



## 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines Workshop #1 Meeting Summary

Wednesday June 11, 2014 10:00am -12:00pm Caltrans Headquarters Room 2116

### 1.) Welcome and Introductions - Laurel Janssen, Deputy Director, CTC

Laurel welcomed everyone to the Workshop and conducted introductions around the room and on the phone. A wide variety of stakeholder groups were represented including local, tribal and regional governments, state agencies from various sectors including transportation, housing and public health as well as advocates for active transportation and environmental conservation. Laurel also introduced Laurie Waters, Senior Transportation Planner at CTC who served as the meeting moderator.

### 2.) STIP Overview – Laurel Janssen

The STIP is a biennial five year plan adopted by the Commission for future allocations of certain state transportation funds for state highway improvements, intercity rail, and regional highway and transit improvements. State law requires the Commission to update the STIP biennially, in even-numbered years, with each new STIP adding two new years to prior programming commitments.

The current structure of the STIP was initiated by SB45 in 1997. The STIP is constrained by the amount of funds estimated to be available for the STIP period in the fund estimate, which is developed by Caltrans and adopted by the Commission every other odd year. The amount available for the STIP is then constrained by formulas for regional and interregional shares per Streets and Highways Code (Sections 164, 187, 188 and 188.8). The 2014 STIP was adopted in March 2014, and the next STIP must be adopted by April 1, 2016.

### 3.) STIP Guidelines Revisions – Laurel Janssen

- Due to interest in the 2014 STIP process, CTC is beginning the 2016 STIP Guidelines update process now to engage stakeholders early.
- At least 3 public workshops are planned to discuss possible updates to the STIP Guidelines: June 11<sup>th</sup> in Sacramento, July 16<sup>th</sup> in Los Angeles, and an August workshop (date to be determined) in San Jose.
- Concurrent policy efforts are underway that will inform the STIP Guidelines update process. These efforts include but are not limited to, the California Transportation Infrastructure Priorities (CTIP) effort by CalSTA, Caltrans preparation of the California Transportation Plan (CTP 2040), the Regional Transportation Planning Agency STIP task force, and the Rural Counties Task Force Rural Performance Measures Inventory.
- The scope of the 2016 STIP Guidelines update will focus on changes that can be made within existing law to improve performance measurement, accountability, and transparency in the programming process. To accomplish this the STIP Guidelines revisions will focus on the following sections:
  - Section 19 – Criteria for Measuring Performance and Cost-Effectiveness*
  - Section 31 – Submittal of Caltrans' ITIP*
  - Section 34 – Interregional Program Objectives*
  - Appendix B – Performance Indicators, Measures and Definitions*

### 4.) Overall Discussion and Dialogue Regarding Section 19 and Appendix B – Moderator Laurie Waters, CTC

For a detailed account of the meeting please see the Meeting Notes on p. 2. Some of the generally agreed upon suggestions resulting from the meeting included the following:

- *Clarifying the goals and objectives for STIP investments,*
- *Focusing on project outcomes,*
- *Simplifying the framework by applying mode neutral performance measures that are clear, useful, and measurable.*

### 5.) Next Steps, Closing, and Action Items – Laurel Janssen/Laurie Waters

- CTC staff thanked everyone for their attendance and contribution to the thoughtful dialogue.
- Everyone is encouraged to submit comments in writing and to contact Laurel Janssen (916) 651-6143 [laurel.janssen@dot.ca.gov](mailto:laurel.janssen@dot.ca.gov) or Laurie Waters (916) 651-6145 [laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov](mailto:laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov) with any questions or concerns.
- Laurie will send out all meeting materials as well as links to the Cal B/C Model, and the *Transportation Funding in California* publication. These items will also be posted on the web at [www.catc.ca.gov](http://www.catc.ca.gov)
- The next workshop will be held July 16<sup>th</sup> 10am-12pm at LA Metro.

### Meeting Notes

Overall Discussion and Dialogue Regarding Section 19 and Appendix B – Moderator Laurie Waters, CTC

Laurie opened the discussion by asking attendees if they had overall comments or questions regarding the STIP process, the following comments and questions were provided by workshop attendees:

- It was requested that the relationship between the RTP and RTIP be discussed so that participants could understand how the plan (RTP) and the program (RTIP) relate to one another. CTC staff explained that the RTP is the long range plan (20+ years) for the region and that the RTIP represents a 5 year subset of projects selected from that Plan. Placer County Transportation Planning Agency added that the RTP also contains performance measures and is developed with substantive public review and input. CTC staff suggested that if the workgroup identifies any policy input that would be more appropriate for the RTP Guidelines which are also developed and maintained by CTC, those suggestions can be noted for the next RTP Guidelines update.
- How will the performance measures identified in the STIP Guidelines be used? CTC staff responded that this effort is intended to identify measures that can be used by everyone in the development of RTIPs and the ITIP. It is important that measures can be reported in a consistent manner so that the benefits of projects programmed in the STIP can be communicated to the public.
- An observation was made that many active transportation projects such as bicycle and pedestrian facilities can be built as a part of larger roadway projects in the STIP. It would be helpful if non-highway alternatives were identified when programming STIP projects and if STIP performance measures were revised to better reflect the benefits of non-motorized projects.
- Has CTC considered FHWA's current efforts to develop federal performance measures that will impact STIP programming? CTC staff responded that coordination with Caltrans and FHWA will be part of this effort.
- An observation was made that with respect to the Section 19 performance measurement criteria, it is important to look carefully at the existing and proposed measures to ensure measures are useful, realistic, supported by available data, and can be measured over time. It was suggested that a smaller committee could be formed to address this issue.
- Is the intent of this effort to establish baseline performance measurement values similar to air emissions budgets that are assigned to regions by the Air Resources Board? CTC staff responded that this effort is not intended to identify specific targets for performance.

Focused Discussion on Section 19 and Appendix B of the STIP Guidelines (see hand out):

- Regarding the Benefit Cost (B/C) Analysis that is used to measure Return on Investment, is Caltrans able to conduct B/C analysis of Transit Projects? Can an RTPA conduct its own B/C analysis for off-system projects, and can Caltrans share the B/C model? Caltrans Office of State Planning responded that Caltrans can conduct B/C analysis for transit projects, the B/C model is available to regions for use and can be customized for off-system projects; however it is a highway centric model. CTC staff will share a link to the Cal B/C Model.
- Are the performance measures intended to be used for before and after analysis of projects? CTC staff responded that the measures are intended to measure the benefit of the project if implemented and that

project benefits/performance should also be reported upon project completion and closeout. It was suggested that performance measures should be incorporated at the project design level and accounted for in the final design contract.

- Does the project level evaluation require reporting on all performance measures? CTC staff responded that regions are allowed flexibility to use their own measures however we could certainly discuss identifying a few standardized required measures. Also the project level evaluation is only required for projects that meet certain size thresholds.
- It was suggested that the first threshold for requiring a project level evaluation (the proposed STIP programming exceeds 50% of a county's target for new programming) be modified to a dollar amount as this threshold applies disproportionately more to rural areas.
- It was suggested that the group find out which measures agencies can actually be reported on and determine what data is available as this would help frame the measures and assist in determining the best ones. The group acknowledged that this would be a good area to explore.
- An observation was made that the STIP performance metric framework is too complicated and has too many measures. This effort should focus on FHWA measures and the measures identified by SANDAG and other MPOs in the *Statewide Performance Monitoring Indicators for Transportation Planning Final Report*. CTC staff responded that the 2014 STIP Guidelines update did incorporate new measures and changes to existing measures to better align with the metrics identified in the statewide MPO report prepared by SANDAG.
- The observation was made that it is unlikely an active transportation project will meet the threshold for project level evaluation but that at the system or corridor level these improvements offer tremendous benefits - how can cities and counties better communicate the benefits of active transportation projects? CTC staff responded that a B/C model is in development for active transportation projects which should help to better capture project benefits.
- A comment was made that the RTP looks at system-wide and modal performance, and it is important to reduce the number of project-specific metrics to better focus on the program level benefits. CTC staff added that project-specific measures are still needed but agreed that a streamlined set of measures would be beneficial.
- CTC staff commented that due to the fact that the STIP represents state funds, it is important to communicate to the public how the state's investment is leveraging the action element of the RTP to show how state and regional goals are being met. It is critical to convey to the public what these projects are doing and why they are important and to understand how these projects further implementation of the RTP.
- Can staff please clarify as to whether the Commission is proposing to select individual projects based on performance? CTC staff responded that project level information is an important component of the RTIP submittal however the responsibility for submitting projects within an RTIP resides with the regional agency and any programming modifications to the RTIP will continue to be made in consultation with the regional agency.
- An observation was made that the holistic approach to measuring the benefit of the RTIP is helpful and applicable in many regions as many projects do not meet the threshold for individual project level analysis.
- A comment was made that timing within the programming process and differences between funding sources is a big driver of which projects are funded with certain types of money. For example, more flexible funding such as Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) or Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) are often used to fund time-sensitive, high-priority projects and other sources of funding with less flexibility (such as STIP) are used to fund investments that are less time sensitive.
- Is there tension between state goals and RTP goals? CTC staff responded that the 2010 RTP Guidelines included the STIP performance measures and outlined the state and federal requirements for RTPs.
- Can the state goals be considered in the core performance measures and not only focus on regional goals? It was stated that regions work within the limitations of STIP funding to develop a subset of projects that meet RTP and state goals.

- CTC staff commented that there are constitutional and statutory restrictions on the STIP and the funds that are programmed in the STIP. Legislation would be required to change or clarify the goals of the STIP.
- An observation was made that now is the opportunity to better align the STIP with state goals through better metrics.
- The discussion of state goals is important and asked how the STIP Guidelines process relates to the CTIP effort. How CTC and CalSTA are working together on STIP reform? CTC staff responded that the CTC STIP Guidelines update process is being undertaken in parallel with the CalSTA CTIP effort. CTC staff values and appreciates the CTIP effort and is participating in it. The 2016 STIP Guidelines update process being led by CTC will offer a transparent, inclusive venue for public input. The CTIP effort recommendations will be combined with the feedback and input from the CTC's public process to allow for a robust policy discussion that will inform changes to the STIP Guidelines.
- A comment was made that any legislative changes to the STIP should be carefully considered. The Fix it First emphasis that CalSTA has placed on rehabilitation of the existing transportation system is appreciated.

Focused Discussion on Table A – Performance Measures (see hand out):

- It was suggested that measures relating to sustainability be combined into a singular metric to demonstrate meeting SB 375 goals.
- It was suggested that the STIP Guidelines should use the federal performance measures to be identified by FHWA with a few additional measures to reflect state goals such as GHG, Livability and Health.
- An observation was made that simplifying measures is good but metrics should be clear to ensure the public knows and understands what is being measured.
- Metrics should be simple. SB 375 goals are important however there are other critical areas as well such as safety.
- The observation was made that looking at fatalities and injuries in aggregate but not by mode does not capture whether an investment in one mode is harmful to another mode. Also for example, proximity to transit does not capture important modal connectivity such as the first mile/last mile transit accessibility.
- Performance measures within the STIP framework could be modified to be more useful.
- Is the STIP a highway program? CTC staff responded that the STIP is comprised of State Highway Account money but it is not limited to highway projects. It is intended to fund state highway improvements, intercity rail, regional highway and transit improvements as well as bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Regions often have to match projects to funding. Caltrans Division of Programming responded that over time, transit funding and active transportation funding (PTA and ATP) have transferred from the STIP to other programs.
- The metrics should be mode neutral and not restrict what the STIP funds will be used for.
- Updating the STIP Guidelines every 2 years allows the Guidelines to reflect changing priorities.
- The downside of set-aside programs for ATP projects is that people think those are the only programs/funding available for those projects, rather than looking to the bigger funding picture. CTC staff replied that STIP funds can be used for both intercity rail and bike/pedestrian projects, the 2014 STIP does feature these types of investments if they are determined by regions or Caltrans to be a priority for STIP funding.
- Bike/pedestrian projects are always part of some regions RTIPs and Part B of Appendix B allows regions to incorporate their own metrics for reporting on program and project performance.
- There is a change happening in the STIP in their region and statewide. It is not just a highway program anymore. CTC staff and the Commission are working towards a more mode-neutral STIP. Santa Cruz, for example, spends approximately 1/3 of their STIP funds on highways and would like to fund more bike/pedestrian projects. STIP funding is not the most flexible source.
- The information sharing in this workshop is very helpful, what goals we are trying to achieve with the STIP? It would also be helpful to better understand all of the funding sources for transportation. CTC staff offered to distribute a link to the Caltrans publication *Transportation Funding in California*.

- The goal of performance measurement is communicating to the public what these projects are achieving and therefore it is important to pick measures that the public knows and cares about such as health, climate change, accessibility.
- Better communication of project outcomes is important to better tell the story in a way that this understandable and meaningful to the public.
- Project selection is an important area to focus on in terms of measuring project benefits. Programming mainly applies colors of money to projects. The first level of project selection happens during the development of the RTP and through regional agency calls for projects.
- An observation was made that public input at the RTP level can be very limited and that project selection is often based solely on need. CTC is the organization that puts the package of projects together and moves the investment portfolio forward. State oversight of project selection is badly needed to certify that a project has true public benefit. CTC staff responded that the CTC cannot select projects for the RTIP and ITIP but transparency within the STIP process is an area of focus for this update and will be up for discussion at the next workshop.
- Tribal governments have limitations on data collection and have a difficult time competing for state funding.
- Roadways need to account for all modes (i.e. complete streets) and consistency of measurement between the RTIP and RTP is needed, also project performance should be measured regardless of project size or funding type.

#### Wrap-up and Final Comments

- Should comments be submitted in writing? CTC staff asked that participants please feel free to submit comments in writing to Laurie Waters [laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov](mailto:laurie.waters@dot.ca.gov)
- It was requested that comments submitted focus on the Guidelines sections highlighted on the workshop notice – performance measurement, transparency, and public participation.
- It was requested that CTC please consider keeping the flexibility for regions to use their own measures through Part B of the STIP Guidelines performance measures appendix.
- The discussion today has been great and that they are interested to keep the discussion going about the STIP and what it can do.
- The following action items were identified – CTC staff will send out meeting notes and will post all meeting materials on the CTC website [www.catc.ca.gov](http://www.catc.ca.gov) , staff will also provide links to the Cal B/C Model as well as the *Transportation Funding in California* publication.
- The next work shop will be held on July 16<sup>th</sup> from 10am to 12pm at the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (Metro) Mulholland Room 1 Gateway Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90012.



# 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines Workshop Sign-In

Wednesday June 11, 2014 10:00am - 12:00pm Caltrans Headquarters Room 2116

Name	Organization	Email
✓ Renée Devere-Oki	SACOG	rdevere-okie@sacog.org
✓ Adrian Cardoso	OCTA	acardoso@octa.net
✓ Melissa White	CALCOG	mwhite@calcog.org
✓ Dave Vauth	MTC	dvauth@mtc.ca.gov
✓ Rachel Moriconi	RTC	rmoriconi@sectc.org
✓ John Asuncion	SCAG	asuncion@scag.ca.gov
✓ Ella Wise	Natural Resources Defense Council	ellawise@gmail.com
✓ Susan de Guina	California Pan-Ethnic Health Network	sdeguina@pehn.org
✓ Rose Aguero	Caltrans	rose.aguero@dot.ca.gov
✓ Barry Padilla	Caltrans	barry.padilla@dot.ca.gov
✓ David Giongco	CTC	DGIONGCO@DOT.CA.GOV
✓ Teresa Favila	CTC	Teresafavila@DOT.CA.GOV
✓ Mitch Weiss	CTC	mweiss@dot.ca.gov
✓ Sarah Brunner	CTC	SBRUNNER@DOT.CA.GOV
✓ CAROLYN FEIRCE-EMME	The Swings Group	carolyn@TheSwingsGroup.com
✓ Jessica Peters	LAD	Jessica.peters@lae.ca.gov
✓ Keith Dunn	SELF Help Counties Coalition	keithdunn@me.com
✓ Angie Acosta	SELF Help Counties Coalition	angie@kithdunnconsulting.com
✓ JACK LOED	ETHNA	JACK.LOED@DOT.GOV
✓ Bruce Roberts	Caltrans - Division of Pail	bruce.roberts@dot.ca.gov
✓ Janeth Fabela	StanCOG	jfabela@stancog.org
✓ GUS KHOURI	TRANSFORM/STIPA	gus@khouriconsult.com
✓ Ted Jackson	CFILC	ted@CFILC.org



# 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines Workshop Sign-In

Wednesday June 11, 2014 10:00am - 12:00pm Caltrans Headquarters Room 2116

Name	Organization	Email
JERRY BARTON	EDCTC / RCTF	jbarton@edctc.org
Colia McAdam	PCTPA	cmcadam@pctpa.net
RACHEL FALSETTI	Caltrans	rachel.falsetti@dot.ca.gov
BALRAJ S. SANDHU	CALTRANS	BALRAJ.SANDHU@DOT.CA.GOV
Jeanil Ward-Walker	SRTSNP	jeanie@safervoytespartnership.org
Dave Snyder	CalBike	dave@calbike.org
Ted Link-Oberstler	Senate Office of Research	ted.link-oberstler@sen.ca.gov
Chris Lee	CA. State Assoc. of Counties	cllee@counties.org
Carrie Pourvahidi	etc	carrie.pourvahidi@dot.ca.gov
Julia Caplan	CDPH - Health in All Policies	julia.caplan@cdph.ca.gov
Meredith Lee	CDPH - Health in All Policies	meredith.lee@cdph.ca.gov
Marilee Mortenson	Caltrans	marilee.mortenson@dot.ca.gov
Kimberly Johnston-Todds	Caltrans	kimberly.johnston-todds@dot.ca.gov
Cheng Yan	FIPWA	cheng.yan@dot.gov
Wade Hobbs	FHWA	wade.hobbs@dot.gov
Anya Lawler	Assembly Trans	anya.lawler@asm.ca.gov
Kate White	CalSTA	kate.white@calsta.ca.gov
Channell Fletcher	Climate Plan	channell.fletcher@climateplan.org