

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT 1 P.M. JANUARY 28, 2020
WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT COMMUNITY ROOM
210 BATTERY STREET, CRESCENT CITY, CA 95531**

1. Call Meeting to Order

2. Public comment period

Public comments are welcome and encouraged; however, no proposed action can be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda.

3. Select chair and vice chair for the 2020 calendar year.

Proposed action: By consensus, select chair and vice chair.

4. Minutes of October 29, 2019

Proposed action: By consensus, approve minutes.

5. Overall Work Program Amendment 2

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC adopt a resolution approving 2019-20 Overall Work Program Amendment 2.

6. Highway Infrastructure Program Funding

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC adopt a resolution programming \$178,782 of federal Highway Infrastructure Program funds to a TAC selected project.

7. Crescent City Sunset Circle

Proposed action: Consider the Crescent City request for additional funds to redesign the ATP funded Sunset Circle project. Make a recommendation to Del Norte Local Transportation Commission.

8. 2020-21 Overall Work Program development

Proposed action: Consider draft Overall Work Program spreadsheets and recommend Commission direct staff to fully develop the 2020-21 Overall Work Program with the presented work elements.

9. Discussion

- Regional Transportation Plan Kickoff Meeting
- Elk Valley Cross Road Corridor Plan
- Information sharing by TAC members

10. Adjourn to the next regularly scheduled meeting on February 25, 2020.

Anyone requiring reasonable accommodation to participate in the meeting should contact the Executive Director Tamera Leighton: Phone (707) 465-3878; email Tamera@DNLTC.org.

**MINUTES
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AT 2:00 P.M. ON OCTOBER 29, 2019**

- Present:** Rosanna Bower, County
Heidi Kunstal, County, Vice-Chair
Melissa Miguelena, Yurok Tribe Transit Manager, via telephone
Jon Olson, City
Suresh Ratnam, Caltrans
Joe Rye, RCTA, via telephone
Kevin Tupman, City
Lane Tvasci, Harbor
- Absent:** John Couch, California Highway Patrol
Brandi Natt, Yurok Tribe
Nacole Sutterfield, City, Chair
- Also Present:** Susan Brown, Rural Approaches
Eileen Cooper, Friends of Del Norte
Valency Fitzgerald, Caltrans
Talitha Hodgson, Caltrans
Tamera Leighton, DNLTC
Kevin Tucker, Caltrans

1. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

Vice-Chair Kunstal called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Public comments are welcome and encouraged; however, no proposed action can be taken on any item not appearing on the agenda. Public Comments are limited to three minutes.

The following person(s) addressed the Committee: Eileen Cooper would like clarity regarding the schedule and field trips for the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) upcoming meeting.

3. MINUTES OF AUGUST 27, 2019

Proposed action: By consensus, approve minutes.

Rosanna Bower noted two corrections to the Wonderstump Road public outreach update discussion item.

Public Comment: None

Jon Olson moved to approve the minutes of August 27, 2019, with two corrections, seconded by Rosanna Bower, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the minutes of August 27, 2019.

4. SB 743 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN CONTRACT AWARD

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC award contract to the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring.

Tamera Leighton reviewed and reported the scores to the TAC members. VRPA received the highest scores.

Public Comment: None

Rosanna Bower moved to approve recommending DNLTC award contract to VRPA, the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring, seconded by Suresh Ratnam, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the recommendation DNLTC award contract to VRPA, the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring.

5. 2020 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE CONTRACT AWARD

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC award contract to the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring.

Tamera Leighton reviewed and reported the scores to the TAC members. Green Dot received the highest scores.

Public Comment: None

Jon Olson moved to recommend DNLTC award contract to Green DOT Transportation Solutions, the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring, seconded by Rosanna Bower, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the recommendation DNLTC award contract to Green DOT Transportation Solutions, the highest-ranking consultant per the TAC member scoring.

6. PUBLIC OUTREACH SCOPE AND COST AMENDMENT

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC award an additional \$10,000 for a total of \$36,000 for Work Element 1: Community and Stakeholder Engagement.

Rosanna Bower reported that the County has expended \$18,000 of the \$26,000 awarded for public engagement and is requesting an additional \$10,000 to complete the work.

Public Comment: None

Jon Olson moved to recommend DNLTC award an additional \$10,000 for a total of \$36,000 for Work Element 1: Community and Stakeholder Engagement, seconded by Rosanna Bower, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the recommendation DNLTC award an additional \$10,000 for a total of \$36,000 for Work Element 1: Community and Stakeholder Engagement.

Public Comment: Eileen Cooper commented that she has attended the Public Engagement events and feels the ditches should be maintained status quo.

7. PROJECT MANAGEMENT SOFTWARE FOR THE COUNTY OF DEL NORTE

Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC adopt resolution awarding up to \$700 of PPM fund to the County of Del Norte for the purchase of Microsoft Project.

Rosanna Bower explained the County's request to purchase the scheduling software, Microsoft Project, using Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM) funds. The scheduling software will be used for transportation-related projects.

Public Comment: None

Jon Olson moved to recommend DNLTC adopt resolution awarding up to \$700 of PPM fund to the County of Del Norte for the purchase of Microsoft Project, seconded by Joe Rye, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the recommendation DNLTC adopt resolution awarding up to \$700 of PPM fund to the County of Del Norte for the purchase of Microsoft Project.

8. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL/CALIFORNIA ENDOWMENT FUNDING ALLOCATION MARY PEACOCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Proposed Action: Recommend DNLTC contribute the fund balance of approximately \$13,000 for Safe Routes to Schools project costs in the Mary Peacock Elementary School zone.

Tamera Leighton explained the leftover fund balance and the uses for the fund and proposes using the leftover funds for curb ramps at Mary Peacock Elementary School.

Public Comment: None

Jon Olson moved to recommend DNLTC contribute the fund balance of approximately \$13,000 for Safe Routes to Schools project costs in the Mary Peacock Elementary School zone, seconded by Rosanna Bower, and unanimously carried; the Technical Advisory Committee approved the recommendation DNLTC contribute the fund balance of approximately \$13,000 for Safe Routes to Schools project costs in the Mary Peacock Elementary School zone

9. DISCUSSION

- Asset Management Presentation by Caltrans – Talitha Hodgson, Valency Fitzgerald, and Kevin Tucker presented an overview of project selection, input opportunities, project development process, asset management, SB 1 State funding, project cycles and timing, and target projects. They also discussed finding methods to better communicate with Districts and are working on policies to improve communications and asset management.

Public Comment: Eileen Cooper commented on the connection corridor to the Farmer's Market at the fairgrounds as dangerous to bicyclists and pedestrians.

- State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) update – Included in above presentation
- SB 1 Project Report Schedule – Attached in packet
- CTC Town Hall meeting update – Tamera Leighton reported the draft agenda has been developed and sent out. Final preparations are being done.

10. ADJOURN TO THE NEXT REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 26, 2019 AT 2:00 P.M.

With no further business to come before the TAC, the Vice-Chair adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m., to the next regularly scheduled meeting on November 26, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamera Leighton, Executive Director
Del Norte Local Transportation Commission



Item 5 Staff Report

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2020
TO: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: TAMERA LEIGHTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: OVERALL WORK PROGRAM AMENDMENT 2

REQUESTED: Recommend DNLTC adopt resolution 2020 1 approving the 2019-20 Overall Work Program Amendment 2.

BACKGROUND: The Overall Work Program (OWP) is the primary management tool for the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission, identifying the activities and a schedule of work for regional transportation planning in Del Norte County.

DISCUSSION: The following chart reflects the changes to the Overall Work Program, thus creating the necessity for Amendment 2.

Work Element:	Purpose of change:	Action taken:
D 1	Adds funding to accommodate actions to support US Highway 199 STIP project and Regional Transportation Improvement Program submission	Funds staff services to accommodate additional work within the limits of the staff services contract.

The proposed resolution and amendment are attached.

RESOLUTION NO. 2020 1

**DEL NORTE LOCAL TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION RESOLUTION APPROVING
AMENDMENT #2 OF THE 2019-20 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM**

WHEREAS, the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission in its official capacity as the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency, hereafter referred to as the RTPA, is responsible for the planning, allocating and programming of funds; and

WHEREAS, the 2019-20 Overall Work Program (OWP) identifies the activities and a schedule of work for regional transportation planning in Del Norte County, and is a requirement of the Memorandum of Understanding between Del Norte Local Transportation Commission and the California Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission adopted the 2019-20 OWP at the May 7 2019 meeting and amended it on December 3 2019; and

WHEREAS, budget adjustments are usual and customary; and

WHEREAS, the expenditure detail and revenue summary are attached to this resolution; and

WHEREAS, Amendment #2 of the 2019-20 OWP makes the following changes:

Work Element:	Purpose of change:	Action taken:
D 1	Adds funding to accommodate actions to support US Highway 199 STIP project and Regional Transportation Improvement Program submission	Funds staff services to accommodate additional work within the limits of the staff services contract.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED AND ORDERED, that the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission hereby approves Amendment #2 of the 2019-20 Overall Work Program.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission, a Regional Transportation Planning Agency of the State of California on the 4th day of February 2020 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

Alex Fallman, Chair
Del Norte Local Transportation Commission

Attest:

Tamera Leighton, Executive Director
Del Norte Local Transportation Commission

WORK ELEMENT D **Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development**
2019-20 OWP Amendment 2

Expenditures		Revenue by Fund Source			
Allocations and Funding Requirements					
	Amount	RPA	STIP/PPM	TDA	
DNLTC Staff Services	\$ 11,000.00	\$ -	11,000.00	\$ -	
Consultant	\$ 60,976.00	\$ -	\$ 60,976.00	\$ -	
TOTAL	\$ 71,976.00	\$ -	\$ 71,976.00	\$ -	

Note: All accounting and reporting is at the product level and all consultant costs are limited by contract.

Objective

To identify and develop candidate projects for the region's transportation programming needs for federal, state and local transportation improvement programs consistent with the 2016 Regional Transportation Plan for future allocations and future capacity made available with the help of Senate Bill 1. To support the construction of the 197/199 corridor STIP funded projects in a manner that explains to the community what is happening to the bridge replacement and curve realignment of a 92 year old bridge, and to protect the investment of regional dollars.

Discussion

Financial planning and programming state highway and local projects is a complex process involving multiple inter-related federal, state, regional, and local agencies as well as innumerable documents and funding programs. The process is further complicated by the necessity to maintain priorities while reporting requirements shift. Without a map and a strategy for developing fundable projects, regions risk missing funding opportunities. The current focus for STIP monitoring is on encouraging the delivery of the US Highway 197/199 corridor STIP funded projects. Del Norte Local Transportation Commission is committed to the delivery of the bridge replacement and curve realignment that has a regional funding investment of \$19.4 million. Developing and maintaining the Regional Transportation Improvement Program is mandatory work for all regional transportation planning agencies in California.

Previous Accomplishments

- Coordinate with TAC and prepare Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) every odd numbered year.
- Monitor the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).
- Develop and provide public information to local, regional, state and federal stakeholders for existing projects in the STIP, including Middle Fork Smith River Bridge replacement and curve realignment on US Highway 199.
- Establish a legal counsel contract and general work scope and goals.

Product 1: Develop and Maintain TIP

The STIP is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the Transportation Investment Fund and other funding sources. STIP and Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP is established by Caltrans) programming generally occurs every two years and is controlled by a complex set of guidelines and requirements. This work is necessary for programming new and maintaining existing STIP funding. Products include staff reports to DNLTC that track progress on projects funded in the STIP.

Task/Activity	Product	Schedule
1 Monitor the Project Charter with Caltrans District 1 for the Middle Fork Smith River Bridge replacement and curve realignment.	Up-to-date project information	Quarterly and as needed.
2 Draft and deliver Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to the California Transportation Commission.	RTIP	Dec-19

3	Facilitate and initiate conversations to present solutions that resolve litigation for US Highway 199.	RTIP July 2019 - June 2020
---	--	----------------------------------

Product D1 Estimate	Amount	RPA	STIP/PPM	TDA
DNLTC Staff Services	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ -
Consultant	\$-	\$ -		\$ -
Total	\$ 11,000	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ -

Product 2: Project Representation

Products include: Documents drafted and delivered to federal court in partnership with regional stakeholders. This project was initiated in June 2014. The schedule will be revised upon Caltrans' document submission to Courts.

Task/Activity		Schedule
1	Complete research and develop strategy for DNLTC to have adequate representation for its Safe STAA project: Bridge replacement and curve realignment on US Highway 199.	July-June
2	Draft and finalize documents that represent the interest of DNLTC and its stakeholder partners for US Highway 199/197 projects.	July-June
3	Represent DNLTC and stakeholder partners in federal court.	July-June
4	Post articles and documents to the website that inform the public regarding the process and activities as appropriate.	July-June

Product D2 Estimate	Amount	RPA	STIP/PPM	TDA
DNLTC Staff Services	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Consultant	\$ 60,976		\$ 60,976	\$ -
Total	\$ 60,976	\$ -	\$ 60,976	\$ -

Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
Overall Work Program Expenditure Detail

2019-20 OWP Amendment 2

Work Element	Description	Funding Sources	DNLTC	Consultant/Other
A	Long Range Planning Coordination	RPA	\$ 32,000	\$ 5,900
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other/RSTP	\$ -	\$ -
Total A	\$37,900		\$32,000	\$5,900
B	Overall Work Program Development	RPA	\$ 14,000	\$ 10,000
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total B	\$34,000		\$ 14,000	\$ 20,000
C	Public Participation and Information Dissemination	RPA	\$ 29,000	\$ 27,500
		PPM	\$ -	\$ 2,500
		TDA	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total C	\$69,000		\$ 29,000	\$ 40,000
D	Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ 11,000	\$ 60,976
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total D	\$71,976		\$ 11,000	\$ 60,976
E	Transportation Development Act Administration and Fiscal Management	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ 28,500	\$ 27,500
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total E	\$56,000		\$ 28,500	\$ 27,500
F	SAFE: Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		SAFE	\$ 6,000	\$ 20,000
Total F	\$26,000		\$ 6,000	\$ 20,000
G	2020 Regional Transportation Plan	RPA	\$ 5,000	\$ 30,814
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total G	\$35,814		\$ 5,000	\$ 30,814
H	SB 743 Implementation Plan	RPA	\$ 5,000	\$ 63,500
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total H	\$68,500		\$ 5,000	\$ 63,500
I	Community and Stakeholder Engagement	RPA	\$ 4,000	\$ 36,000
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total I	\$40,000		\$ 4,000	\$ 36,000
L	Elk Valley Cross Rd Corridor Plan	RPA	\$ 3,300	\$ -
		PPM	\$ -	\$ 4,700
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other: RPA Carryover	\$ -	\$ 49,113
Total L	\$57,113		\$ 3,300	\$ 53,813

**Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
Overall Work Program Revenue Summary**

2019-20 OWP Amendment 2

Work Element	Description	RPA	TDA	STIP PPM	SAFE/RSTP	Work Element Total
A	Long Range Planning Coordination					
Product 1	Regional Transportation Plan Development	\$ 26,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Last Chance Grade Commission Update	\$ 4,000.00		\$ -	\$ -	
Product 3	2020 Economic and Demographic Profile	\$ 7,900.00	\$ -			
	Total Work Element A	\$ 37,900.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,900.00
B	Overall Work Program Development					
Product 1	Overall Work Program	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element B	\$ 24,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 34,000.00
C	Information Dissemination					
Product 1	Informed Local Transportation Commission	\$ 28,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Partnerships and Planning Agreements	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	
Product 3	Website & Crowdsourcing Information	\$ 24,500.00				
	Total Work Element C	\$ 56,500.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$ 69,000.00
D	Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development					
Product 1	Develop and Maintain TIP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,000.00	\$ -	
Product 2	Project Representation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,976.00	\$ -	
	Total Work Element D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 71,976.00	\$ -	\$ 71,976.00
E	Transportation Development Act Administration and Fiscal Management					
Product 1	Office Operations	\$ -	\$ 20,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Fiscal Management	\$ -	\$ 33,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 3	SSTAC Support	\$ -	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element E	\$ -	\$ 56,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56,000.00
F	SAFE: Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies					
Product 1	Call Box System Maintenance & Reporting	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,000.00	
	Total Work Element F	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,000.00
G	2020 Regional Transportation Plan					
Product 1	2020 Regional Transportation Plan	\$ 35,814.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element G	\$ 35,814.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,814.00
H	SB 743 Implementation Plan					
Product 1	SB 743 Implementation Plan	\$ 68,500.00				
	Total Work Element H	\$ 68,500.00				\$ 68,500.00
I	Community and Stakeholder Engagement					
Product 1	Engagement: Wonder Stump Road	\$ 40,000.00				
	Total Work Element I	\$ 40,000.00		\$ -		\$ 40,000.00
L	Elk Valley Cross Rd Corridor Plan					
Product 1	Elk Valley Cross Road Corridor Plan	\$ 3,300.00		\$ 4,700.00	\$ 49,113.00	
TOTAL LABOR AND EXPENSES		\$ 266,014.00	\$ 76,000.00	\$ 79,176.00	\$ 75,113.00	\$ 496,303.00

Item 6 Staff Report

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2020
TO: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: TAMERA LEIGHTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (HIP) FUNDING

REQUESTED: Proposed action: Recommend DNLTC adopt a resolution programming \$178,782 of federal Highway Infrastructure Program funds to a TAC selected project.

BACKGROUND: The Highway Improvement Program (HIP) fact sheet and allocation tables are attached. DNLTC has \$178,782 of federal funding to an eligible project on a major collector or on the State Highway System.

DISCUSSION: The attached fact sheets and formula charts describe in detail the eligible uses of funding. Of note, these are federal funds and are not exchanged, even for small rural projects. The project must be on a Federal-Aid designated project, including major collector projects. Minor collector and local road projects are not eligible.

HIGHWAY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT DISTRIBUTION Rural non-MPO Area ONLY

1	2	3	4	5	6
Rural Non-MPO Counties	FFY 2017/18 Apportionment ¹ (Obligate by 9/30/2021)	FFY 2018/19 Apportionment ² (Obligate by 9/30/2022)	Total Apportionment Available for Programming (Col 2 + Col 3)	Programmed Amount	Unobligated Balance (Col 4 - Col 5)
Alpine	\$ 3,048	\$ 4,294	\$ 7,342		\$ 7,342
Amador	\$ 98,811	\$ 139,217	\$ 238,028		\$ 238,028
Calaveras	\$ 118,233	\$ 166,581	\$ 284,814	\$ (284,814)	\$ (0)
Colusa	\$ 55,562	\$ 78,284	\$ 133,846		\$ 133,846
Del Norte	\$ 74,216	\$ 104,566	\$ 178,782		\$ 178,782
Glenn	\$ 72,950	\$ 102,782	\$ 175,733		\$ 175,733
Humboldt	\$ 349,222	\$ 492,029	\$ 841,250		\$ 841,250
Inyo	\$ 48,110	\$ 67,783	\$ 115,893		\$ 115,893
Lake	\$ 167,746	\$ 236,342	\$ 404,087		\$ 404,087
Lassen	\$ 90,520	\$ 127,536	\$ 218,057		\$ 218,057
Mariposa	\$ 47,344	\$ 66,705	\$ 114,049		\$ 114,049
Mendocino	\$ 227,866	\$ 321,047	\$ 548,913	\$ (548,913)	\$ (0)
Modoc	\$ 25,126	\$ 35,401	\$ 60,527		\$ 60,527
Mono	\$ 36,841	\$ 51,906	\$ 88,747		\$ 88,747
Nevada	\$ 256,201	\$ 360,969	\$ 617,170	\$ (617,170)	\$ (0)
Plumas	\$ 51,900	\$ 73,123	\$ 125,022		\$ 125,022
Sierra	\$ 8,405	\$ 11,842	\$ 20,247		\$ 20,247
Siskiyou	\$ 116,474	\$ 164,103	\$ 280,577		\$ 280,577
Tehama	\$ 164,628	\$ 231,949	\$ 396,576		\$ 396,576
Trinity	\$ 35,762	\$ 50,386	\$ 86,148		\$ 86,148
Tuolumne	\$ 143,621	\$ 202,352	\$ 345,972		\$ 345,972
Statewide Total	\$ 2,192,585	\$ 3,089,197	\$ 5,281,782	\$ (1,450,897)	\$ 3,830,885

Notes:

1. FFY 2017/18 Apportionment; Obligate by 9/30/2021 or lapse. Source FHWA N4510.826, 4/25/2018
2. FFY 2018/19 Apportionment; Obligate by 9/30/2022 or lapse; Source FHWA 4510.835, 3/15/2018
3. Programmed Amount: Includes proposed and already programmed projects

Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) - 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/
- 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; HIP obligations do not count against the Region's/State's balance of formula OA.
- Federal share according to 23 USC 120
 - 88.53% (for CA), except when:
 - on the interstate (90%)
 - meets certain safety project conditions (100%) (See No. 15 in Q and A for more information.)

ELIGIBILITY

- Eligible work defined by to 23 USC 133(b)(1)(A); e.g. construction of highways (a.k.a. Federal-aid system 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 (not HIP eligible) are differentiated from Urban Minor Collectors (HIP eligible) 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. Do the Apportionments set aside additional HIP for other purposes? If so, who may qualify for those funds?
 - a. Yes, some HIP funds are set aside for other special purposes including Puerto Rico, Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects, designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads, and the Territorial Highway Program.
A portion of HIP funds are also set aside for bridge rehabilitation and restoration; however, this is for States in which the percentage of total deck area of bridges classified in poor condition is 7.5 percent or greater, per the National Bridge Inventory. California's bridges statewide are in better condition than this, so does not qualify for this set aside.

Q and A (continued)

10. What is the purpose of the HIP?
 - a. On March 23, 2018 the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 was passed and signed into law. This omnibus 2018 FFY spending bill to fund the US federal government included the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act for that same FFY (DOT Appropriations Act, 2018, title I of division L, Pub. L. 115-141). The following year, the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act for the 2019 FFY was passed (DOT Appropriations Act, 2018, title I of division G, Public Law (Pub. L.) 116-6). These two appropriation Acts set aside funds for the Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP). The Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) provides federal funds to construct highways, bridges, and tunnels. The 2019 HIP fund apportionment may also be used for the elimination of hazards and installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossings.
11. What is the background When the HIP funds are not used by the deadline, what happens to them?
 - a. Any amounts not obligated by the deadline shall lapse. Once the period for obligation has expired, funds will not be permitted to be re-obligated.
 - b. Obligated balances remained available for expenses incurred until the obligation deadline, at which time all unexpended balances expired.
12. When the funds lapse, do they return to the State and Region?
 - a. Once the deadline to obligate funds has past the funds expire and are lost.
13. Will the HIP be continued into 2020 and beyond?
 - a. The HIP has been approved, so far, in single year increments for two FFYs (e.g. 2018 and 2019). As of April 2019, it is not known if the HIP will be continued with additional funding via future legislation.
14. What is the reimbursement Ratio for HIP?
 - a. The reimbursement ratio for HIP projects depends on the location and type of project:
 - i. Most projects will have a reimbursement ratio of 88.53%; this is based on the percentage of nontaxable Indian lands, public domain lands, national forests, and national parks and monuments, within the State.
 - ii. For projects on the Interstate, the reimbursement ratio is 90%, unless the project adds non-high-occupancy-vehicle or auxiliary lanes. For projects that add single occupancy vehicle capacity, that portion of the project will revert to the 88.53% percent level.
 - iii. The Federal share for projects on the Interstate System is 90 percent.
 - iv. For certain types of safety projects, the reimbursement ratio is 100% (see question number 15).

Q and A (continued)

15. What type of safety projects are reimbursable at 100%?

- a. Must be approved by FHWA
 - i. Each year the amount of funds used for safety improvements that FHWA can allow to be 100% reimbursable is legally constrained.
 - ii. Typically, California uses its allotted amount of 100% reimbursement for safety work on the projects in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). As a result, the 100% safety project reimbursement is not available for other federal funding programs such as HIP.

If there was some left over capacity from the 100% safety reimbursement allotment and to be applied to a HIP project, the project would have to consist of only one or more of the below safety components.

- i. Safety components allowed on 100% reimbursed safety projects are:
 - traffic control signalization,
 - maintaining minimum levels of retro-reflectivity of highway signs or pavement markings,
 - traffic circles (also known as “roundabouts”),
 - Safety Rest Areas*
 - pavement marking,
 - shoulder and centerline rumble strips and stripes,
 - commuter carpooling and vanpooling,
 - rail-highway crossing closure, or
 - installation of:
 - traffic signs,
 - traffic lights,
 - guardrails,
 - impact attenuators,
 - concrete barrier end-treatments,
 - breakaway utility poles, or
 - priority control systems for emergency or transit vehicles at signalized intersections
 - Safety Rest Areas [“Safety Rest Area” is defined as an area where motor vehicle operators can park their vehicles and rest; where food, fuel, and lodging services are not available; and is located on a segment of highway that FHWA agrees has a shortage of public and private areas where motor vehicle operators may park their vehicles and rest

If project has a mix of eligible safety components and non-eligible safety components the lower reimbursement ratio must be used.

Highway Infrastructure Program - 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/
- 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; HIP obligations do not count against the Region's/State's balance of formula OA.
- Federal share according to 23 USC 120
 - 88.53% (for CA), except when:
 - on the interstate (90%)
 - meets certain safety project conditions (100%) (See No. 15 in Q and A for more information.)

ELIGIBILITY

- Eligible work defined by to 23 USC 133(b)(1)(A); e.g. construction of highways (a.k.a. Federal-aid system 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 (not HIP eligible) are differentiated from Urban Minor Collectors (HIP eligible) 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.

Highway Infrastructure Program - Fact Sheet

Useful Definitions

Construction Source: 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(4)

The term “construction” means the supervising, inspecting, actual building, and incurrence of all costs incidental to the construction or reconstruction of a highway or any project eligible for assistance under this title, including bond costs and other costs relating to the issuance in accordance with section 122 of bonds or other debt financing instruments and costs incurred by the State in performing Federal-aid project related audits that directly benefit the Federal-aid highway program. Such terms include—

- (A) preliminary engineering, engineering, and design-related services directly relating to the construction of a highway project, including engineering, design, project development and management, construction project management and inspection, surveying, mapping (including the establishment of temporary and permanent geodetic control in accordance with specifications of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration), and architectural-related services;
- (B) reconstruction, resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, and preservation;
- (C) acquisition of right-of-way;
- (D) relocation assistance, acquisition of replacement housing sites, and acquisition and rehabilitation, relocation, and construction of replacement housing;
- (E) elimination of hazards of railway-highway grade crossings;
- (F) elimination of roadside hazards;
- (G) improvements that directly facilitate and control traffic flow, such as grade separation of intersections, widening of lanes, channelization of traffic, traffic control systems, and passenger loading and unloading areas; and
- (H) capital improvements that directly facilitate an effective vehicle weight enforcement program, such as scales (fixed and portable), scale pits, scale installation, and scale houses.

Highway Source: 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(11)

The term “highway” includes—

- (A) a road, street, and parkway;
- (B) a right-of-way, bridge, railroad-highway crossing, tunnel, drainage structure including public roads on dams, sign, guardrail, and protective structure, in connection with a highway; and
- (C) a portion of any interstate or international bridge or tunnel and the approaches thereto, the cost of which is assumed by a State transportation department, including such facilities as may be required by the United States Customs and Immigration Services in connection with the operation of an international bridge or tunnel.

Highway Infrastructure Program - Fact Sheet

FAQs

Eligibility

1. Can HIP funds be added to existing projects?

Yes, eligibility and programming requirements apply.

2. Are there any restrictions on the location of the project in which HIP funds are used?

Yes, the HIP funds must be used in the County designated by the Apportionment Distribution.

3. Can HIP be used for Safety/ATP projects off the Fed-Aid system?

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."

4. What type of safety projects are reimbursable at 100%?

Must be approved by FHWA

- a. Each year the amount of funds used for safety improvements that FHWA can allow to be 100% reimbursable is legally constrained.
- b. Typically, California uses its allotted amount of 100% reimbursement for safety work on the projects in the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). As a result, the 100% safety project reimbursement is not available for other federal funding programs such as HIP.
- c. If there was some left over capacity from the 100% safety reimbursement allotment and to be applied to a HIP project, the project would have to consist of only one or more of the below safety components.
 - i. Safety components allowed on 100% reimbursed safety projects are:
 - traffic control signalization,
 - maintaining minimum levels of retro-reflectivity of highway signs or pavement markings,
 - traffic circles (also known as "roundabouts"),
 - Safety Rest Areas*
 - pavement marking,
 - shoulder and centerline rumble strips and stripes,
 - commuter carpooling and vanpooling,
 - rail-highway crossing closure, or
 - installation of:
 - traffic signs,
 - traffic lights,
 - guardrails,
 - impact attenuators,
 - concrete barrier end-treatments,
 - breakaway utility poles, or
 - priority control systems for emergency or transit vehicles at signalized intersections
 - Safety Rest Areas ["Safety Rest Area" is defined as an area where motor vehicle operators can park their vehicles and rest; where food, fuel, and lodging services are not available; and is located on a segment of highway that FHWA agrees has a shortage of public and private areas where motor vehicle operators may park their vehicles and rest

If project has a mix of eligible safety components and non-eligible safety components the lower reimbursement ratio must be used.

Highway Infrastructure Program - Fact Sheet

5. Are Ferry projects eligible for HIP funds?

No, see eligibility requirements for more information on what is eligible for HIP funds.

6. Are bicycle and pedestrian projects eligible for HIP funding?

- a. No, the purpose of HIP funds is to construct highways, bridges, tunnels, and (in the 2019 apportionment) elimination of hazards and installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossings. Projects primarily focused on bicycle and pedestrian construction, rehabilitation or improvements are not HIP eligible.

7. Is bicycle and/or pedestrian paths included, but incidental to, a HIP eligible highway (e.g. HIP eligible fed-aid road), bridge or tunnel project eligible for HIP funding?

- a. When a HIP eligible highway, bridge, or tunnel is constructed, replaced, or undergoing major reconstruction; the construction, replacement or reconstruction of bicycle and/or pedestrian path(s) may be eligible if the bicycle and/or pedestrian path(s) cost is incidental to the estimated total cost to construct the project (e.g. construction contract total amount) and:
 - If the path(s) is/are existing, is adversely impacted by the HIP eligible highway, bridge, or tunnel work and will be replaced in-kind
 - If the path(s) is/are proposed, the new path(s) is/are required to maintain consistency with the existing roadway corridor, as indicated by existing paths directly adjacent to the HIP eligible highway, bridge, or tunnel project work
 - If the path(s) is/are proposed, the new path(s) is/are required as part of an adopted bicycle and/or pedestrian plan and the path connection end points are either existing or to be constructed as part of a project with CON programmed in the current FTIP/STIP cycle.
 - If HIP eligible, the HIP reimbursement of the pathway(s) is limited to the minimum AASHTO Standard Specification for Highway Bridges, or Caltrans Highway Design Manual design standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
 - If a local agency disagrees with an eligibility determination and is unable to reach agreement with the HIP Program Manager. The local agency may appeal HIP eligibility determination by following the dispute resolution process as outlined in Section 20.4 of Chapter 20 of the LAPM.

8. Are operational improvement projects eligible for HIP funds, such as traffic signal installation?

Yes, traffic signal installation is eligible for HIP funding. Eligible HIP work includes construction of highways, bridges, and tunnels. [23 USC 133(b)(1)(A)] Construction includes “improvements that directly facilitate and control traffic flow, such as grade separation of intersections, widening of lanes, channelization of traffic, traffic control systems, and passenger loading and unloading areas...” [23 USC 101(a)(4)(G)]

9. Will DLA be allowing Toll Credits to be used for the HIP?

Yes, the decision to use Toll Credits 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.

10. Do the Apportionments set aside include additional HIP funds for other purposes? If so, who may qualify for those funds?

- a. Yes, some HIP funds are set aside for other special purposes including Puerto Rico, Nationally Significant Federal Lands and Tribal Projects, designated routes of the Appalachian development highway system and local access roads, and the Territorial Highway Program.
- b. A portion of HIP funds are also set aside for bridge rehabilitation and restoration; however, this is for States in which the percentage of total deck area of bridges classified in poor condition is 7.5 percent or greater, per the National Bridge Inventory. California’s bridges statewide are in better condition than this, so does not qualify for this set aside.

Highway Infrastructure Program - Fact Sheet

11. Are HIP funds only for the Construction phase of work?

No, HIP funds may also be used on PE, RW, and ENV phases of work, so long as the work leads directly to a constructed project.

12. Can HIP funds be obligated just for PE or RW phases of work without having any Construction funds obligated yet?

Projects that are not fully programmed in the FTIP, and cannot provide proof the project is fully funded for all future phases of work, require separate FHWA approval for HIP funds.

13. Can HIP funds be used for a Planning Report or Planning Study?

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.

Funding

1. How are HIP funds awarded to local agencies?

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.

2. What is the reimbursement Ratio for HIP?

The reimbursement ratio for HIP projects depends on the location and type of project:

- a. Most projects will have a reimbursement ratio of 88.53%; this is based on the percentage of nontaxable Indian lands, public domain lands, national forests, and national parks and monuments, within the State.
- b. For projects on the Interstate, the reimbursement ratio is 90%, unless the project adds non-high-occupancy-vehicle or auxiliary lanes. For projects that add single occupancy vehicle capacity, that portion of the project will revert to the 88.53% percent level.
- c. The Federal share for projects on the Interstate System is 90 percent.
- d. For certain types of safety projects, the reimbursement ratio is 100%.

3. What happens to HIP funds if they are not used by the deadline?

- a. Any amounts not obligated by the deadline shall lapse. Once the period for obligation has expired, funds will not be permitted to be re-obligated.
- b. A project has five years from the obligation deadline to expend HIP funds. For example, for funds that were apportioned in FY 2018, the obligation deadline is September 30, 2021 and are available for expenses incurred until September 30, 2026.
- c. The 10 year rule also applies to projects using HIP funds. If a project does not acquire right of way or begin construction by the close of the tenth fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the project is authorized, the local agency will need to repay federal funds expended to FHWA. This includes repayment of HIP funds.

4. When the funds lapse, do they return to the State and Region?

Once the deadline to obligate funds has passed, the funds expire and are lost.

5. After funds are obligated, is there a certain date the project must issue its first invoice by?

Projects should reference their individual Program Supplemental Agreements (PSA) with Caltrans for the first date they must invoice by.

Highway Infrastructure Program - Fact Sheet

6. How often do projects need to invoice?

All projects using federal funds must invoice, at a minimum, every six months or they will be marked “inactive.” Projects that are deemed inactive risk becoming deobligated.

7. Will we have to end up segregating the costs on projects for reporting purposes?

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.

General

1. What is the purpose of the HIP?

On March 23, 2018 the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018 was passed and signed into law. This omnibus 2018 FFY spending bill to fund the US federal government included the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act for that same FFY (DOT Appropriations Act, 2018, title I of division L, Pub. L. 115-141). The following year, the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act for the 2019 FFY was passed (DOT Appropriations Act, 2018, title I of division G, Public Law (Pub. L.) 116-6). These two appropriation Acts set aside funds for the Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP).

The Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) provides federal funds to construct highways, bridges, and tunnels. The 2019 HIP fund apportionment may also be used for the elimination of hazards and installation of protective devices at railway-highway crossings.

2. Will the HIP be continued into 2020 and beyond?

The HIP has been approved, so far, in single year increments for two FFYs (e.g. 2018 and 2019). As of April 2019, it is not known if the HIP will be continued with additional funding via future legislation.

Item 7 Staff Report

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2020
TO: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: TAMERA LEIGHTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: CRESCENT CITY SUNSET CIRCLE PROJECT DELIVERY AND
FUNDING REQUEST

PROPOSED ACTION: Consider the Crescent City request for additional funds to redesign the ATP funded Sunset Circle project. Make a recommendation to Del Norte Local Transportation Commission.

BACKGROUND: The City provides background and discussion information in the attached request for additional funding for the Sunset Circle Active Transportation Program funded project. There is available Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funding for this expenditure.



City of Crescent City
Where the Redwoods Meet the Sea

377 J Street, Crescent City, CA 95531 • 707.464.7483 • Fax 707.465.4405 • www.crescentcity.org



January 21, 2020

Ms. Tamera Leighton, Executive Director
Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
900 Northcrest Drive, PMB 16
Crescent City, CA 95531

RE: Sunset Circle Re-design to fit the project onto ROW that is being acquired.

Need:

The City needs to secure funds to redesign the Sunset Circle Trail because the ROW acquisition has stalled on two pieces of property needed for the current design.

Background:

The DNLTC originally dedicated \$160,000 a 20% match for the Sunset Circle Active Transportation Program application and the CTC Match equaling \$640,000 for a total project cost of \$800,000.

A complaint letter was received from the adjacent property owners of Sunset Circle regarding the Sunset Circle Multi-Use Trail Project and the amount of right of way needed for the project. It was stated in the letter the property owners were not happy with losing a sizable amount of their frontage and they suggested the City look at making Sunset Circle a one-way road to minimize the right of way needed for the project. The City has looked at this option in detail and coordinated multiple phone calls and a site walk with Caltrans to determine the feasibility of this option. The City moved forward with a scope change request to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and received approval and moved forward with the project. The City requested and received \$42,000 for the additional costs regarding the change from DNLTC.

City Staff met with property owners multiple times to ensure all property owners were in agreement with the current design. The current design was conceptually agreed to by the impacted property owners in 2018. Offers were made to property owners once the design was sufficiently complete to develop figures and make calculations on the actual areas needed for the project. While the current project reduced needed ROW acquisition by approximately 75%, negotiations for two of the pieces are currently unsuccessful.

Path to Success:

Options considered to acquire the ROW were condemnation, another round of negotiations, and redesign of the project so that the trail footprint would fit the ROW the City will be able to acquire. Staff's opinion is that condemnation will take too long and may not be successful due to lack of actual "need" for this project based on legal definitions and process required for taking of property. The City is making another attempt at negotiating for the two pieces of property by providing a higher offer to the owner within accepted and reasonable limits for use of public funds; the current ROW acquisition budget is sufficient for the current and considered offers. Staff recommends simultaneously redesigning the trail to fit on ROW being acquired from cooperative owners; design is estimated to take four weeks. Three of six offers



City of Crescent City
Where the Redwoods Meet the Sea

377 J Street, Crescent City, CA 95531 • 707.464.7483 • Fax 707.465.4405 • www.crescentcity.org



have been accepted by property owners. Staff anticipates receiving an approved offer from the County within a week.

Design must be started on or before February 4th, 2020 in order to meet the now tight timeline. Staff recommends this two-pronged approach to provide multiple paths to successful project delivery and to meet the pending deadline for the construction allocation request with District 1; March 16, 2020 is the drop-dead date. City Staff have been coordinating with Local Assistance on required process to ensure project deadlines are met.

While staff has considered making a request for a second time extension with CTC, staff has been told by DNLTC Staff, Caltrans ATP coordinator, and Caltrans local assistance that second time extensions are not granted. Staff is contacting CTC Staff to discuss the possibility of another time extension due to difficulties in ROW acquisition.

Request:

Stover Engineering has provided an estimate for the redesign of the trail based on the development of the trail in the ROW that will be able to be acquired. The plans, specifications and estimate (PS&E) budget is fully exhausted. Staff is requesting \$60,000 from the Del Norte Local Transportation Authority for redesign of the trail to meet the construction allocation deadlines with the California Transportation Commission.

The City is not requesting funding for any City staff time.

Sincerely,

Jon Olson
City Engineer
City of Crescent City

Attachments:

1. Project Schedule



Sunset Circle Schedule for Redesign within ROW

Action/Process	Begin	Schedule Duration is days	End
Offer submitted to Brown	November		
Was able to meet with Eileen Brown to discuss ROW acquisition- (not interested in City's offer)	1/2/2020	0	1/2/2020
City internal discussions on options	1/2/2020	1	1/3/2020
Request Scope and Fee from Stover for Redesign	1/3/2020	6	1/9/2020
Requested meeting with DN LTC Staff to discuss project and funding needs (check level of support)	1/10/2020	5	1/15/2020
Request additional funding from DN Local Transportaion for design of trail that will fit on ROW	1/16/2020	0	1/16/2020
Receive funding approval from DNLTC		12	1/28/2020
Send Scope Change and Contract amendment to Caltrans (assume minor change not required to go to CTC and 1 week turn around on contract amendment)	1/31/2020	7	2/7/2020
City Council Staff Report due	1/29/2020		
City Council approves Stover Contract Amendment etc.	2/3/2020	1	2/4/2020
Stover Design Modifications	2/4/2020	28	3/3/2020
Complete ROW Acquisition and Certifications			3/3/2020
Complete Utility relocation documentation			3/3/2020
Submit Construction allocation package to Caltrans	3/3/2020	7	3/10/2020
Request authorization from City Council to make new offer to Brown	1/21/2020	0	1/21/2020
Issue offer to Brown- if not accepted by 2/3/2020 recommend authorizing contract for redesign	1/22/2020	12	2/3/2020

Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP/Fund # 619)

Description	Year Approved	Allocation Amount	Payee	Invoice or Rescinded Date	Amount Paid or Rescinded	Reserved Balance
Sunset Circle Match	2015	160,000	City of Crescent City		10,509.85	149,490.15
Cooper Avenue Emergency	2017	200,000	City of Crescent City	Jun-17	188,936.42	0.00
Coastal Access on Howe Dr.	2017	125,000	City of Crescent City		125,000.00	0.00
Bluff Stabilization	2017	266,000	County of Del Norte		0.00	266,000.00
Harding Avenue Repair	2017	165,000	City of Crescent City	Jul-18	165,000.00	0.00
Harding Avenue Alternative	2018	81,045	County of Del Norte		81,045.00	0.00
Last Chance Grade Planning 2018-	2018	34,202	DNLTC for Udall/Institute	Jul-18	27,681.94	6,520.06
Harding Ave Cost Increase	2018	28,402	City of Crescent City	Sep-18	28,402	0
Work Element H: Large Wheels	2018	2,500	County of Del Norte	Dec-18	2,306.49	0.00
Sunset Circle Scope Change	2018	42,000	City of Crescent City	Jun-19	42,000.00	0.00
Bluff Stabilization	2018	85,140	City of Crescent City		0.00	85,140.00
						507,150.21

Fund Balance June 30, 2018 (audited)	671,355.70
Invoices paid: July 1, 2018 through June 30, 2019	153,033.43
2018-19 Deposit	235,364.00
Interest income 2018-19	10,420.00
Less outstanding project commitments	-507,150.21
Available for projects	256,956.06

Updated to September 30, 2019

Blue indicates completed

Item 8 Staff Report

DATE: JANUARY 28, 2020
TO: TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
FROM: TAMERA LEIGHTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
SUBJECT: 2020-21 OVERALL WORK PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

PROPOSED ACTION: Consider draft Overall Work Program spreadsheets and recommend Commission direct staff to fully develop the 2020-21 Overall Work Program with the presented work elements.

BACKGROUND: Eligible agencies have presented to DNLTC transportation planning activities needed for their jurisdictions. The preliminary spreadsheet is attached. The Overall Work Program represents the work and the budget for Del Norte Local Transportation Commission for a fiscal year. While the requirements are tied to Rural Planning Assistance funds, the work program is inclusive of other fund sources and represents the total work for the transportation commission. In future meetings, a fully developed draft will be presented for consideration.

The Regional Planning Handbook is posted online:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/owp/index_files/fy1718/Final2017RPH11.9.17.pdf

This handbook provides an introduction to the Overall Work Program:

The core regional transportation planning document is the Overall Work Program (OWP) and its core product is the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

The OWP and RTP are directly and inextricably interconnected. OWP activities support the RTP and development of the RTP is an OWP activity. The RTP is implemented through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

and the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP). Development of the RTIP and FTIP are also OWP activities.

The OWP is a California variant of what federal regulations [23 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) 450.308] refer to as a Unified Planning Work Program (UPWP). Federal regulations do not define it, but list what it must contain, depending on the size of the MPO and various other factors. The least complex OWPs include a description of what work is to be accomplished, when, by whom, and using which specific funding.

The OWP is a one-year scope of work and budget for transportation planning activities and funding sources to be accomplished between July 1 and June 30 of the state fiscal year. It is a statement of proposed work and estimated costs that tie specific available transportation planning funding sources to specific transportation planning activities. The OWP is essentially a grant application for CPG and RPA funds, therefore MPOs and RTPAs are only required to include activities in the OWP funded with these funds. However, many MPOs and RTPAs use the OWP as their annual business plan and budget and choose to include all of their activities and fund sources in the OWP.

Federal law uses the term Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) and defines the term as the official intermodal transportation plan that is developed and adopted through the metropolitan transportation planning process for the metropolitan planning area. California law uses the term RTP. Statutes relative to legislative intent (Gov. Code Section 65070), preparation and contents (Gov. Code Section 65080), and public hearing (Gov. Code Section 65090) effectively provide a definition.

As with most plans, the RTP has a long-term horizon (not less than 20 years within the entire life of the RTP) and identifies existing and future transportation needs in

the region. Although it includes rough cost estimates for the transportation proposals and is fiscally constrained (i.e., the total anticipated cost of the proposals is limited to the total reasonably anticipated revenues for the term of the plan), specific fund sources are usually not identified for the individual transportation proposals.

Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
Overall Work Program Expenditure Detail

2020-21 OWP Preliminary Draft

Work Element	Description	Funding Sources	DNLTC	Consultant/ Other
A	Long Range Planning Coordination	RPA	\$ 32,000	\$ 5,900
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other/RSTP	\$ -	\$ -
Total A	\$37,900		\$32,000	\$5,900
B	Overall Work Program Development	RPA	\$ 16,000	\$ 10,000
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total B	\$36,000		\$ 16,000	\$ 20,000
C	Public Participation and Information Dissemination	RPA	\$ 29,000	\$ 27,500
		PPM	\$ -	\$ 2,500
		TDA	\$ -	\$ 10,000
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total C	\$69,000		\$ 29,000	\$ 40,000
D	Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ 8,000	\$ 60,976
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total D	\$68,976		\$ 8,000	\$ 60,976
E	Transportation Development Act Administration and Fiscal Management	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ 28,500	\$ 27,500
		Other	\$ -	\$ -
Total E	\$56,000		\$ 28,500	\$ 27,500
F	SAFE: Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies	RPA	\$ -	\$ -
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		SAFE	\$ 6,000	\$ 20,000
Total F	\$26,000		\$ 6,000	\$ 20,000
G	2020 Regional Transportation Plan	RPA	\$ 8,000	\$ 40,191
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total G	\$48,191		\$ 8,000	\$ 40,191
H	Transit Planning	RPA	\$ 5,000	\$ 40,000
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total H	\$45,000		\$ 5,000	\$ 40,000
I	Regional Mapping	RPA	\$ 4,000	\$ 12,409
		PPM	\$ -	\$ -
		TDA	\$ -	\$ -
		Other:	\$ -	\$ -
Total I	\$16,409		\$ 4,000	\$ 12,409

**Del Norte Local Transportation Commission
Overall Work Program Revenue Summary**

2020-21 OWP Preliminary Draft

Work Element	Description	RPA	TDA	STIP PPM	SAFE/RSTP	Work Element Total
A	Long Range Planning Coordination					
Product 1	Regional Transportation Plan Development	\$ 26,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Last Chance Grade Commission Update	\$ 4,000.00		\$ -	\$ -	
Product 3	2020 Economic and Demographic Profile	\$ 7,900.00	\$ -			
	Total Work Element A	\$ 37,900.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 37,900.00
B	Overall Work Program Development					
Product 1	Overall Work Program	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element B	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 36,000.00
C	Information Dissemination					
Product 1	Informed Local Transportation Commission	\$ 28,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Partnerships and Planning Agreements	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	
Product 3	Website & Crowdsourcing Information	\$ 24,500.00				
	Total Work Element C	\$ 56,500.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$ 69,000.00
D	Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Development					
Product 1	Develop and Maintain TIP	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,000.00	\$ -	
Product 2	Project Representation	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 60,976.00	\$ -	
	Total Work Element D	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 68,976.00	\$ -	\$ 68,976.00
E	Transportation Development Act Administration and Fiscal Management					
Product 1	Office Operations	\$ -	\$ 20,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 2	Fiscal Management	\$ -	\$ 33,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	
Product 3	SSTAC Support	\$ -	\$ 2,500.00	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element E	\$ -	\$ 56,000.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 56,000.00
F	SAFE: Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies					
Product 1	Call Box System Maintenance & Reporting	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,000.00	
	Total Work Element F	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 26,000.00
G	2020 Regional Transportation Plan					
Product 1	2020 Regional Transportation Plan	\$ 48,191.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
	Total Work Element G	\$ 48,191.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 48,191.00
H	Transit Planning					
Product 1	Transit Hub Location Plan	\$ 45,000.00				
	Total Work Element H	\$ 45,000.00				\$ 45,000.00
I	Regional Mapping					
Product 1	Regional Shapefile Mapping	\$ 16,409.00				
	Total Work Element I	\$ 16,409.00		\$ -		\$ 16,409.00
TOTAL LABOR AND EXPENSES		\$ 230,000.00	\$ 76,000.00	\$ 71,476.00	\$ 26,000.00	\$ 403,476.00