

# CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

JERRY BARTON, VICE CHAIR  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
530.642.5260 - [jbarton@edctc.org](mailto:jbarton@edctc.org)

LISA DAVEY-BATES, CHAIR  
LAKE COUNTY/CITY  
AREA PLANNING COUNCIL  
707.263.7799 - [daveybates@dow-associates.com](mailto:daveybates@dow-associates.com)

NEIL PEACOCK, SECRETARY  
AMADOR COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
209.267.2282 - [neil@actc-amador.org](mailto:neil@actc-amador.org)

## **FINAL**

RCTF AGENDA  
January 20, 2012  
12:30 – 3:30  
Caltrans HQ

1120 N. Street, Room 2116, Sacramento

Call In Number: (713) 576-2028 / Participant Code: 167338

Agenda items may be taken out of order to accommodate discussion.

- |    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| A. | Self Introductions/Information Sharing                                    | All  |
| B. | Approve Minutes of November 18, 2011                                      | Neil Peacock                                 |
| C. | State Budget Update   | Athena Gliddon                               |
| D. | Toll Credits Update   | Athena Gliddon<br>Denix Anbiah/Bill Sandoval |
| E. | California Transportation Commission Update                               | Mitchell Weiss                               |
| F. | Local Assistance Update   | Denix Anbiah/Bill Sandoval                   |
| G. | Mass Transportation Update  | Jila Priebe/Michael Lange                    |
| H. | Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan                               | Bruce De Terra                               |
| I. | Blueprint Update  | Marilee Mortenson                            |
| J. | Advance Mitigation Overview   | Gregg Erickson                               |
| K. | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) Update | Dan McKell/All                               |
| L. | Regional Council of Rural Counties  | Melissa White                                |
| M. | CTC 10-Year Statewide Transportation Needs Assessment                     | Tamera Leighton                              |
| N. | Local Streets & Roads Needs Assessment                                    | Mike Woodman                                 |
| O. | Rural Planning Assistance Funds   | Lisa Davey-Bates                             |
| P. | Grant Opportunities   | All  |
| Q. | RCTF Topics of Significance   | All  |
| R. | Miscellaneous   | All  |

### Agenda Attachments:

*Item B – November 2011 RCTF Minutes*

*Item G – Consolidation/Dissolution/Reorganization of Transit Agencies*

*Item J – Regional Advance Mitigation Planning*

*Item K – Initial Remarks of MAP-21*

*Item P – Transportation Planning Grants (Due April 2, 2012) and SR2S Grants (Due March 31, 2012)*

*Item R – 2012 RCTF Meeting Schedule*



**E. Legislative Update**

**D. McKell**

It was stated that comments are currently being solicited in regard to SB 436, legislation that would establish guidance on developing Regional Advance Mitigation Programs (RAMP). Specifically, comments are being requested on how advance conservation and land management programs, known as "Mitigation Banks", should be structured and how impact mitigations could be integrated on a regional, programmatic basis. It was stated that the Bill's sponsors and interested parties have been working with the Nature Conservancy on detailed aspects of the proposed Bill and more comprehensive information on the proposed legislation would be circulated for review and comment. It was stated that a more comprehensive presentation would be provided at the RCTF's January meeting.

Federal Programs Update: Under the Highway Bill Reauthorization process, it was mentioned that the Senate Reauthorization Bill, MAP 21, was now available for review. As MAP 21 was only recently released, substantive analysis was not yet complete and Caltrans Legislative Liaison will be working with FHWA and other interested parties in performing a detailed review of the legislation. It was also discussed that, as more information on the Bill is available, that the State would need to consider any potential changes to State Legislation needed to implement the Bill at the State level, if MAP 21 does indeed become the next Highway Bill. It was stated that congress expects to hear from California, so expect to hear about opportunities to be involved with State-wide consensus-building efforts to develop coordinated comments on the Bill from California over the coming weeks and months.

Much was discussed in regards to the preliminary analysis of the Bill. For example, it was noted that the Bill emerged from Committee after an 18 – 0 bi-partisan vote, but the Bill would need to go through three additional Committees before being finalized. Also, much was discussed about the significant funding gap (\$12 billion) between the Bill's proposed expenditures and Highway Trust Fund revenues. It was briefly mentioned that the House Bill had not been released in-full, but the outline showed Bill proposing a 6-year horizon, significant funding cuts, and new revenue proposed from future energy projects as a condition of approval.

At this point in the discussion, it was mentioned that the House/Senate Conference process would likely result in changes to the current version of MAP 21 and California's comments would be an important part of that process. Significant discussion occurred regarding what technical aspects of the Bill had been analyzed to-date, it was stated that more information would be forthcoming as the analysis on specific details progressed, and interested parties were directed to numerous sources for more information. Lastly, in regards to the RCTF's participation in this matter, Rachael Moriconi, Mike Woodman, Lisa Davy-Bates, and Neil Peacock all volunteered to represent the group in various venues moving forward.

**F. FTIP Update**

**M. Aljabiry**

A very brief update was provided in this item. It was noted that the current FTIP Amendment was available for comment. FTIPs were due October 1<sup>st</sup> and rural agencies should have contacted the Department to coordinate on the programming of any locally or regionally sponsored projects or processing any update.

**G. Local Assistance Update**

**B. Sandoval**

It was mentioned that Local Assistance was initiating a Disadvantaged Business Opportunity (DBE) Disparity Study to analyze the effectiveness of the DBE participation program. A DBE contract participation survey would be distributed to local and regional agencies to collect data for the study. It was mentioned that the October bond sale generated \$450 million for transportation projects, thereby funding allocation of all Bond funded projects through the end of FY 11/12.

Caltrans Bid Packet Boiler plate was discussed, specifically, in regards to allowing local agencies to consider the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> low bidder's identified UBDE commitments and the Good Faith efforts performed by the low bidder during the bid evaluation process.

Mr. Sandoval directed the group to recent Office Bulletins on process streamlining and updates to the Project Development Procedures Manual and Local Assistance Procedures Manual. He mentioned that Sacramento State was awarded a contract by the FHWA to administer the Transportation Technical Assistance Program (TTAP) program and will be offering course in the near future. Lastly, it was mentioned that an upcoming webinar would be held on the Safe Routes to School program in order to provide technical assistance and improve project development and delivery.

#### **H. Project Initiation Documents (PIDs)**

#### **M. Flournoy**

Mr. Flournoy stated that the new Project Study Report/Project Development Study (PSR/PDS) guidelines developed over the last year have been posted to Caltrans' website and are now available for review. He mentioned that these new guidelines would be integrated with the PDPM and relevant Office Bulletins would be posted to the Local Assistance webpage. He also mentioned that there was PowerPoint training available on the changes made under the new guidelines and that links to the training would be distributed to local agencies. Lastly on this item, Mr. Flournoy noted that a template Reimbursement Agreement was available for local agencies to consider in pursuing future PID efforts. This new process is required to address the anticipated State Budget changes to Caltrans environmental staffing levels. Caltrans Legal has cleared the Agreement for circulation, so interested parties are encouraged to investigate further, as even "oversight only" PID efforts require reimbursement of Caltrans costs for review and approval.

The group discussed the importance of Caltrans cost control measures as a part of any agreements and a question was asked about "lump sum" payments for Caltrans participation in PID work as opposed to a "time and materials" payment system.

#### **I. Mass Transportation Update**

#### **J. Priebe/M. Cody**

State Programs: Ms. Priebe mentioned that a big distribution of funding had been received and a Call for Projects was going to be issued soon for the PTMSIA program. She advised all to make sure their allocation reports are coming in on time in order to demonstrate program compliance. She stated that the Department of Finance is auditing the PTMSIA program and project sponsors will be audited as well. A one week advance notice will be given to those audited starting in October, to be completed in January. She also advised agencies to ensure their TDA audits are in place.

The Statewide Transit Strategic Plan effort is underway, with operator interviews and Transit Plan reviews taking place in order to strategically assess Statewide needs and prioritize future transit investments. It noted that there is an advisory committee working with Caltrans on the Plan that has rural representatives on it and that the Plan would be posted to Caltrans website soon for review and comment.

Federal Programs: It was noted that the 3-year, Title 6 report self-certifications are due soon. Also, the Department is working on the Federal Programs Statewide Management Plan, which will contain a major effort to improve Caltrans' oversight of federally funded transit capital projects. The Plan will have to be approved by FTA and will be available to the public for review by January. On the 5311 program, it was noted that Caltrans is looking to improve various areas of the program through their next call-for-projects. For example, the 6-page expedited application will be used for on-going service wherein no changes are proposed, however, capital projects will require the full-blown application process. They will also be looking to distribute the same level of funding as last year and a call for projects will be sent to the regions soon.

It was noted that the Department needs to receive Certifications and Assurances, so applicants should agenize those for board approval ASAP to ensure they are submitted on time, as Caltrans' goal is to complete the process by the end of the State Fiscal Year.

Ms. Priebe brought up an upcoming web training on the FTA reimbursement process on November 29<sup>th</sup> at 10:00 AM in order to clarify the invoicing process and submittal requirements for supporting documentation.

A question was asked about whether or not Caltrans could assist the regions with tracking local transit funds and the status of local transit projects. It was promised that DMT would look at this issue a bit closer and discuss internally how they might be able to develop a statewide tracking tool for this purpose.

**J. California Interregional Blueprint Interim Report** **G. Corley/ M. Mortenson**

It was noted that two workshops were recently held in both Northern and Southern California, which provided an overview of the effort and a discussion of how the five separate plans for Transit, Rail, Air, Freight, and Highways were incorporated. It was explained hoe the effort has undertaken an inventory of all Sustainable Community Strategies developed to-date by various MPOs and how the Caltrans is looking at the anticipated benefits derived to the State's interregional transportation system as a result. There was discussion on how different aspects of transportation planning are integrated, such as interregional travel and information provided by the Statewide Travel Demand Model. It was noted that rural travel demand analysis will be the focus of significant outreach and investigation over the next couple months, beginning in December.

**K. Regional Council of Rural Counties Update** **M. White**

Ms. White reiterated several of the points discussed above in regards to the Governor's anticipated budget proposal and the Senate Highway Bill, MAP 21. She distributed an analysis briefing performed by RCRC on MAP 21 and discussed several technical aspects of the Bill. She stated that they were interested in hearing questions, comments, and concerns from member agencies, partners, and interested parties. Specifically, she noted that amendments to the Bill will likely be proposed from different quarters of the transportation industry as more analysis is performed. Also, given the fact that the House has not released their detailed legislative language and the House and Senate have not started the Conference process, there are still a lot of variables in the air.

It was recommended that those interested consider the RCRC's talking points, and if interested in assisting with the effort, draft letters for relevant legislators. As discussed above, individual RCTF members pledged to work on this issue directly.

**L. 10-Year State-Wide Needs Assessment** **A. Gilbertson/T. Leighton**

A brief overview of this effort was provided; the intent of the Needs Assessment is to develop a 'big picture' of the State's transportation financing needs that the CTC and other key people can take to the Governor's office and new legislators to discuss statewide transportation funding issues. The effort will help develop a unified, statewide vision to advocate for the state's needs with regard to reauthorization in Washington DC. A committee was formed by the CTC, with staff and consultant support, and the focus of the effort is a three-pronged approach focusing on **system preservation** (including transit, streets and road, ports etc.), **system expansion**, and **system management and operations** (for all modes of transportation).

It was noted that all input received has been integrated and a Draft Final Report was now available for review. In regards to a presentation to the CTC on this issue, several ideas were discussed in order to enhance the report, such as requesting local agencies to provide maps of various project locations for illustrative purposes. It was stated that they would prefer to have a

uniform template for production of the Final Report and interested agencies were encouraged to contact their Districts, who would be coordinating with Headquarters.

Significant discussion occurred on the topic of the proposed "Mobility Recommendations" included with this early draft of the report. Specifically, the RCTF expressed widespread concern with and opposition to the proposed priority given to "metro mobility" in these recommendations and the appropriateness of having such recommendations included in a Needs Assessment. It was stated that these recommendations are being removed from the Report and that these mobility recommendations would be assembled into a separate document that would focus on policy issue and implementation priorities needed to address the needs identified.

It was noted that once this change is made, that the Final Report would be presented to the CTC at its December meeting.

It was noted that, prior to her retirement, Kathy Mathews handed off the responsibility of RCTF participation to Tamera Leighton with the Del Norte Local Transportation Commission. Tamera said that she was participating regularly and shared the concerns regarding the proposed policy recommendations. Lastly, it was stated that, regardless of any concerns related to the policy issue, that the Needs Assessment tool should prove to be a valuable educational tool and could be maintained over time to track the state of California's transportation funding needs.

**M. Local Street & Roads Needs Assessment**

**M. Woodman**

Mr. Woodman noted that a consultant was selected to update the Local Streets and Roads Assessment in September. This was the same firm that performed the last update and based on an expedited delivery schedule, they are anticipated to complete the update by December 2012.

He mentioned that they did not receive an award on their application to the Partnership Planning program, but that the funding request letter discussed extensively at the last RCTF meeting had been distributed and that they were receiving affirmative response from agencies across the State. Unfortunately, he was not able to provide a detailed report on how many agencies had committed to providing said funding as of yet.

**N. California Household Travel Survey**

**P. Spalding**

Mr. Spaulding noted that a pre-test of the survey discussed at the last couple RCTF meetings was now complete. This test focused on the survey tool and retrieval methods used in the process. He stated that 1500 homes had now completed the survey, which is a 7-days a week process.

This testing demonstrated that there was only minor variation in response rates throughout the week; however, Hispanic, large, and young households were underrepresented in the response rates. He stated that they will be focusing on correcting that situation by targeting their outreach program and using Spanish language survey instruments.

He noted that their web-based retrieval system had a high level of response, which was a promising sign. The full survey would be started in December or January once corrections are made based on the results of this testing process. It would take 10 to 12 months to complete.

Discussion took place on the North State Super Region's recent successful grant application for a Transportation and Economic Development Study and the importance of accurately modeling long-distance, interregional recreational travel. Based on this discussion, Mr. Spaulding said he would investigate the tools available to specifically identify this "recreational element" of interregional travel and report back.

**O. Appointment of Rural Representative to CTC**

**M. Clem**

Ms. Clem noted that the terms for two CTC Commissioners would be expiring soon and that the Commission does not currently have any representatives on it that are from rural areas. She discussed the importance of having "equitable geographical representation" on the Commission, as required by State statute. She stated that an individual from the North Coast, current Mayor of the City of Ferndale Jeff Farley, was interested in applying for this position and would welcome any Letters of Support that might be provided by rural agencies across the State. She circulated Mr. Farley's résumé and a draft Support Letter for review.

It was noted that the RCTF, as an advisory Committee to the CTC itself, typically does not engage in "lobbying" and that it may be prudent for individual agencies to send letters independently. The RCTF Chair promised to check with CTC staff about the appropriateness of sending correspondence to the Commission with a "general recommendation" on the topic. It was stated that Mr. Farley would be happy to attend the RCTF's January meeting to introduce himself, but for any who did not feel comfortable supporting a specific candidate, that a letter generally supporting rural representation on the CTC would also be appreciated.

**P. RCTF Topics of Significance**

**All**

The RCTF Chair directed those present to the handouts and meeting materials provided on the various topics of discussion.

3:30

Adjourn

**DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**  
DIVISION OF MASS TRANSPORTATION MS 39  
1120 N STREET  
P. O. BOX 942874  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94274-0001  
PHONE (916) 654-8144  
FAX (916) 654-9366  
TTY 711  
www.dot.ca.gov

RCTF Meeting: 1/20/12  
Agenda Item: G



*Flex your power!  
Be energy efficient!*

January 9, 2012

To: Regional Transportation Planning Agencies  
Metropolitan Planning Organizations  
Transit Agencies

Re: Consolidation/Dissolution/Reorganization of Transit Agencies

The California Department of Transportation (Department) is experiencing an increase in the number of transit agencies that are implementing structural changes, such as reorganizations, dissolutions, consolidations, or agency name changes. This can make it problematic for transit agencies to claim both Transportation Development Act (TDA) and federal funds, or execute contracts. A transit agency's structural change can affect plans, programs, and project lists utilized by the Department, California Transportation Commission (CTC), Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs), Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), Councils of Governments (COGs), cities, counties, transit agencies, and Tribal governments.

To ensure compliance with State and federal funding requirements, the Department is suggesting the following action to be taken to assist transit agencies with changes.

### **Transition Roles and Responsibilities**

Transit Agencies making organizational changes are advised to do the following:

1. Notify the RTPA/MPO and identify the reason(s) for structural change.
2. Incorporate comments received from the RTPA/MPO into the transition plan.
3. Request a concurrence letter from the RTPA/MPO.
4. Notify and provide the Department's district planning office with the following revised documents:
  - An Authorizing Resolution
  - A Disadvantage Business Enterprise Implementation Agreement
  - FTA Certifications and Assurances
  - New Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS)
  - New California Code of Regulation (CCR) numbers
  - Any applicable third party agreements(s)

After transition plan approval, the agency is advised to initiate the following activities:

1. Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs), Asset Assignment Agreements, or Assignment and Assumption Agreements (if applicable) for rolling stock and/or other products procured with State and/or federal funds that are considered full or partial government property.
2. Appropriate project programming amendment requests for existing projects.

### **RTPA/MPO**

1. Distribute the document to the district planning office for review.
2. Transmit RTPA/MPO and Department comments back to the transit agency.
3. Provide RTPA/MPO board approval (authorizing resolution) and a concurrence letter to the transit agency if there is RTPA/MPO/Division concurrence. We recommend not giving approval if the proposed transition cannot legally establish the agency as a TDA claimant, and a State/federal fund recipient.
4. Coordinate with the transit agency and district planning office to prepare necessary MOUs, agreements, and project programming requests so existing assets and projects accurately reflect the agency's new structure or name.

### **District Planning**

1. Distribute the transition information to DMT for review and comment.
2. Coordinate with DMT to determine the agency's eligibility.
3. Provide Department comments to the RTPA/MPO.
4. Provide a transition information support letter to the RTPA/MPO and transit agency after DMT and district planning concur.
5. Coordinate with the RTPA/MPO to prepare necessary MOUs, agreements and project programming requests so existing assets and projects accurately reflect the agency's new structure or name.
6. Consult DMT to determine need for specific MOUs or asset agreements.
7. Send project programming amendment requests to DMT.

### **Division of Mass Transportation (DMT)**

1. Review the transition information and provide comments to district planning office.
2. Provide an agency transition support letter to district planning office after DMT considers the plan acceptable.
3. Notify CTC and the Department's Divisions of Programming and Accounting of the transit agency's structural change.
4. Process accurate project programming amendment requests for active projects.
5. Issue standard agreement amendment(s) for active projects (if applicable).
6. Consult the Department's Legal Division to facilitate and issue MOUs, Asset Assignment Agreements, or Assignment and Assumption Agreements to document the transition and transfer of projects or equipment to the newly established agency (if applicable).
7. Notify FTA of the agency's transition/change (if applicable).

**DMT programs effected:**

*Transportation Development Act (TDA)*

This Program was established to fund planning, maintenance and improvements to public transportation service and encourage regional public transportation coordination. MPOs and RTPAs are responsible for approving agencies as eligible TDA claimants. To thoroughly communicate agency structural changes for those agencies receiving TDA funds, MPOs/RTPAs must also ensure changes are communicated to the State Controller's Office (SCO) and the State Board of Equalization. Detailed definitions for an "eligible" TDA claimant can be found in the Sections 99207, 99209, and 99209.5 of the TDA Statues and California Codes of Regulations at:

<<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA7-15-2011.pdf>>.

*State Transit Programs*

These include:

- The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- The Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)
- The Proposition 1B State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP)
- The Proposition 1A High-Speed Train Urban and Commuter Rail Program

The Proposition 1B Bond – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, Service, and Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) is a State transit program, however, it is administered differently than the State transit programs identified above. To thoroughly communicate agency structural changes for those agencies receiving PTMISEA funds, RTPAs/MPOs and/or affected transit agencies must also ensure structural changes are communicated to the SCO.

*Federal Transit Administration Programs (FTA)*

The Department has designated DMT as the recipient of four Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant programs. These programs are:

- FTA Section 5310 – Elderly & Disabled Specialized Transit
- FTA Section 5311 – Rural Area Formula
- FTA Section 5316 – Job Access and Reverse Commute
- FTA Section 5317 – New Freedom

In order for a transit agency to be eligible for FTA funds they must be an eligible TDA claimant, and demonstrate the technical capacity required to implement and manage projects. DMT can provide new agencies with program overviews to help them prepare.

District Transit Representatives/Regional Planners; please share a copy of this letter with your regional and local transit partners. For additional information or assistance, please contact Division program staff at the numbers listed below:

Area of Assignment	Name	Phone Number
FTA Section 5311	James Ogbonna	(916) 651-6116
FTA Section 5310	Helen Louie	(916) 654-6990
FTA Section 5316 & 5317	Stephanie Watts	(916) 657-9366
TDA	Gordon Arruda	(916) 654-9396
State Transit Programs	Ezequiel Castro	(916) 654-8012
PTMISEA	Stefanie Acton	(916) 654-8172

Sincerely,



JANE E. PEREZ

Chief

Division of Mass Transportation

- c: Martin Tuttle  
Deputy District Directors–Planning  
Shirley Choate  
Garth Hopkins  
Jila Priebe  
Michael Lange  
Nancy Young

**REGIONAL ADVANCE MITIGATION PLANNING:  
EXPEDITING INFRASTRUCTURE WHILE PROVIDING ENVIRONMENTAL AND  
COMMUNITY BENEFITS**

California's public agencies spend billions of dollars each year on needed infrastructure projects to meet the growing need for roads, bridges, levees and other facilities. California hosts an extraordinarily rich array of valuable natural communities and ecosystems that provide habitat for rare wildlife, and are the source for Californians' drinking water and open space for healthy recreation. As California grows, it is imperative that it be done in a manner that protects and enhances the state's natural resources. For three years, state and federal agencies in California have been working together to develop an innovative way to advance needed infrastructure projects more efficiently and provide more effective conservation of our natural resources – through Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP).

RAMP incorporates both a “regional” geographic component and an “advance” time frame. The regional component will allow state and federal agencies to consider the environmental impacts of several planned infrastructure projects at once. The “advance” time frame will identify regional mitigation opportunities that will satisfy anticipated mitigation requirements early in the project planning and environmental review process, *before* the projects are in the final stages of approval. Working together, natural resource and infrastructure funding agencies can estimate mitigation needs early in the projects' timelines, avoiding permitting and regulatory delays and allowing public mitigation dollars to stretch further by securing and conserving valuable natural resources on a more economically efficient scale and before related real estate values escalate. This strategy supports jobs and a vibrant economy – lower mitigation costs lowers overall project costs which frees up funds for additional projects; the certainty provided by RAMP allows infrastructure agencies to deliver on the pipeline of projects more consistently; and it supports jobs in the natural resources sector through restoration and management of natural lands.

This innovative approach differs from the way many infrastructure projects are typically funded and implemented, wherein the agencies engage in project-by-project mitigation, usually near the end of a project's environmental review, with insufficient consideration of regional or statewide conservation priorities. Although this type of mitigation is a valid approach, permitting delays can occur when appropriate mitigation measures cannot be easily identified and agreed upon, and the cost of mitigation often increases between the time the project is planned and funded and the time mitigation land is acquired. As a result, infrastructure funding agencies end up paying top dollar to satisfy mitigation requirements. Project-by-project mitigation also often overlooks regional conservation needs and ecosystem-scale impacts to sensitive species and habitat, thereby missing critical opportunities for efficient, reliable, and biologically relevant mitigation. Additionally, the opportunity for greater benefits to water and air quality and public health are lost.

Successful implementation of RAMP statewide will include improved collaboration between infrastructure funding agencies and natural resources agencies on infrastructure project environmental review and mitigation, and better coordination between mitigation planning efforts and other conservation planning efforts. As a result, mitigation for infrastructure projects will be more proactive and less reactive, more systematic and less haphazard, multifunctional rather than

single purpose, large scale rather than small scale, and better integrated with other planning efforts, resulting in larger scale, more meaningful and cost-effective conservation that advances statewide and regional environmental goals.

### **LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT SYSTEM**

The current project-by-project, species-by-species mitigation approach has limitations and can often result in:

- small, unconnected, and inefficiently managed mitigation sites;
- infrastructure project delays when suitable mitigation land cannot be found;
- high compensation ratios required, adding to mitigation cost, when the infrastructure project has a temporal impact on affected species and habitats;
- limited or no connection to regional or statewide conservation priorities;
- more costly and challenging management of protected or restored mitigation land; and
- additive administrative or support costs associated with requirements to develop separate agreements and implementation mechanisms for each individual project.

### **CHALLENGING ISSUES**

Despite the time savings, reduced costs, and improved environmental and community benefits of regional advance mitigation, it is often difficult to put into practice. The challenges include:

- uncertainty about obtaining assurances from state and federal regulatory agencies that natural resources secured and conserved for mitigation in advance of project-specific environmental review will be acceptable;
- providing ongoing monitoring and management of environmentally sensitive lands for any lengthy period of time in advance of a specifically identified mitigation need; and
- obtaining funding, because mitigation dollars are usually tied to specific infrastructure projects, and advance mitigation projects usually have to compete for funds with infrastructure projects.

### **A COLLABORATIVE PARTNERSHIP**

A RAMP Work Group formed in the spring of 2008 to explore the potential for implementing regional advance mitigation in California. Work group participants include representatives from the California Department of Water Resources, California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, California Department of Fish and Game, California Wildlife Conservation Board, University of California, Davis, The Nature Conservancy and the Resources Legacy Fund.

The Work Group committed to working together on RAMP through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The RAMP Work Group is currently developing a Statewide Framework document intended to convey to lawmakers and agency leaders the goals, benefits, and operational framework of a statewide RAMP Initiative. The Statewide Framework will be completed by November 2011. The Statewide Framework will have a companion document, the RAMP Manual,

which will serve as a comprehensive guidance document for planning and implementing regional advance mitigation throughout California. Development of the RAMP Manual will draw from lessons learned during development and completion of an advance mitigation assessment for a pilot region in the Central Sacramento Valley. The assessment, which will be completed by the end of 2011, will provide the context for implementing advance mitigation in the pilot region.

### **OPTIONS BEING EXPLORED**

The concepts of regional advance mitigation planning are currently being explored by the RAMP Work Group, and solutions have been developed and proposed. Some of these proposals include:

- Create a “trust” or “revolving” fund that would be available for advance mitigation acquisitions.
- Increase the ability of regulatory agencies to work collaboratively to describe and quantify “mitigation credits” that could be created by any acquisition/restoration projects secured by the infrastructure funding agencies or other means.
- Legislation to establish a Regional Advance Mitigation program in California.
- Caltrans’ proposal to develop a Statewide Advance Mitigation Initiative (SAMI), in which federal funds could be used to provide the capital needed for compensatory mitigation needs in advance of project delivery through a RAMP model. Caltrans and federal and state regulatory agencies in the RAMP Work Group signed a MOU that ensures support for SAMI and a commitment to develop a program.

### **BENEFITS OF RAMP**

The RAMP Work Group has also identified numerous benefits that could result from implementing a regional advance mitigation planning program. These benefits could include:

- lower mitigation costs and permit streamlining for the infrastructure funding agency when off-site compensatory mitigation is required;
- fewer permitting or regulatory delays resulting from the need for mitigation;
- greater ecological and financial predictability;
- mitigation site planning, management, and monitoring efficiencies;
- the ability to focus on large scale conservation in order to provide benefits to sensitive species through higher quality habitat, improved connectivity between habitat areas, and better long-term protection;
- the ability to leverage and assist ongoing conservation efforts taking place at the local and state level; and
- greater “co-benefits” to the environment and community, including cleaner water and air, open space and recreational opportunities, and improved public health.

## RAMP vs. SAMI Questions & Answers

---

**Q. Please provide a RAMP & SAMI 101, and the differences between the two.**

**A. Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) 101:**

A RAMP Work Group formed in the spring of 2008 to explore the potential for implementing regional advance mitigation in California. Work group participants include representatives from the California Department of Water Resources (DWR), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, California Department of Fish and Game, California Wildlife Conservation Board, California Department of Parks and Recreation, University of California, Davis, The Nature Conservancy and the Resources Legacy Fund. The large majority of the Work Group committed to working together on RAMP through a Memorandum of Understanding. The RAMP Work Group is currently developing a Statewide Framework document intended to convey to lawmakers and agency leaders the goals, benefits, and operational framework of a statewide RAMP initiative. The Statewide Framework will be completed in late 2011. The Statewide Framework will have a companion document, the RAMP Manual. The RAMP Manual will serve as a comprehensive guidance document for planning and implementing regional advance mitigation throughout California. Development of the RAMP Manual will draw from lessons learned during development and completion Regional Assessment for a pilot region in the Sacramento Valley. The assessment, which will also be completed in 2011, will provide the 20-year strategy for implementing advance mitigation in the pilot region.

RAMP is really the comprehensive planning behind implementing advance mitigation projects for Caltrans and DWR; at this time, there is no funding provided directly to RAMP or to implement the Pilot Project or other advance mitigation projects. We are hoping that Caltrans will be successful in developing SAMI, explained more below, which could fund the RAMP Pilot Project or perhaps DWR will fund the Pilot Project through its available Proposition 1E funds (through 2016). Other infrastructure agencies such as High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA) could explore with Caltrans and DWR, the impacts of its line in regions that may be good candidates for future Regional Assessments. Also RAMP at this point is only for the Central Valley in areas where DWR and Caltrans have overlapping impacts. However, at some point it could be expanded statewide, but would need to include other infrastructure agencies and identify and secure a non-geographic-specific funding source for the planning.

**A. Statewide Advance Mitigation Initiative (SAMI) 101:**

SAMI is a Caltrans' proposal to develop an advance mitigation program with federal funds to provide the capital needed to provide compensatory mitigation needs in advance of project delivery through a RAMP model. Off-site biological mitigation for future projects could be estimated and a conservative portion of the estimate could be purchased in advance as part of a programmatic approach. SAMI could reduce project delays, reduce mitigation costs and improve mitigation quality. Caltrans and federal and state resource and regulatory agencies in the RAMP Work Group have prepared a MOU that ensures support for SAMI and a commitment to start developing a program. The purpose of the MOU is to establish a mutual framework for coordinated review concerning the development of SAMI in California by

## RAMP vs. SAMI Questions & Answers

---

Caltrans and CDFG for advance mitigation of planned transportation projects at a landscape scale. SAMI may include establishment of mitigation and conservation banks, in-lieu fee programs, or other appropriate mitigation or conservation measures. The goal of SAMI is for it to be very flexible in order to meet Caltrans mitigation needs in advance of project delivery, and to provide an option for Caltrans to leverage funds for timely mitigation acquisitions. SAMI is planned to be a statewide program and could include other infrastructure agencies (such as HSRA) where project mitigation needs overlap.

### **Q. My understanding is that Caltrans and DWR are involved in both. Is that right?**

**A.** No, Caltrans and DWR are both engaged in RAMP. At this point, SAMI only covers Caltrans transportation projects.

### **Q. How does SAMI & RAMP relate to each other?**

**A.** RAMP as explained above currently includes two infrastructure agencies in the Workgroup. During the development of regional assessments, more infrastructure agencies (e.g. regional, county and city) may want to participate in the assessments, and benefit from the advance mitigation projects. At this point, the RAMP Workgroup is developing the Statewide Framework and started the development of the first Regional Assessment for the Pilot Project. Based on the Pilot Project Regional Assessment, the first 4-Year Action Plan, which identifies mitigation projects, will be completed.

SAMI once developed could fund the planning of future Regional Assessments and to fund one or more mitigation projects identified in 4-Year Action Plans through the RAMP program. SAMI funds could also be used to plan, develop and fund additional mitigation solutions outside the RAMP program.

### **Q. What are some of the benefits and drawbacks of each?**

RAMP and SAMI are similar in their approach so they share many of the same benefits and drawbacks.

#### **A. RAMP & SAMI - Benefits**

- ▶ Improved collaboration between infrastructure funding agencies and natural resources agencies and better coordination between mitigation planning efforts and other conservation planning efforts.
- ▶ Mitigation planning that will be more proactive and less reactive, more systematic and less haphazard, multifunctional rather than single purpose, large scale rather than small scale, and better integrated with other planning efforts, resulting in larger scale, more meaningful and cost-effective conservation that advances statewide and regional environmental goals.

The RAMP Work Group has also identified numerous benefits that could result from implementing a regional advance mitigation planning program. These benefits could include:

## RAMP vs. SAMI Questions & Answers

---

- ▶ lower mitigation costs and permit streamlining for the infrastructure funding agency;
- ▶ fewer permitting or regulatory delays resulting from the need for mitigation;
- ▶ greater ecological and financial predictability;
- ▶ mitigation site planning, management, and monitoring efficiencies;
- ▶ the ability to focus on large scale conservation in order to provide benefits to sensitive species through higher quality habitat, improved connectivity between habitat areas, and better long-term protection; and
- ▶ the ability to leverage and assist ongoing conservation efforts.

For an infrastructure agency, there could be some distinct advantages once RAMP and SAMI are fully implemented including:

- ▶ The infrastructure project may not have a related mitigation project, and as such will not be scrutinized for typical misconceptions about mitigation. This may allow to reduce the number of public comments that must be addressed and possibly avoid unnecessary lawsuits. In addition, CEQA & NEPA analysis and permits required for the mitigation project would already be completed.
- ▶ Fewer negotiations on the acceptability of the proposed mitigation during permit reviews, because the RAMP and SAMI credits are already approved. This will reduce project delays and help Caltrans deliver projects on schedule.
- ▶ A defined cost for mitigation will be available at the time the projects are being planned, helping Project Managers stay within their budget projections (fewer chances for a cost overrun so long as the amount of impact stays the same or less).
- ▶ Conservation priorities are already mapped out, so that infrastructure projects can be sited to avoid and minimize conflicts and sensitive resources.

### **Drawbacks**

Advance mitigation is exactly that; we are looking at planned infrastructure projects up to twenty years in the future, and trying to determine the mitigation needs of those projects. Therefore, it can be planning rich and require more coordination and time to develop the advance mitigation projects in comparison to identifying a single project specific mitigation project, but the overall outcome should be “faster-better-cheaper.”

Also since RAMP is very “planning rich” with the twenty year regional assessments, and then based on the assessments 4-year Action Plans, which identify mitigation projects that will be constructed, it could lose some flexibility to meet any new or unique mitigation needs, and could take longer than just developing a project specific mitigation project. It also means that there will be more queries for the infrastructure projects being planned in order to allow for the planning to best estimate eventual mitigation needs.

In the short term, because the RAMP Workgroup is working on the first Pilot Regional Assessment, and there is no proof-of-concept pilot site, there are significant time delays to anyone needing a mitigation credit through RAMP. RAMP and SAMI can only provide planning services as budgets and staffing allow. Creating stand alone advance mitigation sites may allow for a single agency to have the credits they need faster than those created by

## RAMP vs. SAMI Questions & Answers

---

RAMP and SAMI if the current pace is kept. This gap in timing will be significantly reduced however as more of the state begins to have RAMP or SAMI planning completed.

**Q. If an infrastructure project has a very fast timeline, joining too large a team may have possible hurdles that could significantly slow down the project's efforts.**

**A.** Yes, RAMP & SAMI are a new approach to advance mitigation; and for now, these efforts are not out in front of project delivery. For the next few years, if an infrastructure project has a tight timeline then participating in RAMP may not make sense. However, once RAMP sponsored sites (with or without SAMI funding) or SAMI funded mitigation sites are created, there may be excess credits available to an infrastructure project that was not part of the original planning and budgets. There is interest in creating enough flexibility in both RAMP and SAMI sites that new projects can use their credits so long as there is no detrimental impact to the original sponsors of the site.

In addition, if the agency is planning for proposed projects, participating in RAMP (areas where DWR, Caltrans and other infrastructure agency has overlapping impacts, at this point limited to the Central Valley) or SAMI (areas where Caltrans and other infrastructure agency has overlapping impacts - statewide) may be the most beneficial for the infrastructure agency.

After transition plan approval, the agency is advised to initiate the following activities:

1. Memorandum of Understandings (MOUs), Asset Assignment Agreements, or Assignment and Assumption Agreements (if applicable) for rolling stock and/or other products procured with State and/or federal funds that are considered full or partial government property.
2. Appropriate project programming amendment requests for existing projects.

### **RTPA/MPO**

1. Distribute the document to the district planning office for review.
2. Transmit RTPA/MPO and Department comments back to the transit agency.
3. Provide RTPA/MPO board approval (authorizing resolution) and a concurrence letter to the transit agency if there is RTPA/MPO/Division concurrence. We recommend not giving approval if the proposed transition cannot legally establish the agency as a TDA claimant, and a State/federal fund recipient.
4. Coordinate with the transit agency and district planning office to prepare necessary MOUs, agreements, and project programming requests so existing assets and projects accurately reflect the agency's new structure or name.

### **District Planning**

1. Distribute the transition information to DMT for review and comment.
2. Coordinate with DMT to determine the agency's eligibility.
3. Provide Department comments to the RTPA/MPO.
4. Provide a transition information support letter to the RTPA/MPO and transit agency after DMT and district planning concur.
5. Coordinate with the RTPA/MPO to prepare necessary MOUs, agreements and project programming requests so existing assets and projects accurately reflect the agency's new structure or name.
6. Consult DMT to determine need for specific MOUs or asset agreements.
7. Send project programming amendment requests to DMT.

### **Division of Mass Transportation (DMT)**

1. Review the transition information and provide comments to district planning office.
2. Provide an agency transition support letter to district planning office after DMT considers the plan acceptable.
3. Notify CTC and the Department's Divisions of Programming and Accounting of the transit agency's structural change.
4. Process accurate project programming amendment requests for active projects.
5. Issue standard agreement amendment(s) for active projects (if applicable).
6. Consult the Department's Legal Division to facilitate and issue MOUs, Asset Assignment Agreements, or Assignment and Assumption Agreements to document the transition and transfer of projects or equipment to the newly established agency (if applicable).
7. Notify FTA of the agency's transition/change (if applicable).

**DMT programs effected:**

*Transportation Development Act (TDA)*

This Program was established to fund planning, maintenance and improvements to public transportation service and encourage regional public transportation coordination. MPOs and RTPAs are responsible for approving agencies as eligible TDA claimants. To thoroughly communicate agency structural changes for those agencies receiving TDA funds, MPOs/RTPAs must also ensure changes are communicated to the State Controller's Office (SCO) and the State Board of Equalization. Detailed definitions for an "eligible" TDA claimant can be found in the Sections 99207, 99209, and 99209.5 of the TDA Statues and California Codes of Regulations at:

<<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA7-15-2011.pdf>>.

*State Transit Programs*

These include:

- The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- The Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP)
- The Proposition 1B State-Local Partnership Program (SLPP)
- The Proposition 1A High-Speed Train Urban and Commuter Rail Program

The Proposition 1B Bond – Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, Service, and Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) is a State transit program, however, it is administered differently than the State transit programs identified above. To thoroughly communicate agency structural changes for those agencies receiving PTMISEA funds, RTPAs/MPOs and/or affected transit agencies must also ensure structural changes are communicated to the SCO.

*Federal Transit Administration Programs (FTA)*

The Department has designated DMT as the recipient of four Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant programs. These programs are:

- FTA Section 5310 – Elderly & Disabled Specialized Transit
- FTA Section 5311 – Rural Area Formula
- FTA Section 5316 – Job Access and Reverse Commute
- FTA Section 5317 – New Freedom

In order for a transit agency to be eligible for FTA funds they must be an eligible TDA claimant, and demonstrate the technical capacity required to implement and manage projects. DMT can provide new agencies with program overviews to help them prepare.

District Transit Representatives/Regional Planners; please share a copy of this letter with your regional and local transit partners. For additional information or assistance, please contact Division program staff at the numbers listed below:

Area of Assignment	Name	Phone Number
FTA Section 5311	James Ogbonna	(916) 651-6116
FTA Section 5310	Helen Louie	(916) 654-6990
FTA Section 5316 & 5317	Stephanie Watts	(916) 657-9366
TDA	Gordon Arruda	(916) 654-9396
State Transit Programs	Ezequiel Castro	(916) 654-8012
PTMISEA	Stefanie Acton	(916) 654-8172

Sincerely,



JANE E. PEREZ

Chief

Division of Mass Transportation

- c: Martin Tuttle  
Deputy District Directors–Planning  
Shirley Choate  
Garth Hopkins  
Jila Priebe  
Michael Lange  
Nancy Young

# CALIFORNIA

## RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

JERRY BARTON, VICE CHAIR  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
530.642.5260 - [jbarton@edctc.org](mailto:jbarton@edctc.org)

LISA DAVEY-BATES, CHAIR  
LAKE COUNTY/CITY  
AREA PLANNING COUNCIL  
707.263.7799 - [daveybates@dow-associates.com](mailto:daveybates@dow-associates.com)

NEIL PEACOCK, SECRETARY  
AMADOR COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
209.267.2282 - [neil@actc-amador.org](mailto:neil@actc-amador.org)

January 11, 2012

To: Dan McKell/Bill Higgins

From: Lisa Davey-Bates, Chair, Rural Counties Task Force

RE: Map-21 Information Sharing – December 10, 2012/RCTF Perspective Summary

The Rural Counties Task Force meets on January 20, 2012 in Sacramento, so the comments I made during the MAP-21 teleconference have not been discussed amongst the group as a whole. With that caveat, it's reasonable to say that the rural counties have surmised that they are happy, in general, to see a bipartisan bill at current funding levels but have concerns of the items I've addressed below. Additional items may surface once the RCTF meets next Friday.

1) The bill recommends eliminating/phasing out MPOs with population under 200,000. That would affect approximately 1/2 of the MPOs in California, or 1/3 nationwide. More discussions need to occur about the actual impacts of this language in the bill. Word is that this may have been an unintended consequence of MAP-21; especially to California, since we are unique to most of the nation. One recommendation may be to grandfather in existing MPOs so that existing State laws, such as Senate Bill 375, can continue to be implemented. It is important to note that the affected MPOs could lose federal planning funds which are an important resource for planning activities. The bill could also create additional competition with the little amount of funding that is available to the smaller RTPAs.

2) MAP-21 redirects TE and SRTS programs into the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program. Surface Transportation Program funds are currently identified under the Transportation Mobility Program, one of the five new core programs in MAP-21. Rurals are concerned that moving the TE and SRTS programs into the CMAQ program could penalize regions with good air quality. Even though the bill is said to "reserve" 50% of the funds (which is equivalent to the amount of funds provided for the Transportation Enhancements set-aside in FY 2009) for projects that "could" be in areas that are in attainment, there are concerns that this could negatively impact the rural areas. There will also be additional pressure on the program since the categories have been expanded to include projects to achieve compliance with the ADA, carpool/vanpool/car share projects, recreational trail programs and more.

3) Currently, the Highway Bridge Program requires States to spend 15% of their annual bridge funds on local bridges. MAP-21 does NOT provide this dedicated funding source, which will even further deteriorate local bridges, impact goods movement and threaten public safety in rural areas.

4) It will be important to establish consensus as soon as possible to support legislation in California that continues distribution of funds with current formulas to ensure an equitable allocation of funds to everyone.

5) Lastly, rurals continue to be concerned by the trend to support additional funding to the major metropolitan areas. It is important to send the message to congress that all regions are in need of additional funding, and that there should be an equitable distribution of transportation funds to California.

## Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart

GRANT	FUND SOURCE	PURPOSE	WHO MAY APPLY	LOCAL MATCH
<b>Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP)</b>	State Highway Account  <b>Budget</b> \$3 million  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000	Fund coordinated transportation and land use planning that promotes public engagement, livable communities, and a sustainable transportation system, which includes mobility, access, and safety.	<p><b>The following may apply directly or as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may apply only as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	10% minimum of the grant amount requested. At least 7.5% of the grant amount requested must be cash match and the rest may be in-kind.*
<b>Environmental Justice (EJ)</b>	State Highway Account  <b>Budget</b> \$3 million  <b>Grant Cap</b> \$250,000	Promote community involvement in planning to improve mobility, access, and safety while promoting economic opportunity, equity, environmental protection, and affordable housing for low-income, minority, and Native American communities.	<p><b>The following may apply directly or as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may apply only as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Public Entities**</li> </ul>	10% minimum of the grant amount requested. At least 7.5% of the grant amount requested must be cash match and the rest may be in-kind.*

\* For in-kind contribution requirements, refer to each grant program’s section in this Guide.

\*\* Public entities include state agencies, the Regents of the University of California, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state. (Government Code Section 811.2)

Note: Redevelopment Agencies cannot apply as an applicant or sub-applicant until AB X1 26 and 27 have been resolved. Please consult your district contract manager before submitting your grant application to the EJ or CBTP grant program to determine eligibility.

## Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart

GRANT	FUND SOURCE	PURPOSE	WHO MAY APPLY	LOCAL MATCH
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Partnership Planning</b></p>	<p>Federal Highway Administration State Planning and Research, Part 1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$1,200,000</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000</p>	<p>Fund transportation planning studies of multi-regional and statewide significance in partnership with Caltrans.</p>	<p><b>The following may only apply as an applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> <p><b>Caltrans District 4 Only:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may only apply as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Other Public Entities**</li> </ul>	<p>20% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 20% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution. Additional local funds above the minimum local match are desired.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Statewide or Urban Transit Planning Studies</b></p>	<p>Federal Transit Administration Section 5304</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$1,500,000</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grant Cap</b> \$300,000</p>	<p>Fund studies on transit issues having statewide or multi-regional significance to assist in reducing congestion.</p>	<p><b>The following may only apply as an applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> <p><b>Caltrans District 4 Only:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may only apply as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Other Public Entities**</li> </ul>	<p>11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.</p>

\* For in-kind contribution requirements, refer to each grant program's section in this Guide.

\*\* Public entities include state agencies, the Regents of the University of California, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state. (Government Code Section 811.2)

# Transportation Planning Grant Summary Chart

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Rural or Small Urban Transit Planning Studies</b></p>	<p>Federal Transit Administration Section 5304</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$1,000,000</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grant Cap</b> \$100,000</p>	<p>Fund public transportation planning studies in rural or small urban areas of California (transit service area with population of 100,000 or less).</p>	<p><b>The following may only apply as an applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> <p><b>Caltrans District 4 Only:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may only apply as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Other Public Entities**</li> </ul>	<p>11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Transit Planning Student Internships</b></p>	<p>Federal Transit Administration Section 5304</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Budget</b> Federal funds \$300,000</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Grant Cap</b> \$50,000</p>	<p>Fund student internship opportunities in transit planning at public transit agencies.</p>	<p><b>The following may only apply as an applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Metropolitan Planning Organizations and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies</li> </ul> <p><b>Caltrans District 4 Only:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> </ul> <p><b>The following may only apply as a sub-applicant:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transit Agencies</li> <li>• Universities and Community Colleges</li> <li>• Native American Tribal Governments</li> <li>• Cities and Counties</li> <li>• Community-Based Organizations</li> <li>• Non-Profit Organizations (501.C.3)</li> <li>• Other Public Entities**</li> </ul>	<p>11.47% minimum (in non-federal funds or an in-kind* contribution). The entire minimum 11.47% local match may be in the form of an in-kind contribution.</p>

\* For in-kind contribution requirements, refer to each grant program’s section in this Guide.

\*\* Public entities include state agencies, the Regents of the University of California, district, public authority, public agency, and any other political subdivision or public corporation in the state. (Government Code Section 811.2)

**FY 12-13 District Grant Marketing**

District	Outreach Date	Location	Time	Method	Contact
1	<i>Workshop currently not planned</i>				For more information call Rex Jackman at (707) 445-6412
2	<i>Workshop currently not planned</i>				For more information call Michelle Millette at (530) 229-0517
3	January 24, 2012	<b>Caltrans District 3 Office</b> Cedar Ridge Room, 1st Floor 703 "B" Street Marysville, CA	9:00 am- 12:00 pm	Workshop <a href="#">Outreach Flyer</a>	For more information call Rebecca Pike at (530) 634-7612
4	February 9, 2012	<b>Caltrans District 4 Office</b> 111 Grand Ave, 6th Floor Atrium Oakland, CA	10:30am- 12:00 pm	Workshop <a href="#">Outreach Flyer</a>	For more information call Beth Thomas (CBTP) at (510) 286-7227 , Blesilda Gebreyesus (EJ) at (510) 286-5575, Erik Alm (Partnership) at (510) 286-6053, or Becky Frank (Transit) at (510) 286-5536
5	February 7, 2012	<b>Buellton Community Rec. Center, Room A</b> 301 Second Street, Suite A Buellton, CA 93427	10:00 - 11:30 am	Workshop	For more information call Brandy Rider at (805) 549-3970
	February 10, 2012	<b>Monterey Conference Center, Ferrante Room</b> One Portola Plaza Monterey, CA 93940	10:00 - 11:30 am	Workshop	
6	<i>Workshop currently not planned</i>				For more information call Randy Treece at (559) 488-4153
9	<i>Workshop currently not planned</i>			An email has been sent out to eligible applicants.	For more information call Dave Bloom (Inyo & E. Kern Counties) at (760) 872-6799 or Forest Becket (Mono County) at (760) 872-0659
10	<i>Workshop currently not planned</i>				For more information call John Gedney (Mountain Counties) at (209) 948-7112 or Tom Dumas (Merced, San Joaquin, Stanislaus Counties) at (209) 941-1921
7, 8, 11, 12	January 19, 2012	<b>Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)</b> 818 W 7th St, # 1200 Los Angeles, CA 90017  ----- Satellite Offices Addresses found at: <a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov/regional-offices/index.htm">http://www.scag.ca.gov/regional-offices/index.htm</a>	9:30 am- 12:00 pm	Joint workshop between Caltran's D7, D8, D11, D12. Main workshop held at SCAG Building in Los Angeles and it will be broadcast to SCAG/COG Regional Satellite Offices in Ventura, San Bernadino, Riverside, Hesperia, Imperial, and Orange Counties. <a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov/regional-offices/index.htm">http://www.scag.ca.gov/regional-offices/index.htm</a>	<b>District 7:</b> For more information call Wilford Melton (EJ and CBTP) at (213) 897-1344 or Melissa Joshi (Partnership and Transit) at (213) 897-1347  <b>District 8:</b> For more information call John Chiu (EJ and CBTP) at (909) 388-7139 or Mark Roberts (Partnership and Transit) at (909) 383-6040  <b>District 11:</b> <a href="#">Outreach Flyer</a> For more information call Mike Kent at (619) 688-6822  <b>District 12:</b> For more information call Damon Davis at (949) 440-3487



**ANNOUNCEMENT: Call for Cycle 10 State-legislated Safe Routes to School Projects**  
**Posted: December 21, 2011**  
**Application Submittal Deadline: March 30, 2012**

**What is the State-legislated Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program?**

A reimbursement funding program for reducing injuries and fatalities through capital projects that improve safety for children in grades K-12 who walk or bicycle to school.

**How much funding is available?**

The amount of funding targeted for Cycle 10 is \$45 million which would be funded from the 2011/12 State Budget Act and the projected funding from the 2012/13 State Budget.

**How are projects selected?**

Caltrans Districts are apportioned funds based upon student enrollment. District project selection committees will score and rate applications using standardized evaluation forms furnished by Caltrans Headquarters. Once projects are selected and prioritized up to their funding limit. Districts will submit their list to Caltrans Headquarters who will validate District selections and compile a statewide list of selected projects for Director's approval. Districts will notify all applicants of the results.

**Who is eligible to apply?**

Any incorporated city or county

**What types of projects are eligible?**

Capital projects must fall under the broad categories of pedestrian facilities, traffic calming measures, installation of traffic control devices, construction of bicycle facilities, and public outreach/education/enforcement. See guidelines for examples. Up to 10% of the construction cost can fund an education/encouragement/enforcement element.

**Is there a local match required, and what is the maximum amount of funding that can be requested?**

There is a 10% local match required; \$450,000 is the maximum amount that can be requested for a total project cost of \$500,000.

**Have there been any changes to the latest set of guidelines for this cycle of funding?**

Cycle 10 guidelines include changes that were initiated through Assembly Bill 516 which was approved by the Governor on September 7, 2011. Please refer to the latest update in the guidelines.

**Where are the guidelines and applications posted, and how can I get more information?**

[www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm)

**Where do I send my application(s)?**

Original, 1 color hard-copy and a copy on CD must be sent to your Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer (DLAE) by the deadline. Applications postmarked on the deadline are acceptable. DLAE information is available at:

[www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/dlae.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/dlae.htm)

# CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

---

JERRY BARTON, VICE CHAIR  
EL DORADO COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
530.642.5260 - [jbarton@edctc.org](mailto:jbarton@edctc.org)

LISA DAVEY-BATES, CHAIR  
LAKE COUNTY/CITY  
AREA PLANNING COUNCIL  
707.263.7799 - [daveybates@dow-associates.com](mailto:daveybates@dow-associates.com)

NEIL PEACOCK, SECRETARY  
AMADOR COUNTY  
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
209.267.2282 - [neil@actc-amador.org](mailto:neil@actc-amador.org)

Location:

Department of Transportation  
1120 N Street, Room 2116  
Sacramento, CA

**Friday, January 20, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm

**Friday, March 16, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm

**Friday, May 18, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm

**Friday, July 20, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm

**Friday, September 21, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm

**Friday, November 16, 2012**

Time: 12:30 pm - 4:00 pm