

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, September 15, 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 (August 2011): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Appointments of Afshin Oskoui (Belmont) and Paul Nagengast (Woodside) to the CMP TAC• Approved – Appointments of David Pine (County Supervisor) and Lauren Bonar Swezey (Facebook) to the RMCP Committee• Approved – Agreement with Kema for technical support for climate action planning technical support in the amount of \$60,000• Authorized – Release for distribution of the Draft 2011 CMP• Adopted – The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan• Approved – Draft 2012 STIP for San Mateo County | Hoang | No materials |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from August 18, 2011 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. Review and recommend approval of the Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County (Action) | Higaki | Page 3-5 |
| 5. MRP Compliance: Baseline Trash Loads and Load Reductions (Information) | Fabry | Presentation |
| 6. Funding allocation of local share under C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee) (Information) | Hoang | Page 6-11 |
| 7. Update on the San Mateo County Smart Corridors Project (Information) | Mohktari | Handouts |
| 8. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information) | Higaki | Page 12-23 |
| 9. Executive Director Report | Napier | No materials |
| 10. 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.

2011 TAC Roster and Attendance									
No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jul	Aug
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x		x		x	x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	n/a						
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning			x				
7	Lee Taubeneck	Caltrans	x				x	x	x
8	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
9	Robert Ovadia	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x			x	
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x	x	x		x	x
11	Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		x
12	Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay Engineering		x		x	x	x	x
13	Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	
14	Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	x		x	x	x	x	
15	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x			x		x
16	Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	
17	Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	
18	Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering	x	x		x	x		x
19	Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning		x					
20	Dennis Chuck	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
21	Paul Nagengast	Woodside Engineering	n/a						
21	Kenneth Folan	MTC							

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

**August 18, 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 Hurley called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, August 18, 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; Richard Napier – C/CAG; Joe Kott – 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 July 21, 2011.

Approved.

4. Review and recommend approval of the Draft 2011 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Preliminary Monitoring Report

John Hoang indicated that the complete Monitoring Report was included with the CMP this month. Item was approved.

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

Jean Higaki presented the 2012 STIP list. Member Patterson commented that Higaki has been helpful in helping city staff understand the process. Item was approved.

6. Travel Model Use Protocol

Joe Kott presented the information and authorization process for utilizing the travel model, clarifying that the developer's fee is \$2000.

7. C/CAG response to the MTC "OneBayArea Grant – Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ Funding" proposal

Jean Higaki presented the item. Rich Napier, Executive Director, encouraged all cities to send the letter into MTC. Member Breault requested that the letters, which can be customized by the cities, be sent from the Public Works Department. The cities' mayor can be the signatory on the letters.

8. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki presented the information.

9. Executive Director Report

Richard Napier, Executive Director, reported that the RWQCB has started to hand out storm water permit fines. Napier indicated that 11 agencies have already received notice of violation. Napier suggests that participation in the NPDES TAC should involve high level city staff also.

10. Member Reports

Co-chair Hurley mentioned that there are currently discussions in Sacramento regarding PID and that there has been an elimination of \$17 million for development of PSRs. There are also discussions about a possible bond sale in the fall for ongoing projects.

End of Meeting at 2:10 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2011
To: Congestion Management Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator
Subject: Review and recommend approval of the Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review and recommend approval of the Proposed 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County.

FISCAL IMPACT

None to the direct C/CAG budget.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

The 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) fund will come from State and Federal fund sources.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

C/CAG is the designated agency responsible to develop the regional share of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for San Mateo County. STIP candidate projects must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan as well as the County's Congestion Management Plan. In addition, projects must have an approved Project Study Report (PSR) or PSR Equivalent.

The STIP is a five-year document adopted every two years that displays commitments of transportation funds for improving highway, transit, and other transportation systems. On June 22, 2011, Caltrans presented the draft STIP Fund Estimates for the five-year STIP period (FY 2012/13 through FY 2016/17) to the California Transportation Commission (CTC). The CTC adopted the estimate at their August 10, 2011 meeting.

The adopted 2010 STIP covered the period between FY 2009/10 through 2014/15. Funds

previously programmed for highway and transit projects as adopted in the 2010 STIP are still committed.

Staff collaborated with the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA) and Caltrans staff and recommend the Proposed Draft 2012 STIP as attached.

On August 18, 2011, the draft 2012 STIP was presented to the Congestion Management Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for review. The TAC recommended approval of the proposed draft 2012 STIP.

On August 29, 2011, the draft 2012 STIP was presented to the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) for review. The CMEQ recommended approval of the proposed draft 2012 STIP.

On September 8, 2011 the draft 2012 STIP was presented to the C/CAG Board for approval. After approval of the draft, the Proposed 2012 STIP will be presented to the committees and Board for approval.

Since the TAC approved the draft 2012 STIP the following changes have been made.

- The numbers that were released earlier, based on the draft Fund Estimate, were inflated. It is expected that San Mateo County will be able to program approximately \$758,000 less from the original ~\$20.3 mil of funds added to the 2012 STIP. The reduced programming is directed to the Countywide ITS Project.
- SMCTA has requested a change to move the SR 1 Calera Parkway funds in one year from FY 14/15 to FY 13/14 to accommodate the current project schedule. This change was presented to the Board on September 8, 2011.
- \$1.9 million is moved from the Countywide ITS Project to Smart Corridors Project to complete funding for construction to the Santa Clara county line.

Upon approval by the C/CAG Board, the Proposed 2012 STIP for San Mateo County will be forwarded to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for inclusion in the Bay Area regional STIP proposal. If approved by the MTC as scheduled in November 2011, the proposal will be forwarded to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for approval in December 2011. During the coming months, it is anticipated Bay Area-wide and statewide negotiations will take place regarding the exact amount of funds available for each county in each fiscal year.

ATTACHMENT

- Summary of Proposed 2012 STIP for San Mateo County

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	(CMIA)	9,172	9,172						
Caltrans	101	658C	Auxiliary Lanes Segment 2, Embarcadero to University (CMIA)	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	1,471			20,471	
Caltrans	92	669B	SR 92 Slow Vehicle Lane Improvements (grf)	13,563	1,023		20,471			12,540	
Caltrans		0700C	Aux Lane Landscaping #700B- 2-yr plant establishment	33		33					
SMCTA/ Pacifica	1	632C	SR 1 Calera Parkway - Pacifica	13,800				6,900	6,900		
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
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
SM C/CAG	VAR	2140E	Countywide ITS Project	4,298			1,977		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)				89,007							
JPB		2140J	CalTrain San Bruno Ave Grade Separation (HSRCSA)	19,203	19,203						
BART		1003J	Daly City BART station improvement, elevator, lighting	900		200	700				
SUBTOTAL - PTA ELIGIBLE (2012/13 thru 2016/17)				900							
SM C/CAG			TE Reserve	5,964	200	1,000	1,000	745	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 ECR median (C/CAG TOD commitment)	779	779						
Half Moon Bay			TE funded - City of Half Moon Bay, Rte 1 landscaping	223	223						
Brisbane			TE funded - City of Brisbane Bayshore 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:				78,485		9,483	4,561	26,315	27,678	3,789	6,659

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 2011
To: CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Funding allocation of local share under C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee)

(For further information or questions contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC receive the information regarding allocation of local share of funding under the C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee) and that TAC members representing local jurisdictions be reminded to submit requests for reimbursement.

FISCAL IMPACT

Total Fiscal Year 2011 allocation of \$1,192,405.40

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Funds are derived from the imposition of \$4 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) on each motor vehicle registered in San Mateo County.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

A letter to City/County Managers (cc: Public Works Director) will be sent out in this month providing instructions on how to claim jurisdictions' share of the funding received under the C/CAG Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee). Funds are provided on a reimbursement basis only for expenses incurred during Fiscal Year 2011. Deadline to submit reimbursement to C/CAG will be December 31, 2011. Fifty percent of the total claim is required to be in the congestion management category, and 50% of the total claim in the stormwater pollution prevention programs.

In addition, C/CAG has started receiving revenues from the new Measure M (\$10 VRF) and plan to make an allocation of Measure M local share before the end of the year. It is anticipated that the allocation process will be similar to the \$4 VRF, which will be twice a year. Jurisdictions will have the flexibility on use of the funds; therefore, there are no requirements to split the funds evenly between the congestion management and stormwater pollution prevention categories.

ATTACHMENT

- Sample allocation letter to jurisdictions

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*

September xx, 2011

City Manager (NAME)

City of _____

Address

City, CA ZIP

Funding Allocation of Local Share Under C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee) – FISCAL YEAR 2010/11

Dear City Manager (NAME),

C/CAG is pleased to notify you that funding under the C/CAG's Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 Vehicle Registration Fee) for FY 2010/11 is now available for distribution to San Mateo County jurisdictions. Your jurisdiction is eligible to submit a request for reimbursement to claim the local share for work performed (expense incurred) during FY 2010/11 for the period from July 1, 2010 to June 30, 2011.

Projects eligible for reimbursement are classified under the Traffic Congestion Management and Stormwater Pollution Prevention categories as shown in **Attachment A**. The total allocation amount for each jurisdiction is calculated based on population share. Funds are allocated twice a year, once for the 1st half of the fiscal year (period from July 1 to December 31) and the second for the 2nd half of the fiscal year (period from January 1 to June 30).

Jurisdictions that submitted a reimbursement request for the 1st half can request for the 2nd half amount. Jurisdictions that have not request for a reimbursement this fiscal year will be eligible to request the full amount. The total FY 2010/11 funds available for each jurisdiction, taking into account reimbursements made to date, are summarized in **Attachment B**.

Please complete a separate Status Report/Request for Reimbursement form (**Attachment C**) for each project for which allocation is requested. Funds are provided on a reimbursement basis only therefore documentation must be included with the forms indicating that funds have already been expended. Please submit your FY 2010/11 funding reimbursement request to C/CAG by December 31, 2011.

If you would like an electronic copy of the reporting form or if you have further questions, please contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105 or email to jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us

Sincerely,

Richard Napier
Executive Director

Cc: Public Works Director

Attachments

ATTACHMENT A

Environmental/Transportation Program Categories

Projects and performance measures under the Traffic Congestion Management and Stormwater Pollution Prevention categories are listed below:

Traffic Congestion Management	
<i>Projects</i>	<i>Performance Measure</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local shuttles/transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of passengers transported.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road resurfacing/reconstruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deployment of Local Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of ITS components installed/implemented.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadway operations such as: Restriping, Signal timing/coordination, Signage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of units replaced and/or upgraded.

Stormwater Pollution Prevention	
<i>Projects</i>	<i>Performance Measure</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street sweeping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Miles of streets swept an average of once a month.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roadway storm inlet cleaning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of storm inlets cleaned per year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street side runoff treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Auto repair shop inspections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of auto repair shops inspected per year.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Managing runoff from Street/Parking lot impervious surfaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Square feet of surfaces managed annually.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small capital projects such as vehicle wash racks for public agencies that include pollution runoff controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of projects implemented.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management and controls 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of pieces of equipment purchased and installed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional used oil drop off locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of locations implemented and operated, and quantity of oil collected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of programs implemented and operated, and quantity of fluids collected.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Square footage of new pervious surface medium strips installed.

ATTACHMENT B

Environmental/Transportation Program (\$4 VRF)

**Total Funds Available for Reimbursement
FY 2010/11
(As of 9/1/11)**

Jurisdiction	% Share of Total	Allocation TOTAL	Reimbursed To Date		Available	
			FY11 (1 st half)		For Reimbursement	
			NPDES	Traffic	NPDES	Traffic
ATHERTON	1.00%	\$ 11,941.68			\$ 5,970.84	\$ 5,970.84
BELMONT	3.51%	\$ 41,903.38	\$ 10,701.07	\$ 10,701.07	\$ 10,250.62	\$ 10,250.62
BRISBANE	0.53%	\$ 6,312.30			\$ 3,156.15	\$ 3,156.15
BURLINGAME	3.89%	\$ 46,385.07			\$ 23,192.53	\$ 23,192.53
COLMA	0.22%	\$ 2,587.84			\$ 1,293.92	\$ 1,293.92
DALY CITY	14.37%	\$ 171,336.40			\$ 85,668.20	\$ 85,668.20
EAST PALO ALTO	4.44%	\$ 52,996.15			\$ 26,498.07	\$ 26,498.07
FOSTER CITY	4.07%	\$ 48,561.89		\$ 24,802.98	\$ 24,280.94	\$ (522.04)
HALF MOON BAY	1.77%	\$ 21,137.44			\$ 10,568.72	\$ 10,568.72
HILLSBOROUGH	1.53%	\$ 18,238.17	\$ 4,657.57	\$ 4,657.57	\$ 4,461.52	\$ 4,461.52
MENLO PARK	4.27%	\$ 50,879.40	\$ 12,993.32	\$ 12,993.32	\$ 12,446.38	\$ 12,446.38
MILLBRAE	2.91%	\$ 34,727.94	\$ 8,868.65	\$ 8,868.64	\$ 8,495.32	\$ 8,495.33
PACIFICA	5.36%	\$ 63,915.02	\$ 16,322.30	\$ 16,322.30	\$ 15,635.21	\$ 15,635.21
PORTOLA VALLEY	0.63%	\$ 7,469.48			\$ 3,734.74	\$ 3,734.74
REDWOOD CITY	10.42%	\$ 124,203.59	\$ 31,718.49	\$ 31,718.49	\$ 30,383.31	\$ 30,383.31
SAN BRUNO	5.87%	\$ 70,021.82			\$ 35,010.91	\$ 35,010.91
SAN CARLOS	3.87%	\$ 46,089.45			\$ 23,044.72	\$ 23,044.72
SAN MATEO	12.93%	\$ 154,187.42			\$ 77,093.71	\$ 77,093.71
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	8.73%	\$ 104,133.22	\$ 26,593.02	\$ 26,593.01	\$ 25,473.59	\$ 25,473.60
WOODSIDE	0.76%	\$ 9,070.87			\$ 4,535.44	\$ 4,535.44
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO	8.92%	\$ 106,306.88	\$ 27,148.11	\$ 27,148.11	\$ 26,005.33	\$ 26,005.33
TOTAL		\$ 1,192,405.40				

Allocation is based on percentage share of the population estimates from the State of California Department of Finance dated 1/1/2010.

*** Please note that 50% of the available funds MUST be spent on Traffic Congestion Management Programs and 50% MUST be spent on Stormwater Pollution Prevention Programs.**

ATTACHMENT C

Environmental/Transportation Program

**Status Report/Request for Reimbursement
Under California Government Code Section 65089.11 et. seq.
FY 2010/11**

(July 1, 2010 through June 30, 2011)

Agency Name:	Date Expense Incurred. From: To:	Date of This Report/Request for Reimbursement:	Amount of Reimbursement Requested:
--------------	--	--	------------------------------------

<p align="center">Program category for this report/request for reimbursement (Submit a new form for each project type)</p>	
<p>Traffic Congestion Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Local shuttles/transportation <input type="checkbox"/> Road resurfacing/reconstruction <input type="checkbox"/> Deployment of Local Intelligent Transportation Systems <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway operations such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restriping - Signal timing, coordination, etc. - Signage <input type="checkbox"/> Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software 	<p>Stormwater Pollution Prevention</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Street sweeping <input type="checkbox"/> Roadway storm inlet cleaning <input type="checkbox"/> Street side runoff treatment <input type="checkbox"/> Auto repair shop inspections <input type="checkbox"/> Managing runoff from Street/Parking lot impervious surfaces <input type="checkbox"/> Small capital projects such as vehicle wash racks for public agencies that include pollution runoff controls <input type="checkbox"/> Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management and controls <input type="checkbox"/> Additional used oil drop off locations <input type="checkbox"/> Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs <input type="checkbox"/> Installation of new pervious surface medium strips in roadways

Briefly describe the project for which reimbursement is requested:

Identify the performance measure related to this project (see chart in Attachment A) that shows that this project benefited motor vehicles. Describe actual performance.

- Performance Measure:
- Total Project Cost:
- Cost applied to this Request:
- Total Project Quantity:
- Quantity applied to this Request:
- Period of performance (as applicable):

Identify the specific benefits to motor vehicles (traffic congestion) or how the project addresses the negative environmental impacts of vehicles (stormwater pollution) as a result of implementing this project. Two examples of projects might be – *“As a result of reducing the delay time at the intersection of X and Y streets, motorists are creating less air pollution and fuel consumption due to extended periods of engine idling. Motorists are able to reach destinations quicker, thereby making more efficient use of time.” “As a result of the removal of waste and pollutants from A, B, and C streets, toxic materials from motor vehicles will not be washed into the storm drains, thereby mitigating the polluting effects of vehicles, and debris on the roads will not be present to damage vehicles in the travel lanes or while parking.”*

Additional Comments:

Certifications

1. I hereby certify that the expenses for which reimbursement is requested are for programs and/or projects that have a relationship or benefit to the motor vehicles that are paying the fee.

This includes:

- **Addressing motor vehicle congestion, and/or**
- **Addressing the negative impact on creeks, streams, bays, and the ocean caused by motor vehicles and the infrastructure supporting motor vehicle travel.**

2. I hereby certify that the information contained in this Status Report and Request for Reimbursement is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge.

By: _____ **Date:** _____

Name: _____ **Title:** City Manager

Copies of paid invoices must be included with this report in order to receive reimbursement.
If you would like an electronic copy of these instructions and the reporting form, please send an Email to jhoang@co.sanmateo.ca.us or call at 650-363-4105.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 15, 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
- P-TAP Round 13 - MTC will be soliciting applications for Round 13 projects. Applications will be due October 7, 2011 by 4:00 p.m. Selection criteria are attached.
- Comments on Proposed One Bay Area Grant Program from Local Streets & Roads Working Group (LSRWG) – Attached is a draft letter developed by a LSRWG subcommittee. The draft was presented at their September 08, 2011 meeting for discussion.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Inactive Project List generated on 8/25/2011
2. PTAP Application information
3. OneBayArea Grant draft comments from LSRWG

Quarterly Review of Inactive Obligations
Local, State Administered Locally Funded and Rail Projects
(Review Period 04/01/2011- 06/30/2011)

Project No	State Project No	Prefix	District	County	Agency	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal	3-Tier Criteria
Updated on 08/25/2011	Inactive Projects (Review period: 04/01/2011-06/30/2011)														
LOOK AHEAD	Agency Action Required														
6000047	04925625L	STPLZ	04	ALA	BART	18TH STREET IN OAKLAND TO ASHLAND AVENUE IN HAYWARD/FREMONT, SEISMIC RETROFIT-AERIAL STRUCTURES	9/21/2010	9/21/2010		L240	\$ 77,996,000.00	\$ 10,648,389.00	\$ -	\$ 10,648,389.00	TIER 1
6000049	04925646L	STPLZ	04	ALA	BART	IN WEST OAKLAND, SEISMIC RETROFIT OF BART FACILITIES	9/21/2010	9/21/2010		L240	\$ 12,725,109.00	\$ 913,421.00	\$ -	\$ 913,421.00	TIER 1
6002005	04928164L	CMLMA	04	ALA	A.C Transit	FREMONT BART STATION & COLISEUM BART STATION, TRANSIT CENTER IMPROVEMENTS	5/9/2008	7/1/1996	5/9/2008	3BC0,3AZ0	\$ 886,706.00	\$ 785,000.00	\$ 785,000.00	\$ -	TIER 3
6014006	04099858L	HP21L	04	SM	San Mateo County Transit District	EL CAMINO REAL FR NOOR AND SYLAN, MEDIAN LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION	4/20/2009	4/20/2009		LY10	\$ 453,871.00	\$ 282,000.00	\$ -	\$ 282,000.00	TIER 2
6014011	04099928L	HP21L	04	SM	San Mateo County Transit District	MISSION ST FR JDALY BLVD TO PARKVIEW AVE. PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	11/11/2010	11/11/2010		LY10,HY10	\$ 1,669,784.00	\$ 700,000.00	\$ -	\$ 700,000.00	TIER 1
6057012	04925411L	HPLUL	04	ALA	Port Of Oakland	MARTINEZ SUBDIVISION RAIL CORRIDOR MP-15, INTER-REGIONAL RAIL INTERMODAL STUDY	4/17/2009	4/17/2009		H660	\$ 150,000.00	\$ 150,000.00	\$ -	\$ 150,000.00	TIER 2
6075016	04925840L	HPLUL	04	CC	EBRPD	LAFAYETTE - MORAGA TRAIL BETWEEN FOYE DRIVE AND CANYON ROAD, RECONSTRUCT AC TRAIL	10/20/2010	10/20/2010		LY10,HY10	\$ 976,007.00	\$ 627,000.00	\$ -	\$ 627,000.00	TIER 1
6084083	04924135L	STPL	04	MULT	MTC	URBANIZED BAY AREA, CMA PLANNING FOR 2003/04	7/30/2008	8/20/2003	7/30/2008	Q230,3480	\$ 5,764,152.00	\$ 5,103,000.00	\$ 5,095,835.69	\$ 7,164.31	TIER 3
6084165	04925800L	CML	04	MULT	MTC	INITIATIVES EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION	8/11/2010	8/11/2010		L40E	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ 4,000,000.00	\$ -	\$ 4,000,000.00	TIER 1
6264016	040A8308L	STPL	04	SCL	Santa Clara VTA	152/156 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS , CONSTRUCT FLYOVER(W/B152 - S/B156)	11/9/2010	1/27/2006	11/9/2010	LY10,L240, HY10,H240	\$ 24,375,114.00	\$ 14,769,040.00	\$ 13,679,998.86	\$ 1,089,041.14	TIER 1
6272023	043A6408L	BRLS	04	SF	San Francisco County Transportation Authority	WESTBOUND ON & OFF RAMP, RECONST EXISTING WB ON & OFF RAMP ON EAST OF YBI	8/20/2010	8/20/2010		L1CE	\$ 4,500,000.00	\$ 3,983,850.00	\$ -	\$ 3,983,850.00	TIER 1
6273045	043A9208L	CML	04	ALA	ACCTC	I-880: MARINA TO HEGENBERGER I/C'S , IMPLEMENT HOV LANES.	5/26/2010	12/19/2007	5/26/2010	L40R,L400, L230	\$ 7,806,000.00	\$ 7,780,000.00	\$ 6,781,000.00	\$ 999,000.00	TIER 1
6411001	04925851L	ISTDEML	04	MRN	Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit District	RR ROUTE FROM LARKSPUR TO SONOMA COUNTY., IMPROVE RR CROSSINGS ALONG THE SMART ROUTE	12/13/2010	12/13/2010		3680	\$ 12,138,005.00	\$ 9,710,404.00	\$ -	\$ 9,710,404.00	TIER 1
6411002	04925853L	ISTDEML	04	MRN	Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit District	SMART ROUTE IN MARIN SONOMA COUNTIES, MECHANICAL & ELECTRICAL SYSTEM IMPROVEMENTS	12/13/2010	12/13/2010		3680	\$ 1,424,020.00	\$ 1,139,216.00	\$ -	\$ 1,139,216.00	TIER 1
46Y1001	04925278L	ER	04	ALA	Oakland	SKYLINE BLVD. NERAR SNAKE RD., ROADWAY REPAIRS	11/10/2009	8/7/2009	11/10/2009	09T0	\$ 1,092,652.00	\$ 1,092,652.00	\$ 912,605.18	\$ 180,046.82	TIER 2



**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
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: September 8, 2011

FR: Amy Burch

RE: P-TAP Scoring Criteria for Round 13 Projects

Background

The Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) provides Bay Area jurisdictions with expertise in implementing and maintaining a pavement management program, primarily the MTC StreetSaver® software. MTC has programmed over \$9.1 million in regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds during the last twelve rounds of P-TAP. In total, MTC has funded 470 projects and assisted all Bay Area jurisdictions with their pavement needs.

MTC will be soliciting applications for Round 13 projects. Applications will be due **October 7, 2011 by 4:00 p.m.** MTC will notify grant finalists in December, 2011, contingent upon Administration Committee approval. All eligible Bay Area cities and counties are encouraged to apply.

Scoring Criteria for Round 13 Projects

MTC staff suggest minor changes to the scoring criteria from Round 12 (see Attachment 1), including removing one criterion – Version of StreetSaver® – that is no longer relevant. As nearly all Bay Area jurisdictions now use StreetSaver®, this measure no longer applies. Additionally, MTC staff proposes adding a five-point bonus for jurisdictions that complete their P-TAP surveys, which MTC uses to improve the program. Please see Attachments 1 and 2 for the scoring criteria for Round 12 and proposed criteria for Round 13, respectively.

Feel free to contact me at 510-817-5735 and aburch@mtc.ca.gov with questions.

SCORING CRITERIA FOR P-TAP 12 PROJECTS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Score Range</u>	<u>Total Points</u>
1	<u>Scope of Work Requested</u>	5 to 20	20
	<i>Jurisdictions applying for Pavement Management System (PMS) projects will receive higher scores.</i>	PMS = 20 PS&E = 5	
2	<u>Centerline Miles</u>	5 to 15	15
	<i>Jurisdictions with fewer centerline miles will receive higher scores.</i>	<100 = 15 100-300 = 10 >300 = 5	
3	<u>Prior P-TAP Recipient</u>	0 to 25	25
	<i>Jurisdictions that have not recently received P-TAP funds will receive higher scores.</i>	Round 9 or earlier = 25 Round 10 = 15 Round 11 = 0	
4	<u>Certification Status</u>	10 to 20	20
	<i>Jurisdictions without current PMP certification will receive higher scores.</i>	Currently Expired = 20 Expired by year end = 15 Certified for 1-2 years = 10	
5	<u>Version of StreetSaver®</u>	0 to 20	20
	<i>Jurisdictions without the online version will receive higher scores.</i>	Version 7.5 = 20 8.0 desktop = 10 Online = 0	
<u>Total Points Possible</u>			<u>100</u>
*Additional Criteria			
	<u>LS&R Needs and Revenue Survey</u>	-100	-100
	<i>Jurisdictions that did not turn in their surveys to MTC are not eligible for P-TAP funding.</i>		

PROPOSED SCORING CRITERIA FOR P-TAP 13 PROJECTS

<u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Score Range</u>	<u>Total Points</u>
1	<u>Scope of Work Requested</u>	5 to 25	25
	<i>Jurisdictions applying for Pavement Management System (PMS) projects will receive higher scores.</i>	PMS = 25 PS&E = 5	
2	<u>Centerline Miles</u>	10 to 20	20
	<i>Jurisdictions with fewer centerline miles will receive higher scores.</i>	<100 = 20 100-300 = 15 >300 = 10	
3	<u>Prior P-TAP Recipient</u>	0 to 30	30
	<i>Jurisdictions that have not recently received P-TAP funds will receive higher scores.</i>	Round 10 or earlier = 30 Round 11 = 15 Round 12 = 0	
4	<u>Certification Status</u>	10 to 25	25
	<i>Jurisdictions without current PMP certification will receive higher scores.</i>	Currently Expired = 25 Expired by year end = 15 Certified for 1-2 years = 10	
*Additional Criteria			
	<u>LS&R Needs and Revenue Survey</u>	-100	-100
	<i>Jurisdictions that have not turned in their surveys to MTC are not eligible for P-TAP funding.</i>		
	<u>P-TAP Survey Completed</u>	5	5
	<i>Jurisdictions that submit their P-TAP surveys will receive a five-point bonus.</i>		
<u>Total Points Possible</u>			<u>105</u>

August 31, 2011

Steve Heminger, Executive Director
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Ezra Rapport, Executive Officer
Association of Bay Area Governments
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Subject: Comments on Proposed One Bay Area Grant Program
 Local Streets & Roads Working Group

Dear Mr. Heminger and Mr. Rapport:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed "One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program," draft dated July 8, 2011. The Local Streets & Roads Working Group (LSRWG), representing public works agencies charged with the operation and maintenance of the backbone of the region's transportation system, strongly supports the "Fix it First" policy established in the current Regional Transportation Plan, which recommends that 81% of all expenditures be dedicated to maintenance and operations, as a priority over expansion and enhancement of the transportation system.

"This plan not only reaffirms the region's long-standing "fix it first" maintenance policy but also expands our commitment to maintaining and operating our existing local roadway and transit systems."
-Transportation 2035 (page 14)

Recognizing the enormity of needs throughout the region, and the wide variation in those needs among the 100+ jurisdictions which comprise MTC, the LSRWG is strongly supportive of the flexibility provided through the creation of the Block Grant approach that was recommended for allocation of Cycle 1 funding. This has enabled each countywide Congestion Management Agency (CMA) to identify the mix of transit, bicycle/pedestrian, and roadway projects which is most appropriate for their member agencies, while recognizing the range of needs that exist between urbanized and rural jurisdictions in the Bay Area.

The LSRWG has carefully reviewed the OBAG proposal for allocation of funds from Cycle 2 of the still-pending federal transportation act, and offers the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATIONS

Priority Development Area (PDA) Minimum

1. Apply the proposal to require that 70% of all funds be spent on projects in PDAs only to Congestion Management/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. This will address the objective of providing incentives to encourage housing development in these areas. Enable Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds to be spent on the entire surface transportation network, as this is the funding source most applicable to meeting the needs of the "Fix it First" policy noted above.

2. Allow the portion of funds reserved for PDAs to be spent not only inside them, but also for projects in their vicinity which support the development of these areas. This will include transit systems, regional bike networks and connections between PDAs as well as regional employment centers, schools, recreation sites and shopping areas.

Performance and Accountability

3. Modify the proposed Performance and Accountability requirements, under **#1, Supportive Local Transportation and Land-Use Policies**, to separate distinct topics into individual items in the list. (Specifically, items (a) and (d) each contain two distinct topics.) Retain the requirement to meet at least two of the longer list of choices to be eligible for grant funds. Clarify the deadline required to submit policies to be eligible for grant funds.

4. Replace the language in item **1(b)** in order to make reference to a programmatic approach to air quality/greenhouse gas reduction per CEQA guidelines.

5. Modify the language in item **1(d)** to apply to adopted bicycle or bicycle/pedestrian plans. Separate to a distinct topic adopted complete streets policies. Delete the reference to "general plans pursuant to Complete Streets Act of 2008."

6. Add additional categories of supportive local transportation and land-use policies which will be more applicable in rural counties and smaller cities. Examples include: adopted local sustainable community strategy, greenbelt policy, urban growth boundaries, policies to conserve resource areas and farmland, and policies for rural areas directing growth into the more-metropolitan segments of the region. Also include a choice for "other" in which a local agency could indicate their supportive policies which don't fit the categories already listed. Choosing "other" and filling in the associated blank would require consultation with CMA and/or MTC staff to verify that the local policy in question does address the desired linkage between transportation and land use.

7. Require local agencies to locally adopt a housing element consistent with RHNA requirements and submit it for HCD approval, rather than requiring achievement of HCD approval to qualify for funds.

8. Define how multi-agency transit districts would be able to qualify for funding if these requirements were in effect.

Priority Conservation Areas (PCA)

9. Make the PCA funding eligible for “transportation investments for the preservation and safety of the city street or county road system and farm to market and interconnectivity transportation needs,” as is required by SB 375, in Government Code section 65080 (b) (4) (C), rather than only for “planning” as is currently listed in the OBAG draft.

Other Recommendations

10. Retain the existing formula for allocation of STP funding to the CMAs for programming, which is based on population, lane mileage, shortfall and preventative maintenance performance (25% each). This maintains the commitment to “Fix it First” and serves as a performance and accountability measure by prioritizing the use of funds for preventative maintenance.

CONCERNS

The LSRWG is pleased to be a full partner in the process of reviewing the proposal for allocation of Cycle 2 funding, and thus has chosen to emphasize the positive aspects of the proposal and offer specific, concrete recommendations for improving the proposal in order to help meet the region’s longstanding goals.

In addition, the LSRWG felt it was important to share with you the concerns which led to these recommendations. The following information is provided as background:

Priority Development Area (PDA) Minimum

1. System preservation and maintenance needs are far greater outside the proposed PDAs, which contain less than __% of the Federal Aid roadway system in the region.

2. Freeing up funding to be spent outside proposed PDAs enables investment in corridors which connect those (primarily residential) areas to employment centers, schools, recreation sites and shopping areas, most of which are located outside PDAs.

3. Maintenance performed on any regionally significant route (typically those in the Federal Aid system) is supportive of PDAs.

4. Enabling STP funds to be spent throughout the Federal-Aid system allows these funds to be spent in the most cost-effective manner, per the recommendations of the local agencies' pavement management systems.

5. Most local agencies rely on federal funding for the preservation and maintenance of their regionally significant roadways, and do not have sufficient local funding to add to the mix. In this way, agencies' road maintenance is similar to the way transit agencies typically use only federal funds for vehicle purchases, and reserve their farebox and other revenues for operations.

6. As PDAs are developed, they are being sited in close proximity to major transit lines, and built with densities which support non-motorized travel alternatives. Thus, they are essentially "self-mitigating" in terms of potential air quality impacts. By contrast, areas outside proposed PDAs have a much greater need to encourage non-motorized travel, and investments in these areas can have potentially greater air quality benefits.

7. Few of the facilities which have been able to benefit from the Regional Bicycle, Transportation for Livable Communities and Safe Routes to School programs are located within PDAs. Allowing use of PDA-restricted funds to be invested in routes which support PDAs will be more productive in terms of meeting the objectives of OBAG.

8. Freeing up funding to be spent outside proposed PDAs will provide greater opportunity to address social equity concerns through investment in economically disadvantaged areas, which are not typically the site of PDAs.

9. Prioritizing funds by reserving 70% of all funds to PDAs does not address the needs of areas of existing housing, which is a much-greater proportion of the overall regional population. The population increase forecast in the Initial Vision Scenario for the RTP/SCS represents only 22% of the total population of the region.

10. Only 67 jurisdictions have even proposed PDAs; as a result approximately 1/3 of local agencies will be ineligible for any funding which is reserved for PDAs. In some counties, this effect is exaggerated; for example, in Napa County only one jurisdiction has a proposed PDA (out of six total agencies) – thus one agency which represents 14% of the countywide population would have exclusive access to this funding. Jurisdictions without PDAs are not likely to propose them, as these would be inconsistent with their general plans which support conservation of resource areas and farmland, and encourage directing growth into the more-metropolitan segments of the region.

11. There are specific timing constraints which limit the ability of local agencies to invest in infrastructure to support PDAs where they are proposed.

a. Land development projects take longer to go through the approval process than is compatible with the timing of Cycle 2 funding. It is necessary to complete the land development approval process in advance of seeking infrastructure funding, in order to be able to design the utility, drainage, driveway and other detailed requirements of the transportation facility improvement.

b. Many land development projects are conditioned to provide the required infrastructure improvements themselves, since those improvements are for the benefit of the private development. It has not been the practice of most public agencies to provide such improvements, at taxpayer expense from any source, for the benefit of private development.

c. Caltrans review regarding utilities further complicates the use of funds within this time frame.

Performance and Accountability

12. The concept of making jurisdictions accountable for proper use of federal funds is a good one. However, the requirements which are currently proposed do not appear to be achievable, and may result in limiting local agency eligibility for use of any of the Cycle 2 funding. Consequently, the region would substantially under-deliver Obligation Authority over the course of Cycle 2.

13. The “Community Risk Reduction Plans (CRRP) per CEQA guidelines” proposal presents mixed signals. CRRPs are not a function of the CEQA guidelines. A “programmatic approach” to air quality/greenhouse gas reduction, as noted in Recommendation #4 above, would be sufficiently consistent with CEQA guidelines so as to allow local agencies can achieve their respective targets.

14. The Complete Streets Act of 2008 is in full effect, and the result is that all local agencies will be required to incorporate bicycle/pedestrian plans and complete streets policies into their general plans, **when they next update their general plans**. It is not likely that most agencies are planning general plan updates during the time frame of Cycle 2, and even for those few that are, it is uncommon to complete an update in that amount of time. What is reasonable, however, is to have adopted a bicycle or bicycle/pedestrian plan and/or complete streets policies as stand-alone documents, which would still provide the necessary direction to local agencies.

15. LSRWG members have consulted with planning staff in their agencies, who widely report that achieving HCD approval of a local housing element is an arduous and lengthy process, the timing of which is not in the control of the local agency.

16. The LSRWG has identified that, although they are not part of our constituent group, transit agencies would have a difficult (if not impossible) time demonstrating

compliance with the proposed requirements, as such agencies do not have general plans, housing policies, etc. nor the authority to address other topics such as employer trip reduction programs.

Priority Conservation Areas (PCA)

17. Local agencies in the region which are supporting appropriate growth patterns by directing growth into urban centers already have plans in place to accomplish these objectives; thus funding for “PCA planning studies” is not needed. Additionally, it is not clear how these planning studies relate to transportation, and therefore how they would be eligible for use of STP/CMAQ funds.

18. Section 65080 (b) (4) (C) of the Government Code (from SB 375) specifically requires that agencies which have resource areas or farmland (as defined in Section 65080.01), be provided financial incentives for the preservation and safety of the local roadway system, especially those routes which serve farm-to-market or community-interconnectivity functions.

Other concerns

19. Several of the CMAs made funding commitments to their member jurisdictions during the programming of Cycle 1 funds, based on their understanding of distribution formulas which would follow in Cycle 2. This was implemented for a variety of reasons, such as to accommodate the minimum project size specified by MTC. The proposal to focus 70% of all funding in PDAs would make it difficult to follow through on those commitments. The binding nature of these commitments and their impact on Cycle 2 funding needs to be determined.

In conclusion, the LSRWG again thanks you for the opportunity to review and comment on the proposed OBAG program. We look forward to continuing to be in conversation with you and your staff as the proposal moves forward. Please contact me at nhughes@ci.fremont.ca.us or call (510) 494-4748 if you have questions or need additional information.

Respectfully,

NORM HUGHES
Chair, Local Streets & Roads Working Group
City Engineer, City of Fremont

C: Alix Bockelman, Programming and Allocations Director, MTC