

CALIFORNIA'S REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES

**November 1, 2000
9:00 am to 11:00 am
San Diego Council of Governments
401 B Street, Suite 800
Conference Room A**

AGENDA

- | | | |
|--|-----------------|------------|
| 1. Call to Order | All | 5 minutes |
| a. Self-Introductions | | |
| b. Announcements | | |
| 2. Minutes from September 28, 2000 Meeting | Dean Delgado | 5 minutes |
| 3. Section 5310 Program | Kathie Jacobs | 10 minutes |
| 4. Review of Caltrans Delegations | Stephen Maller | 15 minutes |
| 5. RSTP, CMAQ & TEA Obligation Balances | Norma Ortega | 10 minutes |
| 6. 2000 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program | Scott McGowan | 10 minutes |
| 7. Training Programs | | |
| a. Local Transit Project Delivery | Peter Steinert | 5 minutes |
| b. Project Programming | Rick Gifford | 5 minutes |
| 8. ITS Deployment Initiatives Project | Robert Ratcliff | 15 minutes |
| 9. Other Business | All | 5 minutes |

Regional Transportation Planning Agencies

Meeting Minutes – September 28, 2000

1. Call to Order, Self Introductions, Announcements

Andy Nash, with San Francisco Transportation Authority, gave a welcome. Heinz Heckerroth gave a reminder on the Tranny Awards. Nominations are due March 1, 2001.

2. Minutes from August 23, 2000 Meeting

There were no comments, minutes were adopted.

3. Final GTIP/TRCP Guidelines

Debbia Mah and Garland Hagen presented information. Garland distributed a handout of the changes and gave a summary of the changes which were based on the workshop and other feedback (See attachment to minutes for more details). Caltrans tried to address all of the significant changes and Garland also noted some technical changes. One notable technical change is:

Page 7, Section 2.4, 4th bullet – should be “Certifying sustained level of transportation expenditures consistent with fiscal years 1997/98, 1998/99 & 1999/00 during the period allocated funds are available for use.”

Debbie Hale and Bob McClearly thanked Caltrans and CTC for their consideration of the RTPAs’ comments.

Several questions were asked. It was clarified that the level of expenditures verification will be part of the Cooperative Agreement and subject to audit. It was also noted that Section 5.4 applies to projects subject to CEQA clearance. Pete Hathaway also clarified that the CTC needs to review the project’s environmental document (notice of preparation, draft document & full document). This applies to State and local projects (Negative Declarations and EIRs). If the project is Categorically Exempt, the CTC also needs to be informed. Also noted was Caltrans’ ability to make allocations – as long as future activities are consistent with the applications & environmental document, then Caltrans can approve the agreement and allocations.

Caltrans agreed to a modification of the language so that the “project funding approval” as described in Section 5.4 will only be required when applicable (project allocations after the environmental phase is complete and projects with negative declarations or EIRs). RTPA recommendation to the CTC is to approve the guidelines as changed, with this one modification, and to thank Caltrans and the CTC for their efforts.

3.5 Section 5310 Program

Peter DeHaan presented a summary of the issue – the final list of projects had changes from a previous draft. This was due to errors, rescoring of projects and a change in the total funding available for projects. As a result some projects which were thought to be above the funding line now were below the line. VCTC requested changes to the list slated for CTC approval. The total for projects which “fell out” from the old list total about \$1 million. Various suggestions were offered:

- Fund projects from “new” list and those above the line on “old” list.
- Fund projects on new list and those that fell out from old list will be placed on stand-by list or put on top of next year’s list.
- Fund the projects that fell out from federal highway funds.
- Fund a majority of projects on the “new” list, reserve some of the funds, allow opportunity for those projects that fell off to appeal and be rescored, then approve remainder of the funds.

There was discussion on these options and concerns with some projects getting an unfair advantage over others.

The RTPA group agreed to recommend the CTC approve the “new” list down to the 100% level, and the other projects which fell off have the opportunity to appeal and be put on the top of the stand-by list or next year’s list depending on their appeal and revised score. The revised project score would have to be above 80 points (which is the cut off for the 100% funding level) to be put on the top of the list next year.

Debbie also mentioned about a delay in purchasing CNG vans. A few agencies in the State are having delays due to testing. Caltrans was asked to help out and work with FTA on this item.

4a. Project Delivery Improvements – Release & Review of District Reports

Therese McMillan presented a status report. Business, Transportation & Housing (BT&H) released the report from the project delivery teams for review. Therese wanted to assemble a small group to scan through the reports and develop a list of priorities for the recommendations. Anyone interested serving on this group should contact Therese and/or Debbie Hale. The reports should be available on the web and through Caltrans publications unit.

The MIS Committee will also be releasing a draft report in October on their efforts. The study of a common project identifier is a short term priority and is underway. The other items being examined are business practices and MIS/database logistics (interfaces,

programs, etc.). There are long term items being reviewed, but short term “triage” activities are also being examined.

4b. Project Delivery Improvements – Local Transit Project Delivery Team

Debbie Hale gave the report. Local transit project delivery team activities include the hiring of a consultant to do training for Caltrans and transit/regional agencies. This effort is expected to start in Spring. David Cabrera is also looking for comments and feedback on transit technologies.

5. Closeout of STIP TEA Program

Marsha Mason distributed some brochures on the TEA program accomplishments. Marsha gave a summary of the results ISTEA TEA program. 402 projects were programmed. California was apportioned \$214 million and \$210 million was programmed, most of which (40%) was for bicycle and pedestrian facilities projects. There is enough funding for the conservation land projects that were provisionally approved at the last CTC meeting. Of the three State shares, \$40 million went to Caltrans, \$40 went to Statewide transportation enhancements and \$52 million went to Conservation Lands. Marsha handed out list of the Regional Program shares/projects and asked each region to review the information and provide any comments or corrections. There was a question on the timeliness of determining project eligibility, and Marsha noted that all if you haven't received a call on the projects on the list, they should be okay.

Pete Hathaway handed out the CTC agenda item (pink). He noted that 355 projects were delivered (about 88%), and 21 were traded into the program. In terms of funding, \$192 million out of \$210 million was delivered. There was \$17 million from delivery failures, and \$21 million in savings, however, the reporting on these failures/savings was spotty. This funding went into the Conservation Lands program.

6. GARVEE Bond Guidelines

Chuck Oldham reported on this item. Guidelines are on the CTC agenda this month as an information item, and are slated for adoption in November. The guidelines have been simplified and reflect timely use of funds issue. GARVEE bonds will be sold by the State, so the State Treasurer will structure the bond and sale of bonds, etc. Chuck does not expect a large demand in the near term given the large cash balances.

How will people know how much the GARVEE cost will be to the applicant? The applicant will have to work with the State Treasury's Office during the development of the financing. It was noted that GARVEE bonds are only for right of way and construction activities and it works through the STIP processes. Projects do not have

to be in STIP prior to issuance of the GARVEE bond, but it will be incorporated into the STIP as part of the GARVEE request.

The RTPA group supported the revised guidelines.

7. Annual FTA Applications

The issue is one that Dan Herron raised at the previous meeting. The FTA application process for rural areas (Section 5310 program) is only a one time per year process. This poses a timing problem for agencies and is causing significant delays. Therese McMillan summarized some of the problems, especially those associated with the timing of the STIP and Section 5310 programs. There are a couple of options to address this issue:

- Have Caltrans and FTA to allow modifications to the applications to the rural program.
- Establish a separate processes – one for Section 5310 and another for flexible federal funds accessed through the STIP.

The RTPA group agreed to send a letter to Caltrans and FTA encouraging those agencies to allow modifications to applications and allowing amendments to the Section 5310 program. If anyone has a special interest in this issue, they should contact Debbie Hale.

8. Other Business

None.

Summary of policy & significant technical revisions to the TCRP guidelines:

- Section 1.2 Definitions Added definitions for spread of funds, rate of reimbursement, and committed funds.
- Section 1.4 Contact Points Clarified order of contact and requirements for submittal of documents.
- Section 2.4 Implementing Agency Clarified requirement for certification of funding consistent with provisions of SB 1662. Also see section 6.1.
- Section 3.2 Allocations Clarified start of work for construction or procurement.
- Section 4.3 Project Financial Plan Dropped presumption of proportional funding and clarified Commission decision regarding fund spread or fund advancement.
- Section 4.5 Alternative Project Clarified Commission considerations of partial projects.
- Section 5.1 Commission Allocations Clarified that demonstration of capacity to operate applies to expanded transit service. Also deleted provision which limited delegated allocation authority to the Department to within 90 days of the approval of project applications.
- Section 5.3 Environmental Documents Clarified Commission/Department role as responsible agency.
- Section 5.4 Project Funding Approval New section clarifying Commission action on project approval for funding subsequent to its review of environmental documents.
- Section 5.5 Special Case Projects Revisions consistent with provisions of SB 1662.
- Section 6. Cooperative agreement Clarified requirement for certification of funding consistent with provisions of SB 1662.
- Section 6.2 Reimbursement Clarified reimbursement for final PS&E subject to Commission project funding approval.
- Section 8.2 Progress Reports Changed due dates and added provision for standard report format.
- Appendix 9.4 Progress Report Form Added standard format for report