 http://www.ambag.org info@ambag.org

James Ghielmetti, Commissioner
Carl Guardino, Commissioner
Ms. Fran Inman, Commissioner
James Madaffer, Commissioner
Mr. Joe Tavaglione, Commissioner
Will Kempton, Executive Director

August 26, 2015

Ms. Lucetta Dunn, Chair
California Transportation Commission
1120 N Street, Mail Station 52
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: CTC Adoption of 2016 STIP Guidelines

Dear Chair Dunn:

The California Regional Transportation Planning Agencies Group (RTPA group) has appreciated the opportunity to work with California Transportation Commission staff for the past year on development of the 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines. Regional Agencies utilize STIP funding along with other critical fund sources to deliver a suite of projects that address regional priorities and meet statewide goals. We appreciate the cooperativeness and collaboration among the regions and CTC staff in making improvements to the guidelines. An example of this work is the voluntary development of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) template by the Regional Agencies. The template will make RTIP submittals more consistent statewide and will present a visualization tool that provides information in an organized and transparent manner.

The RTPA group appreciates that additional language has been added to the STIP Guidelines to reflect the Governor's Executive Order B-30-15 on climate change. However, when considering the Executive Order, it is important to acknowledge that STIP projects are analyzed at the regional level for air quality conformity, and for meeting greenhouse gas emission reduction targets established by the California Air Resources Board. All projects included in RTIP submittals are consistent with the respective adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). In addition, the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) also requires specific analysis at the project level regarding air quality and life cycle costs, and each project proposed for STIP funding is required to submit its CEQA document to the CTC for approval under the 'Future Consideration of Funding' agenda item. Therefore, any additional revisions to the guidelines regarding consistency with Executive Order B-30-15 should be addressed as part of the development of the CTC's Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines as that is the appropriate document that addresses a comprehensive approach on meeting regional and statewide goals. Per Item Number 9 of the Governor's Executive Order, the RTPA group would support convening a statewide technical advisory group to consider how the State and Regions can work cooperatively in further implementing the Governor's Executive Order. Lastly, any administrative impacts on regional agencies should be considered by the state when considering the Executive Order.

The RTPA Group supports the CTC staff recommendation to adopt the 2016 STIP Guidelines currently included in the August 27, 2015 CTC agenda, including the changes recommended by CTC staff per the 'yellow' meeting book item. However, it is important to note that the RTPA group highly discourages any additional changes to the guidelines at this late juncture on the premise that the regional agencies, which are the intended users of the guidelines, would not have adequate time to review and assess the direct and indirect impacts to the respective regions. Furthermore, additional changes to the guidelines may ultimately impact RTIP submittals that are due to the Commission by December 15 further impacting the potential to meet established regional and statewide goals.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me at (805) 961-8900 or by email at skhachek@sbcag.org.

Sincerely,

Sarkes M. Khachek
Moderator
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies Group

cc:

Commissioners, California Transportation Commission
California State Transportation Agency Secretary, Brian Kelly
California State Transportation Agency Undersecretary, Brian Annis
California Transportation Commission Director, Will Kempton
California Department of Transportation Director, Malcolm Dougherty