

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

1:30 p.m., Thursday, January 21, 2010
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes). | Porter/Hurley | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board and CMEQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Appointment of Maryann Moise Derwin (Portola Valley) and Pedro Gonzalez (SSF) to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee• Approved – Agreement with Economic & Planning Systems in an amount of \$85,000 to provide Land Use Analysis for the CTP 2035• Approved – 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County• Approved – Agreement with URS in an amount of \$349,000 for design of the Smart Corridors Project (North section)• Approved – Agreement with Iteris in an amount of \$310,000 for design of the Smart Corridors Project (South section)• Approved – Extension of the Hydrogen Shuttle Program to 12/31/10; Agreement Amendment with Ford Motor Co. in an amount of \$40,000 (vehicle lease) and \$75,000 (operating cost) of the Ford Hydrogen Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vehicle | Hoang | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from November 19, 2009 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. Review and approval of the overall framework for programming of Cycle 1 Federal Transportation funds as well as Federal Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads fund (if available) (Action) | Wong | Page 3-5 |
| 4.1 Review and recommend approval of the project evaluation and selection process for the Cycle 1 Federal Surface Transportation (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Shortfall (Action) | Higaki | Page 6-18 |
| 4.2 Review and recommend approval of a project selection process for Federal Economic Stimulus II funding for Local Streets (if available) (Action) | Wong | Page 19-23 |
| 4.3 Transportation Livable Communities (TLC) (Action) | Madalena | Page 24-29 |
| 4.4 Regional Bicycle Programs (Information) | Madalena | Page 30-34 |
| 4.5 Safe Routes To School (SR2S) (Information) | Hoang | Page 35-41 |
| 5. Report on the C/CAG Board recommendation to fund four projects under the Fourth Call for Projects, Lifeline Transportation Program (Tier 2), for a total of \$603,087 (Information) | Higaki | Page 42-46 |
| 6. Proposed FY 2010/11 State Budget Update (Information) | Napier | Page 47-51 |
| 7. Executive Director Report | Napier | No materials |
| 8. Member Reports | All | |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

1:30 p.m., Thursday, January 21, 2010
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes). | Porter/Hurley | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board and CMEQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Appointment of Maryann Moise Derwin (Portola Valley) and Pedro Gonzalez (SSF) to the Resource Management and Climate Protection (RMCP) Committee• Approved – Agreement with Economic & Planning Systems in an amount of \$85,000 to provide Land Use Analysis for the CTP 2035• Approved – 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County• Approved – Agreement with URS in an amount of \$349,000 for design of the Smart Corridors Project (North section)• Approved – Agreement with Iteris in an amount of \$310,000 for design of the Smart Corridors Project (South section)• Approved – Extension of the Hydrogen Shuttle Program to 12/31/10; Agreement Amendment with Ford Motor Co. in an amount of \$40,000 (vehicle lease) and \$75,000 (operating cost) of the Ford Hydrogen Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vehicle | Hoang | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from November 19, 2009 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. Review and approval of the overall framework for programming of Cycle 1 Federal Transportation funds as well as Federal Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads fund (if available) (Action) | Wong | Page 3-5 |
| 4.1 Review and recommend approval of the project evaluation and selection process for the Cycle 1 Federal Surface Transportation (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Shortfall (Action) | Higaki | Page 6-18 |
| 4.2 Review and recommend approval of a project selection process for Federal Economic Stimulus II funding for Local Streets (if available) | Wong | Page 19-23 |
| 4.3 Transportation Livable Communities (TLC) (Action) | Madalena | Page 24-29 |
| 4.4 Regional Bicycle Programs (Information) | Madalena | Page 30-34 |
| 4.5 Safe Routes To School (SR2S) (Information) | Hoang | Page 35-41 |
| 5. Report on the C/CAG Board recommendation to fund four projects under the Fourth Call for Projects, Lifeline Transportation Program (Tier 2), for a total of \$603,087 (Information) | Higaki | Page 42-46 |
| 6. Proposed FY 2010/11 State Budget Update (Information) | Napier | Page 47-51 |
| 7. Executive Director Report | Napier | No materials |
| 8. Member Reports | All | |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
FOR THE
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**November 19, 2009
MINUTES**

The one hundred eighty third (183rd) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-chair Hurley called the meeting to order at approximately 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, November 19, 2009.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: John Hoang – C/CAG; Richard Napier – C/CAG; Jean Higaki – C/CAG; Parviz Mohktari – C/CAG; Melanie Choy – SMCTA; Marian Lee – SMCTA; Klara Fabry – San Bruno; Jim Bigelow – C/CAG CMEQ

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None

2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMEQ meetings.

As shown on the Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from October 15, 2009.

Minutes Approved.

4. Measure A Program Implementation Update: New Measure A Program Follow-up

Marian Lee, SMCTA, presented the Highway Plan portion of the New Measure A Program, identifying a project selection approach that is Plan-Based and includes performing a needs assessment; developing a comprehensive CIP (5-10 years) for highway, non-mainline, and other categories with considerations for original, new congested corridor, and new supplemental roadways; and developing a funding strategy that takes into account previous commitments, potential funding sources, and project scheduling criteria. Development of the Highway Plan is scheduled to begin January 2010 with a draft due in May and Final Report in June.

Member Breault asked for source documents that contain the “key congestion corridor” definition. Response was that it indicated in the 2004 Expenditure Plan. Member Ovadia requested clarification regarding “old projects” and their funding priorities. Response was that there are still commitments to fund those projects. Member Gonzalo asked if the scheduling criteria is related to cash flow. Response was that the funding strategy needs a rational process that takes into consideration how well the project can compete, which will be a mechanism for cash flow. Jim Bigelow expressed appreciation for receiving the New Measure A Implementation update at the CMEQ and Board meetings and reiterated the request from the CMEQ meeting to add two criteria to the strategy, safety and environmental benefits.

Lee concluded that as part of the process, SMCTA staff would prepare the Board materials, which will be forwarded to the CMP TAC and other groups. A presentation will also be provided to the City Managers group this Friday.

The item was approved for recommendation.

5. Review and recommend approval of the 2010 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County and authorize the C/CAG Executive Director to negotiate with the MTC and CTC to make modifications as necessary

Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, and Sandy Wong presented the 2010 STIP, which includes an updated list of “active” projects that been identified as being in the best position to receive funding.

Discussions and comments followed regarding addition of new projects, project phase(s) to be programmed, priorities, and shifting of funding between FYs. The item was approved for recommendation with changes to the proposed project list, as indicated below:

- The “new” US 101/Broadway Interchange project to be for the design phase only and the funding amount reduced to \$4.5M in FY10/11.
- The Willow Road Interchange design phase funding to be approximately \$4M funding in FY 11/12.
- The Willow Road Interchange reconstruction phase funding to be \$20,471 in FY12/13.
- The “new” Hwy 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement project \$3M funding to be shifted to FY 12/13.

6. Review and approval of the 2010 TAC meeting calendar

Member Ovadia recommended revising the meeting end time to 3:00pm.

7. San Mateo County Smart Corridor Project Update

Parviz Mokhtari provided a project update including cost, schedule and progress.

8. Executive Director Report

Richard Napier, C/CAG Executive Director, stated that C/CAG would be appealing the NPDES Permit.

9. Member Reports

None.

Meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Sandy Wong, Deputy Director
Subject: Review and approval of the overall framework for programming of Cycle 1 Federal Transportation funds as well as Federal Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads fund (if available)

(For further information contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review and recommend approval of the overall framework for programming of Cycle 1 Federal Transportation funds as well as Federal Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads fund (if available).

FISCAL IMPACT

Approximately \$11 million will be available from Cycle 1 Federal Transportation STP/CMAQ programs. C/CAG may use up to 4% for planning and administrative activities.

In addition, Federal Stimulus II funding for Local Streets & Roads may become available. The dollar amount for Stimulus II is unknown at this time. There is discussion at the regional level that the amount for San Mateo County may be approximately \$11 million, if it becomes available.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Cycle 1 Federal Transportation funds are from Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ). Federal Stimulus II would be from Federal funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Federal Cycle 1

On December 16, 2009, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted a resolution for funding of the core programs in Cycle 1 under the upcoming Federal Surface Transportation Program (SAFETEA-LU Continuation). Cycle 1 covers three years: fiscal years 2009/2010, 2010/2011, and 2011/2012. Since FY 2009/2010 is already underway, projects to be funded in Cycle 1 must be delivered in FY's 2010/11 and 2011/12.

In Cycle 1, MTC has delegated to C/CAG to program and administer the following three programs by way of "Block Grant": 1) Local Streets & Road Shortfall; 2) Transportation for Livable Community (TLC); 3) Regional Bike Program (RBP). Up to 4% of the "Block Grant" can be used by the C/CAG for assuming this administrative responsibility. In addition, MTC

also delegates the new Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program to C/CAG. (Note: this SR2S is a new MTC program. It is not intended to replace the existing Safe Routes to School program(s) administered by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)). Total available STP/CMAQ funds in San Mateo County are as follows:

	"Block Grant"			
	LS & R Shortfall	TLC	RBP	SR2S
Available to Program	\$6,564,480	\$2,762,880	\$1,669,440	\$1,429,000
Administration	\$273,520	\$115,120	\$69,560	0
Total	\$6,838,000	\$2,878,000	\$1,739,000	\$1,429,000

Below is a list of some requirements that are common to all Cycle 1 programs. Each specific program guidelines and processes are presented in detail under separate staff reports.

- Minimum project size \$250,000.
- "Complete Streets" approach.
- Priority Development Area (PDA) focus.
- Must comply with regional project delivery policies and schedules.
- Project sponsors must meet all Federal and State requirements.
- 50% of all funds must be used in FY 2010/11, the remaining 50% must be in FY 2011/12.

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (LS&R) SHORTFALL

A separate staff report (for action) with recommendations on project selection process and schedule is being presented to the TAC concurrently for approval, followed by approval request at the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) and C/CAG Board.

TRANSPORTATION FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES (TLC)

A separate staff report (for action) with recommendations on project selection process and schedule is being presented to the TAC concurrently for approval, followed by approval request at the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) and C/CAG Board.

REGIONAL BIKE PROGRAM

A separate staff report (for information only) is being presented to the TAC concurrently for information. Recommendation and approval will be sought at the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) and the C/CAG Board.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S) PROGRAM

A separate staff report (for information only) is being presented to the TAC concurrently for information. Recommendation and approval will be sought at the C/CAG Board, with input and advise from a Task Force (to be formed) with the appropriate expertise.

Stimulus II

On January 11, 2010, staff was notified by MTC to prepare for a list of projects for Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads to be submitted to MTC by January 21, 2010. Legislation for Stimulus II has not been passed, hence the exact dollar amount available (if any), as well as the deadlines to use the funds are unknown at this time. However, MTC is aggressively moving forward in preparation for such funding.

A separate staff report (for action) with recommendations on project selection process is being presented to the TAC concurrently for approval, followed by approval request at the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) and C/CAG Board.

Proposed Framework Across All Programs:

Each of the Cycle 1 “block grant” programs (LS&R, Bike, TLC) has its individual program goals and objectives, hence its individual scoring system. However, with regard to the Stimulus II program, due to its extreme short timeline and vigorous process projects must endure, the focus is on the ability to meet deadlines.

Staff is mindful of the proposed project selection process for Stimulus II may not result in every jurisdiction getting a fair share of Stimulus II funding, as compared to the original Stimulus process that took place last year. However, Cycle 1 funding will be available to fund Local Streets & Roads projects, Bike projects, and TLC projects. Therefore, staff recommend cross-jurisdictional equity be addressed at the overall program level, across all of the Stimulus II, LS&R, Bike, and TLC programs, instead of within each individual program.

The objective of the above approach of striving for cross-jurisdictional equity across all four programs is to maximize the number of jurisdictions getting funded, while meeting the various constraints, requirements, and objectives of the individual programs. It is recommended project scoring systems be used as a guide for project selection, rather than the sole factor based on which funding decisions are made. Final project selection will be based on project scoring superimposed by the equity objective. More specifically, for example, if a jurisdiction received more than a fair share amount of funding in one program such as the Stimulus II program, then candidate projects from that jurisdiction will have lower priority in the other programs.

ATTACHMENT

None.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the project evaluation and selection process for the Cycle 1 Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Shortfall.

(For further information contact Jean Higaki at 599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review and recommend approval the project evaluation and selection process for the Cycle 1 Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) Shortfall.

FISCAL IMPACT

No fiscal impacts to C/CAG.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funds for this program will be approximately \$6.56 million from Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

At the May 11, 2006 meeting, the Board approved the project list for the Third Cycle Federal STP LS&R funding program. It was recommended that C/CAG staff continue to work with the Scoring Subcommittee to review the overall scoring process and consider improvements for the next funding cycle.

A scoring Subcommittee was reconvened and included Brian Lee (San Mateo County), Duncan Jones (Atherton), Larry Patterson (San Mateo), Mo Sharma (Daly City), Van Ocampo (Pacifica), Parviz Mokhtari (San Carlos), Ray Razavi (South San Francisco), Randy Breault (Brisbane), Sandy Wong and John Hoang (C/CAG).

Taking into considerations key issues such as usage, need, equity, readiness, and local match, the subcommittee developed revised scoring criteria to evaluate and prioritize future project applications. The key points that were incorporated in the updated draft included: maintaining the competitive-based process by utilizing a scoring criteria, clarifying the project eligibility and screening factors, simplifying the scoring categories to address Usage (AADT) and Need (pavement condition index), and setting 15% of the available funds for discretionary use.

At the February 8, 2007 C/CAG Board Meeting, the scoring criteria and project selection process

was approved for use in the next funding cycle. A request was made for staff to re-look at the criteria while “fresh” and to present that the criteria be brought to the Board, during implementation of the next cycle funding. The criteria were re-evaluated by the sub-committee on March 30, 2007.

NEW CRITERIA PER MTC

In December 2009, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted a proposed distribution for the Local Streets and Roads Rehabilitation Shortfall Program: based on four factors, each weighted 25% including population, lane mileage, arterial and collector shortfall, and preventative maintenance performance.

For this Cycle, MTC also placed a strong focus on the following issues:

- Priority Development Areas (PDAs),
- Minimum project size of \$250,000
- “Complete Streets” approach
- Regional project delivery

“Planned” and “Proposed” PDAs are determined and classified by the Joint Policy Committee (JPC). A “Planned” PDA has both an adopted land use plan and a resolution of support from the city council or county board.

MTC imposed a \$250,000 minimum project size in an effort to minimize the number of federal-aid projects, which place administrative burdens on project sponsors, MTC, Caltrans, and Federal Highway Administration staff.

“Complete Streets,” emphasize the accommodation of bicyclist, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. State policy stipulates that the above items must be considered in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities.

All selected project are subject to Federal, State, and Regional, requirements. Once a project is programmed regional delivery deadlines will apply. In order to preserve funding within the County action may be taken and penalties may be imposed on jurisdictions unable to make delivery deadlines. At least 50% of the funds must be programmed for delivery in the 2010/2011 Fiscal Year (FY). The remaining funds must be delivered in the 2011/2012 FY.

BLOCK GRANT PLAN

CMAs may work directly with MTC staff to request programming exceptions through the strategic plan process, when balancing MTC conflicting objectives. The CMAs will be responsible for developing a “Strategic Plan”, to be submitted to MTC by April 1, 2010. The Strategic Plan would outline C/CAG’s approach for programming the block grant. It would also contain the rationale behind any difference between C/CAG’s programming approach and the distribution approach proposed by MTC.

Staff has been in contact with MTC staff regarding the “Strategic Plan” and the project selection process. The document will not be extensive (just a few pages) but it should cover the project selection process in enough detail to develop a reasonable program in a very short time frame.

PROPOSED PROJECT EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS FOR LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (LS&R) SHORTFALL

For the LS & R Shortfall, staff intends to proceed with a competitive based project selection process approved in 2007 by the Board. There will be minor modifications to criteria to include the latest MTC emphasis on Priority Development Areas (PDA), "Complete Streets" approach, and other Federal, State, and Regional requirements. These projects are street rehabilitation type projects.

As the Scoring Subcommittee invested much work and discussion (9+ months) in developing an effective project selection process and "fair" scoring criteria, staff felt only minor modifications (updates) should be made to this criteria to address the latest MTC emphasis on PDAs and Complete Streets. Jurisdictional and Project screening requirements were updated to include the latest Federal, State, and MTC requirements. The construction phase limitation was revised to include the design phase in recognition of jurisdictional staff budget issues.

C/CAG will strive to achieve some form of geographic "equity" across all programs such as Stimulus II, LS&R, TLC, RBP to maximize the number of jurisdictions getting funded, while meeting the various constraints and requirements of the individual programs. It is recommended the project scoring system be used as a guide for project selection rather than the sole factor based on which funding decisions are made. Final project selection will be based on project scoring superimposed by the equity objective. For example, if a jurisdiction receives funding in any one of the programs, priority for project selection could drop in other programs.

This process will be presented to the Board in February. Upon approval, this project selection process will be implemented. It is proposed that a project selection subcommittee composed of Public Works Directors/ City Engineers, similar to the scoring committee, be convened to screen and score the project applications.

PROJECT SELECTION DEADLINES

The MTC's project programming deadline for projects is July 30, 2010. This is a very short timeline. In order to meet this schedule the following schedule is proposed.

Action	Date
Submit project selection process (Strategic Plan) to the TAC and CMEQ	January-2010
Submit Strategic Plan to the Board and release "Unified Call for Projects"	February-2010
"Strategic Plan" due to MTC	April 1, 2010
Project application due date	Mid April 2010
Project Selection Process	Mid April - Mid May 2010
Present project selection to TAC & CMEQ	May 20, and May 24, 2010
Present project selection to Board	June 10, 2010
MTC Programming Deadline	July 30, 2010

ATTACHMENT

- Draft Project Evaluation & Selection Process For Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Funding TAC 1/21/10

- Proposed Project Application

**DRAFT PROJECT EVALUATION & SELECTION PROCESS
FOR CYCLE 1 STP/CMAQ
LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS SHORTFALL FUNDING
TAC 1/21/10**

Background

In May 2006, a subcommittee to the CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was formed to evaluate the current project scoring process and develop an updated scoring and prioritization process for project applications that are submitted for Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall (LSRS) funding opportunities. The Subcommittee members consisted of Brian Lee (San Mateo County), Duncan Jones (Atherton), Mo Sharma (Daly City), Van Ocampo (Pacifica), Parviz Mokhtari (San Carlos), Ray Razavi (South San Francisco), Randy Breault (Brisbane), Larry Patterson (San Mateo), Sandy Wong (C/CAG), and John Hoang (C/CAG).

On February 8, 2007, the scoring process was presented to the C/CAG Board and approved. The subcommittee conducted a follow up review, at the Board's request on March 30, 2007.

2009 - The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Emphasis on Priority Development Areas (PDA) and minimum project size requirement.

In December 2009, funding for the next STP cycle will be available to the CMAs for programming by means of a "PDA block grant"; however, MTC wants to ensure an emphasize to use the funds in the support of PDAs. To address MTC intent and policy, another PDA Scoring Criteria is added for this cycle of funding. MTC also imposed a \$250,000 minimum project size in an effort to reduce the number of projects from each County.

The following process was developed in 2007 and updated in 2009 (shown as **Update**) to determine project eligibility and prioritize projects for funding:

Project Eligibility / Screening Factors

First, project applications will be screened to ensure that they meet minimum program requirements for funding:

- Project must meet all Federal, State, and Regional requirements (e.g., Pavement Management System certified agency, STP/CMAQ eligible work, RTP consistency, etc.)
- Project is ready to be programmed (i.e., Project readiness, DBE approved, ROW existing, No significant Environmental issues, etc)
- Project is located on the Federal-Aid System¹

¹ All public roads functionally classified as rural minor collectors or higher are considered on the Federal Aid system.

- Project must have a minimum project size of \$250,000. (**Update – new requirement**)
- Funding is available for both design and construction phase. Design must be tied to construction. No stand-alone design projects are allowed. (**Updated**)
- Requested funding is for roadway pavement rehabilitation and preventative maintenance only. Improvements that are incidental to the paving project such as ADA mandated improvements and traffic signal detection system (loop) replacement may be eligible for grant funds. Other improvements and enhancements may be included in the project as non-participating items.
- Project should extend the service life of the pavement for a minimum of 5 years.
- Street segment receiving rehabilitation funds will be prohibited from receiving new funding for a period of a minimum of 5 years.

Jurisdiction and Project Requirements

Selected projects will be subject to Federal, State, and Regional, delivery requirements as noted in MTC Resolution No.3606.

- Jurisdiction must be in compliance with the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy requirements at the time of project application (e.g. Pavement Management Certified agency.)
- Jurisdiction must comply with all FHWA and Caltrans Local Assistance and MTC project delivery and reporting requirements. (**Update**)
- Jurisdiction must provide a minimum FHWA required local match of 11.47%.
- Jurisdiction must obligate the funds by February 1st of the year programmed² (**Update – MTC obligation deadline moved up by one month**)
- Jurisdiction to submit a completed Routine Accommodation Checklist (for Bicycle and Pedestrians)³ upon project selection and prior to programming. (**Update – required with project “selection” vs. “application”**)
- Jurisdiction is to submit a “resolution of local support” and an FMS project application, prior to programming. (**Update – MTC requirement**)

Project Funding Criteria

C/CAG will strive to achieve some form of geographic “equity” across all five programs (Stimulus II, LS&R, TLC, RBP, Safe Routes to School). For example, if a jurisdiction receives funding in any one of the programs, priority for project selection could drop in other programs. C/CAG would also have the discretion to partially fund project applicants when considering “equity.”

² If jurisdiction determines that project will not meet the obligate deadline, then C/CAG must be formally notified by Nov. 1st. Failure to provide proper notification will result in an imposed penalty that will prevent jurisdictions from receiving any additional funding for a period of one (1) year.

³ New requirements by MTC

Project Scoring Criteria

The Scoring Criteria will be used to rank projects in the four categories that address “usage”, “needs”, “PDA Status” and “Complete Streets”.

“Usage” considers the Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) of a street. “Need” establishes ranking criteria using the Pavement Condition Index (PCI)⁴ for specific streets.

Priority Development Area (PDA) has two categories. “Planned”/“Proposed” PDA and “Not in a PDA”. PDAs are determined by the classification according to MTC or the Joint Policy Committee (JPC). A “Planned” PDA has both an adopted land use plan and a resolution of support from the city council or county board. A link to the JPC PDA data is found at: <http://www.bayareavision.org/initiatives/prioritydevelopmentareas.html>

The “Complete Streets” criteria emphasize the accommodation of bicyclist, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. State policy stipulates that the above items must be considered in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities. A project will either contain “complete street” elements or not, therefore the criteria has two possible score categories.

⁴ A PCI score is generated by the MTC StreetSaver pavement management software. Jurisdictions are required to update their program every 2 years.

The table below shows the criteria with the associated points. Usage and Need category has a maximum 50 points each. PDA Status has a total of 5 points and “Complete Streets” has a total of 5 points for a maximum total of 110 points.

Category	Description	Points	Maximum Points
Usage	Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT)		50
	< 1000	15	
	1001 - 3000	20	
	3001 - 6000	25	
	6001 – 10,000	30	
	10,001 - 15,000	35	
	15,001 - 20,000	40	
	20,001 - 25,000	45	
	> 25,000	50	
Need	Pavement Condition Index (PCI)		50
	< 40	10	
	> 70	20	
	Between 55 and 70	40	
	Between 40 and < 55	50	
PDA Status	Priority Development Area (PDA) Status		5
	"Planned" or "Proposed" PDA	5	
	Not in a PDA	0	
Complete Streets	"Complete Streets" Considered		5
	Contains "Complete Streets" elements	5	
	No "Complete Streets" elements	0	
Possible Total			110

Project Selection

It is proposed that a project selection subcommittee composed of Public Works Directors/ City Engineers, similar to the scoring committee, be convened to screen and score the project applications.

Projects will be ranked in order (highest to lowest) by total points. Projects will be selected by rank with consideration given to jurisdictional funding from other programs. C/CAG would also have the discretion to partially fund project applicants when considering “equity.”

Programming Requirements

In order to preserve funds within the County the following requirements will apply to programmed projects.

During the fiscal year in which a project is programmed, if the project sponsor determines that it will not be able to deliver the project on time (i.e., meet the February 1st obligation deadline), the jurisdiction will need to inform C/CAG in writing by November 1st. With proper notification, no penalty will be incurred by the sponsoring jurisdiction.

After November 1st of the programmed year, if project sponsors will not delivery project within the Regional deadline of February 1st of the programmed fiscal year, and if the sponsor did not inform C/CAG in writing by November 1st, a penalty will be imposed on that jurisdiction and the jurisdiction will be ineligible to apply for any funds in the next funding cycle(s) of the allocation.

**DRAFT 2010 CYCLE 1 STP/CMAQ
LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS SHORTFALL
APPLICATION FOR FEDERAL FUNDS**

Project Title

Project Scope/Description

Project Location with Limits (Attach a map)

Sponsoring Jurisdiction

Contact Person

Telephone Number

Planned Obligation Date:

Is this Project Located on a Federal Aid Roadway? Yes No

If Yes, What is the Federal Functional Classification of each Roadway?

Has it been more than 5 years since these roads were paved? Yes No

If "No" explain:

TOTAL PROJECT COST (\$000)

FUNDS REQUESTED (\$000)*

*Maximum Federal funds at 88.5% of total project cost.

PROJECT AMENITIES % (Cost of Amenities/Total Project Cost)**

** Amenities are defined as signalization, bike paths, transit pullouts, sidewalk ramps, guardrails, culverts, landscaping, and similar non-pavement portions of the project. Attach cost estimate to verify any amenity (non-pavement rehabilitation work) percentage greater than zero.

READINESS EVALUATION:

Proposed Delivery Year

 FY 10/11 FY 11/12

Field Review/Project Study Report or equivalent

 Yes No

DBE Status: Approved Draft Date
Approved Final Date

Environmental Review Status:

State if the project will have major or minor ground disturbance, endangered species impacts, waterway impacts, etc. State if environmental clearance is already in process.

Right-of-Way Acquisition Status:

State here if Right of Way Acquisition is required or if encroachment permits are required from another state or local agency. State here if Right of Way activities have been started.

PS&E Status

State here if the contract plans specifications and estimates have been started.

Agreements/Permits Status

State here if any agreements (Caltrans Coop), or permits (BCDC) are needed and if those activities have been started.

Fill in funding table. Input "0" if zero funds are requested:

Requested Funds	Design	Construction	Total
Local Funds (match)			
STP/CMAQ (requested)			
Other Grants			
Total Funds			

USAGE

A. What is the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of each roadway? Please state the source of this information or attach a copy of the source data.

NEED

B. What is the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of each roadway?

PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) STATUS

C. Is the project located in a Priority Development Area (PDA)? Yes No

If Yes, mark the status of the PDA with the JPC : "planned" "proposed"

Remarks

COMPLETE STREETS

D. Have bicycle/pedestrian/ ADA facilities been considered for inclusion in the project? Yes No

Are bicycle/pedestrian/ ADA elements included in the project? Yes No

OTHER FUNDING CONSIDERATION

E. Has your jurisdiction received "Stimulus II" funds? Yes No

If Yes, how much?

F. Has your jurisdiction received other Cycle 1 funds? Yes No

If Yes, how much?

NOTES:

1. Project applications are due to the City/County Association of Governments no later than: **5:00 P.M., Friday, April 30, 2010.** . **THIS IS THE FINAL DEADLINE FOR RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS FOR THE LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS SHOTFALL FEDERAL FUNDING PROGRAM.**
2. Applications will be limited to a maximum of four (4) submittals per jurisdiction.
3. A funding cap of \$1 million per jurisdiction/agency will be in effect.
4. C/CAG has the discretion to partial fund projects so projects should be “scalable.”
5. C/CAG has the discretion to determine the delivery year of your project.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY:

Local Match % _____

Project qualifies for funding
consideration _____

Amenities % _____

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Sandy Wong, Deputy Director
Subject: Review and recommend approval of a project selection process for Federal Economic Stimulus II funding for Local Streets & Roads (if available)

(For further information contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review and recommend approval of the project selection process for Federal Economic Stimulus II funding for Local Streets & Roads (if available).

FISCAL IMPACT

Federal Stimulus II funding for Local Streets & Roads may become available. The dollar amount for Stimulus II funding for Local Streets & Roads is unknown at this time. There is discussion at the regional level that the amount for San Mateo County may be approximately \$11 million, if it becomes available.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal Stimulus II would come be from Federal funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On January 11, 2010, staff was notified by MTC to prepare for a list of projects for Stimulus II Local Streets & Roads to be submitted to MTC by January 21, 2010. Legislation for Stimulus II has not been passed, hence the exact dollar amount available (if any), as well as the deadlines to use the funds are unknown at this time. However, MTC is aggressively moving forward in preparation for such funding. This approach would position the Bay Area Region to meet whatever stringent deadline requirements that will be attached to the stimulus II funds as well as to enable the Region to obtain the maximum amount of available stimulus funds.

In response to the MTC request, staff sent a “call for projects” to all Public Works departments requesting for project submittals by January 15, 2010. A group of Public Works Directors (including those who had previously participated in similar tasks, and the Chair of the TAC) were called upon to review project applications on January 19, 2010. A preliminary list of projects will be submitted to MTC on January 21, 2010, and will be concurrently presented to the TAC at the January 21, 2010 meeting.

At this time, some of the Stimulus II funding requirements from MTC include:

- Sponsors must enter into contracts for within 90 days of the bill being apportioned.
- Minimum project size \$500,000.
- Local match is not mandatory.
- Must comply with regional project delivery policies, meet all ARRA reporting requirements.
- There is no guarantee than any projects will actually receive any Stimulus II funding.

In light of the extreme short timeline to deliver these projects, it is expected the only projects that could potentially meet the deadlines are those with absolutely no environmental concerns, right-of-way issues, nor permits needed. It is worth to point out that even the “cleanest” project must still go through the steps to meet all Federal requirements such as NEPA clearance, Caltrans Field Review and all other Caltrans reviewing steps, as well as Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approval. The normal amount of time for such review and approval is typically several months, provided quality products are delivered by project sponsors. Consequently, project selection recommendation will be based on:

1. Primary criterion is the ability to meet deadlines.
2. Additional considerations include cross-jurisdictional equity and sponsor’s past performance in terms of quality of products and responsiveness.

Staff is mindful of such approach may not result in every jurisdiction getting a fair share of Stimulus II funding, as compared to the original Stimulus process that took place last year. However, Federal funding for “SAFETEA-LU continuation” is imminent. MTC has delegated to C/CAG to select projects to be funded in the upcoming Cycle 1 of the next Federal Surface Transportation Act. Cycle 1 will including funding for Local Streets & Roads program, Bike program, and TLC program. The schedule for Cycle 1 project selection will be between now and June 2010. Therefore, staff recommend cross-jurisdictional equity be addressed at the overall program level, across all of the Stimulus II, LS&R, Bike, and TLC programs, instead of within each individual program.

The objective of the above approach of striving for cross-jurisdictional equity across all four programs is to maximize the number of jurisdictions getting funded, while meeting the various constraints and requirements of the individual programs. For example, if a jurisdiction receives funding in any one of the programs, priority for project selection could drop in other programs.

ATTACHMENTS

1. “Call for projects” email from Sandy Wong to Public Works Directors
2. Schedule from MTC –Jobs for Mainstreet Stimulus II Potential Delivery Milestones

Sandy Wong - Fwd: TIME SENSITIVE - Federal Stimulus II Funding "Call for Projects"

From: Sandy Wong

Subject: Fwd: TIME SENSITIVE - Federal Stimulus II Funding "Call for Projects"

>>> Sandy Wong 1/11/2010 7:50 PM >>>
Greetings Public Works Directors,

Please read through this email and direct your staff to fill out the attached forms immediately. **Deadline to submit projects to C/CAG using the attached forms is January 15, 2010.**

We just received notice from MTC a few hours ago regarding this potential Federal Stimulus II funding opportunity. The reaction time provided to us is very short. I apologize, but we must do what we can given the time constraint, to develop and submit the best projects in San Mateo County to make use of these funds (if they become available).

Last month, the House approved a second Economic Stimulus proposal that included new funds for surface transportation. Because there is no Senate version of the bill yet, MTC is unable to provide detailed revenue estimates at this time. However, MTC is requesting that the CMAs prepare a prioritized list of local streets and roads system preservation projects. Keep in mind that San Mateo County received approximately \$12 million in the last round of Stimulus for Local Streets & Roads.

In addition, there may be funding for Ready-to-go bicycle and pedestrian projects. Level of funding is also unknown, yet expected to be much less than Streets & Roads.

Please use the attached Word and Excel templates for submitting projects. Below are some helpful information:

1. Project size is \$500,000. Local match is not mandatory.
2. Priority will be given to projects that meet the MTC required deadlines. Please note that May 28, 2010 is for Execution of a Contract rather than for Contract Award. See attached "Stimulus II Potential Milestone Deadlines" sheet.
3. All information in the cells shaded in Yellow in the "Stimulus II LS&R Project Listing.xls" worksheet is **REQUIRED**.
4. A project sponsor cannot add Stimulus II funds to increase the scope of a project that has already been advertised.

5. Sponsors requesting funding are expected to met all deadlines and funding requirements - without any streamlining of the federal-aid process.
6. If funded, project sponsors (and/or the CMAs) should expect to provide updated milestone statuses on a weekly basis.
7. If funded, Evidence/notice of advertisement, Contract Award, and execution of a contract must be transmitted to MTC within 48 hours of such action.
8. If funded, project sponsors should expect to submit an invoice for reimbursement within 30 days of contract award and invoice at least monthly thereafter.
9. Finally, there is no guarantee that any of these projects will actually receive any STIMULUS II funding.

Thank you,
Sandy Wong

Sandy Wong, PE
Deputy Director of C/CAG
(650) 599-1409



**Jobs For Mainstreet
STIMULUS II (FHWA Funds)
Potential Delivery Milestones
Assuming Possible March 1, 2010 Enactment Date**

**50% of the Funds
(90 Days to Award)**

Project Delivery Milestone	Potential Deadlines
Caltrans Field Review	February 15, 2010
NEPA Clearance	February 28, 2010
E-76 RFA Submittals Due to Caltrans District 4	March 1, 2010
E-76 RFA Submittals Due to Caltrans HQ	March 15, 2010
FHWA Obligation (E-76) Approval	March 31, 2010
Advertisement	April 15, 2010
Contract Award	May 15, 2010
FHWA Executive Contract Deadline (90 Days)	May 28, 2010

C:\DOCUME~1\PWUSER\LOCALS~1\Temp\XPgrpwise\[Stimulus II Potential Milestone Deadlines.xls]Potential Stimulus II Deadlines

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee
From: Tom Madalena
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Call for Projects process for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP Technical Advisory Committee review and recommend approval of the Call for Projects process for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is \$2.878 million available for the TLC Program. These funds are available for FY 2010/2011 and FY 2011/2012. C/CAG is allowed to use up to 4% for administrative activity. It is proposed to set aside approximately \$1.4 million to meet C/CAG prior commitments made in the C/CAG 4th Cycle TOD program. The remaining approximately \$1.4 million is proposed for “call for projects”.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Fund sources are composed of Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

MTC administers the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program at the regional level. C/CAG utilizes the County share of the local TLC Program funds for the C/CAG Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program. The total amount available is \$2.878 million. It is proposed to set aside approximately \$1.4 million to meet C/CAG prior commitments made in the C/CAG 4th Cycle TOD program. The remaining approximately \$1.4 million is proposed for “call for projects” in February.

MTC requires the TLC funds be invested in Priority Development Areas (PDA). In order to meet that requirement, staff recommend 80% of the \$1.4 million be invested in PDA which includes the El Camino Real/Grand Boulevard. The remaining 20% of the \$1.4 million will be combined with the Regional Bicycle Program “call for projects” which is opened to the entire county. Bike and ped improvement projects meet the intent of TLC program.

The minimum grant amount will be set at \$250,000 for eligible projects through the TLC Program. Please see the attachment for the listing of approved PDA's in San Mateo County.

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally-identified, infill development opportunity areas within existing communities. They are generally areas of at least 100 acres where there is local commitment to developing more housing along with amenities and services to meet the day-to-day needs of residents in a pedestrian-friendly environment served by transit. To be eligible to become a PDA, an area had to be within an existing community, near existing or planned fixed transit or served by comparable bus service, and planned for more housing.

The San Mateo County TLC Program is for "streetscape" projects. These are projects that enhance the livability of an area such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, and bicycle/pedestrian treatments. Streetscape improvements should strengthen the connections to new development in need of improvements. They should also ensure maximum multi-modal access. The TLC program is designed to provide an opportunity for significant improvements in neighborhoods well-served by transit. Please see the attached Regional TLC Guidance for Streetscapes. Also attached please find the San Mateo County TLC Scoring Criteria and application.

C/CAG will strive to achieve some form of geographic "equity" across all programs such as Stimulus II, LS&R, TLC, RBP to maximize the number of jurisdictions getting funded, while meeting the various constraints and requirements of the individual programs. It is recommended the project scoring system be used as a guide for project selection rather than the sole factor based on which funding decisions are made. Final project selection will be based on project scoring superimposed by the equity objective. For example, if a jurisdiction receives funding in any one of the programs, priority for project selection could drop in other programs.

ATTACHMENTS

- TLC Program Call for Projects
- TLC Scoring Criteria
- List of approved PDA's in San Mateo County

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program Call for Projects

**For projects on El Camino Real/Grand Boulevard and in Priority
Development Areas**

Fiscal Years 2010/2011 & 2011/2012

The City/County Association Governments (C/CAG) is pleased to announce the call for projects for the San Mateo County Transportation for Livable Communities Program (TLC) Program. The San Mateo County TLC Program is for “streetscape” projects. These are projects that enhance the livability of an area such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, and bicycle/pedestrian treatments. Streetscape improvements should strengthen the connections to new development in need of improvements. They should also ensure maximum multi-modal access. The TLC program is designed to provide an opportunity for significant improvements in neighborhoods well-served by transit.

For the Fiscal Year 2010/2011 & 2011/2012 cycle, there is approximately \$1,100,000 available on a competitive basis. Project grant minimum and maximum amounts are set at \$250,000 and \$500,000 respectively.

Eligible project applicants must be a City/County or transit operator within a Priority Development Area (PDA) in San Mateo County. Attached is a list of approved PDA’s in San Mateo County.

For more information on the Priority Development Areas please see:

<http://www.bayareavision.org/initiatives/prioritydevelopmentareas.html>

Eligible Projects:

Streetscape Improvements associated with high-density housing/mixed use and transit:

- bulb outs, sidewalk widening , cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification
- mid block crossing and signal
- new striping for bicycle lanes and traffic lanes
- pedestrian street lighting
- medians, pedestrian refugees
- way finding signage, pedestrian scaled

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

- street furniture including bus shelters, tree grates, benches, bollards, magazine racks, garbage and recycling bins
- permanent bicycle racks, signal modification for bicycle detection
- street trees, raised planters, planters
- costs associated with on-site storm water management, permeable paving

Connectivity Projects - connecting high density housing/jobs/mixed use to transit:

- class one bicycle/pedestrian paths
- pedestrian/bicycle bridges

Please see the attached San Mateo County TLC Scoring Criteria. Please adhere to the information stated in the scoring criteria in your application. Applications should be no more than 20 pages. Provide 6 hard copies (one reproducible) and 1 electronic copy.

Applications are due in April of 2010, attention Tom Madalena.

Tom Madalena
C/CAG
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

For any questions regarding the program or application process please contact Tom Madalena, at 650-599-1460 or tmadalena@co.sanmateo.ca.us.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program Cycle 1

Scoring Criteria

Location	Planned Priority Development Area	20 points maximum
	Potential Priority Development Area	10 points
Proximity to housing/employment	Improvement that serves high density housing or employment areas	10 points maximum
Proximity to transit	Improves access to transit	10 points maximum
Community Involvement	Community engagement process completed	15 points maximum
	Council approval	
	Community support letters	
Match	11.47% Required	35%-49% 15 points maximum
		23%-35% 10 points
		11.5%-22% 5 points
Project readiness	35% Design stage	5 points
	90% Design stage	20 points maximum
Safety	Will project improve safety to the project area?	10 points maximum 3 points
	High Safety Impact Low Safety Impact	
Total		100 points

San Francisco City and County

<i>Area</i>	<i>Designation</i>
<i>19th Avenue Corridor: County Line to Eucalyptus Drive</i>	Potential
<i>Bayview/Hunters Point/Candlestick Point</i>	Planned
<i>Better Neighborhoods: Balboa Park/Market & Octavia</i>	Planned
<i>Downtown Neighborhoods/Transit Infill</i>	Planned
<i>Eastern Neighborhoods</i>	Planned/Potential
<i>Mission Bay</i>	Planned
<i>Port of San Francisco</i>	Planned
<i>San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area</i>	Potential
<i>Transbay Terminal Area</i>	Planned
<i>Treasure Island</i>	Planned

San Mateo County

<i>Area</i>	<i>Designation</i>
<i>City/County Association of Governments: El Camino Corridor</i>	Planned/Potential
<i>City of Daly City: Bayshore</i>	Potential
<i>City of Daly City: Mission Street Corridor</i>	Potential
<i>City of Menlo Park: El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown</i>	Potential
<i>City of Millbrae: Transit Station Area</i>	Planned
<i>City of Redwood City: Downtown</i>	Planned
<i>City of San Bruno: Transit Corridors</i>	Planned/Potential
<i>City of San Carlos: Railroad Area Corridor</i>	Planned
<i>City of San Mateo: Downtown</i>	Planned
<i>City of San Mateo: El Camino Real</i>	Planned
<i>City of San Mateo: Rail Corridor</i>	Planned

Santa Clara County

<i>Area</i>	<i>Designation</i>
<i>City of Campbell: Central Redevelopment Area</i>	Planned
<i>City of Gilroy: Gilroy Downtown Specific Plan</i>	Planned
<i>City of Morgan Hill: Downtown Morgan Hill</i>	Potential
<i>City of Mountain View: Whisman Station Area</i>	Potential
<i>City of Palo Alto: California Avenue</i>	Planned
<i>City of San Jose: Central & North San Jose – Communications Hill, Evergreen</i>	Planned
<i>City of Sunnyvale: Downtown Sunnyvale and Sunnyvale Caltrain Station Area</i>	Planned
<i>City of Sunnyvale: El Camino Real Corridor</i>	Planned
<i>City of Sunnyvale: Lawrence Station Transit Village</i>	Potential
<i>Valley Transportation Authority: City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas</i>	Potential

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee
From: Tom Madalena
Subject: Receive information on the Regional Bicycle Program (RBP)

(For further information or questions contact Tom Madalena at 599-1460)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP Technical Advisory Committee receive information on the Regional Bicycle Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

There is approximately \$1,669,440 available for the Regional Bicycle Program. These funds are available for FY 2010/2011 and FY 2011/2012.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Fund sources are composed of Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

Regional Bicycle Program

Staff will be taking the Call for Projects process for the Regional Bicycle Program to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee for review and approval at the January meeting. This is an informational item for the CMP TAC.

For the FY 2010/2011 & 2011/2012 cycle, there is a total of \$1,969,440 available. \$300,000 of this total comes from the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. The TLC funds available in the RBP will be for eligible combined pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure projects. The eligibility for the \$1,669,440 of the RBP funds is described below.

C/CAG will strive to achieve some form of geographic “equity” across all programs such as Stimulus II, LS&R, TLC, RBP to maximize the number of jurisdictions getting funded, while meeting the various constraints and requirements of the individual programs. It is recommended the project scoring system be used as a guide for project selection rather than the sole factor based on which funding decisions are made. Final project selection will be based on project scoring superimposed by the equity objective. For example, if a jurisdiction receives funding in any one of the programs, priority for project selection could drop in other programs.

C/CAG has administered the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) funds for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) during past funding cycles. The new Regional Bicycle Program (RBP) no longer includes funds for pedestrian projects as it is now only for bicycle funding. Staff intends on issuing the call for projects for the San Mateo County share of the RBP as part of the Block Grant Call for Projects in February. Staff recommends that C/CAG utilize the same process that was used during the last RBPP cycle in 2006. This entails using a competitive process to award the funds. As with the RBPP program before, staff recommends utilizing the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) to evaluate, score, and rank the proposals to create a funding recommendation for the C/CAG Board of Directors. This evaluation process would include site visits by the BPAC for the top projects pre-screened by staff.

This new funding source is for the implementation of bicycle projects that are Unbuilt Regional Bikeway Network Links on the Regional Bicycle Network (RBN) as defined by MTC in the Regional Bicycle Plan for the San Francisco Bay Area adopted in March of 2009. There is some flexibility at the County level being that additional projects could be considered for funding if they meet certain criteria to establish a nexus to the RBN. The RBN criteria are organized in three categories which define the types of connections made by bicycle that have impacts on the accessibility of cycling on a regional level.

Regional Bicycle Network Criteria

Regional Destinations

- 1) Create connections to the regional transit system – including transit centers and ferry terminals (including BART stations, light rail stations, significant bus stops, airports and commuter rail) – from the four directions surrounding each station.
- 2) Provide access to and through the major central business districts of the region or sub region.
- 3) Establish connections to regionally significant activity centers, including selected commercial districts, universities and community colleges, hospitals, regional parks, and recreational venues.

Regional Connections

- 4) Selected connections across county lines.
- 5) Selected connections across barriers created by the regional transportation system (e.g., freeways, interchanges, railroads) and natural barriers (e.g., rivers, creeks and bays.)
- 6) Within current or planned Priority Development Areas (PDAs)

Regional Routes

- 7) San Francisco Bay Trail.

Other regional bicycle routes that serve multiple jurisdictions or connect to adjoining regions (e.g., Iron Horse Trail, Pacific Coast Bikeway, SMART corridor).

It will be at the discretion of the C/CAG BPAC to make the determination that the projects that are not on the MTC Regional Bicycle Network are eligible according to the above criteria. Additionally, the projects would then need to be reviewed by the MTC Regional Bicycle Working Group before they could be programmed by MTC.

Minimum grant amounts for the RBP will be set at \$250,000 and the maximum will be set at \$500,000.

ATTACHMENTS

- Appendix A Unbuilt Regional Bikeway Network Links

Appendix A

Project Identifier	Project Name	Built Miles	Unbuilt Miles	Total Miles	Endpoint A	Endpoint B	Project Cost
SF-38	Alemanya/San Jose, Daly City BART to Valencia St	3.6	0.1	3.7	San Jose Ave/Goethe St/San Mateo County Line	Tiffany Ave/Duncan St/Valencia St	\$8,698
SF-40	14th/15th Street Bike Couplet	1.0	1.0	1.9	Harrison St	Sanchez St	\$92,379
SF-41	7th Street/McAllister Street	1.7	1.6	3.3	McAllister St/Masonic Ave	7th St/Mississippi St/16th St	\$146,699
SF-43	Masonic/Presidio Ave	0.0	1.6	1.6	Presidio Ave/Broadway St	Masonic Ave/Page St	\$152,347
SF-50	Bay Trail -- San Francisco County remainder	5.4	11.3	16.7	San Mateo County	Marin County	\$6,369,201
San Francisco TOTAL		27.6	47.2	74.8			\$24,335,356

San Mateo County

SM-2	BART/SFO Bikeway Project	3.1	6.9	10.0	Goethe St/Hwy 82/San Francisco county line	E Millbrae Ave/S Magnolia Ave	\$588,735
SM-3	Ralston Avenue Bikeway Interchange Improvements (Project #3)	4.6	0.2	4.8	Canada Rd/Hwy 92	Marine Pkwy/Shoreway Rd	\$293,344
SM-6	Recreational Route Bikeway Improvements	9.4	4.6	14.0	Hwy 92	I-280	\$1,483,125
SM-7	North Coast Bikeway (Project #7)	9.7	5.5	15.1	John Muir Dr/Lake Merced Blvd	Hwy 1/16th St/Vallemar	\$203,438
SM-8	North-South Bikeway (Old County Road Section)	4.3	1.6	5.9	Bay Meadows Race Track Entrance	Middlefield Rd/Jefferson Ave	\$231,788
SM-9	Coastside Bikeway Projects (Project #9)	5.2	47.9	53.1	I-280/Hwy 92	Hwy 1	\$2,100,000
SM-11	North-South Bikeway (Bayshore Selection) (Project #11)	4.8	3.5	8.4	Bayshore Blvd/Paul Ave	Herman St/Huntington Ave	\$2,224,688
SM-12	U.S. 101/Broadway Bikeway Project	0.0	0.3	0.3	Carolan Ave/Broadway	Airport Blvd/Broadway	\$68,931

Unbuilt Regional Bikeway Network Links

Project Identifier	Project Name	Built Miles	Unbuilt Miles	Total Miles	Endpoint A	Endpoint B	Project Cost
SM-13	North-South Bikeway (Delaware-California) (Project #13)	3.1	4.8	7.9	E Millbrae Ave/S Magnolia Ave	S Delaware St/E 25th Ave	\$3,297,000
SM-14	Crystal Springs-3rd/4th Avenue Bikeway (Project #14)	1.2	3.8	5.0	Skyline Blvd/Crystal Springs Rd	Bayview Ave/Bay Trail	\$149,625
SM-15	SFIA East Side/Bay Trail Project	2.6	2.9	5.5	Gateway Blvd/S Airport Blvd/Mitchell Ave	Bayshore Hwy/Broadway/Airport Blvd	\$1,615,845
SM-20	Hillsborough to Menlo Park	11.1	1.7	12.9	Crystal Springs Rd/Alameda de Las Pulgas	Santa Cruz Ave/Sand Hill Rd	\$164,403
SM-23	Pacifica to Hillsborough	7.8	2.4	10.2	Sharp Park Rd/Skyline Blvd/Westborough Blvd	San Andreas Valley Rd/Crystal Springs Rd	\$230,627
SM-24	Pacifica to South San Francisco	6.2	0.1	6.3	Sharp Park Rd/Francisco Blvd	Gateway Blvd/E Grand Ave	\$14,098
SM-25	Redwood City to Menlo Park East/West	6.7	0.3	6.9	Whiskey Hill Rd/Sand Hill Rd	Willow Rd/Van Buren Rd	\$59,950
SM-26	Skyline Blvd	0.2	0.5	0.7	San Francisco County Line	Skyline Blvd/John Daly Blvd	\$118,538
SM-27	Bay Trail -- San Mateo County remainder	34.8	17.2	52.0	Santa Clara County	San Francisco County	\$21,412,447
San Mateo County TOTAL		114.9	104.1	219.0			\$34,256,580

Santa Clara County

SCL-1	North 101/CalTrain Corridor	18.0	8.4	26.4	Willow Rd/Willow Pl/Bryant St	N Park Victoria Dr/San Benito Dr	\$4,045,650
SCL-2	I-280 Corridor to San Jose Airport Corridor	12.6	5.9	18.5	Sand Hill Rd/Santa Cruz Ave/Alpine Rd	Airport Blvd/I-880	\$8,599,500

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Program for San Mateo County
(For further information contact John Hoang 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC receives information for the Climate Initiatives – Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Program for San Mateo County.

FISCAL IMPACT

\$1,429,000 is available to San Mateo County jurisdictions for the FY 09/10, FY 10/11 and FY 11/12. (Requires 11.47% match)

SOURCE OF FUNDS

New Federal Transportation Act funding for Cycle 1 is from the Federal STP/CMAQ (Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality) funds

BACKGROUND/DISSION

A component of the Metropolitan Transportation Commissions' (MTC) Cycle 1 Climate Initiatives Program is the Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) program. The purpose of the SR2S element is to further implement program region-wide with the overall goal of significantly reducing emissions related to school-related travel. It is the intent that this region-wide SR2S program will increase the ability of individual jurisdictions to compete for state and federal SR2S infrastructure grants.

For the SR2S program's first funding cycle, \$1,429,000 in CMAQ funds will be distributed to San Mateo County. The fund amount was determined based on grades K to 12 enrolments. Types of infrastructure projects eligible for funding may include installation or improvement of pedestrian facilities, traffic calming, traffic control devices, and bike facilities that improve the safety of walking and biking routes to K-12 schools. Non-infrastructure projects such as public education and outreach activities are also eligible to receive funding. An addition \$2,000,000 is available on a competitive basis to one or more counties to expand implementation of innovative approaches.

C/CAG, in addition to being the designated agency administering the SR2S funds for San Mateo

County will assume the lead agency role for implementing the County's SR2S Program. To accomplish this, a SR2S Task Force will be formed to advise on the development of the program and implementation of the countywide program including development of a project selection process and allocation of funds. The SR2S Task Force will comprise of one or more representatives from the CMP TAC (public works director/city engineer), C/CAG BPAC, bicycle coalition, city police/public safety, schools (superintendent, board, or principal), County of San Mateo Health Department, and other agencies to be determined. It is intended that the SR2S Task Force will report directly to the C/CAG Board. The County's SR2S Program will be developed as a component of the County's CMA Block Grant Strategic Plan.

Per MTC, the timing of project solicitations and programming will occur during the first half of 2010. MTC is currently developing more detailed program guidelines and has planned a SR2S Workshop for January 15, 2010. Attached are two pertinent handouts provided by MTC that outlines how the SR2S Program is managed in other Bay Area counties and program and project eligibility criteria comparisons between the MTC SR2S Program to the State SR2S and Federal SRTS programs. C/CAG staff will attend the workshop and additional information received will be reported at the TAC meeting.

ATTACHMENT

- County Overview (from MTC's Attachment A)
- Program Comparison (MTC's Attachment C)
- Project Eligibility Matrix (from MTC's Attachment D)

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOLS-- COUNTY OVERVIEW

County	Lead Agency	Other Major Partners	# of Schools Implemented	Total Schools		% Schools
Alameda	TransForm	Alameda County Transportation Improvement Authority, Alameda county Public Health Department, Caltrans	61	225	elementary	27%
			6	56	middle	11%
			0	63	high	0%
			0	5	other	0%
			67	349		
Contra Costa	Contra Costa Health Services	West CC Unified School District, Caltrans, Contra Costa Public Works	4	152	elementary	3%
			6	44	middle	14%
			0	31	high	0%
			10	227		
Marin	Transportation Authority of Marin	Marin County Bicycle Coalition, police departments, Alata Planning and Design, Marin County Department of Health and Human Services	37	45	elementary	82%
			11	?	K-8	?
			7	11	middle	64%
			4	9	high	44%
			59	65		
Napa	Napa County Safe Routes to School (coalition)	police departments, fire departments, Napa County Bicycle Coalition, County Board of Education	5	28	elementary	18%
			0	6	middle	0%
			0	4	high	0%
			5	38		
San Francisco	SF Dept. of Health & SF Municipal Transportation Agency	SF, Bicycle Coalition, SF Unified School District, SF Police Department, Dept. of Children, Youth and Families	5	57	elementary	9%
			0	14	middle	0%
			0	23	high	0%
			0	8	K-8	0%
			5	102		
San Mateo	No County Lead-- Various Programs: City of Menlo Park; San Mateo County Health Dept, City of E. Palo Alto & Ravenswood School District.	Menlo Park School district, Caltrans, San Mateo County, School PTAs, City of San Carlos/ Penninsula Interfaith Action	n/a	148	elementary	
			n/a	28	middle	
			n/a	25	high	
			n/a	13	K-12	
				214		
Santa Clara	Traffic Safe Communities Network, SC County Public Health Dept.	Silicon Valley Bicycle Coalition, California Office of Traffic Safety/National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Caltrans, police depts. SC Dept. of Public Health	18	241	elementary	7%
			2	59	middle	3%
			0	50	high	0%
			20	350		
Solano	Solano Transportation Authority	Solano County Department of Public Health, Solano Napa Community Information, school districts, police departments	17	60	elementary	28%
			1	15	middle	7%
			3	12	high	25%
			21	87		
Sonoma	Sonoma Bicycle Coaliton	Dept. Human Services, Sonoma County Transportation Authority	9	99	elementary	9%
			2	24	middle	8%
			0	21	high	0%
			1	35	other	3%
			12	179		
Total			199	1,611		5%

Notes:

Information for San Mateo was not available except for total schools.

Minimum local match required at 11.75% of the project cost.

Climate Action funding would ultimately leverage additional funding to the SR2S program administered by other agencies.

**New Act Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ
Safe Routes To School
December 16, 2009**

(thousands \$)

Estimated Cost of Program	Total School Enrollment (K-12) ¹		Total Annual Funding	Cycle 1 Total Funding
	Attendance	%		
Innovative Approaches				
	TBD	TBD	\$667	\$2,000
Innovative Approaches SubTotal	TBD	TBD	\$667	\$2,000
Supplemental School Roll-out			\$5,000	\$15,000
Alameda	239,163	21%	\$1,073	\$3,220
Contra Costa	183,230	16%	\$822	\$2,467
Marin	35,260	3%	\$158	\$475
Napa	23,406	2%	\$105	\$315
San Francisco	80,177	7%	\$360	\$1,079
San Mateo	106,160	10%	\$476	\$1,429
Santa Clara	300,064	27%	\$1,346	\$4,039
Solano	69,972	6%	\$314	\$942
Sonoma	76,836	7%	\$345	\$1,034
Supplemental School Roll-out SubTotal	1,114,268	100%	\$5,000	\$15,000
Safe Routes To School Grand Total			\$5,667	\$17,000

Notes:

1) Figures from the California Department of Education's website for FY 2008-09 and include both public and private schools

Attachment C: Safe Routes to School Programs Comparison

	State SR2S Program	Federal SRTS Program	MTC SR2S Program
Eligible Applicants	Cities and counties	State, local, and regional agencies experienced in meeting federal transportation requirements. Non profit organizations, school districts, public health departments, and Native American Tribes must partner with a city, county, MPO, or RTPA to serve as the responsible agency for their project.	State, local, and regional agencies experienced in meeting federal transportation requirements. Non profit organizations, school districts, public health departments, and Native American Tribes must partner with a federally eligible recipient for their project.
Program Purpose	Reduce injuries and fatalities to school children and to encourage increased walking and bicycling among students.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable and encourage children, including those with disabilities, to walk and bicycle to school; • Make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative, thereby encouraging a healthy and active lifestyle from an early age; and • Facilitate the planning, development, and implementation of projects and activities that will improve safety and reduce traffic, fuel consumption, and air pollution in the vicinity of schools. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build upon SR2S efforts funded by federal, state, and locally funded programs • CMAQ Program objectives also need to be met: reduce criteria pollutants while reducing congestion • Each county will collaboratively tailor the objective of this program led by the congestion management agencies.
Eligible Projects (See Table 2 for details)	Infrastructure projects Must be located in the vicinity of a school. Incidental “soft” costs (i.e. education, outreach) are permitted up to 10%	Stand-alone infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects (10-30% of program). Infrastructure projects must be within 2 miles of a grade school or middle school	Infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects (Focus on non-infrastructure- For discussion)
Local Match	10%	None	11.47%
Targeted Beneficiaries	Children in grades K-12	Children in grades K-8	Children in grades K-12
Funding	\$24 million per year in CA	\$20 million per year in CA (future levels subject to federal reauthorization)	\$5 million per year available for Region in Cycle 1, or \$15 million total; \$2 million available for innovative approaches
Distribution formula	Competitive	Competitive	Distribution to counties based on total school enrollment in counties, except for the innovative approaches component which is regionally competitive.

Attachment D: Safe Routes to Schools Project Eligibility Matrix

(¹Language from CMAQ Guidance. Note that CMAQ can fund all specific improvements that are eligible in the State and Federal SR2S Programs.)

State SR2S Program	Federal SRTS Program	MTC SR2S Program (CMAQ) ¹
<p>Non-Infrastructure Improvements</p> <p>Public Outreach and Education/Encouragement/Enforcement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes preparing and distributing safety awareness materials to school personnel, students, drivers, and neighboring home and/or business owners. Includes outreach efforts that promote walking and bicycling, to and from school, along the designated school routes. Includes coordinating bicycle rodeos with law enforcement agencies or forming “walking school buses” within neighborhoods. These activities are considered ‘incidental’ and limited to 10% of the construction costs. 	<p>Non-Infrastructure Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public awareness campaigns and outreach to press and community leaders, Traffic education and enforcement in the vicinity of schools, Student sessions on bicycle and pedestrian safety, health, and environment, and Funding for training, volunteers, and managers of safe routes to school programs. 	<p>Non-Infrastructure Improvements</p> <p>Public Education and Outreach Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public education and outreach can help communities reduce emissions and congestion by inducing drivers to change their transportation choices. Activities that promote new or existing transportation services, developing messages and advertising materials (including market research, focus groups, and creative), placing messages and materials, evaluating message and material dissemination and public awareness, technical assistance, programs that promote the Tax Code provision related to commute benefits, and any other activities that help forward less-polluting transportation options. Air quality public education messages: Long-term public education and outreach can be effective in raising awareness that can lead to changes in travel behavior and ongoing emissions reductions; therefore, these activities may be funded indefinitely. Non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use Travel Demand Management Activities including traveler information services, shuttle services, carpools, vanpools, parking pricing, etc.
<p>Infrastructure Improvements</p> <p>Pedestrian facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes new sidewalks, sidewalk widening, sidewalk gap closures, curbs, gutters, and curb ramps. Also includes new pedestrian trails, paths and pedestrian over- and under-crossings. Note: Sidewalk repairs are ineligible. Applicants that propose sidewalk repairs will need to explain why the procedures contained in Streets and Highways Code Section 5611 cannot be exercised to repair the sidewalk. This section allows municipalities to instruct property owners to repair sidewalks on, or fronting, their property. <p>Bicycle facilities:</p>	<p>Infrastructure Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sidewalk improvements: new sidewalks, sidewalk widening, sidewalk gap closures, sidewalk repairs, curbs, gutters, and curb ramps. Pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements: crossings, median refuges, raised crossings, raised intersections, traffic control devices (including new or upgraded traffic signals, pavement markings, traffic stripes, in-roadway crossing lights, flashing beacons, bicycle-sensitive signal actuation devices, pedestrian countdown signals, vehicle speed feedback signs, and pedestrian activated signal upgrades), and sight distance improvements. 	<p>Infrastructure Improvements</p> <p>Bicycle/Pedestrian Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc.) that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips Programs for secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas new construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks, or areas solely for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest

State SR2S Program	Federal SRTS Program	MTC SR2S Program (CMAQ) ¹
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes new or upgraded bikeways, trails, paths, geometric improvements, shoulder widening, and bicycle parking facilities, racks and lockers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-street bicycle facilities: new or upgraded bicycle lanes, widened outside lanes or roadway shoulders, geometric improvements, turning lanes, channelization and roadway realignment, traffic signs, and pavement markings. Off-street bicycle and pedestrian facilities: exclusive multi-use bicycle and pedestrian trails and pathways that are separated from a roadway. Secure bicycle parking facilities: bicycle parking racks, bicycle lockers, designated areas with safety lighting, and covered bicycle shelters. 	
<p>Traffic calming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes roundabouts, bulb-outs, speed humps, raised crosswalks, raised intersections, median refuges, narrowed traffic lanes, lane reductions, full- or half-street closures, and other speed reduction techniques. Note: Improvements to pick-up and drop-off areas are ineligible. The goal of this program is to encourage students to walk and bicycle to school. Exceptions may be granted if the project increases walking and bicycling by students and reduces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic diversion improvements: separation of pedestrians and bicycles from vehicular traffic adjacent to school facilities, and traffic diversion away from school zones or designated routes to a school. Traffic calming and speed reduction improvements: roundabouts, bulb-outs, speed humps, raised crossings, raised intersections, median refuges, narrowed traffic lanes, lane reductions, full- or half-street closures, automated speed enforcement, and variable speed limits. 	<p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic calming measures
<p>Traffic control devices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes new or upgraded traffic signals, crosswalks, pavement markings, traffic signs, traffic stripes, in-roadway crosswalk lights, flashing beacons, bicycle-sensitive signal actuation devices, pedestrian countdown signals, vehicle speed feedback signs, pedestrian activated signal upgrades, and all other pedestrian- and bicycle related traffic control devices. 		

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator
Subject: Report on the C/CAG Board recommendation to fund four projects under the Fourth Call for Projects, Lifeline Transportation Program (Tier 2), for a total of \$603,087.

(For further information please contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462)

RECOMMENDATION

That the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) receive the C/CAG Board recommendation to fund four projects under the Fourth Call for Projects, Lifeline Transportation Program (Tier 2), for a total of \$603,087.

FISCAL IMPACT

This program has approximately \$384,048 in Proposition 1B (Prop 1B) and \$219,039 in State Transit Assistance (STA) available for San Mateo County for the Tier 2 Program. Total funds are \$603,087.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The two State-funding sources are Proposition 1B Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account (PTMISEA) funds (Prop 1B) and State Transit Assistance (STA). All funding is from the MTC Lifeline Transportation Program.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The purpose of the program is to fund community-based transportation projects that improve the mobility of low-income residents. This is an MTC program that C/CAG will administer for San Mateo County. This program requires a 20% local match and the recipient must either be eligible to receive state transit funds or must partner with a sponsor agency that is able to receive transit funds.

Additional STA and JARC Funding

On August 27, 2009 MTC notified staff that \$295,228 in STA and \$220,658 in JARC would be added to the Tier 2 program. Staff increased funding on all projects awarded funds under the Tier 1 call for projects. After fully funding the remaining projects, \$243,039 in STA remained.

As of October 8, 2009 the left over Proposition 1B funds and STA funds from left to program were as follows:

Proposition 1B funds left from Tier 1	\$145,565
Proposition 1B funds left from Tier 2	\$235,179
Left over STA funds from Tier 2 (\$243,039-\$24,000)	<u>\$219,039</u>
Total left over funds to go out for another Call for Projects	\$599,783

On Oct 15, 2009 another call for projects was released to address the remaining STA and 1B funds. On November 24, 2009, MTC notified staff that an additional \$3,304 in 1B funds was available to the County for programming, bringing the total available funds to \$603,087.

All applicants were required obtain sponsorship from the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) for access to the Prop 1B and STA funds. It is estimated that SamTrans will incur up to approximately \$6,000 per project in administrative cost acting as Prop 1B and STA pass through agency. SamTrans issued letters stating that any administrative cost would either come from the projects awarded pass through funds or from local sources via a memorandum of understanding (MOU).

Applications were due on December 2, 2009. Seven applications were received. Since funding for an earlier cycle (2007) of the Lifeline program is coming to an end, about half of the projects were continuation of projects funded under this earlier cycle.

For the selection of projects, C/CAG staff organized a selection committee composed of Juda Tolmasoff from the County Legislative office, Corinne Goodrich from San Mateo County Transit District, William Allen from the MTC Minority Citizens Advisory Committee, Amy Burch from MTC, and Tom Madalena from C/CAG. This committee convened on December 15, 2009 to finalize scoring of the applications.

Application requests exceeded the available funds and operational funds (STA) were very limited. The committee decided to split funds between the top two scoring operational applicants to partially fund two applicants. The committee also decided to split capital funds between the top two scoring capital applicants, fully funding the top project and partially funding the second project. The funding results are attached.

An East Palo Alto need was recognized, however \$499,759 from Tier 1 is already in the pipeline for this project and the panel wanted to see how effectively those funds are spent, before committing additional funding.

The recommendation for additional Tier 2 projects will be sent to MTC for adoption. Project sponsors will then be directed to work with SamTrans to fill out the PTMISEA Prop 1B funding applications to forward to MTC.

MTC will process the PTMISEA applications and funding will pass back through SamTrans to each project sponsor under a SamTrans funding agreement. For STA funds, SamTrans will enter into a funding agreement with each project sponsor to pass through STA funds. .

ATTACHMENTS

- Lifeline Transportation Program Funding Tier 2 Recommendation - Fourth Call - Attachment A
- Lifeline Transportation Program Funding Cycle 2 (Total of Four Call For Projects) – Attachment B

Lifeline Transportation Program Funding Tier 2 Recommendation - Fourth Call

Rank	Agency	Project	STA funds	1B funds	Total \$ To Be Funded	Total \$ Requested	Comments / Concerns
Operation 1	SMC Human Services Agency	Bus tickets and passes for low income families and individuals	109,520	0	109,520	\$200,000	
Operation 2	Family Services Agency of SMC	Transportation for low income seniors	109,520	0	109,520	\$200,000	
Operation 3	City of East Palo Alto	Youth shuttle, mobility manager, weekend shuttle service	0	0	0	\$195,802	Need is recognized, however \$499,759 from Tier 1 is in the pipeline for this project. Committee would like to see how effectively those funds are spent before committing additional funding.
Operation 4	City of Redwood City	CBX Shuttle Service	0	0	0	\$94,252	
Capital 1	City of Daly City	Bayshore bus stop improvements	0	187,181	187,181	\$187,181	
Capital 2	SamTrans	Bus stop improvements within the communities of concern	0	196,867	196,866	\$272,320	
Capital 3	City of East Palo Alto	Replacement of a senior shuttle bus	0	0	0	\$54,400	

Available Source \$	219,039	384,048	603,087
Sum of awarded funds	219,039	384,048	603,087
Left over \$	0	0	0

**Lifeline Transportation Program Funding Cycle 2
(Total of four Call For Projects)**

Tier	Agency	Project	Total \$ Funded
Tier 1	City of East Palo Alto	EPA Youth Shuttle, Manager, Bus shelters, Shuttle Operatations	\$499,759
Tier 1	Daly City	Bayshore Shuttle Service	\$481,014
Tier 1	Samtrans	Fixed Route 280 (East Palo Alto)	\$415,935
Tier 1	Samtrans	Fixed Route 17 (Coastside Service)	\$428,423
Tier 1	Samtrans	Fixed Route 17 (Bus Procurement)	\$900,000
Tier 1	SamTrans	Transit Awareness Option	\$0
Tier 1	Shelter Network	Van purchase and operations for shelter resident transportation	\$100,250
Tier 2	City of Daly City	Bayshore bus stop improvements	\$187,181
Tier 2	City of East Palo Alto	Youth shuttle, mobility manager, weekend shuttle service	\$0
Tier 2	City of East Palo Alto	Replacement of a senior shuttle bus	\$0
Tier 2	City of Redwood City	CBX Shuttle	\$0
Tier 2	Family Services Agency of SMC	Transportation for low income seniors	\$109,520
Tier 2	Pacifica	Senior Service bus/ van purchase	\$56,221
Tier 2	SamTrans	Bus stop improvements within the "communities of concern"	\$196,866
Tier 2	San Bruno	Belle Air Parking Lot modification	\$151,251
Tier 2	San Bruno	Senior Shuttle bus	\$100,000
Tier 2	San Bruno	Sidewalks, solar bus shelters, curb ramps	\$201,600
Tier 2	SMC Human Services Agency	Bus tickets and passes for low income families and individuals	\$109,520

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: January 21, 2010
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Richard Napier, Executive Director
Subject: Proposed FY 2010/11 State Budget Update
(For further information contact Richard Napier at 599-1420)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC receives an update of the proposed FY 2010/11 State Budget

FISCAL IMPACT

FY 2010/11

SOURCE OF FUNDS

State funds.

BACKGROUND/DISSION/ATTACHMENT

Attached is a correspondence (E-mail to Richard Napier) with an extended analysis of the Proposed FY 2010/11 State Budget and its potential impacts on the local government.

Richard Napier - Governor's Proposed 2010-11 State Budget

From: "Gus Khouri" <gus@shawyoderantwih.com>
To: "Richard Napier" <rnapier@co.sanmateo.ca.us>
Date: 1/8/2010 6:40 PM
Subject: Governor's Proposed 2010-11 State Budget
CC: "Sandy Wong" <slwong@co.sanmateo.ca.us>, <ccole@advocation-inc.com>, <cwilson@advocation-inc.com>, "Josh Shaw" <josh@shawyoderantwih.com>, "Paul Yoder" <paul@shawyoderantwih.com>, "Andrew Antwih" <Andrew@shawyoderantwih.com>, "Tressa Wallace" <Tressa@shawyoderantwih.com>

Rich,

Please see below for our extended analysis on the local government impact.

General Fund revenues in 2009-10 are now expected to total \$88.1 billion. This is \$1.5 billion below the estimate at the time of the amended 2009 Budget Act. For 2010-11, revenues without proposed policy changes or other solutions are expected to increase slightly to \$90.9 billion, a 3.2 percent increase from 2009-10.

After the proposed transportation tax changes are included (details below), revenues are estimated to be \$89.3 billion in the budget year. Absent the policy changes adopted in 2008 and 2009, total general fund revenues for 2010-11 would be \$81.8 billion.

The Governor is calling a special session to address the current budget gap. The budget proposes solutions for action in the Special Session that will close \$8.9 billion of the budget gap.

The Governor's budget includes **funding to reimburse local governments for the May 2010 Special Election**: Special Election Costs —\$68.2 million local assistance to reimburse counties for costs incurred for the May 19, 2009, Statewide Special Election.

Here is a link the budget summary: <http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/pdf/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf>

FUND SHIFTS / NEW REVENUE

The Governor Budget proposal includes \$4.5 billion in fund shifts and what he refers to as alternative revenues – including proposals to redirect Prop. 10 and Prop. 63 (requires going to the ballot in June 2010), oil drilling, transportation funding swap.

Automated Speed Enforcement Revenue — Increased revenues of \$337.9 million, which allows for a \$296.9 million General Fund reduction to the Trial Courts. In addition, these revenues would allow for a \$41 million augmentation for trial court security, which would address the trial court security funding shortfall. The new speed enforcement program would utilize red light violation monitoring systems to identify and fine persons speeding through intersections.

California Children and Families Act of 1998 (Proposition 10) — A reduction of \$550 million in General Fund through a redirection of Proposition 10 funding from the California

Children and Families Commission budget to high-priority state programs serving children. This proposal includes shifting (for five years) approximately 50 percent of the Proposition 10 revenues currently directed to state and local accounts within the Commission's budget (\$242 million in 2010-11) and a one-time sweep of state and local reserves (\$308 million). The redirected funds will be used to support children enrolled in programs administered by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Developmental Services. Implementation of this proposal will require voter approval. It is anticipated this initiative will be included in the June 2010 election.

Community Mental Health Services — A reduction of \$452.3 million in General Fund and substitute with Mental Health Services Act (Proposition 63) funding for a portion of the EPSDT program and a portion of the Mental Health Managed Care program. This requires amending the non-supplantation and maintenance-of-effort provisions of Proposition 63 and requires voter approval. It is anticipated this initiative will be included in the June 2010 election.

Cigarette and Tobacco Products Surtax Fund (Proposition 99) — Savings of \$36 million from using available one-time Proposition 99 reserves to offset costs in Medi-Cal.

Children's Health Coverage — A decrease of \$240 million from available proceeds (\$80 million per quarter from April 2009 until December 2010) authorized in law from newly enacted hospital fees. This is in addition to \$320 million reflected in the budget as a workload adjustment.

Forensic Labs Fund Shift —reduction of \$45.1 million by shifting support of the DOJ's regional forensic labs, including lease revenue debt service costs, by increasing penalty assessments. The proposed change would permanently raise an existing penalty assessment based on fines imposed for criminal offenses from \$1 to \$3, and broaden the use of the DNA Identification Fund to include DOJ's crime laboratory operations.

Property Tax Shift — Fund \$350 million in trial court costs with property tax revenues resulting in a comparable level of General Fund savings.

Transportation Funding —The Governor's Budget proposes to achieve \$1.8 billion in General Fund savings while continuing to fund transportation programs at the level anticipated in the 2009 Budget Act. To achieve this goal, the budget proposes to eliminate the sales tax on fuel and increase the excise tax on gasoline by 10.8 cents to partially replace these revenues, thereby maintaining funding for transportation programs while reducing net taxes paid by consumers by \$976 million.

- **Proposition 42**--The proposal eliminates not only the core PTA revenues, but also eliminates the underlying revenue dedicated by Proposition 42 -- what would otherwise be approximately \$1.4 billion this year -- to transportation and transit programs. The revenues that historically would have gone to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), county roads, and city streets, would be replaced by the increased gas tax revenues. The 20% of Proposition 42 revenues historically dedicated to the Public Transportation Account would be eliminated completely.
- **STIP & Local Streets and Roads**--The Governor's tax swap proposes the replacement revenues to be distributed as follows: \$629 million for local streets and roads and \$629 million for the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). He states that this distribution is the same as would have been provided under Proposition 42.
- **PTA and State Transit Assistance Program**--This proposal completely eliminates the core tax revenues historically funding the transit programs supported by the Public Transportation Account.

Because the proposed sales tax / gas tax swap eliminates the underlying PTA revenues, the Governor proposes NO State Transit Assistance Program in FY 2010-11 or beyond. From the revenue received in the PTA in 2009-10, \$57 million in 2009-10 and \$254 million in 2010-11 will be used to fund transit programs' bond debt service costs, as allowed under the recent court decision.

4.8 % percent statewide surcharge on all residential and commercial property insurance to fund Emergency Response Initiative will provide funding to enhance the state's emergency response capabilities.

Fund State Parks from Tranquillon Ridge Oil Revenues — A reduction of \$140 million in General Fund and replacement with revenue generated from the Tranquillon Ridge oil lease. It is estimated that the Tranquillon Ridge oil lease will generate \$1.8 billion in advanced royalties over the next 14 years. This revenue will be used to fund state parks. The Governor's Budget assumes that the State Lands Commission will approve the Tranquillon Ridge proposal. If not approved by the Commission, legislation will be necessary.

Veterans Homes — An increase of \$8.3 million and 97.2 positions to activate business operations and begin admissions at the Veterans Homes in West Los Angeles, Lancaster, and Ventura (GLAVC). An additional \$11.7 million is provided for the full year cost of the GLAVC implementation which began in 2009-10.

Veterans Homes — An increase of \$2.4 million and 16.9 positions to ensure that all aspects of construction and business operations are compliant with federal, state, and local laws at the Veterans Homes in Redding and Fresno.

Mandate Payments — An increase of \$236 million for state reimbursable mandates, consisting of \$141 million for current mandates and \$95 million for the 2010-11 payment of the mandates obligation for costs incurred prior to 2004-05.

Suspend Mandates — A one-time reduction of \$137 million by suspending most mandates not related to elections, law enforcement, or property taxes, consistent with mandate suspensions included in the Amended 2009 Budget Act.

Mandate Deferral — A one-time reduction of \$95 million by deferring the 2010-11 payment of mandates obligation for costs incurred prior to 2004-05, which are statutorily required to be completely paid by 2020-21. The balance will be refinanced over the remaining payment period.

Housing and Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2006 (Proposition 1C) — The budget includes \$131 million in Proposition 1C housing bonds, which is a year-over-year reduction of \$409 million as the majority of bonds have been obligated for housing, infill, and other community development projects. Proposition 1C funding has assisted in the creation and preservation of over 34,000 housing units.

Jail Time Instead of Prison for Specified Felonies — A decrease of \$291.6 million related to proposed statutory changes that would modify sentencing for specified non-serious, nonviolent, non-sex felonies, including drug possession, to be for one year punishable by imprisonment in local jails.

FEDERAL FUNDS

\$6.9 billion in federal funds - if these funds don't materialize, there will be a trigger list.

Expected Federal Funds

- Increase the federal matching fund rate for Medicaid to the national average from the current base Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate for California from 50 percent to 57 percent (\$1.8 billion). This increase would reflect the national average as well as the average of the ten most populous Medicaid states.
- Secure reimbursement for costs that should have been paid by Medicare and changes in the required level of state payment for Medicare prescription drug benefits (\$1 billion).
- Reimbursement for special education mandates at a level commensurate with the requirements under federal law (\$1 billion).
- Full reimbursement for the cost of incarcerating undocumented immigrants through the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (\$879.7 million).
- Expanded federal funding for foster care cases (\$94.4 million).

Trigger Reductions and Revenues if federal funds don't materialize

Reductions (\$4.6 billion General Fund)

- Eliminate the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program (\$1.044 billion).
- Fund existing mental health services with Proposition 63 funds (\$847 million).
- Reduce Medi-Cal eligibility to the minimum allowed under current federal law and eliminate most remaining optional benefits (\$532 million).
- Reduce state employee salaries by an additional 5 percent (\$508 million).
- Eliminate the IHHS Program (\$495 million).
- Redirect additional county savings (\$325 million).
- Eliminate non-court required inmate rehabilitation programs, implement banked parole for low-risk serious and violent offenders, expand crimes where convicted felons will serve time in local jails, and increase the number of parolees each agent will supervise (\$280 million).
- Eliminate the Healthy Families Program (\$126 million).
- Eliminate funding for enrollment growth at the University of California and the California State University (\$111.9 million).
- Eliminate various health services programs funded by Proposition 99 (\$115 million).
- Make an unallocated reduction to trial courts (\$100 million).
- Freeze the level of the awards and income eligibility for Cal Grants (\$79 million).
- Eliminate funding for the Transitional Housing Placement for Foster Youth-Plus Program (\$36 million).

Gus F. Khouri
 Legislative Advocate
 Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.
 1415 L Street, Suite 200
 Sacramento, CA 95814
 Phone (916) 446-4656
 Fax (916) 446-4318