RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

MEETING AGENDA
Technical Advisory Committee

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Date: March 17, 2025

Locations: Riverside County Transportation Commission   Council Chamber Conference Room
March Field Conference Room   City of Palm Desert
4080 Lemon Street, 3rd Floor, Riverside, CA 92501   73510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, CA 92260

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Savat Khamphou, **Chair** / Kenny Nguyen, City of Corona

John A. Corella, **Vice Chair** / Armando Baldizzone, Cathedral City

Art Vela / Nate Smith, City of Banning

Robert Vestal / Dustin Christensen, City of Beaumont

VACANT, City of Blythe

Michael Thornton / Travis Bradshaw, City of Calimesa

Albert Vergel De Dios / Sean Yeung, Caltrans District 8

Stuart McKibbin / Mike Borja, City of Canyon Lake

Andrew Simmons / Maritza Martinez, City of Coachella

Randy Bowman / Mark Lancaster, CVAG

Daniel Porras / Nick Haecker, City of Desert Hot Springs

Jimmy Chung / Yurhi Choi, City of Eastvale

Noah Rau / Jilleen Ferris, City of Hemet

Ken Seumalo / Dina Purvis, City of Indian Wells

Timothy T. Wassil / Donn Uyeno, City of Indio

Paul Toor / Manuel Gonzales, City of Jurupa Valley

Bryan McKinney / VACANT, City of La Quinta

Remon Habib / Yu Tagai, City of Lake Elsinore

Nick Fidler / Carlos Geronimo, City of Menifee

Melissa Walker / Harold Zamora, City of Moreno Valley

Bob Moehling / Jeff Hitch, City of Murrieta

Chad Blais / Sam Nelson, City of Norco

Martin Alvarez / VACANT, City of Palm Desert

Joel Montalvo / VACANT, City of Palm Springs

K. George Colangeli / Dale Reynolds, PVVTA

John Pourkazemi / VACANT, City of Perris

Ryan Stendell / Jeff Benson, City of Rancho Mirage

Farshid Mohammadi / Gilbert Hernandez, City of Riverside

Dennis Acuna / Hector Davila, County of Riverside

Jennifer Nguyen / Mauricio Alvarez, RTA

Travis Randel / Stuart McKibbin, City of San Jacinto

Paul Mattern / Luis Garcia, SunLine

Ron Moreno / Nick Minicilli, City of Temecula

Christopher Tzeng / Cameron Brown, WRCOG

Jason Farag / Cameron Luna, City of Wildomar

STAFF

Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director

Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager

Martha Masters, Planning and Programming Senior Management Analyst

Edward Emery, Planning and Programming Senior Management Analyst

AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Subject to the supervision of the Commission, the Committee shall provide technical assistance to the Commission by reviewing and evaluating the various transportation proposals and alternatives within Riverside County. The Committee shall review, comment upon, and make recommendations on such matters as are referred to it by the Commission, including all matters relating to the programming of federal funds apportioned to the Riverside County and allocated by the Commission.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA*

*Actions may be taken on any item listed on the agenda.

TIME:	**10:00 a.m.**
DATE:	**March 17, 2025**
LOCATION:	**Riverside County Transportation Commission** **March Field Conference Room** **4080 Lemon Street, 3rd Floor, Riverside, CA 92501**
TELECONFERENCE SITE:	**Council Chamber Conference Room** **City of Palm Desert** **73510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, CA 92260**

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, Government Code Section 54954.2, and the Federal Transit Administration Title VI, please contact the Clerk of the Board at (951) 787-7141 if special assistance is needed to participate in a public meeting, including accessibility and translation services. Assistance is provided free of charge. Notification of at least 48 hours prior to the meeting time will assist staff in assuring reasonable arrangements can be made to provide assistance at the meeting.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

2. **ROLL CALL**

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES – NOVEMBER 18, 2024**

    Page 1

4. **PUBLIC COMMENTS –** This is for comments on items not listed on agenda. Comments relating to an item on the agenda will be taken when the item is before the Committee.

5. **SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS 2025 CALL FOR PROJECT NOMINATIONS**

    Page 13

    Overview

    This item is to receive and file information about the upcoming Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2025 Call for Project Nominations.

6. **CALTRANS DISTRICT 8 LOCAL ASSISTANCE UPDATE**

Page 45

Overview

This item is to receive and file an update from Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance.

7. **CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: DECEMBER 2024 AND JANUARY 2025**

Page 55

Overview

This item is to receive and file the December 2024 and January 2025 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting highlights.

8. **RCTC COMMISSION MEETING AND WORKSHOP HIGHLIGHTS: DECEMBER 2024 AND JANUARY, FEBRUARY, AND MARCH 2025**

Page 56

Overview

This item is to receive and file the December 2024 and January, February, and March 2025 Commission meeting highlights.

9. **COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT**

Overview

This item provides the opportunity for the committee members and staff to report on attended and upcoming meetings/conferences and issues related to committee activities.

10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled to be held May 19, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

MINUTES

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
MINUTES

Monday, November 18, 2024

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order by Chair Savat Khamphou at 10:00 a.m., in the March Field Conference Room at the County of Riverside Administrative Center, 4080 Lemon Street, Third Floor, Riverside, California, 92501 and at the teleconference site: Council Chamber Conference Room, City of Palm Desert, 73510 Fred Waring Drive, Palm Desert, California 92260.

2. ROLL CALL

Nate Smith, City of Banning
Dustin Christensen, City of Beaumont
Travis Bradshaw, City of Calimesa
Stuart McKibbin, City of Canyon Lake
John Corella, City of Cathedral City*
Randy Bowman, Coachella Valley Association of Governments*
Savat Khamphou, City of Corona
Noah Rau, City of Hemet
Donn Uyeno, City of Indio*
Manuel Gonzales, City of Jurupa Valley
Bryan McKinney, City of La Quinta*
Yu Tagai, City of Lake Elsinore
Carlos Germino, City of Menifee
Melissa Walker, City of Moreno Valley
Bob Moehling, City of Murrieta
Hector Davila, Riverside County
Travis Randel, City of San Jacinto
Luis Garcia, Sunline Transit Agency*
Ron Moreno, City of Temecula
Cameron Brown, Western Riverside Council of Governments
Jason Farag, City of Wildomar

*Joined the meeting at Palm Desert.

3. APPROVAL OF SEPTEMBER 16, 2024, MINUTES

B/C/A (Corella/Moehling) to approve the Minutes as submitted. There were no objections to this motion.

Abstain: 1 (Germino)

4.   PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

5.   CLIMATE ACTION PLAN FOR TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE

Tyler Madary, RCTC, shared the latest updates related to the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) which was implemented in 2021 by the California State Transportation Agency (CalSTA). Earlier this year, CalSTA declared that it had accomplished the 34 actions that were originally spelled out in CAPTI, and it would now begin to draft new actions to further advance the state's climate action goals.

CalSTA unveiled their draft 2024 CAPTI actions on October 31, and these actions are intended to advance four CAPTI strategies altogether. The actions being: transforming the future of the highway system, reducing greenhouse gas impacts on transportation investments, delivering equitable outcomes, and improving transparency and accountability. There is merit to these strategies, but the issue is how they are implemented and how they will impact our regional projects. The draft actions do have a few items of overlapping interest between CalSTA and RCTC, but others raise significant questions and challenges for RCTC.

First, CalSTA proposes to establish guidelines for the local development of the Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) mitigation banks and exchanges, as well as the start of the statewide program. VMT mitigation banks and exchanges are important tools for mitigating VMT impacts of projects in a more predictable and cost-effective manner. CalSTA also proposes to improve VMT analysis requirements for projects in rural areas. VMT analysis requirements currently follow a one-size fits all approach, but the hope is that this draft action would call for a more reasonable process for projects in Riverside County's rural communities. RCTC believes that VMT analysis and mitigation requirements for projects should be revisited across the board in a manner that recognizes different needs across the county from rural areas to those that are more densely populated.

There are some draft actions proposed by CalSTA that raise questions for RCTC including items that could impact RCTC's policies, the process for taking housing for projects on state highways, and conducting more studies on CAPTI investment outcomes.

Of great concern is CalSTA seeking to change SB 1 program guidelines to increase preference for VMT-reducing projects and to require projects seeking funding to be VMT neutral. Projects that do not meet these standards will not be competitive for state funding. This is problematic considering the fix-it-first legislative intent of SB 1 programs. Staff is also concerned about CalSTA's draft actions to codify CAPTI guiding principles into statute to "ensure continuation of CAPTI in future administrations."   RCTC has continually opposed efforts to codify portions of CAPTI, as this would tie the hands of agencies like the CTC that would otherwise have the discretion to consider the holistic merits of projects in the region. Codifying CAPTI guiding principles could go beyond state funding to include planning, project scoping, and mitigation.

In other words, CalSTA could be looking to cement in law ways to stop projects seen as inducing VMT on state highways.

Now that CalSTA's draft actions have been released, the public comment period is open through Friday, December 13. Staff is preparing a formal comment letter but is also engaging CalSTA in other ways. Shortly before the release of the draft action, RCTC staff received a briefing from CalSTA Undersecretary Mark Tollefson and Deputy Secretary Darwin Moosavi. In that meeting, Executive Director Aaron Hake reiterated the transportation mobility needs and pressures within Riverside County and the needs and pressures require investment in all modes of transportation. Recently, Deputy Secretary Moosavi presented to the joint California Air Resources Board (CARB), CTC, and Housing and Community Development (HCD), in Riverside. In addition to staff speaking during the public comment, CARB Board Members, CTC Commissioners, and HCD Director heard from Assemblymember Sabrina Cervantes and the Greater Riverside Chambers of Commerce who expressed concerns about how these actions could impact the region. Comments from the dais were telling, particularly from a CARB Board Member who emphasized that Electric Vehicle (EV) adoption will never be enough, and that cars on the road must be reduced to meet state climate action goals.

Per the Commission's instruction to staff last month, staff are engaging in a public education effort that includes outreach to each of the cities and the development of materials for use by residents, businesses, and community organizations, as well as local governments. RCTC staff is currently finalizing a template letter for use by the cities that will be shared with the TAC as soon as it is ready. Regional engagement in CalSTA's public comment period is going to be critical to tell our side of the story.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, wanted to stress that this is a huge document that should not be overlooked, as it is really going to tie our hands in terms of the current funding that is distributed through SB 1 and possibly all future funding as well.

Carlos Geronimo, Menifee, wanted to know if there were going to be any metrics added to the draft letter that was going to be distributed. Tyler Madary stated that the comments that will be provided by RCTC will not include metrics. CARB has chosen a methodology that focuses on VMT hence the comment that was made at the joint meeting.

Jason Farag, Wildomar, wondered if the possible SB 1 funding changes were only to the competitive funding or also to the regular maintenance allocation. Tyler Madary clarified that for the purposes of the draft update, it is only for the two competitive programs, though it could later effect other SB 1 funding programs as well. The two that are focused on requiring projects to be VMT neutral or prioritizing projects that reduce VMT, are specific to Solutions for Congested Corridors and Trade Corridor Enhancement Program. From a Legislative Affairs perspective, whatever the agency proposes is one thing, but what the legislature does with it is another.

Carlos Geronimo noted that currently CAPTI is required for projects that are receiving state funding and wondered if that would eventually roll over to local agencies and local projects.

Tyler Madary thought that was a good question, and that in the big picture that was probably going to happen. The state is looking to incrementally have a greater role in how projects are planned, programmed, and funded.

Nate Smith, Banning, stated that with housing and transportation so tied together, cities are obligated to build houses without changing land usage, but have to tell the residents they cannot drive anywhere. Tyler Madary encouraged those points to be added to the letters sent to CalSTA.

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, added that a big talking point or theory in the region is the induced demand issue. Sacramento points to induced demand which is their reason for not wanting to support capacity or interchange redesigns. A narrative that RCTC has been trying to elevate is that everyone is already here in Riverside County, so we are not inducing demand, the people are already here. We now have a responsibility to get them from A to B to C.

Savat Khamphou stated that when filling out grant forms there is a term increased capacity and some of these fixes are not bringing in more capacity, but rather fixing choke points that are already there.

John Corella, Cathedral City, added that there is a lot of infrastructure in the desert region in Coachella Valley that has never been expanded to their full potential, and it is possible that there could be issues with trying to achieve that.

Donn Uyeno, Indio, indicated the city has already prepared a letter. The existing as well as the proposed document were put in Chat GPT to summarize the content. The same was done with the City General Plan and several large projects that have applied for state funding. This could be something that other jurisdictions want to try to be able to better explain themselves in a letter to CalSTA.

6.   PROPOSED 2025 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, shared that the proposed 2025 TAC meeting schedule continues the traditional schedule of meeting every other month on the third Monday. The January TAC meeting falls on the Martin Luther King, Jr. holiday, so the proposal is not to have a January meeting and start the 2025 meetings in March. It is proposed to continue holding the meetings in two different locations, the RCTC Office in the March Field Conference Room and Palm Desert Council Chambers Conference Room.

B/C/A (Corella/Farag) to adopt the 2025 TAC Meeting Schedule. There were no objections to this motion.

7.   ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM – METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS' REGIONAL PROGRAM AUTHORITY TO AWARD PROJECTS BASED ON 20-POINTS METHODOLOGY

Edward Emery, RCTC, provided a presentation on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) authority to award projects based on the 20-point distribution methodology. ATP is a highly competitive statewide program that funds bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs to enhance or encourage biking and walking. The ATP process allows applicants two opportunities for award, one at the statewide level and another at the large Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) level. As the MPO, the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is required to work with county transportation commissions, the CTC, and Caltrans to develop its' regional program recommendations.

At the September 2024 TAC meeting, the TAC approved the MPO component 20-point distribution methodology for Cycle 7 and all future cycles. However, given the low level of funding available, the TAC decided to postpone the approval for the secondary action item which authorizes staff to award projects based on the methodology until after the release of the statewide component scores and after the application of the 20-point distribution methodology.

On November 1, 2024, the CTC released the statewide component funding recommendations. Staff evaluated the applications that were not funded at the statewide level using the 20-point distribution methodology. On November 5, 2024, staff met with Cycle 7 applicants to discuss the results of the application process and come to a consensus on the MPO funding recommendation. An agreement was reached by the end of the meeting. Ultimately, Coachella ranked first but is requesting a total amount of $19.1 million; they agreed to accept $2.1 million to fund the PS&E phase and $398,000 for the construction non-infrastructure phase, leaving $1.9 million available. The next project in line, the County of Riverside's Monroe Street Interchange ATP Improvement Project, was able to accept partial funding for the construction phase. Aside from awarding the partial funding, no other alternative principals or framework was needed.

A slide with the funding recommendations was shown. Projects are pending verification of the CEQA/NEPA status and Commission approval, if applicable. The list is also on page 31 of the agenda packet. All projects will remain on the contingency list should additional Cycle 7 funds be made available in the future.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, asked if this ATP Cycle 7 was a grant that was available every other year with a call for projects. Edward Emery stated that was correct, the call for projects was every other year, but it is not in statute so there is not a mandate for every two years.

B/C/A (Uyeno/Corella) to approve the 20-point distribution methodology for the ATP Cycle 7 Metropolitan Planning Organization component funding. There were no objections to this motion.

8.   SB 821 BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES PROGRAM REFRESH

Edward Emery, RCTC, provided a presentation on the Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 SB 821 Approval of Recommended Program Revisions. SB 821 is a discretionary program administered by RCTC to fund local bicycle and pedestrian projects and master plans.

At the September 2023, July 2024, and September 2024, TAC meetings, the constructive feedback that was received during the FY 23/24 SB 821 cycle was discussed. Staff drafted revisions to the SB 821 guidelines and scoring metrics based on the discussions.

Staff recommended changes to the destinations served question. The proposed changes clarify that points will be awarded based on the types of destinations rather than each individual destination. The aim is to promote projects that would enhance connectivity to a variety of destinations. Staff also proposes to reduce the radius to ½ mile or less for pedestrian projects and one mile or less for bicycle projects to better align with state and federal guidance.

The safety metric changes overall add more clarity. In prior cycles, the safety metric was presented as a single category worth 15 points. Staff recommends dividing that into three separate categories for a maximum of 5 points each. The first sub-question will be awarded points based on the severity of the existing safety hazard at the project location to demonstrate project need. Additional language has been added to offer clarification. The full text is available in the agenda package starting on page 38.

The second sub-question asks for safety countermeasures or safety enhancement features included in the project scope. Applicants are to provide an example of how each countermeasure will improve safety for non-motorized travelers.

The third sub-question is based on the potential of the project to benefit the safety of the non-motorized public. Applicants are to discuss what was considered when evaluating the type of facility for the corridor. This is an opportunity to tell the story and explain to the evaluator why the project is important and why a particular class of facility was chosen as the best option.

The multimodal question has been revised to enhance clarity. Points will be awarded for proposed facilities that enhance pedestrian and bicycle access to other modes of transportation such as Metrolink stations or bus stops. Points will also be awarded for closing gaps in facilities to improve connectivity. Like the destinations served question, staff is also proposing adjusting the radius of the improvements to a maximum of ½ mile for pedestrians and one mile for bicycle projects.

At the July TAC meeting, recommendations to clarify matching funds were discussed because the current guidelines have no definition for what qualifies as matching funds. Based on that discussion, RCTC staff recommends adding language to the metric to clarify that non-SB 821 funds spent on pre-con activities will continue to be counted as matching funds.

Another topic discussed was Class III bike lanes and how to ensure compliance with the Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 that mandates the funds only be spent on bicycle and pedestrian projects. Based on the discussion, staff recommends limiting the funding for Class III bicycle lane projects to the cost associated with striping and signage improvements that are directly related to bicycles; pavement rehabilitation would not be an eligible expense.

To streamline the process for guidelines revisions, staff wants to request Commission approval to delegate this responsibility to the TAC going forward. Any policy changes would still require Commission approval. Staff is not recommending any changes to how large-scale projects are scored based on analysis presented at the September TAC meeting.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, shared that a resident had sent him an email on a legislative policy that had been enacted last year that may have changed the criteria and redefined what a Class III bike lane is. The change is from 35 miles per hour to 25 miles per hour or less and it will limit where they can be installed.

Jason Farag, Wildomar, wanted a clarification on the distinction between the last two safety metrics as they seem similar. One is safety countermeasures, and the other is safety for the non-motorized public. Edward Emery explained that the first category is to describe the conditions currently, including crash data, to show the severity of what is going on or one can propose the idea of being proactive to improve conditions before something happens.. The second sub-question deals with the countermeasures that are proposed to be put in place to address the need. The third question is about the choices that were made to correct these issues and why.

Travis Randel, San Jacinto, was concerned with point metrics related to destinations served. For cities like San Jacinto that are not well built out, lowering the mileage to destinations served significantly limits the opportunities to be competitive even though there is a legitimate need for these pedestrian connections. There should be a way to credit those areas where there is a plan that has not yet been developed or areas that are entitled to development and they should be able to be used for credit.

Edward Emery recommended describing the exact situation in the narrative, stating that the city is growing and where the project may link to in the future.

Savat Khamphou added that while planning takes time, it does come years in advance and if there is supporting documentation from developers, it should be included.

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, thought that reducing the distances for the threshold might be a better thing for everyone. The language states destinations served must be within ½ mile or less from the proposed project, instead of ¾ mile. That is not to say that anything beyond ½ mile would not be considered, the point is that pedestrians should be able to walk there. The process is nimble enough that context can also be considered when reviewing the project applications.

John Corella, Cathedral City, echoed the remarks from San Jacinto and noted that the desert has the same situation. A ½ mile walk doesn't get you very far in the desert.

Edward Emery stated that the exact situation should be described in the narrative, the evaluators are familiar with Riverside County and should be able to understand the specific issues with more spread-out cities.

B/C/A (McKinney/Khamphou) to approve the updated Transportation Development Act Article 3, guidelines and evaluation criteria. There were no objections to this motion.

9.   **OBLIGATION DELIVERY PLAN UPDATE – FEDERAL FISCAL YEAR 2024/25 AND FUTURE**

Martha Masters, RCTC, provided an update on the Obligation Delivery Plan. Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is responsible for ensuring that federal Carbon Reduction Program (CRP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) funds apportioned to Riverside County agencies are allocated and obligated in a timely manner to prevent funds from lapsing. Federal Obligation Authority (OA) for the region is provided on an annual basis and must be used in the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) it is provided. The Commission's goal is to help ensure that 100 percent of the OA in Riverside County is obligated.

Attached in the agenda packet was an Obligation Delivery Plan that provided an outline of projects that have CRP, CMAQ, STBG, and the federal earmarks program for FFY 24/25 and beyond. The information provided comes from milestone updates received from local agencies, discussions with project sponsors, and the monthly meeting Commission staff has with Caltrans Local Assistance.

It is recommended local agencies begin the federal-aid process on FFY 2024 projects as soon as possible and/or devote the resources needed to secure federal approvals for obligation to ensure timely obligation of federal funds. If a local agency anticipates a delay in obligating these funds this year, Commission staff should be provided with the new schedule as soon as possible. Staff is available to assist local agencies with processing Request for Authorization (RFA) submittals and the overall federal-aid process.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, reminded the TAC even though the FFY begins October 1, the state fiscal year begins July 1.

10.   **CALTRANS DISTRICT 8 LOCAL ASSISTANCE UPDATE**

Eddie Moreno-Castaneda, Caltrans, provided a presentation for Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance. A new version of Local Assistance Program Guidelines (LAPG) 25-A: Allocation/Time Extension Form has been released and is available for download on the Caltrans LAPG webpage. This new version should be used moving forward, especially with the deadline coming up on December 2.

Carlos Geronimo, Menifee, wanted to know if one had already been submitted and approved would a new one still need to be submitted. Eddie Moreno-Castaneda stated that would not be necessary. This change would go into effect for the January 2025 CTC meeting forward.

Eddie Moreno-Castaneda continued that a new version of Local Assistance Procedure Manual (LAPM) 3-A: Project Authorization / Adjustment Request has been released and is available for download on the Caltrans LAPM Forms webpage. This form is to utilize federal funding and should be used if there are any adjustments or new authorizations.

Caltrans has selected a new proposed Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) goal of 21.35%, which is slightly reduced. This goal percentage will be applied to all Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-funded projects between Federal Fiscal Years 2025-2027.

In recognition of Native American Heritage Month, the Innovation Exchange Webinar showcases innovative tools being used in Tribal communities for data collection in transportation planning and data sharing in construction management. Participants will hear from the Northern Tribal Technical Assistance Program (TTAP) on results from a recently completed innovation project with the Northern Cheyenne and Crow nations using digital video recorders to collect network data.

There is a virtual workshop for Grants Toolkit for Local and Tribal Agencies. AEM Corporation, on behalf of the Transportation Research Board (TRB), is leading the National Cooperative Highway Research Program (NCHRP) 20-24(146) project, "Guide to Supporting and Sustaining Transportation Grant Programs for Local Governments and Tribes." This project aims to develop resources and guidance for local governments and tribes to effectively manage grant programs. This is a 90-minute virtual session that will engage local governments and tribes to identify the resources they need, the challenges they face, and the gaps in information when applying for and managing grants.

The Traffic Safety Navigator has been distributed. The newsletter provides California Strategic Highway Safety Plan (SHSP) updates along with insights into best practices for implementing strategies that achieve zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries on California's roadways. You can visit the California SHSP website for more information.

If any agency is struggling to provide updates on inactive projects, they can reach out to local assistance staff. You can work with your Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer to invoice or to provide justification.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, shared there are two documents that Caltrans Local Assistance follows, and they are the LAPG and LAPM. Every so often sections or chapters get updated that are significant, so agencies should make sure they have the latest updates and newest document forms. The inactive projects need to be invoiced every six months to a year, depending on the type of project and the project cost. Invoicing at least every four-to-five months will remove projects from the inactive list, helping to stop unnecessary communications from Caltrans.

Jason Farag, Wildomar, wanted to know if on the seismic study Caltrans was evaluating all the as-builts and developing seismic retrofit recommendations, if a recommendation were to come out if there would be fund sources available.

Savat Khamphou shared that after reading the notice that went out, it seemed like it was only going to be a recommendation not mandated by the state to take action.

Eddie Moreno-Castaneda took note of the concern and will provide more information on the topic at the next TAC meeting.

11. **CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: OCTOBER 2024**

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, shared that last month the CTC met in Bakersfield. It was one of the last eventful meetings of 2024. The main highlight is the CTC is working on the 2024 Caltrans State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) guidelines. There have been a couple of public workshops and advocacy groups are putting pressure on the CTC to disallow any items that are deemed as improving traffic flow or throughput in the SHOPP program. SHOPP funds projects like placing new or replacing damaged guardrails, repairing culverts, keeping the roads free of debris, flood waters, repairing bridges, and installing lighting.

There has been a very one-sided attack on SHOPP funds and seemingly a complete disregard for motorists if they are driving in a single occupancy vehicle. While this is sometimes seen as just a Caltrans program, it has been a vital source on many local projects and is essential for maintaining and providing a safe highway system. This will require local agencies to speak up for the region and let a different side of the story be heard.

The CTC will be meeting again here in Riverside on December 5 and 6.

Savat Khamphou, Corona, reminded the TAC as with CAPTI, there is a need to speak up as being silent will only hurt us.

Carlos Geronimo, Menifee, wanted to know when the workshop to provide comments would be. Jillian Guizado stated she would look for that information and get back to the TAC.

Nate Smith, Banning, asked that draft letters be sent out to the TAC to help cities comment for advocacy in general.

Jillian Guizado reiterated that Tyler Madary is working on a CAPTI letter that would be one of the most pressing. The materials will be provided to the TAC soon.

12. **RCTC COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER 2024**

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, shared there have been two Commission meetings since the TAC last met. RCTC will be leading two project study reports for Wildomar interchange projects on I-15, one at Wildomar Trail and the other at Bundy Canyon Road. The consultant contracts were awarded

to HDR Engineering for just under $1 million each. If any agency is looking to complete a PSR soon, they should keep that figure in mind. The oversight agreements with Caltrans are about $300,000 each.

RCTC has gotten out of the only remaining TIFIA loan which was for the I-15 Express Lanes Project. The loan was secured through the Federal Government in 2017 for the lanes that opened in 2021. The $174 million payoff utilizes an inter-fund Measure A loan from Western County Measure A buckets of fund financing and economic development, along with I-15 Express Lanes toll revenues, and Measure A cash savings from construction of the facility. The internal loan is anticipated to repaid within about four years.

There was a CAPTI update and the Commission has been kept in the loop. Many Commissioners representing your agencies are fired up about this and have been asking for the comment letter that was discussed earlier.

Finally, the Commission approved the 2025 calendar, making an unprecedented move to officially go dark in July. There will be no committee meetings in June, and no Commission meeting in July. RCTC has traditionally gone dark in August, but there has been a call for the board to go dark in July.

The next Commission meeting will be held on December 11.

13.   COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT

Savat Khamphou, Corona, thanked everyone for being willing to be vocal and RCTC being a regional transportation authority, they are always looking out for the entire region. Regardless of city size, we are all looking out for each other.

Edward Emery, RCTC, noted that a lot of agencies already use the RIVTrack system for SB 821 projects and RCTC is happy to announce the system has been expanded to include Regional Arterial and TUMF projects. The invoice process will be transitioning over in the next month or so and procedures and/or training will be provided to ensure a smooth transition.

Cameron Brown, WRCOG, shared that the TUMF study has been approved and there are now ordinances and resolution templates that have been sent out. The implementation date is April 1 – June 1, so these items should be added to agendas for approval as soon as possible.

Travis Randel, San Jacinto, mentioned that there have been some changes with the MS 4 permit and there was a workshop two weeks ago, specifically as it relates to Western Riverside County and the Santa Ana Watershed area. One of the biggest concerns was road rehab projects. There was confirmation from the workshop that road rehab, grind and overlay projects, will not trigger the new storm capture device requirements, but we will have to wait and see if it makes it to the final approved document.

Randy Bowman, CVAG, stated that they are just beginning the plan to update the Transportation Project Prioritization Study effort, which will include updating the TUMF Nexus Study. A consultant will come on board next year, as it has been eight years since it was last updated. CVAG also obtained some substantial REAP 2.0 funding that will fund two studies. One is for a VMT study which seems timely considering discussions on many levels. The other study is for additional potential connections to the CV Link project from communities throughout the valley.

Eddie Moreno-Castaneda, Caltrans, had an update on the as-builts from the seismic study. The Highway Bridge Program (HBP) does not have the as-builts for specific seismic bridges, an Excel file was included in their original email to list those bridges that are still needed. There is no funding attached to this, but they are screening the plans.

Bree Content-Watkins, Caltrans, shared that a second email was sent out that included that Excel spreadsheet and highlighted those as-builts that were still needed. If a bridge is not included in the list, it means that as-builts have already been received and you are complete, or it is not needed. There were only about 390 bridges that needed as-builts.

14. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business for consideration by the Technical Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:22 a.m. The next meeting will be on March 17, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jillian Guizado

Jillian Guizado
Planning and Programming Director

AGENDA ITEM 5

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DATE:	March 17, 2025
TO:	Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
SUBJECT:	Southern California Association of Governments 2025 Call for Project Nominations

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is to receive and file information about the upcoming Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) 2025 Call for Project Nominations.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

As part of the review of SCAG's 2021 Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (FSTIP), the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) issued a Corrective Action dated April 15, 2021, to the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) regarding the administration and oversight of the Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) federal formula funding programs. This was followed by a Corrective Action issued to SCAG on August 15, 2022, as part of its 2022 Federal Certification Review. The Corrective Action was predicated on a FHWA finding that California's suballocation of STBG and CMAQ funding was not permitted based on federal guidance. Caltrans and SCAG were given until June 30, 2023, to demonstrate policies and procedures that comply with federal guidance for the administration of these programs.

In 2022, SCAG convened a working group with representatives of each county transportation commission (CTC) in the SCAG region to develop a methodology for programming STBG and CMAQ funds to comply with the federal corrective action. The SCAG Regional Council approved a Compliance Action Plan in February 2023, and received confirmation from FHWA and FTA in April 2023, that the plan addressed the Corrective Action. The Compliance Action Plan indicates SCAG will regularly conduct a call for project nominations in which the SCAG region CTCs will nominate projects for SCAG's consideration. SCAG will then evaluate and select projects to receive federal formula funding which will subsequently be programmed in the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP).

The SCAG-adopted guidelines for the first STBG and CMAQ call for project nominations included a scoring criterion for CTC Prioritization. This criterion required the Commission and the other CTCs to adopt county-specific project prioritization frameworks for projects applying under the call for nominations. Riverside County nominations were submitted to the Commission to receive the CTC Prioritization score which was then factored into the overall SCAG scoring of

projects. The Commission adopted the framework (at that time called, "nomination procedures") for the SCAG 2024 Call for Project Nominations at its December 13, 2023, meeting. With the limited amount of funding available in the 2024 call, the Commission-adopted framework focused on regional priority and regionally significant projects.

SCAG conducted its first call for projects from January 4 to March 29, 2024. A total of 13 applications from nine Riverside County agencies were submitted in the call requesting $110 million of the $275 million available for the entire SCAG region. On June 6, 2024, the SCAG Regional Council awarded $34.5 million to five Riverside County projects, slightly higher than the $33 million target share.

DISCUSSION:

Upon completion of the 2024 Call for Project Nominations, SCAG staff began preparing updated STBG/CMAQ call for projects program guidelines in collaboration with the CTCs. The SCAG Regional Council is anticipated to approve the guidelines on March 6, 2025, and release the SCAG 2025 Call for Project Nominations on March 31, 2025. Per the SCAG guidelines, the Commission had to once again adopt a project prioritization framework for providing the CTC Prioritization scores for Riverside County projects nominated in the 2025 call. Riverside County's estimated target share of the $1.2 billion available in the SCAG 2025 Call for Project Nominations is $152 million.   These amounts are for federal formula apportionments anticipated to be distributed by the state for Federal Fiscal Years 2026/27 and 2027/28.

Recognizing the previous project prioritization framework was developed based on very limited funding being available and that SCAG has updated its STBG/CMAQ call for projects program guidelines, on March 12, 2025, staff sought approval of the revamped project prioritization framework found in Attachment 1. The framework was developed collaboratively with CVAG to ensure nominated projects in the Coachella and Palo Verde valleys are on equal footing with nominated projects in Western Riverside County.

Federalized transportation projects require extensive collaboration and multiple levels of approval from Caltrans to attain project environmental clearance, meet Caltrans and FHWA project delivery requirements to utilize the federal dollars, and ensure federal funds are approved and spent on time and in accordance with federal regulations. Failure to meet these federal funding requirements will result in loss of federal dollars for the region and will provide an opportunity for other CTCs to access these funds. Recognizing the complexities of utilizing federal dollars on transportation projects, staff crafted the Project Prioritization Framework to encourage nominations for projects that are positioned to comply with federal requirements. The proposed framework scoring criteria are: deliverability, eligibility, readiness, and alignment with regional plans.

Two SCAG-led workshops will be held on March 12 and March 18 (registration link). The Commission will hold a joint workshop with SCAG on March 24 (registration link). Nominations will be due May 16, 2025. Commission staff will review the nominations in Riverside

County and, following the adopted framework, will assign a CTC Prioritization score by the August 1, 2025, SCAG deadline. Staff will bring CTC Prioritization recommendations for nominated projects to the Commission for approval to submit to SCAG at its August 2025 meeting.

SCAG will evaluate and score all project nominations following SCAG's adopted STBG/CMAQ call for projects program guidelines (Attachment 2). SCAG will score projects based on the following criteria: CTC Prioritization, Regional Priorities, Federal Performance Management Areas, Community Economic Development Benefits, and Air Quality Improvements and Cost Effectiveness. SCAG staff anticipates submitting the recommended list of projects totaling $1.2 billion to the SCAG Regional Council or Executive/Administration Committee for approval on November 6, 2025.

Attachments:
1)   RCTC Project Prioritization Framework for the SCAG 2025 Call for Project Nominations
2)   SCAG 2025 STBG/CMAQ Call for Project Nominations Guidelines

RCTC PROJECT PRIORITIZATION FRAMEWORK FOR SCAG'S 2025 CALL FOR PROJECT NOMINATIONS

The Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) intends to issue a SCAG region Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)/Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG) Call for Project Nominations in March 2025. The SCAG guidelines require CTCs to perform an initial project screening and evaluation, then submit project nominations to SCAG for regional evaluation and project selection. This document describes the Riverside County Transportation Commission's (RCTC) project prioritization framework for SCAG's 2025 Call for Project Nominations.

Schedule*:

March 12	SCAG-led workshop Anticipated Commission approval of the RCTC Project Prioritization Framework for SCAG's 2025 Call for Project Nominations
March 18	SCAG-led workshop
March 24	County-specific workshop hosted by SCAG and RCTC
March 31	SCAG opens Call for Project Nominations
May 2	Deadline for applicants to request assistance from RCTC on air quality analysis for CMAQ projects
May 16	Nominations due by 5pm
May 19	RCTC to begin reviewing nominations submitted in Riverside County
July 28	Anticipated Budget and Implementation Committee recommendation for Commission approval of county transportation commission (CTC) Prioritization recommendations for nominated projects
August 1	RCTC to provide SCAG its draft CTC Prioritization recommendations for nominated projects by 5pm
August 13	Anticipated Commission approval of CTC Prioritization recommendations RCTC to provide SCAG its Commission-adopted CTC Prioritization recommendations for nominated projects
August – October	SCAG evaluates nominations based on SCAG's adopted STBG/CMAQ Guidelines
November 6	SCAG Regional Council or Executive Administration Committee adopts project lists
January 2026	Approved projects programmed in 2025 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP)

*Dates are subject to change.

Available Funding:

In the SCAG region, an estimated $1.2 billion is available for fiscal years (FY) 2026/27 and 2027/28 across both programs: STBG ($635 million) and CMAQ ($632 million). These are apportionment estimates provided

by Caltrans. Riverside County's target is approximately 12 percent or $152 million. This target does not represent a guaranteed funding level, a nomination floor, or a nomination ceiling.

Screening Criteria and Project Ranking:

RCTC's methodology for screening and ranking projects is as follows, *as determined by responses to the Supplemental Questionnaire provided in Attachment A.*

STBG-eligible Projects

The United States' Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) administers STBG funds. In its most recent implementation guidance, dated June 1, 2022, found here: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/bil_stbg_implementation_guidance-05_25_22.pdf FHWA describes STBG-eligible projects on pages 12 thru 16.

Deliverability, Eligibility, and Readiness (up to 25 points)

Criteria	Point Value
Demonstrates funding is committed to deliver the project	5
Aligns with one or more of the "eligible activities" and confirm project meets location eligibility requirement identified in the June 1, 2022, STBG implementation guidance (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/bil_stbg_implementation_guidance-05_25_22.pdf)	10
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process has been completed or the draft has been released for public circulation	10

Alignment with Regional Plans (up to 25 points)

Criteria	Point Value
Western County: The project is in the 2009 Measure A Expenditure Plan or demonstrates a clear nexus to a Measure A Expenditure Plan project	25
Coachella Valley: The project is in the top 10% of the Coachella Valley Association of Governments' Transportation Project Prioritization Study	25
OR	
Western County: The project is on the backbone network in the Western Riverside Council of Governments' Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Nexus Study	15
Coachella Valley: The project is in the Coachella Valley Association of Governments' Transportation Project Prioritization Study	15

Engagement

Community engagement has been conducted and community support can be demonstrated	Yes or No

2

CMAQ-eligible Projects

The United States' Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) administers CMAQ funds. In its most recent interim guidance, dated October 28, 2024, found here:
https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ENVIRonment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/cmaq-program-interim-guidance-revised-infrastructure-investment-jobs-act.pdf
FHWA describes CMAQ-eligible projects on pages 18 thru 36.

Deliverability, Eligibility, and Readiness (up to 40 points)

Criteria	Point Value
Demonstrates funding is committed to deliver the project	5
Aligns with one or more of the "eligible programs or project types" identified in the October 28, 2024, interim CMAQ guidance and/or confirm the project meets the three CMAQ eligibility criteria: 1) Transportation project 2) Located in nonattainment/maintenance area 3) Provides air quality benefit for the criteria air pollutants (https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ENVIRonment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/cmaq-program-interim-guidance-revised-infrastructure-investment-jobs-act.pdf)	10
Air quality analysis has been completed	10
If requesting CMAQ funding for environmental (PA/ED) phase: Planning-level study is completed. **OR** *If requesting CMAQ funding for design or construction* phase*: National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process has been completed or the draft has been released for public circulation	15

*Construction phase includes but may not be limited to purchase of rolling stock and transit operating projects as eligible under interim CMAQ guidance.

Alignment with Regional Plans (up to 10 points)

Criteria	Point Value
Project is in a plan	10

Engagement

Community engagement has been conducted and community support can be demonstrated	Yes or No

Project Ranking

All nominations submitted via the SCAG process by the May 16, 2025, deadline will be reviewed by an evaluation committee comprised of RCTC and Coachella Valley Association of Governments staff. The prioritization ranking for each project will be provided by RCTC to SCAG as required in the SCAG guidelines.

The cumulative points assigned to a project in accordance with the screening criteria that fall within the Point Range below will be converted to the RCTC Ranking (see table on following page).

3

Point Range	RCTC Ranking
45 - 50	Highly Recommended
35 - 40	Recommended
15 - 30	Contingency List
0 - 10	Not Recommended

Outreach:

All outreach activities will be documented for reporting to SCAG as required. Anticipated outreach activities include:

1. Leading up to and upon release of the SCAG Call for Nominations, RCTC will send multiple emails to its Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) members (generally, public works directors) and individuals who have signed up to receive RCTC Planning & Programming department emails with information about the SCAG Call for Nominations, associated deadlines, and adopted RCTC Project Prioritization Framework.
   a. RCTC Planning & Programming staff will be available between March 12 and May 9 to answer questions and provide input on potential project nominations from eligible applicants.
2. Following Commission adoption of this Project Prioritization Framework (anticipated March 12), RCTC Planning & Programming staff will jointly host a Riverside County-specific workshop with SCAG on March 24.
3. RCTC Planning & Programming staff (and/or SCAG staff) will present the Call for Nominations to the RCTC TAC on March 17 and RCTC Multimodal Bi-Monthly Roundtable Meeting with transit operators on April 8.
4. RCTC's External Affairs Department will share information with Tribal Governments contacts.

DELIVERABILITY

1. Provide evidence of the matching funds identified in the application for all future phases of the project. Evidence may include: a letter of commitment signed by the applicant's executive officer (city manager, CEO, etc.); pages from the approved agency budget which demonstrates the fund sources committed to the project; copies of California Transportation Commission agendas approving the programming of funds to the project; etc.

   > [UPLOAD BUTTONS]

ELIGIBILITY

2. Copy and paste the code section from either the STBG or CMAQ guidance documents linked below which demonstrates the project's eligibility.
   STBG - https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/specialfunding/stp/bil_stbg_implementation_guidance-05_25_22.pdf
   CMAQ - https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ENVIRonment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/cmaq-program-interim-guidance-revised-infrastructure-investment-jobs-act.pdf

   > [COPY AND PASTE CODE SECTION WHICH DEMONSTRATES THE PROJECT'S ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE EITHER STBG OR CMAQ FUNDS]

READINESS

3a. **STBG projects only** Provide a copy of the NEPA signature page or proof of public notice.

   > [UPLOAD BUTTON]

3b. **CMAQ projects only** Provide the completed air quality analysis. *If applicant needs assistance completing an air quality analysis, contact Edward Emery (eemery@rctc.org) by May 2.*

   > [UPLOAD BUTTON]

   CMAQ projects only If applying for PA/ED funds, provide the pages from the plan in which the project is included OR if applying for design or construction funds, provide a copy of the NEPA signature page, proof of public notice, or narrative to demonstrate a plan for obtaining NEPA Categorical Exclusion.

   > [UPLOAD BUTTON]

   > [AS APPLICABLE: NARRATIVE DESCRIBING PLAN FOR OBTAINING NEPA CE]

ALIGNMENT WITH REGIONAL PLANS

4a. *STBG projects only* Provide documentation of where in the RCTC Measure A Expenditure Plan, CVAG TPPS, or WRCOG TUMF Nexus Study the project is found.

[UPLOAD BUTTON]

4b. *CMAQ projects only* Provide documentation of the plan in which the project is found. Evidence may include: pages from a short range transit plan, comprehensive operational analysis, capital improvement program, etc.

[UPLOAD BUTTON]

ENGAGEMENT

5. Provide a narrative write-up and attach documentation (optional) describing the public outreach/community engagement conducted for the project.

[NARRATIVE DESCRIBING PUBLIC OUTREACH/COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONDUCTED FOR THE PROJECT]

[UPLOAD BUTTON]

FFY 2026-2027 & FFY 2027-2028 STBG/CMAQ PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Guidelines outlining the SCAG-administered project selection process in compliance with federal requirements for the Surface Transportation Block Grant program (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ).

MARCH 2025

Table of Contents

List of Exhibits

FFY 2026-2027 & FFY 2027-2028 STBG/CMAQ Program Overview

The federal fiscal year 2026-2027 and federal fiscal year 2027-2028 Surface Transportation Block Grant program (STBG) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement program (CMAQ) Program Guidelines (FFY 2026-2027 & FFY 2027-2028 STBG/CMAQ Program Guidelines), scheduled for adoption by the SCAG Regional Council in March 2025, establish the framework for project selection and allocation of STBG and CMAQ funds within the SCAG region in accordance with 23 CFR § 450.332(c) et al.

Background

Planning and programming actions for federal formula-funded projects and programs are guided by the currently adopted and future iterations of the SCAG Regional Council-approved Connect SoCal 2024 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy, Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), and Federal Performance-Based Planning and Programming and Transportation Performance Management requirements.

Connect SoCal 2024 provides the long-term vision and goals for how the SCAG region will build and support transformative transportation projects and initiatives. Connect SoCal 2024 was developed through extensive stakeholder engagement and robust policy discussions with local elected leaders. Connect SoCal 2024 demonstrates how transportation projects and programs in the six-county SCAG region conform to state of California and federal air quality mandates for funding eligibility. Connect SoCal 2024 also identifies strategies to reduce regional greenhouse gas emissions and criteria air pollutant emissions. An FTIP is prepared by a metropolitan planning organization to list projects to be funded from federal, state, and local sources for the next four-year period. By providing an orderly allocation of federal, state, and local funds for use in planning and building specific projects, the FTIP is a key component in the Connect SoCal 2024 implementation process. The FTIP is required to advance Connect SoCal 2024 by programming projects in accordance with federal and state requirements, including specific requirements for scheduling projects, funding, and the timely implementation of transportation control measures to reduce air pollution. The 2025 FTIP, which was federally approved on Dec. 16, 2024, applies to the STBG/CMAQ call for project nominations for federal fiscal year 2026-2027 and federal fiscal year 2027-2028. The federal fiscal year 2026-2027 through federal fiscal year 2031-2032 FTIP will be in effect by mid-December 2026.

Federal Transportation Performance Management Targets, adopted by the SCAG Regional Council, provide near- and mid-term anticipated outcomes for the transportation network. These inform and are informed by planning and programming actions.

Guidelines and Development Process

SCAG has worked closely with the six county transportation commissions in the region on the development of these guidelines. This coordination included several months of bi-weekly meetings to review each section of the guidelines for potential changes and improvements and circulating the draft guideline document for comment. SCAG will also host workshops open to all eligible applicants related to these guidelines in spring 2025.

Project Selection Process

Funding Availability

Prior to initiating a call for project nominations, SCAG evaluates the availability of STBG and CMAQ funding. The current call for project nominations primarily makes funding available from apportionments for federal fiscal years 2026-2027 and 2027-2028. The current federal surface transportation authorization, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, is in effect through September 2026. Therefore, funding availability for the call for project nominations is subject to a subsequent congressional reauthorization or continuing resolution.

Other considerations in determining funding availability for the call for project nominations may include programming adjustments for previously awarded projects, prior year obligation authority (OA) activity, de-obligations, OA loan repayments, and set-asides for SCAG-selected regional planning activities that would support planning priorities led by SCAG or in partnership with the county transportation commissions (i.e., eligible planning activities that advance implementation of Connect SoCal and performance-based planning and programming in the SCAG region). This is consistent with the initial set of STBG/CMAQ Program Guidelines approved by the SCAG Regional Council in June 2023. These and other administrative processes will be further detailed in SCAG's Administrative Programming Procedures for federal transportation funds. Additionally, use of these funds will be documented in the annual SCAG Overall Work Program and FTIP, as appropriate.

The balance of STBG and CMAQ funding available for programming will be directed through a competitive call for project nominations administered by SCAG, through which SCAG selects projects in coordination with the SCAG region's six county transportation commissions. SCAG is responsible for the development of the call for project nominations process, oversight, and final project selection. SCAG has established performance-based nomination targets to guide the nomination submittals from each county within the SCAG region. The targets do not represent a guaranteed funding level, a nomination floor, or a nomination ceiling.

Exhibit 1   Program Target Percentages

County	CMAQ Target Percentage	STBG Target Percentage
Imperial County	0.6%	1.2%
Los Angeles County	54.8%	53.3%
Orange County	17.3%	17.1%
Riverside County	12.7%	11.8%
San Bernardino County	11.3%	12.2%
Ventura County	3.3%	4.3%

STBG and CMAQ funds are subject to the Timely Use of Funds provisions outlined in Assembly Bill 1012 (Chapter 783 of the Statutes of 1999). Obligation deadlines for these apportionment years are outlined in the table below.

Exhibit 2   Federal Fiscal Year Obligation Deadline

Federal Fiscal Year	2026-2027	2027-2028
Obligation deadline	9/30/2029	9/30/2030

Call for Project Nominations

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

SCAG will conduct a call for project nominations, provide guidance, identify available funding, perform project evaluations, develop a list of prioritized projects, and conduct the SCAG board review and approval process.

The county transportation commissions are responsible for developing their Project Prioritization Framework to guide their evaluation of all applications within their respective county. These evaluations will result in a prioritization ranking. Please see Appendix A for more information regarding the County Transportation Commission Prioritization Framework.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

In general, SCAG region cities, counties, transit agencies, federally recognized Tribal governments, and county transportation commissions are eligible to apply for STBG and CMAQ funds. Though an existing federal-aid master agreement is not required to apply, implementing agencies awarded funding must be eligible for, and have a federal-aid master agreement in place with, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) prior to having awarded funds programmed in the FTIP. This provision might not apply to funds that will be requested for transfer to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Projects considering FTA transfer might need to coordinate with the county transportation commission regarding roles and responsibilities, as the FTA will only accept transfer applications from recognized transit operators.

SCAG encourages potential applicants to review the Caltrans document Factors to Consider Before Applying for Federal Funds. This document presents several common challenges that arise due to specific requirements, regulations, and procedures associated with federal funding. Examples include adhering to federal regulations related to environmental assessments, labor laws, Disadvantaged Business Enterprise participation, Title VI, and quality control and assurance measures.

Each county transportation commission is responsible for coordination and submission of project nominations to SCAG from eligible entities from their respective counties. SCAG encourages each county transportation commission to coordinate with SCAG and other affected county transportation commissions on project nominations for multi-county projects and to support multi-county agency projects such as Caltrans, the Los Angeles-San Diego-San Luis Obispo Rail Corridor Agency, and the Southern California Regional Rail Authority.

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

Projects must be eligible for STBG or CMAQ funds, as detailed in 23 USC Sec. 133, 149, et al.

Additional federal guidance is available below:

STBG Federal Guidance

CMAQ Federal Guidance

Consistent with Connect SoCal 2024 goals and strategies and Federal Performance Measure Goals, projects should be used for activities related to the following primary project categories **and have a clear transportation nexus**:

Tier 1 Regional Priorities

- Clean Transportation – alternative fuel and zero-emission vehicles/buses, infrastructure, and equipment investments that reduce criteria pollutant emissions.

- Resilience of At-Risk Infrastructure – projects that improve the resilience of infrastructure at risk from extreme weather events, natural disasters, or changing conditions, such as coastal erosion, to improve transportation and public safety and reduce costs by avoiding future maintenance or rebuilding costs.

- Transit and Multimodal Integration – support increasing public transit ridership, new or upgraded public transit facilities, operating assistance to sustain or expand service (subject to applicable CMAQ limitations), microtransit, fare subsidies, also including public transit safety and security projects.

- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – TDM activities to reduce single-occupancy vehicle use, including carshare, vanpool, and shared micromobility. Projects to enhance travel and tourism.

- Transportation System Management and Goods Movement – highway or local roadway projects that improve traffic flow, optimize truck and bus throughput, or increase travel time reliability. Includes Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS), truck parking facilities, and on-dock rail projects.

Tier 2 Regional Priorities

- Complete Streets – complete streets projects to enable safe use and mobility for all users.

- Natural Lands Preservation – projects that support the preservation of, and access to, natural lands.

- System Preservation – projects that maintain existing transportation systems and facilities.

Examples of projects that fall into each of these primary project categories are included in Appendix B. These primary project categories were derived from the Connect SoCal 2024 goals and strategies. The tiers were informed by the 2024-2025 SCAG Presidential Priorities and Objectives, which included goods movement, transit recovery, clean transportation technology, and transportation demand management strategies. The resilience of at-risk infrastructure primary project category is included in Tier 1 because of the impacts on transportation infrastructure from recent wildfire and coastal erosion events across the region.

ELIGIBLE COSTS AND MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

Final eligibility determinations are subject to review and approval by Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). As a result, certain components within an eligible project may be deemed ineligible for reimbursement for a specific fund source. SCAG intends to recommend that some projects be funded with a combination of STBG and CMAQ funds to address this issue. However, applicants should also consider exceeding the local match or locally funding contingency to fully fund the project, where components may be deemed ineligible.

Matching requirements for STBG and CMAQ funds are dependent on project type, but most require a minimum of 11.47 percent match in non-federal funds. Tolling projects require a higher 20 percent local match. Toll credits are eligible to be used as a match for STBG and CMAQ funds, which can increase the federal share to 100 percent. However, due to limited availability of toll credits, project applicants should be prepared to provide a local match source in the event toll credits are not available for STBG and CMAQ funds. More information regarding matching funds is outlined in Caltrans' Local Assistance Procedures Manual Chapter 3: Project Authorization.

Applicants should also consult their county transportation commissions for the possibility of additional matching requirements that may be incorporated as part of their Project Prioritization Framework.

Application Process

Through the STBG/CMAQ call for project nominations process, SCAG will select projects nominated from eligible applicants that meet federal requirements, align with Connect SoCal 2024 goals and strategies, and reflect county priorities. All applicants should follow best practices related to virtual and in-person outreach and engagement, which will be evaluated at the project level. SCAG strongly encourages applicants to engage transportation system users, residents, and community-based organizations to ensure communities are meaningfully involved throughout the lifecycle of the project.

All eligible applicants will submit project nominations via the SCAG portal. Project nominations will be subject to the respective county transportation commission's Project Prioritization Framework. The county transportation commissions will then apply their approved Project Prioritization Framework to project nominations submitted within their county and develop project prioritization packages for SCAG's consideration during final project selection.

Exhibit 3   Project Selection Timeline

Project Selection Milestone	Date*
Regional Council adopts Program Guidelines	March 6, 2025
Workshops	March 12 and March 18
Project nominations open to local agencies	March 31, 2025
Local agency project nomination application submission deadline	May 16, 2025, at 5 p.m.
County transportation commission project prioritization packages deadline	Aug. 1, 2025, at 5 p.m.
Regional Council awards funding	Nov. or Dec. 2025

Actual dates subject to change

Regional Project Evaluation

SCAG staff will form a review committee composed of a multidisciplinary group of staff members. The review committee will conduct the regional project evaluation process to review the nomination packets provided by the county transportation commissions and develop a recommended list of projects for adoption by the SCAG Regional Council. This process will consist of the following steps:

1. **Confirm Eligibility**: SCAG staff will review submitted documentation to ensure county transportation commission, potential implementing agency, and project compliance with applicable federal and regional policies. Screening will include a review to ensure consistency with Connect SoCal 2024. Any issues identified will be communicated to county transportation staff and the applicant contact, and projects with unresolved issues will be excluded from further consideration.
2. **Scoring Criteria**: Eligible projects can achieve up to 110 points for projects submitted for potential CMAQ funding and up to 100 points for projects submitted for STBG funding. The review committee will score projects using the following rubric:

Exhibit 4   Scoring Criteria

Scoring Criteria	Possible Points
County Transportation Commission Prioritization: Relative county transportation commission project prioritization. Please refer to Appendix A for more information.	50 Points
Regional Priorities: Based on primary program category. Please refer to Appendix B for more information.	20 Points
Federal Performance Management Areas: Assessment of the degree that the proposed project demonstrates support for FHWA Federal Performance Management areas: • Performance Management Area 1 - Transportation System Safety • Performance Management Area 2 - National Highway Pavement and Bridge Condition • Performance Management Area 3 - National Highway System Performance • Performance Management Area 3 - Freight Movement • Performance Management Area 3 - CMAQ Program • Transit Asset Management • Transit System Safety Please refer to Appendix C for more information. Please also refer to Section 7 of the Connect SoCal 2024 "Performance Monitoring Technical Report" for additional information.	20 Points
Community Economic Development Benefits: Assessment of project benefits to populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities. Please refer to Appendix D for more information.	10 Points
Air Quality Improvements and Cost-Effectiveness: For CMAQ-eligible projects, projects will be evaluated on cost-effectiveness relative to similar projects. Particulate matter 2.5 reducing projects will receive additional points.	10 Points

The review committee will score each project using the criteria outlined in Appendix E.

3. **Project Ranking Process**: Candidate projects will be ranked according to their average review committee score. To ensure that high performing air quality improvement projects are prioritized for CMAQ funding, SCAG staff will first develop a recommended list of eligible projects for CMAQ funding using the comprehensive rubric rankings as well as projects identified as seeking CMAQ funding. (All eligible projects scored with a maximum possible score of 110 points and ranked from highest to lowest score.) In developing this list, SCAG will consider if project elements may not be eligible for CMAQ funds and should be considered for STBG funding.

All remaining projects, including CMAQ-eligible projects not recommended for funding using this first method, will then be ranked with the air quality improvement portion of the rubric score excluded. (All remaining projects scored with a maximum possible score of 100 points and ranked from highest to lowest score.) The latter rankings will be used by SCAG staff to develop a recommended list of projects for STBG funding.

Once the lists are developed, they will be shared with the air quality districts to obtain input on the projects selected for potential CMAQ funding. This will fulfill SCAG's requirement to involve the local air quality districts. SCAG may also consult with Caltrans and others as applicable.

4. **Program Balancing**: Candidate projects will be initially prioritized according to their ranking as described above. However, to achieve programmatic investment thresholds and ensure a balanced program of projects, SCAG staff may adjust project prioritization based on the relative STBG or CMAQ availability and overall program balancing for a variety of project types and regional diversity.

Project scores will be converted into recommendation categories (i.e., Highly Recommended, Recommended, Contingency List, and Not Recommended) prior to publishing the recommended program of projects. To achieve an overall Highly Recommended determination, projects must achieve a score of at least 90 points. To achieve an overall Recommended determination, projects must achieve a score of at least 75 and less than 90 points. To be considered for the Contingency List, projects must achieve a score of at least 65 points. Depending on availability of STBG and CMAQ funds, projects may move between the Recommended list and the Contingency List. Using this process, SCAG staff will develop a draft program of recommended (Highly Recommended and Recommended) and Contingency List projects for SCAG Regional Council adoption. Projects that achieve a score of less than 65 will be determined to be Not Recommended.

5. **Program Approval**: The SCAG Regional Council will consider the recommended STBG and CMAQ projects. Projects approved by the SCAG Regional Council for funding will be eligible for programming in the FTIP.

   If high scoring projects (Highly Recommended and Recommended) are not fully funded or not selected due to funding constraints, they will be prioritized for future funding opportunities as additional programming capacity becomes available for STBG and CMAQ programs prior to the next scheduled call for project nominations process. Contingency List projects will be considered after high scoring projects for future funding opportunities if additional programming capacity becomes available for STBG and CMAQ programs prior to the next scheduled call for project nominations process.

Approved Projects, Federal Programming, and Monitoring

All projects approved by the SCAG Regional Council for STBG and CMAQ funding must be programmed in the FTIP consistent with adopted FTIP Guidelines. Transportation Conformity Regulations require that projects programmed in the FTIP be included in a conforming Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). Therefore, projects that require modeling or inclusion in an RTP/SCS amendment may not be programmed until conformity requirements are met. Approved projects that meet eligibility for transfer to the FTA should consult the FTIP Guidelines and Chapter 3 of the LAPM. Local agencies should work with their county transportation commission to program approved funds in the FTIP. For additional FTIP information, please refer to the latest adopted 2025 FTIP Guidelines approved by the SCAG Regional Council in November 2023.

Following FTIP approval, agencies will need to work with their Caltrans Local Assistance District to prepare the Request for Authorization (RFA) package. For more information on the RFA process, please refer to the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedure Manual and Exhibits. All projects approved for STBG and CMAQ funds must obligate by the deadline. Delays, advancements, and scope changes are subject to SCAG approval.

To ensure the timely use of federal funds, SCAG will collaborate with Caltrans, county transportation commissions, local jurisdictions, and transit operators to ensure federal funding requirements and deadlines are met and funds are not lost to the region. Additionally, SCAG will prepare and submit annual obligation plans to Caltrans, monitor federal fund obligations, overall federal funding levels, and apportionment and OA balances.

Appendix A

County Transportation Commission Project Prioritization Framework

The county transportation commissions will each develop a Project Prioritization Framework outlining how project nominations submitted within the county will be prioritized for funding as part of the final SCAG selection. As part of the development of a county transportation commission's Project Prioritization Framework, the commission may choose to collect high-level solicitations of interest from eligible applicants, conduct interested applicant consultations, or other outreach and engagement to inform the Project Prioritization Framework.

County transportation commissions may opt to include supplemental questions as part of the project nomination application. These supplemental questions are subject to the Project Prioritization Framework, which will directly inform the county transportation commission's prioritization ranking.

SCAG requires each county transportation commission to inform and engage eligible applicants from their respective county on the county transportation commission's Project Prioritization Framework and SCAG's call for project nomination process to maximize project impact and advance collaborative policy goals.

At a minimum, county transportation commissions must incorporate the following regional criteria into their Project Prioritization Framework:

- **Eligibility**: County transportation commissions will screen potential implementing agencies and projects for eligibility with federal and regional requirements. Projects must be eligible for STBG or CMAQ funds, as detailed in 23 USC Sec. 133, 149, et al.

- **County Priorities**: County transportation commissions are expected to develop a prioritization framework that considers applicable county-level plans, policies, and objectives.

- **Community/Stakeholder Engagement**: County transportation commissions should prioritize project nomination applications with demonstrated community support. Community support can be determined through a variety of means, such as responses to public outreach, including comments received at public meetings or hearings, feedback from community workshops, survey responses, plan development, etc.

- **Deliverability and Readiness**: County transportation commissions should evaluate potential implementing agencies and projects for deliverability issues. Commissions should consider if potential implementing agencies have sufficient capacity and technical expertise to meet deadlines. Commissions should encourage projects with demonstrated readiness within the programming period.

Each county transportation commission's Project Prioritization Framework must receive concurrence from SCAG staff as well as approval by the county transportation commission's chief executive officer (CEO) and/or governing board. A draft copy of the project prioritization framework for SCAG comment and concurrence should be provided by March 24. County transportation commissions will be required to provide SCAG with a final copy of the framework and documentation of CEO and/or governing board approval.

County transportation commissions will also be required to inform and distribute the applicable Project Prioritization Framework to eligible applicants in their jurisdiction following approval by the respective governing board and/or CEO. Additionally, county transportation commissions will be required to publish

the approved Project Prioritization Framework and identify a staff contact on their webpage for ease of access by eligible applicants.

County Transportation Commission Project Prioritization Packages

After completing the County Transportation Commission Prioritization Framework, county transportation commissions should submit project nominations and associated documentation to SCAG for evaluation and project selection. Project nomination lists must be approved by the county transportation commission CEO and/or governing board prior to submission to SCAG. Extensions may be granted on a case-by-case basis. Project prioritization packages must include the following elements:

- **County Transportation Commission Project Nomination List**: Complete list of eligible project nominations received for STBG and/or CMAQ funds, identifying the county transportation commission prioritization designation according to approved Project Prioritization Framework.

- **CEO or Governing Board Approval**: Letter from the county transportation commission's CEO or documentation of governing board approving the project nomination list in accordance with the approved Project Prioritization Framework.

- **Outreach Documentation**: Materials verifying county transportation commission compliance with outreach requirements for Project Prioritization Framework.

Appendix B

Project Examples by Category

These primary project categories were derived from the Connect SoCal 2024 goal areas and strategies. The tiers were informed by the 2024-25 SCAG Presidential Priorities and Objectives, which included goods movement, transit recovery, clean transportation technology, and transportation demand management strategies. The resilience of at-risk infrastructure primary project category is included in Tier 1 because of the impacts on transportation infrastructure from recent wildfire and coastal erosion events across the region. Examples of projects that may fall into each of these primary project categories include, but are not limited to, the following:

TIER 1 REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Clean Transportation

- Government-owned non-transit alternative fuel and zero-emission fleets that reduce criteria pollutant emissions.
- Publicly available alternative fuel and zero-emission vehicle fueling and charging infrastructure and equipment that reduce criteria pollutant emissions.
- Alternative fuel and zero-emission bus capital purchase that reduce criteria pollutant emissions.
- Charging and fueling infrastructure and equipment for alternative fuel and zero-emission buses that reduce criterial pollutant emissions.
- Medium- and heavy-duty alternative fuel and zero-emission conversion.

Resilience of At-Risk Infrastructure

- Projects that improve the resilience of infrastructure at risk from extreme weather events, natural disasters, or changing conditions, such as coastal erosion, to improve transportation and public safety and reduce costs by avoiding future maintenance or rebuilding costs.
- Protective features (including natural infrastructure) to enhance the resilience of an eligible transportation facility.
- Resilience and adaptation projects and plans eligible under STBG and CMAQ guidance.

Transit and Multimodal Integration

- Transit plans
- Public transportation agency safety plans
- Comprehensive multimodal corridor plans
- Dedicated bus lanes
- Transit facilities – new/rehab/replacement
- Transit safety and security projects
- Conventional vehicle replacements
- Fleet expansion
- Microtransit
- Operations (subject to CMAQ new-project limitations)

- Free- or reduced-fare programs
- Fare integration programs
- Transit signal priority
- Bus stop and rail station improvements
- Universal basic mobility
- Mobility hubs

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

- Parking – Park and rides, parking pricing
- Ridesharing – vanpool coordination
- Carsharing
- Shared micromobility (bikes and scooters)
- Congestion pricing
- Employer-based strategies (telework)
- Freight TDM strategies
- Curb space management
- Projects to enhance travel and tourism

Transportation System Management and Goods Movement

- Freight and goods movement plans
- Congestion management plans
- New capacity managed lanes (HOV, toll, bus only)
- Managed lanes conversions (HOV, toll, bus only)
- Truck-only lanes
- Truck parking facilities
- New grade separation (rail or roadway)
- Traffic signalization
- Intersection improvements
- Port-related equipment and vehicles
- Port electrification activities
- On-dock rail
- Interchange reconfigurations
- Signal synchronization
- ITS elements

TIER 2 REGIONAL PRIORITIES

Complete Streets

- Complete streets plans
- Active transportation plans
- Local roadway safety plans

- Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, including Class I, II, IV bike facilities
- Complete streets and sustainable streets improvements
- Roundabouts

Natural Lands Preservation

- Wildlife crossings
- Projects and strategies designed to reduce the number of wildlife-vehicle collisions
- Eligible recreational trail projects including maintenance and restoration of existing trails
- Bike and pedestrian access to open space and parks

System Preservation

- Standalone pavement rehabilitation
- Off-system (local) bridge rehabilitation
- Maintenance of existing transportation systems and facilities

Appendix C

Federal Performance Management Areas

Transportation performance management uses system information to make investment and policy decisions to achieve national performance goals. FHWA established national performance measures, target-setting guidance, and reporting requirements for the monitoring of highway performance through three performance management areas:

- **Performance Management Area 1**: Transportation System Safety
- **Performance Management Area 2**: Pavement and Bridge Condition (National Highway System)
- **Performance Management Area 3**: National Highway System, Freight Movement, and CMAQ Program Performance

In addition to the three performance management areas, federal performance measures and reporting requirements were also established for transit asset management (TAM) and transit system safety. Performance metrics for TAM focus on the maintenance of the regional transit system in a state of good repair. Transit system safety performance monitoring assesses the number of transit incidents resulting in fatalities or serious injuries and transit system reliability.

Each of the federal performance management focus areas include an associated set of metrics for which statewide and regional targets must be set. Though project-specific metrics might not be available, projects that will contribute to meeting SCAG's goals for Federal Performance Management areas will be prioritized.

Performance Management Area 1 – Transportation System Safety

- Total number of motor vehicle collision fatalities.
- Rate of motor vehicle collision fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled (VMT).
- Total number of motor vehicle collision serious injuries.
- Rate of motor vehicle collision serious injuries per 100 million VMT.
- Total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries.

Performance Management Area 2 – National Highway System (NHS) Pavement and Bridge Condition

- Percentage of Interstate System pavement in 'Good' condition.
- Percentage of Interstate System pavement in 'Poor' condition.
- Percentage of non-interstate NHS pavement in 'Good' condition.
- Percentage of non-interstate NHS pavement in 'Poor' condition.
- Percentage of NHS bridges in 'Good' condition.
- Percentage of NHS bridges in 'Poor' condition.

Performance Management Area 3 – National Highway System (NHS) Performance

- Percent of interstate system mileage reporting reliable person-mile travel times.
- Percent of non-interstate NHS mileage reporting reliable person-mile travel times.

Performance Management Area 3 – Freight Movement

- Interstate system truck travel time reliability (truck travel time reliability index).

Performance Management Area 3 – CMAQ Program

- Annual hours of peak hour excessive delay per capita.

- Total emissions reduction by criteria pollutant (e.g., particulate matter 10, particulate matter 2.5, ozone, carbon monoxide).

- Percent of non-single occupancy vehicle mode share.

Transit Asset Management

- Equipment: Share of non-revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark.

- Rolling Stock: Share of revenue vehicles that meet or exceed Useful Life Benchmark.

- Infrastructure: Share of track segments with performance restrictions.

- Facilities: Share of transit assets with condition rating below 3.0 on FTA Transit Economic Requirements Model scale.

Transit System Safety

- Number of transit-related fatalities.

- Number of transit-related injuries.

- Number of transit system safety events.

- Transit system reliability.

Additional information is available in the FHWA's Transportation Performance Management Implementation Plan and the FTA's Performance Management webpage.

Appendix D

Community Economic Development Benefits

AREAS OF PERSISTENT POVERTY AND HISTORICALLY DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

For the purpose of this program, SCAG uses the term "Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities" consistent with the U.S. Department of Transportation's "FY 2025 Notice of Funding Opportunity" for the Better Utilizing Investments to Leverage Development (BUILD) grant program.

Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Community are defined as either of the following:

- Any county (or equivalent jurisdiction) with greater than or equal to 20 percent of the population living in poverty as indicated through the BUILD Grant Project Location Verification mapping tool.
- Any census tract with a poverty rate of at least 20 percent, as measured by the five-year data series available from the Census Bureau's American Community Survey and available through the BUILD Grant Project Location Verification mapping tool.

The BUILD Grant Project Location Verification mapping tool should be used to identify Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities as they relate to project location and identified community economic development benefits.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESOURCES

The following strategies, informed by the Connect SoCal 2024 "Equity Analysis Technical Report," have been determined to contribute to advancing community economic development benefits in the SCAG region:

- Access improvements to everyday destinations (e.g., jobs, retail, parks, school, health care) for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities.

- Improvements to mobility options for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities.

- Improvements to walking and biking conditions for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities or on the SCAG High Injury Network.

- Improvements to noise or air quality for residential areas adjacent to railroads and railyards.

- Grade separations to improve safety for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities.

- Transit improvements.

- Adaptation or resilience improvements for populations living in climate risk areas, including flood hazard zones, sea-level rise, wildfire risk, landslide hazard areas, extreme heat, drought, and earthquake hazard zones.

- Air quality improvements for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities that minimize impacts outside of the immediate project area.

- Reduction of noise impacts from transportation for populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities that minimize impacts outside of the immediate project area.

- Reduction of heavy- and medium-duty truck volumes through communities with identified populations living in Areas of Persistent Poverty and Historically Disadvantaged Communities.

Appendix E

Detailed Scoring Rubric

Exhibit 5   Detailed Scoring Rubric

County Transportation Commission Prioritization	Possible Points
Prioritized in the county transportation commission list as Highly Recommended	50 Points
Prioritized in the county transportation commission list as Recommended	40 Points
Prioritized in the county transportation commission Contingency List	20 Points
Not recommended	0 Points
Regional Priorities	**Possible Points**
Project identified as part of Tier 1 Regional Priorities Program Categories: • Clean Transportation • Resilience of At-Risk Infrastructure • Transit and Multimodal Integration • Transportation Demand Management • Transportation System Management and Goods Movement	20 Points
Projects identified as part of Tier 2 Regional Priorities Program that also demonstrate a systems approach to identifying and managing needs by means of: • A transportation related natural lands preservation plan, including for wildlife crossings • A pavement management plan or program • A complete streets plan, program, or policy	15 Points
Projects identified as part of Tier 2 Regional Priorities Program Categories: • Complete Streets • Natural Lands Preservation • System Preservation	10 Points
Projects identified as neither Tier 1 nor Tier 2 Regional Priorities Program Categories	0 Points
Federal Performance Management Areas	**Possible Points**
Project supports multiple federal performance management areas OR demonstrates significant improvement in one federal performance management area, as confirmed by general responses. Project-specific data is available in the current project development phase for multiple federal performance categories.	20 Points
Project implementation supports at least one federal performance management area as confirmed by general responses. Project-specific data is available in the current project development phase.	15 Points
Project implementation supports at least one federal performance management area as confirmed by general responses, but project specific data is not available. (Includes projects in early stages of development that may not have quantitative data available yet.)	10 Points
Project implementation abstractly supports at least one federal performance management area but cannot be confirmed by general responses. There is no current or future planned project-specific data available.	5 Points
Project does not support any federal performance management areas.	0 Points

Community Economic Development Benefits	Possible Points
Proposed project includes four or more strategies that advance community economic development benefits.	10 Points
Proposed project includes one to three strategies that advance community economic development benefits.	5 Points
Proposed project does not include any strategies that advance community economic development benefits.	0 Points
Air Quality Improvements	**Possible Points**
Cost Effectiveness Relative to Similar Projects*	
• 75-100 percentile	8 Points
• 50-74 percentile	6 Points
• 25-49 percentile	4 Points
• 1-24 percentile	2 Points
• Does not address cost-effectiveness	0 Points
Particulate Matter 2.5 Reduction Relative to ALL Projects	
• Top 50% of Particulate Matter 2.5 Reducing Projects	2 Points
• Below top 50% of Particulate Matter 2.5 Reducing Projects	0 Points

If limited or no similar projects are available for evaluation, an alternative evaluation will be conducted

SCAG™
INNOVATING FOR A BETTER TOMORROW

MAIN OFFICE
900 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 1700
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Tel: (213) 236-1800

REGIONAL OFFICES

IMPERIAL COUNTY
1503 N. Imperial Ave., Ste. 104
El Centro, CA 92243
Tel: (213) 236-1967

ORANGE COUNTY
OCTA Building
600 S. Main St., Ste. 1108
Orange, CA 92868
Tel: (213) 630-1599

RIVERSIDE COUNTY
3403 10th St., Ste. 805
Riverside, CA 92501
Tel: (951) 784-1513

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
1170 W. Third St., Ste. 140
San Bernardino, CA 92410
Tel: (213) 630-1499

VENTURA COUNTY
4001 Mission Oaks Blvd., Ste. L
Ventura, CA 93012
Tel: (213) 236-1960

LEARN MORE
SCAG.CA.GOV

AGENDA ITEM 6

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION	
DATE:	March 17, 2025
TO:	Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Martha Masters, Senior Management Analyst
SUBJECT:	Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance Update

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is to receive and file an update from Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Caltrans' Local Assistance Program oversees more than one billion dollars annually available to over 600 cities, counties, and regional agencies for the purpose of improving their transportation infrastructure or providing transportation services. This funding comes from various federal and state programs specifically designated to assist the transportation needs of local agencies. Annually, over 1,200 new projects are authorized through the Local Assistance Program of which approximately 700 are construction projects.

Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance is responsible for processing local agency obligations and allocations of federal and state funds, providing guidance on federal and state regulations, and direction on processes and procedures that are tied to each funding program. Local Assistance is responsible for the current funding programs as identified in Table 1.

Table 1: Caltrans Local Assistance Funding Program Responsibilities

Federal Programs	State Programs
Emergency Relief (ER)	Active Transportation Program (ATP)
Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)	Local Partnership Program (LPP) *Off-system*
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	Local Transportation Climate Adaption Program (LTCAP – PROTECT formula)
Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending (CPFCDS) (Highway Infrastructure Program Earmarks)	Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) *Off-system*
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) *Off-system*
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) *Off-system*
Promoting Resilient Operations for Transformative, Efficient, and Cost-saving Transportation (PROTECT) Program	

State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) *Off-system*	
Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)	

Attachment: PowerPoint Presentation Slide Deck

RCTC TAC MTG
4080 LEMON ST. 3RD FL.
RIVERSIDE, CA 92502

CALTRANS LOCAL
ASSISTANCE D8

MARCH 17, 2025

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Arkansas Local Technical Assistance Program

- **Webinars: Stormwater Management for Local Agencies – Regulations and Documentation**
  March 18, 2025
  11:30 am – 1:30 pm PT

This two-hour webinar begins with the essential knowledge of permits and organizations that govern the management of stormwater on construction projects in Arkansas. In addition, the basics of developing a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and other associated documents will be presented.

- **Webinar: Stormwater Management for Local Agencies – Best Management Practices**
  March 20, 2025
  11:30 am – 1:30 pm PT

This webinar explores concepts and techniques that will assist local agencies in using Best Management Practices to prevent erosion and control sediment during and after construction. Specific information for installation, maintenance, and inspection procedures will be covered.

Register Here

California Air Resources Board
Improved Tools to Evaluate Air Quality Benefits of Transportation Projects

March 18, 2025
3:00 pm – 4:30 pm PT

The California Air Resources Board (CARB) invites you to participate in a virtual public workshop to learn about technical resources and tools that CARB is developing to help evaluate the air quality benefits of transportation projects. These resources and tools will focus on assessing the cost-effectiveness of reducing criteria air pollutants such as ozone and particulate matter.

Registration for the workshop and additional information may be accessed on the CARB workshop page.

National Center for Rural Road Safety

➡The National Center for Rural Road Safety (NCRRS) is a premier center of excellence for training, resources, technical assistance, and education on rural road safety issues. Funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), equipping rural communities to prevent all deaths and serious injuries on their roadways.

March

- NEW! Free Webinar: RSCP M&C 1: Maintaining a Safer Roadway
- 2025 ITE Virtual Spring Conference

April-May

- Online Training: Implementing the Safe System Approach
- National Work Zone Awareness Week (NWZAW)
- NEW! Center for Health and Safety Culture's (CHSC) Positive Culture Framework Training

For a full list of conferences outside of California, visit the National Center for Rural Road Safety website.

Title VI Program Assessment Online Form

Due: March 31, 2025

Caltrans Division of Local Assistance (DLA) is requiring all Local Public Agencies (LPAs) receiving Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds to complete the Title VI Program Assessment Online Form by **March 31, 2025**.

 Per 23 CFR 200.9(b)(7), Caltrans is mandated to assess LPAs to ensure compliance with Title VI, which prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin (including Limited English Proficiency). LPAs are required to complete this assessment every two years (odd years) or when requested.

Webinar: When & How to Use Pavement Preservation & Cold Recycling

Lunch 'n Learn: When & How to Use Pavement Preservation & Cold Recycling
March 20th, 2025
12:00 – 1:00 pm PT
Free!

The **Caltrans Division of Local Assistance** and **Greater Sacramento** Chapter of the **American Public Works Association** welcome the **City & County Pavement Improvement Center** as they present this free webinar, *When & How to Use Pavement Preservation & Cold Recycling*, hosted by the **California LTAP**.

Topics include:

• Pavement distress – causes & remedies
• Assessment of pavement condition to support treatment selection
• Details of selection, design, and construction
• City & County Pavement Improvement Center online training courses

Speakers from The City & County Pavement Improvement Center:
• John T. Harvey, PhD, PE, UC Pavement Research Center, UC Davis
• David J. Jones, PhD, UC Pavement Research Center, UC Davis

Register Now!

For questions or comments, please contact **CALTAP**.

INACTIVE PROJECTS

Local public agencies and Tribes are expected to invoice Caltrans regularly for projects in accordance with Section 630.106 in Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Please work with your Caltrans District Local Assistance Engineer to invoice or to provide justification.

Links

- DLA

- DLA Inactive Projects Website,

- FHWA Obligation Funds Management Guide

QUESTIONS?

AGENDA ITEM 7

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DATE:	March 17, 2025
TO:	Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
SUBJECT:	California Transportation Commission Meeting Highlights: December 2024 and January 2025

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is to receive and file the December 2024 and January 2025 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting highlights.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

December 5 – 6, 2024 CTC Meeting (Agenda)

TAB 20   Update on the 2024 Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP) Grant Awards

TAB 22   Adoption of the State Highway Operation Protection Program (SHOPP) Guidelines

TAB 86   Request of $8,059,000 for three locally administered TCAP projects, off the State Highway System

TAB 87   Request of $29,253,000 for 20 locally administered ATP projects, off the State Highway System

January 30 – 31, 2025 CTC Meeting (Agenda)

TAB 30   Update on 2025 State and Local Transportation System Needs Assessment

TAB 99   Request of $34,236,00 for 18 locally administered ATP projects, off the State Highway System

AGENDA ITEM 8

RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

DATE:	March 17, 2025
TO:	Technical Advisory Committee
FROM:	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
SUBJECT:	RCTC Commission Meeting and Workshop Highlights: December 2024 and January, February, and March 2025

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

This item is to receive and file the December 2024 and January, February, and March 2025 Commission meeting highlights.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

December 2024 Commission Meeting (Agenda)

ITEM 7　　Agreement for the Preparation of Plans, Specifications and Estimates for the State Route 79 Realignment Project Segment 3 Construction Package No. 1

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Award Agreement No. 25-72-005-00 to Jacobs Engineering Group to prepare the plans, specifications and estimates (PS&E) for the State Route 79 Realignment Project Segment 3 Construction Package No. 1 (SR79 Seg 3 or Project) from Newport Road to Simpson Road in the County of Riverside, in the amount of $13,376,400 plus a contingency amount of $1,337,700 for a total amount not to exceed 14,714,100;
2) Approve a non-funding Cooperative Agreement No. 24-72-075-00 with County of Riverside Transportation and Land Management Agency (CRTLMA) for SR79 Seg3 PS&E, right of way (ROW) acquisition, construction, and maintenance;
3) Approve Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Agreement No. 24-72-117-00 with Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) to allocate $35,000,000 in Hemet/San Jacinto Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Zone funding towards the SR-79 Realignment Project. The remaining funding for the PS&E, RPW, and program management phases of the SR79 Seg3 Project will be funded by RCTC local funds;
4) Authorize the Chair or Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute the agreements on behalf of the Commission; and
5) Authorize the Executive Director or designee to approve contingency work as may be required for the Project.

ITEM 9   Election of Riverside County Transportation Commission Officers

                This item is for the Commission to:
                1) Conduct an election of officers for 2025 – Chair, Vice Chair, and Second Vice
                   Chair.

January 2025 Commission Meeting (Agenda)

ITEM 7   Article 3 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Program Update

                This item is for the Commission to:
                1) Approve the revised Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3, or
                   Senate Bill 821 (SB 821), Fiscal Year (FY) 2025/26 Call for Projects Guidelines,
                   including the Evaluation Criteria.

ITEM 8   Active Transportation Program Cycle 7 – Metropolitan Planning Organization
                Component – Selection Criteria for Riverside County Applications and Riverside
                County Project Recommendations

                This item is for the Commission to:
                1) Approve the 20-points distribution methodology selection criteria for the
                   Metropolitan Planning Organizations' (MPO) Regional Program Guidelines for
                   Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 7 and all future ATP cycles; and
                2) Approve the ATP Cycle 7 list of recommended projects and contingency list in
                   Riverside County for MPO adoption in the amount of $4,437,000.

February 2025 Commission Meeting (Agenda)

ITEM 6E   Agreements for Completion of Project Study Report – Project Development
                Support for the 91 Express Lanes Major Pavement Rehabilitation Project

                This item is for the Commission to:
                1) Award Agreement No. 25-31-019-00 with Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
                   (Kimley-Horn) to provide project study report – project development support
                   (PSR-PDS) for the 91 Express Lanes Major Pavement Rehabilitation project
                   (Project) in the amount of $1,505,851, plus a contingency amount of $150,585,
                   for a total amount not to exceed $1,656,436;
                2) Approve Cooperative Agreement 25-31-051-00 between the Commission and
                   Caltrans for project review and oversight services for the Project, in the
                   amount of $300,000;
                3) Authorize the Chair or Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to
                   finalize and execute the agreements on behalf of the Commission; and
                4) Authorize the Executive Director, or designee, to approve contingency work
                   up to the total not to exceed amount as required for the Project.

Agenda Item 8

ITEM 7   Interstate 15 Express Lanes Project – Southern Extension Release of Request for Qualifications for Progressive Design Build Phase 1 Contract

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Authorize the progressive design build procurement by approving the release of the request for qualifications (RFQ) to prospective proposers to perform preliminary engineering and cost estimation (PDB Phase 1) for the Interstate 15 (I-15) Express Lanes Project – Southern Extension (ELPSE).

ITEM 8   Fiscal Year 2024/25 Mid-Year Revenue Projections

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Approve the Fiscal Year (FY) 2024/25 Mid-Year Revenue projections, which includes Measure A Sales Tax Revenues, Local Transportation Funds (LTF) Sales Tax Revenues, and Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fees (TUMF); and
2) Approve the FY 2024/25 mid-year budget revenue adjustments for Measure A (reduction of $17,000,000) and LTF (reduction of $7,000,000).

ITEM 9   Fiscal Year 2025/26 Revenue Projections

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Approve the projection for Measure A sales tax revenues of $262 million for Fiscal Year 2025/26;
2) Approve the projection for Local Transportation Fund (LTF) sales tax apportionment of $148 million for the Western Riverside County, Coachella Valley, and Palo Verde Valley areas for FY 2025/26; and
3) Approve the projection for Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) revenues of $30 million for FY 2025/26.

February 2025 Commission Workshop (Agenda)

Traffic Relief Plan

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Consider next steps on the Traffic Relief Plan (TRP).

Approval to Advertise Innovative Financing Feasibility Study for the State Route 79 Realignment Project

This item is for the Commission to:
1) Authorize the Innovative Financing Feasibility Study (IFFS) procurement for the State Route 79 (SR-79) Realignment Project (Project); and
2) Bring back the results for further Commission action.

Coachella Valley Rail Project Update

> This item is for the Commission to:
> 1) Receive an update on the CV Rail Project.

Interstate 10 San Gorgonio Pass Area Proposed Mobility Improvement Projects

> This item is for the Commission to:
> 1) Direct staff to initiate a Design Engineering Evaluation Report (DEER) for Interstate 10 Ramp Metering through the cities of Beaumont and Banning; and
> 2) Direct staff to initiate a Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for I-10 Express Lanes from State Route 60 to SR-111.

Next Gen Toll Feasibility Study 2.0

> This item is for the Commission to:
> 1) Direct staff to update the Next Gen Toll Feasibility Study completed in 2019.