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Guidelines Development

• Active Transportation Program
• Local Partnership Program
• Local Streets and Roads Program
• Solutions for Congested Corridors
• State Highway Operation and Protection Program
• State Transportation Improvement Program
• Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
• Traffic Congestion Relief Program
SB 1 Program Implementation Overview

SB 1 Accountability In All Guidelines

• “...Adopt performance criteria” & “ensure efficient use” of funds
• “...Fix-it-First” philosophy
• “...Repair roads, bridges, expand the economy, and protect natural resources”
• “...Inspector General shall report annually” on “investigations, audit findings/recommendations”
• “...Commission shall provide project update reports on the development and implementation of the program...”
General Process

- Workshop(s)
- Draft guidelines
- Workshop(s)
- Proposed final guidelines
- Hearing at CTC meeting
- Final guidelines
Guidelines Timeline

June CTC meeting:
• Final Active Transportation Program
• Draft State Transportation Improvement Program
• Final State Highway Operation and Protection Program (interim)

August CTC Meeting:
• Draft Local Partnership Program
• Final Local Streets and Roads Program
• Draft State Transportation Improvement Program
Guidelines Timeline (cont.)

October CTC meeting:
• Final Local Partnership Program
• Draft Congested Corridors

December CTC Meeting:
• Draft Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
• Final Congested Corridors

January CTC meeting
• Final Trade Corridor Enhancement Program
June CTC meeting:
• Final ATP
• Draft STIP
• Final SHOPP (interim)

August CTC Meeting:
• Draft LPP
• Final LS&R
• Final STIP

October CTC meeting:
• Final LPP
• Draft SCC

December CTC Meeting:
• Draft TCEP
• Final SCC

January CTC meeting
• Final TCEP
Guidelines Development

• We need your input
  ❖ Starting today
  ❖ Reporting subgroup

• Timelines may be revised during guidelines development

• Potentially impacted by trailer bills
Workshops – Tentative Schedule

June
• Today
• 28th (a.m.)
• Sacramento

July
• Week of 17th
• Southern California

August
• Week of 1st
• Bay Area

September
• Week of 4th
• Week of 18th
• Sacramento

October
• Week of 2nd
• Southern California

November
• Week of 13th
• Northern and Southern California
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Mitchell Weiss
California Transportation Commission
Mitchell.Weiss@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-2072
State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)

Rick Guevel, P.E.
Associate Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov
What is the SHOPP?

- The SHOPP is the State’s “fix-it-first” program that contains projects that preserve and protect the state highway system.
- SHOPP projects are limited to capital improvements relative to the maintenance, safety, operation, and rehabilitation of state highways and bridges which do not add a new traffic lane to the system. [Government Code, section14526.5. (a) ]
- Prior to the passage of Senate Bill (SB) 1, the SHOPP was an approximate $2.5 billion per year program of projects.
Senate Bill 1

- Adds approximately $1.9 billion per year to accomplish Maintenance and SHOPP performance objectives.
- Requires the Commission to conduct public hearings prior to each biennial SHOPP adoption.
- Provides the Commission with authority to allocate Caltrans’ SHOPP project support resources and to conduct project reviews and approvals.
- Requires the Commission to establish guidelines for carrying out its SHOPP-related oversight responsibilities.
Interim SHOPPP Guidelines

• Draft interim guidelines, stressing accountability and transparency, were developed and published with the Commission’s May 2017 agenda at http://www.catc.ca.gov/meetings/agenda/2017Agenda/2017-05/Yellows/Tab_22_4.25.pdf

• It is anticipated that Final Interim SHOPPP Guidelines will be brought forward for the Commission to consider adopting at the June 2017 Commission meeting.
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Rick Guevel, P.E.
California Transportation Commission
Rick.Guevel@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-0161
Local Streets and Roads Program

Laura Pennebaker
Associate Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov
Program Overview

- Approximately $1.5 billion annually from Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA)
- Distributed via monthly allocations by formula to cities and counties through the State Controller’s Office
- The distribution of RMRA funds to cities and counties is referred to by the Commission as the Local Streets and Roads Program
RMRA Priorities

RMRA funds shall be prioritized for expenditure on basic road maintenance, rehabilitation, and critical safety projects that include but are not limited to:

- Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation
- Safety Projects
- Railroad Grade Separations
- Complete Streets Components
- Traffic Control Devices
Affords flexibility for cities and counties to fund projects in accordance with local needs and priorities so long as the projects are consistent with RMRA priorities.

RMRA funds may be spent on transportation priorities other than maintenance and rehabilitation if a city or county’s average Pavement Condition Index (PCI) meets or exceeds 80 (good – excellent).

- 2016 Statewide Local Streets and Roads Needs Assessment reported that average statewide PCI in 2016 was 65 (at-risk).
Aspirational Uses

To the extent, possible, cost-effective and where feasible, use:

- Advanced materials recycling techniques that lower GHG emissions and reduce maintenance costs
- Project features to support technologies such as ZEV charging and infrastructure-vehicle communications for autonomous vehicles
- Project features that better adapt transportation assets and increase their resiliency to climate change impacts
- Complete streets elements

[SHC Section 2030(c) – (f)]
Basic Project Reporting

Cities and Counties are required to submit the following to the CTC:

A proposed project list which contains the following:
- Proposed project description and location
- Proposed schedule for completion
- Estimated useful life of the improvement
- Projects must be in an adopted city/county budget

A completed project report which contains the following:
- Completed project description and location
- Completion date
- Amount of funds expended on the project
- Estimated useful life of the improvement
Program Structure

Cities & Counties Prepare and Submit RMRA Proposed Project List to CTC to become eligible for funds

CTC collects Proposed Project Lists, compiles and submits statewide list of eligible Cities & Counties to State Controller

State Controller allocates RMRA funding to Cities & Counties

Cities & Counties build projects, prepare and submit Completed RMRA Project Report to CTC

CTC collects Completed Project Reports, aggregates and shares project information with the Legislature and the public

State Controller periodically audits City & County use of RMRA funding

[SHC Sections 2030, 2034, 2036, 2037]
Commission’s Role

- Compiling and sharing information on completed projects
- Promoting transparency and accountability
Guidelines Development

- Work closely with cities, counties and their representatives (i.e. League of California Cities and the California State Association of Counties)
- Collaborate with the State Controller’s Office Divisions of Local Programs and Audits

Program Roll-Out

- Goal of submitting eligible list of jurisdictions to State Controller’s Office by November 1st 2017
Local Streets and Roads Program

Schedule

June – July 2017
Develop Draft Guidelines & Solicit Public Comment

August 2017
Commission Adopts Final Guidelines and Issues Call for Project Lists

Sept. – Oct. 2017
Project Lists Due and Reviewed

November 1, 2017
Provide List of Eligible Cities and Counties to State Controller’s Office
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Laura Pennebaker
California Transportation Commission
Laura.Pennebaker@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-7121
Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

Dawn Cheser
Assistant Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov
Program Overview

- Approximately $300 million annually (50% of the Diesel Excise Tax)
- SB 1 language – “to be expended on corridor-based freight projects nominated by local agencies and the state”
- Establish Accountability Performance Measures
- Proposed Trailer Bill language provides more guidance
• Combines the federal National Highway Freight Program funds with the TCEP funds into a single program.

• Evaluate potential economic and noneconomic benefits to the state’s economy, environment, and public health.

• Include Disadvantaged Communities measures

• Necessitates an update of the CFMP project list
Trade Corridor Enhancement Program

Proposed Schedule
(depending on timing of Trailer Bill approval)

• Workshops – June thru November 2017
• Draft Guidelines – December 6, 2017
• Guideline Adoption – January 31, 2018
• Applications Due – March 2, 2018
• Release Staff Recommendations – April 30, 2018
• Program Adoption – May 16, 2018
Focused Discussion

1. What are your key issues or concerns?
2. How should these key issues be prioritized for future workshops?
3. “..evaluate the total potential economic and noneconomic benefits of the program of projects to California’s economy, environment, and public health.”
4. “Include disadvantaged communities measures....for evaluating benefits or costs for disadvantaged communities and low income communities.”
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Dawn Cheser
California Transportation Commission
Dawn.Cheser@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-7665
Program Goals

• Increase walking and biking
• Increase safety of non-motorized users
• Help regional agencies meet their SB 375 goals
• Enhance public health
• Ensure disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program
• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users
Program Structure

• Competitive funding program
• Funds distributed into the 3 ATP components
  ❖ 50% for the Statewide Component
  ❖ 10% for Small Urban and Rural Component
  ❖ 40% for MPO Component
• A minimum of 25% of funds in each of the 3 components must benefit disadvantaged communities
Eligible Applicants

• Local, Regional, or State agencies
• Caltrans
  - Caltrans can also partner with other eligible agencies
• Transit Agencies
• Natural Resources or Public Land Agencies
• Public Schools or School Districts
• Tribal Governments
• Private Nonprofit (recreational trail funding)
Eligible Projects

• Infrastructure Projects
• Plans (disadvantaged communities)
• Non-infrastructure Projects
  ❖ Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of the program
• Infrastructure Projects with Non-infrastructure components
Every odd year new program of projects adopted

2017 ATP (Cycle 3) recently adopted

Next full cycle - 2019 (Cycle 4)

Call for Projects February/March 2018 (tentative)
SB 1 and the ATP

- SB 1 provides an additional $100 million a year to the ATP through the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) beginning in FY 17-18
  - Increased programming flexibility
  - Opportunity for project selection enhancements

- Emphasizes Accountability and Transparency
ATP Current Status

- 2017 ATP (Cycle 3) - MPO Components adopted at the March and May Commission Meetings
- 2017 ATP Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) - Call for Projects released for the $10 million in GGRF
  - Applications due June 30, 2017
- 2017 ATP Augmentation – Applications due August 1, 2017
- 2019 ATP (Cycle 4) – February/March 2018 (tentative)
ATP Current Status

2017 ATP (Cycle 3)

GGRF (FY 17-18) $10 million
Project Submittals Due June 30, 2017

RMRA (FY 17-18 & 18-19) $200 million
Project Submittals Due August 1, 2017
2017 ATP Augmentation

• $100 million in FY 17-18 and $100 million in FY 18-19 from the RMRA created by SB 1

• Distributed into the 3 ATP components
  ❖ 50% for the Statewide Component
  ❖ 10% for Small Urban and Rural Component
  ❖ 40% for MPO Component

• Unless specified in the 2017 ATP Augmentation Guidelines, 2017 ATP Guidelines apply
2017 ATP Augmentation Guidelines

Project Eligibility (pg. 2 of Guidelines)

• 2017 ATP (Cycle 3) programmed projects that can be delivered earlier (advanced)

• Projects that applied for funding in the 2017 ATP (Cycle 3) but not selected for funding
  ❖ Original 2017 ATP consensus score will stand – projects will not be rescored

Projects that were awarded funds in the 2017 ATP will remain in the component where they were originally programmed
Project Eligibility (pg. 2 of Guidelines)

- If there are not enough viable projects submitted in the 2017 ATP to fully utilize the funds available in the 2017 ATP Augmentation, the Commission may hold a 2017 ATP Augmentation supplemental call for projects.

- If MPO determines that there are not enough viable projects from their 2017 ATP MPO contingency list to fully utilize available funds, the MPO may hold a supplemental call for projects, but must submit a letter explaining the basis for this determination.
2017 ATP Augmentation Guidelines

Submittal Process (pg. 2 of Guidelines)

• Applicants submit updated schedule and funding plan and letter signed by the Executive Officer

• All funds committed to the project must be consistent with the updated schedule
Projects selected based on the project’s 2017 ATP score and project deliverability in priority order:

a) Projects that can deliver all components in FY 17-18 and FY 18-19
b) Projects that can deliver one or more but not all of their components FY 17-18 and FY 18-19
c) Projects that can only deliver project components in FY 19-20 and FY 20-21 as programming becomes available

Programming capacity may become available in FY 19-20 and FY 20-21 through currently programmed Cycle 3 projects advancing.
# 2017 ATP Augmentation

## Fictional 2017 ATP – Adopted Statewide Component ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Fund Request</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Shermer</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Link School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pawnee</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,050</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,950</strong></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

June 9, 2017
## 2017 ATP Augmentation

### Fictional 2017 ATP – Adopted Statewide Component Revised by 2017 ATP Augmentation (1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Fund Request</th>
<th>17-18 (SB-1)</th>
<th>18-19 (SB-1)</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Shermer</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Link School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pawnee</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,150</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Fictional 2017 ATP Advances into 2017 Augmentation – Statewide Component

#### (1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total Request</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Shermer</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Link School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pawnee</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>500</strong></td>
<td><strong>600</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>150</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,150</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2017 ATP Augmentation

### Fictional 2017 Augmentation – Statewide Component Programming Capacity (1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SB 1 Allocation</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance from 2017 ATP Advances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Shermer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(50)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Link School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pawnee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2017 Augmentation Programming Capacity</td>
<td>49,850</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2017 ATP Augmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fictional 2017 Augmentation – Statewide Component Programming Capacity – After Advancements (1,000s)</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017 Augmentation Programming Capacity Statewide Component</td>
<td>49,850</td>
<td>49,500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Projects selected based on the project’s 2017 ATP score and project deliverability in priority order:

a) Projects that can deliver all components in FY 17-18 and FY 18-19
b) Projects that can deliver one or more but not all of their components FY 17-18 and FY 18-19
c) Projects that can only deliver project components in FY 19-20 and FY 20-21 as programming becomes available

Programming capacity may become available in FY 19-20 and FY 20-21 through currently programmed Cycle 3 projects advancing
### Active Transportation Program

## 2017 ATP Augmentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Elgin</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordonia Hills School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornfield County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Preston</td>
<td>Bike and Ped</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2017 ATP Augmentation

## Fictional 2017 ATP – Unfunded Projects Statewide Component ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>17-18 (SB-1)</th>
<th>18-19 (SB-1)</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Elgin</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordonia Hills School Dist</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kornfield County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Preston</td>
<td>Bike and Ped</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Project cannot advance any components – no capacity available in 19-20, will not be selected*
# 2017 ATP Augmentation

## Fictional 2017 ATP Augmentation – Statewide Component (1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>17-18</th>
<th>18-19</th>
<th>19-20</th>
<th>20-21</th>
<th>PA&amp;ED</th>
<th>PS&amp;E</th>
<th>ROW</th>
<th>CON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Shermer</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancelot Link School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome County</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pawnee</td>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Elgin</td>
<td>Ped Improve</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordsmia Hills School District</td>
<td>SRTS</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Preston</td>
<td>Bike and Ped</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2019 ATP (Cycle 4)

What about the $200 million in ATP funds from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account for FY 19-20 and FY 20-21?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed 2019 Active Transportation Program Programming Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB 1 Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ATP funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Future ATP Cycles

Recommend reserving a portion of funds from latter two years of programming for the next cycle.

- Each cycle will be an actual four year program
- Allows for more reasonable project delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Program Example ($ amounts are subject to discussion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reserve from previous cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Accountability

- Implementing agencies submit semi-annual reports on activities and progress
- Implementing agencies submit a final delivery report within one year of the project becoming operable
  - Was original scope delivered
  - Before and after photos
  - Performance outcomes
- Caltrans audits a selection of ATP projects to evaluate the performance of the project
- Commission evaluates program and reports to the Legislature
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Laurie Waters
California Transportation Commission
Laurie.Waters@dot.ca.gov
(916) 651-6145
Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

David Van Dyken
Associate Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov
Program Goals

- Support and encourage collaborative and comprehensive corridor planning
- Benefit mobility, quality of life, and environment through comprehensive planning efforts
- Achieve a balanced set of improvements along highly traveled corridors:
  - Transportation
  - Environmental
  - Community Access
Program Structure

- Competitively awarded funding program
- $250 million each fiscal year, beginning in 2017-18
- Programs of projects will be adopted every two years
- Programming cycles may cover a multi-year programming period and may include updates to previous programs
Eligible Applicants

- Regional Transportation Planning Agency
- County Transportation Commission or Authority
- Caltrans
  - Preference will be given to plans resulting from collaboration between Caltrans and the regional agency
    - Collaboration may be demonstrated by joint project nomination
  - No more than half of the available funding can be awarded to projects exclusively nominated by Caltrans
Comprehensive Corridor Plans
Goals & Expectations

• Provide more transportation choices for residents, commuters, and visitors
• Achieve a balanced set of improvements within highly congested travel corridors including transportation, environmental, and community access considerations
• Multi-modal focus with multi-agency collaboration
Comprehensive Corridor Programs
Examples Cited in SB 1

- The North Coast Corridor improvements along I-5 and the parallel rail corridor in San Diego County
- The SR 91 and Metrolink rail corridor improvements in Riverside County
- Emerging solutions for the US 101 and Caltrain corridor connecting Silicon Valley with San Francisco
- Multimodal approaches for the US 101 and SMART rail corridor in Marin and Sonoma Counties
- Comprehensive solutions for the I-405 corridor in Los Angeles County
Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

Project Components

Projects are required to meet all of the following:

- Make specific corridor improvements
- Be part of a comprehensive plan designed to reduce congestion in a highly traveled corridor
- Preserve the character of the local community
  - How should a corridor plan demonstrate this?
- Create *opportunities* for neighborhood enhancement projects
  - How should a corridor plan demonstrate that it creates *the opportunity* for neighborhood enhancement projects?
Project Nominations

Project nominations must meet all of the following:

• Include documentation validating the project’s consistency with the policy objectives of the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program
  ❖ Both quantitative and qualitative measures
• Project must be included in the region’s RTP
• If the project is located in an MPO, it must be included in an RTP with an ARB-approved Sustainable Communities Strategy
Eligible Projects

- Project elements within the corridor plans may include, but are not limited to the following facility types:
  - State Highways (with limitations)
  - Local streets and roads
  - Public transit facilities, including rail
  - Bicycle and pedestrian facilities
  - Restoration or preservation work that protect critical habitat or open space
Eligible Highway Projects
(Limitations)

• Non-general purpose highway lane capacity-increasing projects limited to:
  ◆ High-occupancy vehicle lanes
  ◆ Managed lanes

• Other highway improvements with the primary purpose to improve safety, such as:
  ◆ Auxiliary lanes
  ◆ Truck climbing lanes
  ◆ Dedicated bicycle facilities
Eligible Highway Projects (Limitations)

- Limitations on the state highway system are in place to mitigate the following:
  - Increases in vehicle miles traveled
  - Greenhouse Gas emission reduction
  - Reduce air pollution
Project Evaluation Steps

1. Determine if the project comes from a qualified comprehensive corridor plan
2. Determine if the project is consistent with the objectives of the corridor plan
3. Preference to be given to projects from corridor plans created in collaboration between Caltrans and regional partners
   - Collaboration may be demonstrated by a project’s joint nomination by Caltrans and a regional agency
4. Evaluate project using the scoring criteria prescribed in SB 1
Project Scoring Criteria as Required by SB 1

- Safety
- Congestion
- Accessibility
- Efficient land use
- Economic development and job creation and retention
- Furtherance of state and federal ambient air quality and GHG emissions reduction standards
- Matching funds
- Project deliverability
Reporting Requirements

Commission to report annually to the Legislature:

• Summary describing the overall progress of each project since the initial award
• Expenditures to date for all project phase costs
• Summary of milestones achieved during the prior year and milestones expected to be reached in the coming year
• Assessment of how the project is meeting the quantitative and qualitative measures identified in the project nomination
Solutions for Congested Corridors Program

Schedule

June – Oct. 2017
Workshops to Develop Guidelines & Solicit Public Comment

October 2017
Presentation of Draft Guidelines

December 2017
Adoption of Final Guidelines and Issue a Call for Projects

February 2018
Project Applications Due

May 2018
Adopt Program of Projects
Part 2 - Program Discussion

• Definition of Terms
• Metrics for Project Scoring
• Considerations for Evaluating Plans
• Application Format and Scoring Considerations
• Project Reporting and Management Considerations
Term Definitions and Metrics

General Questions

• What is a 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.” – Adopted 2016 STIP Guidelines

• What does it mean to have a “highly traveled” corridor?
Term Definitions and Metrics

General Questions

- What is congestion?
  - Highway
    - Caltrans definition is 35mph or slower for 15 minutes or longer
  - Local streets and roads
  - Rail
  - Transit
Project Scoring Criteria Required by SB 1

- Safety
- Congestion
- Accessibility
- Efficient land use
- Economic development and job creation and retention
- Furtherance of state and federal ambient air quality and GHG emissions reduction standards
- Matching funds
- Project deliverability

How should these scoring criteria be measured?
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

David Van Dyken
California Transportation Commission
David.Van.Dyken@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-2076
Local Partnership Program

Jose Oseguera
Assistant Deputy Director
California Transportation Commission

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov
Accountability Themes

• “...Adopt performance criteria” and “ensure efficient use” of funds.
• “...Fix-it-First” philosophy.
• “...Repair roads, bridges, expand the economy, and protect natural resources.”
• “...Inspector General shall report annually” on “investigations, audit findings/recommendations.”
• “...Commission shall provide project update reports on the development and implementation of the program...”
Available Funds

- $200 Million per year
- $2 Billion over 10 years
Local Partnership Program

Tentative Schedule

June – September 2017
Develop Draft Guidelines & Solicit Public Comment

August 2017
Commission is Presented with Draft Guidelines

January 1, 2018
Guideline Adoption
SB 1: Local Partnership Program (LPP)

Language

Who?

• Program funds are “for counties that have sought and received voter approval of taxes or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees.”

• Funds are appropriated “for allocation to each eligible county and city in the county....”

[SHC 2032(a)(1)]
Local Partnership Program

SB 1: Local Partnership Program (LPP) – Trailer Bill Language Modifications

Who?

• “... Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account shall be set aside annually for counties a local or regional transportation agency that have has sought and received voter approval of taxes or that have imposed fees, including uniform developer fees...”

• Funds are appropriated “for allocation to each eligible county and each city in the county by the commission...”
SB 1: Local Partnership Program (LPP)
Language

What?

• “...road maintenance and rehabilitation purposes.”
• “Eligible projects... include but are not limited to, sound walls for a freeway that was built prior to 1987 without sound walls and with or without high occupancy vehicle lanes if the completion of the sound walls has been deferred to lack of available funding for at least twenty years and a noise barrier scope summary report has been completed within the last twenty years.”

[SHC 2032(a)(3)]
Local Partnership Program

SB 1: Local Partnership Program (LPP) – Trailer Bill Language Modifications

What?

• “...for road maintenance and rehabilitation, and other transportation improvement projects purposes pursuant to Section 2033.”

• “Eligible projects... include but are not limited to, sound walls for a freeway that was built prior to 1987 without sound walls and with or without high occupancy vehicle lanes if the completion of the sound walls has been deferred to lack of available funding for at least twenty years and a noise barrier scope summary report has been completed within the last twenty years.”
Proposed Program Approach

• Program 50% of the funds based on a competitive project selection.
  ✓ Develop a process to ensure smaller jurisdictions are able to compete.

• Program 50% of the funds based on formula.
  ✓ Projects will include a project description, costs, scope, schedule and specific outcomes, including useful life.
  ✓ Project recipients will be required to report on progress and outcomes.
Focused Discussion

• What are the key issues?
• Competitive Program – what are the goals?
• Formulaic Program -- what should the framework be?
• Project performance – how to account for every dollar?
• Matching funds – what will be the criteria?
• A fair playing field – how to ensure equitable competition (small versus large jurisdictions)?
Thank you!

Any Questions?

Questions on the phone? Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov

Jose Oseguera
California Transportation Commission
Jose.Oseguera@dot.ca.gov
(916) 653-2094
Public Comment

Question on the phone?
Please email them to: ctc@dot.ca.gov