Streets and Highways Committee
March 12, 2003
Item #3

Potential STIP Guideline Issues for 2003

- STIP project nomination process, Commission expectations, and Commission priorities for new 2004 STIP programming.
    - County share entitlements and advances. The 2004 STIP will add the last year of one 4-year share period and the first year of the following 4-year period. Should each county be guaranteed a fixed proportional share for the new period or should the approach be more flexible as permitted under statute?
    - State highways projects in the 75% regional program. SB 1768 (2002) provides that Caltrans shall have the opportunity to nominate or recommend projects for inclusion in RTIPs. Should the guidelines be amended to encourage consideration of regional program funding for State highway projects or the reservation of county shares for future State highway needs?
- Long term fundability. Should the guidelines specify the long term fundability of the cost to complete projects in an RTIP or the ITIP as a criterion in approving projects for inclusion in the STIP?
- Transportation and land use planning. Should the guidelines provide incentives for land use planning, and how?
- Fiscal year spread. How can or should the Commission emphasize the limitations of the fund estimate by fiscal year without overly restricting project nominations?
- How should we deal with delays in currently programmed projects, either delivery delays or delays due to funding?
    - One option would be to amend the current STIP prior to the Fund Estimate to incorporate project delays.
    - Another is to leave delays to be included in the individual RTIPs and ITIP.
    - In the last STIP cycle, most delays were not identified until after the RTIPs and ITIP had been submitted.
- Special programming issues with a zero or negative fund estimate.
    - Negative nominations? Priorities for removing projects?
    - Reprogram from a zero base, or other reduced base?
- Technical issues.
    - Update to allow for adjustment of Caltrans construction allocations when contract award is less than 80% of engineer's estimate (AB 608, 2001).
    - Update to allow for higher limits on planning, programming, and monitoring (SB 1768, 2002).
    - Clarify share accounting for corridor projects (Caltrans request).
    - Clarify policy for project changes at the time of vote (Caltrans request).
    - Clarify definition of Advance Project Development Element projects to exclude projects that are deliverable for construction within the STIP period, whether or not programmed in the STIP.