



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
www.lakeapc.org

525 South Main Street, Ukiah, CA 95482
Administration: Suite G ~ 707-234-3314
Planning: Suite B ~ 707-263-7799

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING

AGENDA

Thursday, November 16, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

Primary Location:

City of Lakeport
Large Conference Room, 225 Park Street, Lakeport

Teleconference Locations:

525 South Main Street Suite B, Ukiah
Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka
14050 Olympic Drive, Clearlake

General Public Teleconference:

Zoom videoconference link is provided by request. Please send comments to our Senior Transportation Planner, John Speka, at spekaj@dow-associates.com and note the agenda item number being addressed. Oral comments will also be accepted by telephone or video during the meeting when public comment is invited.

Dial-in number: 1 (669) 900-6833 / Meeting ID: 872 6309 6216 # Password: 313306

**Zoom link provided to members in distribution email and to public by request*

1. Call to order
2. Approval of October 26, 2023 Minutes
3. 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program/State Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP/STIP) Discussion and Approval (*Villa*)
4. Discussion and Recommendation on Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Project Selection Strategy (*Villa*)
5. Announcements and Reports
 - a. Lake APC
 - i. Update on Planning Grants (*Speka*)
 - ii. Miscellaneous
 - b. Lake Transit Authority
 - i. Transit Hub Update (*Sookne/Davey-Bates verbal report*)
 - ii. Current Transit Projects (*Sookne/Davey-Bates verbal report*)
 - iii. Miscellaneous
 - c. Caltrans
 - i. Lake County Projects Update
 - ii. Miscellaneous

- d. Regional Housing Update
 - e. Local Agency Updates
6. Information Packet
 7. Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda
 8. Next Proposed Meeting – **December 21, 2023**
 9. Adjourn meeting

Public Expression - The TAC welcomes participation in TAC meetings. Comments will be limited for items not on the agenda to three minutes per person, and not more than 10 minutes per subject, so that everyone may be heard. This time is limited to matters under TAC jurisdiction which have not already been considered by the TAC.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Requests - To request disability-related modifications or accommodations for accessible locations or meeting materials in alternative formats (*as allowed under Section 12132 of the ADA*) please contact the Lake APC office at 707-263-7799 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Posted: November 9, 2023

List of Attachments:

Agenda Item #2 – 10/26/23 Draft Lake TAC Minutes

Agenda Item #3 – Staff Report & 2024 Draft RTIP

Agenda Item #4 – CRP Staff Report & Policy



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL

Lisa Davey-Bates, Executive Director
www.lakeapc.org

525 South Main Street, Ukiah, CA 95482
Administration: Suite G ~ 707-234-3314
Planning: Suite B ~ 707-263-7799

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING Draft Meeting Minutes

Thursday, October 26, 2023
9:02 a.m.

Primary Location:

City of Lakeport Large Conference Room, 225 Park Street, Lakeport

Teleconference Locations:

525 South Main Street Suite B, Ukiah
Caltrans District 1, 1656 Union St., Eureka
City Council Chamber, 14050 Olympic Drive, Clearlake

Present

James Sookne, Lake Transit Authority
Ron Ladd, City of Lakeport
Alan Flora, City of Clearlake (City Manager)
Scott DeLeon, County of Lake, Public Works Director
Blake Batten, Caltrans District 1
Dave Swartz, City of Clearlake (Engineering Consultant)
Victor Fernandez, City of Lakeport (Community Development, Associate Planner)

Absent

Mireya Turner, County of Lake (Community Development Director)
Efrain Cortez, California Highway Patrol

Also Present

Lisa Davey-Bates, Lake Area Planning Council
Nephele Barrett, Lake Area Planning Council
Michael Villa, Lake Area Planning Council
Alexis Pedrotti, Lake Area Planning Council
Jody Lowblad, Lake Area Planning Council
Adeline Leyba, City of Clearlake (Public Works)
John Everett, County of Lake (Public Works)
Tasha Ahlstrand, Caltrans District 1
Kyle Finger, Caltrans District 1
Jeff Pimentel, Caltrans District 1
Lauren Picou, Headway Consultant
Lars Ewing, Lake County Public Services
Joey Hejnowicz, City of Lakeport

1. **Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:02 a.m.

2. Approval of August 24, 2023 Minutes

Alan noted Victor having been mis-titled as the Community Development “Director.” Lisa mentioned that staff would change that.

Motion by Alan, seconded by James, and carried unanimously to approve the August 24, 2023, minutes.

3. 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program/State Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP/STIP)

Michael went over the staff report stating that Lake County region would have \$5,558,000 in funding available for new and existing projects. The August 18th Call for Projects resulted in two applications: one from the City of Clearlake (Dam Road Roundabout), and a second from the County (South Main Street/Soda Bay Road Improvements). Both are noted as priority projects by the Lake APC Board through past resolutions, and both are seeking the entire (or close to the entire) amount of available funds. Michael reminded TAC members that, although the Lake 29 project is not seeking any of the available funds this year, they should keep in mind that it remains a third priority project for the region and that Lake APC staff will likely be seeking funds in future cycles as needed.

Adeline presented the application for the City of Clearlake in which funding is needed for the Dam Road Roundabout project. Considered to be regional need based on collision data on State Route 53 in this area, the project has completed the environmental phase and will soon begin the design and right-of-way phases, both funded. The project will serve a key section of the City including large retail, schools, a courthouse, behavioral health services, and soon the regional transit center and new housing developments as well. Alan added that during peak hours, traffic backs up onto Highway 53 at the four way stop intersection which the roundabout will replace. The requested funds would not be enough to complete construction, and the City is currently looking at ways to cover the shortfalls such as available local funds, or possible competitive grant funding through the Local Partnership Program (LPP).

Scott discussed the County’s South Main Street/Soda Bay Road project. It has been a lengthy and complicated project combining multiple funding sources, as well as including undergrounding utilities and eminent domain issues, with funding needs still needed to complete. As a “corridor” project, the project involves high average daily traffic (ADT) counts and safety/collision challenges. It is uncertain whether PG&E will be able to complete their undergrounding work by next year. The South Main Street phase of the project stretches from the City limits of Lakeport to the intersection with State Route 175, where the corridor turns into Soda Bay Road, the second phase of the project. The requested funds would be used to construct the Soda Bay Road phase of the project. Other funds are already in place for the South Main Street phase, and local funds would be used to cover any remaining shortfalls.

Group discussion went over past uses of STIP funds for leveraging purposes, which resulted in a large amount of SHOPP funds being opened up for the 2C portion of the Lake 29 project. Jeff Pimentel noted that right of way funding for 2B was put forward by D1 for nomination in this year’s Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). Traditionally, this would have included Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds as well, but this year’s nomination would be considering ITIP funding alone. Jeff added the caveat that until the recommendation was officially made, a risk remains that the CTC would still seek local RIP shares. However, the discussion with Caltrans HQ staff to this point was to use only ITIP money. Staff recommendations on the ITIP were expected by November 15.

Michael asked the TAC members to begin the project scoring, which would ultimately determine which project application should receive this year's available STIP funding. Neither of the Lakeport representatives, Ron (Public Works) and Victor (Community Development), were able to complete the scoring sheets. Scott (County of Lake Public Works) scored the County's South Main Street/Soda Bay Road (83 out of 100) above Clearlake's Dam Road Roundabout (72). Alan (City of Clearlake Community Development) scored the Dam Road Roundabout (85) above the County's project (69). James (LTA) scored Clearlake's project (80) above the County's (57). Blake (Caltrans) scored Dam Road Roundabout above Soda Bay Road, 90 to 86. It was considered sufficient to have only one vote apiece for the County and Clearlake, as opposed to including other potential voting members (County Community Development, or Clearlake Public Works). The highest scored project was therefore Clearlake's Dam Road Roundabout, 3 to 1.

Lisa discussed how STIP guidelines require that money cannot be programmed for a project unless it was fully funded, either with the requested STIP funds themselves, or in combination with other identified funding sources. The County's may have the needed additional funding available to fully fund its project, although the project has an uncertain timeline based on PG&E's timeline for the undergrounding work. Clearlake, on the other hand, doesn't currently have the additional funds needed to fully fund the roundabout.

Since the Clearlake project isn't "ready" with clearly identified funds to supplement the STIP money, one option would be to reserve the currently available STIP funds, to be programmed for their project once they secure the rest of the needed funds (i.e. LLP grants, local funds, etc.).

Alan made a motion to accept the scoring in which the Dam Road Roundabout was ranked the highest and put the currently available STIP funds on reserve. No second was made, and further discussion ensued.

A second option was provided by Lisa for the \$5,558,000 to be reserved without going to a specific project. If LPP funds were obtained in the next year or so, Clearlake could request the STIP funds again at that point. If they were otherwise unsuccessful in securing additional funds, the available STIP could be used elsewhere (i.e. a different project).

Dave Swartz made a second on Alan's original motion. Instead of a vote, further discussion focused on whether the County's project was further along and more prepared for the STIP funds. Dipping into future funds was presented as another option, potentially funding both projects.

Alan's original motion was rescinded.

James suggested that if future funds were to be considered, why not program the County's project now and reserve future funds for Clearlake's roundabout.

Alan made a new motion to fund set aside current and future RTIP/STIP funds for both City of Clearlake and the County of Lake projects, which can be amended into to future STIP cycles. Scott seconded. Role call vote; Ron Ladd- yes, Dave Swartz- yes, James Sookne- no, Blake Batten- yes, Victor Fernandez- yes, Alan Flora- yes, Scott De Leon- yes. Motion passes.

4. Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Discussion and Approval

Michael discussed the 2021 cycle having \$55,924 available. A Call for Projects was made on September 12, with a single request made by the County for the Kelseyville sidewalk project. The total needed for the project is \$131,491. Scott described some of the project details including curb/gutter/sidewalks and ADA compliant ramps along Konocti Road between the high school and middle school in Kelseyville. Estimated construction would occur next

summer during the school break.

Motion by Alan, seconded by James, to award the HIP funds to the Kelseyville Project as submitted in their application. Motion passes unanimously.

5. Review and Approval of the Lake APC Overall Work Program Policy and Application Instructions

Lexi discussed forms and guidelines that she had developed to help with the annual OWP application process. These are meant to provide information on how to apply for OWP funds, the types of deliverables that will be expected in the process of using the funds, and the expected expenditure dates based on the type of funds that will be involved (e.g. Rural Planning Assistance, Local Transportation Funds, etc.).

Motion by Alan, seconded by Scott, and carried unanimously to approve the Lake APC OWP Program Policy and Application Instructions as written and send to Lake APC Board for final approval.

6. Announcements and Reports

a. Lake APC

i. Grant Updates

Lisa reported that staff was successful in its application through the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant program for a Wildfire Evacuation and Preparedness Plan, but was unsuccessful for two more, one for a Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Plan, and the other a Clear Lake Ferry Service Feasibility Study. A new cycle for the program was recently opened and staff was planning on applying for funds for a Tribal Lands Access Needs Study. Other applications that were recently submitted included one for a Reconnecting Communities Program grant in the City of Clearlake, and FTA 5310 funds to assist LTA with its NEMT services.

ii. Update on Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

Michael discussed amounts over the past two years. For Cycle 1, there was \$118,677, and \$121,050 for Cycle 2, with the combined amount still available. The TAC was given a chance to review criteria and discussion followed about the types of projects that could qualify. Funds won't need to be obligated until September 2025. The item was continued until the November TAC meeting.

iii. Miscellaneous

None

b. Lake Transit Authority

i. Transit Hub Update

James reported that they had another meeting with Caltrans to see if their staff can allocate all the money at once for design and construction, or if they have to go with the 30% design before additional funding would be allocated. Also, what would actually constitute 30% design for a non-road/building design. Due to continued Caltrans staff turnover, LTA staff has been unable to get a firm answer. Another meeting is scheduled for next week.

ii. Current Transit Projects – None

iii. Miscellaneous - None

c. Caltrans

i. Lake County Projects Update

The Northshore Complete Streets Project Team is incorporating feedback from recent town hall meetings held in recent months. Also, a Clean California “Large Item Dump Day” was held on October 14.

ii. Miscellaneous

Blake encouraged TAC members to attend the Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Workshop taking place later today. The 2024 cycle deadline is in January.

d. Local Agency Updates

City of Lakeport: None

City of Clearlake: Alan reported that the City obtained a Clean California grant involving signage that would be started soon. Also, another Clean California grant was to be used for beautification of areas along Lakeshore Drive. Other projects include recent design work for over 20 miles of new pavement projects, and the completion of the ATP project on Dam Road Extension.

County of Lake: Lars Ewing discussed park beautification projects in the County. Scott went over some chip seal projects that Public Works had completed with a new chip seal cart recently purchased, which was much more efficient than its older one, allowing for extra work to be done. The first year of a 10-year rehabilitation plan would be put out to bid soon targeting the Red Hills Road area of Cobb Mountain. The Board of Supervisors will also be contracting with Coastland Consulting (November 7) for staff augmentation services for its engineering and inspections division. Finally, the Middletown Multi-Use Trail project that had been on hold during the site visit in October is moving again with the contract issues having been resolved. Weather permitting, the project could be completed by mid-November.

General discussion involving problems and delays when working within Caltrans right-of-way (e.g. encroachment permitting, etc.). Lisa noted it may be worth having a discussion between the appropriate Caltrans officials and TAC members. Blake agreed to pass the word along.

7. **Information Packet** – Caltrans Milestone Report for Lake County- September 10, 2023
8. **Public input on any item under the jurisdiction of this agency, but which is not otherwise on the above agenda** – None
9. **Next Proposed Meeting** – November 16, 2023
10. **Adjourn Meeting** – Meeting adjourned at 11:05

Respectfully Submitted,

John Speka
Lake Area Planning Council



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL TAC STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Draft 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
STIP Fund Estimate

DATE PREPARED: 11/09/2023

MEETING DATE: 11/16/2023

SUBMITTED BY: Michael Villa, Project Coordinator

BACKGROUND:

Each odd-numbered year we consider the programming of projects that are to be included in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) that goes into effect July 1 of the following year. We do this by developing our Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) which programs our Regional Improvement Program (RIP) shares of funding as identified by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) in the Fund Estimate (FE).

The CTC approved the Fund Estimate for 2024 STIP at the August 16-17, 2023 meeting. The FE identifies a STIP programming target through FY 2028/29 of \$3,756,000. Of the \$3,756,000, \$188,000 will be programmed for Planning, Programming and Monitoring leaving \$3,568,000 to be available for projects. In the previous STIP cycle we had an unprogrammed balance of \$1,919,000 and lapsed funds of \$71,000 from FY 19/20 which have been added to the 2024 FE increasing the total for projects to \$5,558,000 through FY 28/29

The 2024 FE also identified a Maximum Net Share of \$17,030,000 through FY 31/32. At the October meeting, TAC members were informed that using these advanced shares would lower future STIP cycle funds.

At the October TAC meeting, members scored the projects using the previously adopted scoring criteria in favor of the Dam Road/Dam Road Extension Roundabout. After further discussing the funding and readiness for each project, the TAC decided to recommend reserving the \$5,558,000 target share through FY 28/29 funds as well as reserving \$5,500,000 of the 11,472,000 advanced shares through FY31/32 to program or allocate funds for both projects as soon as each are ready. This decision came about with the uncertainty of when each project will be ready for Construction. These are projects that have both been identified as regional priority projects per Resolution 17-18-10.

Additionally, existing funding for the Lakeport Boulevard and South Main Street Intersection Project will be deprogrammed and reprogrammed for the Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project. This project will be split into two phases. The \$894,000 of RIP funds programmed for the original project will be reprogrammed into Phase 1 of the new project. These funds were previously programmed for Lakeport using the old formula funding distribution method, so they are not subject to the competitive process.

At the November APC Board meeting, the Board discussed the recommendation by the TAC in reserving the FY 28/29 target share of \$5,558,000 and a portion of the advanced shares though FY 31/32 in the amount of \$5,500,000 for both the Soda Bay Road Rehabilitation and Bike Lane Phase 2 project and the Dam Road/Dam Road Extension Roundabout project, respectively. After discussion, the Board gave APC staff direction to move forward with reserving the funds to later be presented at the December APC Board meeting for Public Hearing and Adoption.

Attached you will find a draft of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program for the Lake County Region. This is the document that explains how the region will use the STIP funds. The document is updated every two years and outlines funding for the next five years.

At this time, it is recommended that the TAC recommend approval of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program to the Board for Public Hearing and Adoption at the December Board Meeting.

ACTION REQUIRED: Recommend adoption of the RTIP to the APC Board.

ALTERNATIVES: Modifications to the Draft RTIP may be proposed by the TAC. This can include schedule changes to existing projects.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend adoption of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program to the APC Board.

Lake County/City Area Planning Council

2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program

Proposed Adoption: December 13, 2023

INSERT COVER LETTER

2024 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (2024 RTIP)

Table of Contents

Page Number

Cover Letter

A. Overview and Schedule

Section 1. Executive Summary	X
Section 2. General Information	X
Section 3. Background of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)	X
Section 4. Completion of Prior RTIP Projects	X
Section 5. RTIP Outreach and Participation	X

B. 2024 STIP Regional Funding Request

Section 6. 2024 STIP Regional Share and Request for Programming	X
Section 7. Overview of Other Funding Included in Delivery of RTIP Projects	X
Section 8. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) Funding/Needs.	X
Section 9. Multi-Modal Corridors - Projects Planned Within the Corridor	X
Section 10. Highways to Boulevards Conversion Pilot Program	X
Section 11. Complete Streets Consideration	X

C. Relationship of RTIP to RTP/SCS/APS and Benefits of RTIP

Section 12. Regional Level Performance Evaluation	X
Section 13. Regional and Statewide Benefits of RTIP	X

D. Performance and Effectiveness of RTIP

Section 14. Evaluation of the Cost Effectiveness of RTIP	X
Section 15. Project Specific Evaluation	X

E. Detailed Project Information

Section 16. Overview of Projects Programmed with RIP Funding	X
--	---

F. Appendices

Section 17. Project Programming Request (PPR) Forms	X
Section 18. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2022 RTIP Approval	X
Section 19. Fact Sheet	X
Section 20. Documentation on Coordination with Caltrans District (Optional)	X
Section 21. Detailed Project Programming Summary Table (Optional)	X
Section 22. Alternative Delivery Methods (Optional)	X
Section 23. Additional Appendices (Optional)	X

Regional agency will complete the Table of Contents above.

This page is left blank.

A. Overview and Schedule

Section 1. Executive Summary

The Lake County/City Area Planning Council (APC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Lake County. The APC is required by California State Law to prepare and adopt a Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) by December 15 of each odd numbered year. This RTIP has been developed in conformance with State law and the adopted 2022 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan.

At the August 16-17, 2023 CTC meeting, the California Transportation Commission adopted the 2024 State Transportation Improvement Program Fund Estimate. The Fund Estimate identified a STIP programming target through FY 2028/29 of \$3,756,000 for the Lake County region. The available funding includes \$188,000 available for Planning, Programming & Monitoring, leaving \$3,568,000 available for projects. There is also \$1,919,000 available that was not programmed in the 2022 RTIP as well as \$71,000 in lapsed funds from 19/20. This leaves a total of \$5,558,000 available for projects.

The \$5,558,000 available has not been programmed for new or existing projects; it will be reserved for cost increases at allocation for the Soda Bay Road Rehabilitation Project.

Future Funding Commitments

An additional \$5,500,000 will be reserved for future funding using the advance STIP Maximum Net Shares for the City of Clearlake's Dam Road/Dam Road Extension Roundabout.

Programming Changes

The Lakeport Boulevard and South Main Street Intersection Improvement project will be deprogrammed and reprogrammed as the Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project. This project will be separated into two phases. Funds programmed for the former project will be reprogrammed for Phase 1 of the project and Phase 2 will be programmed when funds become available.

Section 2. General Information

- **Regional Agency Name**

Lake County/City Area Planning Council

Regional Agency Website Link: <http://www.lakeapc.org>

RTIP document link: <https://www.lakeapc.org/library/plans/>

RTP link: <https://www.lakeapc.org/library/plans/>

- **Regional Agency Executive Director/Chief Executive Officer Contact Information**

Name Lisa Davey-Bates

Title Executive Director
Email ldaveybates@dbcteam.net
Telephone 707-234-3314

- **RTIP Manager Staff Contact Information**

Name Michael Villa Title Project Coordinator
Address 525 South Main Street, Suite B
City/State Ukiah, CA
Zip Code 95482
Email villam@dow-associates.com
Telephone 707-263-7799

- **California Department of Transportation Headquarter Staff Contact Information**

Name Sudha Kodali Title Chief, Division of Financial Programming
Address Department of Transportation. Mail Station 82. P.O. Box 942874
City/State Sacramento, CA
Zip Code 94274
Email sudha.kodali@dot.ca.gov
Telephone 916-216-2630

- **California Transportation Commission (CTC) Staff Contact Information**

Name Kacey Ruggiero Title Assistant Deputy Director
Address 1120 N Street
City/State Sacramento, CA
Zip Code 95814
Email Kacey.Ruggiero@catc.ca.gov
Telephone 916-707-1388

Section 3. Background of Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP)

A. What is the Regional Transportation Improvement Program?

The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a program of highway, local road, transit and active transportation projects that a region plans to fund with State and Federal revenue programmed by the California Transportation Commission in the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The RTIP is developed biennially by the regions and is due to the Commission by December 15 of every odd numbered year. The program of projects in the RTIP is a subset of projects in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), a federally mandated master transportation plan which guides a region's transportation investments over a 20 to 25 year period. The RTP is based on all reasonably anticipated funding, including federal, state and local sources. Updated every 4 to 5 years, the RTP is developed through an extensive public participation process in the region and reflects the unique mobility, sustainability, and air quality needs of each region.

Additionally, the Corridor Management Plan (CMP) is a long-range conceptual document detailing how a corridor is performing, why it is performing that way, and how it may perform in the future. The CMP recommends projects and strategies to achieve corridor goals and objectives. The goals of the Lake 20/29/53 CMP are to improve traveler safety, improve mobility through efficiency and reliability, increase multimodal access, economic opportunity and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions along the corridor. The plan lays out the district’s vision for medium and long-term concept development, while conveying key aspects of the existing and planned multimodal transportation corridor.

B. Regional Agency’s Historical and Current Approach to developing the RTIP

The APC has identified priority, regionally significant projects to be considered for RTIP funding. In STIP cycles when those projects do not need funding, or there are remaining funds available after providing for those projects, local agencies may apply for funding. Funds are then awarded based on adopted criteria. The project recommendations are made by the Technical Advisory Committee then presented to the APC Board, typically in November. The final RTIP and project selection is then adopted by the APC Board at a public hearing in November or December.

Section 4. Completion of Prior RTIP Projects (Required per Section 78)

Project Name and Location	Description	Summary of Improvements/Benefits
Clearlake Guard Rails	Install a 120 foot guardrail at the intersection of Ridgeview and Old Highway 53, and a 95 foot guardrail at Davis and Old Highway 53	Improved safety with addition of guardrails.
Olympic and Old Highway 53 Intersection Signal Controller	Replace failing signal controller at the intersection of Lakeshore Blvd and Old Highway 53	New Signal controller installed benefitting traffic flow.

Section 5. RTIP Outreach and Participation

A. RTIP Development and Approval Schedule

Action	Date
CTC adopts Fund Estimate and Guidelines	August 16-17, 2023
Caltrans identifies State Highway Needs	September 15, 2023
Caltrans submits draft ITIP	October 15, 2023
CTC ITIP Hearing, South	November 1, 2023
CTC ITIP Hearing, North	November 8, 2023
Regional Agency adopts 2024 RTIP	RTPA Board Approval Date
Regions submit RTIP to CTC	December 15, 2023
Caltrans submits ITIP to CTC	December 15, 2023

CTC STIP Hearing, North	January 25, 2024
CTC STIP Hearing, South	February 1, 2024
CTC publishes staff recommendations	March 1, 2024
CTC Adopts 2024 STIP	March 21-22, 2024

B. Community Engagement

Provide how community engagement was performed and the benefits the RTIP will achieve once implemented. The discussion should include any potential negative impacts and how these will be mitigated as well as how the mitigation strategy was developed in coordination with the impacted community (see section 23 and 24H).

RTIP projects are derived from the Regional Transportation Plan, which is developed through extensive public participation. While outreach for RTP updates has traditionally been conducted through workshops at various locations throughout the County, COVID-19 protocols in place for much of 2020 and 2021 have required alternative forms of engagement. An online interactive mapping platform was used instead for this purpose, soliciting input through “virtual” means such as mapped location-based comments, opinion surveys, and budget preference tools. Early in the planning and design process, involve community members and environmental organizations to identify potential environmental issues as well as potential avoidance, minimization and mitigation opportunities. Interagency and Intergovernmental involvement included outreach to all cities and the county and consultation with Tribal governments at initial stages of plan development, and throughout the process. In addition to the public participation that goes into the RTP, the RTIP is then developed through a series of public meetings, including a public hearing which is noticed in regional newspapers. As described in Section 4, priority regional projects have been established by the APC. When available and if needed, funding is awarded to these projects prior to other projects being considered for funding. If additional funding is available, projects are selected through a competitive process using adopted criteria.

C. Consultation with Caltrans District (Required per Section 20)

Insert the Caltrans District Number in the text field below.

Caltrans District: 1

Provide narrative on consultation with Caltrans District staff in the text field below as is required per Section 20 of the STIP Guidelines.

The APC works with Caltrans in preparation of the RTIP through the Technical Advisory Committee and through participation on the Policy Advisory Committee. For regionally funded projects on the State system, the APC receives information from project managers at Caltrans regarding needed programming, which is then proposed in the RTIP. No funding of this nature is proposed in this RTIP.

B. 2024 STIP Regional Funding Request

Section 6. 2024 STIP Regional Share and Request for Programming

A. 2024 Regional Fund Share Per 2024 STIP Fund Estimate

Insert your agency's target share per the STIP Fund Estimate in the text field below.

\$5,746,000

B. Summary of Requested Programming – Insert information in table below. Identify any proposals for the Advanced Project Development Element (APDE) share, if identified in the fund estimate, by including “(APDE)” after the project name and location. Identify requests to advance future county shares for a larger project by including “(Advance)” after the project name and location.

Project Name and Location	Project Description	Requested RIP Amount
Planning, Programming & Monitoring		\$188,000
Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project Phase 1		\$894,000

Section 7. Overview of Other Funding Included With Delivery of Regional Improvement Program (RIP) Projects

Provide narrative on other funding included with the delivery of projects included in your RTIP. Discuss if project’s other funds will require Commission approval for non-proportional spending allowing for the expenditure of STIP funds before other funds (sometimes referred to as sequential spending). **Insert information in the table below.**

Click here to enter text.

Proposed 2024 RTIP	Total RTIP	Other Funding							Total Project Cost
		ITIP	Local Funds	HBP	HSIP	SHOPP	DEMO	Utility Underground Funding	
Lake 29 Expressway (Segment 2C)	15630	17951				72882			106463
Lake 29 Expressway (Segment 2A)	900	5100							97000*
Lake 29 Expressway (Segment 2B)	900	5100							133000**
South Main St. Widening & Bike Lanes	6725		47	202			2985	1250	11209
Soda Bay Rd. Widening & Bike Lanes	1503		353		202		1958	1250	5266
Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project Phase 1	965		420						1385
									-
									-
									-
									-
Totals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes: * Includes \$91,000 of Future Unfunded Needs
 ** Includes \$127,000 of Future Unfunded Needs

Section 8. Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) Funding and Needs

The purpose of the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) is to improve interregional mobility for people and goods in the State of California. As an interregional program, the ITIP is focused on increasing the throughput for highway and rail corridors of strategic importance outside the urbanized areas of the state. A sound transportation network between and connecting urbanized areas ports and borders is vital to the state's economic vitality. The ITIP is prepared in accordance with Government Code Section 14526, Streets and Highways Code Section 164 and the STIP Guidelines. The ITIP is a five-year program managed by Caltrans and funded with 25% of new STIP revenues in each cycle. Developed in cooperation with regional transportation planning agencies to ensure an integrated transportation program, the ITIP promotes the goal of improving interregional mobility and connectivity across California.

No ITIP funding is requested. Lake APC is supportive of the Lucerne Complete Streets Improvement Project proposed in the 2022 Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP).

Lake County has no rail network, the majority of people travel the region via the interregional highways via private car or bus service from the Lake Transit Authority (LTA). Currently the most traveled highway is the SR 20 Corridor. Because this highway traverses the North Shore of Clear Lake through various small towns, SR 20 is subject to long delays if traffic incidents occur along the corridor. The Area Planning Council's long-term goal is to make the SR 53/SR 29 Corridor the principal arterial corridor through the region. SR 53 and SR 29 are a fair distance from the lake shore therefore less environmentally sensitive. Segment 2C of the Lake 29 Expressway is a 3.1-mile portion of SR 29 has been completed, expanding the highway from two lanes to four lanes. It is Lake APC's priority to continue this expansion in order to accommodate freight traffic and improve safety; relocating truck traffic to SR 29 will also improve bicycle and pedestrian safety along SR 20 which has a narrower roadway and is surrounded by residential development.

Section 9. Projects Planned Within Multi-Modal Corridors

The Lake 29 Improvement Project is the primary component of what is referred to as the region's "Konocti Corridor," the preferred east-west route through Lake County. The project proposes to widen an approximately eight-mile stretch of State Route (SR) 29 from an existing two-lane highway to a four-lane divided highway with controlled access. From west to east on SR 29, the improvements begin just west of its intersection with SR 175 and will end at its intersection with Diener Drive. The overall goals of the project are to improve truck speeds and travel time reliability by providing consistent, free-flow speeds through this segment of SR 29. The project was broken down into three segments to help diffuse the overall burden of funding in its entirety. Segment "2C," roughly consisting of the westernmost three-mile section of the project has been completed. Segment 2B has secured funding for design, however, funding for right-of-way, construction and support costs of the two segments ("2A" and "2B") has yet to be

secured. As part of the larger Konocti Corridor, the project will also encourage interregional traffic to utilize the southshore routes (SR 53 and SR 29) as opposed to SR 20 along the Northshore, where the highway also serves as “Main Street” to the communities of Nice, Lucerne, Glendale and Clearlake Oaks, thereby increasing corridor safety for multimodal users in these areas.

[Click here to enter text.](#)

Section 10. Highways to Boulevards Conversion Pilot Program

Identify potential state routes within the region that might be potential candidates for a highways to boulevards conversion pilot program (see section 24G).

As referenced in Section 8 and 9, SR 20 along the North Shore of Clear Lake serves as a “Main Street” to the communities of Nice, Lucerne, Glendale and Clearlake Oaks. The RTP identifies the effort to divert the majority of traffic through the county to the SR53/SR29 Corridor via the Lake 29 Improvement Project. SR 20 would be a great candidate for the Highways to Boulevards Conversion Pilot Program.

The Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan and Engineered Feasibility Study, completed in 2020, outlines the regional efforts to focus on the local transportation functions served by Highway 20 in these Northshore communities by reducing vehicle speeds and enhancing pedestrian and bicyclist access and safety. The proposed improvements to the Northshore complement the Konocti Corridor projects on Highway 29. The plan is available on the Lake APC website.

SR 281 from post mile 14 to post mile 17 is constructed to state standards. The remainder of the road continues as Soda Bay Road until it reaches SR 29 in Kelseyville. SR 281 does not serve a statewide purpose due to low volumes and a parallel state route, but this area is heavily traveled by pedestrians and bicyclists because of an adjoining residential development. The roadway does not currently have pedestrian or bicycle facilities or an adequate shoulder; currently bicyclists and pedestrians travel directly in the traffic lanes or below the shoulder in a dirt ditch. This route would also be a good candidate for the Highways to Boulevards Conversion Pilot Program.

11. Complete Streets Consideration (per Section 26)

Consistent with Caltrans’ Complete Streets Action Plan, regions should consider incorporating complete streets elements in all highway projects proposed for funding in the STIP.

For local road improvements, regions should consider incorporating complete streets elements as part of their projects proposed for funding in the STIP.

Please describe any complete streets considerations (optional).

The Complete Streets Act of 2008 required the legislative body of a city or county, upon any substantive revision of the circulation element of the general plan, to modify the circulation element. The circulation element plans for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways. Complete Streets remains an especially relevant topic for communities of Lake County as many roads continue to lack adequate infrastructure for multiple users, yet are still shared by motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists throughout the region. Each agency within the Lake County Region considers Complete Streets Elements for all projects.

The Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project Phase 1, incorporates complete streets elements by improving and constructing sidewalks as well as incorporating bike lanes for both sides of the road.

C. Relationship of RTIP to RTP/SCS/APS and Benefits of RTIP

Section 12. Regional Level Performance Evaluation (per Section 22A of the guidelines)

The Lake County region does not have a Sustainable Communities Strategy or Alternative Planning Scenario. The region is not currently monitoring the performance measures listed in the RTIP template other than Pavement Condition Index on local streets and roads. However, as there are no large-scale local road rehabilitation projects included in the STIP programming for the region, this measurement is not relevant to evaluation of this RTIP. As an alternative to the suggested measures, the APC has prepared the following evaluation of the effectiveness of RTIP projects in achieving the goals and objectives of the RTP.

Below are relevant goals, policies, and objectives excerpted from the 2022 Lake County Regional Transportation Plan, adopted by the APC in February of 2022. The following tables from the RTP summarize the projects from the 2022 RTIP, all of which have been carried over from previous STIP cycles. Specific goals, objectives and policies are then listed which support each project, followed by a description of how the projects link to the objectives and policies.

ELEMENT: OVERARCHING POLICIES

Goal: Develop a multi-modal system of seamless transportation facilities designed to serve both regional and interregional needs.

Objectives	Policies
<p>OI-1: Coordinate, support and encourage multi-modal regional planning activities in Lake County across jurisdictional boundaries.</p>	<p>OI-1.1: Participate in the regional planning efforts of other agencies.</p>
	<p>OI-1.2: Coordinate with local and State agencies on health, security and emergency response planning efforts. Work cooperatively with local, regional and State agencies to ensure effective emergency response efforts are well coordinated during natural disasters such as wildfire or flood events.</p>
	<p>OI-1.3: Support non-motorized, recreational opportunities in and around Clear Lake such as increased public access to the lake, trail development for hiking and equestrian uses, and continued efforts to develop a bike route around the lake.</p>
	<p>OI-1.4: Evaluate individual projects with an eye for potential regionwide impacts when formulating, designing and constructing transportation projects of various modes and at all levels.</p>
	<p>OI-1.5: Work with local jurisdictions to further housing goals of the region and to update and implement Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA).</p>
	<p>OI-1.6: Encourage projects that emphasize infill and transit-oriented development within the region.</p>
<p>OI-2: Support Complete Streets planning to improve multi-modal forms of connectivity within the transportation system.</p>	<p>OI-2.1: Pursue funding in partnership with federal, State and local agencies to fund projects consistent with Complete Streets concepts and design strategies.</p>
	<p>OI-2.2: Encourage local agencies to adopt Complete Streets policies and implement Complete Street strategies and projects.</p>
	<p>OI-2.3: Incorporate Complete Streets concepts and policies into future planning documents.</p>
	<p>OI-2.4: Implement existing strategies within planning documents such as Active Transportation Plan and Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan.</p>
	<p>OI-2.5: Encourage and support transit and active transportation.</p>

Objectives	Policies
	<p>planning and facility improvements.</p> <p>OI-2.6: Support efforts to reduce dependency on automobile use including promotion of bicycle/pedestrian transportation and public transit use.</p>
<p>OI-3: Reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions by promoting and facilitating transit use and increasing active transportation alternatives.</p>	<p>OI-3.1: Facilitate implementation of the Active Transportation Plan (ATP) and construction of ATP and older Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects to encourage students to walk and bike to school rather than traveling by car.</p> <p>OI-3.2: Update the Active Transportation Plan consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan update schedule, or as needed to keep the plan current and meaningful.</p> <p>OI-3.3: Support increased frequency/expansion of transit service consistent with the local Unmet Transit Needs process.</p> <p>OI-3.4: Support and facilitate the installation of electric vehicle charging stations for public use. Explore options for affordable, clean energy technology and programs.</p> <p>OI-3.5: Pursue funding to prepare a regional Travel Demand Model to assist in developing projects that will reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) in the region.</p> <p>OI-3.6: Support planning projects that further greenhouse gas reducing efforts at the State level such as SB 32, SB 375, and SB 743.</p> <p>OI-3.7: Support planning projects which will facilitate a transition to zero emission vehicles consistent with Executive Order EO N-79-20.</p>
<p>OI-4: Reduce and mitigate environmental impacts of current and future transportation projects.</p>	<p>OI-4.1: Early in the planning and design process, involve community members and environmental organizations to identify potential environmental issues as well as potential avoidance, minimization and mitigation opportunities.</p> <p>OI-4.2: Work with local jurisdictions to develop project specific mitigation measures as a means of reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) resulting from land use development.</p>
<p>OI-5: Increase funding for</p>	<p>OI-5.1: Pursue both traditional and non-traditional funding sources</p>

Objectives	Policies
transportation planning, pre-construction activities and construction.	for planning, preconstruction and construction of transportation projects.
	OI-5.2: Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other agencies and organizations to secure funding for projects which further the goals, objectives and policies identified in the Regional Transportation Plan.
OI-6: Support planning projects that will benefit public health in the region.	OI-6.1: Pursue funding sources that encourage active transportation and promote active forms of recreation for residents and visitors of all ages and physical capabilities.
	OI-6.2: Encourage non-motorized planning activities that result in lower GHG emissions and other air pollutants as a means of improving air quality in the region.
	OI-6.3: Pursue funding sources for mobility-oriented projects that improve access to health care for seniors, disabled or economically disadvantaged residents of the region.

ELEMENT: STATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Goal: Provide a safe, well-maintained and efficient State highway network that addresses regional and statewide mobility needs for people, goods and services.

Objectives	Policies
SHS-1: Improve mobility on the State highway system throughout Lake County.	SHS-1.1: Support as the highest priority, completion of remaining segments of the Lake 29 (Diener Drive – SR 175) Expressway Project.
	SHS-1.2: Coordinate with Caltrans to seek ITIP, SHOPP, SB 1 and RAISE funding for the Lake 29 (Diener Drive – SR 175) Expressway Project.
	SHS-1.3: Support periodic update of the approved environmental document for the Lake 29 (Diener Drive – SR 175) Expressway Project to ensure its long-term viability in aiding project implementation into the future.
	SHS-1.4: Identify for funding consideration mobility improvements on SR 20 consistent with the Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan and the Active Transportation Plan.

Objectives	Policies
	SHS-1.5: Identify for funding consideration projects consistent with the SR 53 Corridor Study.
	SHS-1.6: Implement strategies and projects to encourage trucks and interregional traffic to use the Principal Arterial Corridor (includes segments of SR 20 and SR 29, and all of 53) for travel through Lake County.
	SHS-1.7: Implement strategies and projects consistent with the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) and California Freight Mobility Plan (CFMP).
SHS-2: Improve safety conditions on the State highway system serving Lake County.	SHS-2.1: Coordinate with Caltrans to identify safety issues, develop solutions and identify funding opportunities. Include regional input into the District 1 State Highway Operations and Protection Plan (SHOPP).
	SHS-2.2: Coordinate with local and State agencies on security and emergency response planning efforts, including the identification of key evacuation and emergency access routes.
	SHS-2.3: Implement traffic calming and safety improvements along State highway segments that function as “Main Streets” within communities such as Middletown, Nice, Lucerne, Glendale and Clearlake Oaks.
	SHS-2.4: Identify for funding consideration safety projects on all State highways (SR 20, SR 29, SR 53, SR 175 and SR 281) in Lake County.
	SHS-2.5: Identify for funding consideration mobility improvements on SR 20 consistent with the Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan.
	SHS-2.6: Cooperate with Caltrans and Lake County to facilitate implementation of the Highway 20 Traffic Calming and Beautification Plan projects in North Shore communities.
	SHS-2.7: Pursue grant funding for studies and projects to improve active transportation alternatives within State highway segments that function as “Main Streets” within Lake County communities.
	SHS-2.8: Consider construction of grade separations (e.g.

Objectives	Policies
	<p>interchanges, overpasses, underpasses) and roundabouts as long-term solutions to safety and capacity issues at major intersections/junctions on the Principal Arterial Corridor.</p> <p>SHS-2.9: Facilitate the identification of State highway related safety issues within local communities and throughout the County.</p> <p>SHS-2.10: Support the continued development of the Upstate CA Regional ITS Master Plan. Upon its completion, ensure that future ITS projects affecting the Lake County region are in conformance with the goals of the Plan.</p>
<p>SHS-3: Facilitate efficient and safe transportation of goods within and through Lake County.</p>	<p>SHS-3.1: Identify constraints to highway freight movement on segments of the Principal Arterial Corridor not yet programmed for improvement.</p> <p>SHS-3.2: Identify for funding consideration mobility improvements along the Principal Arterial Corridor (SR 20, SR 53 and SR 29) consistent with the California Freight Mobility Plan 2020 (CFMP) and Trade Corridor Enhancement Program (TCEP) Guidelines.</p> <p>SHS-3.3: Identify improvements to Minor Arterial segments of the State highway system that facilitate safe and efficient goods movement.</p> <p>SHS-3.4: Work with the California Trucking Association and other industry organizations to improve safety and remove constraints to safe and efficient goods movement.</p> <p>SHS-3.5: When planning and designing road projects, consider the needs of vehicles used for goods movement, including Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) trucks and vehicles transporting agricultural commodities and products.</p>

ELEMENT: BACKBONE CIRCULATION AND LOCAL ROADS

GOAL: Provide a well maintained, safe and efficient local circulation system that is coordinated and complementary to the State highway system, and meets interregional and local mobility needs of residents, visitors and commerce.

Objectives	Policies
<p>LSR-1: Maintain, rehabilitate and construct local streets and roads consistent with</p>	<p>LSR-1.1: Identify local streets and roads reconstruction projects for funding consideration from the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) as well as other sources.</p>

<p>local and regional needs, city and County area plans, and policies and Complete Streets policies.</p>	<p>LSR-1.2: Prioritize funding resources that may be available through the STIP for capital and safety projects ahead of those for potential rehabilitation projects.</p>
	<p>LSR-1.3: Plan and design rehabilitation and reconstruction projects consistent with Complete Streets concepts and design strategies.</p>
	<p>LSR-1.4: Use the Pavement Management Program to identify and prioritize rehabilitation and reconstruction needs.</p>
<p>LSR-2: Develop multi-modal transportation facilities as needed to adequately serve the mobility needs of residential, commercial and industrial development.</p>	<p>LSR-2.1: Coordinate with state and local agencies and developers to ensure that multi-modal transportation alternatives, consistent with the Complete Streets Act, are considered in the design and construction of their transportation projects.</p>
	<p>LSR-2.2: Support establishment of traffic impact fees to construct new transportation facilities associated with new development.</p>
	<p>LSR-2.3: Identify for funding consideration multi-modal mobility improvements on the Eleventh Street corridor in Lakeport consistent with recommendations of the Eleventh Street Corridor Multimodal and Engineered Feasibility Study.</p>
<p>LSR-3: Improve traffic flow, capacity, safety and operations on the local transportation network.</p>	<p>LSR-3.1: Identify for funding consideration local streets and roads capacity, safety, and operational projects from funding sources available through STIP and other resources.</p>
	<p>LSR-3.2: Coordinate with local agencies on security and emergency response planning efforts, including the identification of key evacuation and emergency access routes.</p>
	<p>LSR-3.3: Limit the approval of new direct access points to State highways.</p>
	<p>LSR-3.4: Plan and design local and State improvements consistent with the SR 53 Corridor Study.</p>
	<p>LSR-3.5: Plan and design improvements consistent with the Highway 20 Northshore Communities Traffic Calming Plan.</p>
<p>LSR-4: Pursue federal, State, local and private funding sources for transportation system maintenance, restoration and</p>	<p>LSR-4.1: Consider development and implementation of a Transportation Impact Fee Program in coordination with Caltrans, the County of Lake, the City of Lakeport and the City of Clearlake.</p>
	<p>LSR-4.2: Assist local agencies in identifying and applying for</p>

improvement projects consistent with this Plan.	funding resources for improvements to travel all modes.
	LSR-4.3: Actively pursue funding sources from local, State, federal and private funding sources, including local-option sales taxes, fees and other programs.

ELEMENT: BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN

GOAL: Provide safe, adequate and connected facilities and routes for bicycle and pedestrian travel within and between the communities of Lake County.

Objectives	Policies
AT-1: Facilitate and promote walking, bicycling and other active modes of transportation.	AT-1.1: Increase the utility of the non-motorized transportation network by expanding the extent and connectivity of the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
	AT-1.2: Develop and maintain a non-motorized traffic count program for the region to identify travel demand and investment priorities
	AT-1.3: Work with State and local agencies to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian amenities, like secure bicycle parking facilities, and safety countermeasures into planning requirements and improvement projects.
	AT-1.4: Encourage and assist local agencies to develop and revise planning documents, zoning ordinances and policies to meet the objectives of the Active Transportation Program and the Complete Streets Act.
AT-2: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).	AT-2.1: Act to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled by increasing pedestrian and bicycle trips
	AT-2.2: Promote safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian access to transit
	AT-2.3: Assist local agencies in the adoption of policies, ordinances, and plans that promote more walkable communities with a mix of land uses
	AT-2.4: Encourage VMT reducing mitigation measures for discretionary development projects at the local and state level.
AT-3: Enhance public health through the development of active transportation projects	AT-3.1: Work with local agencies, schools and public health organizations to engineer, educate, encourage, enforce and evaluate bicycle and pedestrian environments for the benefit of all users and all abilities
	AT-3.2: Identify for funding consideration pedestrian facility improvements consistent with the Lake County Pedestrian Facilities Needs Inventory
AT-4: Preserve investments in the multimodal transportation system	AT-4.1: Maintain safe and accessible bicycle and pedestrian environments to encourage active transportation
	AT-4.2: Plan and budget for lifecycle costs when constructing new facilities for active transportation
AT-5: Increase funding for transportation planning, design and construction of active transportation facilities	AT-5.1: Pursue non-traditional funding sources for planning, design and construction of active transportation facilities.
	AT-5.2: Work cooperatively and collaboratively with other agencies to secure funding for projects that further the goals, policies and objectives of the Active Transportation plan.
	AT-5.3: Incorporate bicycle and pedestrian facilities into road improvement and maintenance projects.
	AT-5.4: Encourage local agencies to require new development to install, contribute to and/or maintain bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including end-

Lake County economic development has been impeded by the difficulty of transporting goods into and out of the county. The north shore communities along SR 20 are prime locations for revitalization of the tourism and hospitality industry that thrived early in Lake County's history. Current traffic conditions on the north shore are impeding this revitalization. Along the north shore, residences, schools, parks and shopping destinations are located adjacent to the highway and the interregional and truck traffic moving through these communities has negatively impacted the quality of life for residents and visitors with air pollution, noise and traffic safety. SR 29 is better suited to manage interregional traffic as it does not serve as a main street for any communities and adjacent land uses are mostly agricultural and industrial.

The benefits of a completed project are also in line with the Caltrans 2021 Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP), which identifies the SR 20/29/53 Principal Arterial Corridor as a "Strategic Interregional Corridor". According to the ITSP, the interregional facility "provides the corridor with vital connections to the interstate system and the rest of the State, providing access to basic goods and services along with routine and emergency medical services. Nearly all segments of the SHS are identified as high wildfire exposure by 2055 in the 2019 Caltrans Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment. This corridor would be the major transportation corridor for response and recovery efforts in the event of emergencies such as forest fires. The region and Lake County have experienced increased and high levels of wildland fire damage with significant wildfires in Lake County in 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 burning over 600,000 acres. This project will help move people efficiently out of evacuation areas and provide efficient mobility for emergency response.

The proposed project is expected to improve overall safety for bicyclists by providing widened shoulders that bicyclists can use, thus reducing modal conflicts. In addition to the direct benefit of SR 29 users, there will be significant benefit to non-motorized users of SR 20 within the "Main Street" communities listed prior by encouraging interregional and truck traffic to utilize the Principal Arterial Corridor of SR 20/29/53.

Projects on the local street and road systems will provide both safety and circulation benefits throughout the region. Complete streets and active transportation benefits will be provided through inclusion of bike lanes, sidewalks and a third center lane which will improve safety operations and provide multi-modal benefits in the two largest local road projects, the South Main Street and Soda Bay Road Corridor improvement projects.

The Lakeport Boulevard Improvement Project will provide significant improvement to traffic flow and reduction of congestion in a busy commercial area in the City of Lakeport. This project will include improvements to important roadway segments for vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, local residents, and business owners. Goals for this project will be to enhance traffic circulation, relieve congestion, better accommodate forecasted traffic demands, create continuity for pedestrians along both sides of Lakeport Boulevard and to create bike lanes. This project is aligned with Caltrans' Complete Streets Action Plan (CSAP) as well as compliments the new Courthouse Project currently under design by the Judicial Counsel.

The Dam Road/Dam Road Extension Roundabout project will mainly address safety and congestion relief for the City of Clearlake. The existing conditions at the proposed site are

unsafe at the intersection by causing traffic to back up onto SR53. The current unsignalized, four-way stop, intersection continues to cause safety issues due to the increased congestion from the opening of the nearby school and expansion of a nearby college. Congestion at the intersection has created problems on both the local and state highway levels. The purpose of this project is to improve traffic operations and flow, while enhancing accessibility, improving safety as well as accommodating bicyclist and pedestrians.

The array of projects programmed in the RTIP serves a range of modes and provide a clear benefit to both the region and the state.

D. Performance and Effectiveness of RTIP

Section 14. Evaluation of Cost Effectiveness of RTIP (Required per Section 22B)The region is not currently collecting quantitative data related to the cost effectiveness indicators listed in the RTIP template other than Pavement Condition Index on local streets and roads. We have, therefore, developed the following qualitative evaluation of the RTIP using the Rural Specific Cost Effectiveness Indicators.

Congestion Reduction: Two of the projects included in this RTIP are intersection improvements that will provide roundabouts at congested intersections. These intersections are all at high volume locations which experience severe congestion at peak times. They are all currently controlled by signage only. These improvements will significantly reduce vehicle idling and congestion at peak times without adding increased capacity. Two of the projects will result in reduced congestion by providing enhanced bicycle and pedestrian access through busy areas, encouraging greater use of these alternative forms of transportation and less vehicular travel in congested areas. The Konocti Corridor will provide passing opportunities to relieve congestion. The upgrade of this section of the Principal Arterial Corridor will help to redirect truck traffic from the narrow and winding SR 20 that runs along the north side of Clearlake.

Infrastructure Condition: The South Main & Soda Bay Road Corridor project will completely reconstruct a length of a busy commercial corridor with a PCI of 37 (as of 2018). Although this roughly 4-mile stretch of road will not make a significant change in the County's overall PCI, it is a significant regional route.

Safety: The two roundabout projects in the RTIP will result in fewer vehicle conflicts. Safety will also be significantly improved for pedestrians in several of the projects that provide new or improved sidewalks and safer crossings. The most significant safety improvement in the RTIP will be provided by the Lake 29 Improvement project. The overall goal of the project is to improve safety by conversion to freeway, which reduces conflicts and improves travel time reliability by providing consistent, free-flow speeds through this segment of SR 29. This project will provide a 60% improvement in safety along a stretch of highway which currently has accident rates that are nearly six times the statewide average.

Environmental Sustainability: Nearly all of the projects in the RTIP will enhance environmental sustainability in the region's transportation system. New or enhanced pedestrian facilities will increase mode share for walking and biking. Improved intersections will decrease idling, and thereby, decrease greenhouse gas emissions. Encouraging the redirection of truck traffic from SR 20, where the highway is "Main Street" for many communities will improve the environment within those communities.

Section 15. Project Specific Evaluation (Required per Section 22D)

The APC is not proposing any new projects that require project specific evaluations

E. Detailed Project Information

Section 16. Overview of Projects Programmed with RIP Funding

Provide summary of projects programmed with RIP funding including maps in the text field below as required per the STIP Guidelines.

For project locations, see maps in the Section 19 Appendix.

AGENCY	PROJECT	COMPONENT	Prior	FY 24/25	FY 25/26	FY 26/27	FY 27/28	FY 28/29
Clearlake	Dam Rd/Dam Rd Extension Roundabout	E&P	211					
		PS&E	563					
		ROW	570					
	Clearlake Guard Rails* (DELETE)	CON	55					
	Olympic and Old Highway 53 Intersection Signal Controller* (DELETE)	CON	131					
Lakeport	Lakeport Blvd & S. Main Intersection (DELETE)	E&P	71					
		PS&E				88		
		ROW					106	
		CON						700
Lakeport	Lakeport Blvd Improvement Project Phase 1	E&P	71					
		PS&E		88				
		ROW			106			
		CON				700		
	Green Street Reconstruction*	CON	133					
Caltrans	Lake 29 Expressway 2A	PS&E	6000					
	Lake 29 Expressway 2B	PS&E**	6000					
Lake County	South Main Street Corridor Improvements	CON	4416					
	Soda Bay Road Corridor Improvements	CON	662					
	Nice Lucerne Cutoff Asphalt Rehabilitation*	CON	205					
APC	PPM	CON	299	50	48	48	94	94
	TOTAL PROPOSED PROGRAMMING		19316	138	154	748	94	94

*Indicates COVID Relief Share Funding

F. Appendices

Section 17. Projects Programming Request Forms (Provide Cover Sheet) – Regional Agencies will add their PPRs in this section for each project included in the RTIP, whether it is a project reprogrammed from the 2022 STIP, or a new project.

Section 18. Board Resolution or Documentation of 2024 RTIP Approval (Provide Cover Sheet) – Agencies will add their resolution or meeting minutes.

Section 19. Fact Sheet (1-2 pages). (See Section 50). The fact sheet will be posted on the Commission’s website and must comply with state and federal web accessibility laws and standards.

Section 20. Documentation on Coordination with Caltrans District (Optional) (With Cover Sheet)

Section 21. Detailed Project Programming Summary Table (Optional)

Section 22. Alternative Delivery Methods (Optional)

Section 23. Additional Appendices (Optional)



LAKE COUNTY/CITY AREA PLANNING COUNCIL TAC STAFF REPORT

TITLE: Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) Funding

DATE PREPARED: 11/09/2023

MEETING DATE: 11/16/2023

SUBMITTED BY: Michael Villa, Project Coordinator

BACKGROUND: The Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) is a federal funding source provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) available for award by the RTPA. The purpose of the CRP is to reduce transportation emissions through the development of State carbon reduction strategies and by funding projects designed to reduce transportation emissions.

Prior to programming CRP funds, Lake APC must develop a Project Selection Strategy that will be used as the basis for all CRP funds. This strategy must reflect the Three Pillars of the State's Carbon Reduction Strategy (CRS) plan:

- Zero-Emission Vehicles & Infrastructure
- Active Transportation & Micromobility
- Rail & Transit

The Lake County region has \$118,677 for cycle 1 of the FFY 2022 apportionment and \$121,050 for cycle 2 of the FFY 2023 apportionment which comes to a total of \$239,727. Funds are available for obligation for a period of 3 years after the last day of the fiscal year for which the funds are authorized. CRP funds can be combined with other eligible USDOT funds that support the reduction of transportation emissions.

Following the August TAC meeting, Lake APC staff developed a draft CRP Policy/Application Requirements, which was sent out a day before the October TAC meeting.

Due to the delayed delivery of the CRP Policy/Application Requirements, at the October TAC meeting it was determined that it would be appropriate to give members more time to review the CRP Policy/Application Requirements to discuss at the November TAC meeting.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review and approve draft Policy/Application Requirements.

ALTERNATIVES: Update Policy/Application Requirements per TAC recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval of draft Carbon Reduction Program Policy/Application Requirements.



Carbon Reduction Program Policy/Application Requirements

On XX, 2023, the Lake APC Board of Directors approved and adopted the policy for the administration and management of CRP funds for the Lake County Region. Eligible applicants should refer to the following policies as they prepare their applications.

PROGRAM OVERVIEW

- A. The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) (Bipartisan Infrastructure Law) provides \$6.4 billion dollars to states, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), and non-MPO Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) like the Lake Area Planning Council (Lake APC) for the Carbon Reduction Program (CRP). The purpose of the CRP is to reduce transportation carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions, from on-road sources. CRP funds are available for five years (2022-2026) and provide opportunities to support local priorities that decrease CO₂ emissions in the transportation sector and support regions towards net zero emissions by 2050.
- B. The allocations are split, with 65% as Local CRP and 35% as State CRP. Local CRP is allocated by population based on the 2020 US Census Urbanized Areas (UZA). Local CRP funds are allocated to MPOs or RTPAs and must be made available for use within the entire boundary. For Lake APC, this means the entire Lake County region. The CRP funds cannot be further suballocated within the Lake APC boundary. Instead, Lake APC must use a competitive, performance-driven process to select and program projects for CRP funds.

ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

- A. Eligible applicants include Lake APC, cities, counties, tribal governments, transit agencies, and non-profit organizations within the Lake County region. For-profit organizations are not eligible. All other entities must partner with a city, county, or transit agency to apply for and/or administer a federal aid transportation project.
- B. Since this is a reimbursement program, recipients must have the capacity to cover project costs at the outset of project or program implementation. Eligible expenses will be reimbursed once the applicant has submitted a reimbursement request and supporting documentation.

PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

- A. CRP funds cover many different types of activities that address carbon emission reductions. A full list of eligible activities is available in the FHWA program guidance: https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/sustainability/energy/policy/crp_guidance.pdf.
- B. The utilization of CRP funds necessitates their allocation to projects from the federally-eligible list, strategically supporting three crucial pillars: bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, rail and

transit initiatives, and the development of zero-emission vehicles and related infrastructure. Eligible applicants must indicate on their Project Evaluation Criteria form how the proposed project meets one or more of the above “pillar” categories.

- C. It is required that an 11.47% percent local match, consisting of non-federal funds, be provided.
- D. The funds can be flexed to FTA upon approval by Caltrans and FHWA. If funds are flexed to FTA, FTA local match rules apply.

FUNDING PRIORITIES

A. Priority – I

- A public transportation project eligible under 23 U.S.C. 142; (this includes eligible capital projects for the construction of a bus rapid transit corridor or dedicated bus lanes as provided for in BIL Section 11130 (23 U.S.C. 142(a)(3)).
- A transportation alternative (as defined under the Moving Ahead for Progress under the 21st Century Act [23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29), as in effect on July 5, 2012]), including, but not limited to, the construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized forms of transportation.
- Development of a carbon reduction strategy developed by a State per requirements in 23 U.S.C. 175(d).
- A project or strategy designed to support congestion pricing, shifting transportation demand to nonpeak hours or other transportation modes, increasing vehicle occupancy rates, or otherwise reducing demand for roads, including electronic toll collection, and travel demand management strategies and programs.
- Efforts to reduce the environmental and community impacts of freight movement.
- Sustainable pavements and construction materials. Sustainable pavements technologies that reduce embodied carbon during the manufacture and/or construction of highway projects could be eligible for CRP if a lifecycle assessment (LCA) demonstrates substantial reductions in CO2 compared to the implementing Agency’s typical pavement-related practices.
- Climate Uses of Highway Right-of-Way Projects including alternative uses of highway right-of-way (ROW) that reduce transportation emissions are also eligible. For example, renewable energy generation facilities, such as solar arrays and wind turbines, can reduce transportation emissions.
- Mode Shift Projects that maximize the existing right-of-way for accommodation of non-motorized modes and transit options that increase safety, equity, accessibility, and connectivity may be eligible.
- Projects that separate motor vehicles from pedestrians and bicyclists

B. Priority – II

- A project described in 23 U.S.C. 149(b)(4) to establish or operate a traffic monitoring, management, and control facility or program, including advanced truck stop electrification systems.
- A project described in 23 U.S.C. 503(c)(4)(E) for advanced transportation and congestion management technologies.
- Deployment of infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems capital improvements and the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communications equipment.
- A project to replace street lighting and traffic control devices with energy-efficient alternatives.
- A project that supports deployment of alternative fuel vehicles, including acquisition, installation, or operation of publicly accessible electric vehicle charging infrastructure or hydrogen, vehicle fueling infrastructure, and purchase or lease of zero-emission construction equipment and vehicles, including the acquisition, construction, or leasing of required supporting facilities.
- A project described in 23 U.S.C. 149(b)(8) for a diesel engine retrofit.
- Certain types of projects to improve traffic flow that are eligible under the CMAQ program, and that do not involve construction of new capacity; [§ 11403; 23 U.S.C. 149(b)(5); and 175(c)(1)(L)].
- A project that reduces transportation emissions at port facilities, including through the advancement of port electrification.
- Climate Uses of Highway Right-of-Way Projects including alternative uses of highway right-of-way (ROW) that reduce transportation emissions are also eligible. For example, biologic carbon sequestration practices along highway ROW to capture and store CO2 may demonstrate potential for substantial long-term transportation emissions reductions. State DOTs Leveraging Alternative Uses of the Highway Right-of-Way Guidance provides information on these practices.
- Projects that match vehicle speeds to the built environment, increase visibility (e.g., lighting), and advance implementation of a Safe System approach and improve safety for vulnerable road users may also be eligible.
- Micromobility and electric bike projects, including charging infrastructure, may also be eligible.

LAKE APC AND PARTNER ROLES

- A. FHWA and Caltrans guidelines identify the roles and responsibilities of state, regional, and local agencies. The following is a summary of those roles:
 - a. The **FHWA** is responsible for final review and approval.
 - b. **Caltrans HQ Division of Local Assistance** is responsible for performing eligibility review of projects selected by Lake APC.
 - c. **District 1** is responsible for reviewing projects, inputting the project information into the Funding Allocation and Delivery System (FADS), and submitting the project details to the Headquarters Implementation division of Caltrans.

- d. **Lake APC** is responsible for developing a program for managing CRP funds, conducting a call for projects, selecting projects for funding, programming projects for funding, and tracking progress on project funding. Lake APC may also serve as an eligible applicant.
- e. **Eligible applicants** identify eligible projects and compete for CRP funds, provide Lake APC and Caltrans necessary information for the programming of funds on selected projects, implement and complete projects, and submit annual (or more frequent) reporting for their projects.

CALL FOR PROJECTS AND PROJECT SELECTION

- A. Lake APC announces a call for projects via email and Lake APC's website and provides guidance and technical support to applicants.
- B. All projects undergo thorough evaluation to ensure alignment with project eligibility criteria and funding priorities, thereby ensuring consistency and strategic allocation of resources.
- C. Following the application deadline, applications will be selected through a competitive process.

PROJECT FUNDING, PROGRAMMING, AND OBLIGATION

- A. The Obligation Deadline (E76) for the year 2022 is September 30, 2025, while for 2023 it is September 30, 2026. The deadlines for the years 2024 to 2026 will be determined based on updates from Caltrans at this website: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/carbon-reduction-program>. It is important to note that the deadline to obligate (E76) is three Federal Fiscal Years after the FFY the funds were apportioned.
- B. The Expenditure Deadline for the years 2022 and 2023 is September 30, 2030, and September 30, 2031, respectively. The Expenditure Deadline for the years 2024 to 2026 will be determined based on updates from Caltrans at this website: <https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/carbon-reduction-program>.
- C. To effectively manage project funds Lake APC will:
 - Review all projects to ensure compliance with Build America Buy America (BABA) requirements, if applicable.
 - Conduct quarterly monitoring project process to identify potential issues or delays that could impede timely completion.
 - When a project is at risk of delay or cancellation, promptly notify the local agency responsible for implementation. Request the agency to assess the reasons behind the project's inability to proceed.
 - Seek the board's approval for reprogramming funds towards a new project(s) if needed.
 - Once approved, initiate the necessary steps to obligate the funds for the selected project(s) and coordinate with relevant stakeholders for smooth execution.
 - Continuously monitor the progress of the new project(s) to ensure timely implementation, promptly addressing any issues or delays and taking corrective actions as necessary.

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

Eligible entities must submit the following documents as part of their application request:

- A. Project Alignment Confirmation (Attachment A)
- B. A map of the project location
- C. Project Evaluation Criteria (Attachment B)
- D. Preliminary project estimate
- E. Additional project support documents, such as excerpts from prior plans or studies may also be attached.

EVALUATIONS

Due to the limited funding available, in the event partner agency requests exceed available funding the project requests will be evaluated by a review panel and scores will be determined by consensus, based on the following initial evaluation criteria:

Project Evaluation Criteria	Points
How well the project supports the State's priorities and one (or more) of the three pillars of the State's CRS plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure• Rail and transit initiatives• Zero-emission vehicles and related infrastructure	15
Eligible Activities	10
Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Regional Priorities	10
Region-wide benefits	10
Project Readiness	5
Maximum Available Points	50

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

For additional information on Lake APC's CRP policy please contact Michael Villa, Lake APC Project Coordinator at 707-263-7799

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Project Alignment Confirmation Form
- B. Project Evaluation Criteria

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

Project Alignment Confirmation

**Project Alignment Confirmation
Carbon Reduction Strategy (CRS) for CRP Project**

Agency Information

Local Agency Name: _____

County: _____ Congressional District(s): _____

Caltrans Dist.: _____ MPO¹ (RTPA, if no MPO): _____

Contact² Name: _____

Title: _____

Phone No.: _____ (Office) _____ (Cell) _____

Email: _____

Project Information

Project Name: _____ Fed-Aid No: _____

Location: _____

Scope of Work

CRP Funds Programming

	Prior	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	Beyond
PE							
RW							
CON							
CE							

Schedule

PE	[mm/yyyy]	RW	[mm/yyyy]	CON/CE	[mm/yyyy]
Authorize PE		Authorize RW		Authorize CON	
Beg. Work		Beg. Work		Award	
NEPA Doc.		RW Cert.		Beg CON.	
PS&E Bid Pkg.				FROE	

Requesting "Flex" FTA funding transfer (for transit, transit related, and multi-modal projects)³

¹ For urban area specify MPO; for rural area specify MPO or RTPA. Must have jurisdiction where project is located.

² Enter the local agency contact to contact to answer any questions regarding this form and proposed project.

³ See FHWA CRP Guidance Section C, No. 3 for more information.

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

Project Alignment Confirmation

Local Agency Certification (_____)

I affirm the information in this form is correct and true to the best of my knowledge. I certify this project complies with the Carbon Reduction Program Implementation Guidance, located on the Division of Local Assistance's Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) web page, and with other guidance, provided on, or linked to, the CRP web page. I understand reimbursable work for project phase of work shall not commence until a Request for Authorization (E76) for the project phase of work has been authorized by FHWA, and we have received the respective E-76 Notice to Proceed.

Signature: _____

Name Date: _____

Job Title: _____

Agency: _____

Phone & Email: _____

Distribution: Submit this form to MPO, or Rural RTPA without MPO, per their instructions

MPO, or Rural RTPA without MPO, Use Only**MPO Certification (or RTPA Certification for rural areas without an MPO)**

I affirm the local agency has consulted with us, the (_____), which represents the area where this project is located. In coordination with the local agency, and after careful review and consideration, we have decided to fund this project with our apportioned CRP funds. We, further understand the authority to select which CRP projects to fund, using our CRP designated apportionments, rests solely with the MPO, or RTPA for rural areas without an MPO, and cannot be delegated. We certify we have developed a competitive, performance-driven project selection process that aligns with the California Transportation Carbon Reduction Strategy, and that it was used to select this project for CRP funding. We further affirm the project selection process is documented, in writing, and is available to FHWA and Caltrans upon request. (*For local agencies in rural areas where there is no MPO, the RTPA shall serve as the MPO for development of the Regional Carbon Reduction Strategy (CRS) and CRP project selection process.*)

Signature: _____

Name Date: _____

Job Title: _____

Agency: _____

Phone & Email: _____

Distribution: DLA-HQ Program Coordinator

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

Project Alignment Confirmation

Director's Office of Equity, Sustainability & Tribal Affairs (ESTA) (HQ) Use Only

CRS- CRP Project Alignment Confirmation

The signature below confirms this CRP project _____ aligns with the California Carbon Reduction Strategy

Signature: _____

Printed Name: _____

Job Title: _____

Distribution: MPO (or Rural RTPA without MPO), DLA-HQ Program Coordinator

Project Evaluation Criteria

1) Supports the State's Priorities and one (or more) three pillars of the State's CRS plan 15 points

Applicants should describe which of the State's three Carbon Reduction Strategy "Pillars" the project falls under (must be one, but can be more) and how the project supports them.

2) Eligible Activities 10 points

Applicants must specify how their project aligns with the eligible activities as defined in the FHWA guidelines.

3) Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and regional priorities 10 points

Describe how the project relates to the regional priorities considered in the Lake County RTP.

4) Region-wide benefits 10 points

Region-wide benefits refer to the positive outcomes and advantages that are experienced by an entire region or area, rather than being limited to specific individuals or communities.

5) Project Readiness 5 points

Applicants must specify the current phase of the project and estimated time of delivery for future phases.