



## 2016 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines Workshop #4 Meeting Summary

Friday September 19, 2014 9:00am -11:00am Caltrans Headquarters, Sacramento

### 1. Welcome and Introductions – Laurie Waters, Moderator, CTC

Laurie 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 and regional governments, legislative staff, state agencies from various sectors including transportation, air quality and public health as well as advocates for active transportation and environmental conservation.

### 2. STIP Overview and Recap of 3<sup>rd</sup> Workshop – Laurel Janssen, Deputy Director, CTC

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 SB 45 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.

The third STIP workshop was held August 21<sup>st</sup> 2014 in San Jose and was well attended by a variety of stakeholders. The third workshop offered robust dialogue and general agreement regarding enhancing the transparency of the STIP, telling the story of the program by more clearly capturing project outcomes, and streamlining performance measures to ensure they are clear and understandable to the public while retaining reporting flexibility for regional agencies.

### 3. Dialogue Regarding Discussion Draft – Laurie Waters and Laurel Janssen

Laurie Waters and Laurel Janssen led the group section by section through the STIP Guidelines Discussion Draft developed by CTC staff that was released on Friday September 12<sup>th</sup>. Most changes to the Guidelines were focused on Sections 19, 31 and 34 pursuant to workshop feedback and stakeholder comments received to date. The Draft Guidelines will be presented to the Commission as an informational item at the October 8<sup>th</sup> CTC Meeting. The following comments and questions were discussed by the group:

- Regional Transportation Planning Agency representatives asked what will happen after the October CTC meeting. CTC staff responded that the Guidelines development process will continue as there are still outstanding areas to be addressed such as a standardized RTIP template and further development of Section 19 regarding Performance Measures. Staff would appreciate continued stakeholder input and another draft may be issued if needed. There is still considerable time for additional revisions to the Guidelines before they are finalized for adoption in August 2015.
- CTC staff indicated that there is a new section within the Guidelines (Section 11) that addresses Multi-Modal Corridors. This section is currently a placeholder and staff would appreciate any comments to enhance this section of the Guidelines.

- Regional agency representatives asked who defines the corridor and if regional agency representatives can define their own corridors. CTC staff responded that Section 11 of the guidelines uses the USDOT definition but that regional agencies have the discretion to reasonably describe/define their own corridors.
- CTC staff discussed the language change in Section 14 which now requires the submittal of a PSR or PSR equivalent with the RTIP or ITIP, either in hard copy or electronic format. Since many Caltrans ITIP projects have completed PSRs as well as environmental documents, Caltrans programming staff questioned whether CTC staff still wanted the PSR submitted. CTC staff responded that PSRs must still be submitted.
- Local agency staff asked if PSRs are required for local projects or SHS projects only. CTC staff responded that the Guidelines specify a PSR or PSR equivalent must be submitted for local projects.
- CTC staff presented a detailed overview of proposed updates to Section 19 – Criteria for Measuring Performance and Cost-Effectiveness. Regional agency staff asked if there were any changes to the definition of “large projects” which require a project-level cost-effectiveness evaluation. CTC staff responded that the large project definition remains the same with the exception of projects which exceed 50% of a county’s target for new programming (as identified in the fund estimate); these are no longer considered to be “large projects.”
- Regional agency staff asked if agencies are required to report on all bulleted measures in Section 19. CTC staff responded that agencies are responsible for reporting on measures listed in Section 19 that the region currently monitors.
- Regional agency staff asked if system performance modeling will be required just for RTIP projects or for the whole RTP. CTC staff responded that the intention of Section 19A is for the agency to communicate at a high-level what the RTP is expected to achieve during the RTIP period. This would include a discussion of how the RTIP projects contribute to that performance, reflecting and building upon the existing modeling work of the RTP. Section 19B specifically pertains to cost-effectiveness and performance of the RTIP and ITIP, and Section 19C pertains to project-specific analysis.
- Legislative staff asked if qualitative analysis is permissible. CTC staff responded that in the event quantitative analysis is not feasible, qualitative analysis would be appropriate.
- Regional agency staff commented that modeling runs are usually completed in 5 year increments. The Appendix A performance measures table column specifying projected system performance at the end of the STIP period should allow regions to use horizon years that are already being modeled. CTC staff indicated that this is an issue for further clarification; regional agencies are encouraged to provide comments and language regarding horizon year flexibility.
- Rural agencies asked for clarification whether regions outside an MPO can continue to use measures they are currently monitoring. CTC staff confirmed that rural agencies outside an MPO are only required to quantitatively report on measures which they currently monitor.
- Section 19C Project Specific Evaluation now includes language requiring that Caltrans provide project-specific data. Caltrans Programming staff asked that agencies please give Caltrans Districts sufficient lead time to process data requests.
- Regional agency staff asked what the baseline is for system performance measurement in Appendix A of the Guidelines and if the baseline can be flexible. The comment was also made that the end performance year should reflect both observed and modeled data. The SANDAG Performance Indicators report relies on data that is readily available to rural and urban regions through sources such as US Census (with the exception of PEMS highway data that may not be available in all regions). CTC staff responded that the intention is for the baseline year to reflect current system performance.

Staff is open to discussing how base year flexibility might be accomplished in a manner that allows alignment with modeling runs yet maintains the intent of capturing current performance.

- Section 19B Evaluation of Cost-Effectiveness of the RTIP or ITIP did not include significant language changes. Regional agencies commented that life-cycle costing time frames would vary based on modeling capabilities. CTC staff asked for regions to provide reasonable life-cycle costing timeframes by modal investment i.e. transit, roadways.
- Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership requested that Decrease in Fatalities and Accidents per thousand dollars invested be analyzed by mode in bullet #2 in Section 19B. Regional agencies inquired as to how fatalities and accidents can be forecasted by mode and rural agencies commented that rural counties have limited modal analysis capabilities.
- Regional agency staff commented that Section B measures don't carry forward the measures identified in Section A and suggested creating a cost-effectiveness version of Section A measures that could be used in Section B. There was general consensus to make Section 19 A, B, and C performance measures consistent.
- Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership suggested that the ATP cost-benefit model currently under development be incorporated into Section 19B. In the event an Active Transportation Project proposed for programming meets the threshold for project-level evaluation, the ATP cost-benefit model could be used to meet the requirement for project-specific cost benefit analysis.
- Rural agency staff commented that Pavement Condition Index (PCI) is an important performance measure for rural areas.
- Section 19C Project Specific Evaluation – Caltrans Programming staff suggested that information regarding proposed changes in the built environment listed in the bullets on p. 9 of the draft guidelines could be captured in the PPR as a way to consistently report this information. CTC staff supports the inclusion of this information in the PPR to ensure consistent reporting and easy identification of project outcomes.
- The comment was made that safety isn't one of the bulleted items on p. 9. CTC staff responded that safety would be considered the outcome of the change to the built environment. It was suggested that safety improvements such as guardrails be added to the list.
- Rural agency staff asked if the Highway Buffer Index metric would capture highway delays in rural areas associated with natural events. MPO staff responded that this information would be available through observed data rather than modeled data.
- Regional agency staff asked that the definitions of the individual performance measures be provided in Appendix A. CTC staff responded that the definitions as specified in the SANDAG report will be incorporated in Appendix A.
- Section 20 – Submittal of RTIPs: language was added requiring that the RTIP identify a discussion of each proposed project's impact on other projects planned or underway within the corridor and information on STIP projects completed since the last RTIP submittal including a summary of project benefits.
- Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership asked if the "benefits" of completed projects could be negative or positive. Staff responded that there could be negative and positive aspects of completed projects.
- CTC staff commented that "completed project benefits" need to be clarified to ensure consistency between Section 20 and Section 68 of the guidelines.
- Section 31 – Submittal of Caltrans ITIP: language was added to this Section requiring 2 ITIP hearings (consistent with SB 486 which is on the Governor's desk for consideration). Caltrans Programming

staff indicated that in the event SB 486 is not signed Caltrans would appreciate flexibility regarding the number of ITIP hearings required in the guidelines.

- Safe Routes to Schools National Partnership commented that hearings could also provide Caltrans with the opportunity to discuss interregional priorities identified in the Interregional Transportation System Strategic Plan.
- Caltrans Programming staff asked that Section 31 clarify that the ITIP will include information on “ITIP” STIP projects as Caltrans would only be reporting on ITIP projects (not RTIP and ITIP projects).
- Section 34 – Interregional Program Objectives: bullets were added to this section to reflect ITSP objectives as proposed in the current ITSP update effort underway. The section also specifies that the ITIP will be based on the ITSP.
- Regional agency staff asked if the new ITSP objectives expand project eligibility in the ITIP. Caltrans and CTC staff responded that project eligibility is still constrained by law but the objectives could influence interregional program priorities.
- Rural agencies expressed concern with proposed strikethrough of trunk system completion priority language for the ITIP on p. 22. Caltrans staff responded that trunk system completion will be reflected as a priority in the ITSP. CTC staff indicated that the STIP Guidelines will reflect the overarching interregional system objectives that are developed through the ITSP and that Section 34 will remain a placeholder until the ITSP is finalized.
- Caltrans Programming staff requested that the bullets on p. 19 and p. 20 be consistent.

#### Focused Discussion on Performance Measures Section 19, Appendix A and Appendix B

- Regional Agency staff suggested that in Section 19C, project-level change in VMT should also be a cost-effectiveness measure. The comment was also made that Section 19A, B, and C creates a three-part analysis which is more labor intensive. CTC staff responded that Section 19A is intended to reflect work that regions are already doing through the preparation of the RTP. Section 19B does create additional work regarding RTIP cost-effectiveness however CTC staff is open to keeping measures consistent among Sections A, B, and C. Section 19C is intended to clearly identify project outcomes and staff is hoping this can be achieved through a simple reporting format such as inclusion of this information on the project PPR.
- Regional agency staff commented that the guidelines don’t address the cost-share issue of STIP funding – the STIP is oftentimes only a sliver of the transportation funding picture. How does CTC staff intend to address STIP-specific benefits vs. total project benefits? CTC staff responded that it is important to understand the total benefits of projects for which STIP dollars are providing leverage.
- Legislative staff commented that as long as the project has a good cost-benefit ratio it would be a prudent investment for state resources.
- Natural Resources Defense Council provided the following feedback: 1.) Highway Buffer Index stands out as the only reliability metric and it relates only to highways, this metric should be eliminated or reliability metrics should be added for all modes, 2.) safety metrics are focused on vehicular travel and they should address all modes, at least qualitatively if data is an issue, and 3.) performance measurement is needed for social equity and disadvantaged communities as this is an area of state goals that is not currently reflected in the guidelines performance measures.
- MPO staff responded that many regions have equity as a goal within the RTP/SCS and may have some limited quantitative information; unfortunately there are no standard metrics.
- Legislative staff suggested that ARB’s recently adopted criteria for measuring Cap and Trade Program benefits to disadvantage communities be utilized as a regional resource for possible metrics.

- Regional agencies commented that, as proposed, Section 19 will require more work for RTIP development, will PPM allocation be increased to address this issue. CTC staff responded that PPM allocations are statutorily limited.
- MPO staff commented that the methodology and data sources for the measures identified in Section 19 and Appendix B are readily available in the SANDAG Performance Metrics report.
- Sierra Club expressed concern that there is a lack of rail improvements and associated feeder bus route improvements in the ITIP, particularly in northern CA. CTC staff responded that language on p. 22 of the guidelines will be clarified to specify that associated feeder bus routes for intercity rail line are part of the interregional rail program emphasis areas.

#### 4. Next Steps and Closing– Laurel Janssen/Laurie Waters

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. All meeting materials will be posted on the web at [www.catc.ca.gov](http://www.catc.ca.gov).

The first draft of the 2016 STIP Guidelines will be presented as an informational item at the October 2014 Commission meeting. The guidelines are still under development at this time, additional outreach and revisions are expected prior to adoption of the final 2016 STIP Guidelines in August 2015.