



# 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, August 22, 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 May 23, 2019 Minutes
3. Discussion of TAC Membership and Possible Development of By-Laws (*Speka*)
4. Discussion of Potential Identification of Projects for Highway Improvement Program (HIP) Funds (*Davey-Bates, Barrett, Sookne*)
5. 2020 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) (*Barrett, Sookne*)
6. Announcements and Reports
  - a. Lake APC
    - i. Miscellaneous
  - b. Lake Transit Authority
    - i. 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
7. Information Packet
8. Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda
9. Next Proposed Meeting – **September 19, 2019**
10. 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: August 15, 2019

*List of Attachments:*

*Agenda Item #2 – 5/23/19 Draft Lake TAC Minutes*

*Agenda Item #3 – TAC Membership staff report & rules*

*Agenda Item #4 -Highway Infrastructure Program Funds Fact Sheet*

*Agenda Item #5 – STIP Staff Report*



# LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director

[www.lakeapc.org](http://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, May 23, 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  
Doug Grider, Public Works Director, City of Lakeport  
Alexis Kelso, Caltrans District 1 (by telephone)  
Adeline Brown, City of Clearlake

#### **Absent**

Hector Paredes, California Highway Patrol

#### **Also Present**

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director, Lake Area Planning Council  
Nephele Barrett, Lake Area Planning Council (by telephone)  
John Speka, Lake Area Planning Council

#### **1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m.

#### **2. Approval of March 21, 2019 Lake APC TAC Minutes**

Scott motioned, Adeline seconded, to approve the March 21, 2019 minutes as written with no changes. Approved unanimously.

#### **3. Discussion of TAC Membership and Possible Development of By-Laws**

John introduced the item which involved TAC roster membership and recent and anticipated turnover at several of the local agencies. The intent is to begin a review of the TAC membership to see whether a need exists to update or amend the agencies that are currently represented. The discussion included the possible development of bylaws as there are currently no record of such a document. The TAC roster has been comprised of eight official members- Lake County Director of Public Works, Lake County Director of Community Development, Lakeport Director of Community Development, Lakeport City Engineer, Clearlake Director of Community Development, Clearlake City Engineer, the Commander of the Lake County Office of the California Highway Patrol and a transportation planner from the Caltrans District One Office. Todd Mansell has been representing the County as an alternate for a number of years. Doug Grider noted that he or Kevin Ingram try to make a point of attending, although the difficulty is that the agencies are

so small that issues often come up which require attention at the expense of attending TAC meetings. Dave Swartz is the new contract engineer for the City of Clearlake and will only be available on Thursdays (per the City's alternate Adeline Brown). The Transit Manager has traditionally had a presence on the TAC, and this should be considered as a possible "official" member. Discussion followed on the purposes of the TAC as well as whether an official quorum could be claimed when less than half of the members were present. Lisa noted that the Lake APC Board relies on TAC expertise and recommendations, reiterating the importance of the group. Other possible members which could be considered include air quality, housing or tribal representatives. Scott noted that some of those listed on the current TAC roster may not realize they are TAC members, or the existence or purpose of the TAC in general, especially given frequent agency turnover. Many times the role of a new official is not fully spelled out in the transition. It was decided that draft bylaws would be developed by staff and reviewed over the next couple of TAC meetings prior to deciding next steps. Also, that outreach to current roster members who rarely attend will be considered explaining the role and purpose of the TAC moving forward.

**4. Discussion and Recommended Approval of the Draft 2019/20 Overall Work Program**

Lisa went over the Final Draft of the Overall Work Program. The TAC was asked to focus on the summary of the work elements for the coming 2019/20 fiscal year. Four new work elements were discussed including the Transit Passenger Survey, Speed Zone Studies for the County and two new grant funded studies: a new SR 53 Corridor Local Circulation Study and a Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Baseline Study. The Work Program itself consists of over \$1,000,000 worth of funding which is partially a reflection of available SB 1 funding. Workloads, however, are becoming more challenging as a side result. Lisa also mentioned that approximately \$27,000 in unprogrammed reserve funding was potentially available for a County polling project to probe how residents would feel about a dedicated transportation sales tax. Similar polling had been done in 2011 for about \$29,000, although that included a countywide poll along with both incorporated cities, so \$27,000 could suffice for a poll of only the unincorporated areas. The polling is a priority for one of the County supervisors, Bruno Sabatier. Scott DeLeon noted that there would probably be competing interests for sales tax funding such as the sheriff and the general fund so it was uncertain if the supervisor was interested in a "general" sales tax (50% threshold needed), or a "specific" tax for road use only (67% threshold required). Lisa asked for TAC guidance whether or not they'd like the money to be used for that, or something else, or simply to have it left in reserve. The poll could ask how residents felt about a variety of funding scenarios (e.g. specific for roads only, law enforcement, other, etc.). Nephela suggested having the funds stay in reserve at this point until more details could be determined such as cost of the polling, interest of the full County Board of Supervisors, etc. Money could later be amended into the OWP after the beginning of the fiscal year in order that a more informed decision be made. The TAC agreed.

Lisa suggested language for a motion that the TAC recommend to the Lake APC Board approval of the FY 2019/20 OWP with the understanding that the TAC would also support a later amendment to the document for the use of reserve funds (WE 604) for future polling efforts involving a specific transportation sales tax for the unincorporated areas of the County. Scott DeLeon made the motion, which was seconded by Doug Grider. Motion was unanimously approved.

**5. Announcements and Reports**

**a. Lake APC**

**i. Highway Infrastructure Program Funds**

Lisa described the program as having begun last year with a second round of funding this year. For Lake County, this equates to two years worth of available funding with last year (Federal FY 2017/18- needs to be obligated by September 30, 2021) totaling \$167,746 and this year (Federal FY 2018/19- obligated by September 30, 2022) \$236,342 for an overall total of \$404,087. Funding needs to be used for roads on the Federal Highway System and all projects will require NEPA, as well as being included in the FSTIP and the RTP. Projects will also require a 20% match and cannot be exchanged for State funds. Nephele believed project rules were similar to STIP with funds used for rehab but not maintenance, and could also include project development but not planning. County Road System (CRS) maps can be used to determine whether projects were located on the federal aid system. Nephele added that rural minor collector roads were ineligible, but not urban minor collectors. Doug thought Martin Street was on the federal aid system and a project from Main Street to at least Bevins Street could be considered on it for this year. Others were noted in the County jurisdiction such as a portion of funding for the Soda Bay Road project. Nephele mentioned that before funds could be obligated, the APC would need to take action and an FSTIP amendment would have to be processed, so projects in the immediate short term wouldn't be realistic. Jurisdictions were asked to come up with a list of projects that might work for discussion and possible action at the next TAC meeting.

**ii. Miscellaneous**

Nephele provided a legislative update. SB 1568, the bill proposing to withhold transportation funding to jurisdictions that were out of compliance with their housing elements, has been put on hold until next year. ACA 1 is moving forward, a bill looking at reducing the two-thirds voting threshold for certain special taxes related to affordable housing infrastructure. SB 152, restructured distribution of ATP funding that would reduce portions that rural areas can compete for, is currently being held in committee and is not moving forward at this time. SB 127, a bill proposing that all SHOPP projects include active transportation improvements and would create a division of Active Transportation within Caltrans, has been amended. The amendments would 1) relax the active transportation requirement for SHOPP projects in cases where they clearly weren't appropriate, and 2) would create a new branch within an existing office as opposed to a whole new division.

**b. Lake Transit Authority**

**i. Student Survey Work Element**

Lisa discussed the free bus fare for students program, paid for by LCTOP funds. It would be expanded to students this summer, including high school. The survey was initially intended to poll college students to see if they would accept a small fee increase to continue the program beyond the grant funded period. It is now to be expanded to poll general ridership about needs for NEMT or other issues affecting elderly or disabled riders.

**ii. Miscellaneous**

Lisa discussed the recent creation of Lake Links, its work with local partners for funding sources, recent purchase of two vans through Lake Transit Authority, and other programs such as Out-of-County NEMT services. John gave a brief update on the Clearlake Transit Hub, how the County would be selling the property to Lake Transit, although it still wasn't known what they would be asking for at this point. Lisa provided an update on LTA and how the search for a Transit Manager was put aside for the time

being. James Sookne was handling many of the former day-to-day duties of the Transit Manager, while Lisa had taken over the administrative end of LTA with the assistance of DBC staff. They are also currently looking for an admin assistant to fulfill some of these roles. Finally, Lisa noted that DBC's contract had been extended for another year to provide Lake APC administrative services.

### **c. Federal & State Grant Status Reports**

#### **i. Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Update**

John reported on a few of the grant projects that APC had been awarded in recent years. A Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting for the Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory project was to be held immediately following the TAC meeting in which the list of potential projects would be discussed. The list was narrowed down to the top 10 or so for each of the four study areas: 10 each for Lakeport, Clearlake, north and west shore communities, and south and east communities in the County. Once the final 40 projects are determined, the consultant will study parameters and costs for each in order to prepare for the next round of ATP funding set for next spring.

Another project reported on was the Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Study. A TAG meeting was held a week ago the previous Tuesday, followed by a workshop held on the following Thursday in front of a well attended Town Hall group in Lucerne. The study will focus on the communities of Nice, Lucerne, Glenhaven and Clearlake Oaks. Some participants of the Town Hall meeting wanted Upper Lake to be included in the study, however, the intention was to examine communities where Highway 20 acts as a Main Street through town, similar to a 2005 beautification and traffic calming study which the project was meant to update. Other issues discussed at the Town Hall meeting included cars speeding through the subject communities and use of the center turn lanes to pass slower moving traffic.

John also covered the Eleventh Street Corridor study. A TAG meeting was also held a week ago the previous Tuesday, which was followed later in the evening with a workshop at the Lakeport City Hall Chambers. Approximately 30 people attended to discuss possibilities to increase multimodal uses and overall safety of the corridor. Community members were provided maps of the corridor to note areas where improvements could be made. Doug mentioned that the workshops can be a good opportunity to educate the public on why certain ideas aren't feasible. The consultants were to take the input received at the workshop and develop possible solutions for review at a later date.

Finally, John noted that two new planning grants had been awarded to the APC. 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), set to begin by July 2020. The second project involves an updated SR 53 Corridor Local Circulation Study. It will provide analysis of Clearlake circulation given the current and expected development along the corridor and its adjacent local roads.

#### **ii. Other Grant Updates**

John provided information to the TAC on two other recent grant opportunities. The first was for a Trails and Greenway program funded through Prop 68 which was recently passed in 2018. A total of \$27 million was available through the State Natural Resources

Agency for competitive non-motorized infrastructure development to provide new or alternative access to waterways or recreational activities. The deadline will be August 29 with the guidelines to be finalized soon. A possible project that could qualify is a County trail project on property that has been purchased by the Watershed Protection District. It would entail trails on top of levees and a bridge, all that will need to be maintained as part of a wetland restoration project. Scott was going to contact the District to let them know of the opportunity.

A final grant opportunity involves SB 2 funding. The monies are intended to increase affordable housing stock, which may relate more specifically to planning. The funding is non-competitive and is meant for General Plan updates, zoning updates or other related planning documents. Doug was to pass the info on to Kevin as there might be a plan update being discussed for Lakeport.

Lisa mentioned that a new round of Sustainable Communities Planning Grants was announced this week with a call for projects in either August or September. TAC members were asked to let APC staff know if there were any planning projects they might want to apply for.

**d. Caltrans**

**i. Lake County Projects Update**

There was no project list provided for the meeting, but Alexis was available for questions. She would also try to have a list of projects prepared for the June 12 APC meeting that could be shared later with the TAC.

**ii. Other Updates**

Funding is still being pursued for Segments 2A and 2B of the Highway 29 project. An INFRA grant application was made earlier in the year requesting \$137 million which APC is still waiting to hear back on. Finally, ground was broken on the SR 20/SR53 Roundabout. The 2C Segment of the Highway 29 project is nearly ready to go out to bid, roughly covering the stretch from Highway 175 to Highway 281. Next spring is the target date to break ground.

6. **Information Packet** - None
7. **Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda** - None
8. **Next Proposed Meeting** – July 18, 2019
9. **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 and Possible Recommendation Amending Lake APC Rules to Add Language on the TAC and Other Subcommittees

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/15/19  
**MEETING DATE:** 8/22/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** John Speka, Senior Transportation Planner

---

**BACKGROUND:** A report was presented at the May TAC meeting which provided a brief history of the TAC's role as well as its make-up. As mentioned in the report, the TAC was not acknowledged in the APC by-laws, although there were references 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.

The original rules for the Lake County/City Area Planning Council (Lake APC) were adopted in 1972, with a "First Amendment" to the rules subsequently adopted in 1991 and ratified in 1992. Staff is recommending that a "Second" amendment to the rules be adopted reflecting the role of the TAC as well as other standing committees such as the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC). Attached to this report is the language recommended to amend the current rules. The primary change to what has been the longstanding make-up of the TAC is the addition of a Lake Transit Authority (LTA) representative. Another notable part of the TAC related portion of the amendment is a recommendation that two-thirds of those present should be required to approve a motion.

We're seeking a recommendation from the TAC on the proposed amendment prior to moving it forward to the Lake APC Board at a future hearing.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** A possible recommendation from the TAC regarding the proposed amendment to Lake APC Rules.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** No action or request for further amendments and review.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** That the TAC recommends the proposed language for a Second Amendment to the Lake APC Rules involving an official provision for "Standing Committees," including matters related to the TAC makeup and process.



The following amendments are proposed to Paragraph 8 of the Rules of the Lake County/City Area Planning Council:

8. ~~EXECUTIVE SESSIONS:~~

~~— The Council reserves the right to hold executive sessions at any time to consider the employment of, or dismissal of any public officer, independent contractor, or employee of the Council. Such executive sessions, if held, shall comply with all provisions of the RALPH M. BROWN ACT as set forth in the Government Code of the State of California.~~

8. STANDING COMMITTEES:

a. Executive Committee: The Council may appoint an Executive Committee consisting of the Chair, the Vice Chair and a third council member from a city, the County, or Member-at-Large. The Executive Committee may carry on the administrative and executive functions of the Council between regular meetings of the Council. The Executive Committee may also be used to oversee the personnel budget and policy issues and make recommendations to the full Council. The Council shall attempt to appoint members to the Executive Committee that reflect a balance between city and County representation.

The Executive Committee reserves the right to hold executive sessions at any time to consider the employment of, or dismissal of, any public officer, independent contractor, or employee of the Council. Such executive sessions, if held, shall comply with all provisions of the Brown Act as set forth in the Government Code of the State of California.

b. Policy Advisory Committee (PAC): The PAC shall consist of the eight (8) Council members and one representative of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The Council's agendas shall be structured such that the Caltrans representative, as a member of the PAC, shall have a vote on all matters dealing with transportation.

c. Technical Advisory Committee (TAC): The TAC shall consist 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, a representative from the Lake Transit Authority, and a transportation planner from the Caltrans District 1 Office, or authorized technical representatives from any of these noted agencies, for a total of nine (9) voting members. If a vote is required, and a quorum is not present, a motion must pass with a two-thirds majority of those members present voting in the affirmative.

The Lake APC seeks the TAC's professional expertise as an independent technical committee. Lake APC recognizes that the TAC is to review material presented before it and make recommendations to the Council. Lake APC also recognizes that, although the impact of the TAC's recommendations on an individual constituent agency may be a factor, the decision-making process must remain a combination of technical information and individual TAC members' education, experience, and professional judgement. Recommendations to the Council

shall remain focused on improvement of the transportation system based on technical considerations.

The Lake APC Executive Director or his/her authorized representative shall have the responsibility of chairing the TAC and ensuring that the TAC's recommendations are reported to the Council.

d. Social Services Transportation Advisory Council (SSTAC): The purpose of the SSTAC is to advise the Lake APC on matters involving the needs of the transit dependent and transit disadvantaged, including the elderly, disabled and persons of limited means. The SSTAC shall consist of a representative of potential transit users 60 years of age or older, a potential transit user who is disabled, two representatives of local service providers for seniors, two representatives of local service providers for the disabled, a representative from a local social service provider for persons of limited means and two representatives from the local Consolidated Transportation Services Agency (CTSA), for a total of nine (9) voting members.



## LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL TAC STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** Highway Improvement Program Funding  
Discussion & Recommendation

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/14/19  
**MEETING DATE:** 8/22/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** James Sookne, Program Manager

---

**BACKGROUND:**

At previous TAC meetings, we discussed the funding available to the region through the Highway Improvement Program (HIP). This is a new federal funding source available to the region for road/street/highway construction projects. The Lake County region has an apportionment of \$167,746 for FY 17/18 and \$236,342 for FY 18/19. It is unknown at this point if this will be an ongoing source of funding. Funds must be used on facilities that are on the Federal Aid System, classified higher than a rural minor collector. These funds can be combined to be used on one single project. FY 17/18 funds must be obligated by September 30, 2021, and FY 18/19 funds by September 30, 2022. There is a 20% non-federal match required. Please see the attached Fact Sheet for additional information.

At this meeting, staff would like to discuss options for utilizing this funding. Options for consideration are as follows:

- Identify existing federally funded, eligible projects that could utilize the funding
- Conduct a special competitive application cycle

The TAC's recommendation will be presented to the APC Board at a future meeting. Once a project is selected for funding, APC will request an FSTIP amendment. Following approval of the FSTIP amendment, the project(s) will follow the standard federal procedures.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Make a recommendation to the APC Board on a preferred approach for awarding funding available through the Highway Improvement Program.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Make a recommendation to the APC Board on a preferred approach for awarding funding available through the Highway Improvement Program. Discuss potential projects or project types that may be eligible and appropriate to utilize funding. Depending on the preferred approach for awarding funding, the TAC may choose to recommend a specific project at this meeting for the Lake APC Board's approval.

# 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/legsregs/directives/notices/n4510826/>
    - [www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/directives/notices/n4510835/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legsregs/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](http://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](http://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](http://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.



## LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL TAC STAFF REPORT

---

**TITLE:** 2020 STIP Fund Estimate and RTIP

**DATE PREPARED:** 8/14/19

**MEETING DATE:** 8/22/19

---

**SUBMITTED BY:** James Sookne, Program Manager

---

**BACKGROUND:**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System. STIP programming generally occurs every two years. The programming cycle begins with the release of a proposed fund estimate in July of odd-numbered years, followed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) adoption of the Fund Estimate (FE) in August. The fund estimate serves to identify the amount of new funds available for the programming of transportation projects.

The CTC is scheduled to adopt the FE for the 2020 STIP at their August 14 meeting. The estimate identified a STIP programming target through FY 2024/25 of \$189,000 for the Lake County region. This estimate takes into account the \$543,000 that was added to Segment 2C of the SR 29 project at the June CTC meeting. Of the \$189,000, \$108,000 are programmed for Planning, Programming & Monitoring, leaving \$81,000 available for new or existing projects.

Over the next few months, APC staff, in conjunction with the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), will be preparing the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which is the document that the APC develops and submits to the State in order to program available funding. The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the CTC by December 15 of every odd numbered year.

At this meeting, we would like to discuss the available funding amount and whether there should be an application cycle this time or leave the funds unprogrammed until the 2022 STIP cycle. We anticipate presenting a draft RTIP to the APC Board in November and the final RTIP in December. If any additional information becomes available prior to the meeting, staff will provide an updated verbal report.

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Determine whether there will be an application cycle for the 2020 STIP.

---

**ALTERNATIVES:** None.

---

**RECOMMENDATION:** Discuss the 2020 STIP Fund Estimate, a potential application cycle, and RTIP development.