



CEAC Transportation Policy Committee
CEAC Public Works Officers Institute (PWOI)
Wednesday, April 3, 2019 | 8:30 am - 10:30 am
Paradise Point Hotel
1404 Vacation Road, San Diego
Mission Bay Room

AGENDA

Chair, David Fleisch, Ventura County
Vice Chair, Scott DeLeon, Lake County
Vice Chair, Steve Kowalewski, Contra Costa County
Vice Chair, Rich Crompton, San Diego County

- 8:30 am I. **Welcome, Self- Introductions, and Opening Remarks**
Chair, David Fleisch, Ventura County
- 8:40 am II. **Transportation Legislative/ Funding Update**
 - Local Streets and Roads Funding Program
 - Federal Surface Transportation Reauthorization*Chris Lee, CSAC Legislative Representative*
Marina Espinoza, CSAC Legislative Analyst
Attachment One: 2019-20 RMRA Funding Schedule
Attachment Two: 2019-20 RMRA Eligibility Checklist
Attachment Three: MAP-21 Reauthorization Priorities
- 8:50 am III. **Caltrans Update**
Mark Samuelson, Assistant Division Chief, Caltrans Local Assistance
- 9:10 am IV. **Roundtable**
 - Usage of SB1 funds above pavement rehab (culverts, bridges, CIP)
 - State of industry to meet demand
- 9:55 am V. **City and County Pavement Improvement Center Update**
- 10:05 am VI. **TDA Working Group Update**
Marina Espinoza, CSAC Legislative Analyst
Attachment Four: Transportation Development Act White Paper
- 10:10 am VII. **Committee Updates**
 - Active Transportation Program-Technical Advisory Committee (ATP-TAC)
 - California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC)
 - California Uniform Construction Cost Accounting Commission (CUCCAC)
 - Highway Bridge Program Committee (HBP)
 - Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)
 - Transportation Cooperative Committee (TCC)
 - Others
- 10:25 am VIII. **Future Agenda Items**
- 10:30 am IX. **Other Items & Adjournment**

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment One..... 2019-20 RMRA Funding Schedule

Attachment Two..... 2019-20 RMRA Eligibility Checklist

Attachment Three..... MAP-21 Reauthorization Priorities

Attachment Four Transportation Development Act White Paper

Attachment One
2019-20 RMRA Funding Schedule

Local Streets and Roads Funding Program Schedule Fiscal Year's 2018-2020, Cycles 2 and 3

FY 18-19 Expenditure Reporting and FY 19-20 List Submittal Schedule	
Technical Updates - CalSMART	December - February
<u>Save The Date</u> FY 2019-20 Proposed Project Lists Due May 1 st . New FY RMRA Estimates Available, New Sample Resolution, & Eligibility Checklist – Sent to Program Stakeholders	Early February
Tentative CalSMART Technical Training	March 26 th – March 27 th
Program Update	March 13th – CTC Meeting
CalSMART Opens for Initial Funding Eligibility Submittals	March 29th
Initial FY 2019-20 Project Lists Due - CalSMART	May 1st by 11:59 p.m.
Staff Review of Project List Submittals	May and June
Adopt FY 2019-20 Initial Eligibility List	June 26th – CTC Meeting
CalSMART Reopens for Subsequent Funding Eligibility Submittals	June 26th
CTC Submits FY 2019-20 Initial Eligibility List to Controller	June 30th
Subsequent FY 2019-20 Project Lists Due - CalSMART	August 1st by 11:59 p.m.
Outreach/Technical Assistance Training for Expenditure Reporting	Early August
Adoption and SCO transmittal of FY 2019-20 Subsequent Eligibility List	August 14th – CTC Meeting
Expenditure Reporting Opens in CalSMART	Mid-August
FY 2019-20 Apportionments Begin from State Controller	Mid-September
FY 2018-19 Expenditure Report due to Commission - CalSMART	October 1st by 11:59 p.m.
Post LSR FY Program Update with Expenditure Report Detail	December 1 st
Deliver LSR FY 2018-19 Expenditure Update	December 4th – CTC Meeting

Attachment Two
2019-20 RMRA Eligibility Checklist

Local Streets and Roads Funding Program

Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Annual Funding Eligibility Checklist

California Transportation Commission



**Local Streets and Roads Funding Program
Annual Funding Eligibility Checklist**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Local Streets and Roads Funding Eligibility Overview 2
A. Funding Eligibility Checklist..... 3
B. CalSMART Information 5
Program Resources 6

Local Streets and Roads Funding Eligibility Overview

Prior to receiving an apportionment of Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account (RMRA) funds from the California State Controller in a fiscal year, a city or county **must submit** to the Commission an **adopted list** of projects proposed to be funded with these funds by **May 1st of each year**. All projects proposed to receive the fiscal year funding **must be adopted** by resolution (public record of the action taken) by the applicable city council or county board of supervisors at a **regular** public meeting **each fiscal year** [Streets and Highways Code (SHC) Section 2034(a)(1)].

The adopted list of proposed projects should, **at a minimum**, include **any new** projects to be funded with that fiscal year's apportionment and **any projects previously listed** that will continue to receive funding in the coming fiscal year (i.e. multi-year funded projects).

Proposed project lists **must** be included in a city/county's adopted resolution (public record of the action taken). **At a minimum**, the proposed project details **must** include the elements mandated by SHC 2034 (a)(1): description, location, schedule for completion and useful life elements. While the online tool requires more project information than required for the adoption of the projects, there must be a clear connection between the proposed projects adopted and those entered into the online reporting system, CalSMART.

CalSMART was developed to promote statewide consistency in the content and format of project information submitted to the Commission, and to facilitate transparency within the Local Streets and Roads Funding Program. The standard project list format that was created in CalSMART will be the **only submittal method** accepted for funding eligibility.

This checklist is intended to provide additional assistance to cities/counties with the development and execution of their proposed project list adoption and successful submittal to the Commission, per SHC 2034(a)(1). The [2019 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program Reporting Guidelines](#) and additional program materials are available on the Local Streets and Roads Program web page (<http://www.catc.ca.gov/programs/sb1/srp/>).

All cities and counties will have an opportunity to identify changes to their project list in a given fiscal year in the Annual Project Expenditure Report, due to the Commission October 1st, each year.

A. Funding Eligibility Checklist

Proposed Project List and Resolution Preparation:

- The city/county is using the most recent version of the Fiscal Year SB 1 Sample Resolution available.
- The resolution the city/county used to adopt the proposed project list was adopted at a **regular** city council or county board of supervisors meeting within the current fiscal year and is in reference to the coming fiscal year's funding and proposed project list.
- The resolution adopting the proposed project list is dedicated to the use of SB 1 RMRA funds associated with the Local Streets and Roads Funding Program and **not** a part of another action. (*The resolution adopting the proposed project list should not be associated with any other funding or budgetary action for the city/county.)
- Each proposed project listed by the city/county intended to use SB 1 RMRA funds made available for the Local Streets and Roads Funding Program, meets the intent of the funding as indicated in SHC Section 2030(a) and the 2019 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program Reporting Guidelines. These funds are intended to be **prioritized** for expenditure on **basic road maintenance** and **rehabilitation projects**, and on **critical safety projects**.

***Helpful Tip** – If the city/county can **answer yes** to any of the following, the proposed project would **presumably be eligible** for use of SB 1 RMRA Local Streets and Roads Program funds:

- Does the proposed project **include**...
 1. Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation (Yes/No)
 2. Safety Projects (Yes/No)
 3. Railroad Grade Separations (Yes/No)
 4. Complete Streets Components (including active transportation purposes, pedestrian and bicycle safety projects, transit facilities, and drainage and stormwater capture projects in conjunction with any other allowable project) (Yes/No)
 5. Traffic Control Devices (Yes/No)
 6. Other (match funds for eligible project advancement) (Yes/No)
 7. Pursuant to Article XIX Section 2(a) of the constitution: "The research, planning, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of public streets and highways (and their related public facilities for nonmotorized traffic), including the mitigation of their environmental effects, the payment for property taken or damaged for such purposes, and the administrative costs necessarily incurred in the foregoing purposes." (Yes/No)
- (If Applicable) The adopted proposed project list includes those projects previously proposed and adopted in prior fiscal year's, in which the upcoming fiscal year funding apportionment may be used in its development and/or delivery. This is the city/county's public reaffirmation of its intent to utilize RMRA Local Streets and Roads Program funds on projects previously proposed as multi-year projects in both delivery and funding.

In Lieu of a Resolution:

***Important Note:** Should a city/county not use a resolution to record official action taken, the following **must** appear in the submitted public record document for funding eligibility:

- The city/county does not use “resolutions” to document official action taken, the city/county has provided public record documenting the following:
 - Public record includes the following statements:
 - Clearly identifies the source and purpose of these funds.
 - Affirms the city/county’s commitment to use the funds as intended by statute. The city/county commits to meeting the reporting requirements as set forth in statute and program guidelines.
 - Provides the fiscal year funding estimate the city/county is anticipated to receive.
 - Clearly identifies the fiscal year for which funding eligibility is being sought.
 - The public record includes the list of (new and relisted) proposed projects intended to **utilize** the **next fiscal year’s** apportionment of SB 1 RMRA funding through the Local Streets and Roads Funding Program.
 - Clearly indicates that the proposed list is/was adopted via the city council/county board of supervisors at a regular public meeting.
 - The public record recording the official action (which **must** include the proposed project list that was adopted) was **signed** and **dated** by either the City/County Manager, Clerk, or Attorney (or another City/County official with signatory authority) and is included in the overall online submittal to the Commission.
 - The adopted project list is **clearly identified** (providing the required proposed project detail indicated in SHC Section 2034) within the signed public record of action document at the time of the online submittal. If the project list is not included in the document itself and is included in an attachment, that attachment **must** be cited in the fully executed public record document and included in the online submittal.
 - A copy of the public notice (published meeting agenda clearly noting its intent to adopt the proposed project list) is included in the online submittal documents. Commission staff will be able to confirm the posting of this notice at the time of submittal review.

***Special Note** – A staff report **may be acceptable** in place of a formal resolution, if it provides the same level of detail listed above, is signed by one of the above listed parties, and includes the required detail of the proposed projects in the document.

B. CalSMART Information

CalSMART Enrollment and Training:

- Confirm the appropriate staff or city/county authorized personnel have established a [CalSMART](#) User Account.
- Ensure city/county CalSMART users enroll and attend the CalSMART User Technical Trainings when offered by Commission Staff.
- Ensure all required project detail and documents, per statute, are readily available and finalized prior to submitting the proposed project list and resolution in CalSMART.

CalSMART – Funding Eligibility Proposed Project Submittal Period:

Previously proposed lists and submitted expenditure reports **cannot** be accessed for edits once the reporting period has closed and the submitted information has been accepted. Please note the following dates in which users will have access to create a Fiscal Year 2019-20 Proposed Project List for funding eligibility.

Initial Funding Eligibility Period	March 29th – May 1st	CTC Adoption – Initial Eligibility List	June 26, 2019
Subsequent Funding Eligibility Period	June 26th – August 1st	CTC Adoption – Subsequent Eligibility List	August 14, 2019

Program Resources

California Transportation Commission Resources:

- [Local Streets and Roads Funding Program](#)
- [2019 Local Streets and Roads Funding Program Reporting Guidelines](#)
- [CalSMART Website](#)
- Statute - Streets and Highways Code Chapter 2, Division 3, [Sections 2030 – 2038](#)

League of California Cities Resources:

- [The League of California Cities](#)
- SB 1 Local Streets and Roads funding projections for [FYs 18-19 and 19-20](#).

California State Association of Counties Resources:

- [California State Association of Counties](#)

State Controller's Office Resources:

- SB 1 Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account Funding [Frequently Asked Questions](#).
- SB 1 Local Streets and Roads FY 18-19 Year-to-Date Payments for [Cities](#) and [Counties](#).

Attachment Three
MAP-21 Reauthorization Priorities



California State Association of Counties
CSAC PRIORITIES FOR MAP 21 REAUTHORIZATION

Approved by the CSAC Board of Directors February 20, 2014

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Increase Federal Revenues for Transportation Infrastructure

Without immediate, bold action by Congress, the Highway Trust Fund will continue to face insolvency. Existing federal revenues continue to fall short of meeting the funding needs to bring our nation's surface transportation infrastructure into the next century. Our future economic prosperity, our commitment to progressive environmental stewardship, and our dedication to the health, safety, and welfare of the traveling public and all Americans demands a significant reinvestment into the transportation network. **CSAC urges Congress to enhance revenues for investment in our national transportation infrastructure.**

The California State Association of Counties (CSAC) – the unified voice of California's 58 counties – believes that until the funding issue is addressed, we will not make significant progress in improving our critical transportation infrastructure. California's counties and cities are facing an \$82 billion funding shortfall over the next ten-years for the maintenance and preservation of the local system, let alone other vital modal needs. On average, pavement conditions are "at risk" and without a surge of new revenue, 25-percent of California's local roads will be in failed condition by 2022. News article after news article discusses staggering figures about the condition of the nation's bridges – an estimated 8,000 bridges nationally are structurally deficient or fracture critical. In California, 950 bridges need replacement and over 1,800 are in need of rehabilitation.

The demands on our infrastructure are relentless – Californians log 300 million vehicle miles traveled annually, which is more than the current system was ever intended to accommodate. At the same time, our existing sources of revenue are declining due to necessary improvements in fuel economy and hybrid, electric, and alternative fuel vehicle technology. In order to address pressing environmental concerns, ranging from air quality and climate change to impacts on our water resources and energy demands, the nation must continue its work to advance technological improvements in fuel economy, alternative vehicles such as zero emissions vehicles, and reduce the amount people must drive to access work, school, home, services, and recreation. These challenges will only exacerbate our current funding dilemma.

CSAC's policy supports a variety of new revenues sources from increasing the federal gas tax to assessing a user fee that more accurately charges motorists for their use of the system than traditional revenues sources. Failing to address the severe funding issue within the next reauthorization effort will only negatively impact the condition of our system, our economy, our environment, and the overall quality of life for Americans. Increased revenue is our highest priority for MAP 21 reauthorization.

In addition to the preeminent priority of addressing the ongoing revenue shortfall, CSAC submits the following additional policy and programmatic priorities for consideration by Congress.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Restore the Highway Bridge Program

- Provide dedicated revenue for on-system highway bridge projects, either by creating a set-aside similar to the off-system highway bridge set-aside or restoring the Highway Bridge Program as a core program. Increase dedicated funding for preventative maintenance on, and replacement of, bridges. This is a critical safety issue.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Focus on Safety

- Increase funding for safety infrastructure projects on the existing transportation system.
- Programs/projects must be aimed at reducing the greatest number of fatalities regardless of ownership of the system.
- Ensure the rural road system, where fatality rates are the highest, retains dedicated funding.
- Promote and increase funding for bicycle and pedestrian safety projects and programs.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Fix-it-First

- Provide increased funding for maintenance and preservation of the existing system. Reinvesting in the system now prevents exponentially higher costs down the road.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Improve Environmental Stewardship & Address Climate Change

- Provide financial incentives to States that adopt and set greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets and programs to accomplish those targets.
- Provide incentives in current programs and/or provide new funding sources for climate change neutral or friendly transportation projects and programs.
- Provide financial incentives for rural sustainability.
- Provide financial support for regional and countywide transportation planning processes that integrate transportation with local land use planning for the mutual benefit of GHG emissions reduction.
- Provide funding for retrofitting equipment and for alternate fuel infrastructure.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Streamlining Project Delivery & Environmental Review

- Approve a state-federal environmental reciprocity pilot program.
- Support streamlining of federal regulations to facilitate more expeditious project delivery.
- Ensure that federal project oversight is commensurate to the amount of federal funding.

MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Increase Flexibility to Meet State, Regional, and Local Needs

- Maximize the use and flexibility of federal funds by not requiring minimum federal matches.
- Eliminate the need to program multiple phases for small projects.
- Eliminate need for TIP programming for air quality neutral projects.

CSAC MAP 21 Reauthorization Priority: Assistance for Data Collection

- Provide funding, training, tools, and uniform standards for the collection of roadway and traffic data specifically for the local and rural roadways.
- Provide assistance for data collection, and determining and quantifying GHG emissions, and other important data for addressing climate change through the analysis of various transportation plan alternatives in long-range transportation plans done in coordination with local land use plans.

For more information regarding these priorities and principles, please contact:

Joe Krahn, Waterman & Associates, (202) 898-1444

Kiana Buss, California State Association of Counties, (916) 327-7500 ext. 566

Attachment Four
Transportation Development Act White Paper

Transportation Development Act

Overview

The Transportation Development Act (TDA), also known as the Mills-Alquist-Deddeh Act or SB 325 (Chapter 1400, Statutes of 1971), was enacted by the California Legislature to strengthen existing public transportation services and encourage regional coordination of transportation. The California Department of Transportation (CalTrans) oversees the TDA, and State-designated Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) are responsible for administering TDA funds for counties and cities.

The TDA establishes a funding mechanism for two major transportation funding sources:

- 1. Local Transportation Fund (LTF):** LTF funds are derived from a quarter cent of the statewide general sales tax. LTF funds are distributed to each county based on the amount of quarter cent sales tax revenue collected. LTF funds may vary each year depending on the sales tax revenue generated in each county. Funds may be used for various transportation programs, including:

- Planning and program activities
- Pedestrian and bicycle facilities
- Community transit services
- Public transportation
- Bus and rail projects

If counties with a population under 500,000 (based on the 1970 federal census) can show they have no unmet transit needs, they may use the LTF for local streets and roads, construction, and maintenance.

- 2. State Transit Assistance (STA) Fund:** STA funds are derived from the statewide sales tax on diesel fuel. The California Legislature appropriates STA funds to the State Controller's Office, which then allocates diesel tax revenue to planning agencies and other selected agencies. State law requires that 50% of STA funds be allocated according to population and 50% according to transit operator revenues from the previous fiscal year. STA funds may be used for transportation planning and mass transportation planning purposes.

State of Good Repair (SGR) Program: SGR program funds are derived from a portion of the "Transportation Improvement Fee"—an additional vehicle registration fee, which became effective in January 2018. SGR program funds are allocated under the STA program formula. The program is estimated to provide approximately \$105 million annually to transit operators in California for eligible maintenance, rehabilitation, and capital projects.

In order to receive their annual allocation of TDA funds, jurisdictions must submit a claim stating their requested funding and the purpose for which those funds will be used.

Farebox Recovery Ratio

To receive their full share of LTF funds, transit operators must meet their farebox recovery ratios, which are set by RTPAs and used to determine a claimant's maximum eligibility for funds. To qualify for TDA funding, transit operators must recover a portion of their operating expenses from the farebox, or fares paid by passengers. Fares may be supplemented by other local revenues. A transit operator may not claim more than 50% of its operating budget from the TDA and must meet the following farebox recovery ratios:

- 20% farebox recovery ratio in an urbanized area
- 10% farebox recovery ratio in a non-urbanized area

RTPAs have some flexibility in adjusting ratios for transit operators providing services in urban and rural areas (at no less than 15%). They may establish any performance criteria, local match requirement, or farebox recovery ratio for services provided to elderly and disabled persons. RTPAs may exempt transit operators from the ratio for services provided along new routes.

Questions for Discussion

- Farebox Recovery Ratio: Does the farebox recovery ratio adequately capture a transit operator's performance? Are there any suggestions to improve the farebox recovery ratio?
- Population and Population Density Differences: What are some of the challenges urban and rural areas face in providing transit services?
- Capital and Operations: How do we measure performance of both capital assets and the operation of the systems?
- General TDA Law: Should LTF funds be spent on local streets and roads? Is the STA funding distribution formula working?
- Overall Service of Transit Agencies: Are transit agencies effectively and efficiently providing reliable service to commuters and the elderly and disabled?
- Federal, State, and Local Funding Sources: What are some of the funding issues transit agencies face? Do federal, state, and local funding sources work well together?
- State Oversight: Which state department or agency should be responsible for transit system oversight and reporting?