

ADDITIONAL REVISIONS TO THE 2018 STIP GUIDELINES

Since the Commission Book was published, the following revisions are proposed to the 2018 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines (Tab 20). These include provisions that allow regions the flexibility to propose uncommitted funds on projects from competitive SB1 programs with certain conditions (Sections 15 and 60).

Below you will find the changes staff is proposing to include in the 2018 STIP Guidelines. All other provisions in the 2018 STIP Guidelines, included as an Attachment under Tab 20, remain. The complete text to the 2018 STIP Guidelines with the proposed changes can be found at www.ctc.ca.gov.

Guidelines Specific to the 2018 STIP

- Commission expectations and priorities. For the 2018 STIP, the Commission expects to give first priority to the reprogramming of projects from the 2016 STIP, as amended, followed by:
 1. Project cost increases requested in RTIPs and ITIP but not programmed in the 2016 STIP
 2. Projects or project components programmed in the 2014 STIP and deleted without prejudice in the 2016 STIP
 3. New projects

Notwithstanding the above, the Commission will consider the Base (Minimum) for their county share period ending in ~~2022-23~~ **2019-20** when selecting projects to program in the STIP.

Permanent STIP Guidelines

Section 10

1996 STIP Projects. All 1996 STIP project costs will be funded off the top prior to the division of new funds between the regional and interregional programs. This grandfathered funding will include Caltrans support costs, and the project cost display for 1996 STIP projects will conform to the same standards used for new STIP projects. Any cost changes to construction or right-of-way capital costs for 1996 STIP projects will be drawn from or credited to county and interregional shares the same as if they were cost changes to new STIP projects. Caltrans support costs for 1996 STIP projects will be drawn from county and interregional shares only to the extent that they are attributable to a change in project scope since the 1996 STIP. Except where there is a proposal for jointly funding a cost increase from county and interregional shares, cost changes that Caltrans requests for projects originally programmed under the former intercity rail, interregional road system, or retrofit soundwall programs or for NAFTA projects programmed in the 1996 STIP will be drawn from or credited to the new interregional share. All other cost changes will be drawn from or credited to the appropriate regional share. Caltrans, in the ITIP, shall report on the budgets for all ongoing grandfathered 1996 STIP projects. This

reporting shall include a comparison of actual expenditures compared to project budgets as reported in the ~~2010~~ **2012** ITIP

Section 15

Programming Project Components Sequentially. Project components may be programmed sequentially. That is, a project may be programmed for environmental work only without being programmed for plans, specifications, and estimates (design). A project may be programmed for design without being programmed for right-of-way or construction. A project may be programmed for right-of-way without being programmed for construction. The Commission recognizes a particular benefit in programming projects for environmental work only, since project costs and particularly project scheduling often cannot be determined with meaningful accuracy until environmental studies have been completed. The premature programming of post-environmental components can needlessly tie up STIP programming resources while other transportation needs go unmet.

The Commission will ~~will~~ **may** program a project component ~~only if it finds that the component itself is fully funded, either from STIP funds or from other committed funds~~ **funded from a combination of committed and uncommitted funds.** The Commission will regard ~~non~~ STIP funds as committed when **they are programmed by the Commission or when** the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For federal formula funds, including ~~RSTP,~~ **Regional Surface Transportation, CMAQ, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality** and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by federal ~~TP~~ **Transportation Improvement Program** adoption. **For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval.**

Uncommitted funds may be nominated only from the following competitive programs: Active Transportation Program, Local Partnership Program, Solutions for Congested Corridors Program, Trade Corridor Enhancement Program, or Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program. The agency must indicate its plan for securing a funding commitment, explain the risk of not securing that commitment, and its plan for securing an alternate source of funding should the commitment not be obtained. If a project with uncommitted funds is programmed, all funding commitments must be secured prior to July 1 of the year in which the project is programmed. Projects programmed by the Commission in the STIP will not be given priority for funding in other programs under the Commission's purview.

Section 60

Commission Action on RTIP Proposals. The Commission will include all RTIP projects nominated from the county share for the four-year share period that ends during the current STIP (i.e., the period ending 2019-20 for the **2018** STIP) unless the Commission finds that (a) the RTIP is not consistent with these guidelines, (b) there are insufficient funds to implement the

RTIP, (c) there are conflicts with other RTIPs or with the ITIP, (d) a project is not in an approved CMP or is not included in a separate listing in the approved RTIP as provided by Government Code 65082, or (e) the RTIP is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds. In making its finding, the Commission will consider the cost-effectiveness evaluation of the RTIP submitted by the region as required in Section 19 of these guidelines. The Commission may also make its own evaluation based on the criteria in Section 19 of these guidelines. **If a region nominates only projects with uncommitted funds (see Section 15) for the four-year share period that ends during the current STIP, the Commission may view the RTIP as not a cost effective use of state funds if there is a significant risk of the projects not receiving the funding commitments.** If the Commission makes one of those findings, it may reject the RTIP in its entirety. For the 6-county SCAG area, the Commission will incorporate or reject each county’s RTIP separately. For MTC and SACOG, the Commission will incorporate or reject the multicounty RTIP in its entirety. For any counties that choose to pool county shares, the Commission will incorporate or reject the counties’ RTIPs together.

Appendix B

From B1 Evaluation Table – Regional Level performance Indicators and Measurements

Goal	Indicator/Measure	Current System Performance (Baseline)	Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe)
Infrastructure Condition	Percent of highway bridges by deck area classified in Poor condition lane miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below).		

From B2 Evaluation Table – Cost Effectiveness Indicators and Measurements

Goal	Indicator/Measure	Current System Performance (Baseline)	Projected System Performance (indicate timeframe)
Infrastructure Condition	Reduce percent of highway bridge deck area in Poor Condition lane miles in need of replacement or rehabilitation (Sufficiency Rating of 80 or below).		