

City-County-State-Federal Cooperative Committee

October 21, 2010

Group Memory

Please Note:

Link to Highway System Engineering Branch Functional Classification Update

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/products.html>

2011 Meeting Schedule Proposed

- January 27, 2011
- March 3, 2011
- May 5, 2011
- July 7, 2011
- September 8, 2011
- November 10, 2011

All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport

Standing Items

1. Upshot review; bin lists review including the one we started on April 11, 2008 for reauthorization issues.
2. CTC developments / update. Need ten or fifteen minutes for that.
3. Caltrans Local Assistance Division Chief needs to get the word out on any regulation or process changes coming up.
4. Annually: Review accomplishments of this CCSFCC.
5. Need for current events – what is going on. Agenda is full, but we need to hear from others on what is going on.
6. From this group, what we need is follow up on how Local Assistance is working in the face of the budget situation. Need to know good, bad and ugly for next year.
7. The budget
8. FHWA report – What is the latest?
9. Status of the safety programs. List of projects that may be delivered this FY.

Expected outcome for Dec meeting.

~~Toll Credit Program~~

Progress on setting up the risk-based approach to reviews by CT and FHWA. (Dec. Meeting)
Agenda for Change discussion.
Invoicing Process
Streamlining Principles – Federal Transportation Act.
MACS –risk-based approach for audits - discussion

Bin List & Great Ideas

1. Need to train district people to be advocates for local programs. (Art; July 15, 1999)
2. Consolidate / Minimize number of federal projects. (Terry A August 21, 2003; modified February 9, 2006)
3. How can we exchange federal money for gas tax on local programs? (Terry A August 21, 2003)
4. Programming rule changes
5. This group should revisit PID resource issue for the next budget. (Ross M, contributed October 2010)

Bin List for specific changes for next authorization. (Started at April 11, 2008 meeting; purpose is to have a single place to register the issues we want to address...)

1. Streamlining – drop Cognizant Agency Audit requirement indirect costs. **April 11, 2008/Terry A**
2. Make bridge rail replacement eligible in the bridge program. **April 11, 2008/Pat D**
3. Streamlining: Delegate authority for R&R bridge projects statewide to Caltrans. **April 11, 2008/Pat D**
4. Requirement of other federal agencies to use FHWA rules – when we move money to other Federal Agency, Why do we need to get assurance that they (other federal agencies) will follow FHWA rules **April 11, 2008/Terry A**
5. Revalidation of NEPA document after some fixed period of time – need a timeframe or threshold for this requirement. **June 27, 2008 / Terry A**
6. Can the local agency advertise the project prior to obligation? **(June 4, 2009)**

Charter

PURPOSE OF GROUP (FROM JUNE 1998; Revalidated in Dec 2009; to be reviewed in Dec 2010)

- ADDRESS FUNDING, PROCEDURAL AND LEGISLATIVE ISSUES RELATED TO TRANSPORTATION FROM A LOCAL PERSPECTIVE. (MODIFIED JUNE 8, 2000).
- ENHANCE THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CITIES & COUNTIES, COG's and RTPA's, CT, CTC AND FHWA. THIS EXTENDS TO IMPROVING COMMUNICATION WITH

ALL STAKEHOLDERS. COLLABORATION IS A KEY METHOD. (MODIFIED DECEMBER 2008)

- IMPROVE THE APPLICATION OF TECHNOLOGY TO SPREAD INFORMATION AND IMPROVE ACCESS TO ALL STAKEHOLDERS. (MODIFIED DECEMBER 2008)
- PROVIDE INPUT TO THE DEPARTMENT AND FHWA TO ENHANCE THE ABILITY TO MEET ALL STAKEHOLDER NEEDS. (ADDED IN JUNE 2000, MODIFIED DECEMBER 2008)

Ground Rules:

Start on time. End on time or early.

Identify if you have to leave early and have an agenda item.

Consensus decisions. You must be able to live with it.

Keep side conversations silent.

Send alternate if you are not able to attend.

Upshot

These are the assignments made at the meeting. As new ones are added they will be appended to the list. As assignments are completed they will be lined out with a strike-through, but left on the list for one meeting. This will provide a running record of assignments made at these meetings.

From June 1, 2006 meeting

262	All for Pat D	Pat DeChellis will continue to work on the HBP funding issue, and wants your input on problems related to this. He needs your data on your bridge problems. Please email him with your information. (see discussion notes outline # 9)	On-going
-----	---------------	--	----------

From February 8, 2007

285	All for Denix	Sometimes the interagency coordination is not what it could be. There are times where reviews are duplicative – things are checked by one agency, only to be requested and checked again by the other agency. If you have examples of this please send them to David Saia. Terry A	On going.
-----	---------------	---	-----------

From December 12, 2008 meeting

From June 4, 2009 meeting

354	Denix/Ross	(Receipt of Federal Funds bypassing the State....sending the money directly to the cities and counties.) The group needs to watch this issue. Denix will work with Ross McKeown to keep the group in touch with this as it emerges. (see discussion notes	ONGOING Aug 6, 2009 Dec 3, 2009
-----	------------	---	---

		outline # 6) This is part of the next authorization.	
358c	All for Denix	Denix would like suggestions to improve LA effectiveness (see discussion notes outline # 12)	On-going

From December 3, 2009 Meeting

364	Denix	Send out a short report to communicate the effectiveness of this forum and its accomplishments.	
-----	-------	---	--

From April 15, 2010 Meeting

373a	Barry L	work with FHWA and Ross at MTC to define the problem related to inactive obligations reporting, and problems with project closeout (see discussion notes outline # 9)	4/29/10 8/5/10
------	---------	---	------------------------------

From June 17, 2010 Meeting

377	Ken	Will check into training opportunities to incorporate the findings and information in the COINs. Report on status. (see discussion notes outline # 2)	8/5/10
378	Yin Ping	Clarify the language for the toll credit program to indicate that toll credit will not be used on already programmed safety projects. Make the document final and remove the "Draft" watermark. (see discussion notes outline # 3)	6/30/10
379	Kiana	Send the broad principles from CEAC discussion on the new transportation act to Denix and the specific streamlining principles when they are ready...	6/17/10
380	Denix	Caltrans will report back to the RTPA's and CSAC, and will report back to this group in the August meeting on ICAPS discussion with FHWA. (see discussion notes outline # 5)	8/5/10
381	Denix	Send out the current versions on the "Agenda for Change" list. (see discussion notes outline # 8)	
382	Denix	The DLAE invoice review checklist will be shared with the members of this group to for their input. Then it will be finalized and implemented. Include a timeline on when this will be completed. (see discussion notes	8/1/10

		outline # 9)	
383	Denix	Verify the process to get "Notice to proceed" dates into the RADS, to ensure that the information is in the system prior to June 30th. (see discussion notes outline # 10)	6/21/10

From Oct 21, 2010 Meeting

384	DENIX	Distribute to local agencies a model of the format for general provisions contracts using the 2010 Plain Language standard specs - Boiler plate. (see discussion notes outline # 3)	April 15, 2011
385a	Mohsen	Provide a draft of the ICRP risk-based audit approach guidelines draft from the CT work group for comment from the members (see discussion notes outline # 6) Include information from other states if possible. Solicit input from local agencies earlier rather than later.	11/15/10
385b	Denix	Request Mary Ann Campbell-Smith to attend the next meeting to report on the risk based approach and respond to group concerns. (see discussion notes outline # 6)	Dec 9, 2010
386	Ray Z	Ray Z needs to discuss with Ross what report would be provided – Bridge committee could use this: Who got "free bridges?" It could be useful information. CT could maybe provide a report to the members on how much toll credit is being used. The data are not broken down by region... The content of this report needs to be worked out. Report needs to be worked out.	11/15/10
387a	Tom M	Send Denix the annotated list of things that can be done – what would be needed, who could do it, etc... Agenda for Change: (see discussion notes outline # 12)	11/5/10
387b	Denix	Agenda for Change: (see discussion notes outline # 12) Send the list out to the group when you get it from Tom M	11/7/10
387c	Kiana	Agenda for Change: (see discussion notes outline # 12)) Sponsor discussion at the CEAC meeting to identify priorities.	11/2010
387c	Kiana	Agenda for Change: (see discussion notes outline #	12/2010

		12) Send the list to the group; bring it forward at the December meeting for this group; report back to this group about the November conference in Riverside.	
388	Bill S	Bill S will send out the new invoice review checklist to this group before it is finalized, for their comments.	11/15/10
389	Yin-Ping	Readjust the bridge committee dates in conflict with this group's meeting schedule. (see discussion notes outline # 15)	12/2010

Critique from June 17, 2010 meeting:

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Efficient Ended early Covered a lot. Use of the screen, system (Mike) Pastries.	Attendance

Critique from Oct 21, 2010

What went well	What Needs Improvement
Attendance Participation Mike's celebration of retirement from CT...	Be here on time. CT streamlining process – they do less so we can do more.

1	9:00	Introductions	All	
---	------	---------------	-----	--

2	9:05	Facilitator/Recorder Role; Ground Rules; Action Items; Review Agenda	Mike Halverson/All	Understand meeting process and status of action items
---	------	--	--------------------	---

3	9:15	CTC Allocation Update	Robert Chung	Information Sharing / Feedback
---	------	-----------------------	--------------	--------------------------------

1. CTC Updates

- 1.1. Deferred allocations will be on the list – when budgets are in place, projects that come in for an allocation will be considered.
- 1.2. Bond funded projects – with the budget we will start making allocations again – PTA still has issues. No advances for projects in the out years. Will be first come, first served.
- 1.3. Governor line-item vetoed a lot of money – 300 million in Prop 1a – leaves about 120 million available.
- 1.4. Proposition 22 may change the way transportation funds are handled.

4	9:25	Changes to Caltrans' 2010 Standards Specifications	John McMillan	Information Sharing
---	------	--	---------------	---------------------

2. Changes to Caltrans' 2010 Standards Specifications

- 2.1. Revisions to Caltrans Standard Specifications include implementation of “plain language” as a concept.
- 2.2. There will be a big reduction in the bulk of the standard specifications documents.
- 2.3. This will be available electronically in April 2011; hard copies will be available in July 2011.
- 2.4. The date for requiring the final switch over has not been decided by the policy makers at Caltrans.
- 2.5. Sections 1 through 9 are now available on the internet.
- 2.6. Outcome
 - 2.6.1. Local Assistance offices need to provide a model of the format for general contracts using the 2010 specs. (See upshot # 384)

5	9:55	FHWA Southern California Office	Karen Bobo	Information Sharing
---	------	---------------------------------	------------	---------------------

3. FHWA Southern California Office Update...

- 3.1. The LA Office will have 11 employees – will be renamed the Southern California office. Some are new positions.
- 3.2. There will be an administrator in that office that reports to Butch.
- 3.3. The two people assigned to Local programs will still indirectly report to Karen B; there will be interaction with Sacramento office.
- 3.4. Travel and budget restrictions have made it challenging to get to So. Cal. The intent of this shift of people is to increase the presence of FHWA in Southern California. People will be there and will be aware of issues; they will be able to attend meetings and provide more timely assistance.
- 3.5.

6	10:00	Indirect Cost Rate Determination	Denix Anbiah	Information Sharing
---	-------	----------------------------------	--------------	---------------------

4. Local Assistance Accomplishment –

- 4.1. Thank you for making 100% delivery for the 11th year, in spite of the challenges.
- 4.2. We want to smooth out the delivery – we delivered 94% in the last 6 months of the year.

5. Indirect Cost Rate Determination

- 5.1. The IC Allocation Plan needs to be approved by CT Audits on an annual basis.
- 5.2. Many local agencies are applying for these funds – CT has asked FHWA on a risk-based approach for the audits. FHWA has agreed to the concept.
- 5.3. CT has formed a team to work out the details for what the risk based approach will be. Before their product is finalized, local agencies will be able to comment on it.
- 5.4. You will be required to meet the deadline – then CT will evaluate your ICRP.
- 5.5. Risk determinations will be made every year.
- 5.6. Smaller agencies do this on a project basis – How will this be accounted for? Larger agencies have a track record that can be looked at – smaller agencies do not have this. Would they always be high risk
- 5.7. Concern: How long will it be for CT to do this review? HOPEFULLY – the approval process will be faster....
- 5.8. Concern: The group would like performance measures to monitor this, and report back to ensure expectations are met.
- 5.9. Concern: Local agencies would like to see guidelines to help their internal auditors see what is the right structure.
- 5.10. Concern: What are the risk factors?
- 5.11. Concern: Volume will continue to go up.
- 5.12.
- 5.13. Expect three features:
 - 5.13.1. Fund requests above a set dollar amount will require a single audit – if you do a Build-upon audit it may put you into a low risk.
 - 5.13.2. Once you turn in a plan, CT will evaluate the risk factors for the particular agency and year – CT will not require an audit if it is determined that the agency is low-risk for that year. You would then not be required to do a detailed audit.
 - 5.13.3. If you are high risk for the year, you can choose CT to do the audit or you can hire an independent auditor. The auditor must still be approved by CT.
- 5.14. Other states are already doing this.
- 5.15. Outcome
 - 5.15.1. Provide a draft of the risk-based approach guidelines for audits, now being developed by an internal CT working group, to the members for comment. Include information from other states if possible, (see upshot # 385a)
 - 5.15.2. Request Mary Ann Campbell-Smith to attend the next meeting to report on the risk based approach and respond to group concerns. (See upshot # 385b)

7	10:15	Toll Credit Program	Yin-Ping Li	Explanation as to why they weren't expanded to all Federal Aid Projects.
---	-------	---------------------	-------------	--

6. Toll Credit Program

- 6.1. Why is toll credit not applied to other safety programs?
- 6.2. For California this has a limited application. Toll credits allow us to use funds spent on toll facilities as a credit for matching funds. It allows us to use federal funds to fund more projects. This credit program does not provide additional federal funds.

- 6.3. We are only using this for the local, off-system bridges that need to be fixed (Non-federal-aid) at this time. Off-system delivery was so poor that we went to 100% funding.
- 6.4. Right now we are evaluating how delivery is coming – if we get additional funding we could consider applying this to other safety programs. Right now the demand for these programs is higher than we can fund. We will re-evaluate this policy in about two years.
- 6.5. The issue is the amount of federal funds is limited... – our toll credit is around \$6 billion.
- 6.6. There are more than enough on-system bridges for the next fifteen years.

8	10:30	E76 Process for Projects with Toll Credits	Ray Zhang / Bill Sandoval	Inform agencies on steps needed to prepare E76 for projects using toll credits.
---	-------	--	---------------------------	---

7. E76 Process for Projects with Toll Credits

- 7.1. Office bulletin published July 22, 2010 has the finalized policy.
- 7.2. You can use toll credit on CMAQ, Demo, STP – all federal programs except for the safety programs...
- 7.3. Projects need to be programmed in the FTIP.
- 7.4. CT requires you to indicate in your request for authorization whether or not you will be using toll credit. You do not need to specify the amount. CT will calculate the amount of toll credit to be used on the particular program.
- 7.5. CT is required to report to FHWA how much toll credit is used.
- 7.6. Outcome:
 - 7.6.1. Ray Z needs to discuss with Ross what report would be provided – Bridge committee could use this: Who got “free bridges?” It could be useful information. CT could maybe provide a report to the members on how much toll credit is being used. The data are not broken down by region... The content of this report needs to be worked out. (See upshot # 386)

9	10:40	Streamlining Principles – Federal Transportation Act	Denix Anbiah / All	Update
---	-------	--	--------------------	--------

8. Streamlining Principles – Federal Transportation Act

- 8.1. Right now there is not much activity in this arena. Not much is happening at the federal level.

10	10:50	State Budget Update	Athena Gliddon	Update
----	-------	---------------------	----------------	--------

9. State Budget Update

- 9.1. Budget was signed on October 8th. There will be an increase in local assistance mostly due to significant Prop 1b bond funds.
- 9.2. COS program was cut; operating expenses were cut – Planning program was cut.
- 9.3. PID funding for off system local projects was cut.
- 9.4. Budget Update will be handed out at the CTC meeting on Nov. 3, with details.
- 9.5.

11	11:00	PIDS Study Proposal	Sharon Scherzinger / Marlon Flournoy	Update
----	-------	---------------------	--------------------------------------	--------

10. PIDS Study Proposal

- 10.1. CT planning program has long range planning for the SHS; regional transportation plans, air quality, environmental justice.
- 10.2. Planning has also got PID work – this is about half the planning staff. PIDs define scope, cost and schedule, to improve management of transportation projects.
- 10.3. Federally funded projects require PID's. CT requires PID's on the system for any locally funded projects. CT is responsible for IQA on local PID's.
- 10.4. Two years ago the Office of the Legislative Analyst (LAO) found that too many PIDs are being produced for available funding. CT was required to meet with other stakeholders and discuss way to have better PID program focus. Also LAO cut staffing by 137 people statewide.
- 10.5. CT has developed a three year PID strategic plan which includes recommendations for streamlining the process and focusing PID's.
- 10.6. Governor has said we should not be doing PIDs for projects not on the state highway system or for projects that do not have an identified funding source. Resources were cut accordingly. Many PIDs were removed from SHOPP, STIP....
- 10.7. There was 64 CT staff cut from the budget. Currently there are 155 PIDS being reviewed for local agencies. CT is legally required to do the oversight but is not funded for this work.
- 10.8. Outcome:
 - 10.8.1. This group should revisit PID resource issue for the next budget.

12	11:10	NEPA Delegation	Cindy Adams	Update
----	-------	-----------------	-------------	--------

11. NEPA Delegation

- 11.1. CT is the only state that entered the NEPA delegation program. We are formally responsible for NEPA, and works directly with the federal agencies on highway projects.
- 11.2. CT was also required to take on legal support for any litigation resulting from the program.
- 11.3. This delegation is set to sunset in August 2011. Congressional action will be required to extend this program.
- 11.4. CT would appreciate your support in extending this program – If CT is not successful then this program will be terminated. FHWA is preparing for this possibility.
- 11.5. CT has cut the time for getting environmental documents done by as much as 1.5 years.

13	11:25	Agenda for Change	Denix Anbiah	Update
----	-------	-------------------	--------------	--------

12. Agenda for Change

- 12.1. Agenda for change spreadsheet has been distributed to the members – There are only 8 items on the list which still have potential. The other items are either done, or cannot be done.
- 12.2. Group suggestion: Identify what exactly would be required to do those items which are not within existing authority of CT Local Assistance. Categorize into various areas which would have potential but would need legislation, or other resources, etc... Would be good to find a home for each idea on the list, rather than saying “We can’t do this...” Even though nothing could be done now, wait for the opportunity.
- 12.3. Next step should be for this group to take the list as annotated and address it at tCEAC transportation Committee at the November Conference in Riverside.
- 12.4. Outcome (see upshot # 387 a thru d)
 - 12.4.1. Tom M - Send Denix the annotated list of things that can be done – what would be needed, who could do it, etc... Agenda for Change
 - 12.4.2. Denix - Agenda for Change Send the list out to the group when you get it from Tom M
 - 12.4.3. Kiana - Agenda for Change: Sponsor discussion at the CEAC meeting to set priorities
 - 12.4.4. Kiana - Agenda for Change: Send the list to the group; bring it forward at the December meeting for this group; report back to this group about the November conference in Riverside

14	11:30	Federal Funding Accountability & Transparency Act (FFATA)	Denix Anbiah	Impact on Local Jurisdictions & Caltrans
----	-------	---	--------------	--

13. Federal Funding Accountability & Transparency Act (FFATA)

- 13.1. CT is required to report award data to OMB; most of the data are already available from the existing systems. There will be additional items required on future authorization forms.
- 13.2. First report for projects obligated in October will be due in November 30, 2010. CT working on how to collect the salary data.
- 13.3. Information is available on USASpending.gov website on what data are already being reported/collected.
- 13.4. Many agencies will be requiring the same information to be reported over and over again.
- 13.5. CT will send out clarification on this.

15	11:35	Invoicing Process Comments	Bill Sandoval	Update on comments received
----	-------	----------------------------	---------------	-----------------------------

14. Invoicing Process Comments

- 14.1. Interim progress invoices were going directly to accounting. Starting in Dec 2009, Local Assistance implemented invoice review. This has not resulted in longer cycle time.
- 14.2. Districts were provided resources and PY’s to do this review.
- 14.3. CT looking at strategies to deal with increased workload and streamline the process.
- 14.4. CT will be adjusting review times. Processing time increases should not be substantial.
- 14.5. CT considering a minimum threshold on invoices.

- 14.6. Concern: CT / FHWA Inactive obligations policy has exacerbated the issue.
- 14.7. Concern: Having CT set a minimum invoice level will not fix the problem. The problem is the federal rules on inactive obligations. This has led to local agencies sending in “progress” invoices for small dollar amounts (which may cost more to process than is being requested for payment) to CT. This keeps the projects off the inactive obligation list.
- 14.8. Concern: CT should not burden local agencies with something that is a CFR / Federal requirements issue. Every time we talk we keep adding to the process.
- 14.9. There is an invoice checklist on the internet website for CT local assistance.
- 14.10. Outcome:
- 14.11. Bill S will send out the new invoice review checklist to this group before it is finalized, for their comments.

16	11:45	Meeting Facilitation in the Future & 2011 CCSFCC Meeting Proposed Schedule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 27, 2011 • March 3, 2011 • May 5, 2011 • July 7, 2011 • September 8, 2011 • November 10, 2011 	Kiana Buss, Dorothy Holzem, Mohsen Sultan / All	Discussion
----	-------	--	--	------------

15. Meeting Facilitation in the Future & 2011 CCSFCC Meeting Agreed - to Schedule:

- 15.1. January 27, 2011 (in conflict with bridge committee)
- 15.2. March 3, 2011
- 15.3. May 5, 2011
- 15.4. July 7, 2011
- 15.5. September 8, 2011
- 15.6. November 10, 2011 (in conflict with bridge committee)
- 15.7. Group discussion
 - 15.7.1. Notes need to include just the action items – no details like past notes.
- 15.8. Outcome
 - 15.8.1. Yin-Ping will be readjusting the bridge committee dates in conflict with this schedule. (See upshot # 189)

17	12:00	Special Presentation	All	
----	-------	----------------------	-----	--

18	12:20	Meeting Wrap-up <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Assignments, Bin List • Desired Outcomes for Next Meeting • Critique Meeting 	Mike Halverson/All	Preparation for upcoming meeting
----	-------	---	--------------------	----------------------------------

19	12:30	Adjourn		
----	-------	---------	--	--

Next Meeting Dates:	December 9, 2010	All meetings to be held at Terminal A – 2nd Floor, Media Room, Sacramento Airport
---------------------	------------------	---

16.