

# 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, October 21, 2010  
San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium  
San Carlos, California**

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- |  |               |               |
|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).   | Porter/Hurley | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board and CMEQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved – Appointment of Mo Sharma, City of Half Moon Bay, to the TAC</li><li>• Approved – Agreement with BAAQMD to receive \$50,000 grant for Climate Action Plan Template and Tool Project</li><li>• Approved – Resolution 10-56 in support of Measure M to fund local transportation improvements in San Mateo County</li><li>• Approved – Amendment to the MOU with Samtrans and VTA for the implementation of the Grand Blvd Multi-modal Transportation Corridor Plan</li></ul> | Hoang         | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from August 19, 2010  | Hoang         | Page 1-2      |
| 4. Recommend approval of the call for projects for the 5 <sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program (Action)  | Madalena      | Page 3-6      |
| 5. Sustainable Community Strategy Process in San Mateo County (Information)  | Napier        | No materials  |
| 6. Highway Plan Implementation Update (Information)  | SMCTA         | No materials  |
| 7. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information)  | Higaki        | Page 7-25     |
| 8. Executive Director Report   | Napier        | No materials  |
| 9. Member Reports  | All           |               |

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

<b>2010 TAC Roster and Attendance</b>						
<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Jan</b>	<b>Mar</b>	<b>May</b>	<b>Jun</b>	<b>Aug</b>
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x			x	x
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering		x	x	x	x
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering		x	x		x
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x	x	
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning					x
Gene Gonzalo	Caltrans	x	x	x	x	
Sandy Wong	C/CAG					x
Robert Ovardia	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x		x	
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x		x
Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x	x	
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x	
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	n/a	x	x	x	x
Robert Weil	San Carlos Engineering		x	x	x	x
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x		x
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning	x				
Dennis Chuck	So. San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x	x	x
Kenneth Folan	MTC					

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

**August 19, 2010  
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciocco Auditorium. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:20 p.m. on Thursday, August 19, 2010.

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; Jim Bigelow – C/CAG CMEQ; Ashley Nguyen – MTC; Grace Cho – MTC; and others not signed in

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

None.

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

As shown on the Agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from Jun 17, 2010.**

Approved.

**4. Air Quality Conformity TIP Workshop (PM 2.5) Presentation**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) representative Grace Cho gave a presentation on the PM2.5 (particulate matter) Project-Level Conformity planning requirements and conformity requirements. Tom Mack from MTC presented on the Web FMS's (Fund Management System) and accessing the new Air Quality Module for projects that are required to go through the air quality consultation process including interagency consultation and hot spot analysis. Jean Higaki also provided a list of projects, currently in the Draft 2011 TIP, which will require air quality information.

Minutes were not taken on the question and answer portion.

**5. Update on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program**

John Hoang provided an update of the program indicating that a Task Force and a Working Group has been formed to help guide the program development process. C/CAG is in the process of developing a Toolkit of projects. A strategic plan has been developed that includes the proposed program structure and components. The Task Force is currently developing a letter of interest and project application to be provided to schools and parents. The program would be implemented during the Spring 2011 semester as a pilot phase and full implementation in Fall 2011.

**6. Update on the \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee Ballot Measure**

John Hoang provided an update that the C/CAG Board, at its July 8th meeting, approved placing the vehicle registration fee on the November 2010 ballot. The final Expenditure Plan includes: 50% to local streets and roads and 50% to Countywide programs, up to 5% for administration, minimum of \$75,000 for each jurisdiction, a 25-year term, an implementation plan every five years, and annual audits. The ballot measure is referred to as Measure M.

TAC members discussed that cities/County should support Measure M at their respective council meetings.

**7. Regional Project Funding Information**

Jean Higaki provided information relevant to the project delivery and federal and regional policy issues affecting local agencies.

**8. Executive Director Report**

Sandy Wong, Deputy Director, reported that the deadline for the municipal regional permit is approaching. C/CAG's role will be to help coordinate the effort with the cities/County.

**9. Member Reports**

None.

End of meeting at 2:55 p.m.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** October 21, 2010  
**To:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Tom Madalena  
**Subject:** Recommend approval of the call for projects for the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program

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

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC recommends approval of the call for projects for the 5th Cycle of the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

There is no direct impact to the C/CAG budget. The program will provide up to \$3,000,000 as an incentive to the Cities/County.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Transportation Enhancement (TE), Federal Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The C/CAG Board of Directors adopted a Transit Oriented Development Housing Incentive Program to promote smart growth and increase the housing stock in San Mateo County. This program provides transportation funds as an incentive for local jurisdictions to build high-density housing (greater than 40 units per acre) within 1/3 of a mile of a BART or Caltrain station, or on a frontage parcel of the El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County. For eligible housing projects, C/CAG will make a commitment to program the incentive funds to transportation project(s) identified by the sponsor if the housing is under construction within two years.

The 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle TOD Program being recommended for approval is similar to the previous cycles of the program. An incentive of up to \$2,000 per bedroom will be provided. For developments with a minimum of 10% of the units set aside for low or moderate-income households, an additional incentive of up to \$250 per affordable bedroom will be provided to encourage low or moderate-income housing. Please see the attached program guidelines for a complete description of the program.

## RESULTS FROM PREVIOUS CYCLES

	<b>Jurisdictions</b>	<b>Projects</b>	<b>Units (Bedrooms)</b>	<b>Incentive Funds</b>
1 <sup>st</sup> Cycle Committed	4	5	NA (1282)	
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Cycle Completed</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>NA (402)</b>	<b>\$707,000</b>
2 <sup>nd</sup> Cycle Committed	5	10	1372 (2407)	
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle Completed</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1075 (2006)</b>	<b>\$1,484,000</b>
3 <sup>rd</sup> Cycle Committed	9	14	1306 (2192)	
<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Cycle Completed</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>828 (1296)</b>	<b>\$1,622,000</b>
4 <sup>th</sup> Cycle Committed	6	10	1391 (2446)	
<b>4<sup>th</sup> Cycle Completed*</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>803 (1301)</b>	<b>\$1,632,000</b>

\* Some of the projects in the 4<sup>th</sup> cycle are still under construction at this time.

## ATTACHMENT

- Program Guidelines for the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program

# 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*

### **Program Guidelines for the 5<sup>th</sup> Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program**

#### **GOAL & OBJECTIVE**

The goal of the C/CAG Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program is to promote, support, and facilitate high-density residential housing projects near transit services throughout the County in order to improve the coordination between land use and transportation. The C/CAG TOD program provides financial incentives to jurisdictions that build eligible Transit Oriented Development housing projects by rewarding them with funds for transportation projects.

#### **ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR TOD HOUSING INCENTIVE FUNDING**

Residential housing projects must meet the following requirements in order to be eligible for funding from the C/CAG Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Housing Incentive Program:

- (1) Transit Oriented Development (TOD) housing projects must be permanent high-density residential housing with a minimum density of 40 units per net acre, located within one-third (1/3) of a mile from a Caltrain or BART station or on a frontage parcel of the El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County. An incentive of up to \$2,000 per bedroom will be provided. For developments with a minimum of 10% of the units set aside for low or moderate-income households, an additional incentive of up to \$250 per affordable bedroom will be provided to encourage low or moderate-income housing.
- (2) A letter from the City Council/Board of Supervisors of the jurisdiction approving the TOD project application for submittal to the C/CAG TOD Housing Incentive Program.
- (3) TOD housing project must not have received an approved building permit from the jurisdiction at the time of application for C/CAG TOD Housing Incentive Program, except for those TOD housing projects that were approved by the C/CAG Board in a previous cycle but did not meet the 2-year deadline to be under construction as stated in item 4 below.
- (4) After the C/CAG Board makes a financial incentive commitment to the TOD housing project, if requirements (1) through (3) above are met, the housing project must be completed or under construction within two (2) years from the date of C/CAG Board financial commitment. If the 2-year deadline is not met, the C/CAG financial commitment will become invalid. However, jurisdictions can reapply in a future TOD cycle.

#### **Definition of Completion/ Under Construction**

A TOD housing project is considered to be under construction if it is in accordance with the following requirements. There are physical units visibly completed or partially completed (under construction). As a minimum the project must have received building permits, demonstrate that less visible construction has started (such as fencing, grading, utilities,

infrastructure etc.) and that both the developer and the jurisdiction are clearly obligated for completion of the project in a timely manner. Jurisdictions must submit the appropriate supporting documentation that the project is under construction and provide documentation on the number of units (including the number of total bedrooms and affordable bedrooms) to be constructed. However, the incentive will not be programmed until the housing construction is completed.

## **INCENTIVE AMOUNT**

C/CAG will make financial commitment to TOD housing projects that meet the eligibility requirements in an amount up to \$2,000 per bedroom in incentive funds. The actual amount of incentive funding per bedroom may be less than \$2,000, depending on the total number of eligible applications. Upon completion of the housing project, jurisdiction must provide a copy of the Certificate of Occupancy to C/CAG. The amount of funding equal to the number of bedrooms completed multiplied by the amount per bedroom committed by the C/CAG Board will be provided to the jurisdiction for transportation improvement projects. Most likely, the transportation funds will come from Federal and/or State transportation funding sources and are restricted for the purpose of street enhancement or bicycle/pedestrian facility improvements, i.e., Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) or Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds.

## **REQUIREMENTS FOR APPROVAL OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING**

- (1) After the housing project is completed or under construction, but no later than two years from the date of C/CAG Board's approval of the financial commitment, jurisdiction must identify the transportation project(s), in writing to C/CAG. The transportation project(s) must meet the requirements of the relevant Federal and/or State transportation programs.

**(2) Jurisdiction must cooperate with C/CAG staff and follow all appropriate steps in programming and delivery of the transportation project(s) as required by the relevant Federal and/or State transportation programs. C/CAG will attempt to program the transportation project as soon as practical depending on funding limitations.****TIMELINE**

- November 18, 2010 – Program approval by C/CAG Board of Directors
- December 1, 2010 - Call for Projects release
- January 21, 2011 - Applications due
- March 10, 2011 – Project list approval by C/CAG Board of Directors
- March 10, 2013 – Housing project must be under construction and transportation project must be identified in writing



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** October 21, 2010  
**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.

MTC is inviting project sponsors receiving STP/CMAQ grants to learn about the federal-aid process. The federal-aid process and MTC delivery requirements have not changed significantly from the previous funding cycle. Cycle 1 grantees already familiar with delivering a STP/CMAQ funded project may elect not to attend. Attendance is required for MTC Climate Initiatives Innovative/Creative program grantees.

P-TAP Round 12 applications were due October 8, 2010. The attached schedule outlines major milestones.

Every two years, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) conducts a survey to determine the maintenance needs, available revenues and resulting funding shortfalls that exist on the region's Local Streets and Roads. The survey (attached) also informs MTC on how jurisdictions are performing in regard to preventively maintaining their roadways. The results of the survey are used to inform long-range regional planning efforts.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. October 27<sup>th</sup> MTC Federal Aid workshop (attendance is required for MTC Climate Initiatives Innovative/Creative program grantees)
2. P-TAP schedule
3. Local Streets and Roads needs survey

**FEDERAL AID PROCESS/  
CLIMATE INITIATIVES COMPETITIVE GRANTS  
PROGRAM OVERVIEW**

**October 27, 2010**

**1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.**

**MTC, MetroCenter Auditorium**

**101 8<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Oakland, CA 94607**

**INTRODUCTIONS**

**1:00 pm - 1:10 pm**

**I. Federal Aid Process\*-**

**1:10 pm - 2:45 pm**

*(Sylvia Fung and Boris Deunert, Caltrans District 4 Office of Local Assistance)*

- Field Review Form/Preliminary Environmental Studies Form (PES)
- National Environmental Policy Act - NEPA Clearance
- Design - Consultant Contracts
- Right of Way-
  - E-76 authorization for Right of Way and R/W Utilities
  - R/W Certification
- Construction - Advertise, Award, and Administer Contract
- DBE Requirements

**BREAK**

**2:45 pm - 2:55 pm**

**II. MTC Project Delivery Issues\*-**

**2:55 pm - 3:20 pm**

*(Sri Srinivasan and Craig Goldblatt, MTC Programming and Allocations)*

- Transportation Improvement (TIP) Programming and Schedule
- Resolution of Local Support
- Delivery (Obligation) Deadlines

**III. Climate Initiatives Competitive Grants\*-**

**3:20 pm - 4:00 pm**

*(Ashley Nguyen, MTC Planning and Craig Goldblatt, MTC Programming and Allocations)*

- Project Management and Requirements
- Delivery Deadlines
- Project Evaluation

\*Presentation handouts to be provided at meeting



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: October 7, 2010

FR: Amy Burch

RE: P-TAP Round 12 Update – Applications Due October 8th

MTC is soliciting projects for Round 12 of the Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) and applications are due by **Friday, October 8, 2010**. The application is available online at: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/PTAP/>.

The following schedule outlines major milestones in Round 12.

### **P-TAP 12 Schedule**

September 9, 2010	MTC advertises call for projects
October 8, 2010	Applications due to MTC
December 8, 2010	MTC notifies grant finalists after Administration Committee approval
January 30, 2011	Local contribution checks due to MTC
February, 2011	Round 12 projects start
May 1, 2011	Deadline to set up StreetSaver Online account profile (new/desktop users only)
April 30, 2012	Final Report due to MTC

Feel free to contact me at 510-817-5735 and [aburch@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:aburch@mtc.ca.gov) with any questions.



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

*Memorandum*

TO: Local Public Works Representatives

DATE: September 24, 2010

FR: Theresa Romell

RE: Upcoming Local Street and Road Needs, Revenue and Performance Survey

Every two years, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) conducts a survey to determine the maintenance needs, available revenues and resulting funding shortfalls that exist on the region's Local Streets and Roads. The survey also informs MTC on how jurisdictions are performing in regard to preventively maintaining their roadways. The results of the survey are used to inform long range regional planning efforts.

MTC staff understands that responding to the survey can be time consuming and is working with the Local Streets and Roads Working Group (LSRWG) to streamline the survey as much as possible. The attached Excel survey and instructions have already undergone some changes to make it more user-friendly. This version of the survey is only meant to be used for discussion / streamlining purposes. The final version of the survey will be distributed to you in October through your CMA. MTC staff would appreciate any feedback that you might have on how to modify the survey to make it more user friendly, without sacrificing the ability to collect the necessary information. If you have any suggestions, please forward them to Theresa Romell at [tromell@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:tromell@mtc.ca.gov), by October 6, 2010.

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership LS&R\2010 LS&R\10 LSR Memos\08\_Oct 07\06b\_0\_LSR Survey.doc

## **DRAFT: 2010 LS&R SURVEY**

### **(For Survey Structure Feedback Only)**

#### **PART 1 – Jurisdiction Information**

*(This portion of the survey will provide MTC with contact information for follow-up purposes and information regarding the status of your jurisdiction's pavement management database.)*

When opening the Excel file containing the 2010 Local Streets and Roads Survey, make sure to select "Enable Macros" when prompted. To begin, please select your jurisdiction's name and county in the two drop-down boxes next to Item 1. Doing so will allow jurisdiction specific information on unit costs and revenues to populate some of the cells in the survey to provide you with reference information.

#### **Contact Information:**

The contact information listed on the survey should belong to the person who has taken on the primary role in completing the survey. MTC staff may need to contact this person if a question arises regarding the survey responses or the information contained in your jurisdiction's pavement management system database. The person whom contact information is listed for should be familiar with both.

#### **Review and Approval:**

At the bottom of Part 1, we ask that your jurisdiction's Public Works Director, Deputy Director, or responsible department head acknowledge that he/she has reviewed and approved the information being submitted on Parts 1 – 5 of the survey by checking the box labeled "Approved". Please note that the "contact information" section should list the name of the person responsible for completing the survey, and the "approval" section should list the name of the appropriate department head concurring with the information provided. These may or may not be the same person.

**PART 2 – Pavement Unit Treatment Costs**

*(This portion of the survey will provide key information used in MTC’s pavement management software model (along with pavement condition and maintenance information) to determine each jurisdiction’s 25-year pavement repair “Need”).*

Part 2 of the survey requests information regarding the unit costs of maintenance treatments for pavements within various PCI ranges. While jurisdictions may vary on the actual maintenance treatments and strategies that are employed, it is important to have a consistent maintenance treatment strategy across jurisdictions for the purpose of projecting the pavement maintenance “Need” in the region. That strategy should be based as much as possible on “best practices” for pavement maintenance.

Below is the standard or “model” maintenance strategy that will be used to determine the pavement maintenance need in the region. This maintenance strategy is based on a combination of common treatments applied throughout the region and the model treatment decision tree that is included in the MTC Pavement Management System (a.k.a., Streetsaver®):

<p><b><u>Preventative Maintenance – PCI &gt; 70</u></b>          Crack Sealing          Slurry Seal          Chip/Cape Seal  <b><u>Light Rehabilitation PCI &lt; 70 &gt; 50 (Non-Load)</u></b> –Thin Overlay  <b><u>Rehabilitation – PCI &lt; 70 &gt; 50 (Load)</u></b> –Thick Overlay  <b><u>Heavy Rehab – PCI &lt; 50 &gt; 25</u></b> – Reconstruct Surface  <b><u>Reconstruction – PCI &lt; 25</u></b> – Reconstruct Structure (Surface &amp; Sub-Layers)</p>
--

Please fill out the two tables requesting unit treatment cost information for arterial / collector roadways and residential or local roadways. A sample table is provided on the next page for your reference.

- The first column of the table provides sample treatments typically used for the various pavement condition categories, as described above. Please input the unit maintenance cost that your jurisdiction expends for either the same or a comparable maintenance treatment as is listed in each row. If your jurisdiction does not use the same or any comparable treatment, please write “N/A” in the column labeled “Comparable Treatment Used” and do not provide a cost. Please keep in mind that since we will be constructing county average treatment costs to be used in determining the pavement maintenance “Need” for each jurisdiction, the more jurisdictions that provide cost information for each of the sample treatments, the more accurate the projection of pavement maintenance “Need” will be.
- The table separates the unit costs into several categories—construction, prep work, administration, and design costs. Depending on your jurisdiction, all applicable maintenance costs may be incorporated into the construction costs, or they may be separated for accounting purposes. The total unit treatment costs should contain, and are limited to, the following items:
  - Material cost
  - Pavement striping costs
  - Replacement of loop detectors
  - Necessary incidental repairs required by the roadway improvement (such as repairs/replacement of storm drains, culverts, drainage channels, curb & gutter, driveway conforms)
  - Adjustment of sanitary, utility and storm drain manholes/survey monuments/storm water inlets
  - Construction traffic control at project site
  - Dust control measures
  - Erosion control measures
  - Repairs to shoulders

- Mobilization costs
- Curb Ramps (if part of a paving project)
- Staff costs
- Construction labor cost
- Construction engineering/management costs (up to 14% of construction cost)
- Project design costs
- Procurement and advertising costs
- Rental equipment costs related to the project

*Pavement treatment unit costs should not include work on sidewalks, traffic signals, slide repairs, and other items not listed above, which fall under “non-pavement” work. These costs will be addressed in the next section.*

- Depending on how your jurisdiction operates, the above costs could fall into one or several of the unit cost categories listed on the table. If one of the table categories does not apply to your jurisdiction, please indicate the column that the cost is included in. For example, if your jurisdiction includes the cost for prep work in construction costs, simply write “included in A” in column B. The “Total Unit Cost” column should represent the sum of the various cost categories and should include all of the cost elements above, as they apply.
- Please use the most recent cost information possible. It is preferable that you do not examine information more than two or three years old in computing the unit treatment costs.
- The table also includes “county average” and “regional” costs for your use as a reference. The costs listed there represent average costs that were calculated based on the survey responses received during the survey effort conducted in 2006. **They are not meant as a benchmark and may be completely different than your jurisdiction’s individual actual costs.** They are simply listed as a guide for jurisdictions. Please utilize your jurisdiction’s specific and most recent information to fill in the table.

**SAMPLE:**

							COUNTY:	
Arterial / Collector		A +	B +	C +	D =	E		REGION
Sample Treatment	Comparable Treatment Used <sup>1</sup>	Construction Costs	Prep Work	Administration / Inspection Cost	Design & Engineering	Total Unit Cost (A through D) <sup>2,3</sup>	2006 Survey County Avg. Total Cost <sup>4</sup>	2006 Survey Regional Total Cost <sup>5</sup>
Crack Sealing		\$ 0.65	Included in "A"	\$ 0.10	\$ 0.18	\$ 0.93	\$ 1.04	\$ 1.01
Slurry Seal		\$ 0.90	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.20	\$ 2.16	\$ 3.66	\$ 2.02	\$ 2.87
Chip Seal / Cape Seal		\$ 4.95	\$ 2.20	\$ 1.09	\$ 2.02	\$ 10.26	\$ 11.86	\$ 11.56
Thin Overlay (≥ 0.5", < 2.0")		\$ 6.12	\$ 2.72	\$ 1.36	\$ 2.47	\$ 12.67	\$ 14.17	\$ 20.20
Thick Overlay (≥ 2.0")	Rubberized Asphalt Overlay - 1"	\$ 8.80	\$ 3.73	\$ 1.85	\$ 3.39	\$ 17.77	\$ 19.48	\$ 22.97
Reconstruct Surface		\$ 14.30	\$ 6.36	\$ 3.17	\$ 5.77	\$ 29.60	\$ 34.08	\$ 36.28
Reconstruct Structure		\$ 39.38	\$ 17.53	\$ 8.75	\$ 15.87	\$ 81.53	\$ 94.59	\$ 87.57

### **PART 3 –Non-Pavement Asset Survey**

*(The purpose of this portion of the survey is to provide information that MTC will use to estimate the Non-Pavement “Need” that exists in each jurisdiction).*

This portion of the survey deals with non-pavement assets that contribute to the cost associated with maintaining your jurisdiction’s local street and road network.

The last local street and road maintenance survey requested information on major non-pavement assets in the region including: Storm drains, sidewalks, curb and gutter, traffic signals, and street lights. The specific information requested included inventory, the expected useful life of those assets, and the approximate replacement costs associated with each asset type. MTC contracted with Nichols Consulting Engineers to develop a model for estimating non-pavement need based on the non-pavement asset survey information provided by local jurisdictions. The result of their work was a mathematical model that used the inventory of curb and gutter and streetlights to predict the total regional non-pavement replacement costs. In order to simplify the data collection process for local agencies, Part 3 of the survey is only requesting that you provide inventory and replacement cost information for your jurisdiction’s curb & gutter and street light assets. You are also asked to provide the level of accuracy of the information that you are providing by selecting the appropriate description in the drop-down menu box next to each item. The information you provide us on the accuracy level will help us in refining the estimation process for Non-Pavement Need. Please do your best to research and provide us with the most detailed and accurate data that you have available.

The total regional non-pavement asset replacement cost that is derived from the mathematical formula will be divided into city non-pavement need and county non-pavement need. The city need will be distributed across all jurisdictions based on relative population share and the county need will be distributed across the unincorporated jurisdictions based on total lane mileage.



## **PART 4–Local Street and Road Revenue**

*(The purpose of this portion of the survey is to gather data on the Local Street and Road revenues available for the pavement, non-pavement, and operations categories in order to estimate the 25-year shortfalls.)*

The revenue portion of the Local Streets and Roads Survey is the most complicated, as well as the most critical for accurately projecting the local street and road shortfalls that will exist over the next 25 years. The following information is intended to assist you in completing the revenue survey. It is important that you fill out the information requested in the survey completely and accurately. The information that you provide could have a direct affect on your jurisdiction's future allocations of regional funding.

### **Overview:**

In order to calculate the shortfall that exists between the local street and road needs and the funds that are available in each jurisdiction to meet those needs, MTC is asking jurisdictions to provide information on the revenues available for street and road expenditures. This information will be used by MTC to estimate the region's local street and road shortfalls both for short-term funding cycles as well as MTC's 25-year Regional Transportation Plan. Accurate reporting of shortfalls is necessary to support arguments for better funding for maintenance of the existing street and road network at the local, regional and state levels. Currently, MTC uses shortfall projections to help guide programming of federal transportation funds for state highways, transit, and local street and road projects.

In Part 4 you are asked to provide historical and anticipated Local Street and Road budget information. This section is the most critical in that it will provide the base figure from which your jurisdiction's available revenue will be projected.

### **LS&R Revenue Estimation Process:**

Based on the information that you provide, MTC will calculate the average annual revenue that is available for your jurisdiction to meet the local street and road need in the categories outlined above. The budget data that you submit will be adjusted to their current dollar value and averaged over the years that you provide data for in order to determine your jurisdiction's average annual budget for local street and road maintenance. *(For reference purposes only, we have included a box on the survey showing what your jurisdiction's average annual revenue amounts for pavements, non-pavements, and total local street & road budget were in the last round of projections, as calculated based on responses to the 2006 LS&R Survey.)* A growth rate, determined by the funding types that comprise your jurisdiction's annual budget, will be applied for each year of the projection period. Federal funds are not included in the estimate of revenue since they are not a steady or reliable source of funding. Each year's figures will be summed to determine the total budgets available for local street and road maintenance. Totals will be reported in year of expenditure (nominal) dollars. Please assume a 3% inflation rate for FY 2009/10 budget figures.

### **General Guidelines:**

#### **Revenue in Relation to Need:**

In order to be accurate, it is critical that MTC's estimates of revenue for local street and road maintenance and rehabilitation correspond to the elements in the estimates of "needs". Revenues that are used for expenditures outside of what will be included in the needs estimate should not be reported in the survey. Based on this criteria if a portion of your local funding

typically goes towards new construction projects, you should deduct that portion from the revenue that you are reporting for pavement and non-pavement maintenance, since new construction costs are not accounted for in the calculation of pavement and non-pavement need.

For your convenience we have provided a list of the elements that are included in the estimates of needs. Please review them so that you will be able to accurately report those revenues that will be available to address them. Only those revenues that will be put towards the maintenance of the existing system should be included in the pavement and non-pavement budget categories. Expansion / improvement (such as a new sidewalk along on an existing roadway) of the existing system should not be included unless there is a legal requirement that the existing system be upgraded in some way (for example—ADA requirements).

*Pavement:*

The estimates for pavement NEEDS will rely on the information that jurisdictions provide on unit costs for different types of pavement repairs.

Below is a list of items that jurisdictions were instructed to include in their calculation of unit treatment costs:

- Material cost
- Pavement striping costs
- Replacement of loop detectors
- Necessary incidental repairs required by the roadway improvement (such as repairs/replacement of storm drains, culverts, drainage channels, curb & gutter, driveway conforms)
- Adjustment of sanitary, utility and storm drain manholes/survey monuments/storm water inlets
- Construction traffic control at project site
- Dust control measures
- Erosion control measures
- Repairs to shoulders
- Mobilization costs
- Curb Ramps (if part of a paving project)
- Staff costs
- Construction labor cost
- Construction engineering/management costs (up to 14% of construction cost)
- Project design costs
- Procurement and advertising costs
- Rental equipment costs related to the project

*Non-Pavement:*

Below is a list of the non-pavement categories that jurisdictions were asked to estimate the 25-year need for:

- Storm Drainage
- Curb & Gutter
- Sidewalks (Public)
- Traffic Signals
- Street Lights
- Jurisdiction Specific Asset

*Operations:*

This category would consist of funds that are used for day-to-day operating expenditures including labor and routine maintenance. You were not asked to provide any information on

your jurisdiction's need for this category; however, we are interested in the amount of local street and road revenue that goes to fund this type of expenditure. We would want to identify the amount of those "Operations" funds so that they are not included in the estimated revenues that will be applied against the pavement, non-pavement, and local bridge need, for determining the shortfalls.

Below are some examples of expenditure items that would fall into the "Operations" category. These examples were taken from past Local Street and Road Revenue Survey responses from Bay Area jurisdictions. You may have an item that you believe falls into this category but is not listed below. If so, we have asked that you describe that item in Section 3 of the survey.

Examples:

- Street sweeping
- Regulation of streets & sidewalks (use permits)
- Graffiti abatement
- Pot-hole patching
- Striping (Not related to re-paving)
- Emergency side-walk repairs
- Routine maintenance of traffic signals (light bulbs, etc...)
- Street Trees
- Landscape Medians
- Overhead – street crew salaries, administration costs (when not part of pavement unit costs)

We would also use this category as a "catch-all" category for expenditure items that do not fall into either the pavement or non-pavement categories as discussed above, and are also not used for new construction expenditures.

*New Construction / Other:*

This category is where you would place funding available for the expansion or improvement of your existing system. It can also be used as a "catch-all" for expenditures that do not fit into any of the other expenditure categories. Examples of the types of expenditures that would fall into this category are new roads, lane widening, new sidewalks, new traffic signals, etc... Also, "other" types of expenditures that may be paid for with LS&R funding such as shuttle services, transportation lobbyists, etc...

Types of Funding:

The survey will ask you to specify the revenues available by funding source as well. Typically, local street and road revenues come from four major sources—gas tax subventions, county sales tax measures for transportation (where applicable), Proposition 42 funding, and other local sources including general funds, street assessment levies, fines, PUC, traffic safety funds, etc... It is important to know the source of funding in order to estimate the rate at which those funds should be grown over the course of the projection period. You will be asked to estimate the portion of your annual budget that comes from these major funding sources, for each of the categories of local street and road maintenance.

Past Revenue Information:

You may want to reference the information that your jurisdiction submitted to the State Controller's Office on local street and road revenues and expenditures. This data is available on a year-by-year basis and is separated into two parts—revenues and expenditures. MTC has used the State Controller's information in the past to produce the local street and road shortfall

projections but have discontinued this practice upon determining that it was not the most accurate source for the specific information we are looking for. If you would like to view your jurisdiction's information, you can find the State Controller's data at the following web address: [www.sco.ca.gov/ard/local/locrep/streets](http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard/local/locrep/streets). Other good sources for information include your jurisdiction's CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) and/or accounting and finance departments.

### **Instructions:**

Please enter the amount of revenue that your jurisdiction has budgeted or expended in total for local street and road purposes in the first row of the tables for each fiscal year. In the rows below, please segment the total local street and road revenue into the three categories of expenditure. The sum of the three categories should not exceed the total. The New Construction / Other category should include the budget amounts for those items that are not included in the Pavement, Non-pavement or Operations category. Please separate the budget amounts by revenue source: Gas Tax, Sales Tax, Proposition 42, and/or Other Local. Please report dollar values in year of expenditure (nominal) dollars. Assume a 3% rate of inflation for FY 11/12 & FY 12/13 budget figures.

In past surveys there have been many questions on whether the survey is asking for budget or expenditure figures. We realize that it is common for jurisdictions to budget funds in a given year and expend them in a different year. Please keep in mind that the goal of this exercise is to determine an average annual amount of funding for the various expenditure categories to be used as a base figure for projecting forward. Please use the figures – budget or expenditure – that you believe will result in the most accurate base figure.

Information has been provided on the survey form for your reference in filling out Section One. The "Budget Reference" box lists what your jurisdiction's average annual revenue amounts for pavements, non-pavements and total local street & road budget were in the last round of projections, as calculated based on responses to the 2006 LS&R Survey. The "Revenue Reference" box lists revenue estimates, prepared by MTC, for the same fiscal years that you are being asked to provide budget information on. While these estimated revenue amounts are for local street and road purposes, we do not know how it will be allocated among the various expenditure categories.

### *"Dos and Don'ts" for Reporting LS&R Budget Information:*

In order to ensure that your city or county's annual average budget for local streets and roads is correctly estimated, please refer to the following guidelines as to what should be reported and what should not.

- *Do* include revenues that are used for expenditures in the pavement, non-pavement and operations categories as outlined in this document.
- *Do* identify the source of the revenue as indicated.
- *Do* include revenues used for new construction/expansion projects in the "New Const./Other" category
- *Do* identify the year, expiration, and source of one-time revenues, i.e., bond measures, grants, loans, etc...in Section 2, provided for this purpose. *Do not include these funds in your budget information.*
- *Do* report dollar values in year of expenditure dollars. Use 3% inflation for future years.
- ***Do not include federal funds.***
- *Do not* assume sales tax revenue past the year of "sunset"

## **PART 5–Performance**

*(This portion of the survey is intended to gather data on preventive maintenance practices in your jurisdiction for the purpose of allocating performance based regional funds)*

Regional funding for local street and road maintenance will be distributed according to an allocation formula developed and approved by the Local Streets and Roads Working Group (a committee of local public works staff that advises MTC on policies pertaining to local streets and roads), in conjunction with MTC staff. The allocation formula contains four factors, weighted 25% each: Population, Arterial and Collector lane mileage, Arterial and Collector shortfall, and preventive maintenance performance.

The preventive maintenance performance portion of the allocation formula is determined by scoring jurisdictions' actual versus recommended percent of total maintenance that is considered preventive. Preventive maintenance, for the purpose of the performance measure, is defined as any maintenance treatment applied to a street that has a pavement condition index (PCI) of 70 or above, *and* for treatments applied to residential and low volume county roads with a PCI of 60 or above.

MTC staff will measure jurisdictions' "actual" performance by extracting maintenance treatment history data from each jurisdiction's pavement management database. An average of the most recent two years worth of maintenance data will be examined to determine the share of *preventive* maintenance that has been performed over that time period relative to the *total* maintenance performed. That percentage will then be compared to the "recommended" percent of jurisdictions' maintenance programs that should be preventive maintenance as determined by each jurisdiction's StreetSaver® database.

In order to extract information from jurisdictions' pavement management databases and measure performance, jurisdictions' databases must include up-to-date, thorough and accurate data on maintenance treatment history. Because the quality of maintenance history information in the pavement management databases varies widely, for this survey round only, jurisdictions will be provided the opportunity to substitute alternate information and documentation that clearly shows budgeted and/or actual preventive maintenance activity as a proportion of their total street and road capital maintenance budget and/or actual expenditures. Information and documentation of this nature includes three years worth of budgeted/actual expenditure information and documentation including a listing of street/road sections treated or budgeted to be treated with preventive maintenance, PCIs of the street segments prior to treatment, and the area treated.

Please see a sample of the documentation that would be required for jurisdictions that do not wish to accept the performance score that has been extracted from their database.

**Sample Preventive Maintenance Documentation Attachment**

Street / Section Name	Length	Width	Area (sq/ft)	PCI Before Treatment	Treatment Name	Date
ALPINE CT	158	33	5214	85	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
AMBERWOOD CIR	1077	32	34464	89	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
KINGSWOOD CT	211	33	6963	83	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
LAKEVIEW CIR	2658	33	87714	73	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
LAKEVIEW CT	192	32	6144	73	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
LYNBROOK DR	853	32	27296	60	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
MARIETTA CT	400	33	13200	63	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
MARKELEY LN	2632	30	78960	17	MILL AND THIN OVI	10/1/2007
MCKINLEY ST	1521	33	50193	43	MILL AND THICK OV	10/1/2007
MEADOWS CT	370	33	12210	89	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
MISSION CIR	1089	33	35937	50	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
MONTANA ST	350	33	11550	44	MILL AND THICK OV	10/1/2007
NEBRASKA ST	422	33	13926	81	MILL AND THICK OV	10/1/2007
OAKBROOK CIR	1918	33	63294	87	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
OAKBROOK CT	264	33	8712	80	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
OAKBROOK DR	6385	40	255400	51	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
ORINDA CT	211	33	6963	89	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
ORINDA WAY	739	36	26604	87	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
PHOENIX DR	2083	33	68739	73	CHIP SEAL AND SLU	10/1/2007
POLK ST	528	30	15840	58	MILL AND THICK OV	10/1/2007
RAINIER CT	370	33	12210	90	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
RAMSGATE CT	211	34	7174	83	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
REGENCY PL	264	33	8712	83	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
RIALTO AVE	1320	33	43560	82	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
RIALTO CT	317	33	10461	82	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007
RIDGECREST CT	634	33	20922	76	SLURRY SEAL	10/1/2007

The performance score that has been determined for your jurisdiction through extracting the information on maintenance treatment history from your database has been provided for you on the survey. If you are satisfied with the score that has been determined by this method, please check the “Approved” box on the survey, and you’re done. If you do not feel that the performance score provided accurately reflects your jurisdiction’s preventive maintenance practices, check the “Not Approved” box and continue with the survey. You will need to complete numbers 3 and 4 on this portion of the survey in order to get performance measure credit in the allocation of funding.

Thank you for taking the time to complete your Local Street and Road survey! **Please submit your completed survey to your county Congestion Management Agency representative no later than XXX, XX, 2010.**

**DRAFT LSR SURVEY TEMPLATE:  
FOR SURVEY STRUCTURE FEEDBACK ONLY**

**PART 1**

**JURISDICTION INFORMATION**

*Cells shaded in yellow require a response*

**1. Jurisdiction Name:** SAMPLE  **County:** SAMPLE 

**2. Contact Information:**

<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Phone:</b>	
<b>Fax:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	

**3. Survey Review and Approval:**

<b>Public Works Director/Deputy Director/Dept. Head:</b>	
Check-Mark indicates review and approval of responses submitted on Attachments 1 - 4 of this	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Approved
<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Title:</b>	

**DRAFT SURVEY FOR STRUCTURE / FORMAT FEEDBACK ONLY**

**PART 2**  
**PAVEMENT UNIT TREATMENT COST SURVEY**

*Cells shaded in yellow require a response*

**Important:** Data should be entered as cost per unit of treatment-- per square yard for all treatments except crack which should be in linear feet.

Arterial / Collector		A +	B +	C +
Sample Treatment	Comparable Treatment Used <sup>1</sup>	Construction Costs	Prep Work	Administration / Inspection Cost
Crack Sealing		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Slurry Seal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Chip Seal / Cape Seal		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Thin Asphalt Overlay (≥ 0.5", < 2.0")		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Thick Asphalt Overlay (≥ 2.0")		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Reconstruct Surface		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Reconstruct Structure		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Residential		A +	B +	C +
Sample Treatment	Comparable Treatment Used <sup>1</sup>	Construction Costs	Prep Work	Administration / Inspection Cost
Crack Sealing		\$	\$	\$
Slurry Seal		\$	\$	\$
Chip Seal / Cape Seal		\$	\$	\$
Thin Overlay (≥ 0.5", < 2.0")		\$	\$	\$
Thick Overlay (≥ 2.0")		\$	\$	\$
Reconstruct Surface (Heavy Rehabilitation)		\$	\$	\$
Reconstruct Structure		\$	\$	\$

- Notes:**
- 1) If your jurisdiction does not use the sample treatment listed, please enter the treatment used by your jurisdiction that is comparable in cost/effec jurisdiction does not utilize the sample treatment or a comparable treatment, please enter "N/A".
  - 2) If any of the cost descriptions in columns A through D do not apply to your jurisdiction, you may enter "N/A"; however, column D should equ
  - 3) Unit costs are in square yards except for crack sealing, which is in linear feet.
  - 4) The costs in this column are the average costs generated from survey responses within your jurisdiction's county. **They are for reference only.**
  - 5) The regional total costs listed in this column are for comparative **reference only** and are regional averages based on prior survey information.

**DRAFT SURVEY FOR STRUCTURE / FORMAT FEEDBACK ONLY**



**PART 3**  
**NON-PAVEMENT ASSET SURVEY**

Non-Pavement Category	Inventory	Unit	Total Replacement Cost	
CURB & GUTTER		ft		Accurate Figures ▼
STREET LIGHTS		ea		Accurate Figures ▼

**DRAFT SURVEY FOR STRUCTURE / FORMAT FEEDBACK ONLY**

**PART 4**  
**LOCAL STREET AND ROAD REVENUE SURVEY**

*Cells shaded in yellow require a response*

Budget Reference		
Average Annual Budget Revenue from 2006 Survey Response		
Pavement	Non-Pave	Total LS&R
\$ 9,947,667	\$ 5,613,000	\$ 27,900,667

**Expenditure / Budget Information:**

**PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL OR OTHER DISCRETIONARY /**

Fiscal Year	FY 08/09			
Rev. Source	Gas Tax	Sales Tax <sup>2</sup>	Prop 42	Other Local <sup>1</sup>
Total LS&R Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Pavement				
Non-Pave				
Operations			N/A	
New Const. /Other			N/A	

- 1) Totals for this category should correspond with your jurisdiction's Street & Road Revenue
- 2) "Sales Tax" refers to the countywide transportation sales tax measures
- 3) Proposition 42 funds, although not received past FY 09/10, may still be used for street & road purposes

**DRAFT SURVEY FOR STRUCTURE / FORMAT FEEDBACK ONLY**

**PART 5**  
**PERFORMANCE MEASURE**

**1. Percent of Total Maintenance Qualifying as Preventive Maintenance**

<b>Recommended:</b>	20.7%
<b>Actual:</b>	19.7%
<b>Performance Score:</b>	<b>0.95</b>

**2. Approval**

Approved: Use Information Above for Performance Measure Calculation

*Note: If "Approved" box is checked, you have completed Part 5 of this survey.*

Not Approved: Substitute Above Performance Score with Information Provided Below

*Note: If "Not Approved" box is checked you must provide all information requested under Items 3 & 4 or the performance score for your jurisdiction will reflect the value provided under Item 1 above.*

**3. Substitute Information (If "Not Approved" Box Above is Checked)**

Fiscal Year	FY 07/08	FY 08/09	FY 09/10
Total <u>Paving</u> Expenditure / Budget*	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Preventive Maintenance Paving Expenditure / Budget	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
% Preventive Maintenance	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
<b>Performance Score:</b>	<b>#DIV/0!</b>		

*\*Expenditure information should be consistent with information provided in Part 4 of this survey.*

**4. Documentation (If "Not Approved" Box Above is Checked)**

**Attach report to this survey including the following information:**

- 1) Listing of streets treated with preventive maintenance or planned for preventive maintenance treatment in FY 08/09 or FY 09/10
- 2) Pavement Condition Indexs (PCIs) prior to preventive maintenance treatment
- 3) Area of street treated (or planned for treatment) with preventive maintenance

**Confirm Information is Attached:**  Listing Attached

**DRAFT SURVEY FOR STRUCTURE / FORMAT FEEDBACK ONLY**