



# MEETING AGENDA

## Technical Advisory Committee

**Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Date:** July 18, 2022

This meeting is being conducted in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Jonathan Hoy, **Chair** / Eric Cowle, CVAG  
Savat Khamphou, **Vice Chair** / Rosalva Ureno, City of Corona  
Art Vela / Nate Smith, City of Banning  
Jeff Hart / Robert Vestal, City of Beaumont  
VACANT, City of Blythe  
Michael Thornton / Travis Bradshaw, City of Calimesa  
Albert Vergel De Dios / Sean Young, Caltrans District 8  
VACANT / Mike Borja, City of Canyon Lake  
John A. Corella / Crystal Sandoval, Cathedral City  
Andrew Simmons / Maritza Martinez, City of Coachella  
Daniel Porras / Nick Haecker, City of Desert Hot Springs  
Jimmy Chung / Dahi Kim, City of Eastvale  
Noah Rau / Nancy Beltran, City of Hemet  
Ken Seumalo / Dina Purvis, City of Indian Wells  
Timothy T. Wassil / VACANT, City of Indio  
Paul Toor / Rod Butler, City of Jurupa Valley  
Bryan McKinney / Julie Mignogna, City of La Quinta  
Remon Habib / Bradley Brophy, City of Lake Elsinore

Nick Fidler / Daniel Padilla, City of Menifee  
Michael Lloyd / Melissa Walker, City of Moreno Valley  
Bob Moehling / Jeff Hitch, City of Murrieta  
Chad Blais / Sam Nelson, City of Norco  
Andy Firestine / Randy Bowman, City of Palm Desert  
Joel Montalvo / Donn Uyeno, City of Palm Springs  
K. George Colangeli / Dale Reynolds, PVVTA  
Stuart McKibbin / VACANT, City of Perris  
Ryan Stendell / VACANT, City of Rancho Mirage  
Farshid Mohammadi / Gilbert Hernandez, City of Riverside  
Mark Lancaster / Mojahed Salama, County of Riverside  
Kristin Warsinski / Jennifer Nguyen, RTA  
Travis Randel / Stuart McKibbin, City of San Jacinto  
Brittney B. Sowell / Rohan Kuruppu, SunLine  
Patrick Thomas / Amer Attar, 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

## 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:** July 18, 2022

**LOCATION:** This meeting is being conducted in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

Join Zoom Meeting - from PC, Laptop or Phone

<https://rctc.zoom.us/j/81345268302>

One tap mobile:

+16699006833,,81345268302# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 813 4526 8302

Find your local number: <https://rctc.zoom.us/j/kEQ7wg7ft>

**The following commands can be used on your phone's dial pad while in Zoom meeting:**

- \*6 - Toggle mute/unmute
- \*9 - Raise hand

*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. HOUSEKEEPING REMARKS**

**3. ROLL CALL**

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - MAY 16, 2022**

***Page 1***

- 5. 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.

**6. INLAND EMPIRE REGIONAL BROADBAND CONSORTIUM**

***Page 11***

***Overview***

This item is to receive a presentation from the Inland Empire Regional Broadband Consortium (IERBC).

**7. RCTC PROJECT AND PROGRAM FUNDING DATABASE - RIVTrack**

***Page 14***

***Overview***

This item is to receive a demonstration of the new Riverside County Transportation Commission (Commission) project and program funding database, "RIVTrack."

**8. LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS UPDATE**

***Page 15***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file an update on legislative affairs.

**9. 2021 AND 2023 FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND 2024 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE**

***Page 19***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file an update on the 2021 and 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

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

***Page 25***

***Overview***

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

**11. CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: JUNE 2022**

***Page 26***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file the June 2022 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting highlights.

**12. RCTC COMMISSION MEETING HIGHLIGHTS: JUNE AND JULY 2022**

***Page 27***

***Overview***

This item is to receive and file the June and July 2022 Commission meeting highlights.

**13. 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.

**14. ADJOURNMENT**

The next meeting of the TAC is scheduled to be held September 19, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.

***MINUTES***

# **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, May 16, 2022**

## **1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting of the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order by Chair Jonathan Hoy at 10:02 a.m., in accordance with AB 361 due to state or local officials recommending measures to promote social distancing.

## **2. CHAIR JONATHAN HOY READ THE HOUSEKEEPING NOTES.**

## **3. ROLL CALL**

### **Members Present**

#### **By Teleconference:**

Nate Smith, City of Banning  
Robert Vestal, City of Beaumont  
Travis Bradshaw, City of Calimesa  
Albert Vergel De Dios, Caltrans  
John A. Corella, City of Cathedral City  
Andrew Simmons, City of Coachella  
Jonathan Hoy, Coachella Valley Association of Governments  
Savat Khamphou, City of Corona  
Jimmy Chung, City of Eastvale  
Noah Rau, City of Hemet  
Ken Seumalo, City of Indian Wells  
Timothy T. Wassil, City of Indio  
Bryan McKinney, City of La Quinta  
Remon Habib, City of Lake Elsinore  
Michael Lloyd, City of Moreno Valley  
Bob Moehling, City of Murrieta  
Randy Bowman, City of Palm Desert  
Don Uyeno, City of Palm Springs  
Stuart McKibbin, City of Perris  
Ryan Stendell, City of Rancho Mirage  
Farshid Mohammadi, City of Riverside  
Mark Lancaster, Riverside County  
Kristin Warsinski, Riverside Transit Agency  
Stuart McKibbin, City of San Jacinto  
Patrick Thomas, City of Temecula  
Cameron Brown, Western Riverside Council of Governments  
Jason Farag, City of Wildomar

**4. APPROVAL OF MARCH 21, 2022, MINUTES**

**B/C/A (Mohammadi/Bowman) to approve the Minutes as submitted. There were no objections to this motion.**

**Abstain: 2 (Rau and Lancaster)**

**5. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no public comments.

**6. SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS REGIONAL DEDICATED TRANSIT LANES STUDY UPDATE**

Jenny Chan, RCTC, noted this item was to receive and file an update from Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) on the Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study. At the November TAC meeting, Priscilla Freduah-Agyemang, Senior Regional Planner from SCAG, presented an item on the study.

Ms. Freduah-Agyemang provided a presentation and an update on the Regional Dedicated Transit Lanes Study. This study is meant to advance the implementation of SCAG's 2020 Connect SoCal, Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategies, which establishes transit as a backbone to improving mobility needs in the region and to meet air quality goals.

The purpose of the study is to continue to support the development of a regional network of dedicated bus lanes and priority treatments to enhance transit services, improve mobility, accessibility and sustainability, and advance the implementation of Connect SoCal. The study seeks to identify key benefits of dedicated bus lanes and primary factors for successful implementation. The study will provide a preliminary assessment on where dedicated bus lanes might be most feasible and beneficial and provide recommendations and guidance for local jurisdictions that are seeking to pilot or implement bus lanes or priority treatments.

This study started in June 2021, and the completion date was extended to September 2022. Stakeholder engagement was the initial step and is ongoing. The best practices review was conducted, and currently work is being done to finalize the existing conditions analysis. All the work has been completed leading up to the next phase which is the corridor evaluation. This is where SCAG will select and evaluate the corridors for the final report.

There has been extensive stakeholder engagement, SCAG previously presented to the TAC, and engaged with various counties and transportation agencies. The engagement kicked off with a transportation agency stakeholder meeting in October 2021. The study has teamed up with the SCAG Regional Transit TAC, sharing the goals and objectives.

The best practices analysis focused on three key questions. For the first, why build dedicated lanes, focus was given to four key elements: reliability, speed, comfort, and convenience.

The second question, where are lanes most feasible and beneficial, utilized metrics to identify and evaluate corridors and looked for supportive conditions. The last question, how jurisdictions pilot or implement, conducted a review of peer regions and stakeholders with a history of successful implementation.

Potential transit priority treatments and solutions that were reviewed were capital improvements, operational and technology enhancements, and policies and other actions. Examples of capital improvements would be transit-only lane configurations, stop positioning and spacing, curb extensions and bus pull out lanes, station area enhancements, and bus and bicycle facilities. Operational and technology enhancements include Traffic Signal Priority and queue jumps, real-time information, fare collection and all-door boarding, and route realignment. The review of policies and other actions included technology information and responsibility sharing, enforcement, and project programming and funding.

There are currently two key policies that support transit priority treatments, Senate Bill (SB) 288 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Exemptions for Transportation Related Projects and Assembly Bill (AB) 917 Video Imaging of Parking Violations. SB 288 provides CEQA review exemptions for certain transit projects that have dedicated lanes, the newer version of this bill being SB 922, which if passed, will extend the current bill to January 2030. AB 917 extended the previous bill limited to only San Francisco City and County, and now includes all of California. The bill authorizes agencies to install automated devices on public transit vehicles for the purpose of video imaging, parking violations occurring in transit only traffic lanes, and at transit stops.

Key takeaways that were learned from the best practices and case study reviews included: strong leadership from the top is always key in building the case for transit priority; agencies' need for long-range planning allowing for flexibility to pursue various funding opportunities; analyzing and incorporating equity and climate impacts on capital projects; identifying scalable solutions; fostering a sense of ownership by jurisdictions; and identifying complementary treatments to enhance the priority treatments.

Project development and implementation takeaways included: alleviating the burden of proof and mitigation for local stakeholders and partners; breaking down barriers through data sharing; developing shared design and procurement standards; aligning schedules for transit priority; capitalizing on pilot project opportunities; and reporting on successes to build the business case and user confidence.

The existing conditions review has included the review of several different agency-wide transportation planning documents, noting the common goals and themes across the documents. Policy decisions were also reviewed, especially those that could affect transit priority treatments. There was some overlap between what was reviewed in the best practices and the existing conditions. Several data sources were also reviewed to help build the context.

The key to reviewing all the documents was the ability to visualize some context to be able to draw critical implications, such as: the current and future conditions; where people live and



work; where equity focused communities are located and the challenges they face; and the overall build of the environment. The most crucial point was understanding how people travel in the SCAG region.

The study is currently looking at the corridor screening goals, criteria, and methodology. The corridor selection process has been narrowed down to four tiers. The first phase was corridor identification and was picked from the existing conditions analysis, identifying what the priorities are according to local and sub-regional plans, and leveraging existing conditions and analysis. The corridor screening phase allows the development of goals to evaluate at a higher level based on existing conditions and pulling the travel data and system performance to analyze what the corridors could be. The next step will be corridor evaluation and finally prioritization.

The high-level methodology for step one, identifying and screening corridors, began by developing goals, adding associate metrics and weights, conducting GIS analysis of the corridors throughout the region, defining alternative methods for goals or treatments, and developing the first list of corridors or areas that pass screening thresholds. This process helped identify six goal areas for treatments consistent with the reflected goals. The first two goal areas are related to system performance and moving and attracting riders, which were given much more consideration as they were the motivating factors for screening roadways across the region.

The corridor screening process assigned scores based on the two primary goals. System performance considered transit speed and reliability potential, minimizing traffic and safety impacts, and regional connectivity. Throughput and riders considered population and employment density, travel markets and trip intensity, and transit ridership.

Of the 46,500 corridors that were analyzed, about one hundred corridors/areas will advance to full evaluation across all six counties. Another two hundred were identified as the next best possible for advancement. SCAG staff is currently reviewing these corridors to determine the final list that will move to the next phase of evaluation and prioritization. TAC members are encouraged to review the comment log that will be provided by SCAG, review the recommended corridors, and provide input or comments. The comment period has been extended to May 27.

## **7. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM - SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS 2023 REGIONAL PROGRAM GUIDELINES - SELECTION CRITERIA FOR RIVERSIDE COUNTY APPLICATIONS**

Ms. Chan provided a presentation on the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 6 2023 SCAG Regional Program Guidelines. As explained at the March TAC meeting, the Commission is expecting to receive \$17.6 million for this year's ATP Cycle 6 Program in Riverside County. Staff appreciated the feedback received at the last TAC meeting regarding the selection methodology. Based on that discussion, staff is proposing the following 20-point distribution methodology for implementation projects: projects requesting construction-only funding will receive 6 points; 4 points will be awarded for projects with

construction funding programmed in the first three years of the program cycle; award 7 points for projects with CEQA/National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) approval or partial award of 3 points for projects that have initiated CEQA/NEPA; and award 3 points for projects identified in an active transportation plan.

To satisfy criteria 3, CEQA/NEPA completion, applicants must submit their completed CEQA and/or NEPA to the Commission by January 3, 2023. To satisfy criteria 3a, CEQA/NEPA started, applicants must submit a letter detailing the environmental work that has been completed to date, by January 3, 2023.

For non-infrastructure projects, staff is recommending to award projects with a minimum score of 80 points in the state scores, with a maximum award amount of \$442,000. Any remaining funding for non-infrastructure and planning projects will be utilized for implementation projects and vice versa.

Jason Farag, Wildomar, asked if a project has CEQA approval, does it automatically get the 7 points, or would it also require the NEPA approval. Ms. Chan noted that the criteria was for CEQA and/or NEPA approval.

Randy Bowman, Palm Desert, sought clarification on accepting environmental documentation through January 2023. Ms. Chan clarified to get either the 7 or 3 points from criteria 3/3a, applicants would need to provide a copy of completed CEQA or NEPA to the Commission by January 3, 2023. If the environmental process has only been started, a letter detailing the environmental work that has been performed will be needed to satisfy the requirement for the 3 points. The procedure will be like last year, a SharePoint site will be available for applicants to upload their files.

**B/C/A (Mohammadi/Bowman) to:**

- 1) Approve the project selection criteria for inclusion in the Metropolitan Planning Organizations' (MPO) Regional Program Guidelines for Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 6;**
- 2) Authorize staff to award projects based on the approved selection criteria for the MPO funding; and**
- 3) Forward to the Commission for final action.**

## **8. ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM AUGMENTATION**

Ms. Chan stated this item was to solicit feedback from the TAC regarding CTC's request to augment the ATP. The CTC requested a one-time \$2 billion general fund augmentation to the ATP in the state's Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget. Based on the May Revise Budget released last Friday, the Governor is proposing a \$500 million bump to ATP.

The CTC is hosting a workshop in two weeks to discuss possible funding augmentation. RCTC staff is unsure what options the CTC is considering but would like to open the discussion

to the TAC in order for staff to advocate for the region appropriately. Anticipated options include: reserving all funding for ATP Cycle 5; reserving all funding for ATP Cycle 6; or potentially a hybrid approach augmenting both cycles. It is worth noting that at the April 2021 Commission meeting, when the Commission adopted the Cycle 5 award list, the Commission also directed staff to prioritize Coachella Valley Association of Governments' CV Arts and Music Line Project for any future supplemental Cycle 5 funding.

Patrick Thomas, Temecula, asked if part of the augmented funding were for Cycle 5, would the same scoring from Cycle 5 be used. Ms. Chan noted that was her understanding. The funds would still be distributed 40% to the state and 60% to MPOs, so mostly likely the same scores that have already been established would be used.

Chair Jonathan Hoy, CVAG, noted that during the summer, there was a discussion about money that had been set aside to augment or add to Cycle 5, but it never made it through. At the time, when they were looking at additional funding, if it were all applied to Cycle 5 there was an idea of which projects would receive funding. Ms. Chan stated that back in the summer, even though the CTC requested \$2 billion, the Governor only agreed to \$500 million. When that is applied to the list of projects, it is anticipated that only projects that scored around the mid-eighties would get funding.

Chair Hoy clarified that this item is to discuss how to apply that additional funding. Ms. Chan concurred, noting that staff is not sure what CTC staff is considering because the Cycle 6 guidelines notes there is a chance of augmenting. This is just an opportunity for the TAC to share what they would like to see happen, so staff can advocate accordingly.

Mr. Thomas commented that the project the city sent for Cycle 5 has since made considerable progress on plans and environmental, so it would be nice to get credit for that progress in terms of scoring.

Mr. Farag wanted clarification as the city is reapplying for Cycle 6 with one of their Cycle 5 applications. If the city happened to receive augmented funds for the Cycle 5 application, how would it affect the Cycle 6 application. Ms. Chan thought that was a good question, but staff was unsure how to answer because it is not clear when funds would be available.

Mr. Thomas added that his city is also reapplying for a Cycle 5 project.

Chair Hoy noted that as CVAG was right on the cusp for funding, they repackaged the application for Cycle 6. With additional funding applied to Cycle 5 and CVAG receiving some of that funding, they would not have a Cycle 6 application. Putting the extra money toward Cycle 5 would be the thing to do.

Ms. Chan asked Tyler Madary, RCTC, if he was aware of the timeline for the \$500 million proposal. Mr. Madary noted that he did not have the timeline, but it was something he would find out.

Mr. Farag added that in repackaging the application, refinements are being made as well as modifications to the project. This could cause an impact depending on which project ends up receiving funding. Ms. Chan wanted to know if the Cycle 5 project did get awarded what that would mean for the city's Cycle 6 application. Mr. Farag noted that the Cycle 6 application is adding a new component so the city would have to review how to approach that.

Jillian Guizado, RCTC, noted that from the comments, it seems getting the funding out of Cycle 6 would be the preference, but for the CVAG project getting funding from Cycle 5 would be better since they were at the top of the list. It is possible that the CTC may try to get this decision nailed down before any scoring comes out on Cycle 6, so that people are not comparing the two lists for scoring. All TAC members are invited to join on the workshop.

Chair Hoy commented that if a decision is made after June 15, when Cycle 6 projects are due, there could be a lot of agencies that will have two applications for both cycles.

Andrew Simmons, Coachella, thought that most people submitting for Cycle 6 would have made modifications from the Cycle 5 application, making it better. That being the case, there could be a preference for having that additional money go to Cycle 6, as the applications are presenting an overall better project. The CVAG project was the next one on the list, and it does affect multiple communities, so the City of Coachella would support having funding allocated to the Arts and Music Project presented in Cycle 5.

Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Guizado that if the outcome were known, it would be easier to know whether to resubmit or pick a new project for Cycle 6.

Ms. Guizado added that there has been talk of this augmentation for over a year now, so heading into Cycle 6 there may be an influx of applications due to the anticipated extra funding. There could also be more competitive projects with the extra funding. There is, however, a level of certainty with the MPO funding.

Ms. Chan stated her take away was that a hybrid approach may be what works best for the TAC. The workshop information will be forwarded to the TAC for their participation.

Ms. Guizado noted that as the workshop is next week, any decision that comes out will be shared with the TAC, since the next meeting is not until July.

## **9. FUTURE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING LOCATIONS**

James Simpson, RCTC, stated staff is seeking concurrence on two concurrent meeting locations for future in-person TAC meetings. Currently, the Commission's TAC falls under the monthly AB 361 resolution which allows public meetings to be held in a virtual setting. At the March 2022 TAC meeting, staff initiated discussion and requested input regarding how to proceed with in-person meetings upon their return. Staff suggested the TAC continue to meet virtually until it is no longer an option.

Two options were proposed by staff, the first option being returning to alternating locations between Riverside and the Coachella Valley. The second option being to have two simultaneous meeting locations, one in Riverside and the other in the Coachella Valley. TAC members inquired about a third option, including an additional meeting location located in the pass area or southwest region.

Staff researched the logistics of having three or more concurrent locations, with two of the three locations being RCTC's Lemon Street office and CVAG's Palm Desert office. Distances from each TAC member agency to each potential location was recorded to determine which location is the closest for each agency, and how many potential miles traveled were saved or added. Upon review, it was noted that adding a third location did not affect any of the 13 agencies that are closest to the CVAG office. While miles traveled would be reduced for some TAC attendees, it did not improve the travel distance for those coming from a sub-region without a meeting site.

Staff is concerned that adding a third meeting site would also pose logistical challenges and as such, is recommending two concurrent meeting sites. Staff encourages TAC members and meeting attendees to establish carpool arrangements with adjacent members to reduce miles traveled. A park and ride map was provided with the agenda for convenience.

**B/C/A (Hoy/Stendell) concurring on the two concurrent meeting locations for future in-person TAC meetings.**

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

Albert Vergel De Dios, Caltrans, provided an update on Caltrans District 8 Local Assistance. Any updates received regarding the additional funding for ATP Cycle 6 will be forwarded to the TAC. As a reminder, for the authorization for construction, it is recommended that agencies request funding for construction engineering (CE) as well, even if just a small amount. This strategy is used so that the project does not become inactive. Although the TAC members are doing great on the inactive projects.

On June 30, the submittals of DBE are due to the district for the next fiscal year. The Quality Assurance Program is also due at this time and is needed when an authorization for construction is requested.

Local Assistance staff will be adding a student assistant, starting June 1, and a Transportation Engineer (TE) will also be starting in mid-August. Any changes in assignments will be sent to TAC members via an email blast.

Leslie Avila, Caltrans, mentioned some available funding opportunities. The ATP Cycle 6 application is due June 15, and the HSIP Cycle 11 application deadline is September 12, 2022. Other funding opportunities presented by the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) in April include MEGA, INFRA, and Rural. While applicants can choose to apply for only one funding opportunity, this combined solicitation will allow applicants to apply for two or all three

by only submitting one application. Funding for the MEGA, INFRA, and Rural opportunities will be awarded on a competitive basis for surface transportation infrastructure projects with significant national or regional impact, or to improve and expand surface transportation infrastructure in rural areas. Application deadline for these funding programs is May 23.

Another posted opportunity is the Reconnecting Communities Pilot Discretionary Grant Program. The bipartisan infrastructure law established this new program that is funded with \$1 billion over the next five years. The program funds can support planning, capital construction, and technical assistance to restore community connectivity, equity, and safety through the removal, retrofit, mitigation, or replacement of eligible transportation infrastructure facilities that create barriers to mobility, access, or economic development. It is anticipated the notice of funding availability will be posted in September 2022. There will be a webinar for those who are interested on May 18.

The Local Assistance Blog added a link to the USDOT website to provide stakeholders with more visibility for upcoming funding opportunities. The USDOT has published a list of anticipated dates for notice of funding opportunities for key bipartisan infrastructure programs. While the list is not comprehensive, it will be updated periodically with new programs and dates.

Earlier this morning, an email blast was sent out covering the end of the federal fiscal year deadlines. The email details specific deadlines for agencies to submit de-obligation requests, E-76 requests, and FTA transfers. These should be submitted as soon as possible as sometimes additional revisions are needed and the various submittal requirements can take time. The E-76 deadline to submit to the district is June 15, 2022. The deadline for FTA transfers is July 8, 2022.

Lastly, there will be another Local Assistance Training Day providing overviews on local project delivery policies, processes, and procedures, and to facilitate peer sharing of local and regional agency best practices across the state. The training will be held on June 7.

## **11. COMMITTEE MEMBER / STAFF REPORT**

Ms. Guizado noted that in 2017, when the State passed SB 1, it created new competitive programs that are now heading into Cycle 3. One of the programs that cities should be interested in is the Local Partnership Program, which is one of two that cities would be eligible for. There is a formula program for the Local Partnership Program, which is only open to agencies like RCTC, but the competitive program is open to jurisdictions that have imposed fees dedicated to transportation improvements. Cities could be eligible using their adopted development impact fees (DIF).

All cities and the County in Riverside have eligibility using the Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) program. That program is 100% dedicated to transportation improvements and all the city councils have taken action to adopt the fee. During the last cycle, it came to RCTC's attention that the CTC did not deem the cities eligible despite meeting the statutory requirements, making the cities apply under the council of governments which ultimately administers the TUMF fees.

RCTC has been working with CTC staff for the last nine months, and finally had a break-through, making all cities eligible to apply independently without going through the councils of governments. The CTC still recommends that cities submit their eligibility information as soon as possible.

If there are any questions about SB 1 programs or CTC guidelines, TAC members are encouraged to reach out to RCTC Planning and Program Department staff.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business for consideration by the Technical Advisory Committee, the meeting adjourned at approximately 11:08 a.m. The next meeting will be on July 18, 2022, at 10:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jillian Guizado". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jillian Guizado

Planning and Programming Director

# ***AGENDA ITEM 6***



<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Inland Empire Regional Broadband Consortium

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive a presentation from the Inland Empire Regional Broadband Consortium (IERBC).

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

IERBC is a non-profit 501(c)(3) that addresses broadband technology access, planning, service reliability, affordability, infrastructure requirements and deployment, and needs within both San Bernardino and Riverside counties. IERBC represents a variety of urban, suburban, rural, mountain, and desert interests in the region to become a “smart region” by closing the digital divide and improving broadband speed, reliability, availability, cost, and access. Both the County of Riverside and County of San Bernardino are members of IERBC, among many others. Efforts are funded through the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). To date, IERBC has successfully facilitated \$55 million in CPUC California Advanced Services Fund Broadband Infrastructure and Adoption Grants in the Inland Empire.

**DISCUSSION:**

The need for a regional collaborative broadband strategy effort, which IERBC embodies, is critical to closing the digital divide in our region. IERBC’s Broadband Infrastructure and Access Plan (Plan), developed in collaboration with the community, stakeholders, government agencies, and internet service providers, focuses on the following issues:

- Needed capital improvement projects
- Programs which address underserved and disadvantaged residents
- Government policy improvements and best practices
- Advocacy efforts and grant funding for the Inland Empire
- Economic development and broadband
- Smart region policies, programs, and implementation

The Plan establishes IERBC as the lead strategic planning resource to help create a smart region and achieve fast, reliable, accessible, available, and affordable broadband high-speed internet service to all residents, businesses, and stakeholders in the Inland Empire.

IERBC recently completed a Caltrans Sustainable Communities Grant as a partner with the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the California Emerging Technology Fund (CETF), and other Southern California Regional Broadband Consortia to release a broadband research study on Earth Day, April 22, 2022, showing that the region can reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and potentially Greenhouse Gas Emissions (GHG) by up to 15% through ubiquitous and affordable broadband.

A key finding in the new research is the private sector identified two top strategies to reduce trip generation as 1) expanding construction of high-speed internet throughout the region and 2) employer tax credits to implement telecommuting. More than half of public agencies, service providers, and education and health organizations surveyed said lack of high-speed internet infrastructure limited the number of employees who can work remotely and said the top strategy to reduce trip generation is to help their clients, including students and patients, access affordable home internet and a computing device.

"Achieving the widespread region's goals will require land-use planners and regulators to think about incorporating broadband into all new projects to help reduce trip generation and ensure digital equity. Decisions made today will impact the future of California's leadership and competitiveness in the world economy and reputation as a pioneering steward of the environment and champion of social equity and justice so all Californians can thrive in the Digital Age," said Kome Ajise, SCAG Executive Director. "High-speed internet infrastructure can not only offset vehicle trips, reduce GHG emissions, and relieve traffic congestion, but ultimately provide all of our communities equitable access to healthcare and the education that the internet provides."

IERBC is also working with CETF to promote its recently published "Getting Connected, A Broadband Deployment and Adoption Resource Guide for Local and Regional Government Leaders," which includes a Checklist for Achieving Digital Equity with Best Practices for Local Government.

The CPUC is now offering two grant programs local agencies can benefit from:

1. California Advanced Services Fund (CASF) Local Agency Technical Assistance (LATA) Grants to local governments and tribes to support broadband planning and pre-construction work that facilitates last-mile broadband infrastructure projects. Eligible expenses include consultant and staff time for conducting needs assessments, environmental and engineering studies, broadband network design, and broadband strategic plans.
2. CASF Adoption Grants includes funding for Digital Literacy Training Programs and public education to communities with limited broadband adoption, including low-income communities, senior citizen communities, and communities facing socioeconomic barriers to broadband adoption. CASF Grants may also fund Broadband Access projects

to provide publicly available or after-school broadband access, including free broadband access in community training rooms or other public spaces, such as government centers, senior citizen centers, schools, public libraries, nonprofit organizations, and community-based organizations. This funding can include community outreach, such as comparison of internet plans, with the community to help broadband adoption efforts.

Attachments:

- 1) SCAG Caltrans Sustainable Communities Broadband Grant Project: “Transportation Broadband Strategies to Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled and Greenhouse Gases Project” <https://www.cetfund.org/report/caltrans-sustainable-communities-grant/>
- 2) CETF “Getting Connected” Broadband Resource Guide and Checklist for Local and Regional Government <https://www.cetfund.org/report/getting-connected-a-broadband-deployment-and-adoption-resource-guide/>
- 3) CPUC CASF LATA Grant Handout <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/internet-and-phone/broadband-implementation-for-california/local-agency-technical-assistance>
- 4) CPUC CASF Adoption Grant Handout <https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/internet-and-phone/california-advanced-services-fund/casf-adoption-account>

# ***AGENDA ITEM 7***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Martha Masters, Senior Management Analyst
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	RCTC Project and Program Funding Database – RIVTrack

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive a demonstration of the new Riverside County Transportation Commission (Commission) project and program funding database, “RIVTrack.”

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

As the regional transportation planning agency for Riverside County, the Commission is the recipient of a multitude of federal, state, and local revenues that fund critical transportation projects in the county. Each funding source has its own set of guidelines that dictate administrative procedures, eligibility, expenditures, and project delivery milestones. Currently, Planning and Programming staff utilize Microsoft Office (Word, Excel, and OneNote) to administer its funding programs and track all program requirements. To advance beyond the current method of fund administration, in October 2020, staff released a request for proposals for a project and program funding database system. In January 2021, the Commission awarded the contract to Netkinetix Inc. (NetK) to develop a cloud-based database application to facilitate project and program fund management. The database system was envisioned to streamline the administrative processes required for Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) updates, the annual Measure A Local Streets and Roads Capital Improvement program, and the Transportation Development Act Article 3 – Bicycle and Pedestrian (SB 821) program. The new database is named “RIVTrack.” Development of the RIVTrack database is ongoing with a scheduled roll-out of the system by winter 2023.

NetK will provide a demonstration of the database features local agencies will be utilizing:

- Module 1 to review and approve draft FTIP project sheets;
- Module 2 to submit annual Measure A capital improvement plans and amendments; and
- Module 3 to submit SB 821 grant applications, claim forms, and extension requests.

Staff has selected some agencies to help test the system and provide feedback. If there are other agencies that would like to volunteer, please reach out to staff as soon as possible. Database training will be provided in the fall.

# ***AGENDA ITEM 8***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Tyler Madary, Legislative Affairs Manager
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	Legislative Affairs Update

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file an update on legislative affairs.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

***The State Budget***

Governor Newsom and legislative leaders agreed to a record \$300 billion budget before the start of the new fiscal year. The Budget includes approximately \$15 billion over multiple years for transportation infrastructure programs. Excluding the high-speed rail funding, this includes \$5.4 billion in Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23, \$2.7 billion in FY 2023/24, and \$2 billion in FY 2024/25 for programs including funding for transit, freight, active transportation and climate adaptation. Funding for these programs include:

- **Transit and Rail Projects**—\$7.7 billion from the General Fund over four years to invest in high-priority transit and rail infrastructure projects throughout the state. Funding will be administered through the Transit and Intercity Rail Capital Program (TIRCP). This funding includes \$3.65 billion for transit investments in the current year – approximately \$1.5 billion for projects in Northern California, \$1.83 billion for projects in Southern California, and \$300 million for adapting certain rail lines to sea level rise. The budget sets aside a minimum of \$900 million in each regional allocation for priority projects for which additional state funding would help maintain or secure additional federal or local funds. The total also includes up to \$150 million for the development of future projects that could eventually compete for additional funding. An additional \$4 billion in transit capital funding will be allocated in the out years, with a minimum of \$300,000 to each eligible entity and the remaining funds distributed by population-based formula.
- **High-Speed Rail**—\$4.2 billion from the High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Fund (Proposition 1A) to complete high-speed rail construction in the Central Valley segment. The budget also establishes an independent Office of Inspector General to provide project oversight and improved governance.
- **Goods Movement and Ports**—\$1.2 billion from the General Fund for port-specific projects that increase goods movement capacity on rail and roadways serving port terminals, including intermodal railyard expansions and electrification, goods movement railway

capacity projects, high-priority grade separations, and zero-emission modernization. 70 percent of these funds are set aside for projects related to the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach.

- **Active Transportation**—\$1 billion from the General Fund in the current year for Active Transportation Program projects that encourage the increased use of active modes of transportation, such as walking and biking, and increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.
- **Grade Separations**—\$350 million from the General Fund to support critical high priority grade separation safety improvements throughout the state.
- **Climate Adaptation Programs**—\$200 million General Fund to identify transportation-related climate vulnerabilities throughout the state and assist in developing and implementing projects to adapt infrastructure given climate change impacts. The Budget also allocates \$200 million federal funds for these purposes.
- **Highways to Boulevards Pilot**—\$150 million to establish the Reconnecting Communities: Highways to Boulevards Pilot Program, which will inform the future conversion of key underutilized highways into multimodal corridors that serve existing residents. The program will further the development of complete streets features as outlined in the Department of Transportation’s Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure.
- **Clean California Local Grants**—\$100 million General Fund in additional funding for the Clean California Program grant program in FY 2023/24.

Additionally, more than \$6.1 billion of General Fund, Proposition 98, Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, and federal funds will be invested in clean trucks, buses, off-road equipment, clean cars, and zero-emission vehicle school buses and charging infrastructure.

### ***Continued Legislative Advocacy***

Throughout the year, RCTC has consistently engaged on Assembly Bills 1778 (Cristina Garcia), 2237 (Freidman), and 2438 (Freidman), which together would hamstring RCTC’s ability to plan, fund, and deliver projects that are seen as conflicting with state climate and equity priorities. All three bills passed out of the Assembly with razor thin majority vote. Ahead of the July 1<sup>st</sup> deadline for bills to pass policy committees in the second house, AB 1778 (Garcia) and AB 2237 (Friedman) failed to advance. The Legislature will reconvene on August 1<sup>st</sup> and August 31<sup>st</sup> is the last day for each house to pass bills. RCTC staff will continue to engage the Riverside County Legislative Delegation regarding AB 2438 (Friedman) and will monitor for any chance of AB 1778 (Garcia) or AB 2237 (Friedman) to be revived as gut-and-amends.

The County of Riverside and the cities have been indispensable partners in RCTC’s engagement on these bills.

The following are brief summaries of the aforementioned bills, as well as SB 1121 (Gonzalez), which RCTC sees as a meaningful first step as the State explores how to advance climate action goals by transitioning our transportation systems to multimodal transit alternatives.



***AB 1778 (Cristina Garcia)***

AB 1778, as written, would halt highway expansions in disadvantaged communities. Specifically, the bill would forbid state funds or personnel time to be used to fund or permit highway expansions in or adjacent to certain census tracts that fall within specified percentile ranges in the California Healthy Places Index for various air quality and economic indicators. The Commission adopted an oppose position on March 9, 2022, for concern of any project prohibitions outside of the environmental review process. AB 1778 (Garcia) failed in the Senate Transportation Committee and is now considered dead.

***AB 2237 (Friedman)***

AB 2237, as written, would require projects funded by local sales tax measures to align with the Climate Action Plan for Transportation Infrastructure (CAPTI) and regional Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS). The bill would also prohibit county transportation commissions from funding a project or program determined to be inconsistent with its most recently adopted SCS. While the bill was amended, it originally required that projects funded by current and future local sales tax measures be reviewed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) for alignment with CAPTI, SCS, and state climate goals, and for projects not in alignment to be reallocated. Through the legislative process, the bill was narrowed to apply to future local sales tax measures, and only VMT-increasing projects programmed by current local sales tax measures that are not in the SCS or the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan (RTIP). However, this provision still would have impacted local projects that would not qualify for inclusion in the SCS or RTIP. The Commission adopted an oppose position on May 11, 2022, taking issue with any attempt to limit its ability to deliver on promises made to voters for Measure A. As a result of collective advocacy, Senate Transportation Committee Chair Lena Gonzalez decided not to schedule AB 2237 (Friedman) for a hearing, causing the bill to not meet the policy committee deadline, and die. However, this bill could come back in another form in August or in the next legislative session.

***AB 2438 (Friedman)***

AB 2438, as written, would require specified state transportation funding programs to incorporate elements of CAPTI. Affected state transportation funding programs include, but are not limited to, the Local Partnership Program (LPP), TIRCP, the interregional transportation improvement program (ITIP), the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP), Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP), and the Trade Corridors Enhancement Program (TCEP). The bill originally would have required for projects to align with CAPTI to receive funds from the affected state transportation funding programs. However, RCTC remains concerned regarding the inclusion of voter-affirmed SB 1 programs, as well as for the potential for the bill to be implemented by state agencies more aggressively than written. Inland regions already struggle to compete for state transportation funding programs. Their lack of resources, necessary rights-of-way, or sufficient multimodal transit networks from which to augment, would make their applications even less competitive against those from coastal urban centers. Not only

would AB 2438 restrict RCTC's ability to compete for state funding for projects that would provide meaningful alternatives to driving, but it would also cut funding eligibility for projects intended to provide congestion relief for communities in the interim. RCTC took an oppose position on March 24, 2022. AB 2438 (Friedman) narrowly passed the Senate Transportation Committee and will next be considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee on August 1, 2022.

***SB 1121 (Gonzalez)***

SB 1121, as written, would require the California Transportation Commission (CTC) to biennially develop a needs assessment of the cost to operate, maintain, and provide for the future growth and resiliency of the state and local transportation system. In developing the needs assessment, the CTC would be required to consult with relevant stakeholders, including, but not limited to, metropolitan planning organizations, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, local governments, and transit operators. In addition, the bill requires the CTC to estimate the cost to provide for future growth of the state and local transportation system in the needs assessment and must include the cost to address climate change impacts. RCTC took a support position on June 15, 2022. SB 1121 (Gonzalez) passed the Assembly Transportation Committee and will next be considered by the Assembly Appropriations Committee on August 3, 2022.

# ***AGENDA ITEM 9***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Martha Masters, Senior Management Analyst
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	2021 and 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program and 2024 Regional Transportation Plan Update

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file an update on the 2021 and 2023 Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) and the 2024 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

The FTIP is a listing of multi-modal transportation projects proposed over a six-year period for the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) region. The projects include highway improvements, transit, rail and bus facilities, high occupancy vehicle lanes, active transportation facilities and activities, signal synchronization, intersection improvements, freeway ramps, and more. SCAG produces a biennial FTIP update for the region on an even-year cycle. The FTIP update is an extensive process that adheres to state and federal requirements under the Clean Air Act and State Implementation Plan, requiring complete review of individual projects and cross-checking modeling details to ensure transportation conformity.

The RTP is a long-range visioning plan that currently outlines more than \$638 billion in transportation system investments through 2045. It is prepared through a collaborative, continuous, and comprehensive process with input from local governments, county transportation commissions, tribal governments, non-profit organizations, businesses, and local stakeholders within the SCAG region.

**DISCUSSION:**

**2021 FTIP**

The 2021 FTIP (#21-00) and Amendments #21-01 through #21-24 have received SCAG/federal approvals as of today. All approved 2021 FTIP amendments are available on SCAG's website: <https://scag.ca.gov/2021-approved-ftip>.

The 2021 FTIP Amendment #21-25 is currently undergoing public review and can be viewed on SCAG's website: <https://scag.ca.gov/2021-proposed-amendments>. Approval of Amendment #21-25 is anticipated in early September 2022.

Staff should be notified by agencies of any FTIP project changes so they can be properly incorporated into the FTIP to avoid project delays, especially as it relates to federal funds that require programming in the FTIP for obligation or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) clearance. The upcoming formal and administrative amendments are due to SCAG on Tuesday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, with anticipated approval in October. Staff requests that any revisions to project sheets be provided by Tuesday, July 26<sup>th</sup>, to meet the SCAG deadline.

The 2021 FTIP Amendment schedule is provided as Attachment 1. Agencies can check their most recently approved FTIP projects by visiting SCAG's website: [SCAG \(ecointeractive.com\)](https://scag.ca.gov/ecointeractive). The 2021 FTIP will expire in December of this year, once the 2023 FTIP is approved. Therefore, staff urges local agencies' staff to review their current projects in the 2021 FTIP and submit any revisions to prevent delays in federal obligations required between now and December.

### **2021 FTIP Guidelines**

The 2021 FTIP Guidelines provide a framework for federal, state, and regional requirements in developing the FTIP for the SCAG region. The guidelines are a good resource for agencies that may have questions regarding, for example, what types of projects need to be modeled and what information is required to model those projects. The 2021 FTIP Guidelines are accessible to all agencies and can be found here for future reference: <https://scag.ca.gov/sites/main/files/file-attachments/f2021-ftip-guidelines.pdf?1614888031>. SCAG updates the FTIP guidelines every two years. Staff are always available to assist with questions.

### **2023 FTIP**

In January 2022, through consultation with local agencies, staff submitted 310 projects (totaling approximately \$10 billion in funds) to SCAG for the 2023 FTIP. The 2023 FTIP is anticipated to be fully approved in December of this year. The 2023 FTIP Amendment schedule was provided by SCAG and is provided as Attachment 2.

Staff are available to assist with any questions about on-going projects that may require updates in the 2021 or 2023 FTIP for federal approvals and/or federal obligations.

As a general reminder, staff can provide agencies all relevant project sheets from the FTIP upon request at any time throughout the year. Non-modeling updates for non-capacity increasing projects can be submitted to SCAG almost every month. Staff will work with agencies on a case-by-case basis if modeling updates are needed for capacity increasing projects, however, these changes are recommended to be brought up to staff as soon as possible. Modeling updates include adding or deleting projects, project completion year updates, and project description/scope changes and their related modeling detail changes.

## **2024 Regional Transportation Plan**

The RTP is the long-range transportation plan as stated previously. Capacity increasing and regionally significant projects must be in the RTP to be programmed in the FTIP. Additionally, capacity increasing projects on the state highway system must be modeled in the RTP with the correct completion year before it receives environmental clearance from Caltrans. Staff anticipates the 2024 RTP project update opportunity to be out this fall with anticipated approval in early summer 2024. Through this opportunity, SCAG will accept model updates for capacity increasing (non-exempt) projects such as scope changes and completion date updates, as well as new projects that will be starting environmental work within the next two to four years. If an agency determines that a new project needs to be added to the model, or that a current project needs modeling updates, contact staff as soon as possible. Staff will be in communication with agencies once SCAG provides the 2024 RTP schedule.

### **Attachments:**

- 1) 2021 FTIP Amendment Schedule
- 2) 2023 FTIP Amendment Schedule
- 3) RTP/FTIP Overview PowerPoint Presentation

2021 FTIP AMENDMENT/ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION SCHEDULE		
Due Date (by Noon)	Amendments	Administrative Modifications
Tuesday, September 24, 2021	2022 STIP - FTIP #21-99	STIP-RTIP submittal for SCAG to perform regional evaluation of system performance and cost-effectiveness. Project information details will be held for 2023 FTIP.
Tuesday, October 5, 2021	Amendment #21-12	
Tuesday, October 5, 2021		Administrative Modification #21-13
Thursday, September 30	Emergency Amendment #21-14 (RCTC)	
Tuesday, November 9, 2021		Administrative Modification #21-15
Tuesday, December 7, 2021		Administrative Modification #21-16
Tuesday, December 7, 2021	Amendment #21-17	
Thursday, January 6, 2022	2023 County TIPs	DEADLINE -- County Submissions
Tuesday, February 8, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-18 §
Tuesday, February 8, 2022	Amendment #21-19 §	
Tuesday, March 8, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-20 §
Tuesday, April 5, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-21 §
Tuesday, April 5, 2022	Amendment #21-22 §	
Tuesday, May 10, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-23 §
Tuesday, June 7, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-24 §
Tuesday, June 7, 2022	Amendment #21-25 §	
Tuesday, July 12, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-26 §
Tuesday, August 9, 2022		Administrative Modification #21-27 §
Tuesday, August 9, 2022	Amendment #21-28 §	

Updated 5/19/22

\*If any comments received during 2021 Public Comment period, we will reject projects for CTCs to address prior to finalizing the amendment.

\*\*This is for modeling changes to FTIP project to be submitted with FTIP Consistency Amendment (Amendment # TBD) to the 2020 RTP A1

\*\*\*This is for Programming changes made to projects submitted in A21-97. projects in this amendment cannot be modified until the 2020 RTP/SCS A#1 is approved.

\*\*\*\*Undertake a modeled 2021 FTIP Amendment to account for as many near term projects as possible that would otherwise be included in 2023 FTIP. In addition, start emissions modeling before August 16, 2021 using EMFAC 2014 and continue emissions modeling through Spring 2022

§ Amendments submitted during this period should only be **emergency type** (necessary changes for obligations) as the 2023 FTIP is being developed. Dates and amendment types may change based on future guidance from FHWA/FTA as it relates to the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act

2023 FTIP AMENDMENT/ADMINISTRATIVE MODIFICATION SCHEDULE		
Due Date (by Noon)	Amendments	Administrative Modifications
Tuesday, March 15, 2022	A-23-99 - Modeling Amendment - Will become Amendment #23-03 *	Amendment to update/add modeling projects once EMFAC2021 is approved
Tuesday, July 19, 2022	Amendment #23-01*	Catch up Amendment - 2022 STIP, 2020 SHOPP, HBP and emergency type changes to address comments received on Draft 2023 FTIP only. Concurrent with 2021 FTIP base
Tuesday, October 25, 2022		Administrative Modification #23-02*
Tuesday, October 11, 2022	Conformity Amendment #23-03 *	
Tuesday, January 3, 2023		Administrative Modification #23-04



**RCTC** RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (RTP) AND FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (FTIP) OVERVIEW

Martha Masters  
Planning and Programming


1

1


**RCTC**

## What is the RTP & how does it relate to the FTIP?

- RTP captures planned transportation projects (long-range plan)
- FTIP implements projects in RTP (short-range plan)



RTP = the design ([plan](#))



FTIP = the construction ([implementation](#))

2

2

**RCTC**

## FTIP: things to know

- Updated every two years
  - 2023 FTIP/Riverside County: 310 projects at \$10B
- Between updates, amendments can be made
- Projects cannot secure NEPA clearance if not included in the RTP and FTIP
- P&P includes RCTC's and local agencies' projects
  - Makes projects eligible for state and federal funds
- Project information must be **up to date** in the FTIP to receive federal funding and environmental clearance

3

3

**RCTC**

## When to contact P&P

- When a **new project** is being **planned**:
  - Projects must be included in the RTP/SCS and FTIP **as soon as possible**
  - Inclusion in the RTP/SCS and FTIP allows the project to clear NEPA
  - Project can **qualify for federal funding**
- When the funding plan **changes**, or the project needs **funding**
- When an existing project **changes**:
  - Funding plan
  - Scope
  - Delivery schedule
  - Phase

4

4

**RCTC**

## How?

- Communicate with us early and often
- Give us best **and** worst case scenarios
  - Cost
  - Milestone Schedule

Activity	Start Date	End Date
CEQA/NEPA		
ROW		
RTL Date	N/A	
CON RFP Release Date	N/A	
Project Acceptance Date	N/A	

- Account for all costs

5

5

**RCTC**

## Upcoming: 2024 RTP

- Begin communications in late summer/early fall 2022
- Anticipated approval in early summer 2024
- Be prepared
  - For capacity increasing projects:
    - Is your project modeled correctly in the RTP/FTIP?
    - Is your project description/scope correct in the RTP/FTIP?
    - If seeking environmental clearance – is your project completion date the same date you have been using throughout your environmental analysis and reports?
    - Do you need to delete or add a new project due to agency priorities?
  - For transit projects: expansions of service may require modeling

6

6

# ***AGENDA ITEM 10***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jenny Chan, Planning and Programming Manager
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	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 obligating and allocating 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**

<b>Federal Programs</b>	<b>State Programs</b>
Active Transportation Program (ATP)	Active Transportation Program (ATP)
Emergency Relief (ER)	Local Partnership Program (LPP) <i>Off-system</i>
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)	Solutions for Congested Corridors Program (SCCP) <i>Off-system</i>
Highway Bridge Program (HBP)	State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) <i>Off-system</i>
Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)	Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) <i>Off-system</i>
State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) <i>Off-system</i>	
Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG)	

# ***AGENDA ITEM 11***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	California Transportation Commission Meeting Highlights: June 2022

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file the June 2022 California Transportation Commission (CTC) meeting highlights.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**June 29 – 30, 2022 CTC Meeting [\(Agenda\)](#)**

TABS 19 - 24	Presentation of Draft 2022 Senate Bill 1 competitive program guidelines and Trade Corridor Enhancement fund estimate
TAB 59	Update on the 2023 Active Transportation Program
TAB 96	Request of \$54,475,000 for two locally-administered STIP projects, on the State ighway System
TAB 97	Request of \$10,133,000 for nine locally-administered STIP and PPM projects, off the State Highway System
TAB 112	Request of \$28,297,000 for 22 locally-administered ATP projects, off the State Highway System
TAB 113	Request of \$11,906,000 for six locally-administered ATP projects, off the State Highway System, programmed in FY 2022-23
TAB 129	Request to extend the period of allocation for 25 locally-administered ATP projects, per ATP guidelines
TAB 135	Request to extend the period of contract award for 12 locally-administered ATP projects, per ATP guidelines

# ***AGENDA ITEM 12***

<b><i>RIVERSIDE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION</i></b>	
<b>DATE:</b>	July 18, 2022
<b>TO:</b>	Technical Advisory Committee
<b>FROM:</b>	Jillian Guizado, Planning and Programming Director
<b>SUBJECT:</b>	RCTC Commission Meeting Highlights: June and July 2022

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

This item is to receive and file the June and July 2022 Commission meeting highlights.

**BACKGROUND INFORMATION:**

**June 2022 Commission Meeting ([Agenda](#))**

Item 6 – Public Hearing – Proposed Budget for Fiscal Year (FY) 2022/23

The Commission:

1. Received input on the proposed FY 2022/23 Budget;
2. Approved the salary schedule effective July 14, 2022, located in Appendix B of the proposed FY 2022/23 Budget;
3. Authorized the expenditure of \$778,800 of 91 Express Lanes toll revenues designated as surplus in accordance with the 2013 Toll Revenue Bonds Indenture to fund Commission costs related to the development of agreements specific to the funding, construction, operations, maintenance, and use of toll revenues for the future direct, tolled connector linking the SR-241 toll road to the 91 Express Lanes (241/91 Connector);
4. Adopted Resolution No. 22-009 *“Resolution of Fixing the Employer Contribution Under the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act at an Equal Amount for Employees and Annuitants”* to increase the health care premium contribution up to a maximum of \$1,500 per month to each employee or non-vested retiree beginning August 1, 2022, as approved by the Executive Committee on March 9, 2022;
5. Closed the public hearing on the proposed FY 2022/23 Budget; and
6. Adopted the proposed FY 2022/23 Budget.

Item 7J – Fiscal Years 2022/23 – 2026/27 Measure A Five-Year Capital Improvement Plans for the Local Streets and Roads Program

The Commission approved the Fiscal Years 2022/23 – 2026/27 Measure A Five-Year Capital Improvement Plans for Local Streets and Roads as submitted by the participating agencies.

Item 7M – Fiscal Year 2022/23 Short Range Transit Plan Updates and Transit Funding Allocations

The Commission:

1. Approved the Fiscal Years 2022/23 – FY 2024/25 Draft Short Range Transit Plans (SRTPs) for the cities of Banning, Beaumont, Corona, and Riverside; Palo Verde Valley Transit Agency (PVVTA); Riverside Transit Agency (RTA); SunLine Transit Agency (SunLine); and the Commission's FY 2022/23 – 2026/27 SRTTP for the Rail and Vanpool Programs;
2. Approved Fiscal Year 2022/23 Transit Operator Funding Allocations of 2009 Measure A, Local Transportation Funds, State Transit Assistance, and State of Good Repair for Banning, Beaumont, Corona, and Riverside; PVVTA; RTA; SunLine; and the Commission's Rail and Vanpool Programs aggregating \$156,413,915;
3. Adopted Resolution No. 22-011, *"Resolution of the Riverside County Transportation Commission to Allocate Local Transportation Funds and State Transit Assistance Funds For the Fiscal Year 2022/23"*;
4. Approved the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307, 5311, 5337, and 5339 Program of Projects (POP) for Riverside County as detailed in the respective transit operators' SRTPs; and
5. Directed staff to submit the federally funded and regionally significant projects to the Southern California Association of Governments for inclusion into the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) as needed for the FTA POP.

Item 9 – Agreement for Preparation of the Project Approval and Environmental Document for the Interstate-10/Highland Springs Avenue Interchange Improvements

The Commission:

1. Awarded Agreement No. 22-72-011-00 to Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. to provide Preparation of Project Approval/Environmental Documents for the I-10/Highland Springs Avenue Interchange Improvements in the cities of Banning and Beaumont (Project) for a twenty-four-month term in the amount of \$2,199,634, plus a contingency amount of \$219,963, for a total amount not to exceed \$2,419,597, contingent upon final TUMF funding approval by Western Riverside Council of Governments (WRCOG) Executive Committee;
2. Authorized the Chair or Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to finalize and execute Agreement No. 22-72-011-00, on behalf of the Commission;
3. Authorized the Executive Director, or designee, to approve contingency work up to the total not to exceed amount as required for these services;



4. Approved Agreement No. 22-72-091-00 with WRCOG for additional Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee Zone funding for the Project in the amount of \$1,000,000;
5. Authorized the Chair or Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to finalize and execute Agreement No. 22-72-091-00, on behalf of the Commission; and
6. Authorized the Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute any future non-funding related amendments to the agreements.

### **July 2022 Commission Meeting [\(Agenda\)](#)**

Item 6 – Public Hearing – Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program – Certification of Final Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), CEQA Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and Approval of Project

1. Conduct a public hearing on the proposed Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program and matters relating to the Program’s compliance with CEQA, including the Final Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report (EIS/EIR) for the Program, CEQA Findings of Fact, Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; and
2. Adopt Resolution No. 22-015 *“Resolution of the Riverside County Transportation Commission Certifying the Final Tier 1/Program Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Coachella Valley-San Gorgonio Pass Rail Corridor Service Program, Adopting Findings of Fact under the California Environmental Quality Act, Adopting a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Adopting a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and Approving the Program”*.

Item 7C – Active Transportation Program – Southern California Association of Governments 2023 Regional Program Guidelines – Selection Criteria for Riverside County Applications

1. Approve the project selection criteria for inclusion in the Metropolitan Planning Organizations’ (MPO) Regional Program Guidelines for Active Transportation Program Cycle 6; and
2. Authorize staff to award projects based on the approved selection criteria for the MPO funding.

Item 7J – Fiscal Year 2020/21 Transportation Development Act and Measure A Audit Results

This item is for the Commission to receive and file the Transportation Development Act (TDA) and Measure A audit results report for Fiscal Year 2020/21.

Item 7K – Interstate 15 Cross-County Toll Segment with the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority

1. Approve the Interstate 15 Terms of Agreement with the San Bernardino County Transportation Authority (SBCTA), outlining SBCTA will build and operate the I-15 Cross-County Toll Segment within Riverside County, including schedule of payments summarizing annual toll revenue transfers to the Commission;
2. Authorize staff to proceed with developing a cooperative agreement with SBCTA detailing material project terms during design and construction phases, and operations for the proposed I-15 Cross-County Toll Segment;
3. Authorize staff to proceed with initiating the due diligence process with the U.S. Department of Transportation's (US DOT) Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) office to review and approve both the toll revenue transfers and sub-lease approach with SBCTA;
4. Authorize the Executive Director, or designee, to negotiate and execute sole-source contract amendments, as it is in the best interest for both the public and Commission to conduct a non-competitive procurement, as follows:
  - a. Amend the I-15 Express Lanes contract with Parsons Transportation Group (PTG) as the project/construction management (PCM) in the amount of \$1,534,912 (Agreement No. 15-31-001-10) for design support, cooperative agreement development, construction support, finance support and tolling interface coordination;
  - b. Amend the I-15 Express Lanes contract with Kapsch TrafficCom USA Inc. (Kapsch) as the Toll Service Provider (TSP) in the estimated amount of \$50,000 to provide design reviews to assess impacts to the existing tolling system;
5. Approve Fiscal Year 2022/23 Budget Amendment with \$593,300 in Local Reimbursements for consultant costs associated with the delivery and coordination of the I-15 Cross-County Toll Segment to be reimbursed by SBCTA;
6. Authorize the pursuit of approximately \$8 million in Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for design and construction phase costs for express lane access improvements near Cantu-Galleano Ranch Road for the I-15 Cross-County Toll Segment; and
7. Authorize the Chair or Executive Director, pursuant to legal counsel review, to execute all necessary agency agreements or amendments to existing agency agreements for TIFIA due diligence and for SBCTA to operate the I-15 Cross-County Toll Segment within Riverside County.

Item 9 – Meeting Format Options

This item is for the Commission to provide direction regarding approach to future meetings.