

# CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

CHARLES FIELD, CHAIRMAN  
AMADOR COUNTY TRANS. COMM.  
(209) 267-2282

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE CHAIRMAN  
DEL NORTE CO. TRANS. COMM.  
(707) 465-3878

DARIN GROSSI, SECRETARY  
TUOLUMNE CO./CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL  
(209) 533-5601

## AGENDA

March 17, 2000

Department of Transportation Building  
1120 N Street, Room 1420  
Sacramento, California

- |            |  |                            |
|------------|--|----------------------------|
| 12:30 p.m. | Approval of Agenda<br>(Any members who have brought questions or issues not otherwise shown on the agenda should bring them up during this part of the meeting to be sure time is made to discuss them.) |                            |
| 12:45 p.m. | Approval of Minutes from January 21, 2000  |                            |
| 12:45 p.m. | CTC Appointment, Rural County Representative   | S. Morrison                |
| 1:00 p.m.  | Legislation  | C. Oldham                  |
| 1:15 p.m.  | Outlook for Increases in Local Road Rehab and Maintenance Funding  | C. Oldham<br>C. Field      |
| 1:30 p.m.  | Needs and Issues Assignments   | C. Field                   |
| 2:00 p.m.  | Governor's Initiative/2000 STIP Update   | C. Oldham<br>P. Hathaway   |
| 2:30 p.m.  | Rural Planning Assistance Funding Increase: Status Report  | S. Scherzinger             |
| 3:00 p.m.  | Overall Work Program Process Clarification   | S. Scherzinger<br>C. Field |

# CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

*CHARLES FIELD, CHAIRMAN  
AMADOR COUNTY TRANS. COMM.  
(209) 267-2282*

*SUSAN MORRISON, VICE CHAIRMAN  
DEL NORTE CO. TRANS. COMM.  
(707) 465-3878*

*DARIN GROSSI, SECRETARY  
TUOLUMNE CO./CITIES AREA PLAN. COUNCIL  
(209) 533-5601*

February 28, 2000

TO: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

FROM: Charles F. Field, Chairman

SUBJECT: RCTF Minutes

Draft minutes from the two workshops and the regular RCTF meeting that were held on January 21, 2000 were distributed to all RCTF Participants on January 27, 2000. Additional copies of these minutes are not included with the agenda packet at this time. Only one person, so far, has commented on the draft minutes. Marsha Mason made a number of minor changes to the TEA program report part of the minutes from the regular RCTF meeting (Item 7, page 4 of 6). Copies of these changes will be brought to the RCTF meeting on March 17, 2000.

CF/nc

# Memorandum

**To:** Chairman and Commissioners

**Date:** February 14, 2000

**From:** Robert I. Remen

**File No:** F 9  
BOOK ITEM 4.1  
ACTION

**Ref:** STATE LEGISLATION

In addition to AB 1706 (Strickland) which the Commission considered last meeting, the following 5 bills dealing with transportation funding are still active in the Legislature. Staff will also report on the status of other bills of interest to the Commission at the February 23, 2000 meeting.

**AB 1093 (Strom-Martin) - Transportation Funding**

LOCATION: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: Creates in the State Transportation Fund the Short Line Railroad Improvement Account to be administered by the Department of Transportation. Authorizes the department to approve grants from funds appropriated therefore by the Legislature and deposited in the Short Line Railroad Improvement Account for short line railroads purposes, as defined, to be funded from the account. Limits the total annual amount of grants that may be awarded to a particular short line railroad and funded from the account to \$500,000.

**AB 1303 (Florez) - Highways: Local Projects: Funding**

LOCATION: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: The bill would appropriate \$300 million from the State Highway Account for allocation to counties (50%) and to cities (50%) for street and highway reconstruction, and repair of storm damage to local streets and highways, and, in a city and county, for other purposes related to transportation, as specified.

**AB 1612 (Torlakson) - Transportation: Congestion Relief: Local Roads**

LOCATION: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: This bill would create the Transportation Congestion Relief and Local Road Improvement Account as a continuously appropriated account in the State Transportation Fund. The bill would require the Controller to transfer, on a quarterly basis, the amount of \$100,000,000 from the General Fund to the account. This provision would not apply in any quarter during which the Governor has proclaimed a state of emergency and declared that the emergency will result in a significant negative

fiscal impact to the General Fund. The bill would require the Controller to allocate the money in the account on a quarterly basis with 50% allocated to the Public Transportation Account, 25% allocated to counties, including a city and county, in accordance with certain formulas, and 25% allocated to cities, including a city and county, apportioned among the cities in the proportion that the total population of the city bears to the total population of all the cities in the state. The provisions of the bill would become operative on the date that Senate Constitutional Amendment 3 of the 1999-2000 Regular Session is approved by the voters to authorize the imposition of an additional sales and use tax for the funding of transportation in certain counties.

**ACA 24 (Baugh) - Transportation Funding**

LOCATION: Assembly Consumer Protection, Governmental  
Efficiency & Economic Development Committee

SUMMARY: Creates the California Twenty-First Infrastructure Investment Fund (Infrastructure Fund) in the State Treasury. Transfers a specified percentage of revenues from the General Fund (ranging from 1% to 5%) to the Infrastructure Fund from the 2000-01 fiscal year to the 2019-20 fiscal year, inclusive, for appropriation by the Legislature for infrastructure investments (including but not limited to transportation).

**SB 1426 (Rainey) - Transportation: Sales Tax on Motor Vehicle Fuel**

LOCATION: SENATE

SUMMARY: This bill would create the Local Transportation Finance Account as a continuously appropriated account in the State Transportation Fund. Would require the State Board of Equalization, in consultation with the Department of Finance, to estimate, on a quarterly basis, the revenues, less refunds, derived during the previous quarter from application of sales and use tax to that portion of the price of motor vehicle fuel resulting from imposition of the federal tax on gasoline and imposition of the tax on motor vehicle fuel under the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law. The estimate would not include the revenues derived from the application of sales and use tax to that portion of the price of motor vehicle fuel resulting from the increase after December 31, 1989, in the rate of state motor vehicle fuel taxes. The bill would require the Controller to transfer, on a quarterly basis, the amount estimated from the General Fund to the Local Transportation Finance Account. The bill would require the Controller to allocate the money in the Local Transportation Finance Account on a quarterly basis, with 50% allocated to counties, including a city and county, in accordance with certain formulas, and 50% allocated to cities, including a city and county, apportioned among the cities in the proportion that the total population of the city bears to the total population of all the cities in the state.

Rural Counties Task Force  
List of Needs and Objectives  
**Year 2000**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Assigned RCTF Member(s)</b>	<i>Explanation of Need/Objective</i>
CTC Representative	Susan Morrison, Del Norte	It has been recommended that the RCTF should urge the Governor to appoint another rural county representative to serve on the CTC. The RCTF's current liaison, Ed Sylvester, Nevada County, will have his term expire in February 2000. <b>Follow up action should be considered urgent.</b>
Local Road Rehab and Maintenance Funding		In early 1999 the CTC made finding additional funds for local road rehabilitation and maintenance one of their priorities. The RCTF conducted its own local road rehabilitation needs survey and it participated in the statewide SR 8 survey of all transportation funding needs. The RCTF is grateful to the CTC for the opportunity to fund local road rehabilitation under the STIP, however, the STIP process is cumbersome and the amount of funds available for local road rehabilitation from the STIP will be inadequate to meet both rehabilitation and new facilities needs for most rural counties in the State. New legislation or a new program to fund local road rehabilitation by an accountable but direct flow of cash to cities and counties is an important goal that remains unachieved.
OWP Planning and PPM Funds	Charles Field, Amador	The funds being made available to rural counties for planning purposes (RPA, FTA, PPM, etc.) have increased in recent years, however, they generally remain inadequate to fund all planning, programming and project monitoring responsibilities now assigned to rural RTPA's/LTC's. Quantification of need was carried out by a RCTF survey and report and Caltrans Planning is processing a finance letter to double the annual RPA allocation to rural counties starting in 2000/01. Follow-up efforts will be necessary.
Clarify/Improve OWP Process	Charles Field, Amador	Many rural counties are having difficulty with the Overall Work Program (OWP) process and the management of funds programmed by this process. The RCTF has developed two worksheets (December 28, 1999 and March 17, 2000) and held one workshop (January 21, 2000) in efforts to clarify and improve the OWP process. The latest worksheet (March 17, 2000) shows there is still substantial work to be done.
RTP Guidelines Update	Celia McAdam/ Kathy Mathews, Placer	Draft revised RTP Guidelines have been developed. The RCTF has held workshops, reviewed them, and submitted their comments to the CTC. The CTC adopted the Guidelines in December 1999 with a policy requiring all counties to maintain updated and compliant RTPs as a condition for approval for STIP funding. The focus of this person's work will be to assist rural counties in developing adequate RTP Updates prior to the 2002 STIP cycle (December 2001). The RCTF carried out a two-day workshop to kick-off this

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Assigned RCTF Member(s)</b>	<i>Explanation of Need/Objective</i>
		effort in early December 1999.
Interregional Transportation System Plan (ITSP)	Darin Grossi, Tuolumne	Caltrans maintains an internal and an external advisory committee for development of an ITSP Update for the 2002 STIP. The ITSP guides use of ITIP funds (the State's 25% share of STIP funds) under SB 45. Up to half of these funds are to go to interregional road projects outside of urbanized areas. There is some concern that the larger more powerful urban and Southern California regions may sway decisions regarding the ITSP and ITIP. The RCTF needs to remain vigilant in monitoring this concern. The RCTF has also supported a policy that the CTC and Caltrans should use the ITSP/ITIP to encourage partnerships with the State's smaller rural counties for funding projects on the interregional road system and not necessarily just on the "high emphasis" or "focus" IIRS routes.
Local Assistance program (HBRR, HES) Exchange		Two or three years ago Caltrans was seriously considering ways to exchange Federal grants to small rural counties with State funds to remove NEPA and other requirements. These requirements cause special hardships for smallest counties and cities with limited staffing, especially after Caltrans' "re-engineering". This was never accomplished. A volunteer is needed to reinitiate this effort and see it through to a successful completion.
SB 45 Project Monitoring/ Reporting Data Base Committee	Walt Allen, San Benito	This committee has focused its work thus far on setting up a statewide monitoring system for STIP projects.
Federal Requirements Streamlining Committee	Scott Mass, Lassen	
RSTP/CEMAQ/TEA Project Delivery Com.	Dan Landon, Nevada	
Local Assistance "Enhanced Training Committee"		
Committee to Review Changes to Local Assistance Procedures and Guidelines Manual	Liz Gillingwater, Madera	
City, County, Caltrans, and FHWA Coordinating Group		This committee has apparently been meeting for several years. Its purpose is to provide a direct link of communication between the cities and counties and Caltrans and the FHWA. Caltrans has requested that the RCTF and the RTPA Group begin to send representatives to participate in these meetings.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Assigned RCTF Member(s)</b>	<i>Explanation of Need/Objective</i>
RTP/RTIP Rural County Performance Measures		It has been proposed that a committee be formed with Caltrans and RCTF representatives to review goals and measurable objectives from existing RTP Updates that can be used to develop performance measures for rural counties to consider in their 2000/01 RTP Updates.
Caltrans/ Regional Planning and Programming Coordination		SB 45 has opened the opportunity for partnerships between the regions and Caltrans. In addition, Caltrans is “hiring-up” and the new staff members are not familiar with regional issues and priorities. It is suggested that the RCTF take a pro-active approach to encourage Caltrans to visit rural counties, become familiar with their planning programs to better “integrate” in local transportation planning and project development activities, and to send representatives to RCTF meetings, etc.
California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS)	George Dondero, Calaveras	A committee has been formed to assist Caltrans in their efforts to combine RTPA project input with Caltrans project input to develop a statewide transportation investment strategy. It is proposed that this input will be collected and mapped using GIS and that based on this information, gaps, conflicts, overlaps and other planning needs can be addressed and a statewide vision for investment can be developed.
Rules for Performance Audits	Russ Gum, Lassen (reporting through Scott Maas)	A committee has been formed by Caltrans Local Assistance (Headquarters) regarding the requirement for pre-performance audits of local projects funded by the STIP. This is a requirement that causes particular difficulties for local agencies and their contractors to provide timely delivery of off-system projects.
2000 RCTF Biannual Meeting	Phil Dow, Lake and Mendocino	
Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Applicability to Rural Counties	Phil Dow, Lake and Mendocino	The RCTF receives periodic reports on CAATS activities including rural ITS applications. Several RCTF members are also involved in the California-Oregon Advanced Transportation System (COATS) study. COATS is studying ITS applications in far northern California and southern Oregon.
FTA Section 5310 and Welfare-to-Work Advisory Committee	Barbara O’Keeffe, Tehama	A RCTF representative has contributed to both of these Advisory Committees since legislation created these programs. These committees have been instrumental in critiquing and recommending adjustments to the program implementation as an ongoing effort to ensure that their limited funding is utilized in the most effective manner.
TEA Advisory Committee	Phil Dow, Lake and Mendocino	A RCTF member was appointed to the TEA Advisory Committee in 1993. With the enactment of TEA-21, the committee focused this year on federal changes to the TEA program as well as review and comment on CTC staff proposed administrative changes.
Tribal Technical Assistance	Phil Dow, Lake and	RCTF assists California’s Native American tribes by providing a member to serve on the

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Assigned RCTF Member(s)</b>	<i>Explanation of Need/Objective</i>
Program (TTAP)	Mendocino	Technical Advisory Committee (as the regional agencies' representative) for the Tribal Technical Assistance Program. Efforts by the TAC in 1998 assured continuance of technical assistance to tribes through a federal training grant.
California Aviation System Plan Steering Committee	Dan Landon, Nevada	
"States's Role in Mass Transportation" Advisory Committee		A RCTF member served on the Advisory Committee for the "State's Role in Mass Transportation" study. The purpose of the study was to objectively consider the relationship between the state and local transit agencies and identify the most effective role for the State in the future. It is expected that there may be a future RCTF role as this study advances to the implementation stage.
1998 California Transportation Plan Advisory Committee	Phil Dow, Lake and Mendocino	A RCTF representative has served as a member of the 1998 California Transportation Plan Policy Advisory Committee. Work concluded in early 1998 on the goods movement element, but involvement continues in development of performance measures for surface transportation modes. Efforts are expected to continue into 1999.

## OWP Process Clarification

### Current Fiscal Year (99/00)

Subject	Need/Request	Response/Action
STIP/PPM Allocations for FY 1999/00	The RCTF requested that Caltrans clarify that 1999/00 PPM funds can be used to reimburse costs for allowable work that has been done since July 1, 1999.	Caltrans Local Programs has advised that PPM funds can only be reimbursed for work done after the Department has approved the funding allocation (for most this was December 1999). This matter is being reconsidered and on 2/23/00 the CTC and Caltrans promised a positive resolution.
Reimbursement of 1999/00 RPA funds	Many rural county OWPs for fiscal year 1999/00 were not submitted and/or approved by Caltrans until the fiscal year was well underway. Caltrans has advised that rural counties should not have been expending RPA funds until OWP agreements were executed by Caltrans. Many rural counties expended RPA funds before their OWPA's were executed. The RCTF has requested Caltrans to enable RPA funds to be used to reimburse allowable costs incurred prior to execution of OWPA's for the current fiscal year while Caltrans makes clear its policy regarding this subject for next fiscal year (FY 00/01).	Caltrans and RCTF representatives continue to confer on this subject. Caltrans Headquarters has stated the OWPA is a contract and that counties should not expend RPA until it is approved.
1999/00 RPA Funds	The RCTF has requested that Caltrans remove the June 30 deadline for expenditure of RPA funds especially since the OWP process has not been running smoothly for all counties in the current fiscal year.	Caltrans cannot approve this request because RPA funds are included in an annual appropriation of funds to the Department that is tied to the State budget.

Subject	Need/Request	Response/Action
Finalize 999/00 OWP	Caltrans has requested that rural counties implement quarterly and mid-year reviews. Rural counties are also supposed to prepare and adopt final OWP amendments for the current fiscal year before April 1, 2000. <b>This is especially important because rural counties need to show how they are going to expend all of their RPA before June 30, 2000.</b>	All rural counties please observe this request.

### Next Fiscal Year (00/01)

Subject	Need/Request	Response/Action
Submit Draft 2000/01 OWPs for Caltrans' Review	All rural counties should submit their draft OWPs for next fiscal year prior to March 1, 2000.	All rural counties please observe this request.
Caltrans Approval of FY 2000/01 OWPs and OWPAs	The RCTF has requested that Caltrans review all draft OWPs and respond regarding their adequacy prior to May 1, 2000. When Caltrans has approved a region's draft OWP, it should directly assist the region in completion of the OWP Agreement prior to July 1, 2000, so that regions can begin to expend these funds as soon as the State Budget is approved.	Caltrans Planning has concurred with this request (provided rural counties submit their draft OWPs before March 1, 2000).
Clarify Uses of STIP, RPA, LTF, and Other Funds Available to Rural Transportation Planning Agencies	The RCTF has requested that Caltrans provide clear guidance regarding the types of uses to which various planning funds can be used.	This clarification has been provided in Caltrans' guidance package and it can be further clarified through Caltrans' review of draft OWPs.
Expand Allowable Use of RPA Funds	The RCTF has requested that the requirements for use of RPA funds should be expanded so that they are as broad as possible given the legitimate planning and programming goals and objectives of rural counties.*	Caltrans has responded that use of RPA is established by federal and state parameters identified in the annual guidance package. OWPs must be designed to fit within these parameters. Caltrans desires continued discussions on this subject.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Need/Request</b>	<b>Response/Action</b>
RPA Discretionary Funds	The RCTF has requested that Caltrans eliminate the RPA “Discretionary” element and provide all RPA funds by the formula allocation.	Caltrans Planning has concurred with this request**
Simplify OWP With Other Funding Agreements	The RCTF has requested that Caltrans include PPM and other funding agreements in one document (preferably the OWP Agreement). This would minimize the number of separate funding agreements that are being processed and tend to keep the rural RTPAs “overall” work program in one place.	Caltrans has responded that the RPA and PPM funds come from different programs and therefore they cannot be approved within one generic document.
Provide RPA and PPM Funds Up-front	The RCTF have requested that both RPA and PPM funds be provided in advance and not on a reimbursement basis. The smallest rural counties are too “cash poor” for the program to work as a reimbursement program.	Caltrans Local Programs is attempting to provide PPM fund allocations and reimbursements early in each fiscal year. Caltrans Planning has indicated that it cannot provide RPA funds “up-front.”
Rural County OWP Guidelines	The rural counties have requested that Caltrans provide a separate streamlined OWP guidance. Each year the present OWP guidance package includes information applicable to the MPOs which tends to complicate, confuse, and delay rural counties’ ability to respond well.	Caltrans Planning has concurred with this request beginning with the guidance package for fiscal year 2001/02.

\*Representatives from Caltrans may need to meet with rural county representatives to clarify mutual goals and objectives regarding use of OWP funds. Every rural county is in a different position with respect to its transportation planning work. Some regions need to seriously upgrade their RTPs and clarify their funding priorities for future funding cycles. Other regions have well-developed RTPs and are clear about their future projects. Their emphasis may then be to study future transportation corridors or to carry out RTP implementation measures such as developing traffic mitigation fee ordinances/programs and carrying out SCA 3 expenditure plans. Given that rural counties lack adequate planning funds from other sources it is in both the State’s and local government’s interests to allow RPA funds to be used for the broadest possible range of transportation planning, programming and implementation work (including links between transportation and land use).

\*\*Caltrans will retain the ability to use a discretionary program to move RPA funds in case some counties cannot spend all of their RPA in a timely fashion and other counties need more.