

DRAFT  
Caltrans District-4 Bicycle Advisory Committee

**Minutes**  
**April 15, 2009 1:30 – 3:30**  
**District 4 Headquarters, Mountain View Room, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor,**  
**111Grand Avenue, Oakland**

**Attendance:**

Ina Gerhard, Caltrans Bicycle Coordinator (Acting)  
Michelle DeRobertis, VTA  
Sean Co, MTC  
Robert Raburn EBBC  
Bob Eltgroth CABO  
Ole Olsen, Delta Pedalers  
Robert Cronin, SVBC  
Paul Goldstein, SVBC  
Rick Marshall, Napa Public Works  
Nick Pilch, Albany Strollers and Rollers  
Pat Pang, Caltrans Office of Advance Planning  
Jean Finney, Caltrans Office of Transit and Community Planning  
Nigel Blampied, Caltrans Office of Program Management  
Roland Au-Yeung, Caltrans Office of Traffic  
Gladwyn d'Souza, Bicyclist, San Mateo County  
Pat Giorni, Bicyclist, San Mateo County

**Item 1. Welcome and introductions were made.**

Pat Pang explained that the BAC is being moved from the Office of Advanced Planning to the Office of Transit and Community Planning along with the Pedestrian Advisory Committee in order to provide consistency with DD-64-R1. Jean Finney is the Transit and Community Planning office chief. She said that Ina Gerhard will continue to be acting BAC coordinator while the Office actively seeks a permanent coordinator by September. The position is considered to be a priority by Bijan Saparti.

**Item 2. Review and approval of the Minutes of January 21, 2009**

The minutes were approved with no changes.

\*\*It is here noted that agenda items were discussed out of order because the presenters had not yet arrived. However, for the sake of continuity, today's minutes will follow the agenda.

**Item 3. Report on Action Items from January 21, 2009 Meeting** – Patrick Pang/Roland Au-Yeung (CT-Office of Traffic)

Attachment 3 Center Line Rumble Strip discussion. Niles Canyon-ALA 84, Hecker Pass-SCL 152, Saratoga to Skyline-SCL 9. Roland will get info for Hwy 1/Woodside-84.

CLRS have been implemented for the past 7 years as a safety measure and are based on findings of a September 2003 study by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (provided next day by email). CLRS have been found to reduce the number of crashes by 25%. CLRS may be more effective because they provide more noise and vibrations than centerline reflectors or Bott's dots. Robert Raburn pointed out that speed reduction is also an effective deterrent of centerline crashes that benefits both the motorist and the cyclist while installation of CLRS is a so-called improvement on a multi-modal road that does not directly provide benefit to bicyclists. Paul Goldstein pointed out that CLRS are still defined as "experimental". Roland's response was that the language should be changed in order to adopt CLRS as a standard application. Roland would like to install CLRS on all the Caltrans/State Highways and will send a list of proposed sites.

Highway 9 (SCL) is undergoing construction now. "Share the Road" signs will be installed. Areas were identified where extra width can be gained without building retaining walls and with minimum excavation to provide extra room for bicycles. The question of the environmental determination for this project was raised and if concerns of bicyclists were considered. Roland responded that the environmental document was a categorical exemption. The CLRS installation is considered as Phase 1 of this project. The shoulder widening plus retaining walls, considered as Phase 2, will need an environmental study completed before it can go forward.

Highway 152 (SCL) was completed 1 year ago.

Highway 84 (ALA) CLRS installation is completed (Phase 1). Phase 2 will improve the road alignment and widen the shoulders. Michelle DeRobertis suggested that doing a two phase approach is backward since there is no analysis of the Phase 1 impact of CLRS installation on cyclists. She further suggested that the shoulder improvements (Phase 2 element) should be in place before the CLRS are installed (Phase 1).

**Item 4. Committee Operational procedures** – Michelle DeRobertis (VTA)

Ina presented Attachments 1 (Operational Procedures, based on the PED in order to present a framework for BAC) and 2 (D-4 BAC Charter, Objective and Goals). The goal of the BAC has been to reach out through the BABC to all bicycle coalitions to address the issues that come through their counties and that those issues would be represented at D-4 BAC by representatives of the local coalitions.

Should we formalize the structure? The consensus is yes so long as membership does not become exclusive. Since the D-4 BAC has no funding input in projects, the committee needs to be not so formal an organization as exists in some county or city BPACs.

Caltrans is looking for input and is interested in hearing what everyone has to say.

Interested, yet unaffiliated members of the public are encouraged to continue attendance.

What do the recommendations from this committee mean? Do they carry weight? Jean Finney outlined that the role of D-4 BAC would be to provide Caltrans with "eyes and ears" as to what the issues are as well as providing a perspective on Caltrans' design plans and planning studies so that it can garner the appropriate bicycle considerations. BAC recommendations would carry more weight than individual comments or concerns.

Whether those recommendations would affect policy remained unanswered. It was suggested that MTC always have representation since it has developed the Regional Bicycle Plan and there needs to be collaboration with Caltrans to implement that Plan. Rather than identify individuals, identify the agencies, organizations and advocates that the D-4 BAC wants included at the table. Identify a county bike coordinator for each county who would, along with MTC, flesh out the governmental agency representation. A list was made of those agencies and organizations, a balance of advocates, county representatives, CT staff representation and CMAs including being open to “members of the public”. This is to be refined by Ina Gerhard, Michelle DeRobertis and Paul Goldstein before the next meeting. They will also explore and develop

- Membership Definition: Create a seat for a county government representative and fill it by contacting county agency calling for candidates to fill that seat through an application process.
- Term of Office: 1 or 2 year commitment
- Alternates: A good way to groom future membership and foster institutional history. Discuss whether they should be expected to attend all meetings, or only in the absence of the appointed representative. However, all information should be distributed to alternates, which presents opportunity for greater distribution of D-4 BAC information.
- Agenda: Members and public would continue to go through the D-4 BAC chair and/or coordinator to construct the agenda in a timely fashion.
- Voting: It was suggested that only members of the D-4 BAC be allowed to vote, not walk-in members of the public. However, it is duly noted that some public representation such as Delta Pedalers, with continued interest in the D-4 BAC should not be formalized out of a vote.
- Notification: Compile an email list of county representation and publicize meetings on Caltrans and other websites.
- Work Plan to include the nomination of a Vice Chair
- Responsibilities of Caltrans: Caltrans should bring issues for advice and to solicit committee input.

**Item 5. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA)** - Nigel Blampied Attachment B-2 (ARRA Funding Prioritization) 62.5% of the ARRA funding has been assigned to the regional agencies. \$9.7 M of that was allotted through MTC to program; 37.5% (\$29 M) to Caltrans. Each portion has money assigned to Transportation Enhancements activities. Bicycle projects qualify. Tight timelines (from March 2) restricted the types of projects submitted because they had to be shovel ready (within 90-120 days) with engineering completed and approved and environmentally cleared. Five projects have been submitted and will go to the MTC for final funding approval on April 22. On Caltrans side, there is not yet a list of funded projects as it is finishing the compilation of that list to meet deadlines. However, what will be chosen are projects that are fairly well advanced, basically projects that were already programmed for the next fiscal year. This means that new projects can now be proposed for programming through MTC and Caltrans, because \$39 million were advanced to this year’s STIP and SHOPP and are now available in the next cycle.

The “Safe Routes to Schools” list of ready-to-go projects submitted to Caltrans HQ (I-580-Dublin/Pleasanton, Benicia Bridge project, and US 101/Ralston overpass) are ineligible for ARRA TE funding, because they are not inter-regional as defined by the legislature (Attachment 4-1 Programming Guidelines). Only a short list of state highways, e.g. US 101, SR 1, SR 152, and I-580, qualify. New signage for the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route and e-lockers for the Capitol Corridor railroad stations may be eligible. ITIP TE projects have to be submitted by Caltrans. Regional STIP TE projects are sponsored by CMAs through MTC. There is a better chance to get MTC-programmed funding through CMA sponsorship of new projects if they are ready to go by the August submittal deadline. Some may qualify for ITIP TE through Caltrans though; so send proposal/request to Bijan Sartipi, because the District does not make the decisions but does put forward projects. Project do not have to be shovel ready since this is regular, not ARRA funding.

**Item 6. Various projects**

Pat Pang responded to Andy Casteel’s (Bay Area Bicycle Coalition) request for solid barriers on I-580 before the approach to the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge toll plaza where bicycling is permitted on the shoulder. This proposal is not acceptable to Caltrans but staff is actively considering an alternative to install a channel line (rigid plastic candlestick markers) along the shoulder to highlight the official separation while not physically taking away the shoulder area from the motoring traffic as a short term solution. There are still maintenance concerns and funding issues to be resolved before this can be implemented. As a long term solution Caltrans is actively participating in an effort with the City of Richmond, Chevron and ABAG (preparation of a PID document per request from Richmond) for construction of a permanent bike trail in the area. It is in the interest of this group to work with the local agency to keep momentum going for the path.

Robert Raburn: “It is rare that an advocacy organization would request a solid barrier on a freeway shoulder, but this is a unique situation where an existing Class I path feeds into a shoulder lane that immediately exits within a ¼ mile onto Western Drive. Maintenance is a concern but should not be a burden for ¼ mile of what is existing. The idea behind this request is also to allow for bi-directional traffic, it is uncertain that this could be done if there are flexible bollards. So from that perspective we want to reach out in the short term and in a cost effective manner to provide that bi-directional route that wasn’t won from the State. The solid barrier is encouraged for this short stretch. But flexible bollards are an improvement over the nothing that exists.”

Within the next 2 years there will be the Scofield deck replacement (rehab) in that same section of I-580. Bus shuttle service will be provided during the construction phase. It is envisioned that the flexible barrier project will take place before the Scofield rehab project.

As an aside, the request was made to refer to paved multi-use paths as “path” or “Class I facility” and not as “trail”.

Marsh Creek Road: No update

Pigeon Pass 84: There is no shoulder. Robert Raburn requested that it be prioritized to construct the shoulder.

Mokelumne Aqueduct over-crossing: Highway 4 By-pass Authority has authorized planning, ARRA funding unlikely.

ALA 84: Rosewaren overpass is in the design phase now to widen into the creek to provide 8' shoulder. Construction to start April 2010.

Site visits were requested for US 101/Ralston and Highway 9 and will be set up by email.

### **Item 7. Announcements**

Jean Finney announced that the position of acting BAC Advisor will rotate to perspective candidates over the next few months. It is hoped that the candidates will ultimately apply for the position, which should be permanently filled in September. Ina will probably not be the coordinator of the next BAC meeting.

Michelle DeRobertis announced a bike ride event on May 17 to celebrate SVBC 10 new overpasses and under-crossings in Santa Clara County. Check the Bike to Work Day events on their website.

### **Item 8. Adjournment**

**Date of the next D4BAC meeting: July 15, 2009**

**Accident Data<sup>1</sup>**  
**for State Routes (SR) 9 and 152 in Santa Clara County**  
**and SR 84 in Alameda County**

State Route (SR)	Location (PMs)	Time Period	# of Accidents
SC-9 <i>Saratoga to Skyline</i>	0.0 – 7.0 Skyline Blvd - 6 <sup>th</sup> Street/Saratoga	1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	135 cross-centerline vehicle accidents with 6 fatalities and 108 injuries
		1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	21 bicycle accidents (23 injuries); 15 between PM 4.5 and 7.0; 18 in northbound direction
Construction of the centerline rumble strips along SR 9 is underway. "Bicycle" and "Share the Road" signs will be installed as part of this project. In addition, the project will include shoulder improvements at selected locations with available right-of-way and minimal environmental impacts. A separate project is being initiated to widen shoulders at various locations along this section of SR 9.			

State Route	Location (PMs)	Time Period	# of Accidents
ALA-84 <i>Tule Canyon</i>	11.1 – 16.7 (Mission Blvd – Town of Sunol)	1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	71 cross-centerline vehicle accidents with 6 fatalities and 94 injuries
		1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	2 bicycle accidents @ PM 13.43 and 16.2
Construction of centerline rumble strips between Mission Blvd and the Town of Sunol was completed in 2007 as an interim safety measures until further improvements along this corridor will be delivered between PMs 12.1 and 18, such as shoulder widening to the current standards, where possible, northbound lane realignment at Rosewornes Underpass and near Farwell Underpass, Alameda Creek Bridge replacement. Begin of construction: Fall 2010.			

State Route	Location (PMs)	Time Period	# of Accidents
SC-152 <i>Hecker Pass Rd</i>	0.0 – 6.1	1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	52 cross-centerline vehicle accidents with 1 fatal and 58 injuries
		1/1/1998 – 5/31/2008	1 bicycle accident @ PM 3.7
Rumble strips were installed along SR 152 between PMs 0.0 and 6.1. The project was completed in July 2008.			

<sup>1</sup> The data were extracted from Caltrans Traffic Accident Surveillance and Analysis System (TASAS)

ITEM 4

Attachment 1



## Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES

### **Committee Meeting Location and Schedule:**

Committee meetings will be held during District 4 business hours on at least a quarterly basis at the District 4 building at 111 Grand Avenue in Oakland.

### **Committee Member Responsibilities:**

The Committee will elect from among its members a Chair and Vice Chair to serve on an annual basis. The Chair will facilitate the meetings using a simplified approach to Robert's Rules of Order. In the event of the Chair's absence from a meeting, the Vice Chair will facilitate.

Meetings are open to the public and anyone may attend. The opportunity for public comment will be available on any item on the agenda; a public comment period will be afforded as well for items not on the agenda within the Committee's scope. To stay on schedule, the Chair may impose reasonable time limits on speakers during meetings.

The Committee's Caltrans staff liaison will be drawn from the Division of Transportation Planning and Local Assistance. The staff liaison will reserve the room for Committee meetings, attend such meetings, and take meeting notes or assign Caltrans staff for that purpose. The staff liaison will also provide the Committee with information on District activities related to the Committee objectives and responsibilities as described in the Committee Charter.

The Chair will develop and send the agenda for the upcoming meeting by electronic mail to the staff liaison at least two weeks in advance of the upcoming meeting. Supporting materials that consist of Caltrans documents and reports will be collected by the staff liaison, while supporting materials derived from sources outside Caltrans will be collected by the Chair and Vice Chair, who will send these by electronic mail to the staff liaison at least two weeks prior to the upcoming meeting. The staff liaison will distribute the draft agenda, supporting materials and meeting notes by electronic mail to the members at least one week before the meeting. If a member lacks access to electronic mail, a paper transmittal will be mailed to that person. The agenda will be finalized and posted by the staff liaison on the District 4 Pedestrian Advisory Committee website at least 72 hours prior to the upcoming meeting.

The Chair and Vice Chair may form subcommittees. Committee assignments will be divided among committee members.

ITEM 4

Attachment 2-

## California Department of Transportation District 4

District 4 > Departments > Division of TP & LA > Caltrans District 4 Bicycle Resources > D-4 BAC Charter

### **CALTRANS DISTRICT 4 BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (D-4BAC) CHARTER**

The District 4 Bicycle Advisory Committee was formed in 1993 by District Director Preston Kelly.

#### **BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MISSION:**

- The primary mission of the Caltrans D-4 Bicycle Advisory Committee is to:
  - increase bicycling and walking projects in accordance with the California Blueprint for Bicycling and Walking and Deputy Directive-64;
  - encourage safe bicycle improvements,
  - and continue to support mandatory and Routine Accommodation for regional bicycle and pedestrian projects across the nine Bay Area counties.

#### **BICYCLE ADVISORY COMMITTEE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:**

1. Increase bicycle and pedestrian projects region wide.
2. Decrease bicycling fatalities and injuries.
3. Provide adequate input for the development of bicycling facilities region wide.
4. Advise and assist Caltrans and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) on implementing Deputy Directive-64, and MTC's "Routine Accommodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians in the Bay Area".
5. Improve ways to involve and incorporate regional, and local bicycle groups, and advocates in information sharing.
6. Provide bicycle input to project management purpose and need statements; project development teams on improvements, retrofit/rehabilitation, new construction, and design issues in early stages of roadway projects.
7. Improve outreach and approach with County Technical Advisory Committees (TAC's), Transportation Authority's (TA's) and Congestion Management Agencies (CMA's), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Caltrans Headquarters Statewide Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee's and Local Agencies staff.
8. Set up a consistent meeting location and schedule for Quarterly Bicycle Advisory Meetings and provide timely minutes for each meeting.
9. Provide input and awareness of reported roadway deficiencies or repairs for field maintenance sweeping, sign and traffic engineering for bicycle travel.
10. Support the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Bicycle Working Group, and MTC Regional Bicycle Plan, and funding programs.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

The D-4BAC will be comprised of State, Local and Regional government agency staff, transportation professionals, and regional bicycle advocates whom regularly work on bicycle and pedestrian issues, and support the awareness and goals to improve non-motorized, bicycle and pedestrian mobility, accessibility and safety throughout the nine Bay Area counties.

In order to enhance the D-4BAC expertise and authority, each member shall meet one or more of the following criteria:

- Formally represent a major governmental agency (other than Caltrans), or Local Agency.
- Formally represent a Regional Bicycle or Pedestrian Advisory group, or advocate.
- Provide the D-4BAC with necessary professional expertise or help balance regional advisory representation.
- Adhere to the D-4BAC Team Charter and meeting roles.

D-4BAC members should:

- Consistently attend meetings or arrange for alternates when necessary.
- Be an advocated for bicycle mobility, accessibility and safety, setting aside other organizational or individual interests.
- Convey the D-4BAC action requests to their organizations for response to the committee.
- Generally promote and support regional bicycle advocate groups and clubs to support the implementation of the *California Blueprint for Bicycling and Walking*, *Deputy Directive DD-64*, the *Design Information Bulletin 82 for ADA Pedestrian Accessibility*, and the Metropolitan Transportation Comission's *Routine Accomodation of Bicyclists and Pedestrians in the Bay Area*.

## NOTES

The Committee Chair and Co-Chairs are the MTC Bike Coordinator, the East Bay bicycle Coalition designee and the Caltrans Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator

Meetings are open to the public and anyone may participate. Public participation will be permitted at a defined time in the meeting agenda.

Contributions to the discussion by each Committee member and public speaker should be brief as necessary, the chair may impose reasonable time limits on speakers. When an action item requiring discussion is under consideration, the chair may give priority to regognizing a Regional Advocate and Caltrans staff.

Copyright © 01-06-2008 Julian W. Carroll

[Conditions of Use](#) | [Privacy Policy](#)

Copyright © 2008 State of California

Item 5 attachment

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

**Transportation Enhancement State ARRA Funding Prioritization**

(All numbers in thousands)

**Attachment B-2**  
MTC Resolution No. 3896  
April 22, 2009  
Page 1 of 1

Project	Current Programming Need			New Programming Need	Total Need	ARRA TE
	RTIP-TE	RTIP	TLC (STP, CMAQ)	Cost Increases		
<b>1. Existing Ready-To-Go TE Projects Currently Programmed in the STIP-TE Program</b>						
AL Oakland, 7th St / West Oakland TOD	1,300				1,300	1,300
CC Concord, Monument Blvd Pedestrian Imps	1,000				1,000	1,000
CC Martinez, Marina Vista Streetscape	127				127	127
SF DPT, Inner Sunset Traffic Calming / Trns Enh	343				343	343
SC Campbell, E Campbell Ave Dwntrn Enh	1,200				1,200	1,200
SL Benicia, State Park Overcrossing of I-780	320				320	320
SN Windsor, Old Redwood Hwy Ped Enh	270				270	270
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>4,560</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>4,560</b>	<b>4,560</b>
<b>2. Other Ready-To-Go TE-eligible Projects in the STIP (Not Programmed in the STIP-TE)</b>						
RG Marin US-101 HOV Gap Closure (Supplmtl)				2,100	2,100	2,100
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>2,100</b>
<b>3. Ready-To-Go TE-eligible Regional TLC Projects with Existing Funding</b>						
RG Regional TLC Projects (in STP/CMAQ)			3,051		3,051	3,051
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,051</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,051</b>	<b>3,051</b>
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,560</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3,051</b>	<b>2,100</b>	<b>9,711</b>	<b>9,711</b>

**STP Suballocation Reconciliation**

Regional STP-TE Available	9,711
RSTP-TE Programming	9,711
Balance (Over) Under	0

**80/20 County/Regional Split Reconciliation**

County	ARRA TE Share	ARRA TE Program	Regional STP/CMAQ Distribution	2010 STIP Credit	2010 STIP+ STP/CMAQ Balance
Regional	2,100	2,100	0	0	0
Alameda	1,570	1,300	270	1,300	1,570
Contra Costa	1,017	1,127	(110)	1,127	1,017
Marin	297	0	297	0	297
Napa	184	0	184	0	184
San Francisco	803	343	460	343	803
San Mateo	833	0	833	0	833
Santa Clara	1,838	1,200	638	1,200	1,838
Solano	481	320	161	320	481
Sonoma	586	270	316	270	586
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,711</b>	<b>6,660</b>	<b>3,051</b>	<b>4,560</b>	<b>7,611</b>

J:\PROJECT\Funding\ARRA\Programming\State Discretionary ARRA\STIP\Resolution 3896 Attachment B-1\_B-2.xls\Res-3896 Alt-B1

Date Printed: 3/27/2009 4:12 PM

ITEM 5

Attachment

**California Department of Transportation  
Interregional Transportation Improvement Program  
Transportation Enhancement Programming Guidelines**

**I. Purpose and Authority**

These guidelines describe the standards, criteria, and procedures for the development of Transportation Enhancement (TE) projects to be programmed in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

In August 2003, the California Transportation Commission (Commission or CTC) approved the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) Program Reform, under Resolution G-03-13, which authorized the programming of TE projects into the STIP. The STIP Guidelines allow the Department of Transportation (Department) to include in the ITIP; TE projects related to the interregional transportation of people or goods or capital outlay projects of statewide benefit and interest.

These guidelines were developed with the following objectives:

- Clearly define roles and responsibilities within the Department
- Establish standards and direction for programming ITIP TE projects
- Develop evaluation criteria under which ITIP TE projects are proposed for programming
- Describe and implement procedures for programming ITIP TE projects

**II. Background**

The Commission approved the original TE program in 1993 and later revised it in 1998. Funds available for TE projects are divided between the Regions and the State. To accelerate the obligation of Federal TE apportionments, the Commission reformed the process in August 2003 to include TE in the STIP. Now, Regions have TE shares in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), and the State has TE shares in the ITIP. Any TE activities associated with a State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) project are funded through the SHOPP, or RTIP if the Regions choose to do so. All TE projects are now subject to the requirements of the STIP as described in the STIP Guidelines, Resolution G-03-19. These ITIP TE programming guidelines do not supersede the STIP Guidelines.

**III. Roles and Responsibilities**

Districts – Project Development

The District identifies the need and develops a proposed ITIP TE funding solution. A formal TE application is then prepared and sent to Headquarters Local Assistance (LA) for review and eligibility determination. Following the eligibility determination, the District prepares and forwards a Project Nomination Form and an ITIP TE Screening

Form to the Division of Transportation Programming STIP Office. The District will assign someone that can answer questions as the project proceeds through the eligibility review and programming process. The District will be the sponsor for other State or Federal agencies or Tribal Governments proposing TE projects. Once an ITIP TE project is programmed, the District will deliver the project as proposed and programmed.

Headquarters Local Assistance – Determines TE eligibility

Headquarters Local Assistance will review TE applications to determine if projects are eligible for TE funding. The Federal Highway Administration TE guidelines will be used for eligibility determination. Headquarters Local Assistance will send a formal response back to the districts as to the eligibility determination. The eligibility determination will also be forwarded to the TE Liaison and the area STIP Liaison in the Division of Transportation Programming. Headquarters Local Assistance will provide a letter to other State and Federal agencies as to the timeline and procedures for submitting TE projects. Headquarters Local Assistance will re-review eligibility at the Draft Project Report stage or when a Program Change Request is processed.

Division of Transportation Programming – Proposes ITIP TE funds for eligible projects

The STIP Office within the Division of Transportation Programming will collect and review Project Nomination and ITIP TE Screening Forms for all eligible ITIP TE projects. The STIP Office will then provide the necessary information to the TE Ranking Committee (TE Ranking Committee is described below). Once the TE Ranking Committee completes the statewide ranking list, the STIP Office will submit the prioritized projects for inclusion into the ITIP for ultimate adoption into the STIP. The STIP Office processes STIP Amendments and time extensions for programmed ITIP TE projects. The STIP Office also reviews the Request for Funds and the corresponding monthly CTC Financial Vote List for correctness. The Chief of the Division of Transportation Programming makes the final decision on which TE projects to propose for the ITIP.

TE Ranking Committee – Prioritizes eligible ITIP TE projects

A committee comprised of five people will convene to review, compare and score eligible ITIP TE project proposals from a statewide perspective and a project category perspective. The TE Ranking Committee (Committee) will be comprised of two members from Transportation Programming STIP Office, one member from LA, one member from Headquarters Planning and one member from Headquarters Environmental. The Committee will assign point values for each submitted ITIP TE project, prepare a statewide ranking list and present the list to Transportation Programming for possible inclusion into the ITIP.

California Transportation Commission

As it relates to these guidelines, the Commission establishes and adopts STIP Guidelines, adopts a new STIP every two years through RTIP and ITIP proposals, approves proposed STIP Amendments to add, modify or delete projects from the STIP, approves time extensions for existing STIP projects and approves STIP project allocations.

**IV. ITIP TE Planning and Programming Guidelines**

All projects under consideration for ITIP funding must be consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), the ITIP themes, the adopted STIP Guidelines and the Director's Policy regarding Context Sensitive Solutions. The following are highlights of these guidelines and standards:

ITSP and ITIP Themes

The overarching theme of the ITIP is to provide funding for projects that improve the interregional movement of people and goods to and through urbanized areas. It was developed using the ITSP as a guide for completion of key portions of the freeway and expressway systems and the Intercity Passenger Rail Program.

This interregional theme recognizes that transportation needs in California are statewide and varied, and the economic health and quality of life in our state is dependent on the development of a complete multi-modal transportation system "to and through urbanized areas". The improvements must also promote equity, strengthen the economy, protect the environment, respect and protect our valued natural resources and promote a higher quality of life. ITIP themes help to meet these goals and guide ITIP investments. These themes are:

- Complete the ITSP focus Routes
- Reduce Congestion and Promote Livable Communities
- Improve Goods Movement
- Encourage Funding Partnerships
- Environmental Justice

STIP Guidelines

The STIP Guidelines provide specific direction for programming ITIP TE projects. The following are of particular importance to TE projects:

- The Department may not propose ITIP TE grants to local agencies
- The Department must be the implementing agency for ITIP TE projects, with the exception of scenic land acquisition or projects implemented by other State or Federal agencies

### Context Sensitive Solutions

The Department's Policy on Context Sensitive Solutions should be used in conjunction with the ITIP and ITSP themes and goals for ITIP TE projects. This policy states:

"The Department uses "Context Sensitive Solutions" as an approach to plan, design, construct, maintain, and operate its transportation system. These solutions use innovative and inclusive approaches that integrate and balance community, aesthetic, historic, and environmental values with transportation safety, maintenance, and performance goals. Context sensitive solutions are reached through a collaborative, interdisciplinary approach involving all stakeholders."

### Federal Matching Requirements

There are two methods of programming the federal match on TE projects. Programming a project with a match and programming a project without a match, as follows:

- With a match - local funds will provide at least 11.47% of the total project cost and the STIP provides 88.53% as federal funds
- Without a match - the STIP will provide the match to federal funds with state funds

The Project Nomination Form and the TE Screening Form must illustrate which type of funding will be required for the federal match.

### **V. Project Evaluation and Scoring**

Proposed projects that satisfy all requirements for ITIP TE eligibility and have the proper complete documentation submitted prior to the final submittal deadline will be evaluated and ranked on a statewide and project category perspective. The Committee will compare and score all projects on a point value scale. The Committee will be subjective, relying on their expertise and experience. The Committee, within the following general framework, may devise its own process and decide what external information to bring for evaluating and scoring the projects. Projects are scored on a 100-point scale with up to 50 points for relative merit and interest from a statewide perspective and up to 50 points for relative value in the project category to which it is assigned by the Committee. Projects that are ITIP TE eligible and have local funding will be given additional consideration during evaluation and scoring. The following are the project categories and the criteria for the statewide evaluation. Following the Statewide Criteria is a detailed explanation of the criteria.

Project Categories

- Historic and archaeological projects
- Scenic beautification projects
- Water quality and wildlife protection projects
- Bicycle and pedestrian projects
- Museums and visitor center projects

Statewide Criteria

- Enhancements to a project on a Focus Route
- Enhancements to a project on a High Emphasis Route
- Enhancements to a project on Interregional Road System (IRRS) Route
- Enhancements to a Highway Project of statewide significance
- Enhancements to Intercity Rail Projects
- Enhancements to an ITIP Grade Separation project
- Enhancements to an ITIP Mass Transit Guideway project
- Grants to other State or Federal agencies for projects to be implemented by Federal or State agencies or for scenic land acquisition by land conservancies
- Projects not integrated with ITIP project, but on IRRS
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities providing an alternative to IRRS Routes
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities providing access to State/National Parks or Interregional Surface Transportation facility
- Pedestrian and bicycle facility on a designated state bicycle route
- Enhancement consistent with a Route Concept Report or Transportation Corridor Report and a District System Management Plan

Detailed Statewide Criteria explanation

- Enhancements to a project on a Focus Route – Focus Routes are a subset of High Emphasis Routes that are the highest priority for completion. These routes are in nonurbanized areas and will complete a statewide trunk system. These Focus Routes include the original 13 High Emphasis Routes detailed in the 1989 Blueprint Legislation. The Focus Routes are the following: (Refer to the IRRS listing in the Attachment.)
  - ✓ ■ Route 101 – Los Angeles to Oregon Border
  - Route 99 – Bakersfield to Tehama County (also includes Route 70 from 99/70 Junction to Route 149)
  - Route 395 – San Bernardino to Oregon State Line (also includes Route 14)
  - Mexico Gateway Routes – Routes 7, 111, 78, 86, and 905
  - Route 58 – Link from Routes 5 and 99 to Routes 15 and 40 to Nevada and Arizona
  - Route 198 – Only direct east/west route in lower Central Valley
  - Routes 41 and 46 – Links 101 to Routes 5 and 99 in the Central Valley
  - ✓ ■ Routes 152 and 156 – Links Central Valley to Monterey Bay region

- Route 20 – Major east/west corridor for the Northern Central Valley (also includes Routes 29, 53, and 49)
  - Route 299 – Major east/west corridor in the north state (also includes Routes 44 and 36)
- Enhancements to a project on a High Emphasis Route – High Emphasis Routes are a subset of the IRRS Routes; non-urbanized portions of these routes connecting urban areas. These routes include Focus Routes as well as the following: (Refer to the IRRS listing in the Attachment.)
 

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ ▪ Route 1</li> <li>▪ Route 5</li> <li>▪ Route 6</li> <li>▪ Route 8</li> <li>▪ Route 10</li> <li>▪ Route 15</li> <li>▪ Route 17</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Route 40</li> <li>▪ Route 50</li> <li>▪ Route 70</li> <li>▪ Route 80</li> <li>▪ Route 95</li> <li>▪ Route 97</li> <li>▪ Route 120</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Route 126</li> <li>▪ Route 138</li> <li>▪ Route 139</li> <li>▪ Route 205</li> <li>▪ Route 215</li> <li>▪ Route 505</li> <li>▪ Route 580</li> </ul>
--	---	---
- IRRS Routes – Routes established by Streets and Highways Code, Sections 164.10-164.20
  - Highway Projects of statewide significance – In keeping with continuing, cooperative, and comprehensive planning, this includes projects of statewide significance with multiple funding sources and support from Regional Agencies
  - Intercity Rail – There are three intercity passenger rail corridors overseen by the Department. A project in this category would enhance an existing project, or improvements along one of the corridors. An example of this would be the restoration of a historic Intercity Rail Train Station. The three corridors are:
    - Capitol Corridor
    - Pacific Surfliner Corridor
    - San Joaquin Corridor
  - Grade Separations – Enhancement to grade separation projects or passenger rail
    - Mass Transit Guideways – Enhancement to a commuter rail project of interregional significance, such as the Altamont Commuter Express
    - Grants to other State or Federal Agencies – Projects to be implemented by another Federal or State agency, or for the purpose of acquiring land for scenic purposes by land conservancies
    - Projects not integrated with ITIP Project, but on IRRS – Stand-alone enhancement projects that are on a designated IRRS

- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities providing an alternative to IRRS Routes – These projects must have interregional and/or statewide significance and provide a viable alternative to a route or route segment
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities providing access to State or National Parks or Interregional Surface Transportation facility – These projects must provide access to a State Park, a National Park, or transportation facility that serves an interregional purpose. These projects must have statewide significance
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities on a designated state bicycle route – These are projects that are on routes are currently designated as a state bicycle route (Currently designated state bicycle routes are: Route 1 – between Capistrano Beach and Lettett; Route 5 – between the Mexican border and Capistrano Beach; and Route 101 – between Leggett and the California-Oregon state line.)
- Enhancements consistent with Route Concept Report or Transportation Corridor Report and a District System Management Plans – These projects tend to be stand alone projects and the enhancements are consistent with the reports

#### VI. Procedures

- For the effectiveness of these guidelines in prioritizing on a statewide level, all proposed ITIP TE project nominations are to be submitted on the same schedule as normal ITIP project submittals. Follow the schedule outlined on the STIP web site: [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/stip.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/stip.htm)
- All project nominations must have a completed TE application turned into the Division of Local Assistance for TE eligibility determination
  - Once a project is found eligible for ITIP TE funding, a completed Project Nomination Form as well as ITIP TE Screening Form (both available on the STIP website) must be turned into the Division of Transportation Programming to determine if ITIP funding is available
- Projects will be proposed for programming based on priority given by the TE Ranking Committee

Attachment – Interregional Road System Routes