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I. INTRODUCTION

The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) has prepared this 2014 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for Butte County in response to the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Cycle. As the designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) serving the incorporated cities of Biggs, Chico, Gridley, Oroville, Town of Paradise and the County of Butte, BCAG is charged with the responsibility of preparing the RTIP.

The 2014 RTIP/STIP covers the five fiscal years through 2014/15 and 2018/19. The purpose of the RTIP is to identify Butte County’s project recommendations for the Regional Improvement Program (RIP) funds made available to BCAG as provided by the STIP process. The RTIP project recommendations are then subject to approval by the California Transportation Commission for inclusion into the STIP.

BCAG has prepared the 2014 RTIP in consultation with each of the cities and county public works staff, Caltrans and the general public. BCAG has followed the adopted STIP guidelines for the preparation of this document.

Caltrans District 3 has been instrumental in providing the necessary project programming request (project information) for jointly funded projects located on the state highway system. All project programming request sheets for each recommended project are included as Appendix 1 and have been submitted electronically.

II. SUMMARY OF 2014 STIP RECOMMENDATIONS

Four Regional Improvement Program projects are recommended for funding, two of which are on the State Route 70 Corridor, one is a carryover bike lane project and the final, a PPM project for a combined total of $16.309 million. The remaining funds are requested to remain as an unprogrammed balance of $2.171 million for a future STIP cycle to be used for the SR 70 Corridor. These projects are summarized in Table 1. Figure 2 on Page 4 identifies the general location for the recommended projects. In addition, Appendix 5 summarized these recommendations in a spreadsheet.
TABLE 1
BCAG 2014 RTIP/STIP RECOMMENDATIONS
(Thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>RIP PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
<th>FUNDING RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Neal Rd Class 2 Bike Lane Project</td>
<td>$1,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAG</td>
<td>SR 70 Passing Lanes – Segment 1</td>
<td>$13,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAG</td>
<td>SR 70 Passing Lanes – Segment 2</td>
<td>$1,325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAG</td>
<td>Planning Programming and Monitoring (PPM)</td>
<td>$444,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL 2012 RTIP RECOMMENDATIONS</td>
<td>$16,309,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of 2014 RTIP Recommendations:

**State Route 70 (Segment 1)** – From Palermo Road to Ophir Rd / Pacific Heights Intersection. The scope of the project is to widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes. BCAG is proposing to continue to use available federal demonstration dollars to completely fund the environmental component. Staff would begin the development of the environmental component for $1,500,000 beginning January 2014. The remaining components are recommended for programming for $13.1 million in RIP and $13.1 million in Caltrans’ IIP funds for a total project cost of $27.7 million.

**State Route 70 (Segment 2)** – From Cox Lane to just south of Palermo Rd. The scope of the project is to widen from 2 to 4 lanes. This project would close the gap between Segment 1 to the north and the recently completed passing lanes on SR 70 near E. Gridley Road to the south. For the 2014 RTIP, staff would recommend just the developmental components of environmental and design. It would be unrealistic to attempt to program anything in addition at this time by the CTC. Remaining components would be recommended as part of the 2016 STIP Cycle if financially able to do so. As such, the RTIP recommendation for this project is only for $1.325 million in RIP funds and $1.325 million in IIP funds for a total cost of $2.65 million.

**Neal Road Bike Lane Project** – This is a carryover project from the 2012 STIP Cycle for $1.44 million. This project is on Neal Road from the Oro-Chico Highway to the Paradise Town Limits and within the Town of Paradise to the Skyway. The scope of the project is to design phased improvements to widen Neal Road to accommodate Class 2
bike lanes from the Oro-Chico Highway to the Town Limits (7.5 miles.) In addition, the project is to construct Phases 1 & 2 to provide Class 2 bike lanes from State Route 99 to 4.7 miles eastward towards Paradise.

This project also includes the installation of "Share the Road" signage on the remainder of Neal Road (2.8 miles) to the Town Limits and within the Town of Paradise to the Skyway (1.7 miles.) as well as new signs on Cohasset Road from Chico City Limits to the Cohasset School (11.5 miles). Funding for this project completes the construction.

**Planning Programming and Monitoring (PPM)** – BCAG staff is requesting $444,000 which represents the allowable 5% of Regional Improvement Program funding for PPM activities. These funds support the staff time necessary for various STIP projects in BCAG's Overall Work Program and Budget. The funds requested cover the 5 year period of the STIP.

**Unprogrammed RIP Balance. (SR 70 Passing Lane Project – Reserve)** – BCAG staff is requesting that the remaining RIP fund balance of $2,171,000 remain as an unprogrammed balance. BCAG intends to program the SR 70 Passing Lane Project (Segment 2) south of Oroville in the 2016 or 2018 STIP Cycle.
### III. 2014 STIP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BUTTE COUNTY

The Butte County Association of Governments requests that the projects identified in this 2014 Butte County Regional Transportation Improvement Program be programmed as part of the 2014 State Transportation Improvement Program. The project programming request (PPR) sheets are included in Appendix 1.

### IV. SUMMARY OF REVENUES & EXPENDITURES – Priority 1

**Butte County’s 2014 Fund Estimates (Revenues)**

Regional agencies were not provided annual targets as in the past STIP cycles. In addition, the Fund Estimate reflects that the new STIP programming capacity is in the latter two years of the STIP.

A copy of the Fund Estimate for Butte County is included as Appendix 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STIP Fund Estimate</th>
<th>Funds (1,000)</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butte County RIP Target</td>
<td>$18,480</td>
<td>Appendix 2 – Fund Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Programming Request</strong></td>
<td>16,309</td>
<td>Appendix 1 - PPR Sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unprogrammed Balance</strong></td>
<td>$2,171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of RIP Expenditures by Fiscal Year (Thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>FY 14/15</th>
<th>FY 15/16</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIP</td>
<td>1,440</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPM</td>
<td>$148</td>
<td>$94</td>
<td>$202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1,588</td>
<td>$919</td>
<td>$2,602</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014 Butte County Fund Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$18,480</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of IIP Recommendations For SR 70 Corridor by Fiscal Year (thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>FY 14/15</th>
<th>FY 15/16</th>
<th>FY 16/17</th>
<th>FY 17/18</th>
<th>FY 18/19</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Segment 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,900</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$825</td>
<td>$2,400</td>
<td>$11,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Revenues and Expenditures ($1,000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RIP</th>
<th>IIP</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Regional Shares Available</td>
<td>$18,480</td>
<td>$14,425</td>
<td>$32,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Priority 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Recommendations</td>
<td>$16,309</td>
<td>$14,425</td>
<td>$30,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Expenditures)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed Balance</td>
<td>$2,171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. CRITERIA FOR MEASURING PERFORMANCE & COST EFFECTIVENESS

Performance Indicators and Monitoring

In order to maximize the state’s investment in transportation infrastructure, the California Transportation Commission has required that each RTIP be evaluated for performance and cost effectiveness. The performance indicators need to show the projects are achieving the goals, objectives and standards which are established as part of the Metropolitan Transportation Plans. Each region should consider improvements to mobility, accessibility, reliability, safety, and productivity in the RTIP submittal. The evaluation of performance and cost-effectiveness will be for a 20-year period. Regions were asked to use the following criteria for measuring performance of the RTIP:

- Change in vehicle occupants, freight and goods, travel time or delay.
- Change in accidents and fatalities.
- Change in vehicle and system operating costs.
- Change in access to jobs, markets and commerce.
- Change in frequency and reliability of rail/transit service.
- Change in air pollution emissions.
- Change in passenger, freight and goods miles carried.

Regions should consider the following criteria for measuring cost-effectiveness of the RTIP:

- Decrease in vehicle occupant travel, freight and goods time per thousand dollar invested.
- Decrease in accidents and fatalities per thousand dollar invested.
- Decrease in vehicle and system operating costs per thousand dollar invested.
- Improved access to jobs, markets and commerce per thousand dollar invested.
- Increased frequency and reliability of rail/transit/service per thousand dollar invested.
• Decrease air pollution emission per thousand dollar invested.
• Increase in annual passenger, freight and goods miles carried per thousand dollar invested.

Each project is evaluated below.

1. **SR 70 Passing Lane (Segment 1).**

The purpose of this project is to reduce travel delay by extending the existing passing lanes to provide additional passing opportunities in both directions. The proposed passing lanes are in the vicinity of the SR 70 from Palermo Road to Ophir Rd, just south of Oroville. The project will reduce congestions and improve operational efficiencies and safety through this segment of the SR70 corridor.

This effort works towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions by reducing congestion in the region and meeting BCAG’s air quality emission reduction goals identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). In addition, the project addresses safety and operational concerns with the corridor. Addressing these concerns is a priority and consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the MTP.

2. **SR 70 Passing Lane (Segment 2).**

The purpose of this project is to reduce travel delay by extending the existing passing lanes to provide additional passing opportunities in both directions. The proposed passing lanes are in the vicinity of the SR 70 from Cox Lane to just south of Palermo Road. The project will reduce congestions and improve operational efficiencies and safety through this segment of the SR70 corridor.

This effort works towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions by reducing congestion in the region and meeting BCAG’s air quality emission reduction goals identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP). In addition, the project addresses safety and operational concerns with the corridor. Addressing these concerns is a priority and consistent with the goals, policies and objectives of the MTP.

3. **Butte County Neal Rd Class 2 Bike Lane Project. – TE Project.**

The project constructs approximately 9.4 Class 2 bike lane miles on Neal Rd. This results in improve traffic safety and circulation while promoting intermodal transportation by providing improved Class 2 bike lanes along Neal Rd. The overall goal is to provide for a contiguous bikeway facility from the Town of Paradise to the City of Chico as currently shown on the Butte County Bikeway Master Plan. This effort works towards reducing greenhouse gas emissions by providing additional biking opportunities in the region and meeting BCAG’s air quality emission reduction goals identified in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP).
4. Planning Programming and Monitoring

The scope of the project is to support BCAG’s planning, programming and monitoring activities. The qualitative performance measure here would be asking whether or not BCAG is delivering STIP projects which meet the goals, policies and objectives of the MTP. The answer would be, “yes”.

Summary

Each project recommended for funding is derived from the current 2012 Butte County MTP/SCS. In addition, all capacity increasing projects have been included in the Butte County Travel Demand Forecasting Model which is used to demonstrate Air Quality Conformity. Therefore all projects, as applicable, have been evaluated as part of the comprehensive Metropolitan Transportation Planning process and approved by the BCAG Board of Directors.

All projects identified for RIP funding address existing safety and operational concerns. CTC’s guidance “Attachment 1 – Part A” has however, been included as Appendix 3. However, “Attachment 1 – Part B” guidance provides an alternative method in which to document the performance measures for the RTIP and has been included. The following section responds to the CTC’s STIP Guidelines in addressing performance measures. BCAG is able to quantifiably demonstrate performance measures in terms of emissions reduced and air quality improved region wide. This method brings consistency between the long range MTP and the short range RTIP and Federal TIP.

Performance Measures Used

BCAG used the Federal Air Quality Conformity Process to quantify and measure performance. The purpose of the conformity determination process is to ensure that BCAG’s plans and programs “conform” to all applicable federal air quality requirements. This ensures that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the relevant national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS). This method also works towards demonstrating effort in meetings the goals of California’s Senate Bill 375, in regards to reducing passenger vehicle greenhouse emissions. As such, using air quality conformity as a performance measurement enables BCAG to quantify improvements for the projects in the 2014 RTIP and show consistency between its programs and plans.

Provide a quantitative and/or qualitative analysis (include baseline measurement and projected program or project impact).

In order to determine emissions associated with the implementation of the 2012 RTIP, the most recent transportation emissions models were used. To develop the air quality
conformity analysis, two models were used: the BCAG transportation model and EMFAC 2011.

The BCAG transportation model was used to prepare the traffic model runs for the necessary analysis years. The BCAG transportation model produced forecasts of vehicle miles traveled (VMT), trip ends, speed distributions, lane miles, and other travel related data required for the emission models.

BCAG used the most current federally approved emissions model, EMFAC 2011, to prepare the regional emissions analysis. In addition, BCAG followed CARB’s methodology outlined in *Recommended Methods of Use of EMFAC2002 to Develop Motor Vehicle Emissions and Assess Conformity*. This methodology has not been updated for EMFAC 2011, but remains applicable.

The transportation model’s future year land use data was developed with the assistance of the local jurisdictions planning staff and is based on land use information from the areas local land use plans, planned development, reasonable assumptions regarding infill and redevelopment, regional growth forecasts, and a review of development attractions (i.e., motorized and non-motorized transportation networks, existing development, service areas, etc.) and discouragements (i.e., resource areas and farmland, public lands, areas exceeding 25% slope, etc.). The general plan and specific plan development activities occurring in the county by the local jurisdictions are reflected in the future year land use assumptions, which are generally representative of the best available information as of June 30th, 2011.

The transportation model contains 912 transportation analysis zones (TAZ’s) within which land use data is summarized into the following 17 categories:

- Single-Family Residential (dwelling units – du)
- Multi-Family Residential (du)
- Mobile Home Residential (du)
- Neighborhood-Serving Retail (1,000 square feet – ksf)
- Region Serving Retail (ksf)
- Industrial (ksf)
- Office (ksf)
- Medical Office (ksf)
- Hospital (ksf)
- Public-Quasi Public (ksf)
- Hotels (rooms)
- University (students)
- Community College (students)
- K-12 Schools (students)
- Park (acres)
- Special Generator for Casino (slots)
- External Trip Distribution for Casino (trips)
The regional emissions analysis begins with the year of 2015, as the transportation conformity rule states that the first emissions analysis year may not exceed five years from the year the RTP/FTIP conformity determination was prepared (2012). The next analysis year is the attainment year for CO under the 80-ton-per-day budget which is 2018. The milestone year of 2025 is included since analysis is required between years and can not be more than 10 years apart. The last year included in the emissions analysis is the long-range MTP horizon year of 2035.

A summary of the analysis years is indicated below:

- **2015** – No greater than five years from the preparation of the FTIP conformity determination
- **2018** – CO maintenance year (new 80 tons-per-day budget)
- **2025** – Milestone year no more than 10 years from last analysis
- **2035** – Horizon year of BCAG’s long-range RTP and additional analysis year for GHG

Regional Emissions Analysis and Forecast

The regional emissions analysis and forecast for ozone precursors, carbon monoxide, PM2.5 and its precursor have been summarized in the following tables. The summary of emissions forecasts is derived from outputs of the EMFAC 2007 Version 2.3 and EMFAC 2011 models. These tables show comparisons of:

- **ROG**: Reactive Organic Gases as an ozone precursor
- **Nox**: Oxides of Nitrogen as an ozone and PM2.5 precursor
- **CO**: Carbon Monoxide
- **PM2.5**: Fine Particulate Matter (smaller than 2.5 micrometers)

### Ozone 8-hour Standard Tests – No-greater-than- 2002 and No-greater-than- 2011 Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### NOx “No-greater-than-2002” and “No-greater-than-2011” Emissions Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Year</th>
<th>NOx Emissions</th>
<th>Less than 2002?</th>
<th>Less than 2011?</th>
<th>Pass Conformity Tests?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Carbon Monoxide Budget Test

**CO “Budget Test” Emissions Test 80 Tons-per-day Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Year</th>
<th>CO Emissions</th>
<th>CO Budget</th>
<th>Pass Conformity Test?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2006 24-hour PM2.5 Standard Test – No-greater-than-2008 Test

**24-hour PM2.5 “No-greater-than-2008” Emissions Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Year</th>
<th>PM2.5 Emissions</th>
<th>Less than 2008?</th>
<th>Pass Conformity Test?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOx “No-greater-than-2008” Emissions Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis Year</th>
<th>NOx Emissions (TONS PER DAY)</th>
<th>Less than 2008?</th>
<th>Pass Conformity Test?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2035</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State the reason(s) why selected performance measure or measures are accurate and useful in measuring performance. Please be specific.

BCAG used the above method because it brings consistency between the RTIP and long range Metropolitan Transportation Plan MTP and the Federal Metropolitan Transportation Improvement Program (MTIP). The above method is also reviewed by Caltrans, FHWA, FTA and the EPA. In addition, BCAG conducts an Interagency Consultation Review (ICR) meeting with the above listed agencies as well as the opportunity for public input.

In addition, the BCAG TDM model incorporates socio-economic data and land use from BCAG’s Geographic Information System to generate the data required for the California Air Resource Board’s emissions factors model to quantify emissions.

Identify any and all deficiencies encountered in as much detail as possible.

The air quality conformity analysis is quantified for the region and is not project specific.

Provide a quantitative evaluation and/or qualitative explanation of how the goals and objectives contained in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) or the Interregional Transportation Strategic Plan (ITSP) are linked to the program of projects contained in the RTIP and the ITIP.

BCAG’s overall transportation goal is to provide a safe, balanced, coordinated and cost-effective transportation system that conserves energy and preserves air quality, serves the needs of the local metropolitan area and region, and is consistent with and helps implement local agencies’ general plans. These goals are consistent between the MTP, RTIP, MTIP, and ITIP. The projects recommended for STIP programming address safety and operational needs while for the most part, work towards reducing greenhouse gas emission and providing or enhancing alternative transportation.

For qualitative explanations, state how progress towards attaining goals and objectives contained in each RTP and the ITSP is assessed and measured. If performance
indicators and/or performance measures used by an agency are different from those outlined in Table A of the Guidelines and as provide in Attachment 1, describe the method(s) used.

The emissions analysis above demonstrates that BCAG is in compliance and “conforms” to the applicable transportation air quality requirements for Butte County.

VI. INTERAGENCY AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

Consultation with Caltrans District 3

BCAG’s 2014 RTIP recommendations are developed in consultation with Caltrans District 3. BCAG recognizes Caltrans as a partner in funding and delivering this region’s top state highway priority, the SR 70 Corridor. During the 2012 STIP cycle, BCAG did not recommend any SR 70 project as the agency was committed in developing the Project Study Report / Project Design Study for the SR 70 Corridor utilizing federal demonstration funds for this effort. As a result of the SR 70 PSR/PDS effort, BCAG is recommending that the SR 70 Passing Lane Project (Segment 1) be programmed thru construction. In addition, BCAG is requesting that the SR 70 Passing Lane Project (Segment 2) be programmed for environmental and design only.

This strategy was presented and supported by Caltrans District 3 during the 2012 STIP cycle and is supported as part of this 2014 RTIP submittal. Attachment 4

Consistency with Federal Plans

Projects identified for programming are consistent with BCAG’s adopted 2012 Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) / Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). The SR 70 PSR/PDS study is currently programmed in the 2013 Federal Transportation Improvement Program. In addition, all 2014 RTIP projects have met their respective air quality conformity requirements as applicable. This ensures that all RTIP projects are consistent with the Goals, Objectives and Policies of the federal program and plan. All documents include a public participation process. All projects will be carried forward into the 2015 MTIP scheduled for adoption soon after the 2014 STIP is adopted.

Public Participation

The 2014 RTIP was prepared in accordance with BCAG’s Public Involvement Procedures (PPP). This process included development in open public forum via the BCAG Transportation Advisory Committee which includes representatives from each of the cities and county, Caltrans, FHWA, FTA, the local Rancherias and citizen representatives. The RTIP list of projects was presented to the BCAG Board of Directors on October 24, 2013. Through BCAG’s public involvement process and each of the respective environmental clearance requirements, the public had, and will continue to have the opportunity to provide input in the planning and programming process. All information is also posted on the internet at BCAG’s RTIP webpage at: www.bcag.org/Planning/2014-RTIP/index.html.