



**VENTURA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Camarillo City Hall
Administrative Conference Room
601 Carmen Drive
Camarillo, CA

Thursday, October 20, 2011 at 9:00 AM

- Item # 1** Call to Order
- Item # 2** Public Comments
- Item # 3** Approval of September 15, 2011 Minutes
- Item # 4** Status of Caltrans Ventura County Satellite Office (oral report)
- Discuss potential decision by Caltrans District 7 to close its Ventura Satellite Office. (District 7 has been invited to send an appropriate representative to participate in the discussion.)
- Item # 5** Approval of 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Submittal
- Approve proposed 2012 STIP submittal to the California Transportation Commission, including commitment of \$20.4 million in future Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to provide for full funding of the Route 101/23 project.
- Item # 6** Discussion with Jacob Waclaw, Federal Highway Administration (oral report)
- Meet Jacob Waclaw of FHWA staff who is available to discuss how FHWA can help meet local agency needs.
- Item # 7** VCTC Comprehensive Transportation Plan (oral report)
- Receive and discuss status report on the VCTC Comprehensive Transportation Plan
- Item # 8** Programming of STP, CMAQ, and TE Funds

- Approve guidelines for a new Mini-Call for Projects to program STP, CMAQ and TE funds anticipated to come available during Fiscal Years (FY) 2011/12 and 2012/13; approve Mini-Call schedule contained in the agenda item; and appoint a Task Force to discuss how to create a “shelf” of ready-to-go projects which can be funded if necessary to prevent a loss of program capacity, and to review project scoring.

Item # 9 Status of Federal Transportation Improvement Program

- Receive report on the status of the Federal Transportation Improvement Program.

Item #10 2012 Committee Meeting Schedule

- Approve 2012 Committee Meeting Schedule.

Item #11 Future Agenda Items

Caltrans Local Assistance Right-of-Way Training

Congestion Management Program Update /Approval

Periodic Highway Construction Updates

Invite SCAG to the TTAC meeting

Regional Transportation Funding & Planning

Update on the new ISTEA Program

Periodic Update on Prop 1B funds

City of Moorpark Functional Classification

Green house Bill Update (SB375)

Item #12 Next Meeting November 17, 2011

Item #13 Adjournment

MINUTES OF THE VCTC TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 14, 2011

Item #1 - Call to order

Chair David Klotzle of Moorpark called the meeting to order at 9:08 AM. The attached attendance sheet shows those present.

Item #2 - Public Comments

Jay Spurgin of Thousand Oaks announced that VCTC had approved the preparation of a TIGER III application for the Route 101/23 Project, and the City Council would be considering the same issue in two weeks. The proposal is that the City would loan the matching funds, to be paid back with future STIP. The design is moving along and will be ready to go next year. The purpose of the application is to advance the project, since we do not know when the state funds for the project will be available.

Jay distributed copies of the Long-Term Needs Assessment prepared by Thousand Oaks.

Peter De Haan of VCTC distributed a letter regarding the possible closure of the Caltrans Ventura County Satellite Office. There was strong concern among Committee members due to the impact of such a closure on the processing of encroachment permits which are needed to deliver many Local Assistance projects, and for the work of utility companies. Jay requested that this item be placed on next month's agenda. David Fleisch of the County suggested that appropriate Caltrans staff be invited to discuss the issue. Ken Matsuoka of Camarillo suggested that the Caltrans Director or representative should be asked to explain this proposal to the Commission at the next meeting. Peter suggested that agencies express their concern to District 7, and also provide copies of any letters to the VCTC Executive Director.

Peter distributed a letter from Linda Tong, Caltrans Right-of-Way Local Programs, requesting each agency with right-of-way expenditures during FY 2010/11 to submit their annual report of right-of-way expenditures by October 1st.

Item #3 – Approval of June 16, 2011 Minutes

Jay Spurgin made a motion to approve the June 16, 2011 meeting minutes, it was seconded by David Fleisch, and the motion was approved unanimously.

Item #4 – Fund Status Report and Monitoring of CMAQ, STP & TE projects & Monitoring

Peter De Haan presented the fund tables showing the status as of September, 1st, noting that Caltrans District 7 had helped in making the update more timely. A significant amount of funds were obligated since the last update. Jay Spurgin noted that the updated project status information submitted at the last meeting by Thousand Oaks had not been included. He also requested that the formatting of the tables be improved, particularly to have the headings at the top of each page.

Item No. 5 – CMAQ Balance Loan to San Diego Association of Governments

Peter De Haan described the situation which developed in July when VCTC was informed that CMAQ program authorizations will be rescinded based on the CMAQ program balances on September 30th, and the decision made by VCTC staff to loan \$5.4 million of the Ventura County program authorization balance to San Diego. He informed TTAC that when the VCTC Board discussed the issue they directed that a process be developed to have ready-to-go back-up projects that can be quickly funded should the need arise. David Fleisch of the County stated that the main concern is the lost opportunity to keep projects. Jay Spurgin clarified that to add a new project to prevent a rescission, that project would have

to have been ready, and projects are never ready as soon as we had hoped. David Fleisch added that it seems this uncertain situation will continue, and we need to be ready when there are sudden opportunities to obtain funding, as happened with ARRA.

Jay mentioned that the difficulty is that some agencies are not able to expend the efforts to prepare projects for delivery without a funding commitment being in place. David Fleisch responded that agencies typically know what their next project is, and that some agencies should be able to have projects ready should unanticipated events occur. David Fleisch suggested that in future similar situations there should be a note sent to TTAC, particularly so that Committee members can brief their Commission members.

Item #6 - Programming of STP, CMAQ, and TE Funds

Peter De Haan summarized the status of federal funding and recommended that VCTC move forward with programming additional funds using the guidelines provided in the agenda, which are intended to minimize the amount of effort given the relatively small amount of funds available for programming. David Klotzle asked if street rehabilitation projects could be considered. David Fleisch suggested that TTAC establish a Task Force to consider how to develop a project contingency list. Ken Matsuoka said that Camarillo has very little that can be considered for funding under the proposed guidelines, and questioned why his city cannot propose instead to have its prior match commitment reduced.

David Fleisch made a motion to approve the staff recommendation, with the change that Priority #4 be added to provide funding for new pavement rehabilitation projects and reduced local match from previously-committed matches, based on geographic equity. The motion was seconded by Ken Matsuoka and approved unanimously.

Item #7 – Reciprocal Agreements Between County and Cities

David Fleisch informed the Committee that the Board of Supervisors has adopted a general agreement to allow the County to work cooperatively with cities so that they can do work for the County. Previously, the County could work for the cities, but the cities could not do work for the County. This agreement is being mailed to each city.

Item #8- Future Agenda Items

- Congestion Management Program Update /Approval
- Periodic Highway Construction Updates
- Invite SCAG to the TTAC meeting
- Regional Transportation Funding & Planning
- Update on the new ISTEAP Program
- Periodic Update on Prop 1B funds
- City of Moorpark Functional Classification
- Green house Bill Update (SB375)

Item #9- Next Meeting

The next meeting is scheduled for October 20, 2011; an announcement will be e-mailed to the group prior to the meeting.

Item #10 - Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

ATTENDANCE LIST OF TTAC MEMBERS / ALTERNATES

Meeting Date: September 15, 2011

Badge #	NAME		PHONE	E-MAIL ADDRESS	SIGNATURE
	Ken Matsuka	City of Camarillo	383-5672	kmatsuka@ci.camarillo.ca.us	
	Bill Golubics	City of Camarillo	388-5356	bgolubics@ci.camarillo.ca.us	<i>Bill Golubics</i>
	Bert Rapp	City of Fillmore	524-1500 x231	brapp@ci.fillmore.ca.us	
	Tom Scott	City of Fillmore	524-1500 x 234	tscott@ci.fillmore.ca.us	
	Glenn Hawks	City of Ojai	640-2560	hawks@ci.ojai.ca.us	
	Greg Grant	City of Ojai		grant@ci.ojai.ca.us	
033	Andrea Boggs	City of Ojai	646-5581 ext 209	boggs@ci.ojai.ca.us	<i>Andrea Boggs</i>
023	Dave Klotzle	City of Moorpark	517-6285	dklotzle@ci.moorpark.ca.us	<i>Dave</i>
	Martin Erickson	City of Oxnard	385-7870	Martin.Erickson@ci.oxnard.ca.us	
	Jason Samonte	City of Oxnard	385-7872	Jason.Samonte@ci.oxnard.ca.us	
	Mamerto Estepa	City of Port Hueneme	986-6589	mestepa@ci.port-hueneme.ca.us	
	Kit Nell	City of Port Hueneme	986-6500	knell@ci.port-hueneme.ca.us	
	Andres Santamaria	City of Port Hueneme	986-6568	asantamaria@ci.port-hueneme.ca.us	
	Brian Yanez	City of Santa Paula		byanez@spcity.org	
015	Chic Dabbs	City of Simi Valley	583-6809	CDABBS@simivalley.org	<i>Chic Dabbs</i>
	David Medina	City of Simi Valley	583-6810	dmedina@simivalley.gov	
62	Kamran Panah	City of Simi Valley	583-6886	kpanah@simivalley.org	<i>K. Panah</i>
011	Jay Spurgin	City of Thousand Oaks	449-2444	jspurgin@toaks.org	<i>Jay Spurgin</i>
	Tom Pizza	City of Thousand Oaks	449-2430	tpizza@toaks.org	
	Rick Raives	City of Ventura	654-7870	rraives@ci.ventura.ca.us	
	Tom Mericle	City of Ventura	654-7870	tmericle@ci.ventura.ca.us	
11	Ben Emami	County of Ventura	654-2087	ben.emami@ventura.org	<i>Ben Emami</i>
17	David Fleisch	County of Ventura	654-2077	david.fleisch@ventura.org	<i>David Fleisch</i>
	Chris Birkelo	Port of Hueneme	(805)488-3677	cbirkelo@portofhueneme.org	<i>Chris Birkelo</i>
	Ben Cacatian	VCAPCD	645-1428	ben@vcapcd.org	<i>Ben Cacatian</i>
	Steve Brown	Gold Coast Transit	483-3959 ext 116	sbrown@goldcoasttransit.org	

LIST OF TTAC MEMBERS / ALTERNATES

[illegible]



Item #5

October 21, 2011

MEMO TO: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: 2012 STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) SUBMITTAL

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve 2012 STIP submittal to the California Transportation Commission, including commitment of \$20.4 million in future Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to provide for full funding of the Route 101/23 project.

BACKGROUND:

State law requires the adoption and submittal of a five-year State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) by December 15 of each odd-numbered year. The Ventura County Transportation Commission (VCTC) is the agency responsible for developing the STIP for Ventura County working cooperatively with Caltrans. The STIP is comprised of a five-year list of capital improvement projects to be funded from VCTC's share of STIP Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds for the period starting July 1, 2012 (FY12/13) and ending June 30, 2017 (FY16/17).

The 2012 STIP for Ventura County is due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) on December 15, 2011. The CTC is responsible for reviewing and approving STIP submittals. The CTC is scheduled to publish the 2012 STIP staff recommendations on March 8, 2012, and adopt the 2012 STIP on March 28, 2012.

DISCUSSION:

Similar to previous STIP cycles, most of the new programming capacity for STIP funds, including Transportation Enhancement (TE) projects, is in the last 2 years of the 2012 STIP (FYs 15-16 & 16-17) because the current STIP is underfunded in the first two years (FYs 12-13 & 13-14). The CTC will, therefore, be forced to postpone some projects to later years. It is unlikely that this will have an impact on VCTC projects currently programmed in the STIP, due to there being no large projects programmed in those years.

The CTC has prepared county share estimates: A base share, Total target, and Maximum share. These amounts are listed in the Exhibit 1 below.

Exhibit 1

2012 STIP/RIP Fund Estimate for Ventura County ((\$1000))			
Program Needs	Base Share through FY15/16	Target through FY16/17	Maximum through FY19/20
	\$12,815	\$25,682	\$62,849
PPM	\$(309)	\$(829)	\$(829)
Metrolink	\$(1,500)	\$(2,097)	\$(2,097)
TE	\$(486)	\$(2,756)	\$(2,756)
Available RIP Funds	\$10,520	\$20,000	\$57,167

The Base share of \$12,815,000 is comprised of county share funds for the four-year period starting FY12/13 and ending FY15/16. County shares are calculated based on a four-year period, whereas the STIP is a five-year program. The CTC has indicated its intent to fund all STIP submittals that are programmed up to the Base amount.

The Target share of \$25,682,000 includes additional revenue estimated to be available in FY16/17 from the first year of the next county share period. FY16/17 represents the end of the 2012 STIP period. It is unlikely that the CTC will program all proposals that request county shares through FY16/17.

The Maximum share of \$62,849,000 represents county share funds through the end of the next county share period that end FY19/20. It is unlikely that the CTC would program submittals that request the Maximum share, except maybe for a few worthy projects in smaller counties. Furthermore, funds are only available for the Maximum share to the extent that some counties are under programmed relative to their Target share, so the CTC will have little if any discretion to fund Maximum shares.

A diagram showing the difference between county share periods and STIP cycles is provided in Exhibit 2.

Exhibit 2

County Share Periods	Base Share				Target				Maximum	
	Total Target									
Fiscal Year	FY 12/13	FY 13/14	FY 14/15	FY 15/16	FY 16/17	FY 17/18	FY 18/19	FY 19/20	FY 20/21	
2012 STIP Period										
2014 STIP Period										

PROPOSED 2012 PROGRAM

The county shares table in Exhibit 1 on the first page includes the deduction of on-going VCTC STIP priority projects that are programmed annually in the STIP: Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM) and Metrolink Annual Infrastructure Replacement/Upgrade projects. TE funds are also deducted from county shares. A discussion of proposed PPM and TE programming is provided below.

Planning, Programming & Monitoring (PPM)

PPM is utilized annually by VCTC to fund planning and programming activities performed by VCTC staff and consultants. The proposed PPM program for the 2012 STIP includes the addition of \$829,000 in PPM

funds, primarily in the last 2 years of the 2012 STIP (FY15/16 & FY16/17). Adjustments have been made between years to stay within the 5% PPM programming limitation. Exhibit 3 displays the existing PPM programmed amounts, and Exhibit 4 displays the proposed 2012 STIP PPM program amounts. Exhibit 5 displays the difference between the proposed 2012 STIP and existing programmed amounts from the adopted 2010 STIP.

Exhibit 3 – Adopted 2010 STIP Programmed Amounts

Planning Programming & Monitoring (PPM)					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$500	\$385	\$510	\$-	\$-	\$1,395

Exhibit 4 – Proposed 2012 Programmed Amounts

Planning Programming & Monitoring (PPM)					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$465	\$413	\$413	\$413	\$520	\$2,224

Exhibit 5 – Proposed 2012 STIP minus Adopted 2010 STIP

Planning Programming & Monitoring (PPM)					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$(35)	\$28	\$(97)	\$413	\$520	\$829

Metrolink Infrastructure Replacement/Upgrade

The annual Metrolink Infrastructure Replacement/Upgrade project is a priority project for VCTC because STIP funds replace Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds that would otherwise not be allocated to local agencies. For many years VCTC has been programming \$1,500,000 in STIP funds annually for this project, and proposes to continue this practice by programming \$1.5 million in FY15/16 and \$597,000 in FY16/17. As described in the discussion on the US-101/SR-23 Interchange, since the STIP funding for Route 101/23 has been established in the TIGER III grant application at \$20,000,000, there is only \$597,000 remaining in the Ventura County STIP Target share for Metrolink Infrastructure in the final year of the STIP. Therefore, staff recommends that the remaining need of \$903,000 in FY 16/17 be funded with a portion of the \$20.4 million in future STP funds that could be committed to support funding of US-101/SR-23 should the TIGER III grant not be approved.

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Program

The total TE Target for VCTC is \$2,756,000, which is primarily available for programming in the last two years of the 2012 STIP (FY15/16 & FY16/17). This is in addition to the existing amount of TE funds programmed in the 2010 STIP totaling \$8,098,000.

Agencies are allowed to program “TE Reserves” when specific projects have not been identified. This provides regional agencies with more time to select projects.

VCTC staff proposes to program the entire TE Target amount of \$2,756,000 as TE Reserves: \$1,389,000 in FY15/16 and \$1,367,000 in FY16/17. Annual TE amounts may change in the future based on local

agency submittals in response to VCTC's request for information on the need for additional project funding.

Exhibit 6 displays the existing TE program from the adopted 2010 STIP, and Exhibit 7 displays the proposed program for the 2012 STIP. The difference between the two tables is displayed in Exhibit 8. The schedule for TE delivery in the first two years was developed in consultation with Camarillo which has all but one of the currently-programmed TE projects.

Exhibit 6 – Existing TE Program

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Reserve					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$3,021	\$3,469	\$1,608	\$-	\$-	\$8,098

Exhibit 7 – Proposed 2012 TE Program

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Reserve					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$-	\$3,021	\$3,469	\$2,997	\$1,367	\$10,854

Exhibit 8 – Proposed TE Program minus Adopted TE

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Reserve					
FY12/13	FY13/14	FY14/15	FY15/16	FY16/17	Total
\$(3,021)	\$(448)	\$1,861	\$2,997	\$1,367	\$2,756

US-101/SR-23 Interchange Project from US101 County Line to Moorpark Road

The US-101/SR-23 Interchange project remains VCTC's number #1 capital improvement project for STIP funding. The construction phase was programmed in a previous STIP but was later dropped due to the lack of STIP funding. VCTC is currently working closely with the City of Thousand Oaks to apply for \$19,500,000 in federal TIGER III discretionary funds, with the STIP share having been set at \$20,000,000, to be advanced through a loan from Thousand Oaks. However, TIGER III awards will not be known until sometime after VCTC takes action on the 2012 STIP, and the STIP policies require that project phases will only be programmed if fully funded.

Staff therefore proposes that VCTC commit to providing \$20,403,000 in future STP funds so that the STIP submittal can be shown as fully funded with no share advance required. This action would consume 2 to 3 years of STP funds that are normally allocated competitively to local agencies for local and regional transportation projects, including local road rehabilitation. Although these funds have historically been programmed through calls for projects, a legitimate use would also be to assist with the state highway priority list, where US-101/SR-23 is now the top priority. Furthermore, there appears to be strong interest on the part of Congress in providing more focus on regional transportation funds for use on highways of national significance, for which this project would qualify. Since the US-101/SR-23 STIP commitment has been set at \$20 million, staff proposes that \$19.5 million of the \$20.4 million in STP funding would be committed in FY 15/16 to the US-101/SR-23 project itself, in place of the TIGER funds should they not be approved. As described in the Metrolink Rehabilitation section, the remaining \$903,000 of STP funds

would be committed for FY 2016/17 Metrolink Rehabilitation, to fund the shortfall in that project due to the need to apply \$20 million in STIP funds to US-101/SR-23.

Should the TIGER III grant be approved, the \$19.5 million in STP funds for US-101/SR-23 would no longer be required, but the \$903,000 commitment to Metrolink rehabilitation would still be needed. Furthermore, should there be US-101/SR-23 cost reductions, the unneeded STIP funds could be transferred to the Metrolink project, thus reducing the STP requirement. If the TIGER III grant is approved, Thousand Oaks would then submit to the CTC a request for approval under Assembly Bill 3090 to advance the project using its own funds, to be reimbursed by STIP funds in the year programmed.

The tables in Attachment 1 summarize the proposed changes to the STIP.

Attachment 1

Existing 2010 STIP RIP & TE Funding Summary

(\$1,000)

					Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Prior	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	R/W	Con	E&P	PS&E	R/W Sup	ConSp
Caltrans	101	2291	LA CO Line – SR23 Improvements	1,600	1,600						0	0	1,600	0	0	0
VCTC	--	9002	Planning, Programming & Monitoring	2,395	1,000	500	385	510	0	0	0	2,395	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	2921	Metrolink Infra. Replace/Upgrade	7,500	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	0	0	0	7,500	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	3565	TE Reserve	8,779	681	3,021	3,469	1,608	0	0	0	8,779	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	20,274	6,281	5,021	5,354	3,618	0	0						

Proposed Changes in Funding

(\$1,000)

					Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Prior	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	R/W	Con	E&P	PS&E	R/W Sup	ConSp
Caltrans	101	2291	LA CO Line – SR23 Improvements	+20,0000	0	0	0	0	+20,000	0	0	+20,000	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	9002	Planning, Programming & Monitoring	+829	0	-35	+28	-97	+413	+520	0	+829	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	2921	Metrolink Infra. Replace/Upgrade	+2,097	0	0	0	0	+1,500	+597	0	+2,097	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	3565	TE Reserve	+2,756	0	-3,021	-448	+1,861	+2,997	+1,367	0	+2,756	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	+25,682	0	-3,056	-420	+1,764	+24,910	+2,484						

Proposed 2012 STIP RIP & TE Funding Summary

(\$1,000)

					Project Totals by Fiscal Year						Project Totals by Component					
Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	Prior	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17	R/W	Con	E&P	PS&E	R/W Sup	ConSp
Caltrans	101	2291	LA CO Line – SR23 Improvements	21,600	1,600	0	0	0	20,000	0	0	20,000	1,600	0	0	0
VCTC	--	9002	Planning, Programming & Monitoring	3,224	1,000	465	413	413	413	520	0	3,224	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	2921	Metrolink Infra. Replace/Upgrade	9,597	3,000	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500	597	0	9,597	0	0	0	0
VCTC	--	3565	TE Reserve	11,535	681	0	3,021	3,469	2,997	1,367	0	11,535	0	0	0	0
			TOTAL	45,956	6,281	1,965	4,934	5,382	24,910	2,484						



Item #8

October 20, 2011

MEMO TO: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

**SUBJECT: PROGRAMMING OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (STP),
CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ), AND
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT (TE) FUNDS**

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve Attachment B guidelines for a new Mini-Call for Projects to program STP, CMAQ and TE funds anticipated to come available during Fiscal Years (FY) 2011/12 and 2012/13.
- Approve Mini-Call for Projects Schedule contained in the agenda item.
- Appoint a Task Force to discuss how to create a "shelf" of ready-to-go projects which can be funded if necessary to prevent a loss of program capacity, and to review project scoring.

BACKGROUND:

At last month's committee meetings, TRANSCOM and TTAC approved guidelines for programming additional federal funds anticipated to become available for FY 2011/12. Due to the relatively small amount of funds anticipated to be available, the proposed process would have minimized the amount of effort by limiting consideration to existing project cost increases and specified new projects. Subsequent to these meetings, Commission staff continued to monitor the situation regarding the federal transportation authorization. Although there is still significant uncertainty regarding the configuration and size of a new federal transportation program authorization, Congress has now approved a six-month authorization extension, continuing the same program structure at the same authorized funding level. As the next presidential election nears, it appears likely that Congress will continue extending the existing programs through FY 2012/13, although it should be recognized that cuts are still possible during this period. Staff therefore believes that further consideration should be given to programming two-years' worth of funds through another Mini-Call for Projects.

To ensure that existing projects requiring additional funds are not delayed, staff brought forward to the Commission the portion of the prior committee recommendation that would allow project sponsors to submit to VCTC by October 28th requests for additional funds for previously approved projects which require the funds before June 30, 2012. Attachment A provides the guidelines which staff recommended for Commission approval to allow these projects to receive funding in advance of another Call for Projects. Staff also recommended that TTAC and TRANSCOM be directed to consider a Mini-Call for Projects to program the anticipated available FY 2011/12 and FY 2012/13 funds remaining available after funds are programmed to existing projects per the Attachment A process.

Last month's description of the funds available to program was based on the assumption that it was only prudent to program anticipated FY 2011/12 funds. The following describes how the programming capacity is increased based on the ability to also program for FY 2012/13.

STP: A total of \$11.1 million was estimated to be available assuming the continuation of the program in FY 2011/12 at the same level as FY 2010/11, and also including an apportionment carryover. Adding another year's worth of funding at the same level will increase the programming capacity to \$19.9 million. However, as part of the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) submittal, which is on this month's TTAC agenda, staff is recommending that VCTC commit to providing approximately \$20 million of STP funds by FY 2015/16 to fund the amount of the Route 101/23 Interchange project cost that cannot be covered by the Ventura County STIP County Share balance. Staff therefore recommends that \$4 million of the \$19.9 million be set aside to begin building a reserve of STP funds to be used to match the STIP funds for Route 101/23. Should the TIGER III grant being submitted by VCTC be approved, the STP funds will no longer be required.

TE: There was \$1.3 million available to program, based on the funds estimated for one year by the California Transportation Commission. Programming two years of funds will double that amount, to \$2.6 million

CMAQ: As discussed last month, there could be a significant rescission of CMAQ, effective September 30, 2011, although the rescinded amount may not be known until several months later due to the time it will take for Caltrans to calculate the final program balances and distribute the rescission amounts. Until the Ventura County rescission amount is known, there can be no presumption of having an available programming balance for FY 2011/12. However, with FY 2012/13 funds added there will be \$7.7 million available to program. The CMAQ program capacity could potentially increase once the rescission amount is determined.

Attachment B provides the proposed Mini-Call for projects guidelines for the Committees' review and approval. Prior to last year's Mini-Call, a Task Force was established to develop new guidelines. Staff recommends at this time that there not be a Task Force to consider guidelines, but that the prior guidelines be used, with changes based on a discussion at the November 2010 Committee meetings regarding strategies to encourage project delivery. As a result, the guidelines have been changed to include Project Readiness and Prior Project Delivery as criteria. Second, staff is recommending that projects below the funding cut-line be approved as a "shelf list" which can be funded without further Committee or VCTC Board action if necessary to avoid loss of apportionment. To assist the Committee in its discussion, the changes to the prior guidelines are indicated. The draft guidelines have been revised to incorporate the recommendations made by TRANSCOM at its October 12th meeting.

At the September Commission meeting, the Commission directed that a process be developed to approve a standby list of ready-to-go projects which could quickly be funded if necessary to avoid a loss of program capacity to the county. Such a list could perhaps be developed through the Mini-Call for Projects. For example, in addition to programming the funds anticipated to be available, a limited amount of lower-scoring project could be pre-approved to receive funds should the need arise. Staff recommends that a Task Force consisting of TRANSCOM and TTAC members be established to consider such a policy, which would be incorporated into the VCTC action selecting the projects to be programmed through the Mini-Call. At a later date the Task Force will meet to recommend project scores.

The following is the proposed schedule for the 2011 Mini-Call for Projects:

VCTC Approval of Mini-Call Process: November 4, 2011

Notification of Funding Availability: November 7, 2011

Applications Due to VCTC: January 9, 2012

Task Force Approval of Projects: week of January 30th

TRANSCOM Approval of Projects: February 9th

TTAC Approval of Projects: February 16th

VCTC Approval to Projects: March 2nd

Approval of Amendment to Federal Transportation Improvement Program: June, 2012

**PROPOSED 2011 GUIDELINES FOR PROGRAMMING CMAQ/STP/TE FUNDS TO
PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED PROJECTS**

(Approved by VCTC 10/7/2011)

Funding Priorities

Supplemental funding will be considered for previously-approved STP, CMAQ, TE, and Proposition 1B projects other than road rehabilitation (which were not approved with a specific scope), for projects that will be ready to obligate the funds by June 30, 2012.

Any other funding proposals, including new projects, will be considered through a subsequent Mini-Call for Projects expected to be concluded by February, 2012, with funds to be programmed in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and available by June 30, 2012.

Eligibility Requirements

To receive funding, the project sponsor must provide VCTC with a letter stating the original project funding, including federal and local funds, the revised project funding, and the requested additional STP, CMAQ, or TE funds. The letter should also provide an update project schedule showing start and end dates for design, right-of-way, and construction.

Funding will only be programmed where the schedule shows the funds can be obligated/allocated by the June 30, 2012 deadline.

Schedule

VCTC Approval of Programming Process: October 7
Notification of Funding Availability: October 10
Funding Request Letters Due to VCTC: October 28
TRANSCOM Approval to Program Funds: November 10
TTAC Approval to Program Funds: November 17
VCTC Approval to Program Funds: December 2
Approval of Amendment to Federal Transportation Improvement Program: April, 2012

**REVISED CMAQ FUNDING
PROJECT SELECTION GUIDELINES
FOR VENTURA COUNTY
(FOR MINI CALL PURPOSES)**

CMAQ funds are used for projects which mitigate congestion and improve air quality. Types of eligible projects are as follows:

Clean Fuel Bus Fleets and Support Facilities

Improved Public Transit/Ridesharing

Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities

Traffic Management / Congestion Relief Strategies

Clean Fuel Fleet Subsidy Programs

Other Projects that meet the screening criteria

Two sets of criteria are used to evaluate projects proposed for CMAQ funding. First, **Screening Criteria** will be used to determine if a proposed project is an eligible candidate. Projects which do not satisfy all of the screening criteria will not be evaluated any further. Second, **Selection Criteria** will be used to evaluate the relative merits of each project to determine what its score/priority ranking should be.

Screening Criteria

The screening criteria are divided into three categories. Proposed projects must meet **all** of these screening criteria in order to move to the next phase of the process.

1. Project Eligibility

- A. Proposed project is eligible for CMAQ funds (see list of eligible project types on page 4-5 of these guidelines)
- B. Project applicant is a city, the County, a transit operator, or other public transportation agency, or a non-profit organization capable of funding and delivering the project, or is a private/public partnership (possibly with some private funding) subject to approval of FHWA and FTA.
- C. Proposed project mitigates measurably improves air quality.

2. Planning Consistency

- A. Project is consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (i.e. SCAG's 2008 RTP).
 - Project is specifically identified in the RTP.

- Project is consistent with the goals and policies of the RTP.
- B. Project is consistent with the most-recently adopted general plan(s).
- C. Project is consistent with the adopted District Air Quality Management Plan.
- D. Traffic flow improvement projects must be on roadways eligible for federal funding, which include projects on rural major collectors (and above) and urban collectors (and above).
- E. Transit improvement projects must be consistent with the policies and standards in the adopted Congestion Management Program.

3. Financial Feasibility

- A. Recipient of funds must have the financial capacity to complete, operate and maintain the project.
- B. Funds required from other sources (for local match) must be reasonably expected to be available.
- C. Project can be implemented within Federal delivery requirements.

Selection Criteria

There are eight selection criteria to be used to evaluate projects which have been found to meet the above screening criteria. Each of the criteria has a specific number of "points" assigned to them; these are maximums and as such 100 points represents a "perfect score" for any project.

Because a priority list of project categories has been established, it is difficult to evaluate projects across categories (i.e. how is a project to improve public transit compared to a traffic flow improvement, or a bicycle facility). Therefore, the criteria below provide a basic framework for ranking projects within each individual category. To a lesser extent, the criteria will help determine project "worthiness" and, in broad terms, the relative strength of each project.

In general, projects will be evaluated against each criteria to determine the degree to which they accomplish the stated goal or purpose.

A. Improve mobility. (0 to ~~30~~ 25 points)

- Project improves mobility Up to ~~30~~ 25 points
- Project does not provides mobility improvement 0 points

B. Improve air quality. (Based on consultation with APCD staff.) (0 to ~~30~~ 25 points)

- Significant reduction in vehicle emissions Up to ~~30~~ 25 points

- No reduction in vehicle emissions 0 points

C. Address multi-modal or HOV needs. (10 points)

- Project improves coordination between, and access to, more than one mode of travel 10 points
- Project provides little or no improvement to coordination between, or access to, more than one mode of travel 0 points

D. Funding Leverage (10 points)

- Applicant provides at least 20% local match over the required match 10 points
- Applicant does not provide at least 20% local match over 0 points

E. Equitable Distribution of Funds (0 to ~~20~~ 15 points)

- Funding the project moves a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding. Up to ~~20~~ 15 points
- Funding does not move local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding 0 points

F. Project Readiness (0 to 15 points)

- Funds can be obligated by Dec 31, 2012 15 points
- Funds can be obligated by April 30, 2013 5 points

NOTE: "Obligated" means the funds are no longer shown in the unobligated apportionment balance, due to FHWA either providing E-76 approval or transferring funds to FTA for a transit project.

PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR CMAQ FUNDING

Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) program funds can be used to fund projects expected to result in tangible reductions in CO and ozone precursor emissions, and under certain conditions PM-10 pollution. Eligible activities include:

Transportation Control Measures: TCMs are likely to be eligible, however the air quality benefits must be determined and documented before a project can be considered eligible. Two TCMs specifically excluded by legislation from CMAQ eligibility are reduction of emissions from extreme cold-start conditions and programs to encourage removal of pre-1980 vehicles. (TCMs are listed on Attachment.)

Transportation Activities in an Approved State Implementation Plan: Transportation activities in approved SIPs are likely to be eligible activities. The activity must contribute to the specific emission reductions necessary to bring an area into attainment.

Transit Projects: In general, CMAQ eligibility is determined on the basis of whether or not the project represents an expansion or enhancement of transit service. Eligible capital projects include new stations, transit centers, and preferential bus/HOV treatment on existing roads: new park-and-ride facilities adjacent to transit stops; and major new fixed-guide way and bus/HOV facilities and extensions; new alternative-fueled transit buses, vans, locomotives and rail cars; and operating subsidies for 3-year demonstrations of new service.

Alternative Fuels: Conversion or replacement of centrally-fueled fleets to alternative fuels is eligible provided that the fleet is publicly owned or leased, and the fleet conversion is in response to a specific requirement in the Clean Air Act or is specifically identified in the State Implementation Plan.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Program: Include eligible projects are construction of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, non-construction projects related to safe bicycle use, and establishment and funding of State bicycle/pedestrian coordinator positions.

Management Systems: Projects required to develop, establish the management systems for traffic congestion, public transportation facilities and equipment, and intermodal transportation facilities and systems, as well as implementation of projects contained in them, are eligible where it can be demonstrated they are likely to contribute to attainment of air quality standards.

Traffic Management/Congestion Relief Strategies: Traffic management and congestion relief strategies for both highways and transit are eligible provided that they can be shown to improve air quality. Projects to modernize traffic signals to improve traffic flow and intelligent transportation systems are included under this category.

Telecommuting: Planning, technical and feasibility studies, training, coordination and promotion for telecommuting are eligible activities under CMAQ. Physical establishment of telecommuting centers, computer and office equipment purchases and related activities are not eligible.

Travel Demand Management: Eligible activities include: market research and planning in support of TDM implementation; capital expenses required to implement TDM measures;

operating assistance to administer and manage TDM programs; and marketing and public education efforts to support and bolster TDM measures.

Intermodal Freight: CMAQ funds may be used for improved intermodal freight facilities where air quality benefits can be shown.

Public/Private Initiatives: The CMAQ program may be used to fund projects or programs that are owned, operated or under the primary control of the public sector, including public/private joint ventures. Under TEA-21, non-profit organizations are eligible as direct recipients of CMAQ funds.

Outreach Activities: Outreach activities, such as public education on transportation and air quality, advertising of transportation alternatives to SOV travel, and technical assistance to employers or other outreach activities for an Employee Commute Option program may be funded under the CMAQ program for an indefinite period. Transit “stores” selling fare media and dispensing route and schedule information which occupy leased space are also eligible and are not subject to the 3-year limit.

Fare/Fee Subsidy Program: CMAQ funds may be used for partial user fare or fee subsidies to encourage greater use of alternative travel modes (e.g. carpool, vanpool, transit, bicycling and walking), as part of a comprehensive, targeted program to reduce SOV use. The subsidized fare/fee must be limited to any one entity or location for a period not to exceed 2 years.

Other Projects and Programs: Other transportation projects and programs, even if they are not included under one of the categories above may also be funded under CMAQ. Innovative activities based on promising technologies and feasible approaches to improve air quality will also be considered for funding. Documentation of air quality benefits must be provided.

**REGIONAL STP FUNDING
PROJECT SELECTION GUIDELINES
FOR VENTURA COUNTY**

Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds are used for transportation capital projects of "regional" significance.

Program Goals

The goal of this regional or countywide program is to provide funds for improvement projects which benefit more than a single community and/or improve access to "regionally significant" facilities. The objectives of the program are summarized as follows:

- o Reduce congestion and improve mobility in Ventura County.
- o Support Ventura County in its efforts to attain Federal and State air quality standards.
- o Serve as an "alternative" funding source for projects beyond the capability of any one jurisdiction to fund.
- o Provide for an equitable distribution of funds across Ventura County.

Two sets of criteria are used to evaluate projects proposed for "regional" STP funding. First, **Screening Criteria** will be used to determine if a proposed project is an eligible candidate. Projects which do not satisfy all of the screening criteria will not be evaluated any further. Second, **Selection Criteria** will be used to evaluate the relative merits of each project to determine if it should be selected for funding and what its priority ranking should be.

Screening Criteria

The screening criteria are divided into three categories. Proposed projects must meet **all** of these screening criteria in order to move to the next phase of the process.

1. **Project Eligibility**

- A. Proposed project is eligible for STP funds (see page 7 for list of eligible projects).
- B. Project applicant is a city, the County, a transit operator, or other public transportation agency.

2. **Planning Consistency**

- A. Project is consistent with the adopted 2004 Regional Transportation Plan.
 - Project is specifically identified in the RTP.
 - Project is consistent with the goals and policies of the RTP.
- B. Project is consistent with the relevant adopted general plan(s).

- C. Project is consistent with the most-recently adopted Air Quality Management Plan.
- D. Roadway improvement projects must be on roadways eligible for federal funding, which includes projects on rural major collectors (and above) and urban collectors (and above).
- E. Transit improvement projects must be consistent with the policies and standards in the adopted Congestion Management Program.

3. Financial Feasibility

- A. Recipient of funds must have the financial capacity to complete, operate and maintain the project.
- B. Funds required from other sources (for local match) must be reasonably expected to be available.
- C. Project can be implemented within Federal delivery requirements.

Selection Criteria

There are nine selection criteria which are used to evaluate projects which have been found to meet the above screening criteria. Each of the criteria has a specific number of "points" assigned to them; these are maximums and as such 100 points represents a "perfect score" for any project.

Projects will be evaluated against each criterion to determine the degree to which they accomplish the stated goal or purpose. To further guide the scoring process, specific points are assigned within each criteria (e.g. Low = 5 points, Moderate = 10 points, High = 15 points). This is intended to simplify the ranking process and focus review on the substantive issues rather than finite point differentials. The ten criteria are described below.

- A. Improve existing level of service (roadway or system) through reduced delay and/or travel time. (15 points)
- B. Improve access to regional facilities such as ports, airports, universities, state & national parks, historic sites or military/government facilities. (~~15~~ 10 points)
- C. Preservations of existing facilities including overlay. (~~10~~ 5 points)
 - Project preserves, replaces or rehabilitates a transportation facility 10 5 points
 - *Does not preserve, replaces or rehabilitates a transportation facility* 0 points
 - Project significantly benefits the residents of at least two jurisdictions in the county 5 points
 - Project significantly benefits the residents of only

~~one local jurisdiction in the county~~ 0 points

D. Improve safety or security on roadways or at transit and transportation facilities. (10 points)

- Project has high impact on a safety or security problem
10 points
- Project has moderate impact on a safety or security problem
5 points
- Project has little or no impact on a safety or security problem
0 points

E. Address multi-modal or HOV needs. (5 points)

- Project improves coordination between, and access to, more than one mode of travel
5 points
- Project does not improve coordination between, or access to, more than one mode of travel
0 points

F. Funding Leverage (5 points)

- Applicant provides at least 40% local match
5 points
- Applicant does not provide at least 40% local match
0 points

G. Transportation control measure (TCM) in the latest District-approved Air Quality Management Plan. (10 points)

- Is the project on the TCM list
10 points
- The project is not on the TCM list
0 points

H. CMP Deficiency (10 points)

- The project is on the CMP deficiency list (pg. 86 of the CMP)
10 points
- Project not on the CMP deficiency list
0 point

I. Equitable Distribution of Funds. (0-20 15 points)

- Funding the project moves a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding
Up to 20 15 points
- Funding the project does not move a local jurisdiction closer to receiving an equitable share of funding
0 points

J. *Project Readiness (0 to 15 points)*

- *Funds can be obligated by Dec 31, 2012* *15 points*
- *Funds can be obligated by April 30, 2013* *5 points*

K. *Prior Delivery Record (negative points)*

- *VCTC will consider subtracting up to five points from an agency's scores for each 2010 Mini-Call STP Project for which construction funds were to be obligated by July 1, 2011 per the project application, but were not as of September 30th. (See Draft List on page 4 of Technical Appendix.) Agencies having such projects should include in their Application Package a letter describing the project's current schedule and explaining why the project is behind schedule. The reduction of points for an agency's project will be based on the legitimacy of the rationale for the project delay being beyond the project sponsor's control.*

NOTE: "Obligated" means the funds are no longer shown in the unobligated apportionment balance, due to FHWA either providing E-76 approval or transferring funds to FTA for a transit project.

PROJECTS ELIGIBLE FOR STP FUNDING

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational improvements for highways, bridges, includes construction to accommodate other modes, seismic retrofit and painting of bridges, environmental mitigation of transportation projects.
- Capital costs for transit projects eligible under the Federal Transit Act and publicly owned intracity or intercity bus terminals and facilities.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities and programs, bicycle and pedestrian projects.
- Highway and transit safety improvements and programs, hazard eliminations, wildlife hazard mitigation, railway/highway grade crossings.
- Highway and transit research and technology transfer programs.
- Capital and operation costs for traffic monitoring management, and control facilities and programs.
- Surface transportation planning activities/Transportation enhancement activities.
- Transportation control measures identified in the Federal Clean Air Act:
 - Improved public transit
 - Traffic flow/A.Q. improvements
 - Ridesharing services/programs
 - Idling control programs
 - Indirect Source Control programs.
 - HOV facilities
 - HOV parking fac.
 - Bikeways/Walkways
 - Flexible work schedules
 - Employer-based incentives
 - Vehicle use restriction prg
 - Bike storage facilities
- Development and establishment of management systems (pavement, bridges, safety, congestion, public transportation facilities and equipment, and intermodal transportation facilities and equipment).
- Transportation project wetlands mitigation.

**TECHNICAL APPENDIX
CMAQ & REGIONAL STP PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA**

The following information is intended to provide a more detailed description of the Selection Criteria for Regional STP and CMAQ projects. Provided for each criteria is either a brief discussion of the specific factors to be considered, or a technical description of how a given criteria is to be measured. Not all criteria for the CMAQ and Regional STP programs are included here. The intent is to provide technical background to guide the applicants as well as the TTAC when it scores of projects.

A. Level of Service Measurement - The key factors to be considered in determining the degree of improvement in LOS are the initial LOS, the amount of improvement expected from the project, and the volume of traffic on the roadway. The following tables provide a guide for the assignment of points to a proposed project (**all values shown are the amount of improvement in the volume-to-capacity ratio**):

B. . Air Quality Improvement - Rating in this criteria will be based on consultation with APCD staff. Scoring will be based on the following factors: 1) the project is a transportation control measure, 2) the project reduces vehicle miles traveled, 3) the project reduces of vehicle starts, 3) the project reduces vehicle emissions, and 4) the project supports implementation of a transportation control measure.

C. Preservation of Existing Facility Scoring in this criteria if the project is preserving, rehabilitating, or replacing an existing transportation facility including pavement of existing roadway.

D. Safety and/or Security Benefit - The two factors to be considered are 1) the anticipated degree of improvement, and 2) the documented significance of the problem.

E. . Multi-Modal or HOV Needs - Scoring in this criteria is based on two primary factors: 1) Reduction in single occupant vehicle trips; and 2) improvement in coordination among different modes.

F. Funding Leverage If the agency is providing a 40% match the project will receive the maximum score for this category.

G. TCM Implementation – The Attachment lists the Transportation Control Measures (TCM) in the latest EPA-approved Air Quality Management Plan.

H. CMP Deficiency this criteria is made to help a project that is shown in the VCTC CMP report as deficient and not meeting the level of service requirement per the CMP guideline.

I. Equitable Distribution - Points under this category will be assigned to projects only after it is determined that the points would help bring a local agency closer to receiving an equitable share of Federal funding. Fair share of funds will be based on each agency's share of Local Surface Transportation Program funds. Projects will first be scored using criteria items A through G for CMAQ (total of 80 points possible) and items A through I for STP (total of 85 points possible). Staff would then apply 15 points to projects if the points help move a local agency closer to receiving an equitable share of funding.

**Transportation Control Measures
(1995 Air Quality Management Plan Revision)**

Ridesharing Strategies

- Carpooling, Van Pooling, BusPooling
- Modified Work Schedules
- Park and Ride Lots

Non-motorized Strategies

- Modified Work Schedules
 - Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities
- TDM Facilities Ordinance**

Traffic Flow Improvement Strategy

**Regional Transportation Improvement
Program; CMP Deficiency Plans**

Land Use Strategy

**TDM Facilities Ordinance,
CMP Lane Use Impact Program**

Transit Strategies

- Public Transit Programs
 - Transit/Land Use Planning
 - Passenger Rail
- Maintain existing levels of service
TDM Facilities Ordinance
Maintain Montalvo to L.A. Service**

DRAFT LIST OF 2010 MINI-CALL STP/CMAQ PROJECTS
LATE AT OBLIGATING CONSTRUCTION FUNDS PER GUIDELINES

Hueneme Road Widening, Oxnard

Street Rehabilitation, Simi Valley

TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES (TE) PROGRAM **PROJECT SCORING GUIDELINES**

SCORING CRITERIA

Each project nomination can receive a maximum of 100 points; up to 60 points in general scoring and up to 40 points in activity-specific scoring. In the general scoring process, all applications are scored by the same point system. For the specific-activity scoring, the transportation enhancement activity categories are grouped into four divisions of commonality, then a proposal is scored within the applicable division.

GENERAL MERIT – These are the scoring values for the general merit criteria, and the possibly points in each area:

Regional and Community Enhancement	50 points
Cost Effectiveness/Reasonable Cost	<u>10 points</u>
Total Possible General Score	60 points

SPECIFIC ACTIVITY – These are the activity-specific divisions and the possible points in each area. A project can score in only **one** of the specific divisions.

1. Bicycle, Pedestrian, Abandoned Rail Right-of-Way	40 points
2. Historic/Archeological/Museum	40 points
3. Transportation Aesthetics/Scenic/Tourist	40 points
4. Highway Runoff/Wildlife Crossings	<u>40 points</u>
Total Possible Specific Score	40 points

EVALUATION PROCESS – Each application will be evaluated on the following general merit criteria:

1. Regional and Community Enhancement (50 points)

The project score in this area is derived from the project's primary effects – its intent and purpose – on the following elements.

- a). Benefit to quality-of-life, community, environment. Examples might include provision of safe, aesthetic pedestrian facility at a rail station, removal of billboards on a scenic highway, provision for wildlife corridors or migration areas.

0-10 points

- b). Increases access to activity centers, such as businesses, school, recreational areas and shopping areas. Connects transportation modes, has multi-modal aspects. Reinforces, complements the regional transportation system, fills deficiency in the system.

0-8 points

- c). Implements goals in the regional transportation plan, or other adopted federal, state, or local plans. Examples might include water quality plans or elements of general plans.
0-8 points
- d). Increases availability, awareness, or protection of historic, community, visual, or natural resources.
0-8 points
- e). Degree of regional or community support. For example, letters of support from local interest groups and public bodies, additional match.
0-8 points
- f). Encompasses more than one of the four activity-specific divisions.
0-8 points

2. Cost Effectiveness/Reasonable Cost (10 points)

The project score in this area is a function of improved performance or productivity of the project as it relates to the annualized total project cost. Where the project does not lend itself to this type of analysis, the reasonableness of the cost should be established. For example, a bicycle route that takes a shorter path may be considered more cost-effective than one that connects the same activity centers in a round about way.

Highly cost-effective	10 points
Reasonable cost or moderately cost-effective	6 points
Low cost-effectiveness	2 points
Not cost-effective/Not applicable	0 points

3. Activity-Specific Enhancement Divisions (40 points)

The Activity-Specific Enhancement Divisions are groupings of the activity categories into 4 divisions with similar characteristics. All TE-eligible projects may compete for funding. The projects may score 0-40 points. **A PROPOSAL CAN SCORE IN ONLY ONE CATEGORY.**

**APPLICATION FOR FUNDS
REGIONAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (RSTP)
CONGESTION MITIGATION AND AIR QUALITY (CMAQ)**

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title:

Lead Agency:

Contact Person:

Title:

Address:

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

Project Description:

(Describe the project's purpose, location, length, limits of work, size, etc. Attach vicinity/site maps and plans, if bike path indicate length)

Project Federal Funding:

Federal Funds Requested: \$ _____

Phase(s): _____

Match: \$ _____ Source(s): _____

Total Project Cost \$ _____

Lead Agency: _____

Project Title: _____

II. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Schedule for Obligating Funds (enter month and year):

Prelim. Eng. _____

Right-of-Way _____

Construction _____

Local Funding Share Detail:

	Federal Funds	Local Match	Total Cost
--	---------------	-------------	------------

Prelim. Eng.	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
--------------	----------	----------	----------

Right-of-Way	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
--------------	----------	----------	----------

Construction	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
--------------	----------	----------	----------

TOTAL	\$ _____	\$ _____	\$ _____
-------	----------	----------	----------

III. ENVIRONMENTAL/SCHEDULE INFORMATION

Environmental/Schedule Information:

Federal environmental clearance category (CE, EA, or EIS): _____

Federal Environmental Process completion date: _____

Engineering	ROW	Construction
-------------	-----	--------------

Start Date: _____	_____	_____
-------------------	-------	-------

End Date: _____	_____	_____
-----------------	-------	-------

Final Completion Date: _____

Lead Agency: _____ Project Title: _____

IV. PROJECT SCREENING INFORMATION

Is the proposed project eligible for the following funds (check all that apply):

STP _____ CMAQ _____

Is the proposed project consistent with the area's adopted general plan?

YES _____ NO _____

Road Projects: Is the project an "urban collector" or above or a "rural major collector" or above?

YES _____ NO _____ N/A _____

Who will have the responsibility for completing, operating and maintaining the project? (If not applicant, please explain.)

V. PROJECT SCORING INFORMATION

Mobility Improvement:

Will the project improve a road's level of service or speed? If yes,

Project ADT: _____, Current LOS: _____

LOS with Project: _____

Will the project improve the level of service of a transit system? If yes, explain:

Will the project improve the level of service of the bikeway/pedestrian system?

If yes, explain:

Lead Agency: _____

Project Title: _____

Air Quality Improvement:

Will the project improve air quality, and if so, how? For example, will the project reduce pollutant emissions, single occupancy vehicle usage, reduce vehicle miles of travel, provide clean burning vehicles, improve traffic flow, etc? If yes, explain:

Multi-Modal/HOV Needs:

Will the project improve the coordination among different modes of travel? If yes, explain:

Funding Leverage

Does the applicant provide at least 40% local match?

YES _____ NO _____

Preservation of Existing Facility

Does the project preserve, replace or rehab existing transportation facility

YES _____ NO _____

Improve Safety

Does the project improve safety or security on a roadway or transportation facility

YES _____ NO _____

**APPLICATION FOR FUNDS
TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT (TE) FUNDS**

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Project Title: _____

Lead Agency: _____

Contact Person:

Title: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____ FAX: _____

Project Description:

(Describe the project's purpose, location, length, limits of work, size, etc. Attach vicinity/site maps and plans)

Project Federal Funding:

Federal Funds Requested: \$ _____

Phase(s): _____

Match: \$ _____ Source(s): _____

Total TE Project Cost \$ _____

Is TE Project Part of a Larger Project? Yes _____ No _____

If Yes, Total Cost of Larger Project, Including TE Project \$ _____

Lead Agency:_____ Project Title:_____

WHICH CATEGORY OR CATEGORIES ENCOMPASS THE ENHANCEMENT?

(May be more than one.)

List approximate amount of federal TE funds to be spent in each of the TE categories:

\$_____ 1. Pedestrian or bike facilities \$_____ 6. Historic
transportation rehabilitation

\$_____ 2. Acquisition of sites \$_____ 7. Rails to
trails

\$_____ 3. Historic highway programs \$_____ 8. Outdoor
advertising removal

\$_____ 4. Landscaping/scenic beautification \$_____ 9.
Archaeology planning/research

\$_____ 5. Historic preservation \$_____ 10. Runoff water
pollution control

Activities outside the categories: List approximate amount of federal TEA funds to be spent
in activities outside the ten categories
(must be necessary and incidental to the portion inside the categories):

\$_____

Describe:

II. FINANCIAL INFORMATION

Project Component Costs:

Preliminary Engineering Phase:

• Construction Documents	\$_____	
• Environmental Documents	\$_____	
TOTAL PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING		\$_____

Right Of Way Phase (Acquisition):

• Capital	\$_____	
• Support costs	\$_____	
TOTAL RIGHT OF WAY		\$_____

Construction Phase:

• Construction contract items	\$_____*	
• Contingencies	\$_____	
• Construction engineering	\$_____	
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION		\$_____

Lead Agency:_____ Project Title:_____

Schedule for Obligating Funds (enter month and year):

Prelim. Eng. _____

Right-of-Way _____

Construction _____

Schedule for Obligating Funds (enter month and year):

Prelim. Eng. _____

Right-of-Way _____

Construction _____

TE Application
Page Four

Lead Agency:_____ Project Title:_____

ITEM ESTIMATE - CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT ITEMS

Item	Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Price
	<u>Amount</u>			

Lead Agency:_____ Project Title:_____

III. ENVIRONMENTAL/SCHEDULE INFORMATION

Environmental/Schedule Information:

Federal environmental clearance category (CE, EA, or EIS):_____

Federal Environmental Process completion date: _____

	Engineering	ROW
Construction		
Start Date:	_____	_____
End Date:	_____	_____
Final Completion Date:	_____	

IV. PROJECT SCORING INFORMATION

Regional & Community Enhancements

Will the project improve the access to a regional facility(ies)? If yes, identify the regional facility(ies) and the access improvements:

Multi-Modal/HOV Needs:

Will the project improve the coordination among different modes of travel? If yes, explain:

CEO CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the applications included in this submittal package represent this agency's complete proposal for projects recommended for funding at this time. Should the projects be approved for funding by the Ventura County Transportation Commission, this agency will commit the local match as specified in the applications, and will make a priority of meeting the stated project delivery deadlines.

This agency is willing and able to maintain and operate the projects contained in the applications, and hereby assures that it will do so, with the proviso that the agency is permitted to transfer this responsibility to another qualified agency that is willing to do so.

Signature

Printed Name

Date

Title*

Agency

*Must be signed by City Manager, County Executive Officer, County Transportation Agency Director, or other organizational CEO.



Item #9

October 13, 2011

**MEMO TO: TRANSIT OPERATORS SUBCOMMITTEE
TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

**SUBJECT: STATUS OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT
PROGRAM (FTIP)**

RECOMMENDATION:

- Receive and file.

DISCUSSION:

Federal law provides that all federally-funded transportation projects, as well as any regionally-significant locally-funded projects, must be included in a Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Organization and approved by the State and Federal Departments of Transportation. Since the Metropolitan Planning Organization for this region is the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the FTIP is adopted by that agency, but under State law the VCTC is responsible for preparing the project listing for Ventura County and submitting that list to SCAG for inclusion in the FTIP.

The 2011 FTIP was approved by the Federal government on December 14, 2010. VCTC staff is about to begin the process for preparing the 2013 FTIP. On the week of October 24th, staff will e-mail each project agency with a pdf file containing its current project list, revised to show the 2013 FTIP format with the first fiscal year being FY 2012/13. Each agency is requested to mark up the TIP sheets and return them to VCTC. The current project status also needs to be written on each sheet. Complete directions will be included in the e-mail with the TIP sheets. In addition, a blank TIP sheet will be provided to include any new regionally-significant locally-funded projects that should be added. New projects nominated through the Mini-Call for Projects should not be included in the submittal, as VCTC will be preparing those FTIP sheets using information included in the applications. TIP sheets for local street and road projects need not be submitted, since the funds for all such projects are included on a single TIP sheet generated by VCTC.

Each agencies' completed FTIP submittal must be provided to VCTC by November 15th. In some cases an agency may want to begin assembling its TIP sheet data prior to October 24th, and for such situations VCTC can, upon request, provide a complete copy of the current FTIP data in the 2011 format, prior to October 24th.

Staff is continuing to process various technical FTIP amendments as the need arises. The currently-adopted FTIP for Ventura County, updated to include approved amendments, can be accessed at <http://www.goventura.org/?q=transportation-improvement-program-tip>, or by going to <http://www.goventura.org>, pointing at "About VCTC" so that the link "Project Programming" appears, clicking on "Project Programming," then on "Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)."

It is always important to note that no federally-funded project phase can be advertised until it has received the federal authorization to proceed, also known as the obligation of funds or E-76. The only exception to this rule is that in some cases transit projects where the federal funds were transferred to the Federal Transit Administration may proceed prior to inclusion in an FTA grant, under the FTA Pre-Award Authority policy, and receive reimbursement should the grant be approved. Agencies with FTA transfer projects should confirm with VCTC or FTA that their projects are eligible for Pre-Award authority before proceeding with such projects.



Item #10

October 21, 2011

MEMO TO: TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FROM: PETER DE HAAN, PROGRAMMING DIRECTOR

SUBJECT: 2012 MEETING SCHEDULE

RECOMMENDATION:

- Approve 2012 Meeting Schedule with meetings continuing to be held at 9:00 a.m. on the third Thursday of the month in the Camarillo City Hall.

DISCUSSION:

The following is the proposed 2012 Meeting Schedule for the Committee's consideration. This schedule will continue the practice of meeting the third Thursday of the month:

January 20
February 16
March 15
April 19
May 17
June 21
July 19
August 16
September 20
October 18
November 15
December 19