

Memorandum

To: Chair and Commissioners

Date: November 27, 2006

File: Book Item 4.4
Action Item

From: JOHN F. BARNA, JR.
Executive Director

Ref.: POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR 2006 STIP AUGMENTATION

Issue: What policies and procedures should the Commission follow in developing the 2006 STIP augmentation?

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Commission approve the attached resolution to adopt policies and procedures specific to the 2006 STIP augmentation and to adopt editorial corrections to the underlying STIP guidelines.

Background: State law 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 statutes further authorize the Commission to amend the adopted guidelines after conducting at least one public hearing. In no event may the Commission change its guidelines during the period between 30 days after the fund estimate adoption and the STIP adoption.

It has been Commission practice to adopt amendments to the permanent STIP guidelines at the time of each fund estimate. Because the circumstances of the fund estimate for each STIP cycle have varied so widely, it has also been Commission practice to adopt policies and procedures specific to each particular STIP cycle at the same time.

The Commission last amended the STIP guidelines on September 28, 2005, prior to the 2006 STIP cycle. Staff proposes to amend the permanent STIP guidelines only to make two editorial corrections. The proposed policies and procedures specific to the 2006 STIP augmentation essentially carry forward the policies and procedures used for the original 2006 STIP. The most significant change is that, because of the bond funding source, the fund estimate will not provide targets by fiscal year. Because the available programming capacity again includes a significant amount from the Public Transportation Account (PTA), the fund estimate will provide each county with both a “total target” and a “highway target,” the latter calculated as if PTA revenues were not available. These targets do not constrain proposals or programming by county, but they recognize the reality of the statewide capacity restrictions imposed by the PTA.

CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
Amendment of STIP Guidelines

RESOLUTION G-06-__
Replacing Resolution G-05-07

- 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 September 28, 2005 (Resolution G-05-07), and
- 1.3 WHEREAS the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by voters as Proposition 1B on the November 7, 2006 ballot, authorized \$2 billion in general obligation bond proceeds to be available for projects in the STIP, to augment funds otherwise available from other sources, and
- 1.4 WHEREAS State law permits the Commission, in consultation with the Department of Transportation and regional agencies, to amend the STIP fund estimate to account for unexpected revenues or other unforeseen circumstances, leading to an augmentation of the STIP, and
- 1.5 WHEREAS the Commission intends to adopt a revised fund estimate and to conduct a special programming cycle to augment the 2006 STIP, and
- 1.6 WHEREAS on November 15, 2006, the Commission staff circulated and posted on the Commission website proposed policies and procedures specific to the circumstances of the 2006 STIP augmentation and its fund estimate, and
- 1.7 WHEREAS the Commission staff has identified editorial corrections to the STIP guidelines to incorporate a change in statute and the name of the executive director,
- 2.1 NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the following two amendments to the STIP guidelines:
 - In section 21, delete the sentence that reads, “If a regional agency receives Federal metropolitan planning funds, however, the RTIP may program no more than one percent of the county share for that agency.”
 - In section 72, replace “Diane C. Eidam” with “John Barna.”and
- 2.2 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Commission adopts the attached policies and procedures specific to the 2006 STIP, and
- 2.3 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 2006 STIP augmentation, to regional agencies, county transportation commissions, and representatives of local agencies and transit agencies.

DRAFT

STIP Guidelines**Policies and Procedures Specific to the 2006 STIP Augmentation**

The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006, approved by voters as Proposition 1B on the November 7, 2006 ballot, authorized \$2 billion in general obligation bond proceeds to be available for projects in the state transportation improvement program (STIP), to augment funds otherwise available for the STIP from other sources. Under the Bond Act, the funds shall be deposited in the newly created Transportation Facilities Account (TFA) and shall be available, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in the same manner as other STIP funds.

The California Transportation Commission has inaugurated a special STIP development cycle to augment the 2006 STIP in advance of the development of the 2008 STIP. When the Commission adopted the 2006 STIP, funding constraints meant that many projects proposed in regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs) and in the interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP) were either not programmed or were programmed for years later than the years the projects could be delivered. The Commission's primary intent for having a 2006 STIP augmentation is to advance the programming of funds for STIP projects that can be delivered prior to the adoption of the 2008 STIP. The Commission also intends to provide an early opportunity to program new STIP projects with the added capacity provided by the TFA bonds.

The Commission's STIP Guidelines, as amended on September 28, 2005, apply to the 2006 STIP Augmentation. The following specific policies and procedures address the particular circumstances of the 2006 STIP Augmentation and fund estimate:

- **Schedule.** The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2006 STIP Augmentation:

Caltrans presents draft fund estimate	November 8, 2006.
CTC adopts fund estimate.	December 14, 2006.
Regions submit RTIPs.	April 2, 2007.
Caltrans submits ITIP.	April 2, 2007.
CTC STIP hearing, South	April 25, 2007.
CTC STIP hearing, North	May 2, 2007.
CTC publishes staff recommendations	May 17, 2007.
CTC adopts STIP.	June 7, 2007.

- **Statewide Fund Estimate.** The statewide capacity fund estimate for the 2006 STIP fund estimate identifies the incremental new capacity beyond the capacity that had been identified in the original 2006 STIP fund estimate. This includes the new TFA revenue and also net changes in estimated revenues from other STIP sources. Those changes are primarily due to changes in actual revenues for 2005-06, changes made in the 2006-07 Budget Act, and a revised assumption about the receipt of tribal gaming revenues.

- Availability of TFA bond revenues. The fund estimate assumes for programming purposes that all potential TFA bond revenues are available in 2007-08. This means that STIP funding proposals in the 2006 STIP Augmentation will not be constrained by fiscal year. The Commission expects that all STIP projects, including projects carried forward from the original 2006 STIP, will be programmed in the fiscal year in which they can be delivered. The actual availability of TFA bond proceeds will be subject to annual appropriation by the Legislature, and the Commission expects that the Legislature will consider the level of programming in making appropriations.
- County shares and targets. The fund estimate table of county shares and targets takes into account all county and interregional share balances through the December 2006 Commission meeting, as well as the new statewide STIP capacity. For each county and the interregional share, the table identifies the following four target amounts:
 - Base. This is the current unprogrammed share for each county and the interregional program, through the December 2006 Commission meeting, without the addition of any new statewide capacity. The Commission expects to give priority to fulfilling these shares in the 2006 STIP Augmentation.
 - Highway Target. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of estimated revenues available for highways and other nontransit purposes (i.e., excluding Public Transportation Account revenues) through 2010-11. It is not a minimum, guarantee, or limit on project nominations or project selection in any county or region for the 2006 STIP Augmentation.
 - Total Target. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of all available revenues, including Public Transportation Account revenues, through 2010-11. It is not a minimum, guarantee, or limit on project nominations or project selection in any county or region for the 2006 STIP Augmentation.
 - Maximum. This target is determined by calculating the STIP formula share of all available revenues, including Public Transportation Account revenues, through the end of the county share period that extends beyond the STIP period, 2011-12. This represents the maximum amount that the Commission may program in a county, other than advancing future share to a county under 1 million population pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 188.8(j).
- Prior Programming. All projects programmed in the 2006 STIP, as amended through the December 2006 Commission meeting, are treated as prior programming and do not count against new programming targets. Caltrans and regional agencies may propose changes in currently programmed projects, including changes in program year and changes in programmed cost. The Commission will not change the program year of any project component now programmed for 2006-07 or earlier, except for Caltrans environmental, design, or right-of-way work where Caltrans indicates that work has not yet begun or has been suspended and it is proposed to delete the work

from the STIP or to delay the beginning of work until 2008-09 or later. Where work is suspended, the amount of expenditure to date will remain as programmed.

- Transportation Enhancements (TE). The 2006 STIP augmentation includes no new TE capacity. However, Caltrans and regions may propose TE amendments within existing capacity, including amendments to designate TE reserves for specific TE projects.
- Advance Project Development Element (APDE). There is no APDE identified for the 2006 STIP or for the 2006 STIP Augmentation.
- 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 2006 STIP Augmentation.
- No Federal Funding. There is no federal funding for the 2006 STIP Augmentation. For this reason, there is no limitation on state-only funding for highway and road projects and no need to identify transit projects as qualifying for federal funding.
- Limitations on planning, programming, and monitoring (PPM). AB 2538 (2006) amended the statutes to permit regional agencies in all counties to receive up to 5% of their county shares for planning, programming, and monitoring. The fund estimate includes a revised table of PPM limitations that incorporates the 5% limit and includes the new capacity in the base. The Commission will program additional PPM within these limits as proposed for 2007-08 and later fiscal years. The amounts in the table include amounts already programmed or allocated within the designated county share periods.
- Commission expectations and priorities. For the 2006 STIP Augmentation, the Commission expects to give first priority to the reprogramming of projects from the original 2006 STIP and to projects to fulfill the current unprogrammed share balances identified through December 2006. The selection of projects for additional programming will be consistent with the standards and criteria in the STIP guidelines.
- Performance Measures. The inclusion of specific performance measures in the 2006 STIP Augmentation cycle 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 is being asked to provide a quantitative and/or qualitative evaluation of their respective RTIPs and the ITIP, commenting on each of the performance indicators and performance measures outlined in Table A. Attachment 1 has been developed to assist agencies with this task. Attachment 1 will be considered the evaluation report for the 2006 STIP Augmentation cycle and will fulfill the requirement outlined in Section 19 of the STIP Guidelines.

The overarching goal for using performance measures in the 2006 STIP Augmentation cycle 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 Attachment 1 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.

Attachment 1

Part A:

Complete Part A.

Use the following to indicate quantitatively how the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) or the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is consistent with the goals established in your Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). If any of the performance measures in Part A do not reflect the goals contained in an RTP/ITSP or if an RTIP/ITIP does not contain goals that are measurable by the performance measures contained within, simply state “not applicable (na)” for each indicator or each performance measure (where appropriate).

Performance Indicators and Measures						
Indicator	Relation to STIP Section 19 Performance Criteria	Performance Measures			Current System Performance (Baseline)	Projected Impact of Projects
		Mode	Level*	Measures		
Safety	2	Roadway	Region	Fatalities / Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)		
	2			Fatal Collisions / VMT		
	2			Injury Collisions / VMT		
	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 1/4 mile of a rail station or bus route.		
Reliability	1	Roadway	Corridor	Travel Time Variability		
	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		
	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 Average Daily Vehicle Trips 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)		
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		
Return on Investment/ Lifecycle Cost	1-7					

*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).

Part B:

If Part A alone is insufficient in indicating how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured, 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 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 Attachment 1, 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.

Part C:

For new projects for which construction of a large new facility or a substantial expansion of an existing facility is proposed and over 50% of a county's target for new programming as identified in the fund estimate is applied or is over \$50 million in total project costs, a project level evaluation is preferable.

If a project-level evaluation is conducted, Table A should be used for reference.