

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*

1:15 p.m., Thursday, November 17, 2011
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 meeting (Oct 2011): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Funding Agreement with SMCTA for \$630,000 for joint and/or co-sponsored programs for FY 11/12• Approved – MOU with SMCTA, SamTrans and VTA for use of the C/CAG Transportation Forecasting Model• Approved – Contract with Ricondo Assoc. for \$64,338 for professional services to support the ACLUP update• Approved – Proposed 2012 STIP for San Mateo County | Hoang | No materials |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from September 15, 2011 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. Receive comments on the Draft 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and recommend adoption of Final 2011 CMP for San Mateo County (Action) | Hoang | Page 3-27 |
| 5. Notification of the 3rd Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Call for Projects (Information) | Higaki | Page 28-44 |
| 6. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information) | Higaki | Page 45-49 |
| 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)**

**September 15, 2011
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, 4th Floor Dining Room. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, September 15, 2011.

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; Jean Higaki – C/CAG; Matt Fabry – C/CAG; 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 indicated on the Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from August 18, 2011.

Approved.

4. MRP Compliance Baseline Trash Loads and Load Reductions (Item moved up on agenda)

Matt Fabry presented on the MRP Compliance Baseline and short-term trash load reduction plan including trash generation rate development, baseline trash loads, control measures to achieve 40% reduction, and the plan development schedule. Member Murtuza inquired about the monitoring locations selected to establish the baseline for the County. Member Ovadia inquired about considerations for monitoring areas with mitigation measures in place, for instant, street sweeping. This item was informational.

5. Review and recommend approval of the Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County

Jean Higaki presented the proposed 2012 STIP. Item was approved.

6. Funding allocation of local share under the C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee)

John Hoang provided information regarding the recent allocation of the local share of funding under the \$4 vehicle registration fee. Letters were mailed out to City Managers on September 14th. The \$4 and \$10 VRF programs overlap until the \$4 VRF program ends December 2012. Clarifications were made with regards to the total amount allocated for each city/County.

7. Update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors Project

Jean Higaki provided handouts which included layouts and elements of the Smart Corridor project and trailblazer sign details. Questions to be forwarded to the project manager are as

follows: request copy of detail plans of the ADMS; inquire about the rationale behind the northern limits of the projects and why it did not go north of 280; inquire about placement of trailblazer signs and the need to take into considerations ADA compliance and minimum clearances.

8. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki presented the item and also handed out a copy of the City of Brisbane's letter to MTC regarding the OneBayArea Grant-Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ Funding. Member Patterson questioned the validity of the information provided on the ARRA bridge project tables and inquired about the process for updating specific project information.

9. Executive Director Report

None.

10. Member Reports

Member Ovadia mentioned that Daly City was audited by Caltrans for a project that was completed 1-1/2 years ago.

End of Meeting at 2:10 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 17, 2011

To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

From: John Hoang

Subject: Receive comments on the Draft 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and recommend adoption of the Final 2011 CMP for San Mateo County

(For further information contact John Hoang 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC receive comments on the Draft 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and recommend adoption of the Final 2011 CMP for San Mateo County.

FISCAL IMPACT

Adopting the CMP in itself will not have any fiscal impact.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Not applicable.

BACKGROUND/DISSION

Every two years, C/CAG as the Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County, is required to prepare and adopt a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The role of a CMP includes: identifying specific near term projects to implement the longer-range vision established in a countywide plan; addressing the transportation investment priorities in a countywide context; and establishing a link between local land use decision making and the transportation planning process.

State law establishing the CMPs include specific requirements for the content and development process, the relationship between the CMP and the metropolitan planning process, and for system monitoring. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for reviewing the CMP for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), evaluation of consistency and compatibility of the CMP in the region, and inclusion of CMP projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) in order to compete for state funding. MTC requested that the draft 2011 CMP be submitted by October 14, 2011.

The C/CAG Board approved the Draft 2011 CMP on September 8, 2011 and authorized its release for review and comments. The Draft 2011 CMP and the notices of its availability for review were issued on September 23, 2011 to all interested parties including local and regional transportation agencies and local jurisdictions. Comments were due on October 14, 2011. In addition to minor editorial changes, the following items were also updated.

- Updated Table 5-1: San Mateo County Employed Residents (Mode of Transportation to Work) to include 2010 data.

Mode	1990	% of Total	2000	% of Total	2010	% of Total
Drive Alone	251,218	72%	256,066	72%	248,192	70%
Carpool	45,104	13%	45,367	13%	39,750	11%
Public Transportation	25,788	7%	26,029	7%	28,430	8%
Walked	8,868	3%	7,609	2%	11,023	3%
Motorcycle	1,333	0%	878	0%		
Bicycle	2,606	1%	2,896	1%	7,567*	2%
Other Means	6,059	2%	2,406	1%		
Work at Home	9,532	3%	12,845	4%	17,722	5%
TOTAL	350,508		354,096		352,684	
Total Population	649,623		707,161		718,451	

Source: 1990 and 2000 Census; 2010 American Community Survey 1-Year

** Available data provided combined Motorcycle, Bicycle, and Other Means*

- Updated Chapter 5: Included additional information regarding shuttle services in San Mateo County.
- Updated Table 8-1: Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) to include the latest project list (Board approved at the October 2011 meeting). (Attached)
- Updated Chapter 9: Data Base and Travel Model incorporating new content to describe the new C/CAG CMP Transportation Model and Database element. (Attached)
- Updated Appendix F, which includes the Final 2011 CMP Monitoring Report, completed on September 19, 2011. The final report includes an updated Table 7: Transit Ridership Totals, as indicated below, shows a decrease of 10% for SamTrans, slight increase for BART, and a 3% for all transit combined.

	Annual Total				Average Weekday			
	2011	2009	2007	2005	2011	2009	2007	2005
SamTrans	13,474,466	14,951,949	14,351,402	14,189,548	44,910	49,950	47,535	46,797
Caltrain	12,673,420	12,691,612	10,980,802	9,454,467	39,909	40,066	34,867	29,270
BART (Colma & Daly City)	7,014,816	7,026,186	6,864,974	6,211,514	23,598	23,711	23,214	20,992
BART (SFO Ext. Stations)	10,097,310	9,900,626	7,662,450	6,788,036	32,294	31,485	24,516	22,196
Combined Transit	43,260,012	44,570,373	39,859,628	36,643,565	140,711	145,212	130,132	119,255

- Updated Appendix G: Status of Capital Improvement Projects includes project status updates since the 2009 CMP. (Attached)
- Updated Appendix K: Checklist for Modeling Consistency

Staff did not receive any external comments by the close of the review period on October 14, 2011, therefore proceeded to finalize the 2011 CMP. The updated version of the 2011 CMP was submitted to the MTC on October 14, 2011, for a consistency review. The “Checklist for Modeling Consistency” (Appendix K) was submitted separately on October 24, 2011. MTC has indicated that their consistency findings process may continue through the November/December timeframe.

The Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee, at its October 31, 2011, recommended adoption of this Final 2011 CMP, allowing staff to incorporate comments received from the TAC and MTC, as needed. Staff request that the TAC recommends adoption of the Final 2011 CMP and also enable staff to incorporate comments received from the MTC, if any, prior to presenting the Final 2011 CMP to the Board for adoption at its December 2011.

The revised CMP approval schedule is as follows:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Activity</u>
Aug 18	Draft Report to TAC – <i>Recommended approval</i>
August 29	Draft Report to CMEQ – <i>Recommended approval</i>
Sept 8	Draft Report to Board – <i>approved for distribution</i>
Oct 14	Draft 2011 CMP due to MTC - <i>submitted</i>
Oct 31	Final 2011 CMP to CMEQ – <i>Recommended adoption</i>
Nov 17	Final 2011 CMP to TAC
Nov/Dec	MTC performs Consistency Findings/approval of 2012 RTIP
Dec 8	Final 2011 CMP to Board

Since the majority of the Final 2011 CMP did not change from the draft version, only the following attachments are included with this report. The complete Final 2011 CMP and Appendices can be view and/or downloaded from the following web page:

<http://ccag.ca.gov/studies-2011CongMgmtPrg.html>

ATTACHMENT

- Table 8-1: Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)
- Chapter 9 – Data Base and Travel Model
- Appendix G: Status of Capital Improvement Projects

Table 8-1: Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program

SUMMARY of PROPOSED 2012 STIP FOR SAN MATEO COUNTY
(\$1,000's)

Lead Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Total	(Info Only) Prior Year	(Info Only) 11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	15-16	16-17
Caltrans	101	658B	Auxiliary Lanes Segment 1, University to Marsh Road (CMAA)	9,172	9,172						
Caltrans	101	658C	Auxiliary Lanes Segment 2, Embarcadero to University (CMAA)	5,049	5,049						
SMCTA	101	702A	US 101/Broadway Interchange	23,218	4,218		19,000				
Caltrans	82	645C	Menlo Park-Millbrae, interconnect signals, phase 2	7,331	7,331						
SMCTA	101	690A	US 101/Willow interchange reconstruction	28,951	2,509	4,500	20,421	1,471	20,471		
Caltrans	92	664B	SR 92/Santa Valeride Lane Improvements (92)	42,662	4,022				42,640		
Caltrans		0700C	Aux Lane Landscaping #700B- 2-yr plant establishment	33		33					
SMCTA/Pacifica	1	632C	SR 1 Calera Parkway - Pacifica	6,900				6,900	6,000		
SMCTA/Pacifica	1	2140H	Hwy 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement	3,000		3,000					
San Mateo	92/82	New	Phase 1 of SR 92 Improvement from I-280 to US 101 - Construction of Operational Improvement at the SR 92/EI Camino Real Interchange - New	5,000							5,000
SM/C/CAG	92	New	Phase 2 of SR 92 Improvement from I-280 to US 101 - Environmental Study for Improvement at the SR 92/US 101 Interchange Vicinity - New	2,411						2,411	
SM/C/CAG	VAR	2140E	Countryside ITS Project	4,298			4,022		4,298		
SM/C/CAG	VAR	2140F	Smart Corridor Segment (TLSP)	10,000	10,000						
SM/C/CAG	VAR	2140F	Smart Corridor Segment (STIP) - Segment 3 to Santa Clara county line	12,977	11,000		1,977				
			SUBTOTAL - HIGHWAY (2012/13 thru 2016/17):	90,478							
JPB		2140J	CalTrain San Bruno Ave Grade Separation (HSRCSA)	19,203	19,203						
BART		1003J	Daly City BART station improvement, elevator, lighting	700		900	200				
			SUBTOTAL - PTA ELIGIBLE (2012/13 thru 2016/17):	700							
SM/C/CAG			TE Reserve	5,964	200	1,000	4,000	248	2,490	1,146	1,128
SM County			TE funded - County of San Mateo Bike Lane (C/CAG TOD commitment)	200	200						
San Bruno			TE funded - City of San Bruno BCR median (C/CAG TOD commitment)	779	779						
Half Moon Bay			TE funded - City of Half Moon Bay, Bcr 1 Landscaping	223	223						
Brisbane			TE funded - City of Brisbane Bayside bike lane	803	803						
MTC	2140		Planning, programming, and monitoring	382		60	60	62	64	67	69
SM/C/CAG	2140A		Planning, programming, and monitoring	2,378		690	353	353	355	165	462
			Grand Total:	78,285		9,283	4,561	26,315	27,678	3,789	6,659

CHAPTER 9

Data Base and Travel Model

Legislative Requirements

California Government Code section 65089 (c) requires that every Congestion Management Agency (CMA), in consultation with the regional transportation planning agency, cities, and the county, develop a uniform data base to support a countywide transportation computer model that can be used to project traffic impacts associated with proposed land developments. Each CMA must approve computer models used for county subareas, including models used by local jurisdictions for their own land use impact analysis purposes. All models must be consistent with the modeling methodology and data bases used by the regional transportation planning agency.

Discussion

This chapter describes the San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Congestion Management Program (CMP) Transportation Model and Database Element. It contains the following sections:

- C/CAG Transportation Model and Database Legislative Requirements
- Overview of the C/CAG CMP Transportation Model

Transportation models are analytical tools that can be used to assess the impacts of land use and development decisions on the transportation system. Transportation models are based on a complex interaction of relationships between variables: for example, the relationship between the price of gasoline and the number of vehicle-miles traveled or transit ridership. They are tools that can be used to project future transportation conditions, and the need for and effectiveness of transportation projects and infrastructure improvements. As long as the basic relationships established in a base year model validation remain well behaved over time, a well-designed and validated transportation model should predict transportation conditions with some degree of confidence.

The CMP transportation database consists of data that in effect document existing and future transportation network conditions and socioeconomic characteristics in a quantitative manner. The databases are a basic input for the C/CAG transportation model (CMP model) and are typically updated based on updates to the regional socioeconomic data sets provided by the

Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and through periodic updates of the transportation networks through development of long-range planning efforts and for specific projects and corridors.

The CMP model serves several purposes:

1. Evaluating the transportation impacts of major capital improvements and land use developments on the countywide CMP System,
2. Establishing transportation system characteristics for use by member agencies in performing transportation impact analyses, developing local transportation models, and preparing deficiency plans.
3. Developing roadway vehicle volume and transit ridership to support planning studies for CCAG and member agencies for corridor and project analysis.

CMP TRANSPORTATION MODEL AND DATABASE LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS

The CMP Statute requires C/CAG to develop a uniform database and model for evaluating transportation impacts. The Statute specifies the following three requirements for the CMP database and model:

1. The CMP must develop a uniform database and model for use throughout the County
2. The CMP must approve local jurisdictions' computer models that are used to determine transportation impacts of land use decisions on the CMP System
3. The CMP database and model must be consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) regional transportation database and model.

Each of these requirements is discussed below.

Uniform Database and Model

The legislative requirement for a uniform countywide model and database is critical to the success of the overall Congestion Management Program. The CMP model is used to assist in the land use impact analysis program, evaluate projects for inclusion in the Capital Improvement Program, evaluate system-level improvements to the CMP System due to deficiency plans and assist with C/CAG and member agencies in project planning and transit service planning.

Local Model Consistency

In addition to the requirement for developing a countywide model, the CMP Statute requires that models developed by member agencies for local transportation analysis be consistent with the CMP model and database. This is a logical requirement that helps assure that all member agencies are using uniform techniques to evaluate the impacts of development projects.

Returning to the concept of transportation models as tools, it is clear that local transportation models will serve a similar purpose. Local models, however, operate on a different scale. While a countywide model may be able to predict future traffic volumes on a roadway, a local model would be capable of predicting the number of vehicles at a much finer detail, for example traffic turning movements at specific intersections. In general, since local transportation models are able to include more background information they provide more detailed “city-specific” information than a countywide model.

Regional Transportation Model and Database Consistency

Consistency with the regional transportation model and database is one of the most important requirements of the CMP Statute. This section describes the regional model and database and consistency requirements.

MTC Regional Transportation Model — The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for developing the Bay Area’s regional transportation model. MTC has been developing a series of transportation models since the mid-1960s. MTC has recently converted the regional models from trip-based to tour-based models (MTC Travel Model One) and is expected to refine the full transition to activity-based models in the very near future. The C/CAG models, however, are based on the previous version of the MTC transportation planning models known as BAYCAST-90. The BAYCAST-90 travel model demand system was originally developed using 1990 Census data and data from the 1990 regional household travel survey incorporating travel diary data from more than 10,000 households.

ABAG Database — The MTC models use input socioeconomic data prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). ABAG projections provide estimates of employment, land use, housing, population, and household income at regional, county and census tract levels. ABAG updates its database forecasts every two to three years. These updates are based on surveys of local land use and development policies as well as revised national, state, and regional forecasting assumptions. The most recent version of ABAG’s officially adopted database for

congestion management application is Projections 2009 (P2009). The P2009 series provide forecasts at five-year intervals from year 2000 to the year 2035. ABAG is currently in the process of updating the regional socioeconomic data through the development of the Sustainable Communities Scenarios as required by California SB 375, and has developed an interim socioeconomic data scenario referred to as the Current Regional Plans scenario. The C/CAG CMP model uses the Current Regional Plans scenario as the basis for the 2035 long-range forecasts for San Mateo County as provided by MTC at the MTC 1454 zone level. The MTC zone level allocations were then sub-allocated to the smaller C/CAG zones based on local development characteristics. As such, the C/CAG socioeconomic data inputs are consistent at both the MTC zone level and the ABAG census tract level.

CMP Model and Database Consistency — The CMP model and database are developed to be consistent with the MTC BAYCAST-90 model and the ABAG Current Regional Plans database. MTC has recently updated the consistency requirements for the 2011 CMP development. The revised MTC Checklist for Modeling Consistency is used to evaluate the 2011 CMP. Summaries of the checklist outputs are provided to MTC in a separate submittal. More details regarding specific consistency issues are described in the following sections.

OVERVIEW OF THE C/CAG CMP TRANSPORTATION MODEL

The current C/CAG model is based on the corridor model developed for the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) Multi-model Corridor Study by the Santa Clara VTA in 2009. The GBI study evaluated the impacts of enhanced transit service (bus rapid transit) and enhanced developed strategies in the El Camino Real corridor to transform an existing auto-oriented commercial transportation corridor into a more transit-oriented mixed-use transportation corridor. The GBI model was essentially the VTA Countywide model with added zone and network detail to improve upon what was network and zone detail based on the MTC regional models for San Mateo County. The basis for the network and zone refinements applied to the VTA Countywide models within San Mateo County were the previous C/CAG Countywide models originally developed in the mid-1990s.

The addition of zone and network detail in San Mateo County required the recalibration of the trip distribution and mode choice models and a validation of the highway and transit assignments to observed road volumes and transit boardings. Using the VTA Countywide model estimated trips tables for the year 2005 (which were calibrated to year 2000 census journey-to-work for home-

based work trips), new trip distribution and mode choice models were estimated for the GBI model.

For the recently updated C/CAG models, the GBI model was applied to produce an updated base year 2005 calibration and validation with selected model enhancements. These enhancements included calibration of the auto ownership models to American Community Survey (ACS) 2005 county-level data, addition of bicycle network infrastructure (bike lanes and paths) in the networks, travel time skims, mode choice and bicycle assignments and development of a toll modeling procedure to estimate express lane vehicle volumes. The model was validated to year 2005 screenline volumes for the AM and PM peak periods and to year 2005 observed transit boardings.

Consistency with MTC Model

As noted previously, the C/CAG model was designed to be consistent with the previous MTC Travel Demand Model forecasting system BAYCAST-90 model. This section provides a general overview of the C/CAG models and also describes several basic modeling characteristics that are shared between the models.

Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's) — The current CMP model has a more refined zone system in San Mateo County and Santa Clara County than the MTC regional models. Additional zones were added to more accurately reflect and support the added roadway network and to provide more detail in transit rich corridors and dense central business districts. In all, an additional 156 zones were added in San Mateo County and an additional 1,122 zones were added in Santa Clara County. The new model maintains the use of MTC's zone system in the remaining seven Bay Area counties, but enlarges the full model region and zones to include Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey, and San Joaquin Counties.

Highway Network and Transit Network — The roadway network used by the C/CAG model includes additional detail in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The current CMP model also includes detailed stop, station and route detail in the transit network for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, and maintains the MTC roadway and transit networks in the remaining Bay Area counties. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) provided the basis for roadway networks in Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties and the San Joaquin County COG provided roadways for San Joaquin County, however, the detailed networks was simplified to match the coarser zone structure in each of those four added counties. Express lane facilities, representing the MTC 'Backbone' express lanes system for 2035, were also coded in the network with a toll facility indicator based on the highway corridor segment and the direction of travel. Differential toll facility codes were required in order to apply specific toll rates to optimize utilization

of the express lanes to preserve level-of-service for free carpool users. The C/CAG model also includes a representation of the bicycle network infrastructure in the base year and 2035 forecast year for San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Francisco and southern Alameda Counties, explicitly representing existing and future bike lanes and bike paths in travel time development, mode choice and bicycle assignments.

Capacities and Speed — The current C/CAG model incorporates the area type and assignment group classification system published by MTC in BAYCAST-90. Input free-flow speeds for expressways are slightly lower in the C/CAG models to more accurately match the travel time for the expressway segments during model validation and improve the assignment match of estimated to observed expressway volumes.

Trip Purposes — The current C/CAG model uses the same trip purposes used in the BAYCAST-90 model and also uses additional trip purposes not modeled by MTC. C/CAG model trip purposes include the following:

- Home-based work trips
- Home-based shop and other trips
- Home-based social/recreation trips
- Non-home-based trips
- Home-based school: grade school, high school, and college trips
- Light, medium and heavy duty internal to internal zone truck trips

The C/CAG model uses MTC BAYCAST-90 trip generation equations for trip production and trip attraction functions for all trip purposes listed above. In order to address special markets not included in the MTC trip purposes, the C/CAG model includes several additional trip purposes beyond those modeled by MTC, including:

- Air-passenger trips to San Francisco International Airport (SFO) and San Jose/Mineta International Airport (SJC) and
- Light, medium and heavy-duty external truck trips

Market Segments — The C/CAG model adopts the BAYCAST-90 disaggregate travel demand model four income group market segments for the home-based work trip purpose in trip generation, distribution and mode choice. In addition, the C/CAG model also maintains the three workers per household (0, 1 and 2+ workers) and three auto ownership markets (0, 1 and 2+

autos owned) used in the MTC worker/auto ownership models. Trips by peak and off-peak time period are also stratified in the trip distribution, mode choice and highway and transit assignment models.

External Trips — The C/CAG model uses a different approach for incorporating inter-regional commuting estimates than MTC. For external zones coincident with the MTC model, MTC interregional vehicle volumes were applied for base year 2000 and adjusted to the future by assuming a 1 percent growth rate per year. For external gateways from San Joaquin County and Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties, the incorporation of those counties as internal modeled areas obviated the development of external vehicle volumes for those areas of the C/CAG models.

Pricing — The C/CAG model uses MTC pricing assumptions for transit fares, bridge tolls, parking charges, and auto operating costs as assumed in the current MTC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) update. All prices are expressed in year 1990 dollar values in the models. The C/CAG model also uses regional express lane toll charges for the AM and PM peak periods that are based on optimizing the level-of-service in the carpool lanes. Depending on the level of utilization, these toll charges would vary by direction, time of day and by specific corridor.

Auto Ownership — The current C/CAG model applies BAYCAST-90 for auto ownership models to estimate the number of households with 0, 1, and 2+ autos by four income groups in each traffic analysis zone. Walk to transit accessibility measures were incorporated in the auto ownership models consistent with MTC BAYCAST-90 to more logically associate low auto ownership households with transit services. The auto ownership models were recently calibrated to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey to match workers per household and auto ownership by county.

Mode Choice — The mode choice models for BAYCAST-90 include the use of nested structures for most trip purposes, however, explicit estimation of nested structures to consider transit submodes were not included in the model specification. The C/CAG model adds a nesting structure for transit submodes of local bus, express bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), light rail, heavy rail and commuter rail underneath the MTC BAYCAST-90 nested structures. Consistent with the BAYCAST-90, mode choice coefficients are preserved by constraining the model to the BAYCAST-90 parameters, except those in transit submode structure. The C/CAG model includes a transit submode nest for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), which is an emerging transit technology in the region. Submode constants for BRT were developed from a market analysis and state

preference survey that compared the relative tradeoffs between bus, light rail and hypothetical BRT service. The resulting BRT constants were between the calibrated submode constants applied to local bus service and light rail service, implying that BRT service is perceived as more attractive than local bus service, but not as attractive as light rail service.

Peak Hour and Peak Periods for Highway Assignments — The C/CAG model uses a three-hour peak period (6 AM to 9 AM) as the basis for determining drive alone, shared-ride, and transit travel times for input to the trip distribution and mode choice models. This was assumed since peak hour travel volumes tend to produce extremely congested conditions for forecast years producing unrealistic volume to capacity ratios and travel times, thus significantly overestimating forecast transit probabilities. The highway assignments produce AM and PM peak hour volumes, AM and PM peak period volumes (5 AM to 9 AM and 3 PM to 7 PM, respectively – each coincident with the time periods of operation for carpools), midday volumes (9 AM to 3 PM) and evening volumes (7 PM to 5 AM). The four time period volumes are then added together to develop daily vehicle volumes.

Vehicle and Transit Assignments — The current C/CAG model incorporates a methodology analogous to the MTC “layered,” equilibrium assignment process, which distinguishes standard mixed-flow lanes from high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. The equilibrium assignment process used in the current CMP model is functionally equivalent to the MTC methodology. The C/CAG model includes additional vehicle classes in the highway assignments for park-and-ride vehicles and drive-alone and carpool toll vehicles.

Drive-alone and carpool toll vehicles for AM and PM peak periods are estimated using a toll model post-processor that estimates toll volumes based on a comparison of the non-toll and toll travel times and costs. This procedure assumes that toll choice occurs after the decision to choose auto versus transit has already been considered, and therefore does not influence transit mode choice. A toll choice constant for drive-alone and carpool modes was developed based on a calibration of toll volumes estimated by application of the toll model to the I-680 Express Lane facility and comparison of estimated to observed express lane volumes. It should be noted that by 2035, in order to maintain the operational feasibility of implementing regional express toll lanes, it was assumed that only 3+ occupant carpools would be allowed to travel in the carpool lanes for free. This was assumed for all carpool facilities in the model region.

In the current CMP model, transit passengers are assigned with a methodology analogous to that used by MTC, with separate assignments for each transit submode and access mode.

Assignments are also performed separately for peak and off-peak conditions. A total of eighteen separate transit assignments are run to cover the full combination of transit submode and access modes as well as to estimate transit ridership for air-passengers and external home-based work transit trips from the San Joaquin (ACE, BART and San Joaquin SMART bus) and AMBAG (Caltrain and Monterey Express) model regions.

Model Validation with 2005 Traffic and Transit Volumes — The current C/CAG model is validated to year 2005 traffic volumes for county-level screenlines and specific major transportation facilities. Two time periods are validated for county screenlines: AM peak period (5 AM to 9 AM) and PM peak period (3 PM to 7 PM). Peak hour validation was performed for US 101 and SR 82 (El Camino Real) using traffic counts provided by Caltrans. Daily transit boardings were validated for the year 2005 at the system level for major regional transit operators (Caltrain, BART, MUNI, VTA and AC Transit) and at the route level for SamTrans express and local routes.

Compliance and Conformance

To be in conformance with the Congestion Management Program, member agencies must ensure that their models are consistent with the CMP model. C/CAG encourages the use of the C/CAG model by the local member agencies in order to ensure consistency, however, member agencies are free to develop their own local models but will be required to produce documentation to demonstrate consistency with the C/CAG models.

C/CAG must also ensure that the C/CAG CMP models are consistent with the MTC regional models. To demonstrate compliance and conformance, MTC has developed a checklist of outputs that are to be produced from the C/CAG models and compared to a comparable MTC regional forecast year model run. C/CAG has prepared the checklist outputs from the most recent 2035 model runs and will provide the results in a separate submittal to MTC.

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
1997/98	Demonstration	Freeway	San Mateo	Route 92 and El Camino Real interchange improvements	2.8 M	X			
1997/98	Demonstration, SAFETEA-LU (HPP)		Pacifica	San Pedro Creek Bridge project at Route 1	1.2 M, 2.2M	X			
1997/98	STIP	Freeway	Half Moon Bay	Route 92 and Main Street intersection improvements: Route 92 widening and realignment	2.8M				X
2004/05	MTC HIP 2nd cycle Transp	Bike/Ped	South San Francisco	BART Linear Park Project (Park Station Lofts Project)	304,800				X
2004/05	MTC RBPP	Bike Ped	Daly City	Lake Merced Blvd Bike Lane (PSE)	74,000				X
2004/05	MTC TLC	Bike/Ped	South San Francisco	BART Linear Park Project	970,000				X
2004/05	SAFETEA-LU (HPP)	Bike/Ped	Belmont	US101 pedestrian bridge	1.7248M & 880,000				X
2004/05	SAFETEA-LU (HPP)	Other Roadway Improvements	C/CAG	Dumbarton Bridge to US 101 connection improvement study	352,000	X			
2004/05	SAFETEA-LU (HPP)	Freeway	SMCTA	Route 101 Auxiliary Lanes: San Mateo 3rd Ave to Millbrae Ave	2.64M				X
2004/05	TOD 3rd Cycle (Co CMAQ)	Ped	Daly City	American Baptist Homes of the West (Mission St Ped improve)	54,530			X	
2004/05	TOD 3rd Cycle (Co CMAQ)	Ped	Daly City	Landmark Plaza Development (Mission St Ped improvement)	238,470			X	
2004/05	TOD 3rd Cycle (Co CMAQ)	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Palm Residences (Delaware Street Improvement)	37,000				X
2004/05	TOD 3rd Cycle (Co TE)	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	SSF BART Station Transit Village (Park Station)	117,012			X	
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	Daly City	Landmark Plaza Development Project	486,200			X	
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	Daly City	Hillcrest Senior Housing	129,100			X	
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	Daly City	Mission Street/John Daly Boulevard Pedestrian Plaza	615,300			X	
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	Redwood City	Villa Montgomery Housing Development streetscape improvements	387,900				X
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	San Bruno	El Camino Real/San Bruno Avenue Streetscape Improvement Project	103,800	X			
2004/05	TOD Incentive	Community Improvement	San Mateo County	Colma Transit Village Apartments connections	1,078,800				X
2005/06	CMIA, SAFETEA-LU (HPP)	Freeway	SMCTA	Route 101 Auxiliary Lanes: Marsh Road to Santa Clara County	60M, 1.58M			X	

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2005/06	STIP	Operational Improvements	C/CAG	San Mateo County Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Project	1.977M			X	
2005/06	STIP	Operational Improvements	Caltrans	El Camino Real Signal Coordination	5.0M			X	
2005/06	STIP	R.R. Grade Separations /Crossing Improve	SMCTA	Tilton Avenue and E. Poplar Avenue RR Grade Separations	9.103M			X	
2005/06	STP	Road Pavement	East Palo Alto	Bay Road rehabilitation	122,000				X
2005/06	STP	Road Pavement	San Bruno	Various streets rehabilitation	294,000				X
2005/06	STP	Road Pavement	San Mateo	Alameda de las Pulgas rehabilitation	448,000				X
2006/07	CMAQ	Ramp Meter	San Mateo County	US 101 San Mateo Ramp Metering (CON)	500,000				X
2006/07	MTC RBPP	Bike Ped	Daly City	Lake Merced Blvd. Bicycle Lane Project (CON)	463,000				X
2006/07	MTC RBPP	Bike Ped	Daly City	Lake Merced Blvd Bike Lane project	537,000				X
2006/07	MTC TLC	Bike Ped	SSF	BART Linear Park (CON)	1,933,000				X
2006/07	STP	Road Pavement	Belmont	Old County Road Rehabilitation (PE)	14,000				X
2006/07	STP	Road Pavement	Daly City	Mission Street rehabilitation	395,000				X
2006/07	STP	Road Pavement	Foster City	Chess Drive rehabilitation	128,000				X
2006/07	STP	Road Pavement	South San Francisco	Grand Ave Rehabilitation (CON)	290,000				X
2006/07	STP 2nd Cycle	Other Roadway Improvements	Belmont	Old County Road rehabilitation	134,000				X
2006/07	STP 2nd Cycle	Road Pavement	Menlo Park	Sand Hill Road rehabilitation	184,000				X
2006/07	STP 2nd Cycle	Road Pavement	Millbrae	Millbrae Avenue rehabilitation	110,000				X
2006/07	STP 2nd Cycle	Road Pavement	San Mateo County	Various streets rehabilitation	500,000				X
2006/07	STP 2nd Cycle	Road Pavement	South San Francisco	Grand Avenue rehabilitation	290,000				X
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Atherton	Valparaiso Avenue Rehabilitation (CON)	470,000				X

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Daly City	East Market & Hillside Blvd Rehabilitation (CON)	350,000				X
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Menlo Park	Sand Hill Road Rehabilitation/Resurfacing (CON)	707,000				X
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Pacifica	Palmetto Avenue Rehabilitation (CON)	405,000				X
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Redwood City	Alameda de las Pultgas/Bay Road Rehabilitation combined w/ Bay Rd/Florence St (CON)	900,000				X
2006/07	STP 3rd Cycle (backfill)	Road Pavement	Half Moon Bay	SR 92 / Main Street Widening (CON)	1,544,000				X
2007/08	Regional Bike /Ped	Bike Ped	County	El Granada (Coastside) bicycle & ped	181,287				X
2007/08	Regional Bike /Ped	Bike Ped	Daly City	Mission Street pedestrian improvements	500,000				X
2007/08	Regional Bike /Ped	Bike Ped	Pacifica	San Pedro Terrace multi-purpose trail	1,000,000				X
2007/08	Regional Bike /Ped	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Delaware Street bicycle and pedestrian improvements	282,600				X
2007/08	Regional Bike /Ped	Bike Ped	SSF	Linear Park trail	537,950				X
2007/08	STIP	ITS	Caltrans	El Camino Real Signa Interconnect and Upgrade	7,135,000			X	
2007/08	STIP	Highway	Caltrans/SMCTA	Auxiliary lanes - 3rd Ave to Millbrae Ave	100,000,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Burlingame	Calif Dr Resurfacing	103,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Burlingame	Hillside Dr Resurfacing	72,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Burlingame	Rollins Rd Resurfacing	103,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	County	Bay Road Resurfacing	250,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Foster City	Foster City Blvd Resurfacing	337,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Foster City	Shell Blvd Resurfacing	140,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Menlo Park	Oak Grove Ave. Resurfacing	109,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Millbrae	Skyline Blvd. Pavement repair	124,000				X

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Pacifica	Sharp Park Rd rehab	165,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Pacifica	Terra Nova Blvd rehab	175,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	Pacifica	Oddstadd Blvd rehab	150,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	San Mateo	J. Hart Clinton Rehab	575,000				X
2007/08	STP 3rd Cycle	Road Pavement	San Mateo	Poplar Ave. Rehab	325,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Brisbane	Bayshore Corridor North-South Bikeway Project (Class II)	550,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Burlingame	California Drive: Shared-Lane Bike Route (Class III)	25,387				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Burlingame	In-Pavement Illuminated Crosswalk System at Broadway & Paloma	40,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Burlingame	Howard Avenue Bike Lane (Class II)	50,467				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Daly City	Soutgate Avenue Bike Lanes (Class II & III)	100,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Daly City	Traffic Accessibility Modifications (Audible and Countdown)	40,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Half Moon Bay	Highway 1 Bicycle Trail Project - Class I	500,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Menlo Park	Install Video Detection Systems for Bicycles at Intersections	110,000				X
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Mateo County Parks	Crystal Springs Regional Trail Design/Construction Documents	105,000		X		
2007/08	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Bikeway Connections and Kiosk	25,738		X		
2008/09	CMAQ	Operational Improvements	C/CAG	Traffic Incident Management (PE)	367,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Colma	D' Street Pedestrian Enhance (CON)	235,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Colma	D' Street Pedestrian Enhance (CON)	250,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Daly City	Mission St. Ped. Improvements. Ph. I (CON)	47,000			X	
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Daly City	Mission St. Ped. Improvements. Ph. I (CON)	499,000			X	

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Daly City	Mission St. Ped. Improvements. Ph. I (CON)	293,000			X	
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Daly City	Mission St. Ped. Improvements. Ph. I (CON)	123,000			X	
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Daly City	Mission St. Ped. Improvements. Ph. I (CON)	900,000			X	
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Pacifica	San Pedro Terrace multi-purpose trail (CON)	150,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Pacifica	San Pedro Terrace multi-purpose trail (CON)	450,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Pedestrian	Pacifica	San Pedro Terrace multi-purpose trail (PE)	50,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Streetscape	Redwood City	ECR/Broadway Streetscape (CON)	8,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Streetscape	Redwood City	ECR/Broadway Streetscape (CON)	251,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Streetscape	Redwood City	ECR/Broadway Streetscape (CON)	380,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Streetscape	San Mateo	Delaware Street Improvements (CON)	70,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ		San Mateo County	Mirada Surf Coastal Trail (CON)	181,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ		San Mateo County	Colma - 'F' Street Sidewalk and streetscape (CON)					X
2008/09	CMAQ		San Mateo County	Menlo Park - Santa Cruz Ave Ped Improv (CON)	27,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ	Bike	San Mateo County	Westborough Blvd Bike lanes improve	18,000				X
2008/09	CMAQ		San Mateo County	Install Permanent Traffic Calming Advisory signs	40,000				X
2008/09	CMIA	Highway	Caltrans/SMCTA	Auxiliary lanes - Marsh to Embarcadero	74,221,000			X	
2008/09	STIP	ITS	CCAG	San Mateo County Smart Corridors	11,000,000		X		
2008/09	STP	Road Pavement	Belmont	Old County Rd Rehab (CON)	120,000				X
2008/09	STP	Road Pavement	Foster City	Shell Blvd Rehab					X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Belmont	Curb ramps	40,000				X

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	County of San Mateo - Parks	Mirada Surf Coastal Trail	100,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Daly City	Install sidewalk bulb-outs	50,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Daly City	New sidewalk and curb ramps	55,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	East Palo Alto	Convert Rail Spur into a ped trail	100,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Half Moon Bay	Class I trail on Hwy 1	100,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Bruno	Install Class II Bike Lanes	32,500				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Bruno	Specialized routing signs	9,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Carlos	Class III Bike Routes and racks	65,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Pedestrian Countdown Signal Heads	15,808				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Video Detection for bicyclist	76,667				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Bike route signs	40,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Install 2 in-ground lighted crosswalks	40,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Woodside	Reconfigure Woodside Rd lanes	25,000				X
2008/09	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Woodside	Modify bike lane drainage inlet	12,000				X
2008/09	TLSP	ITS	CCAG	San Mateo County Smart Corridors	10,000,000		X		
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Atherton	Atherton Roadway Rehabilitation	718,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Belmont	2009 Belmont Overlay	564,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Bike Ped	Belmont	Belmont Bike Pedestrian Bridge	4,500,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Brisbane	Brisbane - Bayshore Blvd Overlay	231,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Burlingame	Burlingame Various Streets Resurfacing	551,000				X

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Colma	Colma - Serramonte Blvd Pavement Rehabilitation	217,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	County of San Mateo	San Mateo County Various Streets Resurfacing	1,726,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Daly City	Street Resurfacing 2009	1,363,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	East Palo Alto	East Palo Alto Various Streets Rehabilitation and Resurfacing	421,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Foster City	Foster City Blvd Resurfacing Project	440,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Half Moon Bay	Half Moon Bay Downtown Streets Rehabilitation	210,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Hillsborough	Hillsborough 2009 Asphalt Overlay	813,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Menlo Park	Menlo Park Various Resurfacing of Various Federal Aid Routes	710,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Millbrae	Millbrae 2009 Various Streets Repair	565,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Pacifica	City of Pacifica Various Fed Aid Street Pavement Rehabilitation Project	777,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Portola Valley	Portola Valley FY 2008-09 Various Streets Resurfacing	196,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	Redwood City	Redwood City - various streets overlay	736,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Bike Ped	Redwood City	Redwood City - El Camino Real/Broadway Streetscape	1,423,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	San Bruno	San Bruno Various Roadway Resurfacing and Overlays	959,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Bike Ped	San Carlos	2009 Pedestrian Improvement Project	559,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	San Mateo	City of San Mateo FY 2008-09 Various FAU/MTS Streets Rehabilitation	1,545,000				X
2009/10	ARRA	ITS	San Mateo	San Mateo County Smart Corridors	1,000,000			X	
2009/10	ARRA	Road Pavement	South San Francisco	South San Francisco FY 2008-09 Various Streets Resurfacing	1,661,000				X
2009/10	STIP (TE)	Bike Ped	San Mateo County	County Bike Lane	200,000			X	
2009/10	STIP (TE)		San Bruno	Median Landscape on El Camino Real	779,000			X	

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2009/10	STIP (TE)		Half Moon Bay	Route 1 median landscaping	223,000				X
2009/10	STIP (TE)	Bicycle	Brisbane	Bayshore Bike Lane	803,000				X
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Burlingame	Ped/Bike Bridge Connection	136,000		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Burlingame	Bike Route Signs	7,500		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Half Moon Bay	Class I Bike/Ped Trail	300,000		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Menlo Park	Bike Route Signage	4,000		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Redwood City	Crosswalks & Curb Ramps	33,584		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Redwood City	Bike Route Sign/Detectors/Racks	42,792		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Redwood City	In-Roadway Warning Light System	64,860		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Bruno	Pedestrian Sidewalk Access Ramps	160,000		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Carlos	Bikeway Sign/Detectors/Class II & III	83,500		X		
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	In-Ground Lighted Crosswalk	47,000				X
2009/10	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Bay Trail Improvements	131,000				X
2010/11	CMAQ	SR2S	CCAG	San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program	1,279,000		X		
2010/11	CMAQ	Road Pavement	Millbrae	El Camino Real/Victoria Ave Pedestrian	355,000		X		
2010/11	CMAQ		San Carlos	East Side Community Transit (PE)	425,696		X		
2010/11	CMAQ	Bicycle	San Mateo	Delaware Street Bike Lane (PE)	60,000		X		
2010/11	STP		Burlingame	Burlingame - Federal Grant Street	308,000		X		
2010/11	STP	SR2S	CCAG	San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program	150,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	Daly City	Street Rehab Program	1,058,000		X		

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	Pacifica	Pavement Rehab	383,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	Redwood City	2010-11 Street	946,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	San Bruno	Various Streets resurfacing	398,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	San Mateo	Street Rehab of Various Fed.	1,255,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	San Mateo County	Pavement Program	1,416,000		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	San Mateo County	Resurfacing of Pescadero Creek Road (PE)	84,989		X		
2010/11	STP	Road Pavement	South San Francisco	Various Streets resurfacing	712,000		X		
2010/11	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	C/CAG	San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan	200,000				X
2011/12	CMAQ		Burlingame	Burlingame Ave. and Broadway District	301,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		Daly City	Citywide Accessibility	420,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		Half Moon Bay	Hwy 1 Bicycle Pedestrian Trail	420,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		Redwood City	Bair Island Bay Trail Improvement	337,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ	Bicycle	Redwood City	Skyway/Shoreline Bike Route	218,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ	Bicycle	Redwood City	Skyway/Shoreline Bike Route (PE)	38,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		San Bruno	Street Median and Grand	654,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		San Bruno	Transit Corridor Pedestrian	263,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		San Carlos	East Side Community Transit	1,795,304	X			
2011/12	CMAQ	Bicycle	San Mateo	Delaware Street Bike Lane	545,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		San Mateo	El Camino Real Phase 1 Improvement	203,000	X			
2011/12	CMAQ		San Mateo County	CSRT South of Dam Conversion	300,000	X			

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2011/12	CMAQ		South San Francisco	Regional Gap	261,000	X			
2011/12	STIP	Highway	Caltrans	Aux lane landscaping #700B - 2-yr plant establishment	33,000		X		
2011/12	STIP	Highway	SMCTA	US 101/Willow Interchange Reconstruction	4,500,000		X		
2011/12	STIP	Highway	SMCTA/Pacifica	Hwy 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement	3,000,000		X		
2011/12	STP	Road Pavement	Menlo Park	2010/11 Resurfacing	385,000	X			
2011/12	STP	Road Pavement	San Carlos	Pavement Rehab Program	319,000	X			
2011/12	STP		San Mateo County	Resurfacing of Pescadero Creek Road	985,011	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	County of San Mateo	Crystal Springs Regional Trail South of Highway 92	194,549	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	County of San Mateo	Crystal Springs Regional Trail South of Highway 92	194,549	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Half Moon Bay	Highway 1 Trail Extension - Seymour to Wavecrest Road	250,000	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Menlo Park	Alpine Road Bike Lane Improvements	78,000	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	Redwood City	Brewster Avenue Bicycle Improvements	107,640	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Bay to Transit Trail - Phase 1	312,000	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Downtown Bicycle Parking	98,783	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	San Mateo	Downtown Bicycle Parking	98,783	X			
2011/12	TDA Art 3	Bike Ped	South San Francisco	Pedestrian Crossing Improvements at El Camino H.S.	98,000	X			
2012/13	STIP	Highway	C/CAG	San Mateo County Smart Corridor - Segment 3	1,977,000	X			
2013/14	STIP	Highway	SMCTA	US 101/Willow Interchange Reconstruction	1,471,000	X			
2013/14	STIP	Highway	SMCTA	US 101/ Broadway Interchange	19,000,000	X			
2013/14	STIP	Highway	SMCTA/Pacifica	Calera Parkway Project	6,900,000	X			

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PRJOECTS

Program Year	Program	Type	Jursidiction	Project Description	Amount	Funding Obligation Pending	Funding Fully Obligated	Under Construction	Completed
2014/15	STIP	Highway	C/CAG	Countywide ITS Project	4,298,000	X			
2014/15	STIP	Highway	SMCTA	US 101/Willow Interchange Reconstruction	20,471,000	X			
2015/16	STIP	Highway	C/CAG	Phase 2 (ENV) at SR 92/US 101 Interchange Vicinity	2,411,000	X			
2016/17	STIP	Highway	San Mateo	Phase 1 - SR 92 Improvement at SR 92/US El Camino Real Interchange	5,000,000	X			

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 17, 2011

To: Congestion Management Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Notification of the 3rd Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Call for Projects.

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

RECOMMENDATION

This is an informational item.

FISCAL IMPACT

This program will have approximately \$3,123,250 available for San Mateo County starting in fiscal year 2010-11 through fiscal year 2012-13. All unused funds will be returned to the program for use in a later cycle.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The State and Federal funding sources include State Transit Assistance (STA), Job Access Reverse Commute (JARC), and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

The Lifeline Transportation Program is a Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) program that C/CAG will administer for San Mateo County. The purpose of the program is to fund projects, identified through the community-based transportation planning (CBTP) process, which improves the mobility of low-income residents.

MTC is currently developing the 3rd cycle guidelines, schedule, and application template. The attached draft guidelines and schedule are subject to change. The current proposed schedule is very aggressive. To save time, staff has asked the C/CAG board to approve of staff issuing a call for projects, upon MTC's adoption of their final guidelines, as long as no major changes to the guidelines are made.

In order to meet the proposed schedule, attached in draft guidelines, staff anticipates that a call will need to be issued in late November or early December. Staff intends to issue a call for projects shortly after MTC has finalized and approved the documents mentioned above. Information will be made available on the C/CAG website.

The anticipated due date for applications will be early January 2012. Government and transportation agencies are encouraged to apply. Because two of the fund types can only be received by recognized transit districts or government agencies, non-profit organizations are encouraged to partner with an appropriate sponsor agency that is eligible to receive STA and/ or STP funds.

Projects must target and serve low-income communities in San Mateo County. Additionally, projects must have measurable deliverables and the project sponsor must possess the ability to effectively reach the low-income communities in need.

ATTACHMENT

- MTC's Draft Third Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Funding

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Third Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines and Funding FY 2011 through FY 2013

Program Goals: The Lifeline Transportation Program is intended to fund projects that result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties, and are expected to carry out the following regional Lifeline Program goals:

The Lifeline Program supports community-based transportation projects that:

- Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process that includes broad partnerships among a variety of stakeholders such as public agencies, transit operators, community-based organizations and other community stakeholders, and outreach to underrepresented stakeholders.
- Improve a range of transportation choices by adding a variety of new or expanded services including but not limited to: enhanced fixed route transit services, shuttles, children's programs, taxi voucher programs, improved access to autos, and capital improvement projects.
- Address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP) or other substantive local planning efforts. While preference will be given to community-based plan priorities, strategies emerging from countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan or other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern will also be considered. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable.
- Transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered when funding projects. Existing transportation services may also be eligible for funding.

Program Administration: The Lifeline Program will be administered by county congestion management agencies (CMAs) or other designated county-wide agencies as follows:

County	Lifeline Program Administrator
Alameda	Alameda County Transportation Commission
Contra Costa	Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Marin	Transportation Authority of Marin
Napa	Napa County Transportation Planning Agency
San Francisco	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Mateo	City/County Association of Governments
Santa Clara	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and Santa Clara County
Solano	Solano Transportation Authority
Sonoma	Sonoma County Transportation Authority

Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for soliciting projects for the Lifeline Program. This requires a full commitment to a broad, inclusive public involvement process and using multiple methods of public outreach. Methods of public outreach include, but are not limited to highlighting the program and project solicitation on the CMA website, sending targeted postcards and e-mails to local community-based organizations, city departments, and non-profit organizations (particularly those that have previously participated in local planning processes), and contacting local elected officials and their staffs. Further guidance for public involvement is contained in MTC's Public Participation Plan.

For the selection of projects involving federal funds, Lifeline Program Administrators must also consider fair and equitable solicitation and selection of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements, i.e. funds must be distributed without regard to race, color, and national origin.

Fund Availability: Fund sources for the Third Cycle Lifeline Program (FY 2011 - FY 2013) include State Transit Assistance (STA), Proposition 1B - Transit funds, Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), and Surface Transportation Program (STP), as shown in Table A. Funding for STA, JARC¹, and STP will be assigned to counties by each fund source, based on the county's share of poverty population consistent with the estimated distribution outlined in Table B. Note that the county shares were updated using 2010 census data which resulted in some shifts compared to previous Lifeline cycles. Lifeline Program Administrators will assign funds to eligible projects in their counties based on a competitive process to be conducted by the Lifeline Program Administrators in each county. Proposition 1B funding will be assigned by MTC directly to transit operators and counties based on a formula that distributes half of the funds according to the transit operators' share of the regional low-income ridership and half of the funds according to the transit operators' share of the regional low-income population. The formula distribution is outlined in Table C. All funded projects must meet the eligibility requirements of the respective funding source.

Multi-Year Programming: The Third Cycle Lifeline Transportation Program will cover a three-year programming cycle, FY2010-11 to FY2012-2013.

¹ Consistent with federal JARC guidance, MTC may set aside up to five percent of the region's FY11, FY12 and FY13 apportionments to fund administration, planning and technical assistance.

Competitive Process: Projects must be selected through an open, competitive process with the following exceptions:

(1) In an effort to address the sustainability of fixed-route transit operations, Lifeline Program Administrators may elect to allocate a portion of their STA funds directly to transit operators for Lifeline transit operations within the county. Projects must be identified as Lifeline projects before transit operators can claim funds, and will be subject to Lifeline Program reporting requirements.

(2) In most cases, Proposition 1B Transit funds will be allocated directly to transit operators by MTC, due to the limited eligibility and uses of this fund source. Upon concurrence from the applicable governing board of the CMA, transit operators may program funds to any capital project that is consistent with the Lifeline Program and goals, and is eligible for this fund source. Transit operators who wish to use Proposition 1B Transit funds for multi-county projects should contact MTC for concurrence. Projects must be identified as Lifeline projects before transit operators can claim funds, and will be subject to Lifeline Program reporting requirements. For Solano and Sonoma counties, Proposition 1B funds are being directed to the CMA, who should include these funds in the overall Lifeline programming effort (keeping in mind the limited sponsor and project eligibility of Proposition 1B funds).

Grant Application: To ensure a streamlined application process for project sponsors, a universal application form (or standard format and content for project proposals) will be used, but, with review and approval from MTC, may be modified as appropriate by the Lifeline Program Administrator for inclusion of county-specific grant requirements. Project sponsors who wish to apply for a multi-county project will apply directly to MTC. A copy of the application for is available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/lifeline/>.

Program Match: The Lifeline Program requires a minimum local match of 20% of the total project cost; new Lifeline Transportation Program funds may cover a maximum of 80% of the total project cost.

There are two exceptions to the 20% match requirement:

(1) JARC operating projects require a 50% match. However, consistent with MTC's approach in previous funding cycles, Lifeline Program Administrators may use STA funds to cover the 30% difference for projects that are eligible for **both** JARC and STA funds.

(2) All auto-related projects require a 50% match.

Project sponsors may use certain federal or local funding sources (Transportation Development Act, operator controlled State Transit Assistance, local sales tax revenue, etc.) to meet the match requirement. The match may include a non-cash component such as donations, volunteer services, or in-kind contributions as long as the value of each is documented and supported, represents a cost that would otherwise be eligible under the program, and is included in the net project costs in the project budget.

For JARC projects, the local match can be *non*-Department of Transportation (DOT) federal funds. Eligible sources of non-DOT federal funds include: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) and Social Services Block Grants (SSBG) administered by the US Department of Health and Human Services or Community Development Block grants (CDBG) and HOPE VI grants administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Grant funds from private foundations may also be used to meet the match requirement.

Eligible Projects: Per the requirements set forth in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), projects selected for funding under the Elderly Individuals and Individuals with Disabilities (Section 5310), Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC), and New Freedom programs must be “derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan”, and the plan must be “developed through a process that includes representatives of public, private, and non-profit transportation and human services providers and participation by members of the public.” A locally developed, coordinated, public transit-human services transportation plan (“coordinated plan”) identified the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, and people with low incomes, and provides strategies for meeting those local needs. The Bay Area’s Coordinated Plan was adopted in December 2007 and is available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/>. The plan includes a low-income component and an elderly and disabled component.

Eligible operating projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, may include (but are not limited to) new or enhanced fixed route transit services, restoration of lifeline-related transit services eliminated due to budget shortfalls, shuttles, children’s transportation programs, taxi voucher programs, improved access to autos, etc. See Appendix 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.

Eligible capital projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, include (but are not limited to) purchase of vehicles; bus stop enhancements, including the provision of bus shelters, benches, lighting or sidewalk improvements at or near transit stops; rehabilitation, safety or modernization improvements, etc.; or other enhancements to improve transportation access for residents of low-income communities. See Appendix 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.

Eligible planning projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, include (but are not limited to) planning assistance for updating Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP), consolidated transportation services planning, and bicycle and pedestrian planning projects. CBTP updates are eligible for STP funding provided the following conditions are met:

- 1) A county has identified a lead agency to update the status of existing plans, needs, and projects, and to track implementation of projects over time;
- 2) A county-led process involving multiple stakeholders has established a way to set priorities for plan updates within the county (e.g., oldest first, largest populations, highest percentage of implemented projects);
- 3) Communities getting plan updates must be indentified as Communities of Concern (CoCs) as part of the Plan Bay Area process to have priority, but countywide updates will be considered in counties with either no CoCs or with more than two-thirds of the county low-income population

residing outside designated CoCs. Counties may decide whether and/or how to prioritize CBTPs over other eligible uses such as bicycle and pedestrian projects. [At the October 14th Planning Committee meeting, there will be a discussion of an alternative four-factor approach to defining Communities of Concern. Based on the results of that discussion, there may be revisions to the CBTP priority process.] See Appendix 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.

Transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered when funding Lifeline projects.

Multi-county projects may also be funded and are encouraged. In recognition of proposed multi-county projects, MTC reserves the right to set aside a portion of funds per county (anticipated to be less than 15%) in order to fund such projects. Project sponsors who wish to apply for a multi-county project should apply directly to MTC. The application form will be available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/lifeline/>. Applicants must submit eight (8) copies and an electronic copy on CD or USB flash drive of their application, by 4:00 PM on Wednesday, February 29, 2012 to:

Kristen Mazur
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700

MTC will screen multi-county applications and coordinate scoring activities with Lifeline Program Administrators.

Project Selection/Draft Program of Projects: MTC is the designated recipient for the Bay Area's large Urbanized Area (UA) funding apportionment of JARC funds. Caltrans is the designated recipient for California's small and non-UA funding apportionment of JARC funds. As the designated recipient, MTC is responsible for ensuring a competitive selection process to determine which projects should receive funding. For the large UA apportionment, the competitive selection is conducted on a county-wide basis. For the small and non-UA apportionment, the competitive selection is conducted by Caltrans.

For the MTC process, standard evaluation criteria will be used to assess and select projects. The six criteria include (1) project need/stated goals and objectives, (2) community-based transportation plan (CBTP) or other substantive local planning effort priority, (3) implementation plan, (4) project budget/sustainability, (5) coordination and program outreach, and (6) cost-effectiveness and performance indicators.² Lifeline Program Administrators may establish the weight to be assigned for each criterion in the assessment process.

Additional criteria may be added to a county program but should not replace or supplant the regional criteria. MTC staff will review the proposed county program criteria to ensure consistency and to facilitate coordination among county programs.

² For future cycles of the Lifeline Transportation Program, transit operations projects will need to be consistent with recommendations stemming from MTC's Transit Sustainability Project. See <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tsp/>

Each county will appoint a local review team of CMA staff, the local low-income or minority representative from MTC's Policy Advisory Council, and representatives of local stakeholders, such as, transit operators, other transportation providers, community-based organizations, social service agencies, and local jurisdictions, to score and select projects. Counties are strongly encouraged to appoint a diverse group of stakeholders for their local review team. Each county will assign local priorities for project selection.

In funding projects, preference will be given to strategies emerging from local CBTP processes or other substantive local planning efforts. Projects included in countywide regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan or other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern will also be considered. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable. Regional Lifeline funds should not supplant or replace existing sources of funds.

A full program of projects is due to MTC from each Lifeline Program Administrator on April 11, 2012. However, with state and federal funding uncertainties, sponsors with projects selected for FY2013 STA and FY2013 JARC funds should plan to defer the start of those projects until the funding is appropriated and secured. Lifeline Program Administrators, at their discretion, may opt to prioritize high scoring projects with FY2011 and FY2012 funds. MTC staff will work with Lifeline Program Administrators on this sequencing; more will be known about the FY2013 funds near the end of calendar year 2012.

Project Delivery: All projects funded under the county programs will be subject to MTC obligation deadlines and project delivery requirements. All projects will be subject to a "use it or lose it" policy. Beginning this cycle, MTC is adding a project delivery requirement that project sponsors must expend the Lifeline Transportation funds within three years of the grant award or execution of subrecipient agreement with MTC, whichever is applicable.

Policy Board Adoption: Projects recommended for funding must be submitted to and approved by the respective governing board of the Lifeline Program Administrator, or for projects funded with Proposition 1B Transit funds, by the Board of the transit operator. The appropriate governing board shall resolve that approved projects not only exemplify Lifeline Program goals, but that the local project sponsors understand and agree to meeting all project delivery, funding match and eligibility requirements, and obligation deadlines and requirements.

Project Oversight: Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for programmatic and fiscal oversight of Lifeline projects, and for ensuring projects meet MTC obligation deadlines and project delivery requirements. In addition, Lifeline Program Administrators will ensure that projects substantially carry out the scope described in the grant applications for the period of performance, and are responsible for approving reimbursement requests, budget changes, and scope of work changes, prior to MTC's authorization. All scope changes must be fully explained and must demonstrate consistency with Lifeline Program goals. Any changes to JARC or STP funded projects must be reported to MTC and reconciled with FTA.

As part of the Call for Projects, applicants will be asked to establish project goals, and to identify basic performance indicators to be collected in order to measure the effectiveness of the Lifeline projects. At a minimum, performance measures for service-related projects would include: documentation of new “units” of service provided with the funding (e.g. number of trips, service hours, workshops held, car loans provided, etc.), cost per unit of service, and a qualitative summary of service delivery procedures employed for the project. For capital projects, project sponsors are responsible for establishing milestones and reporting on the status of project delivery. For planning projects, project sponsors are responsible for establishing a schedule of deliverables related to the project. Project sponsors are responsible for satisfying all reporting requirements, as referenced in Appendix 1. Lifeline Program Administrators will forward all reports containing performance measures to MTC for review and overall monitoring of the Lifeline Transportation Program.

Fund Administration:

For projects receiving JARC Funds: MTC will enter projects into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects sponsored by non-Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grantees, e.g. nonprofits or other local government entities. MTC will enter projects into MTC’s FTA grant planned to be submitted in spring 2012. Following FTA approval of the grant, MTC will enter into funding agreements with subrecipients. Transit operators who are FTA grantees will act as direct recipients, and will enter projects into the TIP and submit grant applications to FTA directly. MTC reserves the right to reprogram funds if direct recipients fail to obligate the funds through grant submittal and FTA approval within 12 months of program approval. See Appendix 2 for federal compliance requirements.

For projects receiving STA funds: For transit operators receiving STA funds, MTC will allocate funds directly through the annual STA claims process. For other STA eligible projects administered by sponsors who are not STA eligible recipients, the project sponsor is responsible for identifying a local transit operator who will act as a pass-through for the STA funds, and will likely seek to enter into a funding agreement directly with the project sponsor.

For projects receiving Proposition 1B Transit Funds: Project sponsors receiving Proposition 1B funds must submit a Proposition 1B application to MTC for submittal to Caltrans with prior review by MTC. The estimated due date to Caltrans is June 1, 2012. The state will distribute funds directly to the project sponsor. Note that although the Proposition 1B Transit Program is intended to be an advance-payment program, actual disbursement of funds is dependent on the State budget and State bond sales.

For projects receiving STP funds: Once the FY13 funds are known to be reasonably available, MTC will enter projects into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for non FTA grantees. MTC will request a transfer of funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to FTA. Following the transfer, MTC will enter projects into MTC’s FTA grant planned to be submitted in spring 2013. Following FTA approval of the grant, MTC will enter into funding agreements with subrecipients. Transit operators who are FTA grantees will act as direct recipients, and once the FY13 funds are known to be reasonably available, will enter projects into the TIP, request FHWA transfers and submit grant applications to FTA directly. MTC reserves the right to reprogram funds if direct recipients fail to obligate the funds through

grant submittal and FTA approval within 12 months of program approval. See Appendix 2 for federal compliance requirements.

Timeline Summary

Action	Due Date
MTC Issues Lifeline Call for Projects	November 17, 2011
Multi-county Project applications due to MTC	February 29, 2011
Board-approved programs due to MTC from CMAs	April 11, 2012
Prop 1B allocation requests due to MTC from project sponsors	April 11, 2012
MTC and transit operators submit TIP Amendments	March/April 2012 – Deadline TBD
Commission approval of Program of Projects	May 23, 2012
MTC submits FY11 Prop 1B requests to Caltrans	June 1, 2012
MTC submits FTA grant with FY11 and FY12 JARC projects	June/July 2012 (following TIP approval)
FY11 and FY12 JARC-funded projects: project sponsors begin to enter into funding agreements	September/October 2012 (following FTA grant approval)
MTC confirms availability of FY13 STA, STP and JARC funding; MTC and transit operators submit TIP Amendments for FY13 JARC and STP projects	Winter/Spring 2013
MTC and transit operators submit FTA grant with FY13 JARC and STP projects	Summer 2013 (following TIP approval)
FY13 JARC and STP project sponsors begin to enter into funding agreements	Summer/Fall 2013 (following FTA grant approval)

**Table A – Lifeline Transportation Program
Third Cycle Funding
FY2010-11 through FY2012-13**

Fund Source	FY2011 Actual	FY2012 Estimate	FY2013 Estimate	Total
STA ¹	(Programmed in Cycle 2)	\$ 11,673,561	\$ 11,907,032	\$ 23,580,593
Prop 1B ²	\$ 46,519,967	-	-	\$ 46,519,967
JARC ³	\$ 2,562,648	\$ 2,562,648	\$ 2,562,648	\$ 7,687,944
STP ⁴	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,971,587	\$ 8,971,587
Total	\$ 49,082,615	\$ 14,236,209	\$ 23,441,267	\$ 86,760,091

Notes:

- (1) FY2011 STA Funds were programmed in Cycle 2. The FY2011-12 STA Estimates reflect the \$413.2 million in the FY2011-12 State Budget. The FY2012-13 STA estimates assume 2% growth.
- (2) FY2011 Prop 1B appropriations represent three years of funding.
- (3) Consistent with federal JARC guidance, MTC may set aside five percent of the region's FY11, FY12 and FY13 apportionment to fund administration, planning and technical assistance.
- (4) STP funds are available to the Lifeline Program starting in FY13, as part of MTC's "Resolution 3814 payback" being implemented in the 2nd cycle STP/CMAQ program (proposed One Bay Area Grants).

Version 10/14/11

Table B – Estimated Funding Target by Fund Source per County

County & Share of Regional Low Income Population	FY2011		FY2012		FY2013			Total	Potential 15% for Regional/ Multi-County
	STA ¹	JARC ²	STA	JARC ²	STA	JARC ²	STP ³		
Alameda 23.7%		685,806	2,772,194	685,806	2,827,638	685,806	2,130,539	9,787,789	1,468,168
Contra Costa 13.4%		387,331	1,565,687	387,331	1,597,001	387,331	1,203,291	5,527,972	829,196
Marin 2.6%		75,235	304,120	75,235	310,202	75,235	233,728	1,073,756	161,063
Napa 2.2%		-	256,062	-	261,183	-	196,794	714,039	107,106
San Francisco 13.1%		378,258	1,529,010	378,258	1,559,590	378,258	1,175,104	5,398,478	809,772
San Mateo 7.6%		218,838	884,598	218,838	902,290	218,838	679,848	3,123,250	468,487
Santa Clara 23.7%		561,175	2,768,861	561,175	2,824,238	561,175	2,127,977	9,404,600	1,410,690
Solano 5.8%		-	678,389	-	691,957	-	521,368	1,891,714	283,757
Sonoma 7.8%		127,873	914,640	127,873	932,933	127,873	702,937	2,934,128	440,119
MTC - Admin, Planning, Technical Assistance ²		128,132	-	128,132	-	128,132	-	384,397	-
Total 100.0%		2,562,648	11,673,561	2,562,648	11,907,032	2,562,648	8,971,587	40,240,123	5,978,359

(1) FY2011 STA Funds were programmed in Cycle 2

(2) Consistent with federal JARC guidance, MTC will set aside five percent of the region's FY11, FY12 and FY13 apportionment to fund administration, planning and technical assistance

(3) STP funds are available to the Lifeline Program starting in FY13, as part of MTC's "Resolution 3814 payback" being implemented in the 2nd cycle STP/CMAQ program (proposed One Bay Area Grants).

Version 10/14/11

Table C – Estimated Funding Target for Proposition 1B Transit Funds per Transit Operator and County

Transit Operator & Hybrid Formula (Share of Regional Low Income Ridership & Share of Regional Low Income Population) ²	Prop 1B ¹			Total
	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013	
AC Transit 18.1%	8,403,487	-	-	8,403,487
BART 17.6%	8,173,010	-	-	8,173,010
County Connection (CCCTA) 1.0%	484,534	-	-	484,534
Golden Gate Transit/Marin Transit 3.2%	1,477,729	-	-	1,477,729
Wheels (LAVTA) 0.5%	240,910	-	-	240,910
Muni (SFMTA) 25.2%	11,723,430	-	-	11,723,430
SamTrans 4.9%	2,272,697	-	-	2,272,697
Tri Delta Transit (ECCTA) 0.7%	327,019	-	-	327,019
VINE (NCTPA) 1.3%	597,647	-	-	597,647
VTA 19.7%	9,186,049	-	-	9,186,049
WestCat (WCCTA) 0.3%	147,335	-	-	147,335
Solano County Operators 3.3%	1,547,328	-	-	1,547,328
Sonoma County Operators 4.2%	1,938,791	-	-	1,938,791
Total 100.0%	46,519,967	-	-	46,519,967

(1) FY2011 Prop 1B appropriations represent three years of funding.

(2) Only transit operators who have previously received Proposition 1B funds are included in the formula distribution

Version 10/14/11

Appendix 1
Lifeline Transportation Program Third Cycle Funding
Funding Source Information

	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)	Surface Transportation Program (STP)
Purpose of Fund Source	To improve existing public transportation services and encourage regional transportation coordination	To help advance the State’s goals of providing mobility choices for all residents, reducing congestion, and protecting the environment	To improve access to transportation services to employment and related activities for welfare recipients and eligible low-income individuals	To fund any Federal highway, including projects on any public road, transit capital projects, and intracity/ intercity bus terminals and facilities.
Detailed Guidelines	http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/TDA2007Work.pdf	www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/infrastructure/PTMISEA_12-05-07.PDF	www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FTA_C_9050.1_JARC.pdf	http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/programadmin/13005.cfm
Use of Funds	For public transportation purposes including community transit services	For public transportation purposes	For transportation services that meet the transportation needs of low-income persons	For public transportation purposes
Eligible Recipients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators ▪ Cities and Counties if eligible to claim TDA ▪ MTC for regional coordination ▪ Other entities, under an agreement with an eligible recipient 	Transit operators or local agencies that are eligible to receive STA funds, as listed by State Controller’s Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operators of public transportation services, including private operators of public transportation services ▪ Private non-profit organizations ▪ State or local governmental authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operators of public transportation services, including private operators of public transportation services ▪ Private non-profit organizations ▪ State or local governmental authority
Eligible Projects	<u>Transit Capital and Operations</u> , including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New, continued or expanded fixed-route service ▪ Purchase of vehicles ▪ Shuttle service if available for use by the general public ▪ Purchase of technology (i.e. GPS, other ITS applications) ▪ Capital projects such as bus stop improvements, including bus benches, shelters, etc. ▪ Various elements of mobility management, if consistent with STA program purpose and allowable use. These may include planning, coordinating, capital or operating activities. 	<u>Transit Capital</u> (including a minimum operable segment of a project) for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rehab, safety, or modernization improvements ▪ Capital service enhancements or expansions ▪ New capital projects ▪ Bus rapid transit improvements ▪ Rolling stock procurement, rehab, or replacements Projects must be consistent with most recently adopted short-range transit plan or other publicly adopted plan that includes transit capital improvements.	<u>Capital and Operating projects</u> including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Services (e.g. late-night & weekend, shuttles) ▪ Ridesharing and carpooling ▪ Transit-related aspects of bicycling ▪ Local car loan programs ▪ Marketing ▪ Certain pedestrian and bicycle projects ▪ Administration and expenses for voucher programs ▪ ITS, AVL, etc. for improving scheduling and dispatch ▪ Mobility management Projects must be derived from the regionally-adopted Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan.	<u>Capital and Planning projects</u> including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public transit capital improvement projects ▪ Rehab, safety, or modernization improvements ▪ Pedestrian and bicycle facilities ▪ Transportation planning activities ▪ Community-Based Transportation Plan updates ▪ Consolidated transportation services planning

	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)	Surface Transportation Program (STP)
Lifeline Program Local Match	20%	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 50% for operating projects (may use STA funds to cover up to 30% if project is eligible for both JARC and STA) ▪ 50% for auto projects ▪ 20% for capital projects 	20%
Estimated timing for availability of funds to project sponsor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators and eligible cities and counties can initiate claims for FY12 and FY13 funds immediately following MTC approval of program of projects for current fiscal year funds. ▪ For “other entities”, the eligible recipient acting as fiscal agent will initiate a funding agreement following MTC approval of program of projects. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of the agreement. 	Project sponsors must submit a Proposition 1B application to MTC for submittal to Caltrans by April 11, 2012. Disbursement timing depends on bond sales.	For FY11 and FY12 funds, following MTC approval of the program of projects, there will be a 3-6 month process of entering projects in the TIP, applying for the FTA grant, FTA review and award. Following FTA award, there will be an additional 3 month process of entering into funding agreements with the non-FTA recipient project sponsors. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of agreements. For FY13 funds, the 6-9 month process of entering projects in the TIP, applying for the FTA grant, and entering into funding agreements will start as soon as the funds are appropriated and secured (approximately Spring 2013).	After the FY13 STP funds are appropriated and secured in approximately October 2013, there will be a 4-6 month process of entering projects in the TIP, applying to FHWA for a funds transfer to FTA, applying for the FTA grant, FTA review and award. Following FTA award, there will be an additional 3 month process of entering into funding agreements with the non-FTA recipient project sponsors. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of agreements.
Accountability & Reporting Requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transit operators and eligible cities and counties must submit annual ridership statistics for the project, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC along with annual claim. ▪ Depending on the arrangement with the pass-through agency, “other entities” will likely submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to the pass-through agency for reimbursement, and then to Lifeline Program Administrators for review. 	Using designated Caltrans forms, project sponsors are required to submit project activities and progress reports to the state every six months, as well as a project close-out form. Caltrans will track and publicize progress via their website.	Non-FTA recipient sponsors will submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC for reimbursement. Non-FTA recipient sponsors will also submit FTA Certifications and Assurances and Title VI reports annually to MTC, and are subject to Title VI monitoring. FTA recipients are responsible for following all applicable federal requirements for preparing and maintaining their JARC grants. All project sponsors will submit annual JARC reporting information to MTC.	Non-FTA recipient sponsors will submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC for reimbursement. Non-FTA recipient sponsors will also submit FTA Certifications and Assurances and Title VI reports annually to MTC, and are subject to Title VI monitoring. FTA recipients are responsible for following all applicable federal requirements for preparing and maintaining their STP grants. All project sponsors will submit annual STP reporting information to MTC.

Note: Information on this chart is accurate as of October 2011. MTC will strive to make Lifeline Program Administrators aware of any changes to fund source guidelines that may be enacted by the appropriating agencies (i.e. State of California, Federal Transit Administration).

Appendix 2 Lifeline Transportation Program Third Cycle Funding

Compliance with Federal Requirements for Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) and Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funds

Applicants should be prepared to abide by all applicable federal requirements as specified in 49 U.S.C. Section 5316, FTA Circulars C 9050.1 and 4702.1A, the most current FTA Master Agreement MA(13), and the most current Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance Programs.

MTC includes language regarding these federal requirements in its funding agreements with subrecipients and requires each subrecipient to execute a certification of compliance with the relevant federal requirements. Subrecipient certifications are required of the subrecipient prior to the execution of a funding agreement by MTC and annually thereafter when FTA publishes the annual list of certifications and assurances.

Direct recipients are responsible for adhering to FTA requirements through their agreements and grants with FTA directly.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act

In connection with MTC's Title VI monitoring obligations, as outlined in FTA Circular 4702.1A (Title VI and Title VI-Dependent Guidelines for Federal Transit Administration Recipients), applicants will be required to provide the following information in the grant application:

- a. The organization's policy regarding Civil Rights (based on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act) and for ensuring that benefits of the project are distributed equitably among low-income and minority population groups in the project's service area.
- b. Information whether the project will provide assistance to predominately minority and low-income populations. (Projects are classified as providing service to predominately minority and low-income populations if the proportion of minority and low-income people in the project's service area exceeds the regional average minority and low-income population.)

In order to document that federal funds are passed through without regard to race, color or national origin, and to document that minority populations are not being denied the benefits of or excluded from participation in the Lifeline Transportation Program, MTC will keep a record of applications submitted for Lifeline funding. MTC's records will identify those applicants that would use grant program funds to provide assistance to predominately minority and low-income populations and indicate whether those applicants were accepted or rejected for funding.

MTC requires that all JARC and STP subrecipients submit all appropriate FTA certifications and assurances to MTC prior to funding agreement execution and annually thereafter when FTA publishes the annual list of certifications and assurances. MTC will not execute any funding agreements prior to having received these items from the selected subrecipients. MTC, within its administration, planning, and technical assistance capacity, also will comply with all appropriate certifications and assurances for FTA assistance programs and will submit this information to the FTA as required.

The certifications and assurances pertaining to civil rights include:

1. Nondiscrimination Assurances in Accordance with the Civil Rights Act
2. Documentation Pertaining to Civil Rights Lawsuits and Complaints

Nondiscrimination assurances included above involve the prohibition of discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, sex, or age, and prohibit discrimination in employment or business opportunity, as specified by 49 U.S.C. 5332 (otherwise known as Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964O, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and U.S. DOT regulations, *Nondiscrimination in Federally-Assisted Programs of the*

Department of Transportation-Effectuation of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act, 49 C.F.R. Part 21. By complying with the Civil Rights Act, no person, on the basis of race, color, national origin, creed, sex, or age, will be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of any program for which the subrecipient receives federal funding via MTC.

As a condition of receiving JARC and STP funds, subrecipients must comply with the requirements of the US Department of Transportation's Title VI regulations. The purpose of Title VI is to ensure that no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance. Subrecipients are also responsible for ensuring compliance of each third party contractor at any tier of the project.

Subrecipients must develop procedures for investigating and tracking Title Vi complaints filed against them and make their procedures for filing a complaint available to members of the public upon request. In order to reduce the administrative burden associated with this requirement, subrecipients may adopt the Title VI complaint investigation and tracking procedures developed by MTC.

Subrecipients must prepare and maintain a list of any active investigations conducted by entities other than FTA, lawsuits, or complaints naming the subrecipient that allege discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin. This list shall include the date, summary of allegations, current status, and actions taken by the subrecipient in response to the investigation, lawsuit, or complaint.

Subrecipients must provide information to the public regarding their Title VI obligations and apprise members of the public of the protections against discrimination afforded to them by Title VI. Subrecipients that provide transit service shall disseminate this information to the public through measures that can include but shall not be limited to a posting on the agency's Web site.

All successful subrecipients must submit compliance reports to MTC. The following contents will be required with the submission of the standard agreement and annually thereafter with the submission of the annual FTA certifications and assurances:

1. A summary of public outreach and involvement activities undertaken and a description of steps taken to ensure that minority and low-income people had meaningful access to these activities.
2. A copy of the subrecipient's plan for providing language assistance for persons with limited English proficiency (LEP) that was based on the DOT LEP Guidance or a copy of the agency's alternative framework for providing language assistance.
3. A copy of the subrecipient procedures for tracking and investigating Title VI complaints.
4. A list of any Title VI investigations, complaints, or lawsuits filed with the subrecipient. This list should include only those investigations, complaints, or lawsuits that pertain to the subrecipient submitting the report, not necessarily the larger agency or department of which the entity is a part.
5. A copy of the subrecipient's notice to the public that it complies with Title VI and instructions to the public on how to file a discrimination complaint.

The first compliance report, submitted with the standard agreement, must contain all of the contents listed above. If, prior to the deadline for subsequent compliance reports, the subrecipient has not altered items 2, 3 and 5 above (its language assistance policies, procedures for tracking and investigating a Title VI complaint, or its notice to the public that it complies with Title VI and instructions to the public on how to file a Title VI complaint), the

subrecipient should submit a statement to this effect in lieu of copies of the original documents. The annual compliance report should include an update on items 1 and 4.

Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS)

JARC and STP recipients/subrecipients will be required to have a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and provide it during the application process.³ A DUNS number may be obtained from D&B by telephone (866-705-5711) or the Internet (<http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>).

Role of Recipients/Subrecipients: JARC and STP recipients/subrecipients' responsibilities include:

- For direct recipients (transit operators who are FTA grantees), submitting a grant application to FTA and carrying out the terms of the grant;
- Meeting program requirements and grant/funding agreements requirements including, but not limited to, Title VI reporting requirements;
- Making best efforts to execute selected projects; and
- Complying with other applicable local, state, and federal requirements.

DRAFT

³ A Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number is a unique, non-indicative 9-digit identifier issued and maintained by D&B that verifies the existence of a business entity. The DUNS number is a universal identifier required for Federal financial assistance applicants, as well as recipients and their direct subrecipients.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: November 17, 2011

To: C/CAG CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information

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

RECOMMENDATION

This is an informational item.

FISCAL IMPACT

None.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

C/CAG staff routinely attends meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and receives information distributed by the MTC pertaining to Federal funding, project delivery, and other regional policies that may affect local agencies. Attached to this report includes relevant information from MTC.

- FHWA policy for inactive projects - The current inactive list is attached. Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm>

Caltrans provides policy and procedural guidance to Caltrans and local agency staff for the management of Inactive Obligations at:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/office-bulletins/ob11-03.pdf

- Cycle 3 Safe Routes To School (SRTS) - The attached Cycle 3 SRTS approved project List was announced on 10/17/2011. In accordance with the Safety Program Delivery Requirements, projects with programmed PE funds are to obligate those funds within 6 months of FTIP approval. MTC has added regional deadlines in advance of the state deadline as noted below.

- Deadlines for State-managed local safety programs – Attached is a listing for the state managed local safety program showing state and regional deadlines. MTC has attached regional deadlines in advance of the state deadlines to ensure the funds are not lost. Sponsors that miss the milestone dates for the local safety projects will be unable to compete for additional funding under these programs. Sponsors that cannot meet the Caltrans deadline should contact Caltrans immediately to discuss options.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Inactive Project List generated on 11/01/2011
2. Approved Project List for Cycle 3 of the Federal Safe Route to School (SRTS) Program
3. List of Projects with Deadlines in FFY 2011/12 Safety Programs (HSIP, HR3 and SRTS)

Quarterly Review of Inactive Obligations
 Local, State Administered Locally Funded and Rail Projects
 (Review Period 07/01/2011- 09/30/2011)

Updated on 11/01/2011		Inactive Projects (Review period: 07/01/2011-09/30/2011)					Updated on 11/01/2011		Inactive Projects (Review period: 07/01/2011-09/30/2011)									
Project No	LOOK AHEAD	Agency Action Required	State Project No	Prefix	District	Agency	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal	3-Tier Criteria	Project No	
5177025	6 MONTH		Submit invoice to District.	04925865L	STPL	04	South San Francisco	HOLLY, ARROYO, GRAND, HILTON, NEWMAN, AC OVERLAY	2/15/2011	2/15/2011		L23E	1,246,185.00	712,000.00	0	712,000.00	TIER 1	5177025
5196035	6 MONTH		Invoice being processed by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	04925839L	STPL	04	Daly City	JUINPERO SERRA, HOFFMAN, SAN PEDRO, AC OVERLAY	2/15/2011	2/15/2011		L23E	1,215,694.00	1,045,304.00	0	1,045,304.00	TIER 1	5196035

Approved Project List for Cycle 3 of the Federal Safe Route to School (SRTS) Program

No.	Project Id	Local Agency	MPO	Project Type*	Project Location**	School Name(s)**	Project Description	Total Project Cost	Federal Funds	NI Federal Funds
22	SRTS03-04-East Palo Alto-01	East Palo Alto	MTC	I(n)	Fordham St. between Notre Dame Ave. and Purdue Ave.; Bay Rd. between Newbridge St. and SR 109 (University Ave.); Pulgas Ave./Runnymede St.; Pulgas Ave. between O'Conner St. and Myrtle St.	Costano ES, Cesar Chavez Academy, Aspire East Palo Alto Charter School, Eastside Preparatory,	Construct sidewalks, curbs and gutters; install LED in-pavement crosswalk lights	\$579,700	\$579,700	\$18,000
25	SRTS03-04-Redwood City-01	Redwood City	MTC	I	Charter St. between Stambaugh St. and Spring St.	Hoover ES	Construct raised crosswalks, bulb-outs, and curb ramps; install minor safety lighting and trees; upgrade crosswalks and signs	\$636,689	\$634,500	
26	SRTS-NI-03-04-Redwood City-01	Redwood City	MTC	NI	Multiple Schools in the Redwood City School District	Adelante Spanish Immersion, Roy Cloud School, Fair Oaks School, Garfield School, John Gill School, Hawes School	Create a SRTS Task Force; conduct walking and cycling assessment and provide tools evaluate behavioral changes	\$209,000	\$204,000	\$204,000
28	SRTS03-04-San Carlos-01	San Carlos	MTC	I	Phelps Rd. between Palm Ave. and Arundel Rd.; Wellington Ave. between Clifton Ave. and San Carlos Ave.; San Carlos Ave. between Phelps Rd. and Arundel Rd.	Arundel School	Construct sidewalks, curb ramps, and roundabout; install crosswalks and all-way stop control	\$340,800	\$340,800	
38	SRTS03-04-South San Francisco-01	South San Francisco	MTC	I(n)	"C" St./W. Orange Ave. and "B" St./W. Orange Ave.	Los Cerritos ES	Construct curb extensions (bulb-outs); speed feedback sign	\$144,300	\$119,300	\$7,900

* I = Infrastructure
 NI = Non-infrastructure
 I(n) = Infrastructure with non-infrastructure elements

** ES = Elementary School
 MS = Middle School

List of Projects with Deadlines in FFY 2011/12
Safety Programs (HSIP, HR3 and SRTS)

- Sorted by RTPA, Agency and Delivery Deadlines
Data as of 9/30/11

General Project Information										Actual Project Delivery Information										Tracking of Project Delivery Milestones				State 2011/12 Delivery Requirement		FY 12 Regional Deadlines		Sponsor Target Dates		Status	
County	Agency	Project Location	Description of Work	Program	Unique Project ID	Federal Project Number	Current Total Project Cost Estimate (\$)	Current Programmed Federal Funds (\$)	Cycle	PE Auth Date	ROW Auth Date	CON Auth Date	Closed out Date	Obligated Federal Amt (\$)	Last Invoice Payment Date	Expended Federal Amt (\$)	FTIP Approval Date *	Date PE should be authorized (6 months after FTIP approval date)	Date CON should be authorized (30 months after FTIP approval date)	Date Close-out should be completed (54 months after FTIP approval date)	Next Phase	Next Phase State Obligation Deadline	Next Phase Regional RFA Submittal Deadline	Next Phase Regional Obligation Deadline	Project Sponsor RFA Submittal Target Date	Project Sponsor Obligation Target Date	RFA Submittal Actual Date	Obligation Date Actual Date			
San Mateo	Daly City	Hickey Blvd./Callan Blvd.	Install protected left-turn phasing; upgrade traffic signals; construct curb ramps	HSIP	HSIP4-04-017		\$ 280,000	\$252,000	4					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	7/13/2011	1/12/12	◆	1/11/14		1/12/16		PE	1/12/2012	11/1/2011	12/31/2011				
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Oak Grove Ave./Merrill St.	Install in-pavement crosswalk lights	HSIP	HSIP4-04-023		\$ 55,000	\$49,500	4					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	7/13/2011	1/12/12	◆	1/11/14		1/12/16		PE	1/12/2012	11/1/2011	12/31/2011				
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Santa Cruz Ave. in the vicinity of Hillview MS	Install in-pavement lighted crosswalks at three intersections and install a new striped crosswalk with landing/ramp	SRTS	SRTS1-04-010	5273(017)	\$ 143,000	\$143,000	1	10/30/2007				\$ 15,400	7/22/2009	\$ 15,400	9/30/09	Completed as of 3/31/10	✓	3/31/12	◆	3/31/14		CON	3/31/2012	12/31/2011	2/29/2012				
San Mateo	South San Francisco	Grand Ave./Magnolia Ave.	Install traffic signals; construct curb ramps; improve drainage	HSIP	HSIP4-04-024		\$ 415,800	\$374,200	4					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	7/13/2011	1/12/12	◆	5/13/14		5/13/16		PE	1/12/2012	11/1/2011	12/31/2011				
San Mateo	Woodside	Woodside Rd. (SR 84) near Albion Way at Woodside Elementary School	Upgrade crosswalks, school area signs, and flashing beacons	HSIP	HSIP4-04-021		\$ 215,600	\$194,000	4					\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	7/13/2011	1/12/12	◆	3/13/14		3/13/16		PE	1/12/2012	11/1/2011	12/31/2011				