



**California  
Transportation  
Commission**

**1999 ANNUAL REPORT  
TO  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE**

**Volume II**

**1999 Accomplishments/Activities**



**Pursuant to Government Code, Sections 14535-14536**

**Adopted December 8, 1999**

## **COMMISSION MEMBERS**

**Edward B. Sylvester, Chairman**

**Dana W. Reed, Vice Chairman**

**Robert J. Abernethy**

**Jeremiah F. Hallisey**

**James W. Kellogg**

**Roger A. Kozberg**

**Esteban E. Torres**

**Robert A. Wolf**

## **COMMISSION STAFF**

**Robert I. Remen, Executive Director**

**Pete Hathaway, Chief Deputy Director**

**David Brewer, Deputy Director for Highways & Programming**

**Robert Chung, Deputy Director for Transit**

**Stephen Maller, Deputy Director for Program Delivery**

**Charles C. Oldham, Deputy Director for Policy & Planning**

**Rick Gumz, Program Manager**

**Kathie Jacobs, Proposition 116 Program Analyst**

**Patti Lowry, Executive Assistant**

**Bruce Cox, Clerical Support**

**Carol Peterson, Clerical Support**

**Terri Rosnow, Clerical Support**

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**1999 ANNUAL REPORT  
TO  
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE**

**Volume II**

**1999 Accomplishments/Activities**

**Adopted  
December 8, 1999**

**STATUTORY REQUIREMENT  
FOR  
ANNUAL REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE**

(GOVERNMENT CODE)

CHAPTER 3. ANNUAL REPORT

**Commission's Annual Report**

*Amended: Statutes of 1984, Chapter 95 (SB 283)*

14535. The commission shall adopt and submit to the Legislature, by December 15 of each year, an annual report summarizing the commission's prior-year decisions in allocating transportation capital outlay appropriations, and identifying timely and relevant transportation issues facing the State of California.

**Contents of Annual Report**

*Amended: Statutes of 1997, Chapter 622 (SB 45)*

14536. (a) The annual report shall include an explanation and summary of major policies and decisions adopted by the commission during the previously completed state and federal fiscal year, with an explanation of any changes in policy associated with the performance of its duties and responsibilities over the past year.

(b) The annual report may also include a discussion of any significant upcoming transportation issues anticipated to be of concern to the public and the Legislature.

**CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE**

**CONTENTS**

**VOLUME I – 2000 ISSUES**

- A. Funding Constraints on Transportation Investment
- B. Delivery Constraints on Transportation Investment
- C. Outlook for 2000 STIP
- D. June 2000 Deadline for Proposition 116 Program
- E. Pursuing TEA-21 Implementation
- F. Trade and Commerce
- G. California Transportation Planning Directions Statement
- H. Role of the State in Transit
- I. High-Speed and Very High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail
- J. Native American Tribal Transportation Issues
- K. Solutions to Seismic Safety of San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge
- L. Rural County Issues

**VOLUME II – 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES**

- A. SR 8 Report on Ten-Year Transportation Funding Needs
- B. 1999 Legislation
- C. 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Augmentation
- D. 2000 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Fund Estimate
- E. State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Guidelines
- F. Project Study Report (PSR) Guidelines
- G. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Guidelines
- H. Local Assistance Guidelines
- I. Delegations to Caltrans
- J. FY99-00 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program
- K. FY99-00 Federal Elderly & Disabled Transit Program
- L. Implementation of AB 2782 (Keeley, 1998), NCRA
- M. Implementation of SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998), LA-Pasadena Blue Line
- N. Strengthening State, Tribal and Regional Government Transportation Partnerships
- O. Annual Report – Proposition 116 Programs Implementation
- P. Annual Report – Seismic Retrofit Program
- Q. Annual Report – Real Estate Development Issues
- R. Annual Report – Rural Counties Task Force
- S. Annual Report – Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics
- T. Rail Transit in the South San Francisco Bay Area

## VOLUME II

### 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

#### Table of Contents

II-A. SR 8 Report on Ten-Year Transportation Funding Needs.....	1
II-B. 1999 Legislation.....	11
II-C. 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program Augmentation.....	23
II-D. 2000 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate .....	31
II-E. State Transportation Improvement Program Guidelines .....	35
II-F. Project Study Report Guidelines .....	41
II-G. Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines.....	45
II-H. Local Assistance Guidelines .....	47
II-I. Delegations to Caltrans .....	49
II-J. FY99-00 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program.....	51
II-K. FY99-00 Federal Elderly & Disabled Transit Program .....	55
II-L. Implementation of AB 2782 (Keeley, 1998), NCRA.....	57
II-M. Implementation of SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998), LA-Pasadena Blue Line .....	61
II-N. Strengthening State, Tribal and Regional Government Transportation Partnerships .....	65
II-O. Annual Report – Proposition 116 Programs Implementation	
1. Overview of Proposition 116.....	69
2. Rail Program .....	71
3. Competitive Bicycle Program .....	93
4. Non-Urban County Transit Program .....	99
5. Waterborne Ferry Program.....	103
6. Museum of Railroad Technology.....	107
II-P. Annual Report – Seismic Retrofit Program.....	109
II-Q. Annual Report – Real Estate Development Issues.....	111
II-R. Annual Report – Rural Counties Task Force .....	117
II-S. Annual Report – Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics .....	121
II-T. Rail Transit in the South San Francisco Bay Area.....	127

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **A. SR 8 Report on Ten-Year Transportation Funding Needs**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### A. SR 8 (Burton) Report on Ten-Year Transportation Funding Needs

#### Background

Senate Resolution 8 (Burton, 1999) requested the California Transportation Commission, in consultation with the California Department of Transportation and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, to produce and submit to the Senate Transportation Committee and the Senate President pro Tempore, by May 10, 1999, a "10-year needs assessment of the state's transportation system", including, but not limited to:

- unfunded rehabilitation and operations needs for state highways, local streets and roads, the state's intercity rail programs, and urban, commuter, and regional transit systems, including ferry systems, over the next 10 years;
- high-priority projects expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be advanced for completion as expeditiously as possible.

SR 8 also asked Caltrans and the Commission to address workload and staffing requirements for Caltrans to perform project support work to complete the projects contained in the assessment; and to identify measures to ensure timely and cost-effective project delivery.

#### Overview of Effort in Response to SR 8

The effort undertaken by the Commission, in response to SR 8, was ambitious and collaborative. It involved questionnaires and individual inquiries to all cities and counties, transit operators, regional transportation planning agencies, seaports and commercial airports. It also involved extensive analysis by Caltrans relative to state highways, with emphasis on rehabilitation, operational improvements, and interregional highway and passenger rail improvements. In all, some 1,000 transportation agencies were contacted, with most providing input for the study.

With only four months available for completing this effort, the SR 8 report was, of necessity, limited to a compilation of surveys. It did not offer a tightly integrated, prioritized, planning exercise. The various surveys were not normalized for compatibility. Rather, responses from all respondents were assembled and summarized, with detailed responses presented in an appendix.

The SR 8 report demonstrates a substantial unfunded need to reinvest in California's existing transportation systems. It also demonstrates the substantial funding requirements to expand those systems, both through lower cost operational improvements and more costly capacity increases. These costs, while substantial, reflect the challenges of aging transportation systems and "catching up" with three decades of population growth that out-paced highway and roadway capacity increases by a factor of two, and growth in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) that out-paced population by a factor of three:

	<u>Total Population</u> (% incr.)	<u>VMT-State hwy</u> (% incr.)	<u>lane miles-hwys.</u> (% incr.)	<u>VMT-hwy/roads</u> (% incr.)	<u>lane miles-hwy/roads</u> (% incr.)
1967	19.2m ( 0%)	51 billion ( 0%)	39,480 ( 0%)	100 billion ( 0%)	*297,128 ( 0%)
1977	22.4m (17%)	81 billion ( 58%)	47,305 (20%)	149 billion ( 48%)	*328,573 ( *11%)
1987	27.7m (45%)	122 billion (139%)	48,257 (22%)	228 billion (127%)	345,257 ( *16%)
1997	32.7m (70%)	153 billion (200%)	49,527 (25%)	285 billion (184%)	<b>381,827 ( *29%)</b>

\*-estimated

The report offered four points of caution grounded in its methodology:

1. **Gaps and Duplications:** investment needs identified in this report reflected responses by individual transportation agencies. Some agencies did not respond at all to a particular questionnaire, and some only reported in some categories. Moreover, by their very nature, individual sections of this report carried some duplication. For example, Caltrans and select regional agencies may each have cited the same improvements for a given interregional route; Caltrans, regional agencies and port authorities may each have cited the same ground access improvements; regional agencies and transit operators may have cited the same transit system improvements or expansions. However, the potential for such duplication was limited, given the overall scope and magnitude of the survey. Nevertheless, given the differences in data and the potential for some overlap, the report cautioned against simply adding up individual cost estimates to reach a precise “bottom-line” conclusion as to the total need for transportation investments over the next ten years. In effect, the report represents a series of snap shots, rather than a well-crafted mosaic.
2. **Order of Magnitude:** there were clear differences among respondents in how they track and report data. Responses varied based on different assumptions used by different jurisdictions. However, statewide “highs” and “lows” seemed to balance and cancel out against each other. Accordingly, the Commission was reasonably confident of the orders of magnitude, in part because of cross-checks against local, regional and statewide sources.
3. **Priorities and Trade-Offs:** time and discretion did not permit a centralized reassessment by the Commission of priorities assigned by respondents. However, the Commission noted the appropriateness of the Legislature to consider funding needs for reinvestment in existing transportation systems as a priority over system expansion. Yet, the reported noted that the sheer magnitude of rehabilitation needs, when compared against the magnitude of funding increases under consideration by the Legislature, would likely require trade-offs between rehabilitation, operational improvements and system expansion.
4. **Implementation Processes:** the report focused on expenditure needs, as defined by transportation agencies, but did not consider nor recommend how new funds should be programmed or expended. The Legislature could choose to rely on the STIP process to distribute new funds among transportation agencies. Or it could establish a series of categorical programs, specifying ground rules and responsible agencies, weighing the priorities of such programs by way of distributing projected new revenues among them. Or, it could pursue a combination of the above. Again, as with prioritizing projects and considering trade-offs, the SR 8 report did not address options for implementing new funds.

## **Summary of Findings**

### **Regional Agencies: Highways, Arterials, Urban/Commuter Rail, Bike/Pedestrian Projects**

38 of California's 48 regional transportation agencies, representing 98% of the state's population, responded to a questionnaire asking for high-priority projects expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits within ten years, excluding projects believed to be fundable in that time frame. Regions were asked to identify projects in seven categories, four of which--state highway expansion, local arterial road expansion, urban and commuter rail expansion and bicycle and pedestrian projects--were the principal source of data for this section of the report. Responses to the other 3 categories--new technology and system management, seaports and airports--were used largely to cross-check responses from other agencies, including transit operators, cities and counties, port authorities, and Caltrans.

Unlike other respondents, regional agencies tended to take widely varying approaches to their responses. All were asked to rely on their long-range regional transportation plans as the basis for identifying projects and costs over and above those fundable from existing revenue sources over the next 10 years. In fact, some regions were much more aggressive than others--particularly in the category of Local Arterial Road Expansion--some specifying projects totally outside their regional plans, while others limited themselves to accelerating projects from the outer 10 years of their plans into the first 10 years. Thus, because of these greatly varying approaches, caution should be taken in simply adding up the dollar needs expressed by regional agencies to derive a statewide expression of need in any given category. At the same time, the **project-specific listings of high priority projects from each regional agency offer an invaluable source of projects that could be funded** given an increase of statewide and/or regional revenue.

With that caveat, regional agencies identified **\$19.6 billion** in high priority state highway expansion projects (excluding another \$3.8 billion in projects also identified by Caltrans as high priority for interregional routes); \$16 billion of these projects are found in 5 urban regions: Los Angeles, the 9-county Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Bernardino, San Diego and Riverside. Regions also identified **\$13.1 billion** in high priority local arterial expansion projects, with great variances among responses. Regions also identified **\$15.4 billion** for high priority urban rail and busway expansion projects: \$3.7 billion in the Bay Area, \$9.2 billion in Los Angeles, and \$0.8 billion each in Orange County, Sacramento and, San Diego; they identified another **\$4.0 billion** for high priority commuter rail expansion in the Bay Area, Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, and Ventura. Regions also identified **\$1.3 billion** in high priority bicycle and pedestrian projects, with \$0.5 billion in the MTC region and \$0.4 billion in Los Angeles, San Diego and the 4-county Sacramento area regional transportation planning agency.

**Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation** - 57 of California's 58 counties and some 400 of its 471 cities responded to a questionnaire regarding pavement rehabilitation. They provided data on the size of local systems, annual expenditures for pavement rehabilitation, the adequacy or shortfall of annual expenditures for maintaining current levels of repair, and the estimated one-time cost of retiring any backlog necessary to bring local pavement up to good condition. This combined one-time backlog, extrapolated to all cities and counties, totaled **\$10.5 billion**; the annual combined increase in backlog, at current funding levels, totals **\$400 million**.

**Local Streets and Roads: Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement** - Caltrans provided a survey of off-highway system bridge replacement needs projected over the next 10 years. The total estimated cost of critical replacement was \$1.1 billion and the total estimated cost of critical rehabilitation was \$1.2 billion. Another \$0.4 billion was estimated as the remaining cost for seismic retrofitting local bridges. Against this combined ten-year need of \$2.7 billion, Caltrans estimated \$2.1 billion in federal BR funds and local match, leaving a **\$0.6 billion** shortfall.

**Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads** - The federal Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) submitted a 10-year list of projected road improvements on or leading to Native American reservations and rancherias in California that will not be funded under BIA's \$5 million annual Road Program. The unfunded list totals over **\$0.2 billion**. The Commission also surveyed more than 100 tribes recognized by the federal government in order to identify any added projects not on the BIA list. Only a few responded to that survey, reporting less than **\$10 million** in added projects.

**State Highways: Interregional Improvements - Non-Urbanized Areas** - Drawing from its Interregional Strategic Plan, Caltrans identified \$7.8 billion projects on interregional highways outside of urban areas on routes identified as Focus Routes, Other High Emphasis Routes, and Other Priority Routes. Those routes represent the major through-routes and backbone of state's highway network, serving as primary links between the state's major economic centers and geographic regions, for agriculture and for recreation, and linking rural and smaller urban centers. Interregional projects either would help to complete these corridors or address recurrent congestion and safety problems. Of the total \$7.8 billion in projects, \$4.8 billion were on Focus Routes, \$1.9 billion on Other High Emphasis Routes, and \$1.1 billion on Other Priority Routes. Assuming an estimated \$2 billion in additional Interregional programming available through the STIP process in the coming decade (i.e., the 2000, 2002, 2004 and 2006 STIPs), approximately **\$5.8 billion** of the identified interregional projects would go unfunded, although that figure could be further diminished to the extent that regional agencies contribute regional or other local funds.

**State Highways: Interregional Improvements - Urbanized Areas** - Interregional highways connecting California's cities also extend into and through them. For example, several interstate highways in Southern California reach into downtown Los Angeles, connecting to airports and seaports. Route 99 passes through or adjacent to nine urban areas up and down the Central Valley. Route 101 along the coast passes through the Bay Area, serving as an important part of the local freeway network there. A statewide highway network depends on investments on routes in and through urban areas. As part of the interregional network, Caltrans identified three principal "gateway" areas--in Los Angeles, the Bay Area, and along the Mexican border--for international and national trade and commerce and intermodal goods movements connectivity and transfer. Added capacity, operational improvements, and new technology strategies were all cited as necessary to address current and projected traffic growth on urban and gateway routes. Nevertheless, **Caltrans did not provide cost estimates for unfunded high priority interregional improvements within urban areas**. These were viewed by Caltrans, as, in part, the funding responsibilities of regional agencies and, as such, were encouraged to be considered within on-going regional and interregional planning processes.

**State Highways: Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation** - Caltrans reported \$12.5 billion in State highway rehabilitation needs for roadways, long-life pavement, structures, and roadside—in comparison to \$7.0 billion for these activities in its 1998 ten-year Highway Rehabilitation (SHOPP) Plan. The increases were due primarily to added focus on structures and longer-life pavement. As the 1998 STIP Fund Estimate set aside funding for rehabilitation consistent with the ten-year Plan, a shortfall of **\$5.5 billion** remains to fully fund the newly-reported work within ten years. Caltrans also reported \$0.7 billion needed for maintenance and other facilities.

	<u>Roadway Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Long-Life Pavement</u>	<u>Structure Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Roadside Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Total</u>
10-Yr Needs	\$3.5 billion	\$5.5 billion	\$3.0 billion	\$0.5 billion	\$12.5 billion
<u>10-Yr SHOPP</u>	\$3.3 billion	\$1.1 billion	\$2.2 billion	\$0.4 billion	<u>\$ 7.0 billion</u>
<b>UNFUNDED</b>					<b>\$ 5.5 billion</b>

**State Highways: Safety Improvements** - Caltrans identified \$1.8 billion in highway safety improvements for the next ten years, well above the \$0.7 billion in the current 10-Year SHOPP Plan, leaving the **\$1.1 billion** shortfall. The increase was due to recalculations of accident costs for fatalities and injuries (despite decreases in the fatal-plus-injury crash rate since 1992.) Safety projects included intersection modifications, curve corrections, median barriers, rumble strips and widenings on 2- and 3-lane roads, and removal or shielding of obstructions along State highways.

**State Highways: Recurrent Problems** - Caltrans identified some 1,000 locations on the State Highway System facing repeated closures due to drainage or flooding problems, erosion, rockfall or slope movement. Recurrent closures disrupt movement of people, goods and service and pose costly and repeated repair work. Caltrans estimated that some \$0.8 billion have been spent on repeated or short-term repairs. More permanent solutions to these problems range from upgrading highway features to re-design on new alignments. Caltrans identified **\$4.3 billion** in projects to cure most of these reoccurring problems; however, as none are included in the ten-year Highway Rehabilitation Program, this work is essentially unfunded.

**State Highways: Operational Improvements** - Caltrans identified \$3.1 billion in operational improvements on State highways, well above the \$0.4 billion included in the most recent ten-year SHOPP Plan, leaving a shortfall of **\$2.7 billion**. This increase resulted from more operational improvements (\$1.5 billion) and initial funding of Intelligent Transportation System deployment (\$1.2 billion) through Caltrans' Traffic Operations Program (TOPS). (Caltrans assumed \$7.2 billion in operational improvements would be funded over ten years through the STIP.)

**California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS)** – The mission of CAATS--a non-profit partnership of public and private entities and academia--is to deploy advanced transportation technologies for efficient, seamless transportation systems to improve safety and mobility, reduce congestion, minimize environmental impacts and reduce life-cycle costs, while developing and expanding California's intelligent transportation industry. CAATS identified **\$2 billion** in public investments to improve operational systems, accommodate 40% of anticipated traffic growth, and add to safety and reliability of individual trips. CAATS estimated this investment would provide a foundation for an \$11 billion market in California over ten

years. Work was focused on traffic management and operations, traveler information, public transit, goods movement enhancements, electronic payment, and vehicle safety and control.

**State Highways: Storm Drainage Retrofit** - Caltrans identified a cost of **\$6 billion** for drainage system improvements and water treatment facilities to ensure compliance with federal and state water quality standards from state highway storm drain runoff. (Caltrans also reported that local agencies could face a considerably larger cost for runoff from local streets, roads and other sources.) Caltrans must comply with a 1994 U.S. Court decision for runoff mitigation in Los Angeles, a 1997 consent decree for a similar complaint in San Diego, renewal of seven expiring storm water discharge permits in California's larger urban areas and expansion of permit requirements into smaller urban and possibly rural areas.

**State Highways: Retrofit Soundwalls** - Caltrans reported a cost of **\$625 million** to fund "retrofit soundwalls", with 75% located in Los Angeles County alone. "Retrofit soundwalls" are located on highways or freeways where traffic noise levels exceed federal standards, the highway or freeway was built before 1974, and adjacent development pre-dates construction. Currently, 58 retrofit soundwall projects remain unfunded from the 1989 Transportation Blueprint's program, at a cost of \$205 million. Since 1989, Caltrans identified 158 more locations that meet the "retrofit soundwall" criteria, due to higher noise levels from increased traffic or surface deterioration, at an added cost of \$420 million.

**Airports: Ground Access Improvements** - California can expect a doubling or even tripling of air passenger and air cargo traffic over the next 20 years. In conjunction with the 1999 update of Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan, some 34 general aviation airports identified 65 ground access improvements at a total cost of nearly **\$0.3 billion**. In addition, Commission staff surveyed 17 large commercial airports; of these, Los Angeles International reported the greatest ground access need of **\$2 billion**; 8 others report ground access needs of **\$0.6 billion** (including \$222 million for Oakland, \$160 million for San Diego and \$150 million for Palmdale.) All of these projects are unfunded, other than through regional and interregional shares of the STIP.

**Seaports: Ground Access Improvements** - California's commercial deep water ports are critical to California's economy, accounting for \$138 billion in imports, \$447.5 billion in exports and supporting 1.5 million in California jobs during 1997. Of California's eleven commercial seaports, seven identified projected ground access needs over the next ten years of **\$569 million** in road and rail improvements near the ports, including \$305 million around the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, \$90 million around the Port of San Diego, \$81 million around the Port of San Francisco and \$80 million around the Port of Oakland. Moreover, the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles identified another **\$43 million** for specified State highway improvements, with yet another **\$455 million** needed to improve the Long Beach Freeway (I-710). Essentially all of these projects are unfunded, other than through regional and interregional shares of the STIP.

**North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) Transportation Infrastructure** - Caltrans reported \$254 million in remaining highway improvements in San Diego (\$174 million) and Imperial (\$80 million) Counties, needed to serve increased commercial vehicle traffic over the

next ten years resulting from NAFTA. Moreover, Caltrans identified \$135 million of investments in the San Diego and Arizona Eastern Railway from Calexico to the Port of San Diego. The combined total of **\$389 million** is essentially unfunded, other than through regional and interregional shares of the STIP and other local funds.

**Los Angeles Basin Rail Consolidation and Grade Separation Needs** - Following construction of the Alameda Corridor, which will provide a grade-separated freight rail corridor from the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach to downtown Los Angeles, attention must now shift to move freight beyond the congested Los Angeles basin. Extension of such a corridor would provide public benefits of improved safety and air quality and private sector economic benefits resulting from increased shipping speed and reliability. Unlike the initial Alameda Corridor, which entails a single, consolidated rail corridor, rail traffic east of downtown Los Angeles operates in three corridors. A study by SCAG of grade-separating all three corridors through Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties estimated costs of **\$2.3 billion**, divided into \$2.1 billion for the two Los Angeles-San Bernardino rail corridors (including a key rail-to-rail grade separation in Colton) and \$0.2 million for grade crossings in Orange County. These costs could be greatly reduced if agreement could be reached on a single corridor consolidation.

**Short Line Railroads** - Eight of California’s 30 short line railroads reported **\$225 million** of unfunded ten-year needs for storm damage, railbed, trestle and other work. Short line railroads contend with inherited deferred maintenance, storm damage, existing track condition, varying market strength and financial base. Two public short lines, the Northwestern Pacific and San Diego & Arizona Eastern, face challenging futures, with 100 miles of track closed by storm damage, deferred maintenance, marginal markets, and \$130 million of unfunded needs to reopen.

**Intercity Passenger Rail Service** - Caltrans identified \$3.4 billion in expenditures to maintain and enhance intercity passenger rail service on three existing service routes (San Diegan, San Joaquin, and Capitol Corridors) and another \$0.8 billion for new service on six more routes (Coast, Monterey, Redding, Reno, Las Vegas, and Coachella Valley). These expenditures would help implement Caltrans’ Intercity Rail Program Vision, tripling rail passenger miles over the next decade, so rail can achieve a 5% modal share of intercity and regional commute travel by making rail travel more competitive with the automobile. Caltrans’ Vision depends on major funding for more daily trains, improved on-time performance, enhanced reliability, reduced running times, and more efficient service. Projects and increased expenditures include:

	<u>existing routes</u>	<u>new routes</u>
\$2.4 billion - track and signals	\$1,900 billion	\$381 million
\$1.1 billion - operations	\$ 952 million	\$173 million
\$0.5 billion - rolling stock	\$ 336 million	\$169 million
\$0.1 billion - station improvements	\$ 127 million	\$ 15 million
\$0.1 billion - maintenance facilities	\$ 25 million	\$ 20 million
<u>\$0.1 billion - grade X-ng imprvmnts</u>	<u>\$ 91 million</u>	
<hr/>		
\$4.2 billion - TOTAL (\$3.1 billion - capital projects; \$1.1 billion - increased operations)		

Reliance on existing revenues would preclude most of these improvements. Through the coming decade, the STIP process could provide \$200-400 million for Intercity Rail projects, leaving a shortfall of **at least \$2.7 billion**. The entire **\$1.1 billion** in increased operational costs must

come from the Public Transportation Account (PTA) which has a projected \$50 million deficit over the next 4 years. Moreover, the **\$0.5 billion** need for increased rolling stock is ineligible for State Highway Account funds, and thus depend on the oversubscribed PTA Account.

**Bus and Rail Transit: Operating Shortfall** - 270 public transit operators were surveyed for three levels of service: 1) maintaining existing levels of service for ten years; 2) enhancing service to meet current unmet demand; 3) expanding service to achieve 50% growth in ridership. While only 63 operators responded to the survey (including the 12 largest operators, 14 of the 18 mid-sized operators, and 37 smaller operators), they provide 85% of California's transit service. existing service - the cost of maintaining existing service for ten years was reported at \$6.6 billion for rail and \$17 billion for bus, with an estimated **\$0.7 billion** shortfall in State operating support. enhanced service - the ten-year added cost of enhanced service was projected at \$1 billion for rail and some \$3 billion for bus with an estimated **\$1.6 billion** shortfall in State operating support. expanded service - the ten-year added cost for expanded service was projected at another \$1.3 billion for rail and \$3.5 billion for bus, with an estimated **\$1.5 billion** shortfall in State funding.

**Bus and Rail Transit: Rolling Stock** – respondents identified a projected ten-year need for bus and rail rolling stock of \$4.3 billion to maintain existing levels of service, another \$1.2 billion to provide enhanced service in response to existing unserved demand, and yet another \$1.7 billion to expand current service by 50%. In all, operators projected shortfalls in State funding for rolling stock of **\$0.7 billion**, **\$0.6 billion**, and **\$1.1 billion** for existing, enhanced and expanded service.

**Bus and Rail Transit: Capital Improvements** – respondents reported ten-year shortfalls of **\$0.8 billion to \$2.1 billion** for existing through expanded service for various capital improvements including: maintenance facilities and equipment (up to \$0.6 billion), rail station improvements (up to \$0.6 billion), alternative fuel conversion (up to \$0.1 billion), and power and signaling systems (up to \$0.9 billion). Rail operators also report rail extensions totaling up to \$10.4 billion for expanded service, with projected shortfalls of up to **\$4.1 billion**.

**Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Operations** - Maintaining existing levels of ADA operations by public transit operators are projected to cost \$0.6 billion over 10 years, with State funds expected to provide \$0.2 billion of that amount, leaving an estimated shortfall in State funding of just under **\$0.1 billion**. Enhanced and expanded levels of ADA operations over 10 years are projected to carry added costs of \$0.2 billion and \$0.4 billion combined, with estimated shortfalls in State funding of **\$26 million** for enhanced service and another **\$114 million** for expanded service. The aggregate shortfall in State funds for all three levels of service is identified as \$0.2 billion. (As noted, any shortfalls in non-State funds were not reported in this survey.)

**Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Capital Improvements** - Existing levels of ADA service were reported as needing \$176 million in capital investment over ten years, with a shortfall in projected State funding of **\$24 million**. Enhanced and expanded levels of ADA operations would require \$57 million and \$56 million in capital investments, respectively, with shortfalls in

State funds of **\$29 million** and **\$9 million**. The aggregate shortfall in State funds came to \$62 million.

**Elderly and Disabled Paratransit Non-Profit Providers** - Based on historic trends and projected growth in elderly and disabled population, the report estimated ten-year capital needs of \$0.3 billion for 4,900 paratransit vehicles and related computer and communications equipment, with some 2,800 vehicles likely funded through the federal Elderly and Disabled Transit Program, leaving a shortfall of **\$0.1 billion**.

**SUMMARY OF FINDINGS OF 10-YEAR FUNDING NEEDS**

	<u>UNFUNDED</u>
Regional Agencies: Highways, Arterials, Rail, Bicycle and Pedestrian .....	\$53.6 billion
Highways.....	\$19.6 billion
Arterials.....	\$13.1 billion
Urban and Commuter Rail .....	\$19.6 billion
Bicycle and Pedestrian .....	\$1.3 billion
Local Streets and Roads: Pavement Rehabilitation .....	\$10.5 billion
Local Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement .....	\$ 0.6 billion
Native American Reservation Roads and Access Roads .....	\$ 0.2 billion
State Highways: Interregional Improvements in Rural Areas.....	\$ 5.8 billion
State Highways: Interregional Improvements in Urban Areas .....	unspecified
State Highways: Bridge and Highway Rehabilitation .....	\$ 5.5 billion
State Highways: Safety Improvements .....	\$ 1.1 billion
State Highways: Recurrent Problems.....	\$ 4.3 billion
State Highways: Operational Improvements.....	\$ 2.7 billion
California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems (CAATS) .....	\$ 2.0 billion
State Highways: Storm Drainage Retrofit.....	\$ 6.0 billion
State Highways: Retrofit Soundwalls .....	\$ 0.6 billion
Airports: Ground Access Improvements.....	\$ 2.9 billion
Seaports: Ground Access Improvements .....	\$ 1.1 billion
North American Free Trade Agreement Transportation Infrastructure .....	\$ 0.4 billion
Los Angeles Basin Rail Consolidation and Grade Separation Needs.....	\$ 2.3 billion
Short Line Railroads .....	\$ 0.2 billion
Intercity Passenger Rail Service.....	\$ 4.3 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Operating Shortfall (3 levels of service).....	\$0.7 - 3.8 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Rolling Stock (3 levels of service).....	\$0.7 - 2.4 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: Capital Improvements (3 levels of service) .....	\$1.0 - 6.2 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Operations (3 levels of service).....	\$0.1 - 0.2 billion
Bus and Rail Transit: ADA Capital Improvements (3 levels of service).....	<\$0.1 - <0.1 billion
Elderly and Disabled Paratransit Non-Profit Providers .....	\$ 0.1 billion

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **B. 1999 Legislation**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### B. 1999 Legislation

The Commission's main legislative focus in 1999 was on bills addressing California's acute transportation funding needs and reforms to expedite the design and construction of programmed projects. New Commission responsibilities resulting from legislation approved in 1999, and the final status of the bills tracked by the Commission are summarized below.

#### New Commission Responsibilities Resulting from 1999 Legislation

##### Inclusion of a Freight Rail Element in the State Rail Plan (AB 74, Strom-Martin)

Requires Caltrans to add a rail freight element to the 10-year State Rail Plan biennially for submission to the Legislature, the Governor, the Public Utilities Commission, and the California Transportation Commission. The plan shall be submitted to the Commission on or before October 1 of each odd-numbered year for its advice and consent, and to the Legislature, the Governor, and the Public Utilities Commission by the following March 1. The plan shall consist of a passenger rail element and a freight rail element. Existing law requires Caltrans to prepare a 10-year rail passenger program.

##### Pre-allocation Expenditures by Local Entities on STIP Projects (AB 872, Alquist)

Authorizes a regional or local entity to expend its own funds for any component of a transportation project within its jurisdiction that is included in the current fiscal year of the STIP and for which the Commission has not made an allocation. The amount expended would be authorized to be reimbursed by the state, subject to annual appropriation by the Legislature, if: (1) the Commission allocates funds and Caltrans executes a fund transfer agreement for the project during the same fiscal year as when the regional or local expenditure was made; (2) expenditures made by the regional or local entity are eligible for reimbursement in accordance with state and federal laws and procedures; and (3) the regional or local entity complies with all legal requirements for the project.

##### Project Delivery Reforms (AB 1012, Torlakson)

States that it is the intent of the Legislature to expedite the use of the excessively large cash balance in the State Highway Account and to direct the California Transportation Commission and Caltrans to accomplish the tasks necessary to put these taxpayer funds to work at the earliest possible time on needed transportation improvements. AB 1012 establishes Caltrans project delivery teams, a Caltrans Management Information systems advisory group, funding for project support work on projects not in the STIP, a reimbursable work sub-account, State Highway Account loan program, project study report waiver process, and requires local agencies to use certain federal funds within 3 years. Specifically, AB 1012 includes the following responsibilities for the Commission:

**Serve on Advisory Committee on Upgrading Caltrans' Data Automation System** -

Designates the Commission as a member of an advisory committee that will recommend ways to upgrade and modernize the data automation system within Caltrans to enable tracking the status of specific transportation projects and monitoring the use of federal transportation funds, as well as other features that foster efficiencies in the delivery of transportation projects. Not later than February 1, 2001, the committee shall submit the final plan to the Legislature.

**Establish Procedures for Advance Project Development Element of STIP** -

It is the intent of the Legislature to facilitate project development work on needed transportation projects by adding an advance project development element to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), beginning with the 2000 STIP. The Commission shall designate in the fund estimate for each STIP an amount to be available for the advance project development element, which shall be not more than 25 percent of the programmable resources estimated to be available for the first and second years following the period of the STIP. The department, transportation planning agencies, and county transportation commissions may nominate projects to the Commission for inclusion in the advance project development element through submission of the regional transportation improvement program and the interregional transportation improvement program. The Commission may develop guidelines to implement this section.

Not later than September 1, 2002, the Commission shall report to the Governor and the Legislature on the impact of adding the advance project development element to the STIP. The report shall evaluate whether the element has proven effective in producing a steady, deliverable stream of projects and whether addition of the element has resulted in any detrimental effects on the state's transportation system.

**Establish Procedures for Loans from State Highway Account Cash Balance** -

The Commission may advance unallocated funds in the State Highway Account (SHA), in the form of loans, to transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions, transit districts, city and county governments, and local transportation authorities for the advancement of projects eligible under the STIP that are included within an adopted regional transportation plan.

When considering loan applications, the Commission shall ensure that:

- Projects comply with environmental impact report certification requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, and the project proponents have prepared an environmental impact report under that act.
- Total project costs are greater than \$10 million. In counties with populations of less than 500,000 persons, the Commission may waive this requirement if 50 percent of a county's share for the current county share period is equal to or greater than the amount to be loaned.

- A fiscal assessment of the applicant's ability to repay a loan has been made by an independent fiscal consultant selected by the applicant from a pre-qualified list of fiscal consultants approved jointly by Caltrans and the Commission. Caltrans shall make a recommendation to the Commission based on the analysis conducted by the independent fiscal consultant regarding each specific loan. Costs incurred for this assessment shall be paid by the applicant.
- The maximum amount of funds that may be loaned to any single county in any single loan for one or more projects shall be not more than 50 percent of the most recent regional-choice funding allocation made pursuant to Section 188.8 of the Streets and Highways Code, in an amount of not more than \$100 million.
- If a default occurs, 100 percent repayment of the principal and interest, plus a penalty charge of 5 percent of the outstanding principal, shall be required in the form of a reduction in the county's next allocation of county share funding. If that reduction is not sufficient to pay the principal, interest, and penalty due, further reduction shall be made from subsequent allocations until the outstanding amount is paid in full. Additionally, the defaulting county shall be ineligible for regional choice fund programming until the outstanding amount is paid in full.
- The total amount of outstanding loans approved under this program may not exceed \$500 million at any one time.
- Interest rates on loans shall be set at the rate paid on money in the Pooled Money Investment Account during the period of time that the money is loaned.

The Commission shall approve or disapprove all loan applications not more than 30 days after the application is submitted, and when approved, the money for the loan shall be transmitted by Caltrans directly to the applicant not later than 30 days after approval. Caltrans shall require in writing that projects funded under this section be under construction not later than six months after the date the loan funds are transmitted, if not, the loan shall be paid back, with interest, not later than 10 days after Caltrans notifies the recipient that repayment is due.

The loan program created under this section shall automatically commence on a first-come, first-served basis whenever the SHA cash balance exceeds \$400 million and shall be suspended whenever the Commission determines that moneys in the SHA will reach a cash balance of less than \$400 million, except that the Commission may terminate the program at any time it deems termination to be the most prudent course of action.

For purposes of informing potential loan applicants of the availability of funds to be loaned, the Commission shall adopt, on January 15 and July 15 of each year, projections regarding the availability of funds to be loaned and the period of time during which funds will be available. Caltrans shall report to the Commission prior to each projection regarding the cash-flow needs of the STIP for the following six months.

Not later than 120 days from the effective date of the act (January 27, 2000), the Commission, in consultation with Caltrans and interested parties, shall propose guidelines and procedures to implement and expedite the loan program.

Not later than 180 days from the effective date of the act (March 31, 2000), the Commission, after a public hearing, shall adopt a uniform loan agreement package, including guidelines and implementation procedures, and shall begin operation of the loan program. The Commission shall make available to all interested parties the loan agreement associated with every specific loan made under this section for a period of 30 days prior to approval of those loans by the Commission.

The Commission shall recommend to the Governor and the Legislature any suggested changes in the dollar limits required and any proposed solutions to any other issues relating to the program's impact on expediting delivery of transportation projects.

**Adoption of Expedited Project Study Report Process** - In order to assist in the delivery of high-priority transportation projects, as determined by the Commission, or advance project development work, the Commission shall adopt, not later than January 30, 2000, guidelines for an expedited process through which projects may comply with the requirement that a project study report be prepared in order for a project to be considered for inclusion in the STIP. The expedited compliance process may be initiated whenever the Commission finds it to be in the public interest. The guidelines shall require that any request for use of the expedited compliance process be approved by the county agency responsible for submission of projects for inclusion in the STIP and that each county approval be reviewed and approved by Caltrans.

**Timely Use of Federal Transportation Funds** - Caltrans shall monitor and prepare a quarterly report for submission to the Commission regarding the use of federal transportation funds, including Regional Surface Transportation Program funds and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program funds, to assure full and timely use. Caltrans shall provide written notice to implementing agencies when there is one year remaining within the three-year apportionment period. Within six months of the date of notification, the implementing agency shall provide to Caltrans a plan to obligate funds that includes a list of projects and milestones. If the implementing agency has not met the milestones established in the implementation plan, prior to the end of the three-year apportionment period, the Commission shall redirect those funds for use on other transportation projects in the state.

**Continuation and Reporting - Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program**  
**(SB 117, Murray)**

Deletes a 10-year limitation on funding the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Demonstration Program Fund, renames the fund the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program Fund. Requires the Commission, on or before December 31 of each year, to provide the Assembly and Senate budget committees with a list of projects funded from the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program during the previous fiscal year and a copy of the most recent criteria for allocating grants pursuant to this section.

**Establish Federal Highway Grant Anticipation Note Financing Program** **(SB 928, Burton)**

Authorizes the Commission, in cooperation with the State Treasurer, Caltrans and regional transportation planning agencies, to issue federal highway grant anticipation notes (GARVEE bonds) to accelerate funding for eligible transportation projects.

The Commission may select and designate eligible projects to be funded from the proceeds of notes, if financing of the project from the proceeds of notes has been approved by the Federal Highway Administration and the regional transportation planning agency, and the project has completed environmental clearance and project design.

On or before April 1 of each year, the Commission, in conjunction with the Treasurer's office, shall prepare an annual analysis of the bonding capacity of federal transportation funds deposited in the State Highway Account.

The Commission, in cooperation with Caltrans and regional transportation planning agencies, shall establish guidelines for eligibility for funding allocations under this program. The guidelines shall be nondiscriminatory and shall be designed to allow as many counties as possible to establish eligibility for funding allocations under this program, regardless of the population or geographic location of the county.

The Treasurer may not authorize the issuance of notes if the annual repayment obligations of all outstanding notes in any fiscal year would exceed 30 percent of the total amount of federal transportation funds deposited in the SHA for any consecutive 12-month period within the preceding 24 months.

All funds allocated to a project under this program, including cost overruns and financing costs, shall be counted against the STIP county share for the county in which the project is located.

In order to provide security for repayment of the notes, the Commission shall adopt a resolution dedicating and pledging any future receipts of federal transportation funds received by the state to the payment of principal, interest and premium on the notes, for as long as any notes remain outstanding.

Upon taking the actions authorized under this program, the Commission may request the Treasurer to issue notes to provide funds for the eligible projects.

On or before April 1 of each year, the commission shall prepare and submit an annual report regarding the preceding calendar year to the Governor and the Legislature. Each report shall compile and detail the total amount of outstanding debt issued pursuant to this chapter and the projects funded by that outstanding debt.

**Final Status of Bills - Bills Signed By The Governor**

**AB 71 (Cunneen) - High-Occupancy Vehicle Lanes, CHAPTER 330, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, whenever it authorizes or permits exclusive or preferential use of highway lanes or highway access ramps for high-occupancy vehicles to also extend the use of those lanes or ramps to inherently low-emission vehicles, as defined in federal regulations, as specified regardless of vehicle occupancy or ownership, that display the special license plates specified.

**AB 74 (Strom-Martin) - Transportation Funding, CHAPTER 373, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Transportation Commission, to develop a State Freight Rail Plan, and to submit that plan biennially, as specified, to the Legislature, the Governor, the Public Utilities Commission, and the California Transportation Commission.

**AB 168 (Ackerman) - Funding Exchange, CHAPTER 278, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the Orange County Transportation Authority to exchange funds apportioned and paid to the authority for certain state funds appropriated to the Department of Transportation.

**AB 283 (Longville) - Property Acquisition, CHAPTER 546, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY Authorizes the Department of Transportation, following the adoption of a resolution by a County Board of Supervisors to acquire property intended for state highway purposes by eminent domain, to condemn the same property or interest described in the resolution.

**AB 405 (Knox) - Highways: Construction: Funding, CHAPTER 378, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the Department of Transportation to conduct a pilot project for design-sequencing contracts to design and construct no more than 6 transportation projects, selected by the Director of Transportation; requires the department to prepare a yearly status report on contracting methods, procedures, costs, and delivery schedules and, with completion of all projects, to contract with a 3rd party for a report for submittal to the Legislature.

**AB 872 (Alquist) - Local Project Funds, CHAPTER 572, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes a regional or local entity to expend its own funds to complete any transportation project within its jurisdiction that is included in the current fiscal year's state transportation improvement program and for which the California Transportation Commission has not made an allocation.

**AB 1012 (Torlakson) - Project Delivery: Funding, CHAPTER 783, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Would establish Caltrans project delivery teams, Caltrans Management Information systems advisory group, funding for project support work on projects not in the STIP, a reimbursable work sub-account, State Highway Account loan program, project study report waiver process, and requires local agencies to use certain federal funds within 3 years.

**AB 1318 (Bates) - Federal-Aid Highway Funds, CHAPTER 628, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Prohibits using specified toll funds and private entity expenditures as a credit toward the nonfederal share for any project that is not within the county or counties in which the toll facility is located, unless the Department of Transportation determines that there is no project within that county or counties for which the credit may be used.

**AB 1371 (Granlund) - Transactions and Use Tax, CHAPTER 110, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the Town of Yucca Valley, subject to the approval of 2/3 of the voters voting on the issue at an election, to levy a transactions and use tax pursuant to the Transactions and Use Tax Law at a rate of 0.25%, or a multiple thereof, not to exceed 1%, for purposes of funding transportation and park repair, replacement, construction, and reconstruction.

**AB 1383 (Thompson) – EE&M Program, CHAPTER 607, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation to extend the completion date to 6/30/2002, for specified Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Projects.

**AJR 6 (Briggs) - Federal Funds, RESOLUTION CHAPTER 58, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Memorializes the President and the Congress to use the framework established under the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century when allocating federal transportation funds to California.

**SB 63 (Solis) - HOV Lanes: Occupancy Level, CHAPTER 168, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation to establish preferential use lanes on the San Bernardino Freeway, and to set the minimum occupancy level on those lanes at 2 persons, including the driver; requires the completion of an operational study concerning the use of those lanes and a report to the Legislature.

**SB 117 (Murray) - Environmental Enhancement, CHAPTER 739, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Deletes a 10-year limitation on funding the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Demonstration Program Fund, renames the fund the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program Fund. Requires Caltrans to provide the Assembly and Senate Committees on Budget & Fiscal Review with a list of projects funded from the program on or before December 31.

**SB 252 (Kelley) – I-15 Highway Tolls, CHAPTER 481, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Changes the level of service in specified High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes under the jurisdiction of the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) on I-15.

**SB 364 (Perata) - State-Local Partnership Program, CHAPTER 47, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Extends, notwithstanding the expiration of the State-Local Transportation Partnership Program, the authority to let construction contracts for certain projects under the program until June 30, 2000, and would require that funds appropriated for those projects be expended not later than June 30, 2003.

**SB 557 (Peace) - Relinquishment of Route 54, CHAPTER 99, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the California Transportation Commission to relinquish to the City of El Cajon a specified portion of State Highway Route 54, upon terms and conditions the Commission finds to be in the best interests of the state. Authorizes the commission to relinquish State Highway Route 144 to the City of Santa Barbara, upon determination by the Commission that it is in the best interests of the state to do so, and if the city has agreed to accept the relinquishment.

**SB 565 (Costa) – Caltrans Fresno Office, CHAPTER 951, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Director of General Services to undertake a study regarding the purchase, exchange, acquisition of real property and the construction of facilities in the County of Fresno for use by the Department of Transportation and other state agencies; requires the Director to report to the Legislature on or before December 31, 2000.

**SB 798 (Burton) - Relinquishment: Route 101, CHAPTER 559, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Relinquishes to the City and County of San Francisco a specified portion of State Highway Route 101 and specifies that Caltrans retains jurisdiction over another portion of Route 101; requires the city to utilize any proceeds from the excess right-of-way for the Octavia Street Project to pay the city's share of the costs of that project.

**SB 804 (Perata) - Rail Feeder Bus Service, CHAPTER NO.458, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Specifies situations when Caltrans is not authorized to provide funding to Amtrak for the purpose of entering into a contract with a motor carrier of passengers for the intercity transportation of passengers over regular routes.

**SB 886 (McPherson) - Passenger Rail Service, CHAPTER 103, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the Transportation Agency of Monterey County to be a party to any contract entered into, as specified, between the Caltrans and the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for passenger rail service along the San Francisco-San Jose-Monterey corridor.

**SB 928 (Burton) - Transportation Financing - CHAPTER 862, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Would authorize the Commission, in cooperation with the State Treasurer, Caltrans and regional transportation planning agencies, to issue federal highway grant anticipation notes (GARVEE bonds) to accelerate funding for eligible transportation projects, and to establish guidelines for project eligibility and the implementation of GARVEE bond financing allocations.

**SB 1221 (Schiff) - Historic Property Fund, CHAPTER 759, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Establishes the Historic Property Maintenance Fund in the Treasury and requires that all revenue collected by Caltrans from rental receipts from a federally designated historic property, or from property listed as a state historical resource, that is owned by Caltrans and located in the I-710 right-of-way corridor in South Pasadena be deposited into the fund.

**SB 1286 (Mountjoy) - Airports Grant Repayment, CHAPTER 105, STATUTES OF 1999**

SUMMARY: Makes technical changes in the State Aeronautic Act which specifies if an airport for which payments have been made from the Aeronautics Account ceases to be open to the general public for more than one year, the public entity to which those payments were made is required to pay to the state, for deposit in the account, an amount computed by Caltrans, as prescribed.

**SR 8 (Burton) - 10-Year Needs Assessment, PASSED 2/19/1999**

SUMMARY: Requests that the Commission produce and submit to the Senate by May 10, 1999, a 10-year needs assessment of the state transportation system's (1) Unfunded rehabilitation, maintenance, and operations needs and (2) High-priority projects, that are expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state, which should be moved forward for completion as expeditiously as possible.

**Bills Vetoed By The Governor**

**AB 23 (Lowenthal) - Highways: State Highway Route 710, VETOED 09/27/1999.**

SUMMARY: Revises the designation and description of State Highway Route 710, upon completion of the specified transfers, to include the transferred property; requires the City of Long Beach to transfer a specified portion of a highway, specified portions of certain streets, and certain bridges to state ownership, as prescribed, and would require the Department of Transportation to generally keep the transferred property safe as a continuation of State Highway Route 710.

**AB 73 (Hertzberg) - Highways: Safety Roadside Rest Areas, VETOED 10/09/1999**

SUMMARY: Authorizes the Department of Transportation to operate and maintain 6 safety roadside rest areas as a joint economic development demonstration project where there is a public need for a rest area, and the joint economic development proposal will result in an economic savings to the state.

**AB 308 (Longville) - Transportation: Funding, VETOED 10/10/1999**

SUMMARY: Permits Regional Transportation Plans to include an assessment of transit rehabilitation and transit capital needs in the policy element and requires the Commission to report the identified needs in the Annual Report to the Legislature.

**AB 597 (Longville) - Highways: Design, VETOED 09/28/1999**

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation to establish an internal working group to assist in developing flexible statewide highway design standards for federal-aid highways that are not on the National Highway System, and for all other state highways and highway projects.

**AB 1155 (Torlakson) – Transportation Sales Tax: Expenditure Plans, VETOED 10/10/1999**

SUMMARY: Specifies that SCA 3, if approved by the Legislature, is to appear on the November 7, 2000 ballot, and would establish deadlines and public hearing requirements for a county's adoption of a transportation expenditure plan of revenues generated from the approval of SCA 3.

**SB 1043 (Murray) - Transportation: High-Speed Rail Authority, VETOED 7/28/99**

SUMMARY: Requires the plan for the construction and operation of a high-speed train network for the state to be submitted to the Legislature for submission to the voters, and would provide for the termination of the Authority by June 30, 2001.

**Bills Remaining in the Legislature**

**AB 102 (Wildman) - Highways: Soundwalls**

STATUS: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: Requires expenditures for retrofitting the soundwalls on the Department of Transportation's 5/3/1989 Retrofit Soundwall List, to be funded prior to making funds available for the State Transportation Improvement Program. Provides that soundwall retrofit projects on the department's priority list would not be funded as regional soundwall projects.

**AB 357 (Calderon) - Grade Separation Projects**

STATUS: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: Requires the Public Utilities Commission to report, on or before March 30, 2000, to the Legislature and the California Transportation Commission on the sufficiency of the proposed specified amount for annual allocation for grade separation projects, as specified.

**AB 581 (Firebaugh) - Transportation: Southern California Governments**

STATUS: Senate Inactive File

SUMMARY: Requires the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) to evaluate the growth of traffic congestion on the Long Beach Corridor, and to assess the impact of that congestion on the movement of goods from the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles on persons using the Corridor to commute to work, and on traffic in local communities, and to provide alternative solutions to mitigate the congestion.

**AB 779 (Torlakson) - Land Use Planning: Transit Facilities**

STATUS: Senate Governmental Organization Committee

SUMMARY: Authorizes metropolitan planning organizations and transportation planning agencies to establish transportation planning revolving funds, under specified conditions, to make loans to cities and counties to enable them to prepare specific land use plans linking land use and transportation.

**AB 1425 (Runner) - Transportation Improvement Program Funding**

STATUS: Senate Appropriations Committee

SUMMARY: Exempts from the state's allocation formulas the remainder of certain federal funds for highways and transportation apportioned to the state, except for specified funds that have been programmed under the 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program.

**AB 1612 (Florez) - Local Streets and Highways: Reconstruction**

STATUS: Senate Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: Provides that the Controller shall allocate funds appropriated by the Legislature in the annual Budget Act from the State Highway Account in the State Transportation Fund to counties (50%) and to cities (50%) for street and highway reconstruction, and repair of storm damage to local streets and highways.

**SB 14 (Rainey) - Highways: Exclusive-Use & Preferential-Use**

STATUS: Senate Unfinished Business File

SUMMARY: Requires each transportation planning agency or county transportation commission, that contains, or proposes to contain, in its jurisdiction, preferential or exclusive use lanes, to prepare an HOV Master Plan that will be available to the public and all interested parties; makes related changes, to the extent this bill would require local governmental entities that contain HOV lanes in their jurisdictions to prepare an HOV Master Plan.

**SB 170 (Rainey) - Bridges: Trespassing Punishment**

STATUS: Assembly Appropriations Committee

SUMMARY: Enacts provisions making it a misdemeanor for any person to climb upon any railing, cable, suspender rope, tower, or superstructure of a toll bridge or other bridge property with regard to toll bridges under the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation Commission; requires a court to impose as a condition of that probation that the person perform not less than 40 hours and not more than 160 hours of community service in the county in which the violation occurred.

**SB 315 (Burton) - Transportation Infrastructure Bonds**

STATUS: To Conference Committee

SUMMARY: Enacts the Transportation Infrastructure Bond Act of 2000, which would authorize, for purposes of financing activities relating to the repair and upgrading of transportation infrastructure, the issuance, pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law, of \$8 billion of bonds.

**SB 1084 (Mountjoy) - Airport Land Use Commissions**

STATUS: Assembly Transportation Committee

SUMMARY: Requires the Department of Transportation to reimburse each airport land use commission for the costs of undertaking project review activities; appropriates a specified amount to the Department from the Aeronautics Account; specifies that for the purposes of this bill, each airport land use commission shall be allocated a specified amount.

**SCA 3 (Burton) - County Transportation Sales and Use Taxes (As amended September 1, 1999)**

STATUS: Assembly Floor

SUMMARY: Would, for a period of 20 years, impose an additional state sales and use tax rate of 0.5% exclusively for the funding of transportation purposes in a county if that county has adopted a transportation expenditure plan on or before the date this measure is approved by the voters. This bill would require the county transportation expenditure plan to specify the requirements for amending that plan, and to designate a countywide agency to administer the plan and tax revenues. This measure would, in an otherwise qualified county in which a limited duration transactions and use tax for transportation funding or for general purposes is in effect on the date this measure is approved, impose the additional tax only when that tax is repealed or becomes inoperative.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **C. 1998 STIP Augmentation**



## **II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES**

### **C. 1998 STIP Augmentation**

In September 1998, the California Transportation Commission scheduled a special programming cycle to augment the 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This special cycle included a revised 1998 STIP Fund Estimate, a revision of the 1998 STIP Guidelines, the submittal of new programming proposals by regions and Caltrans, and adoption of the 1998 STIP Augmentation by the end of March 1999. The Commission took action to schedule this special cycle after consulting with other interested parties, including Caltrans and regional agencies. The enactment of the Federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) in June 1998 had removed uncertainties clouding the original 1998 STIP Fund Estimate and, furthermore, had authorized nearly \$1 billion more than the Fund Estimate had anticipated.

At its December 1998 meeting, the Commission decided, in response to a letter from Senator Betty Karnette, Chair of the Senate Transportation Committee, to delay the adoption of the revised Fund Estimate and Guidelines until January 1999. Senator Karnette requested the delay until after the submission of the Governor's Budget and the commencement of regular business by the new Legislature. At the Commission's January 14-15, 1999 meeting, the new Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Secretary, Maria Contreras-Sweet, added her support and that of Governor Davis, urging the Commission to proceed with the process to allow the programming of the new funds.

The 1998 STIP, adopted in June 1998, was the first STIP developed under SB 45 (1997). It is a six-year STIP, covering the period from Fiscal Year 1998-99 through FY 2003-04, serving as a transition from the seven-year STIPs of the past to the four-year STIPs of the future. The next regular STIP, the 2000 STIP, will be the first four-year STIP and will revisit the latter four years of the 1998 STIP, from FY 2000-01 through FY 2003-04. The next STIP to add new program years will be the 2002 STIP, also a four-year program, adding FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The 1998 STIP was also the first STIP to include and count Caltrans support costs.

Since the enactment of SB 45, the STIP has consisted of two broad programs, a regional program funded from 75% of new STIP funding and an interregional program funded from 25% of new STIP funding. The 75% program is further subdivided by formula into county shares. County shares are available solely for projects nominated by regions in their regional transportation improvement programs (RTIPs). Under SB 45, the California Transportation Commission must accept or reject each RTIP in its entirety. The Commission may reject an RTIP only if it finds that the RTIP is not consistent with the Commission's STIP Guidelines or is not a cost-effective expenditure of State funds.

SB 45 also permits any regional agency with a population of less than 1 million to request an advance against its future county share in order to fund a larger project. The Commission may make county share advances using funds freed up by reserves elsewhere. Any region may

propose to reserve all or a portion of its current share for future projects. A decision not to approve a requested advance does not require rejection of an RTIP.

The 25% interregional program is nominated by Caltrans in its Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Caltrans and regions may also propose to fund a project jointly, with shares from both the regional and interregional programs. At the request of the incoming Administration, the Commission agreed to delay the consideration of any proposals for the interregional program, including joint funding proposals, while continuing on schedule with augmentation for the regional program.

### **Revisions to 1998 STIP Fund Estimate**

The Commission adopted the Revised 1998 STIP Fund Estimate in January 1999, identifying \$1.689 billion in available programming capacity (including Caltrans support costs) for the six-year STIP period. This amount included \$149 million in unprogrammed balances from the original Fund Estimate, as well as \$1.540 billion in new funding. The Fund Estimate identified the following spread across the period (in millions of dollars):

<u>FY 99</u>	<u>FY 00</u>	<u>FY 01</u>	<u>FY 02</u>	<u>FY 03</u>	<u>FY 04</u>	<u>Total</u>
547	235	12	98	194	602	1,689

The Revised Fund Estimate was generally based on the same assumptions used in the development of the original 1998 STIP Fund Estimate. Aside from the previously unanticipated Federal revenues from TEA-21, the principal changes were the updating of State revenue balances and projections, the use of new cash expenditure assumptions based on historical rates for SHOPP, STIP, and local assistance projects, and the reduction in the reserve for economic uncertainties from \$200 million to \$100 million. The reduction in the reserve for economic uncertainties recognized the general reduction in funding uncertainty since the adoption of the original Fund Estimate.

The statutory distribution formulas were applied against the \$1.540 billion in new funding, yielding \$1.155 billion in additional county shares and \$385 million for the interregional share. Adding these new shares to prior unprogrammed balances and prior advances yielded \$1.394 billion in available county shares and \$267 million in available interregional share.

On the following page is a table of the county and interregional shares for the 1998 STIP Augmentation. The table indicates each of the adjustments reconciling the newly added share to the balance available for new programming. For each share, the available balance was determined by taking the added share and:

- Adding the prior unprogrammed balance (or deducting the prior advance);
- Adding the long-term reserve identified in the 1998 STIP (which had not been included in the prior unprogrammed balance);
- Deducting the TEA/RSTP transfer identified in the 1998 STIP (that is, undoing the 1998 STIP's transfer of TEA funds into the non-TEA balance, since TEA had since been removed from the STIP);



- Adding cost savings from grandfathered 1996 STIP projects (that is, amounts by which allocations were less than programmed); and
- For San Diego County, adding the amount of the grandfathered 1996 STIP rail reserve (which was not included in the Fund Estimate's count of prior committed projects).

The figures in the table do not include \$498.5 million in rail project programming in Los Angeles County that was subject to reprogramming in accordance with a June 2, 1998 memorandum of understanding between the Commission and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA). Unlike the San Diego rail reserve, this amount was included in the Fund Estimate's count of prior committed projects.

### **Revisions to 1998 STIP Guidelines**

The 1998 STIP Augmentation was generally developed under the same guidelines used for the original 1998 STIP (see the Commission's 1998 Annual Report, Volume II, pp. 4-8). In January 1999, however, the Commission adopted revisions to the guidelines to take into account the Augmentation's special circumstances and timing, to incorporate changes brought about by TEA-21, and to incorporate Commission policy changes based on experience acquired through the original adoption process.

The revisions included the following major policy changes:

- Separation of the TEA program from the STIP. The amended guidelines reflected the Commission's concurrent action to establish the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program outside the STIP and as a separate element in the Fund Estimate.
- Regional program project eligibility. The Commission expanded STIP eligibility to incorporate storm damage repair and to reiterate the eligibility of local system rehabilitation. This expansion and reiteration were made in response to the storm damage and rehabilitation needs identified in SB 1477 (1998), as approved by the Legislature, and to direction provided by Governor Wilson in his SB 1477 veto message.
- Cost flexibility for local projects. The amended guidelines permitted local agencies to shift funds between the two project development components (environmental and design) and to shift up to 20% of project development, right-of-way, or construction allocations between components. This change was intended to provide local projects with the same kind of flexibility applied to Caltrans projects.
- Federal high priority (demonstration) projects. The amended guidelines incorporated Commission policy that when TEA-21 demonstration funds supplant STIP regional, STIP interregional, or local funding, the funds supplanted will be in proportion to the original commitment from each funding source.
- Timely use of funds. The amended guidelines incorporated Commission policy that funds allocated to local agencies for construction or equipment acquisition must be encumbered by contract award within 12 months. This provision was intended to apply to local

projects the same policy that had been applied to Caltrans construction contracts since 1996.

### **Policies to Facilitate Local Street and Road Projects**

At its January 1999 meeting, the Commission also adopted a list of ten policies designed to facilitate the programming of local street and road rehabilitation projects in the STIP, pending a longer term funding solution for such projects. These policies were, in effect, an extension of the 1998 STIP Guidelines:

1. Ongoing eligibility. Restate Commission view that local rehabilitation projects are STIP-eligible on an on-going basis.
2. Project study reports. Simplify PSR requirements for local rehabilitation projects.
3. Threshold of eligibility. Underscore that the standard for local rehabilitation projects should be the Federal standard (5-year life rather than 10-year life).
4. Redress. Recognize that cities and counties that feel that they were excluded from consideration by regional agencies can so advise the Commission at STIP hearings.
5. Monitoring. Commit to tracking and monitoring programmed local rehabilitation projects through quarterly reports.
6. Analysis. Profile local rehabilitation projects in Staff Recommendation report prior to STIP adoption.
7. Delegate allocation vote. Delegate to Caltrans allocation vote for local pavement rehabilitation projects with stipulation that projects varying from STIP commitments would still be voted by the Commission.
8. \$300 million minimum target. For the 1998 STIP Augmentation, establish a target of at least \$300 million for local rehabilitation projects, program-wide, rather than region by region.
9. State cash. For the 1998 STIP Augmentation, of the \$700 million in State-cash-only programming capacity, target up to \$300 million for local rehabilitation projects.
10. Timing. Underscore that regions should aim local rehabilitation projects at the first two years of the 1998 STIP where \$800 million of the \$1.7 billion in new programming capacity and some \$300 million of nearly \$700 million in State cash capacity are found.

### **Regional Program Proposals and Adoption**

By February 1999, the regional transportation planning agencies had submitted their regional transportation improvement program (RTIP) proposals for the 1998 STIP Augmentation. At the request of the incoming Administration, the Commission proceeded with adoption of the Augmentation regional program in March, while deferring consideration of the interregional program, including joint regional/interregional funding proposals.

In their submittals, the regions identified \$509 million in new regional program funding, including \$32 million from regions proposing advances against future county shares. With \$1.34 billion identified in the Fund Estimate as available capacity for the 75% regional program, this left more than \$800 million (more than 60%) reserved for future programming.

By project category, the new projects included (in millions of dollars):

RTIP PROJECT CATEGORIES

<u>Project Type</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Planning, programming, and monitoring	\$3.5	0.7%
RSTP/CMAQ match	8.4	1.7%
Ridesharing/transportation demand mgmt	0.1	0.0%
State highways	256.4	50.4%
Rail projects	16.1	3.2%
Non-rail transit	10.4	2.0%
Grade separations	2.3	0.4%
Local road improvements	28.9	5.7%
Local road rehabilitation	<u>182.9</u>	<u>35.9%</u>
TOTAL PROJECTS	\$508.9	100.0%

In January, the Commission had established a target of \$300 million statewide for local street and road rehabilitation projects in the STIP augmentation. The regional proposals received in February from 30 counties identified \$183 million for local rehabilitation work out of the \$509 million programmed statewide. That represented 61% of the rehabilitation target reached with 38% of the available funds. Since March, STIP amendments have added another \$149 million in regional projects to the STIP, including another \$92 million in local rehabilitation work. Through the end of 1999, that represents 92% of the rehabilitation target reached with 49% of the available funds.

In addition to the funding listed above, ten counties proposed \$13.5 million in county share for specific joint project funding with the interregional program. Los Angeles also identified \$36.7 million of its unprogrammed regional share “to provide match to ITIP projects.” The statutes and the Commission’s STIP Guidelines permit joint funding where the joint funding proposal is included in both the RTIP and the Caltrans ITIP.

In adopting the 1998 STIP Augmentation in March, the Commission included all RTIP proposals, with the following exceptions and qualifications:

- Action on proposals for joint regional and interregional project funding was deferred pending submittal of the Caltrans interregional program.
- Three counties (Humboldt, Mendocino, and Tuolumne) proposed rail projects that do not qualify for State Highway Account funding, from either State or Federal sources. Though they might qualify for Public Transportation Account (PTA) funding, the Fund Estimate found that no PTA funding would be available for the current STIP. Funding proposed for

these projects was held in reserve until PTA becomes available or the funding is reprogrammed for other purposes.

### **Interregional Program**

In June 1999, Caltrans presented its interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP) for the STIP Augmentation, which the Commission amended into the STIP in July. Caltrans identified \$374 million in projects, including \$8 million in projects that had previously been amended into the STIP, a net addition of \$366 million. With an available balance of \$267 million in the Fund Estimate for the interregional program, adding all of this project funding required a \$99 million advance to the interregional program share.

Caltrans described its interregional program augmentation as including projects grouped into four themes:

- **Congestion Relief:** Projects that improve the State highway system by providing more capacity, reducing congestion, and improving safety. 22 projects for \$169 million.
- **Alternatives to Highway:** Intercity passenger rail projects that provide a transportation option. 20 projects for \$103 million.
- **Shelf:** Projects where only the support costs are requested now, so that they can be readied for construction during later STIP cycles when more funds are available. 25 projects for \$92 million.
- **Major mitigation:** Projects that keep the state's promises to mitigate impacts from projects and protect the natural resources of California. Two projects for \$10 million.

The amendment of this interregional program into the STIP also included \$40 million in county share funding, consistent with the proposals for joint funding included in the RTIPs for ten counties, including \$26 million from Los Angeles. These regional funds matched \$44 million in interregional program funding.

### **Status of County Share Advances**

SB 45 and the STIP Guidelines permit regions to request, and the Commission to approve, advances of future county shares to regions with a population of 1 million or less. The Commission may make an advance for a single larger project in each county. The Commission may make advances using funds freed up from long-term reserves in other county shares or from reserves in the interregional program.

In the original 1998 STIP, the Commission approved advances for projects in 7 counties. Five of these advances were retired either by the Augmentation's county share increase or by fund substitution:

- For Alpine, Amador, and Calaveras Counties, \$3.0 million advanced for the Angels Camp Bypass in Calaveras County was retired.

## Volume II-C, 1998 STIP Augmentation

- For Kern County, \$30.2 million advanced for the Route 58 Freeway in and near Bakersfield was retired.
- For Fresno County, \$17.6 million advanced for the Route 180 Freeway was retired.
- For Ventura County, \$15.0 million advanced to complete funding of the widening of Route 23 between Route 118 and Route 101 was retired.
- For Madera County, the original \$6.2 million advanced for the extension of the Route 41 Freeway northward to Avenue 12 was reduced to \$1.7 million. In its RTIP, Madera proposes to eliminate the advance by substituting Federal high priority (demonstration) funds.

The two other advances remained:

- For the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, the \$11.8 million advanced for improvements on Route 49 in and near Auburn was reduced to \$3.1 million.
- For Monterey County, the \$26.3 million advanced for the Prunedale Bypass was reduced to \$11.2 million.

The 1998 STIP Augmentation added three new county share advances and increased a fourth:

- For Fresno County, \$30.375 million was advanced for the \$37.961 million West Phase I and Hughes/West Diagonal project on and near Route 180 west of Route 99.
- For Kern County, \$1.099 million was advanced for a \$1.100 million project to repair storm damage and reconstruct Wheeler Ridge Road, a county road.
- For Glenn County, \$1.003 million was advanced for a \$1.392 million project to reconstruct Route 162 (Woods Street) in the City of Willows.
- For the Placer County Transportation Planning Agency, adding \$4.75 million county share funding for joint funding of right-of-way for the Lincoln Bypass required increasing the total advance for the Route 49 project to \$7.866 million.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **D. 2000 STIP Fund Estimate**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND ACTIVITIES

### D. 2000 STIP Fund Estimate

In August 1999, the Commission adopted the 2000 STIP Fund Estimate, which provided no change from the programming capacity identified in the January 1999 fund estimate for the 1998 STIP Augmentation. The 2000 STIP, scheduled for adoption in March 2000, will complete the transition from seven-year to four-year STIPs, one of the major changes made under the reforms of SB 45 (1997). The four years of the 2000 STIP are the same as the last four years of the six-year 1998 STIP, with no new program years added.

Subsequently, the enactment of AB 1012 (Torlaksen) called for an “advance project development element” to be added to the STIP, beginning with the 2000 STIP. Under the advance project development element (APDE), project development work may be programmed in the four years of the STIP utilizing capacity advanced from years 5 and 6, the first two years beyond the STIP period. AB 1012 specifically called for the STIP fund estimate to identify up to 25% of the estimated STIP capacity for years 5 and 6 as available for APDE work in the current STIP.

In September, after Legislative passage of AB 1012 but prior to its signature by the Governor, the Commission received reports from Caltrans and Commission staff on potential revisions to be made with enactment of AB 1012, including revenue and expenditure assumptions for years 5 and 6, FY 2004-05 and FY 2005-06. The Commission took final action to amend the Fund Estimate for the 2000 STIP Advance Project Development Element at its November 3-4 meeting.

The amendment makes \$375 million for the 2000 STIP Advance Project Development Element. That is 25% of \$1.5 billion, an amount estimated to be available for the STIP in FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06. This estimate assumes an increase for the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) of \$835 million beyond the amounts projected in the current Caltrans Ten-Year Rehabilitation Plan.

#### Base Fund Estimate

As compared with the Fund Estimate for the 1998 STIP Augmentation, adopted just 7 months earlier, the base 2000 STIP Fund Estimate (excluding the AB 1012 advance project development element):

- identified a deficit of \$524 million;
- identified “contingency resources” of \$1.672 billion, based on a projection of underspending from local assistance programs, primarily from the Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) program, under which Federal funds are allocated under State law directly to regional agencies; and
- devoted the contingency resources first to making up the deficit, with the remaining balance going to the SHOPP, leaving no new programming capacity for the STIP.

In summary form, the base Fund Estimate included the following:

	FY 2000/01	FY 2001/02	FY 2002/03	FY 2003/04	4 Year Total
Resources: State + Fed	5,310	5,055	4,837	4,637	19,839
Caltrans State operations	1,237	1,264	1,293	1,322	5,116
Local Assistance	976	978	995	1,005	3,953
SHOPP commitments	1,217	1,187	1,212	1,196	4,812
STIP commitments/reserves	2,008	1,762	1,457	1,256	6,482
Remainder (shortfall)	(126)	(136)	(120)	(141)	(524)
Contingency resources	671	367	338	296	1,672
Net Available	545	231	218	155	1,148

As compared with the January estimate for the 1998 STIP Augmentation, the change in estimated resources available was insignificant. The identified deficit was due primarily to three factors:

- an increase in the estimate for State operations, due primarily to a statewide increase in State salary rates;
- an increase in the cost of SHOPP commitments, due primarily to an increase in assumed inflation rates and an increase in estimated support costs for minor projects, for which project development costs have proven to be higher than typical for larger projects; and
- an increase in local assistance, due primarily to a new retrofit soundwall program proposed by Caltrans and the Administration (\$226 million over 6 years; \$170 million for the STIP period).

The \$1.672 billion in contingency resources represented a new approach to the fund estimate, unique to the circumstances of the 2000 STIP period. Unlike any fund estimate in the past, this approach makes funds that are available for one program available at the same time for an alternative use. It recognizes that large sums in state local assistance programs, primarily RSTP and CMAQ, have gone unspent and that this is not likely to change dramatically soon. In effect, the \$1.67 billion amounts to double-programming, or to an advance of unspent funds from the local assistance programs to the STIP and SHOPP.

During the past two years, local agencies have expended only about 40% of the \$600 million per year in RSTP and CMAQ funds made available to them under Federal and State law. The amount included in the fund estimate assumes that this rate will rise gradually over the STIP's 4 years to 45%, 50%, 55% and 60%.

Whenever local agencies fail to deliver projects to spend the Federal funds assigned to them, Caltrans has had to deliver and fund additional Federally-qualified projects from the SHOPP or STIP to avoid the loss of Federal spending authority that expires at the end of each Federal fiscal year. If the recent 40% rate of local delivery continues next year, Caltrans' capacity to absorb the additional Federal funds may be depleted. It is the intent of Caltrans and the Commission that the contingency reserve be used as a basis for more Caltrans engineering resources, to get more projects shelf-ready and to be able to continue using all Federal spending authority available to California.

### **AB 1012 Advance Project Development Element**

The enactment of AB 1012 (Chapter 783, Statutes of 1999) provided another approach to the development of additional shelf-ready projects, projects that can be ready to draw upon additional program funding capacity. AB 1012 requires that the fund estimate, beginning with the 2000 STIP, identify an amount for programming in the “advance project development element.” The amount is to be up to 25% of the amount estimated to be available for the STIP in years 5 and 6, the first two years beyond the four-year STIP period. The amount is to be available within the STIP’s four years to program for project development (environmental and design work) for projects that otherwise qualify for the STIP. The amount is subject to division between the STIP’s interregional program and the individual county shares according to the regular STIP formulas. In effect, the programming of projects through the project development element is an advance of future STIP capacity.

At its November 3-4 meeting, the first after the enactment of AB 1012, the Commission adopted an amendment of the 2000 STIP Fund Estimate identifying \$375 million (25% of \$1.5 billion) as the statewide amount for the 2000 STIP Advance Project Development Element. This estimate, together with a county share breakdown, was first presented for information and discussion at the Commission’s September 29-30 meeting. The estimate assumes that SHOPP programming in FY 2004/05 and FY 2005/06 will be increased by \$525 million in SHOPP capital outlay and another \$310 million in SHOPP support costs over the amounts identified in the current Caltrans Ten-Year Rehabilitation Plan. These figures and assumptions are subject to review at the time of the 2002 STIP Fund Estimate.

A full summary of the 2000 STIP Fund Estimate, including both the AB 1012 advance project development element and regular carryover balances and advances, is displayed on the following page.

**2000 FUND ESTIMATE SUMMARY**  
**Includes STIP Amendments and Allocations Through December 1999**  
(\$1,000's)

County	Share	Progr'd	Balance Unprogr'd	Balance Advanced	Proj Devel (AB1012)
Alameda	211,535	199,325	12,210	0	10,379
Alpine/Amador/Calaveras	23,472	19,764	3,708	0	1,702
Butte	27,237	10,257	16,980	0	2,001
Colusa	7,374	6,441	933	0	513
Contra Costa	119,602	111,982	7,620	0	6,466
Del Norte	6,556	5,579	977	0	490
El Dorado LTC	15,845	11,577	4,268	0	1,185
Fresno	91,290	121,665	0	30,375	6,827
Glenn	10,917	11,920	0	1,003	562
Humboldt	38,742	21,665	17,077	0	2,047
Imperial	46,306	33,364	12,942	0	3,180
Inyo	45,624	41,586	4,038	0	2,692
Kern	151,680	152,779	0	1,099	8,951
Kings	24,882	23,039	1,843	0	1,300
Lake	14,497	6,540	7,957	0	844
Lassen	24,004	22,687	1,317	0	1,235
Los Angeles	1,055,858	997,498	58,360	0	65,745
Madera	14,921	14,474	447	0	1,116
Marin	38,609	38,609	0	0	2,139
Mariposa	5,559	5,528	31	0	416
Mendocino	25,518	24,344	1,174	0	1,908
Merced	29,680	29,329	351	0	2,217
Modoc	13,169	10,071	3,098	0	678
Mono	39,147	39,047	100	0	1,973
Monterey	84,947	95,012	0	10,065	3,672
Napa	19,591	16,861	2,730	0	1,218
Nevada	13,849	13,247	602	0	1,036
Orange	279,740	220,486	59,254	0	17,886
Placer TPA	32,192	40,058	0	7,866	1,677
Plumas	13,473	10,117	3,356	0	769
Riverside	200,241	172,663	27,578	0	12,255
Sacramento	125,451	111,279	14,172	0	8,648
San Benito	9,675	8,976	699	0	613
San Bernardino	314,436	302,311	12,125	0	16,961
San Diego	377,200	303,549	73,651	0	20,624
San Francisco	74,742	53,848	20,894	0	5,588
San Joaquin	84,201	62,305	21,896	0	4,532
San Luis Obispo	74,862	71,430	3,432	0	3,688
San Mateo	86,306	63,425	22,881	0	5,649
Santa Barbara	77,606	77,414	192	0	4,345
Santa Clara	163,174	92,040	71,134	0	12,200
Santa Cruz	34,780	32,738	2,042	0	2,159
Shasta	42,304	35,182	7,122	0	2,176
Sierra	6,936	2,712	4,224	0	357
Siskiyou	26,802	26,802	0	0	1,518
Solano	41,624	41,624	0	0	3,112
Sonoma	69,680	56,160	13,520	0	3,761
Stanislaus	56,520	31,164	25,356	0	3,420
Sutter	11,639	8,471	3,168	0	771
Tahoe RPA	8,937	4,409	4,528	0	514
Tehama	17,537	9,637	7,900	0	1,077
Trinity	20,077	18,038	2,039	0	783
Tulare	80,186	36,455	43,731	0	4,248
Tuolumne	11,899	7,551	4,348	0	890
Ventura	107,536	102,391	5,145	0	6,202
Yolo	24,545	22,611	1,934	0	1,675
Yuba	8,824	5,918	2,906	0	660
<b>Statewide Regional</b>	<b>4,683,536</b>	<b>4,115,954</b>	<b>617,990</b>	<b>50,408</b>	<b>281,250</b>
<b>Interregional</b>	<b>1,478,436</b>	<b>1,537,664</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>59,228</b>	<b>93,750</b>
<b>Statewide Total</b>	<b>6,161,972</b>	<b>5,653,618</b>	<b>617,990</b>	<b>109,636</b>	<b>375,000</b>

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **E. STIP Guidelines**

## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### E. STIP Guidelines

On August 18, 1999, the Commission adopted permanent STIP Guidelines, as required by SB 45 (1997), to replace the interim guidelines that had been in place since the development of the 1998 STIP. These permanent guidelines build upon and incorporate most of the earlier guidelines (see the 1998 Annual Report, pp. II-4-8). The Commission adopted the original 1998 STIP guidelines on January 15, 1998, with STIP adoption due at the end of March 1998. This was in keeping with SB 45's call for interim guidelines to carry out legislative intent that the 1998 STIP conform with the requirements of SB 45 to the maximum extent feasible, taking into account the limited time allowed between the enactment of the bill and the adoption of the 1998 STIP.

The Commission amended the 1998 STIP Guidelines in January 1999 to cover the 1998 STIP Augmentation, adopted in March 1999. Meanwhile, in accordance with SB 45, Caltrans presented proposed permanent guidelines to the Commission on February 1, 1999. The Commission reviewed the guidelines with Caltrans and the regional agencies after the adoption of the STIP Augmentation, with public hearings held in Los Angeles on June 7 and in Sacramento on July 15.

The new permanent guidelines retain the following major provisions from the original 1998 STIP Guidelines:

- Project Study Reports. SB 45 requires that a project have a project study report (PSR) before being included in an RTIP or the ITIP. The STIP guidelines specify that this requirement applies to projects programmed for project development only as well as to projects proposed for right-of-way and construction. Amendments to the PSR guidelines later clarified the simplified and expedited procedures that apply to projects programmed only for project development (see Section II-F, PSR Guidelines). The STIP guidelines specifically exempt the programming of project planning, programming and monitoring and the STIP match for RSTP and CMAQ projects from the PSR requirement.
- Full funding of project components. SB 45 calls for programming by project components: environmental and permits, plans, specifications, and estimates (design), right-of-way, and construction. The guidelines permit a project to be programmed for some components without being programmed for construction, but require that any component programmed be fully funded.
- Project eligibility. SB 45 describes STIP projects as capital projects and otherwise defines project eligibility very broadly, particularly for the regional program. The guidelines clarify that capital projects include project development costs and could also include non-capital costs for transportation system management or transportation demand management projects where the regional agency finds the project to be a cost-effective substitute for capital expenditures. The reconstruction of local roads and transit facilities is permitted; maintenance is not. These provisions were expanded and reiterated in the January 1999 revisions to the guidelines described further below.

- Timely Use of Funds. SB 45 specifies that programmed funds are available for allocation only until the end of the fiscal year for which they are programmed. When allocated, they are available for expenditure for another two fiscal years. The legislation permits the Commission to extend each of these deadlines one time for up to 20 months if it finds that an unforeseen and extraordinary circumstance beyond the control of the responsible agency has occurred that justifies the extension. The guidelines specify that the timely use of funds provision does not apply to Caltrans support costs, which the Commission does not allocate, or to Caltrans right-of-way costs, which the Commission allocates annually on a lump sum basis rather than by project. For Caltrans projects, only construction costs are subject to the timely use of funds provision.
- Display of project descriptions and costs. The guidelines modify prior standards for displaying projects to meet the requirements of SB 45. These standards distinguish between Caltrans and non-Caltrans projects because of the difference between them in allocation procedures. Specifically, the guidelines call for project costs and program year to be provided for each of the four statutory components for non-Caltrans projects and six components for Caltrans projects. The basic components are (1) environmental studies and permits; (2) preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates; (3) right-of-way acquisition, and (4) construction. For Caltrans projects, right-of-way support and construction engineering must be identified separately, bringing the total to six components. For Caltrans projects, each component except right-of-way is to be programmed entirely in one year, even if expenditures occur over several years. (A recent amendment to the guidelines adds that Caltrans will also identify the fiscal year during which the draft environmental document is scheduled for circulation.) For non-Caltrans projects, each component may be spread across fiscal years.
- County shares and STIP amendments. The guidelines interpret various provisions of SB 45 regarding the counting of project costs and cost changes against county shares. Generally, SB 45 provides that the amount counted is the amount programmed or allocated rather than the amount actually and ultimately expended. Under the guidelines, the amount counted for non-Caltrans projects is simply the amount the Commission allocates. For Caltrans projects, the amount counted is the amount the Commission allocates for construction and the amount programmed for right-of-way and the support components. By statute, the count of right-of-way costs for Caltrans projects is changed only if the final estimate exceeds 120% of the programmed amount. The count of project development costs is changed only if it varies by 20% or more from the amount programmed. To be consistent with the legislation and to avoid the manipulation of county shares, the guidelines do not permit STIP amendments (1) to change Caltrans right-of-way costs, except in conjunction with the annual right-of-way plan; (2) to change Caltrans project development costs, except when the change is 20% or more; or (3) to change the programming of any funds after they are allocated. A fourth item relating to the timely use of funds was added in the permanent guidelines and is described below.

The permanent guidelines also retain the following major provisions, first introduced in the guideline amendments adopted in January 1999 for the 1998 STIP Augmentation:

- Separation of the TEA program from the STIP. The guidelines reflect the Commission’s action to establish the Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program outside the STIP and as a separate element in the Fund Estimate.
- Regional program project eligibility. The Commission expanded STIP eligibility to incorporate storm damage repair and to reiterate the eligibility of local system rehabilitation. This expansion and reiteration were made in response to the storm damage and rehabilitation needs identified in SB 1477 (1998), as approved by the Legislature, and to direction provided by Governor Wilson in his SB 1477 veto message.
- Cost flexibility for local projects. The guidelines permit local agencies to shift funds between the two project development components (environmental and design) and to shift up to 20% of project development, right-of-way, or construction allocations between components. This is intended to provide local projects with the same kind of flexibility applied to Caltrans projects.
- Federal high priority (demonstration) projects. The guidelines incorporate Commission policy that when TEA-21 demonstration funds supplant STIP regional, STIP interregional, or local funding, the funds supplanted will be in proportion to the original commitment from each funding source.
- Timely use of funds. The guidelines incorporate Commission policy that funds allocated to local agencies for construction or equipment acquisition must be encumbered by contract award within 12 months. This provision is intended to apply to local projects the same policy that has been applied to Caltrans construction contracts since 1996.

### **New Guideline Provisions**

The new STIP guidelines also include the following major policy changes:

- Programming transportation management systems projects. Under statute, these projects might be programmed in either the STIP (where they would come from a county’s share) or the SHOPP (where they would effectively be funded off the top on a statewide basis). The guidelines state that Caltrans may program transportation management systems (TMS) projects on State highways in the SHOPP where they are part of the region’s adopted strategy for addressing systemwide congestion. At the same time, the guidelines encourage regions to propose TMS projects for the STIP in their RTIPs “if timely programming through the SHOPP isn’t possible because of funding limitations in the SHOPP.” TMS projects are defined to include transportation management centers, including computer hardware and software, and connections between a transportation management center and either another center or various field elements, including traffic sensors, message signs, cameras, and ramp meters.
- Criteria for measuring performance and cost effectiveness. SB 45 explicitly amended the section of statute calling for STIP guidelines (Government Code Section 14530.1) to require that the guidelines include “objective criteria for measuring system performance and cost-effectiveness of candidate projects.” The permanent guidelines include a new section that calls for Caltrans and each region to evaluate the ITIP and each RTIP “for performance and cost-effectiveness at the

system or project level as appropriate.” Beginning with the 2002 STIP, Caltrans and each region are to submit to the Commission a report on the performance and cost-effectiveness of its ITIP or RTIP, which the Commission will consider in approving RTIPs or including ITIP projects in the STIP. Each evaluation report is to demonstrate the effectiveness of the ITIP or RTIP in meeting the goals, objectives, and standards in the regional transportation plan and the Caltrans Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP). Regions and Caltrans are responsible for determining the evaluation methodology to be used. The guidelines suggest various criteria that regions and Caltrans should consider, while leaving it to the regions to select the most applicable criteria.

- Reserves. The permanent guidelines generally delete the interim guidelines’ references to “reserves” and specifically delete the interim guidelines’ provisions for short-term and long-term reserves. All available fund balances are simply either programmed or unprogrammed. An unprogrammed balance is automatically retained in the interregional or county share, as the case may be, without requiring a special reserve status. Unprogrammed balances are not subject to loss through the timely use of funds requirements. On a statewide basis, the Commission may utilize unprogrammed balances to support advances of county shares or the interregional share.
- Timely use of funds and STIP amendments. The timely use of funds statutes, as described above, encourage the use of realistic schedules in programming and sanction delivery failure. However, the original 1998 STIP Guidelines allowed for the approval of STIP amendments at any time, with the result that late-year amendments could be used to negate any consequences of the statutory deadline. In response to the large number of STIP amendments brought to the Commission late in the 1998-99 fiscal year for projects that were failing to meet the statutory deadline, the Commission directed that the permanent guidelines be revised to specify that the Commission will not amend the STIP to delete or change the program year of the funding for any project component in the current fiscal year or earlier. The revised guideline specifies that an agency responsible for a project failing to meet its deadline should request an extension rather than a STIP amendment.
- Project delivery goals and reporting. A new section of the guidelines sets project delivery goals for Caltrans and local projects and requires regular project delivery status reports to the Commission. For Caltrans projects, the delivery goal for each fiscal year is 90% of the projects and 100% of the funds programmed. For local projects, the goals are 90% of the projects and 95% of the funds. The goals apply to all projects programmed against funds allocated through the State (including both STIP and SHOPP). Caltrans is required to provide the Commission with quarterly status reports on its delivery. Each regional agency is required to provide semiannual reports on delivery by local agencies within its jurisdiction.

### **AB 1012 Advance Project Development Element**

On November 3, 1999, the Commission adopted additional guidelines to implement the provisions of AB 1012 (1999, Torlakson) adding an advance project development element to the STIP. The intent of the new element is “to facilitate project development work on needed transportation projects to produce a steady flow of construction work.” AB 1012 called for the fund estimate to identify an

amount to be made available for the advance project development (APDE), beginning with the 2000 STIP. That amount is to be available only for project development work on projects otherwise eligible for the STIP. The amount is to be up to 25% of the amount estimated to be available for programming in the first two years beyond the four-year STIP period. The amount is subject to the regular STIP interregional and county share distribution formulas.

The guidelines adopted by the Commission specify that projects will be funded from the APDE in the same manner as other STIP programming, except that APDE programming is limited to the two project development components of STIP projects, (1) environmental and permits, and (2) plans, specifications, and estimates. Project development work already in the STIP may not be shifted to the APDE. APDE programming will be treated as an advance of regular future county or interregional share. Every county is eligible for APDE programming, unlike regular STIP county share advances, which are not available to counties in regions over 1 million population. APDE programming for any county or the interregional program is limited to the county or interregional share. Any unused APDE share is converted into regular share for the next STIP and any APDE programming is deducted from the regular share for the next STIP. Each successive STIP fund estimate will include new interregional and county APDE shares.



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **F. PSR Guidelines**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### F. Project Study Report Guidelines

#### Background

In 1987, legislation was enacted that required preparation of a Project Study Report (PSR) as a prerequisite for adding a project into the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The intent behind this requirement was to improve the relative accuracy of a project's cost, scope, and schedule at the time of its initial entry into the STIP and, in so doing, better inform those interested in the project, better manage the design of the project, and improve the overall quality and reliability of the STIP as a whole. In 1990, further legislation clarified the responsibilities of Caltrans and regional agencies in the selection of projects for PSR preparation and the preparation process itself. That legislation called upon the Commission, in conjunction with Caltrans, cities, counties and regional agencies, to adopt guidelines for the preparation of PSRs. The initial PSR Guidelines were adopted by the Commission in September 1991.

#### Updating the 1991 PSR Guidelines

Since the adoption of the initial PSR Guidelines in 1991, considerable change was implemented at the federal and State levels pertaining to programming of transportation projects, including the federal ISTEA (1992) and TEA-21 (1998) and STIP reform (SB 45, 1997). This, and the extended experience with the preparation of PSRs, led to call for updating the PSR Guidelines for the first time since their initial adoption in 1991.

During 1999, Caltrans assembled a task force with staff representatives of regional agencies, cities, counties and the Commission. That task force oversaw the drafting of the updated PSR Guidelines. Issues considered by Caltrans and the task force included:

- level of detail to be included the Guidelines;
- provide opportunity for regional agencies to adopt additional standards at their option;
- clarify PSR review responsibilities for State highway and non-highway projects;
- clarify PSR approval responsibilities for State highway and non-highway projects;
- establishment of project managers for State highway and non-highway projects.

#### PSR Reform

Also during 1999, considerable attention was given by the Legislature to the PSR requirement and whether it had evolved into a more elaborate, costly and time-consuming procedure than was originally envisioned or intended. The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO), in its analysis of the proposed FY 1999-00 Budget, wrote extensively on PSRs, noting that they often are “very

lengthy studies, taking between one to two years and an average of 2.6 PYEs to prepare.” They also noted that the cost of preparation for a PSR is not charged against a county share or against the interregional or regional components of a STIP, thereby creating incentive to load more effort that typically would be funded through the STIP into the PSR effort, thereby further delaying programming and obscuring the ultimate cost of project development.

Also during 1999, Assembly Transportation Committee Chairman Torlakson authored omnibus legislation to help expedite and improve project delivery—the process for designing and engineering a project and readying it for construction. Among the many provisions of that bill, AB 1012 (Chapter 783, Statute of 1999) is the provision for an expedited PSR process.

### **Commission’s Further Direction for Revising PSR Guidelines**

In part responding to the Legislative Analyst’s comments and to AB 1012, the Commission provided further guidance to Caltrans in the preparation of revised PSR Guidelines. Specifically, the Commission sought further attention in the draft guidelines to the following issues:

- **conflict resolution** - expanding the conflict resolution process to ensure that a disagreement around project scope, between Caltrans and a local or regional agency, does not unduly delay the ability to move ahead with programming that project in the STIP for design, engineering, and environmental assessment, and that conflict resolution process can move beyond the district level when warranted.
- **Project Development Support PSRs** - making explicit the opportunity to prepare limited PSRs when the intended initial programming of a project into the STIP was for project development work only “to allow engineering and environmental studies to proceed to evaluate the merits and feasibility of alternatives.”

The final revised Guidelines included added statements to clarify and underscore the following:

- the decision to prepare a PSR is a **cooperative effort** between Caltrans and regional or local agencies;
- for State highway projects, there is to be **open and continuous communication** between Caltrans and regional or local agency in the preparation of the PSR;
- discussion of alternatives in a PSR should include a **Minimum Project Alternative**;
- technical changes to Caltrans’ Project Development Procedures Manual related to PSRs may be made by Caltrans (when shared with Commission staff); but **policy changes require Commission action**.

Perhaps most importantly, the Guidelines now state:

- **The Commission also intends that PSR’s and project study report equivalents will not forestall or preclude the programming of a project.**

With these changes, the Commission adopted the revised PSR Guidelines in November 1999.

**Further Discussion of Conflict Resolution**

At its November 1999 meeting, the Commission engaged in discussions with Caltrans and local representatives regarding disagreement over the geometrics of an interchange project and an adjacent private development project. If left unresolved, that disagreement would have delayed the PSR process, the programming of the project into the STIP, the environmental process and the eventual construction of the much-needed interchange. Through the Commission's encouragement, that disagreement appears, at this writing, to have been resolved.

However, that matter gave rise to further discussion of the PSR Conflict Resolution Process and whether the Commission might not offer, under certain circumstances, a constructive forum for helping to resolve conflicts that might not otherwise be resolved in a timely manner. Caltrans was asked to present at the Commission's December meeting some suggested language to provide for this opportunity in the PSR Guidelines.



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **G. RTP Guidelines**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### G. Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines

#### Regional Transportation Plans

Each Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) is required to adopt and submit an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to the California Transportation Commission and Department of Transportation (Caltrans). The RTP is intended to serve as a comprehensive planning tool directing the RTPA's policies and actions, and providing a framework for the development of a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system. State law requires the RTP in urban regions to be updated every three years and every four years in non-urban regions.

To ensure a degree of statewide consistency in the development of RTPs, the Commission is authorized under Government Code Section 14522 to prepare RTP Guidelines, in cooperation with the RTPAs and Caltrans. In February 1999, the Commission established a task force to update the RTP Guidelines to reflect new transportation planning requirements resulting from SB 45 (Kopp, 1997) and the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21). The task force was composed of representatives of the following agencies:

- California Transportation Commission,
- Caltrans,
- Urban and rural regional transportation planning agencies,
- California Air Resources Board,
- Energy Commission,
- California Highway Patrol,
- Governor's Office of Planning and Research,
- Native American Tribal Governments,
- Federal Highway Administration,
- Federal Transit Administration, and
- US Environmental Protection Agency.

The updated RTP Guidelines were submitted to the Commission in August 1999, and were adopted by the Commission on December 9, 1999. In conjunction with the adoption of the RTP Guidelines, the Commission adopted a policy requiring a current RTP which complies with the RTP Guidelines as a condition of accepting a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for inclusion in the STIP. A "current RTP" is an RTP adopted within three years (four years in non-urban regions) of the date of STIP adoption.

**Issues** - Issues addressed in the updated RTP Guidelines included:

- **Performance Measures** – The RTP Guidelines state that each RTPA should define a set of “program level” transportation system performance measures which reflect the goals and objectives adopted in the RTP. These performance measure are used to evaluate and select plan alternatives. Government Code Section 14530.1 (b)(5) requires more detailed project specific “objective criteria for measuring system performance and cost effectiveness of candidate projects” in the STIP Guidelines. The program level performance measures in the RTP set the context for judging the effectiveness of the RTIP, as a program, in furthering the goals and objectives of the RTP, while the STIP Guidelines address performance measurements of specific projects.
- **RTP/RTIP Linkage** - SB 45 requires that projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) be specifically identified in the RTP. The RTP Guidelines strengthen the linkage between the RTP, a policy instrument, and the RTIP, a funding instrument. The Action Element and Alternatives Analysis portions of the Guidelines focus on improving project identification in the RTP. The RTP Guidelines stress the importance of clearly discussing the purpose and need of plan alternatives, strategies, and projects within the RTP. The discussion of purpose and need in the RTP will facilitate linking specific projects to the RTP in expanded project specific environmental documents.
- **Maintenance and Rehabilitation** - The RTP Guidelines call for the identification in the RTP of maintenance and rehabilitation needs, investment priorities and implementation procedures for local street, road, and transit systems by local government.
- **RTP/ RTIP/ITIP Integration** - The RTP Guidelines recommend cooperative integration of planned capital improvements on the Caltrans interregional system into the RTPs and RTIPs. The dual eligibility for funding operational improvements on the State Highway System either through the Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) or the RTIP, also requires a joint planning and programming process between Caltrans and the regional transportation planning agencies.
- **Streamlined Guidelines** - To make the Guidelines easier to use by urban and rural transportation planning agencies, the text of the Guidelines has been edited to include only the basic information on the statutory requirements and Commission recommendations for RTP content. All statutory requirements are clearly identified in the text. Supporting information has been provided in appendices to the plan. An “RTP Content Check List” (Appendix A) has been provided for use in developing and reviewing RTPs.
- **California Transportation Planning Directions Statement** - The RTP Guidelines require that RTPs reflect the California Transportation Planning Directions Statement developed by the Commission and the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency. This statement, called for by budget control language contained in the FY1999-00 Budget, will promote greater consistency and coordination between regional and interregional transportation planning and programming by providing strategic objectives and guidance for the development of regional transportation plans, regional transportation improvement programs and the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **H. Local Assistance Guidelines**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### H. Local Assistance Guidelines

Section 14529.1 of the Government Code (SB 45, 1997) requires the Commission to establish Guidelines for Allocating, Monitoring, and Auditing Funds For Local Assistance Projects. These guidelines are intended to verify that the local entity has the resources and capabilities to implement the project in a timely manner, and to establish a process for monitoring the progress being made on projects and whether funds are being properly used. In October 1998, the Commission requested that Caltrans develop the guidelines for submittal to the Commission in January 1999. The guidelines, as drafted, were presented and discussed at the Commission's January 14, 1999 meeting. They were prepared to be consistent with the Commission's STIP Guidelines. On January 27, 1999, Caltrans distributed copies of the proposed guidelines to each regional agency, county transportation commission, and representatives of other local agencies.

On February 15, 1999, the Commission adopted these Local Assistance Guidelines. In July and August 1999, the Commission considered further amendments to these guidelines for projects funded through the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program, and two other technical adjustments pertaining to Federal Transit Administration funds and Proposition 116 funds. Following public hearings in July and August, the Commission amended the Guidelines accordingly on August 18, 1999.



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **I. Delegations to Caltrans**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### I. Delegations to Caltrans

The California Transportation Commission, pursuant to General Provision No. 7 of the Streets and Highways Code and Sections 14527(h) and 14533 of the Government Code, is authorized to allocate funds for various types of transportation projects and to delegate that authority to the Department of Transportation (Caltrans). Over the past year, in the interest of using resources more efficiently by streamlining the allocation process and accelerating construction of projects, the Commission has formally delegated allocation authority to Caltrans for six types of transportation projects. In delegating this authority, the Commission has placed specific reporting requirements on the Department that are intended to provide the Commission with the ability to stringently oversee these allocation processes and thereby fulfill its fiduciary responsibilities under the law.

The six types of projects for which the Commission has delegated allocation authority are:

1. 1998 STIP planning, programming and monitoring funds (CTC Resolution G-98-18);
2. 1998 STIP funds for rideshare projects (CTC Resolution G-98-24);
3. 1998 STIP funds to match federal funds from Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) (CTC Resolution G-98-25);
4. STIP funds for local storm damage and local street and road pavement rehabilitation (CTC Resolution G-99-09);
5. SHOPP funds for state highway pavement rehabilitation (CTC Resolution G-99-10); and
6. STIP funds for project development components of local grant projects (CTC Resolution G-99-11).

A brief summary of the allocations for these six categories of projects during the 1999 are as follows:

<u>Delegation</u>	<u>Dollars Allocated (1,000's)</u>	<u>Projects</u>
1. Planning	5,431	29
2. Rideshare	6,726	8
3. RSTP/CMAQ Match	977	16
4. Local Rehabilitation	96,352	208
5. State Rehabilitation	190,825	46
6. Project Development	4,597	47

In addition to the six new delegation types, there are two other major types of projects for which Caltrans has long standing authority from the Commission to allocate funds. The first of these allows allocation of funds for projects to correct for certain situations caused by floods, slides, earthquakes, material failures, slipouts, and unusual accidents or similar events (CTC Resolution G-11 as revised by Resolution G-94). It is under this delegation that a considerable amount of the seismic safety retrofit work has been done. The second long-standing area of delegation allows Caltrans to adjust allocations originally made by the Commission, in order to bring the allocations in line with actual project costs and thereby allow Caltrans to award and administer contracts for the projects (CTC Resolution G-12).

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **J. FY99-00 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### J. FY 1999-00 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

#### Background

The Transportation Blueprint Legislation of 1989 (Streets and Highways Code, Section 164.56) created the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation (EEM) Program, as a \$10 million annual program for **ten years** to fund environmental enhancement and mitigation projects directly or indirectly related to transportation projects. EEM projects must fall within any one of three categories: highway landscape and urban forestry; resource lands; and roadside recreation. Projects funded under this program must provide environmental enhancement and mitigation over and above that otherwise called for under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The statute mandates the State Resources Agency to evaluate projects submitted for this program and the California Transportation Commission to award grants to fund projects recommended by the Resources Agency. Any local, State or federal agency or nonprofit entity may apply for and receive grants. The agency or entity is not required to be a transportation or highway related organization but must be able to demonstrate adequate charter or enabling authority to carry out the type of project proposed. Two or more entities may participate in a joint project with one designated as the lead agency. The Resources Agency has adopted specific procedures and project evaluation criteria for assigning quantitative prioritization scores to individual projects. In funding the program, an attempt is made to maintain a 40/60 North/South split.

Through the first nine years of the EEM Program (including the most recent annual programming cycle for FY1999-00, adopted by the Commission in July 1999), a total of 408 projects have been programmed at a total cost of \$90.4 million. Forty percent of these projects were highway landscape and urban forestry, 34% were resource lands, and 26% were roadside recreation.

Under the 1989 Transportation Blueprint Legislation, the EEM Program was to sunset after FY2000-01. However, in recent years, legislation has proposed extending that Program indefinitely at the original annual funding level of \$10 million per year. The Commission's Fund Estimates for both the 1998 STIP and the 2000 STIP assumed continuation of the EEM Program through at least FY2003-04. Finally, in 1999, SB 117 (Murray) was signed into law, eliminating the program's 10-year sunset.

**FY1999-00 EEM Program**

For FY 1999-00, the Resources Agency evaluated 146 projects seeking a combined total of almost \$30 million in State funding. From this list of projects, the Agency recommended to the Commission 90 projects with a total cost of almost \$19.5 million in State funding. The Commission programmed 41 of those projects, totaling \$10 million -- the amount included in the FY 1999-00 budget for the program. In deciding which projects to program, the Commission considered the Resources Agency's prioritization scores, project costs, project deliverability, and the linkage of the enhancement project to a transportation project. The 41 projects programmed for FY 1999-00 were as follows:

	<u>No. of Projects</u>	<u>Grants</u>
Highway Landscape and Urban Forestry	8 projects (20%)	\$1,178,000 (12%)
Resource Lands	15 projects (37%)	\$5,090,000 (51%)
Roadside Recreation	<u>18 projects (44%)</u>	<u>\$3,732,000 (37%)</u>
TOTAL	41 projects (100%) <sub>2</sub>	\$10,000,000 (100%)

Taken together with projects previously programmed in the first eight years of the program, the EEM Program between FY 1991-92 and FY 1999-00 has made commitments to a total of 408 projects as follows:

	<u>No. of Projects</u>	<u>Grants</u>
Highway Landscape and Urban Forestry	162 projects (40%)	\$28,320,515 (31%)
Resource Lands	140 projects (34%)	\$39,303,264 (43%)
Roadside Recreation	<u>106 projects (26%)</u>	<u>\$22,807,221 (25%)</u>
TOTAL	408 projects (100%)	\$90,431,000 (100%) <sub>1,2</sub>

---

<sub>1</sub>The extra \$431,000 in programming capacity was generated from savings in previous years of the program.

<sub>2</sub>Does not add to 100% due to rounding.

**ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT AND MITIGATION PROGRAM  
FISCAL YEAR 1999-00**

**NORTHERN PROJECTS**

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
CITY OF SACRAMENTO	UEDA PARKWAY OFF-ROAD REC & ENV ENHANCEMENT	250,000
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	JEDEDIAH SMITH PARKING/TRAIL IMPROVEMENTS	86,742
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	TOMALES BAY LAND ACQ PROG AT MILLERTON POINT	445,000
SONOMA COUNTY	WEST COUNTY REGIONAL TRAIL	200,000
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	STUMP BEACH TRAIL REHABILITATION	74,500
PORT OF OAKLAND	UNION POINT WATERFRONT PARK	250,000
THE BIG SUR LAND TRUST	BIG SUR NATIVE LANDSCAPE RECOVERY	250,000
SAN JOAQUIN COUNCIL OF GOV	SAN JOAQUIN CTY SWAINSON'S HAWK & ASSOC SPEC HAB ACQ	250,000
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	LAKE OROVILLE-FOREBAY & AFTERBAY TRAIL & RIP HAB IMP	227,000
CITY OF FOLSOM	HUMBUG-WILLOW CREEK PARKWAY TRAIL	241,525
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	MARSH & RIDGE TRAIL DECOMM & TRAILS RESTORATION	243,425
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	NEWFIELD ACQ.SUGARLOAF RIDGE STATE PARK	250,000
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	COASTAL DUNE HABITAT REST FOR SENSITIVE SPECIES REC	220,000
EAST BAY REG PARK DIST	LAS TRAMPAS TO PLEASANTON RIDGE REG WILDLIFE CORR ACQ	225,000
CITY OF ALBANY	ALBANY URBAN FORESTRY PROGRAM	50,500
ALAMEDA COUNTY	ALAMEDA COUNTY URBAN AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY	176,650
TREE FRESNO	CLOVIS RAIL TRAIL	192,325
BEAR RIVER REC & PARK DIST	BEAR RIVER SPORTS COMPLEX/PARK LANDSCAPING	39,000
OUR CITY FOREST	INNER CITY GREENING	168,100
CITY OF MODESTO	HETCH HETCHY BICYCLE TRAIL	159,483
	TOTAL	3,999,250

**SOUTHERN PROJECTS**

<u>APPLICANT</u>	<u>PROJECT</u>	<u>FUNDING</u>
ORANGE COUNTY	PARK & TRAIL STAGING AT IRVINE RANCH HISTORIC PARK	250,000
DEPT OF PARKS & REC	CAMBRIA COAST RANCH ACQUISITION	500,000
MOUNTAINS REC & CONS AUTH	LAS VIRGENES VIEW PARK TRAIL AND TRAILHEAD	190,000
CITY OF SAN DIEGO	DEL MAR MESA VERNAL POOL ACQUISITION	250,000
CNTR FOR NATURAL LANDS MGMT	COACHELLA VALLEY PRESERVE SAND SOURCE AREA ACQ	250,000
STATE COASTAL CONSERVANCY	LOS OSOS COASTAL DUNES ACQUISITION	500,000
CITY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO	HASTINGS/SHEFFER PROPERTIES ACQUISITION	250,000
CITY OF SOLANA BEACH	SOLANA BEACH LINEAR PARK	250,000
NATURAL HERITAGE FOUND	SOUTH BALDWIN LAKE WATERSHED ECOLOGICAL PRESERVE	200,000
CITY OF MAYWOOD	MAYWOOD RIVER PARK	250,000
SAN DIEGO COUNTY	RUTHERFORD RANCH/VOLCAN MOUNTAIN ACQ, PHASE VI	500,000
MONO COUNTY	CONWAY RANCH	500,000
U.S. FOREST SERVICE	EASTERN SIERRA INTERAGENCY VISITOR CENTER	250,000
CITY OF LOS ANGELES	COOL GREEN COMMUNITIES	250,000
CITY OF SAN DIEGO	NORMAL HEIGHTS PARK ACQUISITION	287,000
VETERANS PARK	VETERANS PARKWAY - WILSHIRE BLVD.	250,000
THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND	OTAY VALLEY REGIONAL PARK ACQUISITION	500,000
CITY OF SAN DIEGO	TREES - 2 K SAN DIEGO TREE PLANTING	227,750

Volume II-J, FY99-00 Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program

CITY OF LANCASTER	CALIFORNIA POPPY RESERVE REGIONAL BIKEWAY	250,000
CITY OF LAKE FOREST	LAKE FOREST DRIVE MEDIAN LANDSCAPE ENHANCEMENT	16,000
CITY OF BISHOP	BISHOP SKATE PARK ENHANCEMENT	80,000
	TOTAL	6,000,750

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **K. FY99-00 Federal Elderly & Disabled Transit Program**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### K. FY 1999-00 Federal Elderly and Disabled Transit Program

Assembly Bill 772 (Chapter 669, Statutes of 1996) assigned to the California Transportation Commission an oversight role for the Federal Transit Administration's Elderly and Disabled Transit Program (Title 49 U.S.C. Section 5310). This federal program was established in 1975 and has been administered by Caltrans since its inception. It provides approximately \$7 million in federal funds annually for grants to purchase transit capital equipment to meet the specialized needs of elderly and/or disabled persons for whom mass transportation services are unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate. A minimum 20% local funding match is required.

Specifically, AB 772 placed three mandates on the Commission for this program:

1. Direct Caltrans on how to allocate funds for the program.
2. Establish an appeals process for the program.
3. Hold at least one public hearing prior to approving each annual program.

In order to comply with these mandates and develop an allocation process, the Commission directed its staff to work with a 15-member advisory committee including representatives from regional planning agencies, State and local social service agencies, the California Association for Coordinated Transportation, and Caltrans. The process adopted by the Commission calls for project scoring by each Regional Transportation Planning Agency and subsequent creation of a statewide list by a Statewide Review Committee integrating regional priority lists utilizing objective criteria adopted by the Commission. The Statewide Review Committee consists of representatives from the State Departments of Rehabilitation, Developmental Services, Aging, and Transportation. Commission staff acts as facilitator/coordinator for the Committee. The process includes: 1) a staff level conference to discuss technical issues with project applicants and regional agencies; and 2) a public hearing conducted by the Commission. Following the conference and the hearing, the Commission then adopts the annual program.

**FY 1999-00 Program** – For this year's process, the staff level conference was held in July and the Commission's public hearing was held in August. Following the hearing, the Commission adopted the FY 1999-00 program containing projects equal to 110% of the estimated available funding level. Projects were shown down to the 110% level in case projects higher on the list were unable to move forward or additional funds became available. The Commission directed Caltrans to allocate funds to projects on the adopted list down to the level of actual available funding, as announced by the Federal Transit Administration.

Actual available funding for the FY 1999-00 Program came to \$9,004,492 (including the required 20% local match)--\$431,766 less than the original estimated level of \$9,436,258. This reduction resulted in twelve fewer projects being funded than originally estimated. Despite this reduction, the State still managed to provide 70 agencies with 171 vehicles and 74 supporting equipment projects for FY 1999-00.



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **L. Implementation of AB 2782 (Keeley, 1998), NCRA**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### **L. Implementation of AB 2782 (Keeley, 1998), North Coast Railroad Authority**

#### **Background: Origins, Funding Concerns and Uncertain Future**

The North Coast Railroad Authority (NCRA), a local public agency, was established by SB 1663 (Keene, 1990) to ensure that railroad service continue in the event of abandonment of service, bankruptcy and/or sale of the 300-mile rail line between Arcata (Humboldt County) and Lombard (Napa County). In 1992, NCRA acquired the 186-mile rail line between Arcata and Willits (Mendocino County) for \$6.1 million from federal bankruptcy court. In 1996, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad Authority (NWPRRA), a joint powers agency comprised of NCRA, the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway, and Transportation District and Marin County, purchased from Southern Pacific for \$43 million the 114-mile rail line between Willits-Healdsburg/Novato and Lombard.

NCRA has achieved some success during the past seven years as a rail freight agency serving the market between Arcata and Sonoma County, but has been plagued by chronic problems, some external and some of its own making. Despite \$60 million in State and federal transportation capital funding, NCRA has been unable to build up any capital or operating reserves. Moreover, NCRA must deal with washouts and landslides every winter, which interrupt revenue service. It had suffered in the past few years from a deficient accounting and management system, which delayed release of disaster relief funds. And, it has had to borrow periodically from its shippers and from the City of Willits for current expenses (including storm damage repair) and capital improvements.

In 1998, the railroad line was closed because it failed to meet federal safety regulations. Today, after numerous repairs, NCRA is attempting to re-open the line, but has yet to receive federal approval. NCRA lacks operating funds. The Commission is unable to offer operating fund assistance; it has no statutory standing to direct transportation funds to freight operators. Further, NCRA, as a freight operator, is ineligible for capital funds from the State Highway Account funds from the STIP. Public Transportation Account (PTA) funds from the STIP can be used by NCRA for capital purposes. However, in the fund estimates for the 1998 STIP and, more recently, for the 2000 STIP, the PTA Account was projected to be over-subscribed by \$50 million; consequently no PTA funds are available for NCRA.

#### **Commission Responsibilities under AB 2782 Toward North Coast Railroad Authority**

In light of the above uncertainties, the Legislature passed and the Governor signed AB 2782 (Keeley), on September 28, 1998, which appropriated \$2 million from the General Fund to the Commission for the immediate and critical needs of NCRA, including, but not limited to:

- implementing an accounting system that complies with Commission requirements for receipt of State and Federal funds;

- addressing environmental concerns raised by the Departments of Fish and Game, Toxic Substance Control, and Justice;
- payment to contractors and vendors for services rendered prior to June 30, 1998, excluding any contractual obligations to Railways, Inc.

AB 2782 further directed that any remaining funds should be for additional needs of the NCRA, including, but not limited to, the following:

- necessary actions to meet the requirements of the compliance order of the Federal Rail Administration concerning the operation of the railroad;
- necessary capital improvements to safely operate and maintain the rail service;
- any other expenditure needed to comply with findings or recommendations of the Commission or any other government agency with jurisdiction or involvement with NCRA activities.

AB 2782 precluded the use of these funds as repayment of the Q-Fund loan.

The Commission was required to report on or before December 31, 1999, to the Chairperson of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee and the chairpersons of the fiscal committees of the Legislature on how the funds allocated pursuant to this subdivision have been expended by NCRA and any state agency that received an allocation of funds for expenditure. Funds appropriated shall be available for encumbrance by the Commission until June 30, 2000.

### **Commission Allocates \$2 Million Appropriated by AB 2782 to NCRA**

In October 1998, the Commission began undertaking its responsibilities to implement AB 2782. After the initial allocation in October 1998, the Commission directed NCRA to prioritize its needs between the categories described in AB 2782 and provide an estimate of its assets and accounts payable. NCRA estimated its Accounts Payable at \$5.5 million, which far exceeded the \$2 million available. The priorities established by NCRA seemed at variance with AB 2782. Consequently, the Commission sought and received guidance from the Legislature regarding NCRA's priorities. After the October allocation, the Commission made three more allocations in February, March and May 1999, committing the remaining funds. The \$2 million has been used as follows:

- **\$774,175 (39%)** to fund NCRA's "Accounting System Project" and to pay for an executive director and two office staff from October 1998 through June 30, 2000;
- **\$567,000 (28%)** to pay 270 creditors. Of this amount, NCRA proposed to use \$53,000 to fully pay 156 creditors where NCRA owes the creditor \$1,000 or less; the remaining \$514,000 would be used to partially pay, on a pro rata basis, debt owed to the remaining 114 creditors.

- **\$210,000 (11%)** for former employee claims pay for unpaid compensation, accrued vacation, medical insurance payroll deductions, and anticipated legal costs from disability claims.
- **\$165,000 (8%)** to meet Federal Railroad Administration Emergency Order 21 to bring signals and tracks up to Federal standards.
- **\$163,000 (8%)** to retire payroll tax debt and estimated penalties for 1996, 1997 and 1998 owed to the federal government.
- **\$87,825 (4%)** for environmental clean-up sought by Departments of Fish and Game, Toxic Substances Control, and Justice, as well as the North Coast Water Quality Control Board.
- **\$33,000 (2%)** to defend NCRA against a lawsuit filed by Department of Justice on behalf of Fish and Game and Toxic Substances Control and to appeal FEMA's retroactive application of its landslide policy to NCRA railroad landslide disasters. (The lawsuit was settled.)

In receiving the \$2 million in allocations, NCRA agreed to:

- submit a resolution to the Commission certifying it would use the funds for the activities allocated. Further, should unexpended funds remain, NCRA was permitted to shift funds to another category, providing it notified Caltrans and the Commission;
- permit Caltrans or other State agency to audit it and its use of these General Funds.

### **Commission Expectations of NCRA**

Although NCRA received General Funds via AB 2782 in 1998, no additional funds were provided in the FY 1999-00 Budget. NCRA still faces a number of issues. In 2000, the Commission expects NCRA to:

- show that its accounting and management procedures, paid for with AB 2782 funds, meet generally accepted accounting procedures. This step is crucial if NCRA expects to receive funding beyond that needed for establishing an accounting and management system. The Commission must be assured that NCRA can demonstrate that its financial records, accounting procedures, and management oversight are in place and functional;
- complete its single audits and bring its annual financial statements current;
- comply with Federal Railroad Administration restrictions that currently prohibit the railroad from operating due to safety standards;
- seek additional capital funding through the 2000 STIP process, through regional transportation improvement programs, or some alternative source to bring current the sinking fund to pay the \$12 million Federal Q fund loan due in 2013;
- resolve issues with Caltrans in order to use the \$8.6 million in federal ISTEAs demonstration funds for capital projects on the railroad line. These issues include: resolving FEMA audit issues (resolved); addressing environmental concerns (resolved through Consent Decree); preparing business plan for use by NCRA, State and local jurisdictions in assessing NCRA's current and future actions and associated risks (completed); comply with Federal Railroad Administration safety concerns (ongoing); bring \$12 million Q fund loan current (pending).



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

**M. Implementation of SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998),**

**LA-Pasadena Blue Line**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### M. Implementation of SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998), Los Angeles Pasadena Blue Line

#### Background

In late 1997, the Commission and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) recognized that they had to proceed through the 1998 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) process, programming some \$680 million in new funding capacity without the benefit of financially viable, long-range planning documents to help guide and determine the compatibility of incremental decisions with long-range objectives, all consistent with available funding. This was a particular challenge, given the difficulties encountered by MTA in implementing its passenger rail program. Accordingly, the Commission expressed its willingness to extend additional time to MTA beyond the June 1998 deadline for STIP adoption, to help assure a sound regional programming exercise.

In June 1998, the Commission and MTA executed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) pertaining to funding four passenger rail projects that were included in the previous 1996 STIP: the North Hollywood, Mid City, and East Side extensions of the Metro Red Line and the Pasadena extension of the Metro Blue Line. At the Commission's December 1998 meeting, the MOU was fulfilled as it related to the Metro Red Line. (MTA decided to complete the North Hollywood extension, while suspending the Mid City and East Side extensions due to overall funding constraints.)

#### Requirements of SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998)

Provisions in the CTC-LACMTA MOU pertaining to the Pasadena Blue Line project were impacted by legislation enacted after the June 1998 MOU was executed. Prior to 1999, SB 1847 (Schiff, 1998), MTA was responsible for most transit guideway projects in Los Angeles County and had specified duties and responsibilities with regard to transportation. SB 1847, however, established the Pasadena Metro Blue Line Construction Authority (PMBLCA) for the purpose of completing the Los Angeles-Pasadena Metro Blue Line light rail project. As specified in SB 1847, the light rail project would start at Union Station in Los Angeles and end at Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard in Pasadena. The project would also include any mass transit guideway planned east of Sierra Madre Villa Boulevard along the rail right-of-way extending to Claremont.

Under SB 1847, MTA was required to:

- identify and expeditiously enter into an agreement with PMBLCA to hold in trust with PMBLCA all real and personal property, and any other assets, accumulated in the planning,

design, and construction of the project, including, but not limited to, rights-of-way, documents, third-party agreements, contracts, and design documents, as necessary for completion of the project.

- transfer the unencumbered balance of all local funds currently programmed for completion of the project and that have been identified in the Restructuring Plan adopted by the MTA Board of Directors on May 13, 1998, to PMBLCA for completion of the project.
- take action to ensure that the unencumbered balance of state funds currently programmed or allocated to the MTA for completion of the project and that have been identified in the Restructuring Plan adopted by the MTA Board of Directors on May 13, 1998, shall be allocated to PMBLCA for completion of the project. Any transfer of funds by the MTA under this section shall be subject to the terms of the memorandum of understanding entered into between the MTA and the Commission on June 2, 1998.
- assume responsibility for operating the project upon dissolution of PMBLCA.

Under SB 1487, PMBLCA was given the following directives:

- conduct the financial studies and the planning and engineering necessary for completion of the project;
- complete a detailed management, implementation, safety, and financial plan for the project and submit the plan to the Governor, the Legislature, and the Commission not later than 90 days after establishment of PMBLCA;
- receive allocations of state funds for the project;
- enter into a memorandum of understanding with MTA that specifically addresses the ability of the MTA to review any significant changes to the project;
- not encumber any future farebox revenue anticipated from the operation of the project;
- not encumber the project with any obligation that is transferable to the MTA upon completion of the design and construction of the project, except as specified (excluding any joint development programs that may be utilized to contribute to the financing of project design and construction);
- administer the design and construction of the Pasadena Metro Blue Line, excluding rolling stock, which is a component of the operation of the project and shall be administered by the MTA;
- dissolve upon completion of the project.
- report to the Commission on its progress with the Pasadena Metro Blue Line construction, including but not limited to progress relative to the schedule specified in the 1998 STIP.

**Commission/MTA/PMBLCA Memorandum of Understanding:**

In June 1999, in response to SB 1847's provisions, the Commission entered into a new three-party MOU with MTA and PMBLCA. The three-party MOU established terms, conditions and responsibilities for each agency in meeting SB 1847's requirements, as well as retaining the pertinent objectives from the Commission's June 1998 MOU with MTA.

Under the MOU, PMBLCA was to prepare a **full funding capital plan** for the Pasadena Blue Line and submit it for Commission action prior to June 1999. (PMBLCA has since met this requirement.) Further, MTA was to prepare a **full funding operational plan** for the Pasadena Blue Line within the context of its total system operating plan and submit it to the Commission prior to consideration and action on an allocation request by PMBLCA. (MTA has since met this requirement.)

Also under the MOU, after accepting PMBLCA's capital plan and MTA's operational plan, the Commission was to allocate funds programmed in the STIP to the PMBLCA. (The Commission did so in November.) Lastly, under the MOU, PMBLCA is to make periodic reports on its progress in building the Pasadena Blue Line, within the timetable set forth in the 1998 STIP; and MTA is required to make periodic reports regarding the funding status of its operational plan and the financial impact of the federal consent decree between MTA and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and Bus Riders Union on its operations and capital projects.

**MTA Operational Plan and PMBLCA Allocation Request:**

- As noted, MTA agreed to prepare a full funding operational plan for the Pasadena Metro Blue Line within the context of its total system operating plan and submit it to the Commission, prior to Commission consideration and action on an allocation request by PMBLCA. MTC did so in November 1999. The plan was intended to show that MTA, as operator of the MTA bus/rail system, will have sufficient revenue to operate the new Pasadena Blue line extension, along with its entire system, while meeting at the same time, the following challenges: complying with the Federal Transit Administration requirement to complete the Red Line North Hollywood extension and identify a course of action for the East Side and Mid City extensions;
- addressing up to \$1 billion in capital and operating shortfalls; and
- providing bus service levels that meet the federal consent decree reached with the Bus Riders Union and the NAACP Legal Defense Fund.

MTA's operating plan assumes that Pasadena Metro Blue Line service will commence July 1, 2003, with daily ridership averaging 19,300 during FY 2003-04 and growing to 26,050 by FY 2009-10. The plan further projects the annual operating costs (including security) of \$33.6 million in FY 2003-04, increasing to \$40.3 million by FY 2009-10. The plan projects farebox revenues of \$4.7 million (or, 14% of total operations) in FY 2003-04, increasing to \$6.9 million (or, 17% of total operations)

by FY 2009-10. Funding sources for operations during the first three years include federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Proposition A funds, followed in the next four years (FY 2006-07 through FY 2009-10) with a slightly different mix of Propositions A and C local sales tax funds and State-subsidized TDA funds.

The plan identifies a \$144 million shortfall in systemwide operating funds, with \$26 million of the shortfall restored as part of MTA's FY 2000 budget, leaving a net ten year shortfall of \$118 million (\$11.8 million/year through FY 2009-10). **MTA believes the shortfall can be resolved through future cost reductions and one-time revenue sources. Finally, MTA states that the federal Consent Decree does not impact, at this time, MTA's ability to operate the Pasadena Blue Line.**

After considering MTA's operational plan at its November 1999 meeting, the Commission accepted that plan and acted to allocate \$83.2 million to PMBLCA toward the construction of the Pasadena Blue Line.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **N. Strengthening State, Tribal and Regional Government Transportation Partnerships**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### N. Strengthening State, Tribal & Regional Government Transportation Partnerships

The Commission held a workshop, chaired by Commissioner Robert Wolf, with Native American Tribal Governments, Caltrans, and Regional and Metropolitan Planning Organizations on September 15, 1999 at the Morongo Indian Reservation in Cabazon. The workshop was entitled “Strengthening State, Tribal and Regional Government Transportation Partnerships.” Its purpose was to identify Native American transportation issues, and discuss ways of improving the Government-to-Government coordination of transportation planning and programming in order to better integrate the land use policies and transportation needs of the Tribal governments into the state and regional transportation planning process.

Attendance at the meeting included representation from 76 Tribes from throughout the State; the California Transportation Commission; Caltrans Headquarters, District 8 and District 11; San Diego Association of Governments, Southern California Association of Governments, Riverside County Transportation Commission, San Bernardino Association of Governments, Imperial Valley Association of Governments; Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA); and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The following Tribes and Tribal organizations were in attendance:

#### Northern California

- Cahto Tribe

#### Central California

- Hopland Band of Pomo Indians
- Scotts Valley Tribe

#### Southern California

- Cabazon
- Cahuilla Band of Indians
- Chemehuvi Indian Reservation
- Morongo Band of Mission Indians
- Santa Rosa Rancheria
- Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla
- Jamul Band of Mission Indians
- Los Coyotes
- Rincon
- Santa Ysabel Reservation

#### Tribal Organizations present:

- Reservation Transportation Authority (represents 23 Tribes in southern California).
- Central California Policy Committee (represents 52 Tribes in central California).
- Native American Negotiating Rule Making Committee (represents all Tribes in California at national meetings held throughout the United States).

**Issues** – The following issues were discussed at the workshop:

- **Address Tribal Issues Through a Government-to-Government Process** - TEA-21 requires that transportation planning activities among Indian Tribal Governments, the BIA, FHWA, Federal Transit Administration (FTA), States and local governments be performed on a Government-to-Government basis. Also, the FHWA and FTA require the State, Regional Planning Organizations, and Metropolitan Planning Organizations to consult with and consider the interests of Indian Tribal Governments in the development of transportation plans and programs, and with respect to each area of the State under the jurisdiction of all Tribal government, the program shall be developed in consultation with the Tribal government and the Secretary of the Interior. Tribal lands are located in all but two counties (Orange and Los Angeles) in California. Commissioner Wolf, Caltrans, and the regional agencies present, all expressed a commitment to work with the Tribes on transportation issues.
- **Consultation** – It was suggested that discussion and consultation on transportation policies at the state level should be between the existing BIA Advisory Committees, which are composed of elected Tribal leaders, and the Secretary of Business, Transportation and Housing, the California Transportation Commission, and the Director of Caltrans. The BIA Advisory Committees are the appropriate forum for developing unified positions among the Tribes on issues to be negotiated with the State. At the project level, the most effective coordination would be between individual Tribes, or coalitions of Tribes, and the Regional Transportation Planning Agency and Caltrans District.
- **Federal Funding** – The federal Indian Reservation Roads (IRR) Program provides \$275 million a year nationwide for improvements that address transportation issues specific to the Tribes, with \$1.7 million (0.6%) of these funds available for more than 100 federally recognized Tribes in California. The Commission’s SR 8 Report identified \$275 million of road improvement needs for access to and circulation within Tribal lands over the next ten years. Tribal representatives asked the Commission to help secure more of the federal funds by supporting their requests to; (1) increase the share of IRR funds allocated to California Tribes to 9.1962% of the program total (California’s minimum guarantee percentage of federal highway funds), and (2) guarantee 100% obligational authority for the IRR Program.
- **State and Local Funding** – The FHWA representative stated that there is no legal impediment that would prohibit the use of federal funds programmed by the State or regional agencies in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) on projects on Tribal lands. Tribes were encouraged to participate in the planning and programming process at the local level where programming decisions for 75% of STIP funding are made. Participation in the local process is particularly important in counties with county transportation sales taxes.
- **District 11 Activities** – The Caltrans District 11 Director, Gary Gallegos stated that he is planning on creating a Native American Advisory Committee for District 11. Tribes requested that Caltrans Director, Jose Medina encourage other districts to do the same. Allan Hendrix indicated that he would carry this message back to Director Medina. Mr. Gallegos said that he is working with some

Tribes on a training program for the use of heavy equipment in road construction. The program will also assist Tribes in acquiring Caltrans equipment that is on the replacement list.

- **STIP Process** - The Tribes asked that state law be amended to give Tribes the same standing and eligibility as cities and counties in transportation planning and programming. Tribal members pay local and state sales and fuel taxes and, as an equity issue, should be included policy bodies that determine the use of the tax revenues. The Tribes proposed a demonstration project to form a Reservation Regional Transportation Authority in Southern California which would cooperate with the regional transportation planning agencies, but would also have direct access to the Commission for programming projects.
- **Bureau of Indian Affairs** - Tribes indicated that there is a misconception that the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is able to take care of all Tribal needs and issues. They pointed out that the BIA is not being given the resources necessary to even begin to address the needs for construction and maintenance of Tribal roads. Current annual BIA funding provides only \$2 to \$8,000 per Tribe for transportation planning, less than \$700,000 statewide for maintenance, and approximately \$1.5 million for construction for all Tribes in the State.
- **Support for a Tribal Desk at the Governor's Level** - Tribes requested support to have an Indian desk in the Governor's Office. Commissioner Wolf indicated that he would support this concept.

**Commission Action** - Commissioner Wolf reported on the workshop to the full Commission at its September 29-30 meeting. Based on that report, the Commission has committed to the following course of action:

- Continue working with the Tribal leaders on a Government-to-Government level to identify Native American transportation issues, and to develop policies to resolve these issues at the State level,
- Communicate with the California Congressional delegation and the BIA, calling for an increased share of federal IRR Program funding going to Tribes in California, specifically supporting (1) increasing the share of IRR funds allocated to California Tribes to 9.1962% of the program total (California's minimum guarantee percentage of federal highway funds), and (2) guaranteeing 100% obligational authority for the IRR Program,
- Better integrate the land use policies and transportation needs of the Tribal governments into the state and regional transportation planning process through requirements in the Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines adopted by the Commission,
- Support and encourage funding of transportation projects accessing Tribal lands through state and local transportation programs,
- Support and encourage better integration of the Tribes into the transportation decision making process in California at the State and local level, and
- Work toward conducting workshops in Northern and Central California similar to the September 15 workshop in Cabazon.



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **O. Annual Report**

#### **Proposition 116 Programs Implementation**

- 1. Overview of Proposition 116**
- 2. Rail Program**
- 3. Competitive Bicycle Program**
- 4. Non-Urban County Transit Program**
- 5. Waterborne Ferry Program**
- 6. Museum of Railroad Technology**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation

#### 1. Overview of Proposition 116

In June 1990, the voters approved Proposition 116, the Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA), which provides \$1.99 billion in general obligation bond funds principally for rail development throughout California. The intent of the CATIA programs is to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution and provide better transportation options for all Californians through feasible, cost-effective capital projects. CATIA designated the California Transportation Commission to oversee the following five programs:

- Rail \$1.850 billion
- Non-urban County Transit \$ 73 million
- Waterborne Ferry \$ 30 million
- Competitive Bicycle \$ 20 million
- State Rail Museum \$ 5 million
- CTC/Caltrans Administration \$ 10 million

Through December 1999, the Commission has approved 451 individual applications totaling \$1.78 billion for all CATIA programs, which represents 89% percent of the total \$1.99 billion authorized for expenditure. Of the \$1.78 billion in approved applications:

- \$1.65 billion was for rail projects.
- \$73 million was for non-urban county transit.
- \$30 million was for waterborne ferry projects.
- \$20 million was for the competitive bicycle program.

Of the \$201 million in remaining Proposition 116 funds, \$194 million is authorized for rail projects, \$5 million is authorized for a rail technology museum and \$2 million (of the original \$10 million available) is authorized for State administrative costs.

#### Rail Program

The Commission has approved applications for 108 rail projects totaling about \$1.65 billion of the \$1.85 billion authorized under CATIA; \$201 million remains available to Caltrans and 6 local jurisdictions (Marin, Monterey, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, Sonoma Counties and the City of Irvine, Orange County) for approval. Of the \$201 million, \$121 million (60%) is authorized for the City of Irvine (Orange County), \$17 million (8%) is authorized for Caltrans to use on intercity rail projects, and the remaining \$56 million (28%) is authorized for the applicants in Marin, Monterey, Sacramento, Santa Cruz, and Sonoma Counties.

### **Non-urban County Transit Program**

The Commission has approved applications for 248 non-urban transit projects among the 28 non-urban counties, consuming all of the \$73 million authorized under CATIA; \$72,000 remains available to Butte County to be reprogrammed for new projects.

### **Waterborne Ferry Program**

The Commission has approved applications for 15 ferry projects during the FY 1991-92 and FY 1992-93 funding cycles, programming the entire \$20 million authorized under CATIA for the competitive waterborne ferry program. Of the \$20 million approved, all but \$710,000 has been allocated. The \$710,000 was originally approved for a dock replacement project in the Town of Tiburon. Tiburon, working with the Blue and Gold Fleet Company, was able to bring the existing dock up to ADA standards without having to replace it. Consequently, the original dock replacement project was no longer necessary and Tiburon is proposing to submit an application for other landside dock improvements.

The Commission has also approved and allocated the entire \$10 million designated in CATIA for the City of Vallejo for ferry vessel acquisitions and docking and terminal improvements.

### **Bicycle Program**

The Commission has approved the entire \$20 million authorized under CATIA for the competitive bicycle program. These funds were approved for 66 bicycle projects in 25 counties throughout the State during two funding cycles in FY 1991-92 and FY 1992-93. Additionally, seven projects have been approved from the Commission's priority stand-by list and three projects have been shifted from the federal Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) program that were funded from bicycle project cost savings and deletions, for a total of 76 projects statewide. (In 1998, the Commission decided to use Proposition 116 funds on TEA bicycle projects that also met the Proposition 116 eligibility requirements. The Commission concluded that having another statewide competitive cycle for the small amounts of Proposition 116 funds becoming available due to cost savings and project deletion/failure was not cost effective. Further, the original Proposition 116 competitive bicycle priority stand-by list was no longer current and the top-ranked projects on the list were already funded through Proposition 116 or other sources.)

### **State Railroad Technology Museum**

The California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has stated its intent to submit a Proposition 116 application by 2001. The California State Railroad Museum Foundation estimates the Museum of Railroad Technology will cost between \$21 and \$25 million. The project funding will come from CATIA (\$5.0 million), potential Park Bond financing (from the March 2000 Proposition 12 ballot measure – a \$2.1 billion Safe Neighborhood, Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act), lease-revenue bonds issued by the State Public Works Board, potential TEA funds, and the balance of funds raised privately by the California State Railroad Museum Foundation.



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation

#### 2. Rail Program

The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA) authorizes \$1.85 billion for rail projects throughout the State. The Commission has approved applications for 108 rail projects totaling \$1.65 billion; and approximately \$194 million remains available for approval.

#### Major Rail Projects Approved During 1999

During 1999, the Commission approved eleven new and amended applications totaling \$184.1 million for rail projects in Sacramento, Los Angeles, Orange, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and El Dorado Counties, as well as the San Joaquin Intercity Rail Corridor. A discussion of the more significant CATIA rail project applications approved by the Commission during 1999 is detailed below.

**Sacramento Regional Transit (RT) District South Corridor Light Rail Extension** – In March 1999, the Commission approved RT's application for \$87 million in CATIA funds for its South Corridor Light Rail Extension, a six-mile extension of its light rail system south from Downtown Sacramento to Meadowview and to purchase light rail vehicles for the Folsom and Sacramento Amtrak Station extensions. The approval consisted of an amendment to a previously approved \$10 million Proposition 116 application for the Folsom and Roseville extensions and re-directed \$4,644,000 no longer needed from those two extensions to serve as the local match to Federal funds for purchasing 16 light rail vehicles for RT's Folsom extension and Downtown Sacramento (Amtrak Station) extension projects.

The \$87 million approval included the approval of \$82,893,509 in Proposition 116 funds that were available under Public Utilities Code (PUC) 99643 to RT and re-directed \$262,491 no longer needed from the previously approved Folsom/Roseville extension for a total of \$83,156,000 in Proposition 116 funds to fully fund the South Sacramento Corridor extension at \$222,000,000 using a mixture of State, Federal and local funds. The Commission's approval of the \$83.1 and \$4.6 million in Proposition 116 funds leaves \$380,440 for a future project from the \$100 million authorized in PUC Section 99643.

The \$100 million authorized in Proposition 116 requires a dollar-for-dollar match. The South Corridor Light Rail Extension project consists of final design and construction of a six-mile dual track light rail alignment that begins east of the existing 16<sup>th</sup> Street Station in Sacramento, extends south onto the Union Pacific Railroad corridor and continues generally along its western side, ending at Meadowview Road in South Sacramento. Six stations are proposed with the last three stations having park and ride facilities. The entire alignment will be at-grade. For about one-half the length of the combined LRT/UPRR corridor, the Union Pacific tracks will be shifted eastward to provide room for the light rail tracks. Grade crossing gates and signals will be repositioned and modified to serve both the railroad and the light rail system. The current project construction cost estimate is \$208 million or approximately \$35 million per mile, which is comparable with the construction costs of other light rail systems nationwide.

**Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board – CalTrain Capital Improvements** – In June 1999, the Commission approved \$8.6 million in CATIA funds for the CalTrain Capital Improvements projects for platform, track and signal rehabilitation in the City of San Mateo, City of Redwood City and the Peninsula Commute Corridor in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The Commission’s approval of the \$8.6 million committed the last remaining funds of the \$173 million originally authorized in Proposition 116 to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board.

Proposition 116 authorizes \$173 million for allocation to the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB) for expenditure on CalTrain capital improvements and acquisition of rights-of-way in the Counties of San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara. In 1991, the Commission approved \$124.0 million of the \$173 million available for the PCJPB to acquire the right-of-way between San Francisco and San Jose. Since 1991, the PCJPB has used the remaining \$49 million for various track and station improvements on the line, to extend the line south of San Jose to Gilroy, to rehabilitate locomotive rail cars and to supplement other Proposition 116 funds (from other PUC Sections) to purchase rail cars.

The net result of these improvements is that the PCJPB can operate the rail service with an estimated decrease in travel time of about 4 ½ minutes between San Jose and San Francisco, where express service is currently about 82 minutes and regular service is about 97 minutes.

**San Joaquin Corridor Intercity Rail Service Including Bakersfield Amtrak Station Project** In June and September 1999, the Commission approved \$8.6 million and \$1.4 million respectively in CATIA funds for the Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans’) track improvements in and near Stockton on the Burlington Northern and Santa Fe (BSNF) for San Joaquin Service and track and signal improvements at the new Bakersfield Amtrak Station.

Proposition 116 authorizes \$140 million to Caltrans for intercity rail projects on the Los Angeles-Fresno-San Francisco Bay Area (San Joaquin) rail corridor and extension to Sacramento, including at least \$60 million for rail rehabilitation and other rail improvements to provide intercity rail service between Fresno and Oakland via Madera, Merced, Turlock and Modesto, and not more than \$30 million for rail rehabilitation and other rail improvements between Stockton and Sacramento via Lodi and Galt. Since 1992, Caltrans has applied for \$124 million of the \$140.0 million available for track and station improvements on the San Joaquin Corridor, as well as augmenting other bond funds to purchase rolling stock. The Commission’s approval of the \$22 million in Proposition 116 funds during 1999 reduced the \$140 million authorized in PUC Section 99629[a] to \$16.1 million.

The passenger train service that will be made possible by these projects will eliminate the need for connecting feeder buses between Stockton and Sacramento on those San Joaquin schedules that offer train service to Sacramento. This will make intercity travel to and from Sacramento more attractive to the public, by providing an improved alternative to highway travel. The new Bakersfield Amtrak station track and signal improvements will improve the operating speeds, in and out of the station, on this portion of the San Joaquin Corridor from 20 mph to 40 mph.

**City of South Lake Tahoe's Park Avenue Intermodal Station** – In July 1999, the Commission approved \$6.7 million in CATIA funds for construction of an Intermodal station in the City of South Lake Tahoe, that is compatible in the future for rail transit.

Proposition 116 authorizes \$7 million to the City of South Lake Tahoe for acquisition of rights-of-way, construction of an intermodal station and related facilities for an exclusive public mass transit guideway project. The City of South Lake Tahoe intends to acquire a 1.3-acre site for its Intermodal station in fall 1999 using local funds; construction of the station is scheduled to begin in 2000. The City of South Lake Tahoe will construct an Intermodal station designed to coordinate mass transit, shuttle services and intercity bus and van service, as well as a ski gondola between South Lake Tahoe and the Heavenly Valley Ski Resort. The City has not yet concluded that a mass transit fixed guideway project is financially feasible. However, the City has stated that the station will be designed and operated so that it can accommodate a fixed guideway mass transit system, either surface or aerial, should such a system become feasible in the future.

The South Lake Tahoe Redevelopment Agency has acquired approximately two miles of easements for a mass transit guideway system on either side of Highway 50, running from Stateline, Nevada, west to Ski Run Road in South Lake Tahoe, the location identified as most feasible for initiation of mass transit service. The City would not begin construction of a fixed guideway mass transit system, at least, until after the Intermodal station is completed in 2001. Between 1999 and 2001, the City plans to re-examine potential funding sources for construction, rolling stock, and operating and maintenance costs. The City needs to ensure that the ridership need exists to support a fixed guideway system before it begins construction. Should the City certify the need and identify sufficient funding to make a mass transit system feasible, it would begin planning and performing environmental work for such a system in 2002-2003.

The timing of additional hotel construction, a new convention center, expansion of area ski resorts and other factors will determine the timing of a mass transit system. Depending upon the aforementioned events, the City might be able to start construction sometime between 2004 and 2006.

**City of Irvine Guideway Demonstration Project – Phase II, Pre-Construction** – In March 1999, the Commission approved \$2.4 million in CATIA funds to complete the Phase II detailed conceptual engineering and environmental work leading to the design and implementation of its Urban Rail Guideway Demonstration project.

Proposition 116 authorized \$125 million, on a dollar-for-dollar match basis, for allocation to the City of Irvine for construction of a guideway demonstration project. The guideway demonstration project consists of two components: Preliminary engineering on the 28-mile Orange County Corridor CenterLine (CenterLine) project and the City of Irvine Guideway Demonstration project which is a subset of the CenterLine project. The Irvine component of this project would be the development of a 4- to 5-mile guideway system with approximately 10-15 stations within employment and mixed-use sites, as well as an Intermodal station to be built in conjunction with the CenterLine project.

The ongoing issue of operations and how the applicant would fund it was raised during the Commission's review and approval of the Proposition 116 application process. The Commission indicated it intended to monitor this situation closely and that the subsequent Proposition 116 application for capital improvements must resolve how the new CenterLine system operations would be funded prior to approval of the remaining \$120.6 million in bond funds. As an alternative to the Irvine Guideway Demonstration project, the City and OCTA agreed to review using the remaining Proposition 116 funds for the CenterLine project. The City and OCTA were given a deadline of January 2000, to present a workable proposal to the Commission.

At the January Commission meeting, the City of Irvine and OCTA will report its findings regarding capital cost of the Irvine Demonstration Guideway project. It is expected that the City of Irvine will re-direct the remaining \$120.6 million in Proposition 116 funds to the OCTA CenterLine project, providing that OCTA agrees to develop a bus system in Irvine to the CenterLine project, build a spur to UC Irvine, and a parking structure at the Irvine Transportation Center.

The estimated project cost is \$1.6 billion in combined State (\$375 million), Federal (\$1.0 billion) and local (\$225 million) funds. Of the \$375 million in State funds, \$125 million in Proposition 116 funds would be used for design and construction. The details of the overall funding program will be more thoroughly evaluated and defined by the City of Irvine and OCTA.

### **Allocations**

Through December 1999, \$1.60 billion of the \$1.65 billion in approved rail program applications has been allocated to specific projects (see Exhibit 2), leaving \$46 million remaining to be allocated.

### **Approved Projects Without An Allocation**

Proposition 116 specifies that any funds not obligated by July 2000 could be redirected by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature to alternate rail projects within the same jurisdiction. Further, any funds remaining unobligated by 2010 could be redirected for rail purposes anywhere in California. At the close of 1999, \$239 million remain either unallocated or unapplied for by the applicant agency. Among these are 7 projects with approved applications totaling \$45.6 million for which the designated applicants have yet to ask for an allocation. In the Commission's August 1999 survey, applicant agencies with unallocated balances were asked to determine when allocation requests would be submitted for the remaining \$45.6 million (see Exhibit 4). Of the \$45.6 million, all but \$6.1 million is expected to be requested by the end of FY 2000-01: \$16.8 million is expected to be requested by January 2000, \$6.3 million by July 2000, \$16.3 million by FY 2000-01, with the balance of \$6.1 million remaining after FY 2000-01. The status of the 7 projects is as follows:

1. Caltrans: Various Projects – Of the unallocated balance of \$3.4 million Caltrans expects to submit allocation requests for the entire \$3.4 million by January 2000.

2. Caltrans: Alameda Corridor Grade Separations – Of the unallocated balance of \$18.0 million Caltrans expects to submit an allocation request for \$11.9 million by January 2000, \$6.1 million during after FY 2000-01.
3. Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (PCJPB): Track Rehabilitation – Of the unallocated balance of \$1.6 million, PCJPB expects to submit an allocation request for the entire amount by January 2000.
4. SRTD: Sacramento Regional Transit District Light Rail Extensions – Of the unallocated balance of \$10.0 million, SRTD expects to submit an allocation request for the full amount during FY 2000-01.
5. SRTD: Sacramento Regional Transit District Mather & Downtown Vehicle Purchase – Of the unallocated balance of \$4.6 million, SRTD expects to submit an allocation request for the entire amount by July 2000.
6. NSDCTDB: Oceanside to San Diego Rail Service – Of the unallocated balance of \$1.3 million, NSDCTDB expects to submit an allocation request for the entire \$1.3 million during FY 2000-01.
7. City of South Lake Tahoe: Park Avenue Intermodal Station – Of the unallocated balance of \$6.7 million, the City of South Lake Tahoe expects to submit an allocation request for \$1.7 million by July 2000 and the remaining \$5 million during FY 2000-01.

### **Proposition 116 Designations Without Project Application Approval**

As noted, Proposition 116 specifies that any funds not obligated by July 2000 can be redirected by a two-thirds vote of the Legislature to alternate rail projects within the same jurisdiction. Further, any funds remaining unobligated by 2010 could be redirected for rail purposes anywhere in California. At the close of 1999, Proposition 116 designates \$193.6 million in CATIA rail program funds for which the Commission has yet to receive a project application, as shown on Exhibit 3. In August 1999, Commission staff surveyed designated CATIA recipients to determine when applications for remaining CATIA funds could be expected. Based on that survey, applications for \$8.8 million were anticipated to be submitted by January 2000, \$152.8 million by July 1, 2000, with the remaining \$32.0 million to be applied for after FY 2000-01.

**Caltrans** (\$17 million) and the **City of Irvine** (\$120.6 million) represent \$137.6 million or 71 percent of the remaining \$193.6 million in rail program funds still available as of December 1999. In December 1999, Caltrans completed a Proposition 116 application for the Oakland Maintenance Facility totaling \$12.3 million. The City of Irvine, is expected to report at the January Commission meeting that they intend to direct the remaining \$120.6 million in Proposition 116 funds to the OCTA CenterLine Project. The City of Irvine had anticipated submitting a funding request between March and June 30, 2000, when its intended project was the Irvine Guideway Demonstration Project; however, the shift of these funds to an alternate project will likely cause a further delay.

**Marin and Sonoma Counties'** ability to encumber its \$28 million in Proposition 116 funds by the June 30, 2000 deadline has been significantly reduced since the November 1998 defeat of sales tax measures in both counties. The Sonoma-Marine Area Rail Transit (SMART) joint powers authority is hoping to complete a rail transit feasibility study by the end of 1999. SMART is proceeding to plan for rail service on the publicly-owned Northwestern Pacific rail line and to prepare for a future sales tax election. SMART expects to apply for the Proposition 116 funds before 2010.

Both the **Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission** and the **Transportation Agency for Monterey County** (TAMC) have each planned weekend intercity rail service. Monterey is expecting to submit its application to the Commission by June 30, 2000 with a balance of \$3 million to be sought after FY 2000-01. The timing and intended project for Santa Cruz's application is uncertain.

**Sacramento Regional Transit District** (SRTD) expects to submit by June 30, 2000 an application for the remaining \$0.4 million of the original \$100 million available to SRTD.

### **Rail Application/Allocation Process**

Applications for CATIA funding are evaluated with respect to contributions made to the total regional transportation system (both public and private sectors), including associated improvements to streets, roads and highways, and coordination between intercity, commuter, and urban rail systems, and other transportation modes. Qualifying rail projects must lie within those corridors or be for those purposes listed in the Public Utilities Code (Sections 99621-99627, 99629-99645, 99647 and 99649).

Each application must supply all data required for evaluation describing how the grant funds will be used and what other capital funds are available for the project. The application must also include an operating plan for any new service, identify the sources and availability of funding required for construction and operation of any new service, and a cash expenditure plan which identifies the cash flow necessary for the implementation/completion of the project. The project must have the appropriate environmental clearance (permits) prior to an allocation of funds. Pre-construction activities (preliminary engineering, right-of-way assessment environmental studies, and planning studies) do not require environmental clearance in advance. The Commission will allocate funds to a project after evaluation and approval of the application.

### **Transit Integration Plans**

CATIA requires all applications for rail transit extensions to include a Transit Integration Plan (TIP) for coordinating rail, bus, and other forms of transportation and for avoiding duplicative and competing bus service. CATIA also requires that TIPs be reviewed by a Peer Review Committee (PRC) of at least three persons.

**Peer Review Committee**--Between July 1991 and January 1992, the Commission appointed a statewide Peer Review Committee (PRC), which included members from regional transportation agencies, private sector bus operators, a Caltrans representative and representation from the

public at large. The PRC serves as a resource pool for two working groups, one from Northern California and the other from Southern California. Specifically, the Northern California PRC reviews TIPs for Southern California projects, and vice versa (Exhibit 5).

**Transit Integration Plan Guidelines**--The PRC developed TIP guidelines in consultation with Commission staff, which were adopted by the Commission in May 1992. The guidelines apply to all Proposition 116 rail projects, whether the intended service is urban, commuter, or intercity rail. Each TIP is required to address seven general categories, including:

- Plan Development Process
- Service
- Schedules
- Fares
- Public Information and Marketing
- Facilities and Access
- Financial Analysis

Under the guidelines, the PRC is required to review the adequacy of each plan and make its final recommendation to the Commission within 90 days of receipt of all necessary information. After initial Commission approval of the TIP, the rail applicant is required to self-certify the plan's continuing validity and provide updated information to the extent the plan changes.

**Status of Transit Integration Plans To Be Submitted**--The Commission expects to receive three TIPs for the following projects:

1. San Francisco-Seaside/Monterey Intercity Rail Service (\$17.0 million in CATIA funds)—Submittal of a TIP is expected in 2000.
2. Metro Rail Pasadena Blue Line (\$40.0 million in CATIA funds)—Submittal of a TIP is expected in 2001.
3. Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension (\$32.2 million in CATIA funds)—Submittal of a TIP is expected in 2000.

**Status of Transit Integration Plans Being Reviewed**

1. Tasman Corridor West Extension (\$40.6 million in CATIA funds)-- A TIP was submitted in August 1999 and is currently being reviewed. (*Review due to be complete in December 1999.*)

**Status of Approved Transit Integration Plans for Active Projects**

The PRC members have determined the TIPs for the projects listed below to be in conformance with the Commission's evaluation guidelines:

1. Altamont Corridor (\$13.7 million in CATIA funds)—San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (1997).

2. San Francisco MUNI F-Embarcadero Streetcar Extension (\$8.5 million in CATIA funds)-- San Francisco Public Transportation Commission (1996).
3. Metro Rail Green Line (\$83.5 million in CATIA funds)—Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Agency Metro Green line (1996).
4. San Diego Mission Valley West Light Rail Extension (\$31.7 million in CATIA funds)-- San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (1995).
5. Sacramento Light Rail Transit Extensions (\$12.4 million in CATIA funds)--Sacramento Regional Transit District (SCRTD) - Folsom Corridor and Roseville Corridor Extensions (1993).
6. Mt. Shasta-McCloud Rail Corridor (\$956,000 in CATIA funds)--Siskiyou County Transportation Commission (1993).

### **Rail Program Application Approvals**

As noted previously, through December 1999, the Commission has approved approximately 107 rail project applications totaling \$1.65 billion, or approximately 89 percent of the available rail funds. Each of these approved applications is described below, and summarized in Exhibit 2. The eleven applications approved during 1999 are highlighted in bold italic type.

#### **Alameda County**

- Alameda County: Altamont Commuter Rail Stations/Platforms Project (\$1.6 million)--Construction of two rail stations in Livermore and one Pleasanton for the Altamont Corridor Commuter Service between Stockton and San Jose (1997).
- BART Dublin/Pleasanton Extension (\$59.4 million)--Construction of 13.8 mile, 3-station extension of BART system from San Leandro to Dublin/Pleasanton in Alameda County (1993).

#### **Contra Costa County**

- West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee/Richmond Intermodal Transfer Station (\$1.5 million)--For the design and upgrades of the Richmond Intermodal Transfer Station (1998).
- BART Pittsburgh/Antioch Extension (\$35.5 million)--Proposition 116 share, combined with \$35 million in Proposition 108 funds, applied toward the 7.8-mile, 2-station extension of the BART system from Concord to West Pittsburgh/Antioch in Contra Costa County (1992).

#### **Humboldt and Mendocino Counties**

- North Coast Railroad Tie Replacement Project (\$756,795)--Railroad tie replacement element of the North Coast Railroad Northern Projects for freight and passenger service improvement (1996).
- North Coast Railroad Phase II Capital Improvements (\$3.1 million)--Capital improvements to freight rail service, including track, tunnel, and bridge rehabilitation (1993).
- Eureka Southern Railroad Acquisition (\$6.1 million)--Acquisition of the bankrupt Eureka Southern Railroad's right-of-way and capital assets by the North Coast Railroad Authority (1991).

**City of Irvine**

- City of Irvine and Orange County Transportation Authority (\$2.4 million) -- Completion of the detailed conceptual engineering and environmental clearance work for the City's Guideway Demonstration Project (1999).
- City of Irvine and Orange County Transportation Authority (\$2.0 million)--Detailed conceptual engineering and environmental clearance work for the Irvine Urban Rail Guideway Demonstration Project (1998).

**Los Angeles County Metropolitan Authority (LACMTA)**

- LACMTA: Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension (\$5 million)--Amended application for the remaining \$500,000 on the Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension project for use on tunnel, station and track work construction activities (1998).
- LACMTA: Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension (\$ 32.2 million)--Amended applications to reduce the LALRV project from 74 to 52 vehicles and budget by \$17.2 million, and apply those funds to the Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension, with an additional request to approve \$15.0 million in remaining Proposition 116 funds (1998).
- LACMTA: Metro Rail Pasadena Blue Line (\$40.0 million)--Right-of-way acquisition and construction of the Metro Rail Pasadena Blue Line (1995).
- LACMTA: Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood Extension (\$25.0 million)--Construction of the Metro Rail Red Line North Hollywood extension project (1995).
- LACMTA: Metro Green Line Light Rail Transit Service (\$84.0 million)--Capital improvements including construction of track and station improvements and acquisition of light rail vehicles (1994).
- LACMTA: Acquisition of Light Rail Vehicles (\$33.6 million)--Purchase of light rail vehicles for Metro Green Line, Pasadena Blue Line, and Metro Blue Line services (1994).

**Monterey County**

- Transportation Agency for Monterey County: San Francisco-Monterey Intercity Rail Service (\$0.5 million)--Preliminary engineering and environmental assessment work needed to reinstate passenger rail service along the Monterey Branch Line (1998).

**North San Diego County Transit Development Board (NSDCTDB)**

- NSDCTDB: Oceanside to San Diego Commuter Rail Service--Amended application to add additional elements to the scope of work approved in 1994 (1996).
- NSDCTDB: Oceanside to San Diego Commuter Rail Service (\$24.5 million)--Project development and capital improvements including preliminary engineering and design, track work, and station construction (1994).
- NSDCTDB: Solana Beach Commuter Rail Station (\$2.0 million)--Construction of an intercity/commuter rail station in mid-San Diego County (1993).
- NSDCTDB: Poinsettia Siding Project (\$3.6 million)--Construction of a 3.2-mile double track siding project at the Poinsettia commuter rail station in San Diego County (1993).

### **Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board**

- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Platform, Track and Signal Rehabilitation (\$8.6 million) – Reconstruct track, improve signal and construct concrete platform (1999).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Mountain View CalTrain Station Improvements (\$0.4 million)--To supplement planned improvements at the Mountain View CalTrain station. (1998).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Passenger Rail Car Purchase (\$2.5 million)--Combined with federal funding and state funds transferred from Caltrans for the procurement of 6 cab control cars and 13 trailer cars (1998).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Track Rehabilitation-- Amended application to modify the approved scope of work previously approved in 1993 (1997).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: CalTrain Station Improvements-- Amended application to modify the approved scope of work for the San Francisco Specific Projects previously approved in 1993 (1996).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Track Rehabilitation-- Amended application to modify the approved scope of work previously approved in 1993 (1996).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Station Rehabilitation-- Amended application to modify the approved scope of work previously approved in 1993 (1996).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: CalTrain Maintenance Facility (\$455,000)--Preliminary engineering and environmental development of the CalTrain Maintenance Facility (1996).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: CalTrain Capital Improvements (\$21.0 million)--Various capital improvements including locomotive and passenger car rehabilitation, new locomotive and equipment purchase, track work, and station and system improvements (1995).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: CalTrain Satellite Maintenance Facility (\$1.0 million)-- Construction of a satellite maintenance facility at Cahill Station in San Jose (1993).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: CalTrain Station Improvements (\$2.4 million)--Capital improvements to key CalTrain stations to comply with Americans with Disabilities Act of 1991 requirements (1993).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Track Rehabilitation (\$10.3 million)--Track rehabilitation of CalTrain service between San Jose and San Francisco (1993).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Station Rehabilitation (\$2.2 million)--Rehabilitation of CalTrain stations including parking, landscaping, and passenger shelter construction (1993).***
- ***Peninsula Corridor JPB: Peninsula Commute Right-of-Way Acquisition (\$124.0 million)--Acquisition of rights-of-way from Southern Pacific for the existing Peninsula Commute Service from San Francisco to San Jose and extension from San Jose to Gilroy (1991).***

### **Sacramento Regional Transit District**

- ***Sacramento RTD: South Sacramento Light Rail Extension (\$83.2 million) – Application for purchase of light rail vehicles and extension of the light rail system to south Sacramento (1999).***
- ***Sacramento RTD: Folsom and Downtown Amtrak Station Extensions (\$4.6 million) –Amended application to purchase new light rail vehicles (1999).***

- **Sacramento RTD: Folsom/Roseville Extension** (\$4.6 million) – *Amended application to redirect funds to two new projects (1999).*
- **Sacramento RTD: Folsom Corridor Light Rail Extension** (\$5.2 million)--Amended application to reduce the amount approved for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the light rail extension from Butterfield Road to Mather Field Road from \$8.5 million to \$5.2 million, backfilled with other funds (1997).
- **Sacramento RTD: Folsom Corridor Light Rail Extension** (\$8.5 million)--Amended application to reduce the amount approved for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the light rail extension from Butterfield Road to Mather Field Road from \$12.7 million to \$8.5 million, backfilled with other funds (1996).
- **Sacramento RTD South Sacramento Light Rail Extension** (\$1.8 million)--Preliminary engineering and final environmental impact statement development for the South Sacramento light rail extension (1995).
- **Sacramento RTD: Folsom Corridor Light Rail Extension** (\$12.7 million)--Amended application to reduce the amount approved for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the light rail extension from Butterfield Road to Mather Field Road from \$14.9 million to \$12.7 million (1995).
- **Sacramento RTD Folsom Corridor Light Rail Extension** (\$14.9 million)--Right-of-way acquisition and construction of extension of light rail line from the Butterfield Station to Mather Field Road (1994).
- **Sacramento Regional Transit District Light Rail Extensions** (\$10.0 million)--Preliminary engineering and design, and property acquisition for two extensions of the existing light rail system from Watt/I-80 to Antelope Road (7 miles) and from Butterfield to Sunrise Boulevard (6 miles) (1992).

**San Diego Metropolitan Transit Development Board (SDMTDB)**

- **SDMTDB: San Diego Mission Valley West Light Rail Extension** (\$31.7 million)--Construction of the Mission Valley West light rail extension (1995).
- **SDMTDB: San Diego Rail Yard Expansion** (\$8.8 million)--Amended application to reduce the previously approved rail yard property acquisition and capital improvements project from \$17.4 to \$8.8 million (1995).
- **SDMTDB: San Diego Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition** (\$16.0 million)--Purchase of 30 light rail vehicles to increase frequency on the South and East light rail lines of the San Diego Trolley (1992).
- **SDMTDB: San Diego Rail Yard Expansion** (\$17.4 million)--Property acquisition and capital improvements to expand the San Diego light rail yard facilities to accommodate increased light rail vehicle fleet (1992).

**San Francisco City and County**

- **San Francisco Municipal Railway/Muni Metro Turnback** (\$3.2 million)--Amended application to reduce the Muni Metro Turnback project by \$3.2 million in Proposition 116 funds due to cost savings and apply those cost savings to the MUNI Advance Train Control System project for capital expenditures (1998).
- **San Francisco Municipal Railway Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition** (\$8.5 million)-- Amended application to apply \$8.5 million in cost saving to the Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition from the \$11.7 million approved in 1992 for the Extension of Muni Metro tunnel under Market Street to Embarcadero and Folsom Street (1996).
- **San Francisco MUNI F-Embarcadero Streetcar Extension** (\$8.5 million)--Construction of the MUNI F-Embarcadero Streetcar Extension (1995).
- **San Francisco Municipal Railway Capital Improvements** (\$9.7 million)--Geneva Green Center capacity modifications for the President Conference Committee streetcar, installation of Muni subway signal system, and 1-mile track replacement (1993).

- San Francisco Municipal Railway Metro Extension to 6th Street and Streetcar Rehabilitation Project (\$2.0 million)--Final design and construction of Muni Metro extension to 6th Street and President Conference Committee streetcar rehabilitation (1993).
- San Francisco Municipal Railway Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition (\$3.1 million)--Acquisition of replacement light rail vehicles for San Francisco Muni system (1993).
- San Francisco Muni Metro Turnback (\$11.7 million)--Extension of Muni Metro tunnel under Market Street to Embarcadero and Folsom Street, including installation of switches and turnback tracks below ground (1992).

#### **San Joaquin County**

- San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission: Altamont Commuter Rail Service (\$13.7 million)--Rolling stock purchase to implement the Altamont Corridor Commuter Rail Service between Stockton and San Jose (1997).
- San Joaquin County Council of Governments: (\$0.3 million)--Economic and preliminary engineering study of the Stockton-Manteca-Tracy rail corridor (1991).

#### **San Mateo County**

- BART: San Francisco Airport Extension (\$10 million)--Construction of an 8.7-mile extension and four stations from Colma to an intermodal BART/CalTrain station in Millbrae (December 1997).

#### **Santa Clara County**

- Substation Upgrade Project (\$0.4 million)--Amended application to utilize cost savings from the Tasman Corridor West Light Rail Extension project and apply these funds to the Substation #2 Upgrade project located south of Tasman Drive near North First Street in the Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor (1998).
- Guadalupe Shelter and Windscreen Project (\$0.5 million)--Amended application to utilize cost savings from the Tasman Corridor West Light Rail Extension project and apply these funds for the design and construction of shelters and windcreens at various stations on the Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor (1998).
- Embedded Girder Rail Replacement Project (\$0.9 million)--Amended application to utilize cost savings from the Tasman Corridor West Light Rail Extension project and apply these funds for the replacement of embedded girder rail southwest of the intersection of Tasman Drive and North First Street on the Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor (1998).
- Tasman Corridor West Extension (\$40.6 million)-- Right-of-Way acquisition and construction for the Tasman Corridor West Extension in Santa Clara County utilizing \$6.1 million in cost savings of the \$12.5 million approved in 1992 for the Peninsula Corridor Service Extension to Gilroy (1996).
- CalTrain Extension to Gilroy (\$12.5 million)--Provide station, signal, and track improvements for a 25.4-mile extension, from San Jose to Gilroy, of existing Peninsula Corridor Service between San Francisco and San Jose (1992).

#### **Santa Cruz County**

- Through December 1999, no Proposition 116 Applications have been approved for the \$11 million authorized under PUC Section 99640.

**Sonoma and Marin Counties**

- Through December 1999, no Proposition 116 Applications have been approved for the \$28 million authorized under PUC Section 99639.

**Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA)**

- SCRRA: Oceanside-Fullerton Commuter/Intercity Rail Service (\$68.8 million)--Capital improvements including additional track, extended sidings, signal system, station improvements, and construction support costs (1993).
- SCRRA: San Bernardino-Los Angeles Commuter Rail Service (\$380,000)--Amended project application for design and construction management for the San Bernardino-Los Angeles rail service stations (1993).
- SCRRA: San Bernardino-Riverside-Fullerton Commuter Rail (\$79.2 million)--Capital improvements including track and station improvements, crossovers, and the acquisition of rolling stock (1993).
- SCRRA: Southern California Santa Fe Rights-of-Way Acquisition (\$72.8 million)--CATIA share, combined with \$100.5 million in Proposition 108 funds, applied toward the total \$500 million in State/local funds for the purchase of 340-mile Santa Fe rights-of-way acquisition, easements, and operating rights in Southern California for commuter, intercity and urban rail service (1992).
- SCRRA: Los Angeles-San Bernardino Commuter Rail Line (\$83.9 million)--Capital improvements for a 60 mile commuter rail system between the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal and San Bernardino (1992).
- SCRRA: Los Angeles-Fullerton Commuter Rail Line (\$78 million)--Capital improvements and rail passenger cars for a 25.8-mile commuter and intercity passenger rail line between the Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal and the Fullerton Amtrak station (1992).
- SCRRA: Los Angeles-Ventura Commuter Rail Line (\$65.0 million)--Implements a commuter rail service between Moorpark in Ventura County and downtown Los Angeles and expands intercity rail service between Santa Barbara and Los Angeles (1991).
- SCRRA: Shared Rail Maintenance Facility (\$22.1 million)--Construction of a centralized rail maintenance facility at Taylor Yard near Los Angeles Union Passenger Terminal which serves the Southern California Metrolink commuter rail system (1991).

**City of South Lake Tahoe**

- *City of South Lake Tahoe Park Avenue Intermodal Station (\$6.65 million) – Construction of an intermodal station in the City of South Lake Tahoe that is compatible in the future for rail transit (1999).*
- City of South Lake Tahoe Light Rail Transit System Alternative Analysis (\$350,000)--Alternative analysis of a proposed light rail transit (LRT) system in South Lake Tahoe (1992).

**Department of Transportation— (PUC Section 99622)**

**Capitol and San Joaquin Intercity Rail Corridors**

- *Oakland Maintenance Facility (12.3 million) – Construct a maintenance facility in the City of Oakland for the Capitol Corridor State and Amtrak trains (1999).*

- **Bakersfield Amtrak Station Track and Signal Improvements (\$1.4 million) – Improve track and signals at the new Bakersfield Amtrak station that will improve the operating speeds, in and out of the station, from 20 to 40 mph (1999).**
- **Stockton BNSF Track Improvements (\$8.6 million) – Construct track and signal improvements to remove speed restrictions on the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) main line through Stockton (1999).**
- Stockton-Sacramento Track Improvements (\$26.7 million)—Track and signal improvements necessary to accommodate Amtrak San Joaquin passenger train service between Stockton and Sacramento (1998).
- Stockton-Sacramento Track Improvement Engineering Project (\$1.1 million)—Engineering and design work required to support construction of improvements for State-supported Amtrak San Joaquin passenger train service between Stockton and Sacramento. (1998).
- Merced Intercity Rail Amtrak Station (\$1.4 million)-- Construction of the new Merced Intercity Rail Station and parking lot improvements (1998).
- Bakersfield Intercity Rail Amtrak Station (\$4.25 million)-- Construction of the new Bakersfield Intercity Rail Station and track improvements (1998).
- Capitol Corridor/San Joaquin Intercity Rail Service Improvements (\$2.9 million)--Track improvements on the Capitol and San Joaquin intercity rail corridor near the Martinez (Contra Costa) Amtrak station (1997).
- Capitol and San Joaquin Corridor Statewide Americans with Disabilities Act Project - Phase II (\$400,000)-- Final engineering, plans and specifications development for Capitol and San Joaquin Corridor compliance with requirements mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (1996).
- Capitol Corridor Station Platforms Project (\$1.5 million)-- Construction of six intercity rail platforms to comply with requirements mandated by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and California Car equipment (1996).
- Modesto Intercity Rail Station (\$2.1 million)-- Construction of the Modesto Intercity Rail Station (1996).
- Capitol Corridor Jack London Square Station (\$1.8 million)--Construction of intercity passenger rail service station (1994).
- Capitol Corridor Intercity Rail Service Improvements (\$56.8 million)--Capital improvements for *Capitol* and *San Joaquin* intercity rail corridors including replacement of jointed track with continuous welded rail, tie replacement, installation of centralized traffic control system and track and signal work -- approval contingent on compliance with six principles related to future use of this corridor for commuter rail service (1994).
- Amended Application for San Joaquin Corridor Capital Improvements Project (\$425,000)--Property acquisition and installation of double track north of Bakersfield Amtrak station (1994).
- San Joaquin Route Improvement Project (\$35.4 million)--Construction of new double track segments, yard track improvements, grade crossing, signal system improvements, and bridge construction to increase capacity (1993).
- City of Hayward Capitol Corridor Intercity Rail Station--Revised application to reflect only a change to the proposed location of the Hayward Capitol Corridor intercity rail station (1993).
- California Car Procurement (\$19.2 million)--CATIA funds in combination with \$68.7 million in Proposition 108 funds for procurement of 27 additional intercity California Car rail passenger cars and one locomotive (1993).

- Stockton-Sacramento Interconnect (\$2.2 million)--Construction, signal and track improvements on existing Southern Pacific and Santa Fe lines permitting the northerly extension of the San Joaquin intercity rail service from its current terminus in Stockton to Sacramento (1992).
- Capitol Corridor Stations in Hayward and Fremont (\$2.4 million)--Right-of-way acquisition and capital improvements for two new intercity rail stations in Cities of Hayward and Fremont (1992).
- Capitol Corridor Improvements (\$42.1 million)--Capital improvements to initiate intercity rail service operated by Amtrak between San Jose, Oakland, Sacramento and Roseville (1991).

**Department of Transportation— (PUC Section 99622[b])**

- Bakersfield-Los Angeles Preliminary Engineering and Feasibility Study (\$5.0 million)--Study of all high speed technologies with speeds of 125 mph and above, and feasibility of the potential alignment for this corridor.

**Department of Transportation— (PUC Section 99623)**

**San Diegan Intercity Rail Corridor**

- Moorpark/Goleta Track and Signal Improvements Project (\$7.5 million)--Track and signal improvements on the San Diegan intercity rail corridor between Moorpark and Goleta (1997).
- Carpinteria Loading Platform Project (0.4 million)—Platform improvements on the San Diegan intercity rail corridor at the Carpinteria Station (1997).
- Goleta Layover Facilities and Station Project (\$2.1 million)-- Construction of the Goleta Layover Facilities and Station (1996).
- Santa Barbara Railroad Station Improvement Project (\$4.7 million)--Acquisition and rehabilitation of the historic Santa Barbara Rail Station along the Los Angeles - Santa Barbara intercity rail corridor (1995).

**Department of Transportation— (PUC Section 99624)**

- *Alameda Corridor Grade Separation – Pacific Coast Highway (\$18.0 million) – Amended application to revise the original scope of work to include additional work elements that are funded out of the 1998 Interregional Improvement Program (IIP) and to segregate the Pacific Coast Highway Grade Separation project from the Alameda Street and Del Amo grade separation projects (1999).*
- *Alameda Corridor Grade Separation – Alameda Street (\$11.9 million) – Amended application to reduce the Proposition 116 funds from \$21 million to \$11.9 million. The project cost has remained the same and will be backfilled with Federal funds. The amended application also segregates the Alameda Street Grade Separation project from the Del Amo and Pacific Coast Highway grade separation projects (1999.)*
- *Alameda Corridor Grade Separation – Del Amo Boulevard (\$34.1 million) – Amended application to increase the Proposition 116 funds from \$25 million to \$34.1 million due to an increase in right-of-way acquisition costs and to segregate the Del Amo Grade Separation project from the Alameda Street and Pacific Coast Highway grade separation projects (1999).*
- Alameda Corridor Grade Separations (\$16.0 million)--Amended application to revise the original scope of work, requests a waiver of Allocation Resolution BFP 97-06 (Section 2.4) and the segregation of the Sepulveda Grade Separation project from the other three previously approved grade separation projects (1998).
- Alameda Corridor Grade Separations Amended application to allow up to five percent of the \$80.0 million approved in 1994 to be expended on pre-construction activities related to the development of four grade separations along Alameda Street in Los Angeles County (1996).

- Alameda Corridor Grade Separations (\$80.0 million)--Construction of four grade separations along Alameda Street in Los Angeles County, which includes property acquisition, preliminary engineering, and construction activities. The grade separations are part of the proposed Alameda Corridor project that will connect the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach along a consolidated 20-mile transportation corridor (1994).

**Department of Transportation— (PUC Section 99649)**

- California Car Procurement--Amended 1992 \$118.4 million application to separate commuter car portion from California Car procurement contract, and instead authorize two local commuter rail operators to pursue their own commuter car acquisitions with no change in funding (1995).
- California Car Rolling Stock Acquisition (\$118.4 million)--\$100 million specifically designated in CATIA for the California Car, combined with an additional \$31.5 million in Proposition 108 funds, and \$18.4 million in other CATIA funds, for the purchase of 88 rail passenger cars for commuter and intercity rail service throughout the State (1992).

**EXHIBIT 1  
PROPOSITION 116 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS  
THROUGH DECEMBER 1999 (Dollars in Millions)**

Volume II-O-2, Prop. 116, Rail Program

Program Type	Prop. 116 Authorized	Amount Approved	Amount Remaining	Recipient/ County	Project Type Specified In Proposition 116	Match Required	Type of Service	PUC Section
Rail Program	\$1.0	0.0	1.0	Caltrans	ROW Statewide Survey	0	N/A	99621
	140.0	123.9	16.1	Caltrans	LA-Fresno-SF Rail Corridor	0	Intercity	99622(a)
	5.0	5.0	0.0	Caltrans	LA-Bakersfield High Speed Rail Study	0	Intercity	99622(b)
	85.0	84.9	.2	Caltrans	Placer-Santa Clara Capitol Corridor	0	Intercity/Commuter	99622(c)
	81.0	81.0	0.0	Caltrans	LA-Santa Barbara Rail Corridor	0	Intercity/Commuter	99623(a)-(c)
	80.0	80.0	0.0	Caltrans	Alameda Corridor	0	Freight	99624(a)
	100.0	100.0	0.0	Caltrans	California Car Procurement	0	Intercity/Commuter	99649
	6.0	6.0	0.0	North Coast Railroad Authority	Rail/Freight-Humboldt TBD	0	Unspecified Rail/Freight	99625(a)
	4.0	4.0	0.0	North Coast Railroad Authority	Rail/Freight-Mendocino TBD	0	Unspecified Rail/Freight	99626(a)
	202.0	202.0	0.0	LOSSAN	LA-San Diego Rail Corridor	0	Intercity/Commuter	99629(a)-(c)
	229.0	229.0	0.0	Los Angeles	Metro Rail/other Rail TBD	0/50%	Urban/Unspecified Rail	99630(a)-(b)
	79.0	79.0	0.0	SCRRA	SB-Riv-Or Rail Corridor	0/50%	Commuter/Unspecified	99631 (1)-(3)
	98.0	98.0	0.0	SCRRA	SB-LA Rail Corridor	0/50%	Commuter/Unspecified	99632(a)(1)(2)
	61.0	61.0	0.0	Alameda	BART and Other Rail TBD	50%	Urban/Unspecified	99633
	37.0	37.0	0.0	Contra Costa	BART and Other Rail TBD	50%	Urban/Unspecified	99634
	35.0	35.0	0.0	San Francisco	Rail Projects TBD	50%	Unspecified	99635
	173.0	173.0	0.0	Peninsula Corridor JPB	CalTrain Improvements/ROW	0	Commuter	99636(a)-(d)
	10.0	10.0	0.0	San Mateo	BART Projects TBD	50%	Urban	99637
	17.0	0.4	16.6	Monterey	CalTrain/Other Rail TBD	0/50%	Commuter/Unspecified	99638(a)/(b)
	28.0	0.0	28.0	Marin/Sonoma	Rail TBD/Rail and Other TBD	50%	Unspecified	99639(a)/(b)
	11.0	0.0	11.0	Santa Cruz	Rail Projects TBD	0/50%	Intercity/Unspecified	99640(a)/(b)
	47.0	47.0	0.0	Santa Clara	Rail Projects TBD	50%	Unspecified	99641
	77.0	77.0	0.0	San Diego	Rail Projects TBD	50%	Unspecified	99642
	100.0	99.6	0.4	Sacramento	Rail Projects TBD	50%	Unspecified	99643
14.0	14.0	0.0	San Joaquin	Altamont Rail Service and Study	50%	Unspecified	99644	
125.0	4.4	120.6	City of Irvine	Guideway Demo. TBD	50%	Unspecified	99645	
7.0	7.0	0.0	City of South Lake Tahoe	Park Avenue Intermodal Station	0	Unspecified	99647	
Rail Program Subtotal	<b>\$1,852.0</b>	<b>\$1,658.2</b>	<b>\$193.8</b>					
Other Programs & Administration	73.0	72.9	0.1	Non-Urban	Rail/Paratransit/Bicycle	0	Unspecified	99628
	20.0	20.0	0.0	Competitive - Local Agencies	Bicycle Project TBD	0	Bicycle Projects	99650
	20.0	20.0	0.0	Competitive - Local Agencies	Ferry Projects TBD	0	Waterborne Ferry Projects	99651
	10.0	10.0	0.0	City of Vallejo	Ferry Projects TBD	0	Waterborne Ferry Projects	99646
	5.0	.0	5.0	State Parks & Rec.	Rail Museum	0	Rail Technology Museum	99648
10.0	8.0	2.0	CTC/Caltrans	Program Administration	0	N/A	99652	
Other Programs & Admin. Subtotal	<b>\$138.0</b>	<b>\$130.9</b>	<b>\$7.1</b>					
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$1,990.0</b>	<b>\$1,789.1</b>	<b>\$200.9</b>					
	100.0%	89.9%	10.1%					

Due to rounding there may be a slight difference in the totals from Exhibit 1 to Exhibit 2.

**EXHIBIT 2**

Volume II-O-2, Prop. 116, Rail Program

**PROPOSITION 116 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS  
THROUGH DECEMBER 1999 (Dollars in Millions)**

Application No.	Applicant Agency/Project Title	Amount Approved	CTC Appvd. Allocation	Not Yet Allocated
1, 2*	Caltrans/California Car Procurement	\$100.0	\$100.0	\$0.0
3, 4*	Caltrans/Capitol Corridor Improvements	40.0	40.0	.0
5, 6*	Caltrans/Capitol Corridor-Hayward and Fremont Stations	2.4	2.4	.0
7	Caltrans/Capitol and San Joaquin Route Improvements	44.5	44.5	.0
8, 9*	Caltrans/Capitol Corridor Jack London Square Station	1.8	1.8	.0
10	Caltrans/Track Connection at Stockton	2.2	1.7	.6
11	Caltrans/High Speed Rail Study (LA-Bakersfield)	5.0	4.7	.3
12, 13*	Caltrans/San Joaquin Route Improvements	35.8	35.8	.0
14	Caltrans/San Joaquin California Car Procurement	19.2	19.2	.0
15	Caltrans/Statewide ADA Project- Phase II	.4	.4	.0
16	Caltrans/Capitol Corridor Station Platforms	1.5	1.5	.0
17	Caltrans/Martinez Station Track Improvements	2.9	2.9	.0
18	Caltrans/Modesto Rail Station Project Development	.1	.1	.0
19	Caltrans/Modesto Rail Station Construction	2.0	2.0	.0
22	Caltrans/Santa Barbara Station Improvements	4.7	4.7	.0
23	Caltrans/Goleta Layover and Station Facilities	2.1	2.1	.0
24	Caltrans/Moorpark-Goleta Track & Signal Improvements	7.5	7.5	.0
25	Caltrans/Carpinteria Loading Platform Project	.4	.4	.0
26	Alameda County/BART Dublin-Pleasanton Extension	59.4	59.4	.0
27	Alameda County/Altamont Commuter Rail Stations/Platforms	1.6	1.6	.0
28	Contra Costa BART/Pittsburg-Antioch Extension	35.5	35.5	.0
29	NCRA/Eureka Southern RR Acquisition	6.1	6.1	.0
30	NCRA/Phase II Capital Improvements	3.1	3.1	.0
31	NCRA/Tie Replacement (Northern Projects)	.8	.8	.0
32	Peninsula Corridor JPB/ROW Acquisition	124.0	124.0	.0
33	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Satellite Maintenance Facility	1.0	1.0	.0
34	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Station ADA Improvements	2.4	2.4	.0
35, 36*	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Track Rehabilitation	10.3	10.3	.0
37, 38*	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Station Rehabilitation	2.3	2.3	.0
39, 40*	Peninsula Corridor JPB/CalTrain Capital Improvements	21.0	19.4	1.6
41	Peninsula Corridor JPB/CalTrain Maintenance Facility Study	.5	.5	.0
42*	Sacramento RTD/Engineering and Design-Folsom/Roseville	4.7	4.7	.0
43, 44*, 45*, 46*	Sacramento RTD/Mather Field Road Light Rail Extension	5.2	5.2	.0
47	Sacramento RTD/South Sacramento Light Rail Extension	1.9	1.9	.0
101	Sacramento RTD/South Sacramento Light Rail Extension	83.2	73.2	10.0
48	Sacramento RTD/Mather Field & Downtown Sac. LRV Purchase	4.6	.0	4.6
49	San Diego MTDB/Light Rail Vehicle Acquisition	16.0	16.0	.0
50	San Diego MTDB/San Ysidro Rail Yard Expansion	8.8	8.8	.0
51	San Diego MTDB/Mission Valley West Light Rail Extension	31.7	31.7	.0
52	San Joaquin COG/Economic Feasibility Study	.3	.3	.0
53	San Joaquin COG/Altamont Commuter Rail Service	13.7	13.7	.0
54	Santa Clara CTA/CalTrain Extension to Gilroy	5.7	5.7	.0
55	Santa Clara CTA/Tasman Corridor West Extension	39.5	39.5	.0
56	SCRRA/LA-San Bernardino Commuter Rail Line (Metrolink)	84.0	84.0	.0
57	SCRRA/LA-San Bernardino Commuter Rail Line (Metrolink)	.4	.4	.0
58	SCRRA/LA-UPT-Fullerton Commuter Rail Line (Metrolink)	75.0	75.0	.0
59	SCRRA/LA-Ventura Commuter Rail Line (Metrolink)	65.0	65.0	.0
60	SCRRA/Shared Facilities (Metrolink)	22.1	22.1	.0
61	SCRRA/Santa Fe Right-of-Way Acquisition	72.8	72.8	.0
62	SCRRA/San Bernardino-Riverside-Fullerton (Metrolink)	79.1	79.1	.0
63	SCRRA/Oceanside-Fullerton Commuter Rail (Metrolink)	68.8	68.8	.0
64	Los Angeles MTA/LRV Acquisition	16.4	16.4	.0
65, 66*	Los Angeles MTA/Green Line Construction	83.5	83.5	.0
67	Los Angeles MTA/Red Line North Hollywood Extension	25.0	25.0	.0
68	Los Angeles MTA/Pasadena Blue Line	40.0	40.0	.0
71*	San Francisco MUNI Capital Improvements	12.9	12.9	.0
72	San Francisco MUNI Metro Extension/PCC Car Rehabilitation	2.0	2.0	.0
73, 74*	San Francisco MUNI LRV Replacement	11.6	11.6	.0
75	San Francisco MUNI F-Embarcadero Streetcar Extension	8.5	8.5	.0
76	North San Diego County/Solana Beach Commuter Rail Station	2.0	2.0	.0
77	North San Diego County/Poinsettia Siding Construction	3.6	3.6	.0
78, 79*	North San Diego County/Oceanside-San Diego Capital Improvements	24.5	23.1	1.3
81, 82*	San Mateo County/BART San Francisco Airport Extension	10.0	10.0	.0
83	Contra Costa County/West Contra Costa TAC--Richmond Intermodal Station	1.5	1.5	.0

**EXHIBIT 2**  
**PROPOSITION 116 PROJECT ALLOCATIONS**  
**THROUGH DECEMBER 1999 (Dollars in Millions)**

Application No.	Applicant Agency/Project Title	Amount Approved	CTC Appvd. Allocation	Not Yet Allocated
84	Peninsula Corridor JPB/CalTrain Railcar Purchase	2.5	2.5	.0
85	San Francisco MUNI Metro Advance Train Control System	.0	.0	.0
87	Los Angeles MTA/Red Line North Hollywood Extension	32.2	32.2	.0
89	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor-Bakersfield Amtrak Station	4.3	1.7	2.5
90	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor New Merced Rail Station	1.4	1.4	.0
91	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Mountain View CalTrain Station Improvements	.4	.4	.0
92	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor--Stockton-Sacramento Track Improvement	1.1	1.1	.0
93	Los Angeles MTA/Red Line North Hollywood Extension	.5	.5	.0
94	Monterey County/San Francisco to Monterey Rail Plan	.5	.5	.0
95	Santa Clara CTA/Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor	.4	.4	.0
96	Santa Clara CTA/Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor	.5	.5	.0
97	Santa Clara CTA/Guadalupe Light Rail Corridor	.9	.9	.0
98	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor--Stockton-Sacramento Track Improvements	26.7	26.7	.0
99	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor--Stockton-Sacramento Track Improvements	8.6	8.6	.0
100	Peninsula Corridor JPB/Track Improvements	8.6	8.6	.0
88	City of Irvine/Guideway Demonstration Project	2.0	2.0	.0
102	City of Irvine/Guideway Demonstration Project	2.4	2.4	.0
80	South Lake Tahoe/Guideway Alternatives Analysis	.4	.4	.0
103	South Lake Tahoe/Park Avenue Intermodal Facility	6.7	.0	6.7
20, 21*, 86	Caltrans/Alameda Corridor - Sepulveda Grade Separation	16.0	16.0	.0
104*	Caltrans/Alameda Corridor - Del Amo Grade Separation	34.1	34.1	.0
105*	Caltrans/Alameda Corridor - Alameda Street Grade Separation	11.9	11.9	.0
106*	Caltrans/Alameda Corridor - Pacific Coast Highway Grade Separation	18.0	.0	18.0
107	Caltrans/San Joaquin Corridor - Bakersfield Track & Signal Improvements	1.4	1.4	.0
108	Caltrans/Capitol Corridor - Oakland Maintenance Facility	12.3	12.3	.0
	<b>Rail Program Subtotal</b>	<b>\$1,658.2</b>	<b>\$1612.5</b>	<b>\$45.7</b>
246	Various/Non-urban County Program	72.9	69.1	3.8
78	Various/Bicycle Program	20.0	19.8	.2
15	Various/Waterborne Ferry Program	20.0	19.3	.7
5	Vallejo/Waterborne Ferry Program	10.0	10.0	.0
	CTC and Caltrans Program Administration	8.0	8.0	.0
	<b>Other Programs and Administration Subtotal</b>	<b>\$130.9</b>	<b>\$126.2</b>	<b>\$4.7</b>
	<b>Total 116 Authorized by Voters</b>	<b>\$1,990.0</b>		
451	<b>Total 116 Approved Applications/Allocations</b>	<b>\$1789.1</b>	<b>\$1738.66</b>	<b>\$50.4</b>
	<b>Percent Allocated from Approved 116 Applications</b>		<b>97.2%</b>	<b>2.8%</b>
	<b>Total 116 Not Yet Approved</b>	<b>\$200.9</b>		

\*Reflects amended application for that same project.

Due to rounding there may be a slight difference in the totals from Exhibit 1 to Exhibit 2.

**EXHIBIT 3**

**AUGUST 1999 SURVEY OF ANTICIPATED PROPOSITION 116  
RAIL PROGRAM APPLICATION SUBMITTALS**

No.	Applicant Agency	Available Funds	Amount to be Requested by 1/1/00	Amount to be Requested by 7/1/00	Amount to be Requested in FY 2000/01	Amount to be Requested After FY 2000/01
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$193,603,440</b>	<b>\$8,808,090</b>	<b>\$152,795,350</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$32,000,000</b>
1	City of Irvine	\$120,600,000	\$0	\$120,600,000	\$0	\$0
2	Sacramento Regional Transit District	\$380,440	\$0	\$380,440	\$0	\$0
3	Caltrans $\Delta$	\$17,073,000	\$8,808,090	\$7,264,910	\$0	\$1,000,000
4	Sonoma County (Santa Rosa-Larkspur JPA)	\$17,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$17,000,000
5	Transportation Agency for Monterey County	\$16,550,000	\$0	\$13,550,000	\$0	\$3,000,000
6	Santa Cruz County Transportation Commission	\$11,000,000	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$0	\$0
7	Marin County (Santa Rosa-Larkspur JPA)	\$11,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$11,000,000

$\Delta$  \$1,000,000 for the Statewide Right-of-Way Survey (PUC Section 99621) is included in this amount.

**EXHIBIT 4**

**AUGUST 1999 SURVEY OF ANTICIPATED PROPOSITION 116  
RAIL PROGRAM ALLOCATION SUBMITTALS**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Applicant Agency</b>	<b>Available Funds</b>	<b>Amount to be Requested by 1/1/00</b>	<b>Amount to be Requested by 7/1/00</b>	<b>Amount to be Requested in FY 2000/01</b>	<b>Amount to be Requested After 2000/01</b>
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$45,592,957</b>	<b>\$16,859,457</b>	<b>\$6,294,000</b>	<b>\$16,339,500</b>	<b>\$6,100,000</b>
1	Caltrans – Various	\$3,400,000	\$3,400,000	\$0	\$0	\$0
2	Caltrans - Alameda Corridor Grade Separations	\$18,000,000	\$11,900,000	\$0	\$0	\$6,100,000
3	Peninsula Corridor JPB - Track Rehab.	\$1,559,457	\$1,559,457	\$0	\$0	\$0
4	Sacramento Regional Transit District-Light Rail Extensions	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$0
5	Sacramento Regional Transit District-Mather & Dtwn. Vehicle Purchase	\$4,644,000	\$0	\$4,644,000	\$0	\$0
6	North San Diego County TDB-Oceanside-San Diego Rail Service	\$1,339,500	\$0	\$0	\$1,339,500	\$0
7	City of South Lake Tahoe	\$6,650,000	\$0	\$1,650,000	\$5,000,000	\$0

**EXHIBIT 5  
TRANSIT INTEGRATION PLAN  
PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE (PRC) MEMBERS**

**NORTHERN CALIFORNIA  
PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr. Paul Bartlett  
Chairman Working Committee  
Fresno

Mr. Bruce Behrens (representing Caltrans on both  
Northern and Southern California PRC groups) - Acting  
Assistant Deputy Director  
Legislative Affairs  
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORTATION  
Director's Office

Mr. Howard Goode, Deputy General Manager, Planning  
& Engineering  
SAN MATEO COUNTY TRANSIT DISTRICT  
(SAMTRANS)

Ms. Joanne Koegel, Deputy Executive Director  
SACRAMENTO AREA COUNCIL OF  
GOVERNMENTS

Ms. Pilka Robinson, General Manager  
SACRAMENTO REGIONAL TRANSIT DISTRICT

Mr. Jack Pisano, Contract General Manager  
SAN FRANCISCO GRAY LINE

Mr. Michael Tanner, Manager  
Grant Development and Reporting Division  
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT

Mr. Peter M. Cipolla, General Manager  
(Northern California PRC Chair)  
SANTA CLARA COUNTY TRANSAGENCY

Chester Moland, General Manager  
GOLDEN EMPIRE TRANSIT DISTRICT

The Honorable Robert Cabral, Supervisor  
SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA  
PEER REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr. James Gosnell  
(Southern California PRC Chair)  
SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF  
GOVERNMENTS

Ms. Susan Hafner, General Manager  
RIVERSIDE TRANSIT AGENCY

Ms. Felicia Brannen, Government Relations Assistant  
LONG BEACH TRANSIT

Mr. Thomas Larwin, General Manager  
SAN DIEGO METRO TRANSIT DEVELOPMENT  
BOARD

Mr. Dean Delgado, Principal Transportation Analyst  
ORANGE COUNTY TRANSIT AUTHORITY

Mr. James Seal  
CALIFORNIA BUS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Jim McLaughlin  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation

#### 3. Competitive Bicycle Program

##### Background

The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA) authorizes \$20 million (PUC Section 99650) for a competitive program to provide grants to local agencies for capital bicycle improvement projects that provide safety and convenience for bicycle commuters. The Commission's policy guidelines set the funding for the CATIA bicycle program at \$4 million a year over a five-year period, but authorize the Commission to set a different level if competition for funding demonstrates that a greater amount is necessary. Following the FY 1991-92 funding cycle, due to the tremendous applicant response in FY 1992-93, the Commission opted to program all remaining funds in the second round, rather than over five annual competitive application cycles.

In June 1991, the Commission delegated to Caltrans' Office of Bicycle Facilities the lead responsibility for administering the bicycle program. Specifically, Caltrans staff have been responsible for evaluating and prioritizing applications based on the criteria contained in the Commission's CATIA Bicycle Program Guidelines, and making recommendations to the Commission on which projects should be approved for funding.

##### Program Status

With the approval of the FY1991-92 and FY1992-93 funding cycles, the total \$20 million authorized under CATIA for the competitive bicycle program has been programmed by the Commission for 76 projects in 25 counties throughout the State as follows:

**FY 1991-92 Funding Cycle** -- Through December 1999, the Commission has allocated \$8.2 million to all 36 projects in the FY1991-92 Funding Cycle, as shown in Exhibit 1. Sixteen of these projects achieved cost savings totaling \$990,793. This entire amount has been reprogrammed to bicycle projects on the FY1992-93 Standby List or other eligible Transportation Enhancement Activity (TEA) Program projects.

**FY 1992-93 Funding Cycle** -- Currently 31 projects are proposed from the FY1992-93 list for a total of \$9.3 million in CATIA funds. Through December 1999, the Commission has allocated \$9.3 million for approved FY1992-93 projects, as shown in Exhibit 1. Between June 1994 and December 1998, the Commission approved seven additional projects listed on the Stand-by List totaling \$756,875 with funds made available from either project cost savings or from project deletions from the FY1991-92 and FY1992-93 project lists.

**Qualifying Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) Program Projects** – In January 1998, the Commission approved a State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) amendment that reprogrammed \$2,562,000 in TEA Program savings created by actual project cost savings and deletions. These savings were used to augment an existing TEA Program project and added five new TEA Program projects. This action also included shifting two TEA

projects totaling \$900,000 into the Proposition 116 Competitive Bicycle Program, funding them with Proposition 116 Bicycle project savings. This change increased the total number of bicycle projects funded through the Proposition 116 Competitive Bicycle Program up to 76. In March 1999, the Commission approved a STIP amendment that reprogrammed \$800,000 for one TEA project into the Proposition 116 Competitive Bicycle Program by using funds from project cost savings and a project deletion. The March 1999 STIP amendment maintains the total number of Competitive Bicycle Program projects at 76.

### **Status of Allocation Requests**

Through December 1999, \$19.8 million or 99 percent of the \$20 million has been allocated for projects included in both the FY1991-92 and FY1992-93 funding cycles. The remaining \$200,000 in unallocated funds was for a project in the City of Orinda which has been completed with other funds. The City of Orinda notified Commission staff that they would not seek an allocation, leaving approximately \$204,000 available for other purposes. Staff intends to prepare, for the January 2000 Commission meeting, recommended qualifying Transportation Enhancement Activities (TEA) bicycle projects that can encumber funds prior to July 1, 2000 (PUC Section 99684), and reprogram Proposition 116 Competitive Bicycle funds from the remaining unprogrammed funds to projects on the TEA Standby List that can meet the Competitive Bicycle Program criteria and the June 30, 2000 deadline for encumbering and expending the funds.

**Exhibit 1  
Application/Allocation Approvals Through December 1999**

No.	Applicant	Project	Approved Project Amount	Actual Approved Project Amount	Amount Allocated	Amount Re-programmed
1	City of Simi Valley	Arroyo Simi Bicycle Path - Cl. I	\$478,000	\$478,000	\$478,000	\$0
2	City of Santa Cruz	Bay Dr. Bicycle Detection	40,000	40,000	40,000	\$0
3	San Benito COG	Sunnyslope Rd. - Cl. II	21,000	21,000	21,000	\$0
4	City of San Francisco	Commute Bikeways - St. Improvements	263,000	211,214	211,214	\$23,497*2
						\$28,289*3
5	County of Santa Cruz	Soquel Dr. Bike Lane - Cl. II	90,000	90,000	90,000	\$0
6	County of Santa Cruz	Chanticleer Ave. - Cl. II	187,000	149,274	149,274	\$37,726*3
7	Yuba and Sutter Counties	5th St. Bridge Bikeway - Cl. I	690,000	690,000	690,000	\$0
8	County of Santa Barbara	Countywide Commuter Bikeway	446,600	446,600	446,600	\$0
9	Southern Calif. RTD	Blue Line Bicycle Parking	39,960	39,300	39,300	\$660*3
10	City of Alameda	Bay Farm Island Bike Bridge - Cl. I	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	\$0
11	County of Sonoma	Sebastopol Commuter Bikeway - Cl. I & II	200,000	200,000	200,000	\$0
12	Santa Cruz MTD	Bus Bike Racks	36,000	36,000	36,000	\$0
13	County of Santa Cruz	McGregor Dr. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	136,350	136,350	136,350	\$0
14	City of Santa Clarita	Santa Clara River Bike Trail - Cl. I	800,000	800,000	800,000	\$0
15	County of Contra Costa	Delta De Anza Trail - Cl. I	300,000	300,000	300,000	\$0
16	City of Los Angeles	Railroad Crossing Bikeway Improvements	100,000	100,000	100,000	\$0
17	City of Los Angeles	Plummer St. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	30,000	30,000	30,000	\$0
18	City of Los Angeles	East Tujunga Phase I - Cl. I, II, & Parking	200,000	200,000	200,000	\$0
19	City of Los Angeles	East Tujunga Phase II - Cl. I, II, & III	100,000	100,000	100,000	\$0
20	City of Claremont	Commuter Bicycle Facilities – Parking	24,100	17,509	17,509	\$6,591*3
21	City of Riverside	Phase I - Cl. II Bikeway & Parking	120,000	0	0	\$120,000*1
				38,640	38,640	(\$38,640)*3
22	City of Hawaiian Gardens	City/Regional Bikeway - Cl. I, II, III, Parking	80,000	80,000	80,000	\$0
23	City of Berkeley	Bicycle Sensitive Loop Detectors	66,000	66,000	66,000	\$0
24	City of Lancaster	Bicycle Locker/Rack Installation - Parking	19,500	16,735	16,735	\$2,765*2
25	County of Santa Cruz	Conflict Reducing Bikeways - Rd. Imp.	73,196	39,621	39,621	\$33,575*1
26	City of Sand City	Sand City/Seaside Bike Path - Cl. I	1,389,000	1,389,000	1,389,000	\$0
27	Corte Madera/Larkspur	Bicycle Path - Cl. I	69,000	69,000	69,000	\$0
28	City of Colton	Bicycle Network - Cl. II & Parking	528,115	130,550	130,550	\$397,565*4
29	County of San Diego	Dehesa Rd. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	260,000	232,393	232,393	\$27,607*4
30	County of San Diego	Sweetwater Rd. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	183,000	183,000	183,000	\$0
31	County of San Diego	Ashwood St. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	157,000	141,808	141,808	\$15,192*3
32	County of San Diego	Wintergardens Blvd. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	130,000	130,000	130,000	\$0

Volume II-O-3, Prop. 116 Programs – Competitive Bicycle Program

No.	Applicant	Project	Approved Project Amount	Actual Approved Project Amount	Amount Allocated	Amount Re-programmed	
33	City of Whittier	Bicycle Storage & Lighting – Parking	39,000	32,158	32,158	\$6,842	*3
34	City of Mt. View	Stephens Creek Trail - Cl. I	449,000	449,000	449,000	\$0	
35	City of San Diego	West Bernardo Dr. Bike Lanes - Cl. II	425,000	0	0	\$265,000	*1
				101,542	101,542	\$58,458	*4
36	City of West Hollywood	West Hollywood Bikeways	37,000	31,334	31,334	\$5,666	*4
		<b>Subtotal FY 1991-92</b>	<b>9,206,821</b>	<b>8,216,028</b>	<b>8,216,028</b>	<b>990,793</b>	
37	County of Sacramento	Sunrise Corridor	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$0	
38	San Francisco	Bicycle Route Signage	85,000	85,000	85,000	\$0	
39	City of Capitola	41st Ave/Clares St/Rispin St	175,000	175,000	175,000	\$0	
40	City of Palo Alto	Alma Street Bike Bridge	196,650	196,650	196,650	\$0	
41	City of Davis	Putah Creek Overcrossing	750,000	750,000	750,000	\$0	
42	Santa Barbara	City-wide Bikeway Safety Enhancements	320,000	320,000	320,000	\$0	
43	City of Huntington Beach	PCH Bike Lanes	750,000	0	0	\$750,000	*5
44	County of Contra Costa	Iron Horse Trail	600,000	600,000	600,000	\$0	
45	City of Folsom	American River Bike Crossing	750,000	750,000	750,000	\$0	
46	City of Chico	Bridge & Bikeways	728,500	550,000	550,000	\$156,500	*2
						\$22,000	*5
47	County of Monterey	Pine Canyon-King City Bike Path & Bridge	365,000	365,000	365,000	\$0	
48	County of Sacramento	Hazel/Folsom Bikeway & Overcrossing	750,000	750,000	750,000	\$0	
49	City of Capitola	McGregor Drive Bike Lanes	150,000	150,000	150,000	\$0	
50	San Diego	Grand Avenue/Mission Bay Drive Bikeway	137,000	137,000	137,000	\$0	
51	San Francisco	Valencia Street Commute Bikeway	285,000	285,000	285,000	\$0	
52	Town of Mammoth Lakes	Mammoth Lakes Trails	309,573	217,928	217,928	\$91,645	*4
53	County of Santa Cruz	Porter Street Improvement	267,046	267,046	267,046	\$0	
54	City of Santa Monica	Broadway Addition	75,585	38,153	38,153	\$37,432	*4
55	San Diego	Ocean Beach Path Ext.	350,000	350,000	350,000	\$0	
56	Santa Cruz	Broadway Corridor Lanes/Loop Detection	228,000	228,000	228,000	\$0	
57	City of Chino	Chino City-wide Bicycle Plan	364,147	364,147	364,147	\$0	
58	County of Lake	Lake Street Bikeway	208,242	208,242	208,242	\$0	
59	City of Los Angeles	Sepulveda Blvd. Bike Lanes C34	50,000	0	0	\$50,000	*1
60	County of Riverside	Bike Locker Network	155,000	134,655	134,655	\$15,698	*5
61	City of San Jose	Bicycle Transportation Corridor	180,500	180,423	180,423	\$77	*3
62	Del Norte LTC	Washington Blvd. Bikeway	156,600	156,600	156,600	\$0	
63	County of Humboldt	Central Avenue Shoulder Widening	142,200	117,347	117,347	\$12,143	*3
						\$12,710	*4
64	City of Manhattan Beach	Manhattan Seg Bay Cities Reg Bikeway	266,224	0	0	\$266,224	*4
65	City of San Buenaventura	Ventura Commuter Bicycle Trail	750,000	750,000	750,000	\$0	
66	City of Stockton	Calaveras River Bikeway	202,000	202,000	202,000	\$0	
67	Santa Cruz	Plaza Lane Bicycle Parking	32,000	22,387	22,387	\$9,613	*2
68	Santa Cruz	Commerce Lane Bicycle Parking	18,000	10,950	10,950	\$7,050	*2

Volume II-O-3. Prop. 116 Programs – Competitive Bicycle Program

No.	Applicant	Project	Approved Project Amount	Actual Approved Project Amount	Amount Allocated	Amount Re-programmed	
69	San Diego	Perez Cove Way Bicycle Path	20,000	0	0	\$20,000	*2
70	City of Santa Clarita	Santa Clara River Commuter Bikeway	555,912	555,912	555,912	\$0	
		<b>Subtotal FY 1992/93</b>	<b>10,793,179</b>	<b>9,337,440</b>	<b>\$9,337,440</b>	<b>\$1,451,092</b>	
		<b>Total FY 1991-92 &amp; 1992-93</b>	<b>20,000,000</b>	<b>17,553,468</b>	<b>17,553,468</b>	<b>2,441,885</b>	
		<b>To Be Programmed</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$2,446,532</b>			
		<b>STAND-BY LIST PROJECTS</b>					
71	SANBAG	Commuter Rail Station Bicycle Storage		21,000	<b>21,000</b>	\$21,000	*1
72	County of Mariposa	Bus & Bus Stop Bike Racks		6,000	<b>6,000</b>	\$6,000	*1
73	Los Angeles	Watts Bikeway		99,500	<b>99,500</b>	\$99,500	*1
74	<del>County of Santa Cruz</del>	<del>Broadway-Brommer Bike Path</del>	15,000	0	<b>0</b>	\$0	*5
75	City of Hercules	San Pablo Avenue Improvements		75,000	<b>75,000</b>	\$75,000	*1
76	City of Palmdale	Sierra Highway Regional Bikeway		212,075	<b>431,500</b>	\$431,500	*1, *2
				39,428			*2
				179,997			*2
77	City of Brentwood	Brentwood Bikeway		37,725	<b>108,875</b>	\$108,875	*3
				659			*3
				28,289			*3
				6,591			*3
				1,359			*3
				15,191			*3
				6,841			*3
				77			*3
				12,143			*3
78	City of Chico	State Route 32 Bikeway (TEA)		700,000	<b>700,000</b>	\$700,000	*4
79	City of Orinda	State Route 24 Bikeway (TEA)		<b>200,000</b>	<b>0</b>	\$200,000	*4
80	City of Oakland	Embarcadero Bay Trail (TEA)		22,000	<b>800,000</b>	\$800,000	*5
				750,000			*5
				15,000			*5
				13,000			*5
		<b>Stand-by List Subtotal</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>2,441,875</b>	<b>2,241,875</b>	<b>\$2,441,875</b>	
		<b>TOTAL COMPETITIVE BICYCLE PROGRAM</b>	<b>\$17,568,468</b>	<b>\$19,995,343</b>	<b>\$19,795,343</b>	<b>\$10</b>	**
		<b>PERCENT OF TOTAL BICYCLE PROGRAM</b>		<b>87.8%</b>	<b>99.0%</b>	<b>\$4,647</b>	***

\*1 – Various Standby projects per PA-94-11  
 \*2 – City of Palmdale  
 \*3 – City of Brentwood  
 \*4 – City of Chico and City of Orinda

\*5 – City of Oakland  
 \*\* Amount remaining due to rounding  
 \*\*\* Amount remaining to be programmed





## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation

#### 4. Non-Urban County Transit Program

##### Background

Proposition 116, the Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA), authorizes \$73 million (PUC Section 99628[a]) in general obligation bond funds for allocation to 28 specified non-urban counties on a per capita basis for railroad grade crossing improvements, acquisition of railroad rights-of-way for rail transportation purposes, rail passenger safety improvements, purchase of paratransit vehicles, and other capital facilities for public transportation. In October 1991, the California Transportation Commission adopted the official population data from the 1990 Federal Decennial Census and the proportionate non-urban county program funding levels for the 28 non-urban counties designated in CATIA (Exhibit 1). The Commission delegated lead administrative responsibility for the non-urban transit program to Caltrans. Responsibilities include review of all non-urban county transit project applications and allocation requests, with the exception of rail projects, which are reviewed by Commission staff.

In contrast to the Proposition 116 competitive Waterborne Ferry and Bicycle Programs, the Non-Urban County Transit Program is a non-competitive program with specified funding levels for each of the 28 non-urban counties based on population size. Unlike the bicycle and waterborne ferry programs, project allocation requests are submitted by non-urban counties on a staggered basis over several years consistent with each project delivery schedule. This method accommodates, for example, projected growth in ridership for transit systems and the corresponding need for additional transit vehicles and new or expanded transit facilities.

##### Program Status

Through December 1999, the Commission has approved 248 applications for non-urban county transit, bicycle, and rail projects totaling \$73 million authorized under CATIA for the Non-urban County Transit program. The Commission has reserved Butte County's remaining per capita share of \$0.1 million for future projects. The approved application amounts, by county, are included in Exhibit 2.

During this same period, the Commission has allocated \$66.9 million or 92% of the total \$73 million. The \$66.9 million allocated represents a \$6.9 million increase over the amount allocated by the end of 1998. The allocation amounts, by county, are also shown in Exhibit 2.

##### Status of Unallocated Projects

Of the 28 non-urban counties, sixteen have unallocated funds remaining. Thirteen counties have unallocated funds for transit projects totaling \$3,183,679; two counties, San Luis Obispo and Sutter, have bicycle funds remaining for a total of \$866,871; and two counties, Nevada and Tuolumne, have funds remaining for both transit and bicycle projects totaling \$1,953,130. Each county with remaining unallocated funds is shown in Exhibit 3.

## EXHIBIT 1

**CLEAN AIR AND TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1990  
NON-URBAN COUNTY TRANSIT PROGRAM  
RURAL COUNTY PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CAPITAL  
GRANTS ALLOCATION\***

County	Projected population as of 04/90**	Population Percent	Allocation
ALPINE	1,113	.000710	51,886
AMADOR	30,039	.019180	1,400,203
BUTTE	82,120	.116289	8,489,131
CALAVERAS	31,998	.020431	1,491,517
COLUSA	16,275	.010392	758,624
DEL NORTE	23,460	.014979	1,093,537
EL DORADO	125,995	.080451	5,872,985
GLENN	24,798	.015834	1,155,905
IMPERIAL	109,303	.069793	5,094,924
INYO	18,281	.011673	852,129
LAKE	50,631	.032329	2,360,054
LASSEN	27,598	.017622	1,286,421
MARIPOSA	14,302	.009132	666,657
MODOC	9,678	.006179	451,119
MONO	9,956	.006357	464,077
NAPA	110,765	.070727	5,163,071
NEVADA	78,510	.050131	3,659,574
PLUMAS	19,739	.012603	920,091
SAN BENITO	36,697	.023432	1,710,552
SAN LUIS OBISPO	217,162	.138664	10,122,538
SHASTA	147,036	.093887	6,853,766
SIERRA	3,318	.002118	154,661
SISKIYOU	43,531	.027795	2,029,103
SUTTER	64,415	.041131	3,002,566
TEHAMA	49,625	.031687	2,313,162
TRINITY	13,063	.008341	608,903
TUOLUMNE	48,456	.030940	2,258,672
YUBA	58,228	.037180	2,714,172
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1,566,092</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$73,000,000</b>

\*Public Utilities Code Section 99628

\*\*Census Population for California Cities and Counties:  
1990 and 1980 **Report SR 91-1 (January 25, 1991)**  
Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit.

**EXHIBIT 2  
PROPOSITION 116 NON-URBAN COUNTY TRANSIT PROGRAM  
APPLICATION/ALLOCATION APPROVALS THROUGH DECEMBER 1999**

County	Per Capita Amount	Approved Applications				Approved Allocations				Balance
		Transit	Bicycle	Rail	Total	Transit	Bicycle	Rail	Total	Remaining
Alpine	\$51,886	\$51,886	\$0	\$0	\$51,886	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$51,886
Amador	1,400,203	1,400,203	0	0	1,400,203	1,400,203	0	0	1,400,203	0
Butte *	8,489,131	7,235,350	1,181,781	0	8,417,131	7,215,350	1,181,781	0	8,397,131	20,000
Calaveras	1,491,517	425,995	1,065,522	0	1,491,517	425,995	1,065,522	0	1,491,517	0
Colusa	758,624	758,624	0	0	758,624	758,624	0	0	758,624	0
Del Norte	1,093,537	837,537	256,000	0	1,093,537	837,537	256,600	0	1,093,537	0
El Dorado	5,872,985	4,214,802	1,658,183	0	5,872,985	4,214,802	1,658,183	0	5,872,985	0
Glenn	1,155,905	1,155,905	0	0	1,155,905	1,155,905	0	0	1,155,905	0
Imperial	5,094,924	2,150,000	166,000	2,778,924	5,094,924	2,150,000	166,000	2,778,924	5,094,924	0
Inyo	852,129	852,129	0	0	852,129	674,322	0	0	674,322	177,807
Lake	2,360,054	1,401,216	958,838	0	2,360,054	1,401,216	958,838	0	2,360,054	0
Lassen	1,286,421	1,286,421	0	0	1,286,421	1,286,421	0	0	1,286,421	0
Mariposa	666,657	666,657	0	0	666,657	666,657	0	0	666,657	0
Modoc	451,119	451,119	0	0	451,119	395,799	0	0	395,799	55,320
Mono	464,077	60,469	403,608	0	464,077	60,469	403,608	0	464,077	0
Napa	5,163,071	2,663,071	2,500,000	0	5,163,071	2,508,554	2,507,730	0	5,016,284	146,787
Nevada	3,659,574	2,308,156	1,351,418	0	3,659,574	1,889,418	1,135,518	0	3,024,936	634,638
Plumas	920,091	727,100	192,991	0	920,091	727,100	192,991	0	920,091	0
San Benito	1,710,552	1,710,552	0	0	1,710,552	1,634,841	0	0	1,634,841	75,711
San Luis Obispo	10,122,538	2,396,205	4,693,871	3,032,462	10,122,538	2,397,000	4,673,871	3,032,462	10,103,333	19,205
Shasta	6,853,766	6,853,766	0	0	6,853,766	6,853,766	0	0	6,853,766	0
Sierra	154,661	154,661	0	0	154,661	154,661	0	0	154,661	0
Siskiyou	2,029,103	1,947,189	0	81,914	2,029,103	1,531,189	0	81,914	1,613,103	416,000
Sutter	3,002,566	569,000	2,433,566	0	3,002,566	569,000	2,367,566	0	2,936,566	66,000
Tehama	2,313,162	2,313,162	0	0	2,313,162	1,529,734	0	0	1,529,734	783,428
Trinity	608,903	210,000	398,903	0	608,903	158,782	398,903	0	557,685	51,218
Tuolumne	2,258,672	1,875,500	383,172	0	2,258,672	940,000	0	0	940,000	1,318,672
Yuba	2,714,172	270,000	2,444,172	0	2,714,172	270,000	2,444,172	0	2,714,172	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$73,000,000</b>	<b>\$46,946,675</b>	<b>\$20,088,025</b>	<b>\$5,893,300</b>	<b>\$72,928,000</b>	<b>\$43,807,345</b>	<b>\$19,410,683</b>	<b>\$5,893,300</b>	<b>\$69,111,328</b>	<b>\$3,816,672</b>
<b>SUMMARY</b>	Applications:	150	92	6	248				<b>94.8%</b>	<b>5.2%</b>

\* \$72,000 remains for application

**EXHIBIT 3**  
**PROPOSITION 116 NON-URBAN COUNTY TRANSIT PROGRAM**  
**STATUS OF UNALLOCATED FUNDS**

County	Programmed Amount	Programming Date	Project Type	Remaining Balance	Expected Allocation Date	Reason For Delay
Alpine	\$51,886	PA-93-10 2/24/93	Transit	\$51,886	<b>Unknown</b>	
Butte*	\$8,417,131	PA-96-05 3/27/96	Transit	\$20,000	March 2000	
Inyo	\$852,129	PA-93-32 8/5/93	Transit	\$177,807	Spring 2000	Rescoping project, now Dispatch facility
Modoc	\$451,119	PA-95-06 3/30/95	Transit	\$55,320	March 2000	Staffing Changes
Napa	\$5,163,071	PA-97-08 4/2/97	Transit	\$146,787	December 2000	Rescoped Project
Nevada	\$3,659,574	PA-93-47 12/15/93 PA-96-05 3/27/96 PA-97-25 12/10/97	Bicycle \$6,000 Transit \$122,395 Transit \$506,243	\$634,638	March 2000	Lack of Staffing
San Benito	\$1,710,552	PA-97-13 5/1/97	Transit	\$75,711	<b>Unknown</b>	
San Luis Obispo	\$10,112,538	PA-97-01 1/29/97	Bicycle	\$20,000	Spring 2000	
Siskiyou	\$2,029,103	PA-99-17 7/15/99	Transit	\$415,994	February 2000	Originally Scheduled for Spring 2000
Sutter	\$3,002,566	PA-93-96 7/9/93	Bicycle	\$66,000	March 2000	Rescoped Project
Tehama	\$2,313,162	PA-93-22 6/3/93 PA-93-25 7/3/93	Transit \$500,000 Transit \$283,428	\$783,428	February 2000	Staffing Changes and weather
Trinity	\$608,903	PA-92-43 11/16/93	Transit	\$51,218	February 2000	Waiting for study completion
Tuolumne	\$2,258,672	PA-96-05 3/27/96 PA-94-22 10/19/94	Transit \$935,500 Bicycle \$383,172	\$1,318,672	March 2000	Negotiating Planning Process
<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>\$40,640,406</b>			<b>\$3,817,461</b>		

\* \$72,000 remaining for application



## **II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES**

### **O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation**

#### **5. Waterborne Ferry Program**

##### **Background**

The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA) allocates \$20 million (PUC Section 99651) for a competitive program to provide grants to eligible applicants for construction, improvement, acquisition and other capital expenditures associated with waterborne ferry operations. The CATIA also provides a noncompetitive allocation of \$10 million (PUC Section 99646) to the City of Vallejo for ferry vessels and terminal improvements.

##### **Competitive Program - FY1991-92 Funding Cycle**

In December 1991, the Commission approved \$10.97 million of the \$20 million authorized under CATIA for five waterborne ferry project applications. The approved projects and corresponding State funding commitments are shown in Exhibit 1. Through December 1999, the Commission has allocated the entire \$10.97 million or 100% of the total programmed to all five approved projects. The allocation amounts, by project are also shown in Exhibit 1.

##### **Competitive Program - FY1992-93 Funding Cycle**

In May 1993, the Commission approved the remaining \$9.03 million in CATIA waterborne ferry program funds for ten projects. The approved projects and CATIA funding levels are shown in Exhibit 1. Through December 1999, the Commission has allocated \$8.3 million or 92% of the total \$9.03 million to nine of these ten projects. The project funding levels and allocation amounts are also shown in Exhibit 1.

##### **Status of Allocation Requests**

Through December 1999, \$19.3 million or 96.4 percent of the total \$20 million programmed has been allocated. In September 1999, Commission staff explored with the Town of Tiburon, the lone remaining applicant agency, when an allocation request for the balance of unallocated funds (\$710,000) would be submitted for their ferry project. The status of the Town of Tiburon's project is as follows:

1. Town of Tiburon (\$710,000)— According to the Town Engineer, the Blue and Gold Company has agreed to reconfigure the current dock to make it ADA compliant, in a manner that appears acceptable to those concerned with environmental and adjacent property impacts. If that agreement is finalized, Tiburon will consider submitting a revised application, eliminating the dock reconfiguration and including instead a pedestrian walkway, a covered pedestrian waiting area and bicycle access and storage. The amended application would acknowledge that the original intent of the project would be met by the Blue and Gold Fleet performing ADA compliance to the dock. The Town of Tiburon anticipates submitting the amended application early in 2000.

**City of Vallejo Waterborne Ferry Projects**

Under CATIA, \$10 million is authorized for allocation to the City of Vallejo for expenditure on waterborne ferry vessels and terminal improvements. In May 1993, the Commission approved a project application from Vallejo for \$2.86 million in CATIA funds for the acquisition of two ferry vessels with a project title of “Northbay Ferry Demonstration Project-Phase 1”. In September 1996, due to various extenuating circumstances, the Commission approved an additional \$115,201 in Proposition 116 funds to the project. In November 1993, the Commission approved a second application for a third ferry vessel from Vallejo for \$3.65 million with a project title of “Interim Ferry Service”, which later realized cost savings of \$13,124. In December 1996, the Commission approved an application for \$2.69 million for Vallejo Terminal improvements with a project title of “North Bay Ferry Demonstration Project - Phase II, Terminal Improvements.” In February 1998, the Commission approved two applications from the City of Vallejo for the remaining \$0.7 million in CATIA funds. \$396,304 was approved for the construction of a public “Ferry Dock at Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco” project and \$303,696 was approved for the “Baylink Maintenance Facilities Upgrade” project located at the Mare Island Naval Shipyard.

The five projects discussed in the preceding paragraph represents the Commission’s approval and allocation of the entire \$10 million designated in CATIA for the City of Vallejo for ferry vessel acquisitions and docking and terminal improvements.

**EXHIBIT 1  
PROPOSITION 116 WATERBORNE FERRY PROGRAM  
APPLICATION/ALLOCATION APPROVALS THROUGH DECEMBER 1999**

Applicant		Project	Approved Project Amount	Amount Allocated	Unallocated Balance
<b>FY 91/92 Competitive Ferry Program</b>					
1	City of Alameda	Alameda/Oakland Ferry Vessel	\$2,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$0
2	City of Alameda	Shoreline Protection Project	462,735	462,735	0
3	City of Avalon	Repair Terminal & Dock	1,500,000	1,500,000	0
4	Port of San Francisco	Pier 1/2 Improvements	5,809,000	5,809,000	0
5	GGB Hwy & Transp. Dist.	Ferry Vessel	702,000	702,000	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$10,973,735</b>	<b>\$10,973,735</b> 100.0%	<b>\$0</b> 0.0%
<b>FY 92/93 Competitive Ferry Program</b>					
1	City of Alameda	Alameda/Oakland Ferry Vessel	\$1,102,491	\$1,102,491	\$0
2	City of Alameda	Main St. Barge Rehabilitation	227,774	227,774	0
3	Town of Tiburon	Dock Realignment & Repair	710,000	0	710,000
4	City of Sausalito	Terminal Upgrade	600,000	600,000	0
5	LACMTA	Terminal & Parking Improvements	1,300,000	1,300,000	0
6	GGB Hwy & Transp. Dist.	Larkspur Ferry Access Improvement	50,000	50,000	0
7	Port of San Francisco	Terminal Upgrade	2,723,184	2,723,184	0
8	Port of Oakland	Oakland Ferry Terminal Improvement	406,127	406,127	0
9	City of Alameda	East End Ferry Vessel	1,100,000	1,100,000	0
10	GGB Hwy & Transp. Dist.	Ferry Vessel	806,689	806,689	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$9,026,265</b>	<b>\$8,316,265</b> 92%	<b>\$710,000</b> 8%
<b>Total FY 91/92 and 92/93</b>			<b>\$20,000,000</b>	<b>\$19,290,000</b> 96.4%	<b>\$710,000</b> 3.6%
<b>Vallejo Waterborne Ferry Program</b>					
1	Vallejo	Ferry Demonstration Project-Phase I	\$2,975,201	\$2,975,201	\$0
2	Vallejo	Ferry Vessel & Rehabilitation	3,636,876	3,636,876	0
3	Vallejo	Ferry Demonstration Project-Phase II	2,687,923	2,687,923	0
4	Vallejo	Public Ferry Dock Project	396,304	396,304	0
5	Vallejo	Baylink Ferry Maintenance Facility	303,696	303,696	0
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$10,000,000</b>	<b>\$10,000,000</b> 100.0%	<b>\$0</b> 0.0%





## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### O. Proposition 116 Programs Implementation

#### 6. Museum of Railroad Technology

The Clean Air and Transportation Improvement Act (CATIA) includes \$5 million for the California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for construction of the California State Museum of Railroad Technology, and specifies that these funds shall be provided to DPR when sufficient funding for the entire project is available.

The effort to build a California State Railroad Museum began in 1969. The first phase of the project, the Central Pacific Railroad Passenger Station, was completed in 1976. By 1986, several more phases of the project were completed including:

- Museum Library and Archives,
- Big Four Building, which houses the Museum's administrative functions, the Huntington Hopkins Hardware Store and the Stanford Gallery,
- 100,000 square-foot Museum of Railroad History,
- Sacramento Southern Railroad, which is the Museum's operating tourist railway, and
- Central Pacific Railroad Freight Depot and Steam Navigation Terminal.

Planning began in the mid-1980s for the Museum of Railroad Technology, the next phase of the California State Railroad Museum. A feasibility study, site selection, schematics and preliminary working drawings were completed by mid-1991. At that time, DPR pursued local agency lease-revenue financing for the balance of non-Proposition 116 project funds. Since that time, however, other more appropriate sources of funds have been identified which DPR will be pursuing. DPR has completed a financial analysis in preparation for proceeding with the project.

The proposed Museum of Railroad Technology has three major components:

1. Interpretive Galleries – Formal museum galleries containing broad-based interpretive exhibits about railroad engineering and technology.
2. Restoration Shop – Facilities for the restoration and maintenance of the Museum's collection of historic locomotives and cars. The public would have access to the Restoration Shop in order to see and understand the preservation work that would occur there.
3. Reference – Covered storage for the Museum's non-exhibited collection of locomotives and cars, as well as educational facilities and expansion of the Museum Library and Archives.

The addition of a Railroad Technology Museum has been a long sought goal of DPR and would fulfill the Museum's 1973 Master Plan. In the 1980s, the preferred site for this facility was the historic Southern Pacific Sacramento Shops, but the then-owner Southern Pacific (SP) Railroad informed DPR that this site was not available. As a result, DPR had been pursuing the Technology Museum expansion at a site near Front and R streets in Sacramento.

However, since the Union Pacific Railroad (UP) purchased SP, DPR had an opportunity to redirect its attention to the preferred site at the historic Southern Pacific Sacramento shops adjacent to the existing Rail Museum. The Railroad Technology Museum is the same project, just at a different site. The change in location would cause a 5 to 7 year delay because the development of the Railroad Technology Museum project is tied to the Union Pacific's toxic remediation of the site. This location change, however, would allow the preservation of one of the most important industrial sites in the Western United States. The project would be compatible with and "anchor" UP's contiguous development of the 235 acre railroad yard and be consistent with City of Sacramento redevelopment objectives for downtown, the riverfront and the UP Railyard.

According to DPR, the Museum of Railroad Technology will cost between \$21 and \$25 million, including approximately \$1.4 million expended to date for design development, preliminary working drawings and an environmental impact report. Project funding will come from CATIA (\$5.0 million), potential Park Bond financing (through Proposition 12 on the March 2000 ballot – a \$2.1 billion Safe Neighborhood, Parks, Clean Water, Clean Air, and Coastal Protection Bond Act), lease-revenue bonds issued by the State Public Works Board, potential Transportation Enhancement Activities funds (TEA), and the balance of funds raised privately by the California State Railroad Museum Foundation. DPR staff has indicated that their current plan calls for a Proposition 116 application to be submitted by 2001. The phasing plan developed with UP includes building security and cleaning which has already occurred, stabilization and build out for public accessibility. Complete stabilization of the buildings is planned for Phase II (2000 to 2003), and full accessibility as a public facility is planned for Phase III (2006).

Commission staff will be assisting DPR by working with California State Railroad Museum and Foundation staff on the development of their Proposition 116 applications and monitoring the progress of this multi-phased project.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **P. Annual Report**

#### **Seismic Retrofit Program**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### P. Annual Report - Seismic Retrofit Program

The damage suffered by California highway bridges during the 1989 Loma Prieta and the 1994 Northridge earthquakes has made the seismic retrofitting of California's bridges the State's number one transportation priority. Since the Loma Prieta earthquake over ten years ago, the seismic retrofit program has focused on those bridges deemed most vulnerable or critical to emergency response capability during a widespread civil disaster. This includes most of the single column bridges in high priority fault zones and some of the most vulnerable multiple column supported bridges. Also included in this group are State-owned toll bridges. The seismic safety retrofit program has been a major accomplishment of Caltrans and the Business Transportation & Housing Agency, with 1,037 of the 1,039 Phase 1 bridges and 1,117 of the 1,155 Phase 2 bridges fully retrofitted, leaving only two Phase 1 bridges under construction and 38 others nearing construction. Retrofitting all state-owned toll bridges is either underway or expected to begin within the coming year, with the exception of the new replacement of the eastern span of the Oakland Bay Bridge. In all, the estimated combined cost for Phase 1, Phase 2, and toll bridge seismic retrofitting comes to **\$5.1 billion**. Nearly another \$1 billion will be required to retrofit locally-owned bridges not part of the State highway system.

#### Toll Bridge Seismic Retrofitting

**Funding Sources** - With the enactment of Senate Bill 60 (Chapter 327, 1997), toll bridge seismic retrofitting was recognized as both a State and regional priority and responsibility. The State share of funding for the toll bridge retrofit program totals \$1.665 billion: \$790 million from Proposition 192 (a \$2 billion bond measure for seismic retrofitting, passed by voters in 1996) and \$875 million from the State Highway Account and Public Transportation Account. The regional share totals \$875 million from toll revenues. This amount may increase, depending on the design selected for the replacement of the east span of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge or any amenities requested by the Bay Area. The \$790 million in Proposition 192 funds has now been fully allocated by the Commission.

**Estimated Cost** - The total estimated cost of the toll bridge retrofit program is \$2.62 billion. The new eastern span for the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge is estimated to cost \$1.29 billion; another 20 projects to retrofit the western span of the Bay Bridge and six other State-owned toll bridges will cost \$1.33 billion. Caltrans currently expects to complete retrofit of the west span of the Bay Bridge by summer of 2005 and the new eastern span by spring of 2005. The remaining bridges are expected to be retrofitted between winter of 2000 and winter of 2004.

#### Status of State-Owned Non-toll Structures

Prior to the January 1994 Northridge earthquake, an estimated 1,039 single- and multi-column non-toll bridges were known to need retrofitting. These 1,039 bridges were defined as Phase 1 of the State's Seismic Retrofit Program. Subsequent to the Northridge earthquake, an additional 1,364 bridges were identified as requiring further review to determine if they required retrofitting; of those, 1,155 bridges were identified as needing retrofit and have become known as Phase 2.

**Phase 1** – In early 1994, Caltrans established a goal to complete construction on all Phase 1 projects by December 31, 1995. While this goal was not attained, Caltrans made a very good effort by completing construction on 988 bridges by that date (95% of the goal). As of October 15, 1999, construction was complete on all but two of the 1039 Phase 1 bridges. The total construction cost for Phase 1 is expected to be \$850 million - \$100 million more than the originally estimated \$750 million. Support costs are expected to total an additional \$270 million, for an overall cost for Phase 1 of \$1.12 billion.

**Phase 2** – Caltrans' goals for Phase 2 were to have all plans prepared by June 30, 1996, all contracts awarded by December 31, 1996, and all construction completed by December 31, 1997. As of June 30, 1996, plans were prepared for 1,105 bridges (96% of the first goal); and, as of December 31, 1996, contracts were awarded on 1,022 bridges (88% of the second goal). As of October 15, 1999, construction was complete on 1,117 bridges (97% of the total 1,155 bridges). The current total estimated cost for Phase 2 is \$1.35 billion.

### **Status of Locally-Owned Structures**

In addition to the work necessary on State-owned bridges, 1,200 locally-owned bridges are being tracked through the Local Bridge Seismic Retrofit Program. The total cost of local bridge retrofit is **roughly estimated** at \$835 million. Of this amount, \$335 million has already been spent or obligated. The remaining \$500 million is an estimate of what will be necessary to complete the total local retrofit. Because 719 (60%) of the 1200 bridges are still in the pre-strategy or design stages, the \$500 million estimate is highly subject to change. Caltrans was charged (State Highway Code Section 179.3(a)) with the responsibility of completing bridge plans and specifications for all locally owned bridges except for the 322 bridges in Los Angeles and Santa Clara Counties.

Information for locally-owned bridges is somewhat difficult to compile on a statewide basis because of the number of agencies involved. As a result, some volatility in local program statistics can be expected. That said, as of October 15, 1999, the breakdown of the 1,200 locally-owned bridges is as follows:

- Retrofit strategy remains to be developed for 339 local bridges
- 380 local bridges are in the design phase
- 119 local bridges are under construction
- Retrofit is complete on 198 local bridges
- Retrofit is not required on 164 local bridges.

# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **Q. Annual Report**

#### **Real Estate Development Issues**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### Q. Annual Report - Real Estate Development Issues

#### Background

In the early and mid 1980's, the real estate development issues requiring oversight by the Commission were becoming increasingly more sophisticated. As a result, in 1986, the Commission created an Airspace Advisory Committee to serve in an advisory role to both the Commission and Caltrans in the review of proposed airspace development leases and joint development. In October 1994, the Commission directed the Airspace Committee also to review and comment on the Department's asset management and excess land activities. The Committee currently consists of six members appointed by the Commission Chairman from recommendations by Commissioners. Current Committee members, as shown on the following roster, are all from the private sector with a wide range of expertise in finance and property development/management. The primary objective of the Committee is to assist in maximizing State income from leasing and managing Caltrans properties. In this role, the Committee has proven to be of great value to the Commission and the Department.

#### Streamlining Committee Procedures

During the past year, the Committee, with the help of Caltrans, recommended and the Commission approved procedures to streamline interaction between the Committee and the Department. The intent of this streamlining is to focus the Committee's efforts on Commission policy issues and larger transactions and thereby make the process more efficient and productive. The new procedures allow certain more routine leases to be brought directly to the Commission for approval without prior review by the Committee. The Department's reporting requirements to the Committee were also revised to provide a more integrated report package that will be less burdensome for the Department while still providing the Committee with the information it needs to continue to offer the Commission and the Department the prudent advice for which the Committee is known.

#### Program Revenues

Over the last year, the Committee played a major role in assisting Caltrans and the Commission with a large excess land sale in San Francisco. The property was originally appraised at a value that would have netted the State approximately \$17 million. Upon the insistence of the Committee, Caltrans put the property out to bid. At its August 1999 meeting, the Commission approved the sale of that property for **\$49 million**. The Airspace Committee continues to work with the Department on its asset management program, its annual business plan, joint development and its wireless telecommunications program. The telecommunications program involves the leasing of airspace rights for the placement of telecommunications equipment, such as cellular phone towers, on or over Caltrans owned right-of-way and other Caltrans properties. The potential for the program is substantial. As of the end of FY1998-99, 126 wireless facilities have been approved, of which 54 are constructed. Total revenues for the 25 months the program had been in existence were \$1,417,000, with \$956,000 of that revenue occurring during Fiscal Year 1998/99.

During FY 1998-99, the Airspace Advisory Committee recommended approval of only two new leases. However, a resurgent economy, a greatly accelerated lease bid program by Caltrans (bid leases do not require review by the Committee or the Commission), a seismic retrofit program that is all but complete, and \$956,000 of additional income from the new wireless telecommunications program have all contributed to a 46% increase in gross income from \$13,003,520 to \$18,979,571. Caltrans’ operating expenses for the program increased by \$224,069 or 16.3%, resulting in a net income increase of \$5,751,982 from \$11,630,179 to \$17,382,161 or 49.5%. These substantial increases require some clarification. The total income figure includes \$2.5 million in revenues generated from sites under the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge, which in previous years was reported separately by Caltrans. However, even with this income backed out of total revenues, total income increased a very robust \$3,476,051 or 26.7%, with net income increasing \$4,849,392 or 41.7%.

The primary reasons for this dramatic improvement include: increased demand for parking, the rapid growth in the wireless telecommunications program, and Caltrans’ aggressive pursuit of reevaluations and inflation adjustments for existing leases. The increase in expenses is the result of increased resources dedicated to the airspace program for the purpose of increasing revenues.

<b>Airspace Program Annual Income</b>					
	<b>94/95</b>	<b>95/96</b>	<b>96/97</b>	<b>97/98</b>	<b>98/99</b>
Gross Revenues	11,939,240	12,375,128	12,099,287	13,003,520	18,979,571
Expenses	1,558,995	1,611,255	1,286,571	1,373,341	1,597,410
Net Income	10,380,245	10,763,873	10,812,716	11,630,179	17,382,161

**Joint Development of Safety Roadside Rest Areas**

In the mid-1980s, Caltrans began a focused effort to privatize rest area development in order to broaden the program’s funding base. State legislation was passed (Streets and Highways Code 226.5), which gave the Department the authority to construct, operate and maintain a maximum of six new rest areas as a joint economic development demonstration project. Due to federal restrictions on commercial activities within the operating right of way on Interstate routes, these facilities would be at interchange locations.

Several locations were identified and requests for proposals were issued. Most proposals received were unacceptable because the developers were requiring Caltrans to provide most of the capital outlay costs. The Airspace Advisory Committee recommended the State contribution be no more than 50% of the public portion of the rest area, with a market-rate return on that investment.

Over the past 14 years, Caltrans has pursued eight of the most promising potential joint development rest area projects, each of which has failed for either economic or political reasons.

Meanwhile, the State Department of Rehabilitation's Business Enterprise Program has placed blind vendors in 9 rest areas; that program is building 6 units for completion this year and has plans for 14 more units by the end of 2002. The Business Enterprise Program was approached about participation in rest area development, but indicated this was beyond their authority and funding ability.

Caltrans continues to encourage, discuss and pursue joint public/private development proposals wherever opportunities arise. Last year, several entrepreneurs contacted Caltrans for information and to explore potential partnerships. Interest came from a developer of a proposed truck stop at Otay Mesa at the Mexico border and from two different entrepreneurs with properties on routes leading into Yosemite National Park. Beyond initial informational meetings, these contacts have not resulted in further activity. Currently, discussions are being arranged between the Caltrans office in San Bernardino and an Italian corporation, Compagnia Finanziaria Mobiliare, which is interested in exploring the joint development potential of a site along Interstate 15 north of San Bernardino.

In 1994, Caltrans initiated a rest area adoption component within its Adopt-A-Highway program. This component allowed a sponsor to pay the cost of contracted janitorial service in exchange for permission to operate a Traveler Services Information Center. Eastbound Donner Summit Safety Roadside Rest Area was adopted for four years; however, the adopter chose not to renew the agreement in 1998. No other adoptions materialized. Caltrans subsequently overhauled the program to issue permits to private operators of Traveler Service Information Centers, which include public information and commercial advertising at rest areas. The operators retain revenues from commercial travel-related advertising, provided they maintain at least 40 percent of display space dedicated to non-commercial recreational, historical, environmental and tourist-related information. One entrepreneur is operating in various areas around the State. Another has permits to operate but has not yet begun operations.

Caltrans has also executed a five-year lease agreement with the Collier Interpretive and Information Center Agency to build, operate and maintain a Welcome Center at the Randolph C. Collier Safety Roadside Rest Area on Interstate 5 in Siskiyou County. The Agency is seeking a Federal Transportation Enhancement Activities Grant this year. The Agency received funding to operate a temporary information booth at the rest area this summer.

Rest area privatization continues to face challenges, including the federal prohibition commercial facilities on Interstate routes within the operating right of way. Almost 100 million people use California rest areas each year, and the number is rising. Truck services are particularly lacking, and most rest areas are filled with trucks by dusk. The occurrence of trucks using highway ramps and shoulders for overnight parking is significant and presents a serious traffic safety issue. Caltrans plans to focus attention on this problem, perhaps becoming the catalyst in encouraging the private development of more overnight truck parking areas.

Earlier this year, Caltrans assembled a team of its rest area designers, managers, and stakeholders to make recommendations for improving the safety roadside rest area system. The team's recommendations included:

- Raise the priority of the rest area system as integral to highway safety.
- Update the safety roadside rest areas system master plan.
- Rescind the mandatory privatization policy for new rest area units while continuing to pursue privatization opportunities that arise.
- Expand and formalize public and private partnerships.
- Conduct ongoing evaluation of rest area system performance.
- Investigate in-route truck parking capacity issues.

Public demand for increased rest area capacity and improved levels of service, as well as the State's responsibility to address observed safety deficiencies, necessitates an adjustment to policy that will encourage joint development activities without restricting state-funded improvements in the absence of viable private participation.

The Commission strongly believes, that both the safety and truck capacity issues, combined with the overall demand for rest area services brought about by 100 million annual users, create an exceptional opportunity for adding commercial services to further serve and attract the motoring public—and at the same time create an added funding sources for expanding, operating maintaining and rehabilitating California's roadside rest system. The State needs to aggressively pursue joint development of rest areas and to work towards legislatively expanding the current authority for joint development to include development and rehabilitation of existing rest area facilities as well as building new facilities. Commercial development has the added advantage of making rest areas safer in that a commercial presence at rest areas, particularly those in more isolated locations, will act as a deterrent to criminal activity.

As a first step towards achieving those goals the Commission, at its November 1999 meeting, directed Caltrans to, within six months, provide the Commission with quantitative data regarding the costs of typical new facilities, rehabilitation of existing facilities, and annual operational costs for maintenance, law enforcement etc. The Commission also asked the Department to thoroughly analyze the crime and safety issues surrounding rest areas.

**AIRSPACE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**Al Auer**

Albert J. Auer & Associates  
Irvine

**Max Green**

The Seeley Company  
Los Angeles

**Nina Gruen**

Gruen Gruen - Associates  
San Francisco

**William Hauf**

William J. Hauf Company  
San Diego

**Roslyn Payne**

Jackson Street Partners Ltd.  
San Francisco

**Tom Wolff**

Thomas Wolff and Company  
Irvine



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **R. Annual Report**

#### **Rural Counties Task Force**



## **II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES**

### **R. Annual Report - Rural Counties Task Force**

The Rural Counties Task Force is made up of the State's 26 smallest county Regional Transportation Planning Agencies or Local Transportation Commissions. These 26 agencies are generally those with populations less than 250,000. The task force was formed in 1988 as a joint effort between the California Transportation Commission and the rural counties. The role of the task force is to provide a direct opportunity for the small counties to remain informed and become involved with changing statewide transportation policies and programs.

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) 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 rural counties.

As a result of the population growth that has occurred throughout the State, coupled with the implementation of SB 45 (1997), demands on transportation systems and the responsibilities of small local planning agencies have expanded significantly. The roles and responsibilities of the agencies now go way beyond their original duties involving Transportation Development Act management and the maintenance of Regional Transportation Plans. 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 is a list of the recent accomplishments that have involved the task force membership during 1999, and that will continue to involve the task force into the year 2000.

#### **Local Road Rehabilitation and Maintenance Funding**

On December 18, 1998, the California Transportation Commission conducted a workshop in Oakland, concerning the statewide need for local road rehabilitation and maintenance funding. During the workshop, Commissioners heard from representatives of both urban and rural counties about the backlog in local road maintenance that has accrued over the past 30 years, and that threatens the integrity of our existing circulation system. While Caltrans receives funding through the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) to maintain the state transportation system, funding to maintain local county and city streets has fallen far behind what is necessary to protect the public's investment. As a result of this workshop, the CTC made a commitment to help support efforts to fund local road rehabilitation needs.

The rural counties have, with their limited resources, tried to help quantify and address the need for local road rehabilitation funding. This quantification effort occurred through both the statewide

transportation needs inventory directed by Senate Resolution 8 and by a separate task force survey of local road rehabilitation needs. Key findings of the SR 8 survey were that approximately \$10.5 billion would be needed statewide to bring local county roads and city streets up to a “good” (not “excellent”) condition. The SR 8 inventory also found that statewide approximately \$400 million would be needed annually to keep these roads in “good” condition.

Given these circumstances, the task force membership is very concerned about the closing of the 1999 legislative session without passage of legislation that provides a significant source of new funds for local road rehabilitation and maintenance. The task force stands willing to continue its efforts to help secure needed funds for local road rehabilitation and maintenance during the year 2000.

### **Regional Transportation Plans**

Under changes in law that were affected by SB 45, rural regions are to update their Regional Transportation Plans every four years. Consistent with the spirit of SB 45, these plans are supposed to contain the information that supports specific projects nominated for state funding through the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). During 1999, representatives of the task force worked with CTC and Caltrans staff to develop a new set of post SB 45 Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines. The task force also set a goal of having all rural county Regional Plans up-to-date by December 2001, in anticipation of the 2002 STIP funding cycle. To help implement this goal, the task force held two workshops concerning the new Guidelines on September 17, 1999 and October 8, 1999.

### **Performance Measures**

A task force member has served as a member of the 1998 California Transportation Plan Policy Advisory Committee working on the development of performance measures for transportation modes. The task force is actively assisting Caltrans and the CTC in implementing performance measure requirements of SB 45 to ensure that the State’s transportation funds are being spent in the most responsible and effective manner.

### **Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP)**

SB 45 mandates that 75% of STIP funds be programmed and expended for regional improvements nominated by the regional planning agencies through their Regional Transportation Improvement Plans, and 25% of STIP funding be programmed and expended for interregional improvements nominated by Caltrans through the 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. The task force actively participated in the initial development of the ITSP during 1998. In 1999, the task force participated in the “external advisory” group meetings conducted by Caltrans to create an update of the ITSP.

### **Project Delivery**

The task force has remained attentive to statewide concerns regarding lagging project delivery and the resultant large balance of transportation funds that are obligated but not spent. The task force is aware that this problem has at least two main components. One component involves some of the State's rural counties that have programmed STIP funds for local projects and yet are not delivering these projects on schedule. The task force understands why the CTC has strengthened the "timely use of funds" provisions in STIP Guidelines to ensure that local projects will be delivered on schedule in the future.

The second component of the project delivery problem involves the inability of both urban and rural local agencies to deliver, on time, those federally funded projects that are outside of the STIP. The task force appreciates that during 1999 the Legislature and Governor approved increased funding for the Caltrans Local Assistance Program. The task force will, during the year 2000, work to ensure that these new local assistance resources are available to carry out an active "outreach" effort to assist rural regions in understanding and fulfilling State and Federal requirements so these projects can be delivered on schedule.

### **Caltrans/Regional Planning Improvement and Coordination**

SB 45 has provided the opportunity for enhanced partnerships between the regions and Caltrans. However, large scale hiring by Caltrans will probably result in new staff members who are not going to be entirely familiar with regional issues and priorities. The task force is attempting to encourage Caltrans' planners to regularly visit rural counties and become familiar with their planning programs. The task force intends to request that representatives from each of the Caltrans districts that serve rural counties send representatives to attend future task force meetings.

### **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Applicability to Rural Counties**

The task force receives periodic reports on California Alliance for Advanced Transportation Systems activities including rural ITS applications. Several task force members are also involved in the California-Oregon Advanced Transportation System (COATS) study. COATS is studying ITS applications in far Northern California and Southern Oregon.

### **State Level Working Committees**

In addition to their many other efforts, various task force members also worked on the following statewide committees:

- Project Study Report Guidelines Update
- FTA 5310 and Welfare-to-Work Advisory Committee
- Tribal Technical Assistance Program (TTAP)
- "State's Role in Mass Transportation" Advisory Committee
- California Transportation Investment Strategy (CTIS)
- Rules for Performance Audits



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **S. Annual Report**

#### **Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### S. Annual Report - Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics

#### Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics

Section 14506.5 of the California Government Code states, “The Chairman (of the Commission) shall appoint a Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, after consultation with members of the aviation industry, airport operators, pilots, and other aviation interest groups and experts, as appropriate. This Technical Advisory Committee on Aeronautics shall give technical advice to the Commission on the full range of aviation issues to be considered by the Commission.” The current membership of the TACA is listed at the end of this section.

This statutorily mandated advisory committee is of great value to the Commission in carrying out its responsibility to advise the Secretary of the Business, Transportation, and Housing and the Legislature on state policies and plans for transportation programs in California.

#### Commission’s Aviation Responsibilities

The Commission’s primary responsibilities regarding aeronautics, include:

- advising and assisting the Legislature and the Secretary of the Business, Transportation and Housing Agency in formulating and evaluating policies and plans for aeronautics programs;
- adoption of the California Aviation System Plan (CASP), a comprehensive plan defining state policies and funding priorities for general aviation and commercial airports in California; and
- adoption and allocation of funds under the three-year Aeronautics Program, which directs the use of State Aeronautics Account funds to:
  1. provide a part of the local match required to receive federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants; and
  2. fund capital outlay projects at public-use airports through the California Aid to Airports Program (CAAP) for airport rehabilitation, safety and capacity improvements.

#### TACA’s Activities During 1999

During 1999, the TACA met four times. The work of the TACA focused on:

- developing the aviation element of the Commission’s SR 8 Report to the Legislature which identified ground access needs over the next ten years for Commercial and General Aviation airports in the state;
- advising the Commission on adoption of the update of the Capital Improvement Plan Element of the California Aviation System Plan;
- advising the Commission to continue the local match rate required for CAAP grants at 10%, this rate was adopted by the Commission on March 5, 1999;

- working with Caltrans to develop recommendations on the Proposed 2000 Aeronautics Program. The 2000 Aeronautics Program will be adopted by the Commission in March 2000;
- developing recommendations on future State aviation program funding, including establishing a tax code section for aviation gasoline separate from the tax code section for automobile gasoline, reviewing the equity and adequacy of aviation State tax rates, and redirecting existing taxes paid by the aviation industry from the general fund to aviation purposes;
- providing recommendations on aviation of legislation; and
- cooperating with Caltrans and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to coordinate state and federal aviation programs.

### **Senate Resolution 8 - Airport Ground Access Improvement Needs**

Senate Resolution 8 (Burton, 1999) requested the California Transportation Commission, in consultation with the California Department of Transportation and the state's regional transportation planning agencies, to produce and submit to the Senate Transportation Committee and the Senate President pro Tempore, by May 10, 1999, a "10-year needs assessment of the state's transportation system", including, but not limited to, (a) unfunded rehabilitation and operations needs for state highways, local streets and roads, urban, commuter and intercity rail service, and transit systems, and (b) high-priority projects expected to reduce congestion and provide economic and environmental benefits to the state. The Commission's SR8 Report to the Legislature included the following information on the ground access needs over the next ten years for the Commercial and General Aviation airports in the state.

Air passenger and air cargo traffic is expected to double or even triple of over the next 20 years. International airports throughout the State are well positioned to take advantage of the economic growth around the Pacific Rim, provided adequate air and ground access capacity is developed. However, California's ability to capitalize on the growing demand in international business services and goods movement is being constrained by inadequate airport capacity and crippling ground access congestion at our major commercial airports. While large commercial airports are able to raise significant revenue to expand ground-side and air-side operating capacity of the airports, they are limited by the federal government in their ability to use airport revenues to address ground access needs beyond airport property.

Caltrans requested information on airport ground access needs in the 1999 update of the Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan, and in addition, the Commission surveyed 17 large commercial airports. In total, 41 airports have reported 103 unfunded ground access projects costing **\$3.1 billion**. **The reported projects include 13 State Highway improvements for \$0.4 billion, 88 local road projects for \$2.0 billion, and 2 passenger rail projects for \$0.7 billion.**

Los Angeles International Airport (LAX), with the largest funding need, is in the process of updating its Master Plan to accommodate a projected increase in air passengers from 54 million annual passengers (MAP) in 1996 to 98 MAP in 2015, and an expected 140% increase in air cargo from 1.8 million metric tons per year in 1996 to 4.2 million metric tons per year in 2015. Ground access funding needs at LAX are estimated at **\$2.4 billion**. Another 8 commercial

airports report ground access funding needs of **\$0.6 billion**. San Francisco International Airport (SFO) did not report any unfunded ground access needs over the next 10 years because they are currently implementing a fully funded \$2.5 billion expansion program. The SFO program includes another \$1.1 billion of state, federal, local and airport funds to extend the Bay Area Rapid Transit system into the airport. The reported ground access funding needs are listed in the table below.

AIRPORT	State Highway		Local Roads		Rail		Total Cost
	Projects	Cost	Projects	Cost	Projects	Cost	
Byron			2	\$2,000,000			\$2,000,000
Chiriaco Summit			1	\$30,000			\$30,000
Colusa County			1	\$425,000			\$425,000
Corcoran			1	\$50,000			\$50,000
Desert Center			1	\$400,000			\$400,000
Firebaugh			1	\$190,000			\$190,000
French Valley			2	\$367,000			\$367,000
Fresno Yosemite International			4	\$11,000,000			\$11,000,000
Hemet-Ryan			3	\$846,500			\$846,500
Jack McNamara Field			3	\$207,000			\$207,000
Lake Tahoe			6	\$1,515,000			\$1,515,000
Livermore Municipal			1	\$2,000,000			\$2,000,000
Los Angeles International	5	\$297,000,000	11	\$1,479,450,000	1	\$575,000,000	\$2,351,450,000
Los Banos Municipal			1	\$50,000			\$50,000
Marina Municipal			1	\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
McClellan-Palomar			4	\$11,550,000			\$11,550,000
Meadows Field			1	\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000
Metropolitan Oakland International			5	\$56,999,000	1	\$130,000,000	\$186,999,000
Monterey Peninsula			1	\$2,663,000			\$2,663,000
Napa County			1	\$740,000			\$740,000
Nevada County Airport			2	\$25,000			\$25,000
Oceano County			2	\$30,000			\$30,000
Ontario International			2	\$27,100,000			\$27,100,000
Oxnard			4	\$2,300,000			\$2,300,000
Palmdale Regional			1	\$150,000,000			\$150,000,000
Paso Robles Municipal	2	\$600,000	2	\$175,000			\$775,000
Petaluma Municipal			1	\$80,000			\$80,000
Placerville			1	\$302,657			\$302,657
Rio Vista			1	\$100,000			\$100,000
Salinas Municipal			1	\$350,000			\$350,000
Sacramento International			2	\$150,000			\$150,000
San Diego International			1	\$160,000,000			\$160,000,000
San Jose International	2	\$30,000,000	1	\$1,000,000			\$31,000,000
San Luis Obispo County - McChesney Field			4	\$1,710,000			\$1,710,000
Santa Maria Public			1	\$450,000			\$450,000
Stockton Metropolitan	2	\$29,000,000	1	\$34,530,000			\$63,530,000
Thermal			5	\$614,000			\$614,000
Truckee-Tahoe			2	\$1,461,000			\$1,461,000
Ukiah Municipal - Mendocino County			2	\$175,000			\$175,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>\$356,600,000</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>\$1,953,035,157</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>\$705,000,000</b>	<b>\$3,014,635,157</b>

**California Aviation System Plan Capital Improvement Plan**

The California Aviation System Plan (CASP) process was established in state law in 1989. The Legislation defined the elements of the CASP, including a 10-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) based on adopted airport master plans. The CIP is updated every two years and only projects consistent with the CASP and included in the CIP can receive funding from the State Aeronautics Account. The Aeronautics Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) defines the airport improvement needs reported to Caltrans by airports and regional transportation planning agencies. The 1999 update of the CIP was adopted by the Commission on July 14, 1999 and will be used by Caltrans to develop the recommended 2000 Aeronautics Program.

The CIP is financially unconstrained and contains 2,125 projects with a total cost of \$2.9 billion; 1,293 projects for \$462 million at General Aviation airports, 410 projects for \$264 million at Reliever airports, and 422 projects for \$2.1 billion at Primary/Commercial airports. The three largest categories of improvements are for primary runway improvements which account for 25% of the requested funding, 20% of the requested funding is for ramp/apron improvements, and 20% is for other runway/taxiway improvements. This CIP does not include the expansion of Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) which is in the process of updating its Master Plan. The LAX expansion project could require as much as \$12 billion in funding by the year 2015.

The 1999 CIP is the first to also include information on airport ground access needs. Upon adoption of the January 1998 CIP, the Commission requested that future updates of the Aviation CIP include identification and assessment of the ground access improvements needed at California airports. Although State Aeronautics Account revenues do not fund airport ground access improvements, they are nonetheless critical to the effective operation of California's system of airports and can be funded through other programs such as the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). A total of 105 projects were submitted totaling \$3.1 billion. The projects include 13 state highway improvements for \$400 million, 88 local road projects for \$2 billion, and 2 passenger rail projects for \$705 million. The largest need (\$2.35 billion) is at Los Angeles International Airport.

### **Aviation Program Funding**

The annual funding level for the state aeronautics program provides approximately \$1.5 million a year for state capital grants to airports, \$1.5 million to cover half of the local match required to receive federal AIP grants, and \$1.5 million for an automatic \$10,000 annual grant to every publicly-owned public-use general aviation airport in the state. Clearly, the \$85 million of state funding needed for the general aviation projects in the adopted 1999 Aviation CIP overwhelms the current funding level for the state Aeronautics Program. It would take 57 years to fund the \$85 million of general aviation needs in the CIP at \$1.5 million per year. A more reasonable general aviation program annual funding level in California would be at least \$10 million.

The ground access needs of commercial airports, which can not be funded with airport revenues under federal law will demand a substantial investment of public funds to prevent gridlock at the State's major commercial airports as air traffic doubles over the next 15 years. The \$1.5 billion per year STIP is an important funding source for airport ground access. For example, the Commission programmed \$250 million in the STIP to help fund the extension of the Bay Area

Rapid Transit (BART) system to San Francisco International Airport. However, there is already fierce competition for STIP funds. TACA recommends that an appropriate state funding source for airport ground access improvements and expanded General Aviation (GA) funding would be the redirection of existing State sales tax revenues from jet fuel sales out of the General Fund and into the Aeronautics Account. This approach is identical to the long-standing practice of using the sales tax paid on diesel and gasoline fuel taxes for public transit improvements.

The funds could be used for commercial airport ground access improvements, improvements to better integrate air service between GA and commercial airports, and to provide funding for safety improvements at GA airports. This would fund these aviation related improvements by redirecting taxes already being paid by the aviation industry from the state General Fund to aviation programs. TACA also recommended legislation to establish a tax code section for aviation fuel separate from the State gasoline tax in order to establish a fuel tax rate based on the funding level appropriate to meet State aviation responsibilities and to avoid impacts on aviation fuel from gasoline tax increases for reasons unrelated to aviation.

#### **California Aid to Airports Matching Rate**

The Commission is required to annually establish a rate between 10% and 50% at which local governments must match California Aid to Airports Program grants in the State Aeronautics Program. TACA recommended that the Commission continue the long-standing matching rate of 10% for FY 1998-99 in order to ensure that the maximum number of airports can participate in the Aeronautics Program and to be consistent with the matching rate required for federal Airport Improvement Program (AIP) grants. Further, a low match rate does not result in a small number of large grants because statute limits program grants to a maximum of just \$500,000. The Commission adopted a resolution on March 31, 1998, maintaining the matching rate at 10%, and continued the commitment it made in 1995 to consider changing the required matching rate only at the time of the biennial adoption of the Aeronautics Program in order to ensure that the matching rate for a specific project would not be changed once it was included in the program.

#### **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS MEMBERS**

- **Marlin Beckwith**, Program Manager, Caltrans Aeronautics Program
- **Neil Bennett**, Regional Director, Air Transport Association of America
- **Herman Bliss**, Manager, Western Region Airports Division, Federal Aviation Admin.
- **Daniel Burkhart**, Regional Representative, National Business Aviation Association
- **Curt Castagna**, President, Aeroplex Aviation (Long Beach Airport)
- **Don H. Clausen**, Aviation Consultant, Member of Congress 1963-1983
- **Steven Irwin**, Airport Operations Supervisor, San Francisco International Airport
- **Jack Kemmerly**, California Regional Representative, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Assoc.
- **Tim Merwin**, Principal Planner, Southern California Association of Governments
- **Mark F. Mispagel**, Chairman, Special Counsel, El Toro Master Development Program
- **James Monger**, Airport Director, San Bernardino International Airport Authority
- **O.B. Schooley**, Aviation Consultant



# **1999 ANNUAL REPORT TO LEGISLATURE**

## ***Volume II – Accomplishments/Activities***

### **T. Rail Transit in the South San Francisco Bay Area**



## II. 1999 ACCOMPLISHMENTS/ACTIVITIES

### T. Workshop on Rail Transit in the South Bay Area

#### Background

On October 13, 1999, the Commission's Public Transit Committee (PTC) held a workshop in San Jose to learn about rail transit and work force issues in the South Bay area. The Committee, chaired by Commission Vice-Chair Reed, invited a number of rail transit operators, a Silicon Valley employer association, the state employment department, and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to participate in the workshop. The workshop was entitled "Workshop on Rail Transit in the South Bay Area, Plans, Gaps, Funding Sources, and Future Service". At the meeting, Vice-Chairman Reed requested Commissioner Hallisey to preside over the workshop.

#### Issues

Commissioner Hallisey stated that the PTC's purpose in conducting the workshop was to examine the views of the State, local employers, MTC, and rail transit operators regarding current and future rail transit service and its impact on employment in the South Bay Area.

Each agency in making its presentation considered the following:

- ten-year outlook for population, jobs, congestion, and transit demand in South Bay;
- planning that is underway to provide current and future Silicon Valley commuters with alternate transportation modes, to contend with worsening congestion;
- elimination of transit gaps, improvement in transit connectivity, and the relative importance of increased service from current rail operations vs. rail extensions;
- the means of funding rail transit improvements;
- the means of funding rail transit operations;
- the types of rail service that will be needed to meet projected demand over ten years.

The following agencies made presentations at the PTC Workshop:

#### State

--California Employment Development Department (EDD)

EDD also presented its view on mass transportation and the work force.

#### Employer/Manufacturing Association

--Silicon Valley Manufacturers Group

The Manufacturers Group also addressed the impact of mass transportation corridors on the work force in San Jose and the South Bay area.

Local City and County presenters

- City of San Jose
- San Mateo Board of Supervisors

Both agencies also addressed the impact of mass transportation corridors on the work force in San Jose and the South Bay area.

Regional Transportation Planning Agency

- Metropolitan Transportation Commission

MTC also addressed a number of planning, transportation, and funding issues.

Public Transit Operators

- Altamont Commute Express
- Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority
- San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District
- San Francisco Peninsula Commute Service
- Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

The operators also addressed in their presentation their current service, future improvements and investments under consideration, operational costs and alignments, transit gap closures and potential extensions.

**Findings**

Most of the participants agreed with the premise that increased rail service and extensions are needed in the South Bay area to provide some relief to current and future congestion. No consensus was reached, however, regarding whether the technology selected to circle the Bay should be conventional commuter rail, light rail or BART-type technology. Further, although public agency presenters seemed to support a future BART extension between Fremont and San Jose, a number of interest groups disagreed with that premise and recommended extending Caltrain or commuter/intercity rail service.

The Public Transit Committee was informed that:

- increased rail transit service and extensions were needed in the South Bay area;
- job growth continues to exceed housing growth in the South Bay area, and employees commute in increasingly from the northern Bay Area and from the San Joaquin Valley;
- Silicon Valley continues to be a tremendous generator of jobs in the high technology sector, while housing stock continues to lag behind;
- choices of technology (i.e., BART, commuter/heavy rail, or light rail transit technology) for circling the Bay Area are still being discussed. MTC is currently leaning toward closing transit gaps first, such as Fremont to San Jose, and then considering brand new extensions; with existing infrastructure, several rail technologies could be used together to circle the Bay, rather than one single technology;

- capital funding is projected to be limited for rail transit and for highways; MTC reported that 83% of the \$6.9-8.4 billion expected to be available over the next 20 years would be used to maintain and sustain the existing Bay Area system;
- \$6.3 billion is the estimated cost of improving transit connectivity; by comparison, a BART extension from Fremont to San Jose would cost \$4.0 billion;
- \$1.5 billion is needed for grade separations, electrification, and increased service for existing Caltrain service between San Francisco (4<sup>th</sup> and Townsend) and Gilroy; (Comparable estimates for a BART extension from Millbrae to San Jose were unavailable.)
- \$0.8 billion is needed for intercity and commuter rail improvements and light rail extensions;
- the \$6.3 billion needed to improve transit connectivity would essentially consume all available funds, leaving little for maintaining or sustaining existing transit and roads.
- 20-year operational costs were not available at the Workshop, but represent another significant draw on the funding available for transportation purposes;
- transportation solutions must include looking at jobs/housing balance and how to keep that equation balanced.

### **Conclusion**

The Public Transit Committee reported the results of its Workshop at the November Commission meeting. The Committee found from the data presented at the Workshop that opportunities for growth and economic development in the South Bay will continue to outpace even optimistic assumptions regarding funding for transportation. Further, the Committee found from that data that the projected growth in jobs would continue to outpace the growth in housing, let alone affordable housing. Therefore, the constraints on funding and the continued likelihood of increased commuting make it critical that comprehensive approaches to transportation problem-solving and growth in general be used. Also, these factors make the project selection process and the broad participation in that process essential.

The Committee also concluded that the Commission should be more proactive in its involvement in the project assessment and selection process. Continued economic growth compatible with environmental quality and quality of life is of critical importance not only to local communities and regions, but to the state as a whole.

