

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

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

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE

DEL NORTE CO. TRANS.

(707) 465-3878

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

Item 1

AGENDA

November 17, 2000
Department of Transportation Building
1120 N Street, Room 1420
Sacramento, California

- | | | | |
|------------|-------------|--|-----------------------|
| 12:30 p.m. | Item 1 | Approval of Agenda
(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.) | |
| 12:40 p.m. | Item 2 | Approval of Minutes from September 15, 2000 | |
| 12:45 p.m. | Item 3 | Legislation | C Oldham |
| 1:00 p.m. | Item 4 | Caltrans and Local Project Delivery
AB 1012 Recommendations, etc. | G. Otremba |
| 1:30 p.m. | Item 5 | OWP Review and RPA Expenditure Status | S. Scherzinger |
| 2:00 p.m. | Item 6 | Status Reports Concerning RCTF Issues/Objectives/
Assignments | |
| 3:00 p.m. | Item 7 | Draft RCTF Annual Report to the CTC | C. Field
K. Jacobs |
| 3:30 p.m. | Adjournment | | |

DRAFT
California Rural Counties Task Force
September 15, 2000
Meeting Minutes

Meeting was called to order at approximately 12:30 p.m.

Attendance: See sign in sheet.

Item 1 and 2: Introductions, Approval of Agenda, Announcements and Approval of Minutes

A representative of the California Transportation Foundation announced scholarships are available to students interested in Transportation. Also, handouts were circulated for nomination of Tranny Awards.

Sharon Scherzinger, of Caltrans, announced that Transportation Planning courses are open to local agencies in addition to Federal and State agencies. Ms. Scherzinger passed around sign-up sheets.

A discussion ensued about how to program rehabilitation projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). It was noted that the new CTC guidelines permit flexibility and local agencies should work with their Local Assistance office in this regards.

Item 3: Governors Initiative vs. Rural County Transportation Needs and Issues

John Ferrera of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency was introduced. Mr. Ferrera discussed the Governor's Congestion Relief Plan and the need for timely project delivery. Mr. Ferrera dispelled the rumor that the Governor intended to overturn S.B. 45. Mr. Ferrera described the significantly increased revenue from the Federal and State gas taxes and the need to address this through a revised State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate and get the money out on the transportation system through an expedited 2000 STIP. He reinforced that if a rural county isn't ready to program projects it may need to put its STIP funds into reserves.

Charles Field spoke to the need for more up front money to better plan and identify priorities and develop shelf ready projects. Mr. Ferrera stated the importance of utilizing unused funding from one region to accomplish other high priorities somewhere else.

Questions arose regarding S.B. 1809 having to do with environmental mitigation. It was decided that Celia McAdam would review the bill and provide input to John Ferrera from a rural prospective and e-mail other counties that input.

Phil Dow discussed the need for a local State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) program. The lack of such a program puts pressure on regions to fund local road priorities instead of State highway projects.

Wes McDaniel announced that Nancy Knofler has been appointed the Executive Director of the El Dorado Transportation Commission.

John Ferrera was asked if all the available Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds were going to be programmed to projects in the Governor's Transportation Improvement Program (GTIP). He responded that this would not happen. Jim Nicholas said the State was looking for good projects all around the State. Celia McAdam illustrated the need for better understanding about how ITIP projects will be selected.

Mr. Ferrera indicated that while some GTIP projects are under funded, the Administration has in no way indicated the desire to take funding away from some to accommodate others. Mr. Ferrera also briefly described the need for some project delivery reform but no specific legislation has been targeted.

Charles brought up the need for commitments to be made on ITIP partnerships. Mr. Ferrera said partnerships are occurring that the Department is very proud of.

Walt Allen discussed needs in San Benito County and Route 25. Specifically, Caltrans needs to be able to say how much they can contribute so that regions can complete project financing plans.

Mr. Ferrera reiterated the desire of Caltrans to partner on major capacity increasing projects, that Caltrans had been directed to work with local agencies and that all reasonable offers should be considered. While rehabilitation projects are not discouraged, capacity increasing State highway projects are what the STIP is intended for. The Governor has provided \$900 million to cities and counties for rehabilitation. But the Governor recognized that \$6.8 billion allocated to transportation is only a starting point. Mr. Ferrera also noted that Caltrans' SHOPP program has been greatly enhanced.

George Dondero noted the need for rural representation on the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Mr. Ferrera noted that the Governor's office is aware that while there is currently fine representation on the CTC, a gap remains on rural representation.

Darin Grossi spoke briefly on the need for more recognition of local needs in SHOPP programming. The rather unknown process surrounding project selection results in large disparities between county funding levels. He stated that it appeared local input had no role in State decision making. Jim Nicolas agreed the process is obscure. Mr. Ferrera noted that many people choose to live in rural areas with less improved roads, but safety was the State's primary concern.

Charles Field continued to review the rural County's issues identified in the CTC's annual report to the legislature.

A discussion ensued regarding gas tax formula distribution. Mr. Ferrera suggested that the Legislature currently supports the existing formula and that if this is an issue, rural counties need to let their Legislators know it's a concern. Walt Allen discussed some options for gas tax distribution that County Engineers Association of California (CEAC) is working on. Mr. Ferrera indicated the Governor's willingness to sign any fair bill the Legislature can put together.

A brief discussion on State Constitution Amendment (SCA) 3 ensued, with Mr. Ferrera illustrating the Governor's unwillingness to support SCA 3. However, no distinct position was outlined on the Governor's position regarding lowering the two-thirds requirement for transportation tax measures.

Walt Allen was asked to check into concerns about Proposition 34's impact on local traffic impact fees.

Charles discussed the need for rural counties to be able to utilize more STIP funds for Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) activities.

Item 4: Caltrans Project Delivery

Charles Field outlined some of the issues and concerns regarding Caltrans project delivery. It was stated that slow delivery can affect regions ability to program funds. Celia McAdam discussed how in Placer County a local jurisdiction used its local match funds to pay for environmental studies using private consultants on a State project to expedite the delivery process.

Walt Allen described a problem he had with Caltrans where the scope of work for a project grew so extensive that it became unaffordable.

Leonard Turnbeaugh noted that cost escalation on simple projects is uncontrollable. Charles noted the importance of staying engaged with Caltrans throughout the project delivery process on RIP funded projects.

Dana Cowell discussed a new Caltrans program, called "Change Control", that enhanced the environmental review process to better scope projects and avoid costly project changes later in the delivery process. Dana discussed the need for regularly scheduled interagency meetings.

Dana Cowell briefly discussed the restructuring of tailored districts and that the directors for each district will now be responsible for capital projects within their district. Dana also discussed an alternative type of PSR called Project Development Services used to scope environmental projects and identify project support costs.

Charles Field raised the concern that GTIP projects might take resources away from RIP projects causing them to fall behind in their schedule. Jim Nicholas encouraged rurals to propose partnership projects with Caltrans, but realize delays will occur and be patient. Jim agreed that communication is critical and that it is very important to ask questions of Caltrans project managers. Jim assured the group that rurals do have a place in the ITIP.

Wes McDaniel raised a concern about the recent Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) project list being dismissed in favor of a state project list. Pete Hathaway spoke to the desire of the CTC to fund State priorities with the statewide TEA funding program. Regional priorities need to be funded with regional TEA programs. Pete suggested local agencies work with Caltrans project managers to suggest enhancement projects related to other capital projects.

Walt Allen raised questions about how ITIP decisions are made. Jim Nicholas responded that Caltrans begins by looking at the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) to identify statewide interest on the Interregional Road System. Priorities can generally be found on the Focus and High Emphasis routes. However, if a county puts all or most of its RIP funding into a State highway project and asked Caltrans to put a small portion of funding into a non-focus route project, Caltrans will indeed feel compelled to partner on the project. Jim encouraged all counties to bring their best proposals to the district representatives. However, Jim reminded everyone that with just \$290 million statewide not everybody will be accommodated in this STIP cycle.

Darin Grossi discussed the difficulty in not only putting together a project proposal, but holding the proposal together through several STIP cycles and several local elections without written agreements. Jim responded that Caltrans has a matrix identifying partnership projects with funding needs through 2009. To get recognition of long term partnership needs, Tuolumne and others need to get on the matrix. Pete Hathaway described the approach of Kern County, which has adopted a matrix out to 2012 that shows how much funding is needed from Caltrans. Kern County feels comfortable with the probability of receiving those funds given that the majority of project funding will be local. Mr. Hathaway said if Tuolumne County can only commit 85% of its RIP funds to a major State highway project and needs 15% from Caltrans, that sounds like a good deal. But Caltrans can't take every offer in every STIP cycle. Pete pointed out that in the last year Caltrans began PSR's for about two billion in projects. Local agencies are doing the same. At some point these projects will move into the STIP and the CTC will do everything possible to fund them. But, if they all arrive in the same STIP, some tough choices will have to be made by the State.

Pete Hathaway discussed the reasoning for the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) and Focus routes. If there is a project on a Focus route, eventually Caltrans will get the project done, even if they pay 100% of the cost. If a region has a Focus route project way down the list of priorities and wishes to have it delivered sooner rather than later, it may offer some regional funds to entice Caltrans to deliver the project. If a project is on an interregional non-focus route for recreation, timber or agricultural

purposes, Caltrans will expect almost a total commitment of regional funding toward a funding partnership. The notion of taking a route such as 25, 65 or 49 and sticking it into the interregional focus route system is not consistent with the State goods movement objectives and would be a wasted effort.

Jim Nicholas offered to meet with Tuolumne, Amador, Calaveras, Alpine and San Benito Counties to discuss partnering Memorandum of Understanding's (MOU's) after September 29th.

Item 5: Rural Counties and the Public Transit Account

Pete Hathaway began the item by pointing out that the Governor's Transportation Initiative provides \$264 million to the Public Transit Account (PTA) over four years, with more than half in the first year. These funds are within each county regional share. You don't have to use any of it, or you can program your entire regional share toward public transit. Depending on the level of demand for these funds, the State will have to make appropriate funding decisions. Pete suggested that if a region wants PTA funds, it should request it through the RTIP. If State-only funding is desired, this should also be requested through the RTIP. Operations and maintenance is not fundable through the STIP. However, major capital maintenance can be funded through the STIP. Any PTA funding will be a draw down from RIP funding. Buses, maintenance yards, washers, etc. are all considered capital projects.

Item 6: Status Reports Concerning Other Issues/Objectives and Assignments

Darin Grossi asked if there were any preliminary estimates of the 2002 STIP Fund Estimate. Pete Hathaway responded that \$3.5 billion appears to be a conservative estimate.

Pete then distributed a list of 39 enrolled bills ready for the Governor's signature. A brief discussion of various bills ensued.

Pete discussed proposed Federal regulations and a unified California response. The response has four general comments: 1) Don't tell us how to do our planning just provide us general goals to be achieved; 2) need environmental streamlining, particularly streamlining already in place by FHWA needs to be recognized and accepted by other Federal resource agencies; 3) NEPA needs broader reform and the Environmental Justice Department needs have a role in the environmental process, but the Feds should not dictate how that role will be integrated into planning and; 4) a national architecture for ITS will stifle its implementation. The Task Force concurred that, if the State desired a signature on the response letter, Charles Field has such authorization.

Charles asked if anyone had any committee assignment reports. Nevada County solicited support for increased PPM in a legislative bill.

Phil Dow and Walt Allen agreed to work with each other on a biannual meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

DG/km/db

**RCTF SIGN-IN
9/15/00 MEETING**

Charles Field	ACTC	209-267-2282
John Ferrera	BTH	916-323-5412
Susan Morrison	Del Norte LTC	707-465-3878
Scott White	Caltrans, D2	530-229-0518
Phil Dow	Lake/Mendocino COGs	707-463-1806
Mike Woodman	NCTC	530-265-3202
Celia McAdam	PCTPA	530-823-4030
Walt Allen	San Benito COG	831-636-4170
Gwen Plummer	Mono County	760-924-5450
Craig Tackabery	Mono County	760-934-8989 x 257
Leonard Turnbeaugh	Alpine County	530-694-2140 x 24
George Dondero	Calaveras COG	209-754-2094
Samson A. Okhade	SACOG	916-457-2264
Alyssa Begley	Caltrans, New Tech	916-654-9968
Sharon Scherzinger	CT, Planning	916-653-3362
John Jelichich	Trinity Co. RTPA	530-623-1351
David Burns	Trinity Co. RTPA	530-623-1351
Darin Grossi	Tuolumne County/RTPA	209-533-5601
Dana Cowell	CT-District 10	209-948-7906
Wes McDaniel	EDCTC	530-642-5260
Jim Nicholas	Caltrans	916-654-4013
Scott McGowen	Caltrans	916-654-4587
Ann Marie Robinson	Caltrans	916-324-5829
Michelle Millette	Caltrans	530-741-5435
Gene Murtey	CT	916-654-6722
Pete Hathaway	CTC	916-653-3148

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

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

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE

DEL NORTE CO. TRANS.

(707) 465-3878

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

Item 4

November 7, 2000

TO: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

FROM: Charles F. Field, Chairman

SUBJECT: Caltrans and Local Project Delivery AB 1012 Recommendations

The recommendations of the AB 1012 Project Delivery Task Forces are apparently available. This document is not yet available on the Internet and its distribution is thus far somewhat limited. Gary Otremba (Caltrans District 2) will lead a discussion concerning these recommendations during the Task Force meeting on November 17, 2000.

CF/nc

CALIFORNIA RURAL COUNTIES TASK FORCE

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

SUSAN MORRISON, VICE

DEL NORTE CO. TRANS.

(707) 465-3878

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

Item 5

November 7, 2000

TO: Rural Counties Task Force Participants

FROM: Charles F. Field, Chairman

SUBJECT: OWP Review and RPA Expenditure Status

During the Task Force meeting on November 17, 2000 Sharon Scherzinger will lead a discussion concerning rural counties progress in executing their annual Overall Work Programs (OWPs). All rural counties should have submitted their first quarterly OWP progress reports to their district offices by October 31, 2000. Please bring any questions or issues that you may have concerning your annual planning programs to the Task Force meeting on November 17 so that we may discuss them.

CF/nc

**RCTF ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES *
Reports for November 17, 2000**

<u>ISSUE/OBJECTIVE</u>	<u>ASSIGNED</u>
CTC Representative	Susan Morrison
Local Road Rehab Funding & STIP Protection (Gov.'s Initiative)	Celia McAdam
Formulas for Distribution of Local Road Funds	Walt Allen
Increase PPM Funds	Dan Landon
Clarify/Improve OWP Process	Charles Field
Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP)	Darin Grossi
HBRR/HES Exchange and Federal Aid Project Streamlining	---
SB 45 Project Monitoring/Reporting Database	Walt Allen
Local Assistance "Enhanced Training Committee"	Walt Allen
City/County/Caltrans FHWA Coordinating Group	Spencer Clifton
Committee to Review Changes to Local Assistance Procedures and Guidelines Manual	Liz Levine
RSTP/CMAQ/TEA Project Delivery Committee	Dan Landon
RTP/RTIP Rural County Performance Measures	Dan Landon
Caltrans Regional Planning and Programming Coordination Committee	No Report
California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS)	George Dondero
2000 RCTF Biannual Meeting	Phil Dow
Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Applicability to Rural Counties	Phil Dow
FTA 5310 and Welfare to Work Advisory Committee	Susan Morrison
TEA Advisory Committee	Phil Dow
California Aviation System Plan Steering Committee	Dan Landon
State's Role in Mass Transportation Advisory Committee	Phil Dow
State Planning Guidelines Development Quality Team	Charles Field
Garvee Bonds Guidelines Committee	Scott Maas
Civil Rights Review Title 9	Celia McAdam
RCTF Dues	Dan Landon
Next TEA Federal Reauthorization	---

*Verbal reports or discussion of any item listed may occur during the meeting regardless of whether or not a written report is included with this agenda packet.

DRAFT
11-17-00

Rural Counties Task Force – Annual Report

The State of California contains 28 rural counties, which generally have populations of less than 250,000 and do not have a single urbanized area greater than 50,000. Rural counties provide food, fiber, timber and mineral products for California industry and residents, as well as recreation for urban residents and tourists. In order to provide a direct opportunity for the small counties to remain informed, have a voice, and become involved with changing statewide transportation policies and programs, a task force was formed in 1988 as a joint effort between the California Transportation Commission and the rural counties. Twenty-eight rural county Regional Transportation Planning Agencies or Local Transportation Commissions are represented on the Rural Counties Task Force (RCTF).

The Task Force is an informal organization with no budget or staff that generally meets every other month. A member of the California Transportation Commission (CTC) usually acts as liaison to the Task Force, and CTC and Caltrans staff typically attend these meetings to explain and discuss changing statewide transportation issues that may be of concern to the rural counties.

With the implementation of SB 45 (1997), demands on transportation systems and the responsibilities of small local planning agencies have expanded significantly. More effort is now being applied in the areas of project specific planning, programming and monitoring. Under SB 45, the value and purpose of the task force is expanding as well.

The following are recent challenges and accomplishments that have involved the Task Force members during 2000, as well as items that will continue to involve the Task Force into the year 2001.

Local Road Rehabilitation and Maintenance Funding

In 1998, the Commission opened the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to local road rehabilitation projects, because of need, even though the projects did not fit well with the intent of the STIP. (The STIP has traditionally been a capital improvement, capacity enhancement program.) Many local rehabilitation projects were added to the STIP, with many of them in rural counties. The California Transportation Commission loosened the local road rehabilitation definition in the STIP Guidelines to make local road rehabilitation an easier fit for the STIP funds. The rural counties have, with their limited resources, tried to quantify and address the need for local road rehabilitation funding. During 1999 and most of 2000, the Task Force, along with a coalition of representatives from Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) and Councils of Government's (COG's) and cities and counties, submitted input to the Governor and the Legislature encouraging that funds be provided directly, each year, to cities and counties as a reliable annual subvention specifically for local road rehabilitation outside of the STIP. As a result, the Governor's Transportation Initiative) provided a one-time \$400 million for FY2000/01 and an estimated \$120 million in each of the subsequent five years.

These funds must be shared by all cities and counties statewide. Unfortunately, the rural city and county apportionments from this total will meet less than 5% of rural county needs. Based on the RCTF local road rehabilitation funding needs survey that was conducted in February, 1999, the one-time cost to bring the State's rural county roads back up to "good" (not excellent) condition is approximately \$1 billion. To keep these roads in good condition from that point forward it will cost more than \$50 million per year. The RCTF has consistently reaffirmed that one of its top priorities is to have the State help to address the need for additional local road rehabilitation funding and, if successful, to reduce the amount of local road rehabilitation being funded by the STIP.

Allocation Formulas For Highways, Street and Road Funding

The CTC's 1999 Annual Report to the Legislature states that "some rural counties have suffered a real dollar decline in maintenance funding since 1990 even after the transportation blueprint's gasoline tax increases of early 1990 due to reduced federal timber receipts..." (and other factors). The Commission recommends the Legislature, in dealing with the funding shortfall for road maintenance statewide, "consider the funding situation for rural road programs, giving rural counties a larger share in keeping with their maintained road mileage, higher unit costs, and lack of access to alternative funding." The Rural Counties Task Force did not take the opportunity provided by the Governor's Initiative to stress this need, preferring, instead, to focus attention on the fact that all cities and counties simply need more direct and reliable funding for local road rehabilitation and maintenance.

Additional Funding for Capacity, Operational and Safety improvements

Substantial additional funding for capital improvements such as that which could have been provided through SCA 3 or ACA 24 is still needed in rural areas if rural counties are going to maintain safe and adequate transportation systems according to the long-range needs identified in their Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs). All rural counties in the State are required to develop RTPs. These RTPs must identify "financially realistic" as well as "financially constrained" lists of needed transportation projects. More and more rural counties are finding out that they will not be able to obtain the "realistic" funding needed over the life of their 20-year plans to fund the projects that are needed to maintain safe and adequate countywide transportation systems. More and more rural counties are therefore sharing with their urban counterparts the need for some substantial new source of transportation funding. Most rural counties cannot expect to fund sales tax measures by the currently required 2/3 majority vote.

Rural Planning Funds

The Rural Counties Task Force worked with Caltrans to secure a doubling of Rural Planning funds within the Caltrans Budget. Starting with the Governor's Budget for 2000-01 the \$2 million set aside for Rural Planning funds has been increased to \$4 million retroactive back to July 1, 2000. The primary need and use for these additional funds is to improve the Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs) and transportation planning processes in rural counties. One direct result should be better transportation project prioritization, selection and definition which, in turn, should lead to better project delivery.

Project Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds

Rural counties have indicated that they support increasing the amount of STIP funds that can be used for Project Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) from 2% to 5%. The Rural counties will seek special legislation during the next legislative session to increase the PPM allowance to at least 5%. The rural counties have disadvantages that aren't seen in the urban areas. They don't have staff or consultants available to deal with many of the federal requirements and Caltrans procedures that must be addressed in the delivery of State or Federally funded projects. For example, the recently enacted Federal Disadvantaged Business Enterprise requirements call for data collection, annual hearings and a monitoring process by each city and county. Rural counties need the ability to program 5% of STIP, or more, in order to improve their ability to deliver more State and Federally funded transportation projects.

Streamlining Federal Requirements

In addition to the need for more rural planning and PPM funds, numerous problems and potential solutions have been discussed concerning the subjects of streamlining federal requirements and improving Caltrans local assistance in rural areas. One way to directly streamline Federal requirements in rural counties is to remove them by exchanging Federal transportation funds for State-only funds. The CTC is already providing this exchange of funds through its RSTP and TEA Programs. The rural counties appreciate and will continue to use these opportunities as well as the new opportunity recently provided by the CTC to exchange Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAG) funds for State-only funds where applicable. Rural counties also appreciate the CTC policy that provides State-only funds through the STIP for local road projects costing less than \$750,000. The Rural Counties Task Force is encouraging expanding opportunities to exchange federal funds for State funds in rural areas to the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation (HBRR) program, the Hazard Elimination and Safety (HES) program, and to other programs where possible. The benefit of exchanging federal funds for State funds is that the rural counties no longer have to deal with many of the federal regulations such as, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises programs, or Federal environmental requirements that severely hinder them. For example rural counties are familiar with managing California's environmental laws (CEQA) but they typically do not have the extra staff resources or experience necessary to deal with the more complex federal environmental laws (NEPA).

Improving Caltrans Local Assistance

For the past two years the State has increased Caltrans budget to expand the staffing available for local assistance. The rural counties have reported experiencing a direct benefit from this action. Caltrans Local Assistance is practicing direct "outreach" with its new personnel which is improving rural counties abilities to implement Caltrans procedures and to meet Federal requirements where applicable. Additional PPM and State-only funding is also needed because Caltrans Local Assistance can only go so far with their outreach efforts. For example, they can help explain the new Federal DBE requirements or how to process a NEPA environmental document, they cannot, however, send staff into a small city or county to actually implement either.

Rural County Representative on the CTC

Rural counties need a representative on the CTC. The RCTF is aware that two positions are available on the CTC (in January 2001 there will be four). The RCTF has encouraged the Governor to maintain at least one member on the CTC who is from one of the State's smaller rural counties. At least two rural county representatives have applied for the available positions. A rural county representative on the CTC will further help efforts to ensure communication and cooperation between the CTC, the Governor's administration, Caltrans, and the State's 26 rural counties.

Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)

SB 45 mandates that 75% of the STIP funds be programmed and expended for regional improvements nominated by the regional planning agencies through their Regional Transportation Improvement Plans (RTIPs), and 25% of STIP funding be programmed and expended for interregional improvements nominated by Caltrans through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Projects nominated for funding in the ITIP should be consistent with the statewide Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), just as regional improvements are expected to be consistent with Regional Transportation Plans. Caltrans has sought partnerships with rural counties to form joint IIP and RIP funding partnerships for "focus" and "emphasis" highways identified within the ITSP. Many valuable State-regional highway projects are becoming funded in this way. Several rural counties have identified State highway projects that are regional priorities in their RTPs and RTIPs, but that do not qualify for "focus" or "emphasis" status in the State's ITSP. Caltrans, the CTC, and the BTH Agency have been working with the RCTF to clarify and assure that some level of State share IIP funding will be available to those rural counties willing to program substantial regional (RIP) shares (and in some cases other local funds) to projects on non-focus/emphasis State highways.

State Level Committees

In addition to those issues and objectives listed above, various RCTF members are also providing a rural counties' perspective to the following efforts. Many of these efforts involve participation on committees established by Caltrans.

- Clarify and Improve Overall Work Program Process
- Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan
- Senate Bill 45 Project Monitoring/Reporting Data Base
- Local Assistance "Enhanced Training and Outreach"
- Caltrans, City, county, Federal Highway Administration Coordinating Group
- Streamlining Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures and Guidelines Manuals
- Regional Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement/Transportation Enhancement Activities Project Delivery
- Regional Transportation Plan/Regional Transportation Improvement Program Rural County Performance Measures
- State Planning Guidelines Development Quality Assurance Team
- Next TEA Federal Reauthorization
- California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS)
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)
- Federal Transit Administration Program for Elderly and disabled Individuals (FTA 5310) And Welfare to Work Advisory Committee
- Garvee Bonds Guidelines Committee
- Civil Rights Review Title 9