



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
www.lakeapc.org

367 North State Street, Ukiah, CA 95482
Administration: Suite 204 ~ 707-234-3314
Planning: Suite 206 ~ 707-263-7799

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING AGENDA

DATE: Thursday, May 23, 2019

TIME: 9 a.m.

PLACE: City of Lakeport
Large Conference Room
225 Park Street
Lakeport, California

Caltrans-District 1
Teleconference
1656 Union Street
Eureka, California

Teleconference Dial-In #: 866-576-7975 Passcode: 961240

1. Call to order
2. Approval of March 21, 2019 Minutes
3. Discussion of TAC Membership and Possible Development of By-Laws (*Speka*)
4. Discussion and Recommended Approval of the Draft 2019/20 Overall Work Program (*Davey-Bates, Pedrotti*) *Attachment to be provided at a later date.*
5. Announcements and Reports
 - a. Lake APC
 - i. Highway Infrastructure Program Funds (*Davey-Bates*)
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - b. Lake Transit Authority
 - i. Student Survey Work Element
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - c. Federal & State Grant Status Reports
 - i. Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Update (*Speka*)
 - ii. Other Grant Updates (*All*)
 - d. Caltrans
 - i. Lake County Projects Update
 - ii. Other Updates
6. Information Packet
7. Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda
8. Next Proposed Meeting – **June 20, 2019**
9. Adjourn meeting

Public Expression - The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requests - To request disability-related modifications or accommodations for accessible locations or meeting materials in alternative formats (*as allowed under Section 12132 of the ADA*) please contact the Lake APC office at 707-263-7799 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Posted: May 16, 2019

List of Attachments:

Agenda Item #2 – 3/21/2019 Draft Lake TAC Minutes

*Agenda Item #3 – TAC Membership staff report
- TAC Roster*

Agenda Item #5ai -Highway Infrastructure Program Funds Fact Sheet



Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
www.lakeapc.org

367 North State Street, Ukiah, CA 95482
Administration: Suite 204 ~ 707-234-3314
Planning: Suite 206 ~ 707-263-7799

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Draft Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 21, 2019
9 a.m.

City of Lakeport
Large Conference Room
225 Park Street
Lakeport, California

Present

Scott De Leon, Director of Public Works, County of Lake
Todd Mansell, Department of Public Works, County of Lake
Kevin Ingram, Community Development Director, City of Lakeport
Doug Grider, Public Works Director, City of Lakeport
Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1 (by telephone)
Alan Flora, City Manager, City of Clearlake

Absent

Hector Paredes, California Highway Patrol

Also Present

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director, Lake Area Planning Council
Alexis Pedrotti, Lake Area Planning Council
Nephele Barrett, Lake Area Planning Council
John Speka, Lake Area Planning Council

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 9:05 a.m.

2. Approval of August 23, 2018 Lake APC TAC Minutes

Todd motioned, Kevin seconded, to approve the August 23, 2018 minutes as written with no changes. Approved unanimously.

3. Progress Status Report on FY 2018/19 Overall Work Program Projects

Lexi provided a summary of expenditures through the second quarter of the 2018/19 fiscal year showing that only 25% of the budget has been expended (the third quarter ends at the end of March). Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) funds were used for the Countywide Sign Inventory Project (Work Element [WE] 614) with not much of it spent to date. Only 25% of RPA funds can be carried over from year to year. Each of the three agencies have \$1,500 budgeted for the project (e.g. consultant selection, kick-off meeting, etc.), but nothing has yet been seen from their end. Other elements were discussed to see where the local agencies needed to bill APC to show the funds being spent. Some of the RPA money budgeted for the Sign Inventory would need to be shifted out as there was more than could be used, even

in the event that the project was to go over budget. Lisa explained to Alan that the original plan was for the City of Clearlake to provide additional funding (\$30,000) to the project in order to have a usable sign inventory program developed from scratch (Lakeport and the County already were using their own sign inventory programs). Because the consultant proposal was well below the originally budgeted amount, some or all of these extra funds may not be needed, depending on how much work will later be needed to complete that component of the project. A final amendment to the current OWP budget will need to be made by April 15, so it was requested that the local agencies submit any billable hours soon in order to determine how much could be carried over. Lexi would be sending individual emails to local agency staffs to let them know where each of them stand relative to certain work elements. The bottom line is that RPA funds were in risk of being lost this year if more expenditures could not be accounted for.

4. Discussion of the Draft 2019/20 Overall Work Program

Lexi went over agency requests received from the County and the City of Clearlake (but not from the City of Lakeport) for the upcoming year's OWP. A spreadsheet was reviewed including a breakdown of projects and funding sources for each agency as well as budgets for APC and consultants. The amount for the County (\$15,000) was shown to be quite a bit lower than in the past. The City of Clearlake was higher than in past years at \$29,000. Lexi discussed the typical process for requests to be made for money within the work program, which normally starts with applications being made in January. New projects for the year include a Transit Passenger Survey and Speed Zone Studies. Carryover moneys for grant awarded funds include those for the Eleventh Street Corridor Plan, the Highway 20 Northshore Traffic Calming Plan, the Bus Passengers Facility Plan and the Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory Plan. "Pending" funds are also listed for a State Route 53 Corridor Study and a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Regional Baseline Study, neither project having been awarded grant funding to date, but in the event they are awarded (notice will be in May) they were added to the OWP to show that there are available funds for the matching amount. Local funds are expected to be less than normal for the coming year, so RPA funding will be used for many elements. As a result, eligibility and carryover matters will need to be followed more closely. Finally, Lisa noted that it will have to be determined who will handle the speed zone studies. She mentioned that Phil may be available to work part-time to cover this task. Lexi continued discussing how the Draft OWP had been submitted to Caltrans for comment. After these have been received and addressed, a final version will be brought to the TAC for a recommendation to the APC Board for adoption, prior to the end of the fiscal year (June 30).

Lisa discussed a trend towards more grant awarded (and consultant led) projects than in recent years. It could be a reflection of the agencies struggling to keep up with current workloads. Doug Grider noted that floods and fires have kept them busier than normal. Also, SB 1 funding has required additional reporting this year which is more time consuming and burdensome than the previous year. Lisa announced that Lexi would soon be taking on a new role as a project manager to help local agencies track and manage a variety of projects. This will help alleviate some of the burden placed on these agencies by State or federal funding programs with respect to meeting requirements, deadlines, etc. Lisa had also contacted Caltrans to note the problems the locals are facing. Currently, the State periodically corresponds with the County via conference call to go over the status of individual projects. Lisa suggested trying to set something up for the two cities to have the same opportunity, which according to Clearlake and Lakeport staff, would be helpful. Lisa

was to contact Susie Theiss at Local Assistance to discuss the possibilities.

5. Update by Local Agencies on Existing Local Transportation Fund (LTF) 2% Bike and Ped Allocations and Call for Projects for Fiscal Years 2015/16 through 2018/19

Lisa discussed past agreements with the TAC to have such funds set aside from year to year and held in reserve until an appropriate amount had accumulated to put towards projects. These funds have also traditionally been used as a local match for grant funded projects (e.g. Safe Routes to School, ATP, etc.). There is a total of \$88,445 currently available when this year's total is added to past reserves. A list of past projects (by jurisdiction) was presented in the staff report. She referenced the County having received \$51,181 between the 2102/13 and the 2014/15 fiscal years for a Konocti Road project that hasn't been used yet. The project was said to be over budget at this point and hasn't moved forward. Todd mentioned that the plan was to apply for ATP funds for construction in the next cycle. He also asked if APC staff would be able to assist with bike/ped counts. Nephelie mentioned that MCOG video counters could be used, and that Phil may be able to have those set up for the County. Should they end up receiving the ATP funds, Todd wasn't sure if the 2% funds would still be needed, although it could help as a match that would help the project score higher. Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E) and Environmental had already been completed with Safe Route to School funds. Lisa said they could continue the conversation at a later date to determine whether the money was still needed.

The City of Lakeport had \$15,000 from the same time period. Neither Kevin nor Doug were able to remember what it was for, feeling it may have been as a match for a project at the time. Kevin felt it may be useful for a match once the Pedestrian Facility Needs Inventory was complete (next year) and ped projects had been prioritized for the City. Doug felt it could be rolled into the Hartley Street project. Lisa reminded them that the funds were initially dedicated for a specific project, which had been agreed to by the TAC at that time. It would need to go back into the existing fund balance and the TAC would need to then determine if it should be used for some other specific project (whether it be another Lakeport project or elsewhere). The next ATP cycle will open next year and 2% funds could be used as a potential match at that time. Lisa was concerned that the funds weren't being used and it could be argued that the money should instead be used for transit purposes like the majority of the LTF funds. Lisa added that some of the 2% could be used as a local match for pedestrian facilities around the future transit hub as another possibility. Alan said that he may be interested in projects along Lakeshore Drive in the future. As the Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory Project unfolds, some of these may rise to the top of a priority list. For now, it was agreed that the 2% list will be kept as is.

6. Announcements and Reports

a. Lake APC

i. Proposed 2019 Lake TAC Meeting Schedule

Lisa noted that it was later in the year to be presenting the schedule, but this is the first time the TAC has met. Alan said that he would like to receive notice of TAC meetings in the interim (until a new Public Works Director can be hired) and to also include Dave Swartz (Clearlake's contract engineer). Lisa asked whether Julie Burrow (Clearlake Planner) should be invited as there is an official seat for that position. This will be a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) year, so it may be helpful to have full representation from each of the jurisdictions. Lexi added that each of the agencies should revisit who the right contacts should be given retirements and staff changes. Lisa

will have a current list sent to each of them and asked that they provide feedback so an updated list can be made.

ii. Miscellaneous

Nephele discussed proposed legislation at the State level that may affect future reporting for certain projects. The first is an existing law (AB 434) having to do with ADA accessibility on Caltrans websites. After July 1, Caltrans websites will need to be compatible with screen readers and everything submitted by agencies will need to have the same compatibility. Another bill (AB 659) involves proposed legislation that creates a tech grant program to develop “smart cities.” Other proposed legislation that may be relevant for this region will tie transportation funding to housing development. AB 1568 proposes to withhold Local Streets and Roads (LSR) funding beginning in 2020 for jurisdictions where adequate housing production goals are not being met. There may be a current push to revise parts of the bill to focus on housing element compliance as opposed to housing production goals (given that local jurisdictions have only limited roles in housing development). Finally, a bill is supposed to be coming from Senator Beall that will change the formula which divides ATP grant funding. Currently, 50% goes to large urban areas, 40% to a statewide pot, and 10% goes to small urban and rural competitive pot. The expected proposal from Senator Beall would have the split be 75% for large urban, 10% statewide and 15% small urban and rural. Typically, Lake/Mendocino projects have drawn from the small urban and rural portions, although not always. For instance, a trail project in Covelo (Mendocino County) was funded through the statewide pot given its high accident rate. Also, newer criteria will focus on “transformative” projects. As a result, applications will need to address how important the project will be for the jurisdiction.

Nephele wanted to also remind the TAC that a new STIP cycle will start this year. A fund estimate will be released this summer. She’s anticipating that it should be a decent amount this cycle based on expected federal funding levels and SB 1. Also, a cost escalation rate should be considered (approximately 3.2% annually) when making STIP funding requests as projects would be several years out.

Finally, Lisa informed members that the current 5-year contract for Davey-Bates Consulting will be up this year. She noted that she had spoken to the APC Board which supports an extension of the current contract as opposed to going out to bid.

b. Lake Transit Authority

i. Lake Transit Authority Transit Hub Update

John discussed the proposed transit hub in Clearlake on County-owned property along Dam Road Extension. There was a discussion with the County Board of Supervisors last September to determine how Lake Transit Authority (LTA) may be able to acquire the property. It was determined at that time that given the County’s current financial predicament, they would like to sell the property for a fair price as opposed to having it donated. There was a more recent meeting between interested stakeholders (Clearlake, the County, LTA, etc.) to discuss potential configurations of the property and what would best accommodate the future transit hub. The County is currently looking at having the property appraised for a 3-acre portion of their larger holding. Once the property can be divided, LTA will go back to the Board of Supervisors to settle on an

actual price. LTA is looking into the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) program as a possible funding mechanism for land purchase and/or construction of the transit hub. A new call for projects is expected to come out towards the end of this summer.

ii. Miscellaneous- None

c. Federal & State Grant Status Reports

i. Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Update

John reported on four grant projects that have been awarded to Lake APC. Two projects have been ongoing for over a year. The first is the Bus Passenger Facility Plan which is looking into improving bus stop facilities throughout the region. A list of existing facilities (e.g. pull-outs, shelters, benches, signs, etc.) was analyzed to address their current conditions. Facility improvements were also recommended for the region as a whole. Another component of the project was to identify priority sites within each of the three jurisdictions and develop conceptual plans for their improvement. Kit's Corner in the County, Austin Park in Clearlake and a site on South Main Street in front of Grocery Outlet were the three chosen sites.

The second project, the Pedestrian Needs Inventory and Engineered Feasibility Study (EFS) was discussed next. After developing a list of 230 potential pedestrian projects, the list has been refined to approximately 90 to 100. The next phase is to apply criteria similar to that used for Active Transportation Program (ATP) grading to further reduce the number of projects down to 40, or 10 within each of the two cities, 10 within the unincorporated northshore communities and 10 in the southern communities of the County. In some cases, a single "project" will consist of a cluster of smaller projects such as a grouping of sidewalk gaps within a defined area. Larger, stand-alone projects would be easier to identify for purposes of a single project. It is anticipated that the priority lists and their corresponding engineered feasibility studies will be completed in time for the next ATP cycle during the next calendar year.

Another (non-grant funded) project in the region is the Countywide Sign Inventory Project. TJKM and their subconsultants, NDS, are in the data collection phase inventorying signs within each of the three jurisdictions. John was to contact TJKM to get a status update on how far along they are in the process.

The Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan is in the early stages of data collection. Traffic counts are to be taken soon on designated intersections within the four communities of the study (Clearlake Oaks, Glenhaven, Lucerne and Nice).

Finally, the Eleventh Street Corridor Multi-modal Engineered Feasibility Study is also in the early data collection stages. A meeting is scheduled for March 27 for the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) to go over project status and scheduling potential outreach efforts.

Two additional planning grant applications were made several months ago and we should hear by May whether or not they were successful. The first is for a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) baseline study to help with future traffic analyses given a new CEQA requirement to measure traffic impacts by VMT as opposed to the current measure of

Level of Service (LOS) by January 1, 2020. The second application is for an updated SR 53 Corridor Local Circulation Study. It will provide additional analysis within portions of Clearlake given the current and expected development along the corridor and its adjacent local roads.

ii. Other Grant Updates- None

d. Caltrans

i. Lake County Projects Update

Alexis referred to the list of Caltrans projects in the packet and asked if there were any questions. Todd asked about the status of the Highway 20/53 roundabout project. Alexis was to check with the project manager. Lisa noted that the Lake 29 project was experiencing delays due to PG&E-owned utilities that need to be relocated. Due to the bankruptcy declaration, a judge has to review any work in this area.

ii. Other Updates

None

- 6. Information Packet**
- 7. Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda - None**
- 9. Next Proposed Meeting – April 18, 2019**
- 10. Adjourn Meeting - Meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

John Speka
Lake APC Transportation Planning



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL TAC STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Discussion of TAC Membership/Development of By-Laws

DATE PREPARED: 5/15/19

MEETING DATE: 5/23/19

SUBMITTED BY: John Speka, Senior Transportation Planner

BACKGROUND:

Recent and anticipated staff turnover at several of the local agencies have led to a recent review of the TAC staff roster and its practices. While no mention of the TAC was found in the APC by-laws, references have been found in past MOUs between Caltrans and Lake APC that “the Area Planning Council will have a Technical Advisory Committee” to advise on all technical aspects of regional transportation planning.

The membership has consisted for approximately 30 years or more of the Director of Public Works of Lake County, the Community Development Directors of Lake County and the cities of Clearlake and Lakeport, the City Engineers of Clearlake and Lakeport, the Commander of the Lake County Office of the California Highway Patrol, and a transportation planner from the Caltrans District One Office, for a total of eight members. As mentioned, staff turnover at the local agencies has and is expected to lead to further uncertainty with regards to who the TAC should consist of in coming years.

Given the situation, it is a good time to reiterate the TAC’s purpose as an advisory body to the Lake APC, as well as to open a conversation about what the future of the TAC should look like. For instance, neither a Highway Patrol official nor City Engineers have participated on the TAC in several years. As a result, the advisory body may not be receiving the type of input intended when it was initially formed. In addition, a lack of full participation could mean that quorums are not present to take action or make official recommendations on certain topics.

It may be a good time to consider the development of a set of by-laws for the TAC, or to perhaps also look at its make-up to determine if changes should be recommended to the Lake APC Board in the future.

ACTION REQUIRED: For discussion purposes only.

ALTERNATIVES: None.

RECOMMENDATION: Provide input on potential changes to the TAC for future APC Board consideration.

**LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL'S
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)**

Lake County/City APC TAC Voting Members

Hector Paredes <i>CHP</i>	Public Information Officer California Highway Patrol 5700 Live Oak Dr. Kelseyville, CA 95451	707-279-0103 Fax: 707-279-2863 hparedes@chp.ca.gov
Scott DeLeon <i>County DPW</i>	Director of Public Works & Mngr. Lampson Field Airport County of Lake 255 N. Forbes Street, Room 309 Lakeport, CA 95453	707-263-2341 Fax: 707-263-7748 scott@d@co.lake.ca.us
Byron Turner <i>County Planning</i>	Principal Planner, Community Development County of Lake 255 N. Forbes Street, Room 323 Lakeport, CA 95453	707-263-2221 Fax: 707-263-2225 byron.turner@lakecountycalifornia.gov
Doug Grider <i>Lakeport DPW</i>	Public Works Superintendent City of Lakeport 591 Martin Street Lakeport, CA 95453	707-263-3578 Fax: 707-263-9413 dgrider@cityoflakeport.com
Kevin Ingram <i>Lakeport Planning</i>	Community Development Director City of Lakeport 225 Park Street Lakeport, CA 95453	707-263-5613 x11 Fax: 707-263-8584 kingram@cityoflakeport.com
Dave Swartz <i>Clearlake DPW</i>	Public Works Director City of Clearlake 14050 Olympic Drive Clearlake, CA 95422	707-994-8201 Fax: 707-995-2653 swartz@cecusa.net
Alan Flora <i>Clearlake Planning</i>	City Manager City of Clearlake 14050 Olympic Drive Clearlake, CA 95422	707-994-8201 Fax: 707-995-2653 gfolson@clearlake.ca.us
James Sookne	Lake Transit Authority	

Caltrans Representative & Lake APC Staff

Alexis Kelso <i>Caltrans</i>	Department of Transportation Caltrans District 1 P.O. Box 3700 Eureka, CA 95502	707-445-6409 Fax: 707-441-5869 alexis.kelso@dot.ca.gov
Lisa Davey-Bates <i>Executive Director</i>	Davey-Bates Consulting 367 N. State Street, Suite 204 Ukiah, CA 95482	707-234-3314 Fax: 707-671-7764 ldaveybates@dbcteam.net
Nephele Barrett <i>Principal</i>	Dow & Associates 367 N. State Street, Suite 206 Ukiah, CA 95482	707-463-1806 Fax: 707-463-2212 barrettn@dow-associates.com

Alternates

Todd Mansell <i>County DPW</i>	Special Projects Engineer Lake County Public Works Department 255 N. Forbes Street Lakeport, CA 95453	707-263-2716 Fax: 707-263-5843 todd_m@co.lake.ca.us
-----------------------------------	--	---

Highway Infrastructure Program Funds Fact Sheet

BACKGROUND

- Made up of two apportionments
 - FHWA Notice N4510.826 issued April 25, 2018 and FHWA Notice N4510.835 issued March 15, 2019
 - <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/directives/notices/n4510826/>
 - www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/directives/notices/n4510835/
- Total of \$4.709 billion appropriated for distribution to the States by formula
- Distributed to States in the same ratio as the FY 2018 and FY 2019 formula obligation limitations, respectively
- Suballocated within State:
 - By population (Local Agency portion, 53% in 2018 and 54% in 2019)
 - Urbanized areas > 200,000 population
 - Areas > 5,000 to 200,000 population
 - Areas 5,000 population or less
 - Any Area (State portion, 47% in 2018 and 46% in 2019)
 - Funding Distribution from CT Transportation Programming
 - www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/federal/fedfiles/res_publications/hip-2018.pdf
- FHWA Highway Infrastructure Program Guidance
 - www.fhwa.dot.gov/federalaid/projects.pdf#page=78

AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS

- The **2018 Apportioned HIP funds** must **obligate by September 30, 2021** and **expend by September 30, 2026**.
- The **2019 Apportioned HIP funds** must **obligate by September 30, 2022** and **expend by September 30, 2027**.
- Funds are not subject to Obligation Limitation. As such, HIP obligations do not count against the Region's/State's balance of formula OA.
- Federal share according to 23 USC 120
 - 90% on interstate, 80% otherwise, subject to sliding scale
 - 100% for certain safety projects

ELIGIBILITY

- Projects eligible according to 23 USC 133(b)(1)(A); e.g. construction of roads, bridges and tunnels.
- PROJECTS MUST BE ON THE FEDERAL-AID SYSTEM. No projects on roads classified as a local road or rural minor collector unless:
 - on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991
 - for bridges (except new bridge at new location)
 - approved by the Secretary
- Rural minor collectors are differentiated from urban minor collectors using the latest (2010) U.S. Census Maps
 - www.census.gov/geographies/reference-maps/2010/geo/2010-census-urban-areas.html
- For **2019 Apportioned funds**, eligibility also includes "elimination of hazards and the installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossings."

REQUIREMENTS

- Programming and expenditure of funds must be consistent with 23 U.S.C. 134 and 135
 - Projects must be consistent with the Long-Range Statewide Transportation Plan & Metropolitan Transportation Plans
 - HIP funds must be programmed for projects identified in the FTIP/FSTIP prior to obligation
- Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBE) rules apply

MISCELLANEOUS

- HIP funds CANNOT be exchanged for State Cash (unlike RSTP funds, per Streets and Highways Code 182.6)
- Follow Local Assistance Procedures Manual to process HIP funding requests.

Q and A

1. Will DLA be allowing Toll Credit to be used for the HIP?
 - a. Yes, the decision to use Toll Credit on a specific project, however, resides with the programming entity (MPO/RTPAs, Bridge/Safety Program coordinators). With the relatively short time frame for which these funds are available, toll credits will help use them faster.
2. Can HIP be used for Safety/ATP projects off the Fed-Aid system?
 - a. No, the 2018 guidelines say the funds cannot be used on local roads and rural minor collectors (off fed-aid system). "Pursuant to section 133(c) of title 23, U.S.C., projects may not be undertaken on a road functionally classified as a local road or a rural minor collector unless the road was on a Federal-aid highway system on January 1, 1991, except; (1) for a bridge or tunnel project (other than the construction of a new bridge or tunnel at a new location); and (2) as approved by the Secretary. Further, 23 U.S.C. 133(g)(1) allowing a portion of Surface Transportation Block Grant funds to be obligated on roads functionally classified as minor collectors does not apply to these funds."
3. Will we have to end up segregating the costs on projects for reporting purposes?
 - a. Yes, costs will need to be segregated on engineer's estimates for dissimilar fund eligibilities as applicable. No special reporting requirements have identified. Separate fund line entries for the HIP funds will be required on the E-76s, Finance Letters, invoices, etc., to allow tracking of the funds usage.
4. Can HIP funds be added to existing projects?
 - a. Yes, eligibility and programming requirements apply.
5. Are Ferry projects eligible under the Highway Infrastructure Program?
 - a. No, see eligibility requirements for more information on what is eligible for HIP funds.
6. Are HIP funds only for the Construction phase of work?
 - a. No, HIP fund may also be used on PE and RW phases of work, so long as the work leads directly to a constructed project.
7. Can HIP funds be used for a Planning Report or Planning Study?
 - a. No, HIP funds must be used to construct a project; hence HIP funds cannot be used for planning reports or planning studies for future projects.
8. How are HIP funds awarded to local agencies?
 - a. The HIP funding distribution among the states is determined by FHWA. Once California receives its distribution, Caltrans Programming further apportions the funding per the population distribution, as required by the HIP. MPOs or RTPAs award the specific HIP projects, in accordance with 133(d)(3) of title 23, U.S.C. MPOs and RTPAs are responsible for programming the HIP projects within their jurisdictions into the FTIP/FSTIP prior to fund obligation.
9. Were additional funds set aside from the second appropriation? If so, who may qualify for those funds?
 - a. Yes, the 2019 Act set aside \$3.25B for other non-HIP programs/activities. This includes bridge replacement and rehabilitation program (\$475M), the Territorial Highway Program (\$5M) and the Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects program (\$25M). Any funding California received from these set asides are not part of the HIP, hence, eligibility and award for these are administered via the rules of each of their respective programs.