

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, June 16, 2016
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd 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 meetings (May, June): | | No materials |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Contract with Iteris to provide Smart Corridor ITS Network Monitoring and Maintenance Support for \$92,732 over two years• Approved – Contract with LCA to provide AFRP outreach support for \$38,960• Approved – Appointment of Peykan Abbassi (Half Moon Bay) on the TAC and Stormwater Committee• Approved – Appointment of Ray Chan (Millbrae) on the TAC• Approved - Agreements with BAAQMD for FY16/17 TFCA funds for \$1,277,039.76• Approved –Agreement with Commute.org for FY16/17 TFCA funds for Countywide Trip Reduction Program for \$525,000• Approved – Agreement with SamTrans for FY16/17 TFCA funds for shuttle services, bike racks on buses, and San Carlos Shuttle projects for \$431,988• Approved – Agreement with SamTrans for Measure allocation for FYs16/17-17/18 for \$2.8M• Approved – Agreement with SMCOE for the Countywide SRTS Program for FY 16/17 for \$564,711• Approved – C/CAG 2016-17 Program Budget and Fees | | |
| 3. | Approval of the minutes from April 21, 2016 | Hoang | Page 1-2 |
| 4. | Receive a presentation on the Mobility As A Service (MaaS) Project (Information) | Raney | Handouts |
| 5. | Review and recommend approval to provide funds to County of San Mateo 2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project in an amount not to exceed \$100,000 (Action) | Hoang | Page 3-5 |
| 6. | Review and recommend approval of the definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program (Action) | Higaki | Page 6-8 |
| 7. | Review and recommend approval of the scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program (Action) | Higaki | Page 9-16 |

¹ For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 260, 295, 390, 391, KX 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.

8. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information)	Yu	Page 17-22
9. Executive Director Report	Wong	No materials
10. Member Reports	All	

2016 TAC Roster and Attendance					
No.	Member	Agency	Jan	Mar	Apr
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering		x	
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x	x
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering		x	x
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	x	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning			
7	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x		
9	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering		x	x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x		
11	Jeff Moneda	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x	x	x
13	Peykan Abbassi	Half Moon Bay	n/a	n/a	n/a
14	Justin Murphy	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x
15	Ray Chan	Millbrae Engineering	n/a	n/a	n/a
16	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x		x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x
18	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x	x	
19	Jay Walter	San Carlos Engineering	x	x	x
20	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering	x	x	x
21	Brian McMinn	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x	x	x
23	Kevin Mulder	MTC	n/a	x	
24	vacant	Caltrans			

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

**April 21, 2016
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Hurley called the meeting to order at 1:16 p.m. on Thursday, April 21, 2016.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Dave Bishop - Colma; Beverly Thames, Rumika Chaudhry – County of San Mateo; Peykan Abbassi – Half Moon Bay; Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Eliza Yu – C/CAG; and other attendees not noted.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting.

Approved.

3. Approval of the Minutes from March 17, 2016.

Approved with correction.

4. Receive a presentation on the County Aerial Imagery

Beverly Thames and Rumika Chaudhry, San Mateo County, presented information on the County's project to acquire aerial imagery and LiDAR data and benefits the imagery can provide the cities for transportation, infrastructure, and environmental planning projects as well as public safety related activities. The County will be releasing a request for proposal to purchase the imagery and LiDAR data and is seeking interest from C/CAG and the cities and request funding assistance for the project. Currently, the 2014 imageries are available to all cities for free but for the new imagery, cities would need to contribute funds towards the project to be able to access the new imagery.

It was requested that staff follow up with the TAC members and cities and provide additional information on the project benefits, gauging whether cities are interested in the aerial imagery and LiDAR data and determine whether to provide funding assistance towards the project. Staff will bring back a recommendation to the TAC at a future meeting.

5. Review and recommend approval of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework

Jean Higaki presented the OBAG 2 framework including eligibility and requirements and a revised proposed funding scenario for Local Streets and Roads.

There were no comments. Item was approved.

6. Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2016/17- 2020/21)

John Hoang presented the proposed final Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan, which included revision based on previous comments received from the TAC and Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) committee. The proposed Plan maintained the same allocations as in the current Plan ending FY 2016, which includes the following program categories: Up to 5% - Administration; 50% - Local Streets and Roads; 22% - Transit Operations/Senior Transportation; 10% - ITS/Smart Corridor; 6% Safe Routes to Schools; and 12% - NPDES/Municipal Regional Permit.

With regards to the unspent money from the current Implementation Plan (FY12-16) which will be eligible to be redistributed, a plan will be developed and be presented to committees separately for recommendations. It was noted the performance measures for each program category should be consistent with information included in the annual performance reports.

Item was approved.

7. Review and recommend approval of the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2016/2017 and FY 2017/2018

Tom Madalena presented the final project list recommended for funding under the FY 2016/17 and FY 2017/18 C/CAG – TA Shuttle Program for a total of \$8,981,323 (\$921,528 - C/CAG; \$8,981,323 – TA).

Item was approved.

8. Receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3

Eliza Yu presented information on the ATP Cycle 3, including highlights of the draft application, scoring criteria, and guidelines. A question was asked as to whether the community of concern areas were already included on the MTC maps. Also regarding disadvantaged communities, the 25% requirements would be met both at the state as well as local levels.

9. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki provided handouts of information pertaining to the ATP webinar, PMP Certification and the soon to be released MTC pavement condition report. Higaki also provided updated on the repurposing of federal earmarks.

10. Executive Director Report

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, reported that the STIP is in bad shape. Projects affected by the reduction in the STIP funds included the Willow/101 I/C and El Camino Real/92 Interchange, which is ready to list. The \$9M originally slated for the US-101 Carpool/Express lane project has be moved out to a further year since the CTC will not be recommending the project. The environmental phase of the project is currently funded by the TA.

11. Member Reports

None.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 16, 2016
To: Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
From: John Hoang
Subject: Review and recommend approval to provide funds to County of San Mateo 2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project in an amount not to exceed \$100,000

(For further information or response to questions, contact John Hoang at 650-363-4105)

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review recommend approval to provide funds to County of San Mateo 2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project in an amount not to exceed \$100,000.

FISCAL IMPACT

\$80,000 - \$100,000

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Transportation Funds

BACKGROUND

At the April 21, 2016 TAC meeting, staff from the County of San Mateo Information Service Department provided information on the County led project to acquire new aerial imagery and LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) data covering all of San Mateo County. County staff provided samples of functionalities and benefits of the imagery and data including possible uses applicable for transportation and infrastructure planning, urban and environmental planning, as well as public safety projects. The County is currently seeking funding assistance for the project and solicited interest from the Committee members representing the cities and C/CAG. It was proposed that if C/CAG and/or cities are interested in jointly funding the project with the County, then C/CAG and member agencies/cities can have access to all the imagery and data collected by the County. It was suggested that Committee members share the project information with other departments at their respective cities to gauge interest in accessing the imagery and data.

Following the meeting, C/CAG staff surveyed all the TAC members regarding their interest in accessing the aerial imagery and LiDAR data with the intent that if enough cities are supportive of the proposed project then C/CAG would consider contributing funds to the project on behalf of the cities, which will enable all cities in County access to the information for free. A number of cities responded positively, indicating interest in the imagery and support for the project.

Considering interest from the cities and the potential benefits, staff proposed contributing between \$80,000 to \$100,000 towards the project on behalf of all the cities/member agencies, which will enable cities access to the aerial imagery and LiDAR data for free. The final contribution amount will be determined based on final cost of the project.

ATTACHMENTS

- 2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project Description (County of San Mateo)

County of San Mateo 2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project

San Mateo County is currently looking to fund its estimated \$ 250K '2016 Aerial Imagery and LiDAR Data Acquisition Project'. The project's key components with cost estimates are included below: components:

1. Acquiring 6" Digital Orthorectified Aerial Imagery
2. Acquiring High Resolution Airborne Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) Data and Products:
 - a. 2-m Digital Terrain Model (DEM)
 - b. 1-ft Contour lines
 - c. Building footprints

PRODUCT	ESTIMATED COST
6" Digital Orthorectified Aerial Imagery	~ \$70,000- \$80,000
High Resolution Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) Data and Products	
2-m Digital Terrain Model (DEM)	~ \$80,000
1-ft Contour lines	~ 30,000
Building footprints	~ \$60,000
Total	~ \$250,000

Previously, the County has been sharing aerial imagery and LiDAR data in various digital formats with local governmental entities, emergency service providers, consultants, non-profit organizations, academic institutions, and local GIS users to provide a common reference for conditions across San Mateo County.

It is our hope that spreading project cost across a large funding base will make it easy to frequently update aerial imagery data and to acquire other useful products like LiDAR, contours and DEM. Cost sharing will also allow partners to maximize their ROI and spread the financial investment across the many different agencies that benefit from the use of the images and other products.

Our project timeline is include below

EVENT	TARGET DATE
RFP Release Date	July 5, 2016
Proposal Deadline	August 5, 2016
Vendor Selection and Contract Negotiations	August 30, 2016
Project Start Date	Early September, 2016

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 16, 2016

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

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program

(For further information, contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462 or jhigaki@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC review and recommend approval of the definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds allocated by MTC via OBAG 2 which includes Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2015, MTC and ABAG adopted Resolution 4202 approving the OBAG 2 Grant Program. The guidelines for PDAs have remained the same from OBAG 1 to OBAG 2:

- 70% of OBAG 2 funds must be spent on PDAs within San Mateo County
- Projects can count towards a PDA if it connects or provides “proximate access” to a PDA
- The Congestion Management Agency (CMA) may define how a project meets a “proximate access to PDAs” in considering the PDA investment target.

Per MTC Resolution 4202, MTC has provided CMAs guidance in applying the definition of proximate access to PDAs (see below):

Defining proximate access to PDAs: The CMAs may determine that a project located outside of a PDA provides proximate access to the PDA, and thus counts towards the county’s minimum PDA investment target. The CMA is required to map these projects along with the associated PDA(s) and provide a policy justification for designating the project as supporting a PDA through proximate access. This information should assist decision makers, stakeholders, and the public in evaluating the impact of the investment on a nearby PDA, to determine whether or not the investment should be credited towards the county’s PDA minimum investment target.

It is proposed to keep the same definition of “proximate access” that was vetted through the C/CAG committees and adopted by the C/CAG Board under OBAG 1. By meeting any one of the six categories below, a project would meet the definition of proximate access to a PDA. The proposed six categories are:

1. The project provides direct access to a PDA (ex. a road, sidewalk, or bike lane that leads directly into a PDA); or
2. The project is within ½ mile radius of a PDA boundary; or
3. The project is located on a street that hosts a transit route, which directly leads to a PDA; or
4. The project is located within ½ mile of one or more stops for two or more public or shuttle bus lines, or within ½ mile of a rail or regional transit station, that is connected to a PDA; or
5. The project provides a connection between a Transit Oriented Development (TOD), as defined by C/CAG and a PDA. (A TOD is previously defined by C/CAG as permanent, high-density residential housing with a minimum density of 40 units per net acre, located within 1/3 mile from a Caltrain or BART station or on a frontage parcel of the El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County); or
6. The project is a bicycle/pedestrian facility that is included in an adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan within San Mateo County and is part of a network that leads to a PDA.

The latest PDA boundary delineation map can be found at: http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive_maps/.

ATTACHMENTS

1. MTC’s Examples of Proximate Access Areas from OBAG 1

Attachment 2: Examples of Projects That Provide Proximate Access to a Priority Development Area

For illustration purposes, below are examples of projects outside of PDAs which may count towards OBAG minimum expenditures in PDAs, by providing proximate access to a PDA. The intention of these examples is to provide general guidance to CMAs in their discussions with their board, stakeholders, and the public about how to apply this definition.

Project Type	Eligible Examples
Road Rehabilitation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A continuous street rehabilitation project that directly connects to a PDA. A road project in the geographic vicinity of a PDA which leads to a PDA. (Ygnacio Valley Road within Walnut Creek both inside and outside of the PDA)
Bicycle / Pedestrian Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A bicycle lane / facility that is integral to a planned bicycle network (i.e. gap closures) that leads to a PDA (Alto Tunnel in Mill Valley). • A bicycle / pedestrian project that directly connects to a PDA; or in the geographic vicinity of a PDA that leads to a PDA. (Entire Embarcadero Rd Bicycle Lanes alignment in the City of Palo Alto which crosses over the El Camino Real PDA. Georgia Street Corridor Bicycle Improvements in Vallejo, small portion in PDA)
Safe Routes to Schools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A project outside of a PDA that encourages students that reside in a PDA to walk, bike, or carpool to school. (District wide outreach and safety programs)
County TLC Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For enhancement / streetscape elements, the following projects may be supportive of PDAs although outside of their limits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PDA corridor gap closure (El Camino Real segments between PDAs in Sunnyvale and Santa Clara) ○ PDA connection to a nearby significant transit node (North Berkeley BART station to University Avenue PDA)

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 16, 2016

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

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and recommend approval of the scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG CMP TAC review and recommend approval of the scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds allocated by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) via OBAG 2 include Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds and Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds.

BACKGROUND

On November 18, 2015, MTC and ABAG adopted Resolution 4202 outlining and approving the OBAG 2 Grant Program. OBAG 2 is composed two fund sources, Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) and covers (five years) FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22.

MTC OBAG 2 policy allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Local Streets and Roads Preservation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Transportation for Livable Communities, Planning, and outreach activities.

On May 12, 2016 the C/CAG Board adopted the funding Framework for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) in San Mateo County. That funding framework dedicated \$5,421,000 to the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

\$5,421,000 will be directed for competition in the TLC Program to fund a wide range improvements and facilities that support and promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile.

TLC project improvements are intended to support community based transportation projects that reduces air pollution in downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. A wide range of improvements include but are not limited to transit station improvements (plazas, station access, pocket parks, and bicycle parking), Bicycle and pedestrian “complete street” improvements, and multi-modal streetscape improvements. Projects must be able to support alternative transportation modes (no landscape only projects). Projects must result in a capital improvement and cannot be planning only.

Attached are proposed applications, screening requirements, and scoring criteria for this program. The CMP TAC and CMEQ will review the scoring criteria and make a final recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

The Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) scoring panel, composed of staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District, and C/CAG will perform the initial scoring of projects in the TLC Program. The TLC scoring panel’s recommendations will be forwarded to the TAC and CMEQ for final recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

Screening Requirements and Scoring Criteria

Because the funding is federal CMAQ allocated through MTC Resolution 4202, the project is subject to all Federal, State, and Regional requirements and deadlines. Projects must also follow all the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans Local Assistance, and MTC delivery procedures.

MTC requires a minimum of 70% of all OBAG 2 funds to be invested in ABAG recognized Priority Development Areas (PDAs). This means that after projects are ranked, projects will be funded as ranked by keeping the running totals of PDA versus non-PDA funds. If non-PDA funds are exhausted first, projects in PDAs may continue to get funded as ranked until the PDA funds are exhausted. It may result in lower scoring PDA projects, being funded over higher scoring non-PDA projects. Projects deemed “in proximate access” to a PDA count as investments in a PDA.

MTC requires that at least half of all OBAG 2 funds be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2020. Remaining OBAG 2 funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2023. Preliminary Engineering (PE) funds are expected to be obligated in the first year of programming (January 31, 2018). Projects that cannot meet this deadline should not apply for OBAG 2 funding.

Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) must demonstrate compliance with MTC's Resolution 4202 by screening and evaluating projects using specific factors. MTC guidelines requires that CMAs develop evaluation criteria for projects that place an emphasis on supporting projects in PDAs with high housing growth, projects that support multi-modal access, projects located in Communities of Concern (COC), projects in affordable housing PDAs, mitigation projects in PDAs that overlap with Air District "Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE)" Communities, and anti-displacement criteria. MTC is in the process of developing an anti-displacement policy which will be incorporated into this program.

Project Selection Process

Project sponsors may not apply to both the TLC and BPIP for the same project. Project sponsors should review the program goals and typical project types associated with each program and submit an application for the most suitable program. Applications will be screened for duplication. Project sponsor may combine their OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads (LSR) project with a TLC project; however it will not count as "match" in an application as both funds sources are Federal.

The Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) scoring panel will perform the initial scoring of projects in the TLC Program. The TLC scoring panel's recommendations will be forwarded to the TAC and CMEQ for final recommendation to the C/CAG Board.

In order to prevent the concentration of OBAG 2 funds to any one jurisdiction, staff is proposing a maximum award amount of \$1 million per project and a maximum award amount of \$1.5 million per jurisdiction among both the BPIP and TLC programs. Minimum grant size for this program is \$250,000.

Below is the tentative schedule for the TLC program. This schedule is subject to change as it is dependent upon adoption of the anti-displacement requirements currently being developed by MTC:

Action	Tentative Dates
Call for Projects approved by the Board	August 11, 2016
Call for Projects Issued to the Agencies/ Public	August 15, 2016
Workshop held for project applicants	Last week of August
Application due date	October 21, 2016
Screening of applications	November 2016
Funding recommendations made by selection panel	Dec 2016/Jan 2017
Present recommendations to C/CAG Committees	February/ March 2017
Project list approved by the Board	May 2017
Project list to MTC	May 2017
Project submissions due in FMS	Summer 2017

ATTACHMENTS

1. OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements
2. C/CAG OBAG 2 Call for Projects Draft Screening Criteria
3. C/CAG OBAG 2 Draft Scoring Criteria for TLC
4. MTC OBAG 2 Housing Formula Factors and Distribution Within County

OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements

Highlights of the MTC OBAG 2 adopted proposal:

- OBAG 2 allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Local Streets and Roads Preservation, Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements, Transportation for Livable Communities, Planning, and outreach activities.
- During OBAG 1 the Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads) programs were provided to San Mateo County outside of the OBAG umbrella. MTC has shifted these programs under the OBAG 2 process.
- For San Mateo County, 70% of all funds must be spent in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), however Safe Routes to School is not subject to the PDA spending requirement.
- Projects can count towards a PDA if it connects or provides proximate access to a PDA. The definition of “proximate access to a PDA” will be proposed as a separate item.
- Pedestrian and bike project eligibility will be expanded to not be limited to the regional bike network.
- Minimum OBAG 2 grant size for this county is \$250,000. All project funds must be rounded to the thousands for programming.
- Each jurisdiction must identify and maintain a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA projects from inception to project close-out.
- Per MTC Resolution No. 3036 Request for obligation deadlines are November 1 of the prior program year in order to obligate funds by January 31 of the program year (e.g. if program year is 2018 delivery deadline is November 1, 2017.)

Eligibility Requirements

In order to be eligible for any funding related to the OBAG 2 funding, a jurisdiction must comply with the following requirements:

Complete Street Requirements - Jurisdictions that have not updated their circulation element after 2010 to meet the State’s Complete Streets Act requirements will need to adopt a complete streets resolution per the MTC model used for OBAG 1, if they have not already done so.

Housing Element Requirement - Agencies must have housing elements adopted by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HDC) by May 31, 2015. Agencies must continue to submit the annual housing Element Report to HCD to remain eligible for funding.

Anti-Displacement Requirement - MTC has directed their staff to develop anti-displacement policy recommendation and return to the commission in spring 2016 with a recommendation.

As of February 2016, all jurisdictions in San Mateo County are in compliance with the Complete Streets and Housing Element requirements.

C/CAG OneBayArea Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Screening Requirements Fiscal Years 2017/2018 – 2021/2022	
Overall OBAG 2 Requirements	MTC OBAG 2 Overall Program Goals Requirements and Minimum Screening Requirements
MTC OBAG Program Goals	MTC's funding approach to integrate the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. MTC OBAG program goals are intended to reward local agencies that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process, produce housing, and target project investments to the region's Priority Development Areas (PDAs).
70% of OBAG Funds spent in PDAs	MTC requires a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in ABAG approved Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or in proximate access to PDAs. Safe Routes to School is not subject to this requirement.
Timely Use of Funds	Countywide, half of all OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2020. All remaining OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2023. Non-infrastructure projects and Preliminary Engineering (PE) phases are expected to be programmed and obligated in the first program year.
Minimum Screening Requirements	
CMAQ fund source	Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed. Local Streets and Roads is funded through STP fund sources.
Construction Phase	Project cannot be a design only project. Project funds may cover some design cost but project must include a fully funded construction phase. Non-infrastructure projects (e.g. Educational and Outreach) are federally categorized as a construction phase.
Map project location in relation to a PDA	All project locations must be mapped. Projects not located directly in a PDA must show where project is located in proximity to a PDA. See attached definition of "proximate access to a PDA". See scoring criteria for further information.
Online Complete Street Checklist	The MTC Complete Streets online checklist must be completed for each project application.
MTC OBAG 2 Checklist for Local Compliance	Applicant agency is required to fill out and submit the MTC OBAG 2 Checklist for Local Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202
Minimum Local Match	Federally required 11.47% of total project cost in local funds (non-federal cash match). For capital improvement projects, fully funding with design with local funds towards overall project match (toll credits) is highly encouraged.
Local Match Limitations	No "In-kind" match allowed. For capital improvement projects, fully funding with design with local funds towards overall project match (toll credits) is highly encouraged.
Single Point of Contact	Every recipient of OBAG 2 funds will need to identify a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA administered funds within that agency. This person must have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out.
Eligible Applicants	Federally recognized local agencies in San Mateo County (e.g. Cities, County, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District) and entities with existing executed Master Agreements with Caltrans Local Assistance.
Minimum/ Maximum Grant Size	Minimum \$250,000 per project. Maximum \$1,000,000 per project. Maximum allowable grant funds per jurisdiction is \$1,500,000 (for BPIP and TLC combined).
Housing Element	Applicant agency is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-22 RHNA prior to June 30, 2016. The agency's annual housing Housing Element Report must be submitted to HCD each year through the end of the OBAG 2 program (FY 22) in order to be eligible for funding.
Complete Streets Resolution or Letter	Applicant agency must have an MTC approved complete streets policy resolution no later than December 31, 2016. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 after January 1, 2010.

**C/CAG OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Scoring Criteria
Fiscal Years 2017/2018 – 2021/2022
Transportation For Livable Communities (TLC) Program**

Program Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create enjoyable and safe multi modal experiences. • Facilitate multi modal mobility. • Enhance connections between alternative modes of transportation. • Enhancements that support community based transportation that brings vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation (e.g. no landscape only projects)</p>	
Eligible Types of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape improvements such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, way finding signage, landscaping, and bicycle pedestrian treatments that focus on high-impact, multi-modal improvements. Project must contain multi-modal elements (no beautification/ landscape only projects). • Complete streets improvements such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. • Transit station improvements (plaza, station access, bike parking), transit access projects (connecting housing to jobs and mixed land use to transit). • Transportation Demand Management project such as car sharing, vanpooling coordination and information, and Clipper related projects. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation</p>	
Fund Source		
CMAQ fund source	Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed.	
Scoring Criteria		
	Maximum Score	
Location in relation to a Priority Development Area	Projects are located in a PDA or in Proximity to a PDA (Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all OBAG funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA) (In a PDA =10pts, In proximate access to a PDA =5pts)	10
RHNA/ Housing Production	Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production. (1-5)	5
	Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels	2
Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities	If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center and improvements are consistent with the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines. (0-2)	2
Community of Concern	Project location in relation to Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community based Transportation Plans. Project is identified in one of the Community Based Transportation Plans developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities. (Project is in a CBTP = 10pts, Project is located in a COC = 5pts)	10
Affordable Housing	Located in a PDA that has affordable housing preservations or creation strategies and community stabilization policies. (1-5)	5
User Benefit	Project has a high need (2 points) Project is a safety project (3 points) Project is expected to have high use (3 points) Project is expected to have a high return on investment (2 points) Project meets the intent and goals of the program (4 points)	14
Planning	Project is listed in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, station area plan, transit plan, or other area planning document). (1-5)	5
Connectivity/ Improves Transportation Choices	Project connects or improves access to housing/ jobs/ "high quality" transit (4 points) Project connects a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network. (4 points) Project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach. (4 points) Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and travel demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels (2 points)	14
Support	Project has council approval and community support. (1-10)	10
Match Funds	Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47-20% =2pts, 21-30%=5pts, 30-40% =7 pts, 40%+= 10pts)	10
Readiness	Project is free of Right of Way complications (project has secured encroachment permits, or is entirely on city property). (1-4)	4
	Project has secured all required regulatory agency permits (e.g. BCDC, RWQCB, CCC, USFWS). (1-4)	4
	Project is designed (0-100%). (1-5)	5

Scoring Criteria		Maximum Score
RHNA/ Housing Production	Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production.	1 to 5

Jurisdiction	Points
Atherton	1
Belmont	1
Brisbane	1
Burlingame	1
Colma	1
Daly City	4
East Palo Alto	2
Foster City	2
Half Moon Bay	1
Hillsborough	1
Menlo Park	2
Millbrae	1
Pacifica	2
Portola Valley	1
Redwood City	5
San Bruno	4
San Carlos	1
San Mateo	5
South San Francisco	3
Woodside	1
San Mateo County Unincorporated	3

Basis for San Mateo County Share of OBAG funding
50% 2014 Population
12% Housing 2007-2014 RHNA Very Low, Low and Moderate Income
8% Housing 2007-2014 RHNA
12% Housing 2007-2014 Housing Production
18% Housing 2007-2014 Housing Production for Very Low, Low and Moderate Income

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 16, 2016
To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)
From: Eliza Yu, Transportation Programs Specialist
Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information

(For further information, contact Eliza Yu at 650-599-1453 or eyu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Regional project and funding information.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

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 their policy for the management of Inactive Obligations at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/InactiveProjects/FHWA%20FY14%20Inactive%20Guidance%20Letter.pdf>

Project Delivery

ATP Allocation Requests - The next CTC meeting date to receive a FY 16/17 ATP allocation is August 17-18. Requests for allocation with all documentation are due to Caltrans and MTC by June 20, 2016. Reminder: per MTC Resolution 3606, CTC allocation requests to the CTC/Caltrans for federal funds must be accompanied with a complete and accurate E-76 Request for Authorization (RFA) package so the authorization/ obligation may be processed immediately following CTC action. MTC will not sign off on allocation concurrences for federally funded ATP projects unless the E-76 RFA package is also submitted.

Calls for Projects

Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) Revised Delivery Requirements and Cycle 8 HSIP call for projects was announced on May 9, 2016. The deadline to submit an application is **Friday, August 12, 2016**. Additional information is available online at: http://dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/apply_nowHSIP.htm

Caltrans revised its delivery guidelines beginning with Cycle 7 of the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). Delivery milestones have been changed to be consistent with calendar years as opposed to date of FTIP approval. The new guidelines are attached (i) and have been updated and posted online at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/delivery_status.htm. Project sponsors are encouraged to review the updated requirements, particularly the highlighted areas, as they are currently in effect for Cycle 7 and will be applied to the upcoming Cycle 8 program.

Miscellaneous MTC/ Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification – Status of PMP certification status is attached. Jurisdictions without a current PMP certification are not eligible to receive regional funds for local Streets rehabilitation and will have projects removed from the obligation plans until their PMP certification is in good standing. **Staff has contacted MTC on agencies whose PMP certifications have an expiration date of last year listed and MTC has confirmed that these are typos and that these agencies' PMP certifications are up to date.** Contact Christina Hohorst, PTAP Manager, via email at chohorst@mtc.ca.gov if you need to update your certification.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Caltrans Inactive Obligation Project List as of June 9, 2016
2. MTC Federal Obligation Status for FY 2015-16, as of April 30, 2016
3. MTC's PMP Certification Status of Agencies within San Mateo County as of June 10, 2016

Caltrans Inactive Obligation List - Updated on 06/09/2016

Status	Agency Action Required	Agency	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Last Action Date	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal
Inactive	Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately.	Redwood City	VARIOUS BRIDGES IN CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	02/17/2015	06/22/2011	02/17/2015	02/17/2015	\$30,000.00	\$26,559.00	\$13,249.74	\$13,309.26
Inactive	Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately.	San Mateo	VARIOUS LOCATIONS SOUTH OF CYPRESS AVE, PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	02/12/2015	06/19/2013	02/12/2015	06/11/2015	\$1,680,514.00	\$1,339,924.00	\$117,350.00	\$1,222,574.00
Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE	Redwood City	CHARTER ST BETWEEN STAMBAUGH AND SPRING, CROSSWALK, BULB OUT, CURB RAMP	04/14/2015	04/26/2012	04/14/2015	04/14/2015	\$577,293.00	\$577,293.00	\$290,660.66	\$286,632.34
Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE	Belmont	BELMONT VILLAGE, SPECIFIC IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	04/09/2015	04/09/2015		04/09/2015	\$550,000.00	\$440,000.00	\$0.00	\$440,000.00
Future	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 08/20/2016	San Mateo County	SKYLINE BLVD CROSSING LOWER CRYSTAL SPRINGS DAM AREA IN SAN MATEO COUNTY, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT(TC)	08/26/2015	07/08/2011	08/26/2015	08/26/2015	\$13,895,994.00	\$3,114,404.00	\$128,722.54	\$2,985,681.46
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	San Mateo	BERMUDA DRIVE - FIESTA CHANNEL BRIDGE, BRIDGE REHABILITATION_BR# 35C-0077	08/06/2015	02/11/2010	08/06/2015	08/06/2015	\$698,125.00	\$618,050.00	\$297,015.37	\$321,034.63
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	South San Francisco	GRAND AVE/ MAGNOLIA AVE, TRAFFIC SIGNALS INSTALLATION	08/13/2015	10/24/2011	08/13/2015	08/13/2015	\$474,500.00	\$374,200.00	\$58,544.37	\$315,655.63
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	South San Francisco	ORANGE AVE AT C AND B STREET, CONSTRUCT CURB EXTENSIONS SPEED FEED BACK	08/11/2015	03/22/2012	08/11/2015	08/11/2015	\$358,512.00	\$119,300.00	\$27,500.00	\$91,800.00
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	South San Francisco	MISSION RD AND EVERGREEN, INSTALL TRAFFIC SIGNALS	08/20/2015	07/22/2013	08/20/2015	08/20/2015	\$457,800.00	\$310,000.00	\$77,670.00	\$232,330.00

Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	South San Francisco	EL CAMINO REAL (SR82) DR CHESTNUT TO ARROYO AVE, IMPROVE PED. CROSSINGS, BULB OUT, ADA RAMPS	08/18/2015	01/31/2014	08/18/2015	08/18/2015	\$170,000.00	\$150,000.00	\$16,274.87	\$133,725.13
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	Woodside	MOUNTAIN HOME RD OVER BEAR CREEK; 0.3 MI SOUTH OF SR 84, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	09/24/2015	03/16/2012	09/24/2015	09/24/2015	\$107,428.00	\$95,106.00	\$84,207.14	\$10,898.86
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	Half Moon Bay	MAIN ST AT PILARCITOS CREEK APPROXIMATELY 0.25 MI S OF STATE HIGHWAY 92, REPL OF BRIDGE,WIDENING, ARCHITECHTURAL TREATMENT	09/10/2015	04/13/2011	09/10/2015	09/10/2015	\$1,127,000.00	\$997,733.00	\$380,000.28	\$617,732.72
Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016	San Mateo County	UNINCORPORATED AREAS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY NEAR MENLO PARK,SAN GREGORIO & PESCADAR, BRIDGE PRECENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	09/15/2015	03/16/2012	09/15/2015	09/15/2015	\$161,020.00	\$142,551.00	\$113,534.25	\$29,016.75

STP-CMAQ Obligation Status Report

Fiscal Years: FY 15/16

May 11, 2016

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Phase	TIP ID	Status	Fund Code	Fed Project Data		FY		Fund Programming Information			Obligation Information			Balance
							Prefix	ID	Appn	Prog	STP Amt	CMAQ Amt	Total Amt	Date	STP Amt	CMAQ Amt	Total Amt
San Mateo County																	
San Mateo	Belmont	Ralston Avenue Pedestrian Route	CON	SM-130017	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5268(019)	15/16	15/16		250,000	250,000	11/10/15		250,000	250,000
San Mateo	Belmont	Old County Road Bicycle/Pedestrian	CON	SM-130018	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5268(018)	15/16	15/16		270,000	270,000	11/02/15		270,000	270,000
San Mateo	CCAG	San Mateo County SR2S Program	CON	SM-110022	PROPOSED	CMAQ-T4-2-RSRTS-REG	STPCML	6419(020)	15/16	15/16		252,000	252,000	03/10/16		252,000	252,000
San Mateo	Caltrain	Caltrain Control Point Installation	CON	SM-130026	ACTIVE	STP-T4-2-TCP-TPI-REG	FTASTP	6170(034)	16/17	16/17	1,465,386		1,465,386	04/19/16			1,465,386
San Mateo	Caltrain	Map Based Real-Time Train Display for	CON	SM-150007	ACTIVE	STP-T4-2-TCP-TPI-REG	FTASTP	6170(034)	16/17	16/17	44,000		44,000	04/19/16			44,000
San Mateo	Daly City	John Daly Boulevard Bicycle /Ped	CON	SM-130011	PROPOSED	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5196(039)	15/16	15/16		1,290,000	1,290,000	03/02/16		1,290,000	1,290,000
San Mateo	MTC	Regional Planning Activities and PPM -	PE	SM-090024	ACTIVE	STP-T4-2-OBAG-PL	STPL	6084(175)	15/16	15/16	720,000		720,000	01/15/16	720,000		720,000
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Menlo Park-Various Streets Bike /Ped	CON	SM-130008	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5273(025)	15/16	15/16		499,000	499,000	10/29/15		498,783	498,783
San Mateo	Millbrae	Millbrae Various Streets and Roads	CON	SM-130009	ACTIVE	STP-T4-2-OBAG	STPL	5299(014)	16/17	16/17	445,000		445,000	03/10/16	445,000		445,000
San Mateo	SamTrans	SAMTRANS: Preventive Maintenance	CON	SM-030023	ACTIVE	STP-T4-2-TPI-REG	FTASTP	6014(017)	16/17	16/17	305,295		305,295	04/19/16			305,295
San Mateo	San Bruno	San Bruno Transit Corridor Pedestrian	CON	SM-110012	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5226(021)	15/16	15/16		123,000	123,000	11/02/15		102,528	102,528
San Mateo	San Carlos	San Carlos Streetscape and Ped	CON	SM-130012	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-2-OBAG	CML	5267(021)	15/16	15/16		150,000	150,000	02/25/16		150,000	150,000
San Mateo	San Mateo	San Mateo Downtown Parking Tech	CON	SM-150016	PROPOSED	CMAQ-T4-2-CIP-REG			15/16	15/16		1,385,000	1,385,000				1,385,000
San Mateo	San Mateo	San Mateo Downtown Parking Tech	PE	SM-150016	PROPOSED	CMAQ-T4-2-CIP-REG			15/16	15/16		115,000	115,000				115,000
San Mateo County Totals											2,979,681	4,334,000	7,313,681	1,165,000	2,813,311	3,978,311	3,335,370

PMP Certification
June 10, 2016

Expired
Expiring within 60 days
Certified

* "Last Major Inspection" is the basis for certification and is indicative of the date the field inspection was completed.

County	Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection*	Certified	P-TAP Cycle	Certification Expiration Date
Marin	Ross	8/31/2014	Yes	15	9/1/2016
Marin	San Anselmo	10/31/2014	Yes	15	11/1/2016
Marin	San Rafael	7/31/2014	Yes	17	8/1/2016
Marin	Sausalito	11/30/2014	Yes	15	12/1/2016
Marin	Tiburon	9/30/2015	Yes	16	10/1/2017
Napa	American Canyon	10/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
Napa	Calistoga	8/31/2014	Yes	17	9/1/2016
Napa	Napa	12/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
Napa	Napa County	10/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
Napa	St. Helena	8/31/2014	Yes	15	9/1/2016
Napa	Yountville	8/31/2014	Yes	15	9/1/2016
San Francisco	San Francisco	8/31/2013	No	16	9/1/2015
San Mateo	Atherton	9/30/2014	Yes	17	10/1/2016
San Mateo	Belmont	11/30/2014	Yes	15	12/1/2016
San Mateo	Brisbane	8/31/2014	Yes	17	9/1/2016
San Mateo	Burlingame	1/31/2016	Yes	16	2/1/2018
San Mateo	Colma	9/30/2015	Yes	16	10/1/2017
San Mateo	Daly City	12/31/2014	Yes	17	1/1/2017
San Mateo	East Palo Alto	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	Foster City	8/31/2015	Yes	16	9/1/2017
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	8/31/2013	No	16	9/1/2015
San Mateo	Hillsborough	9/30/2014	Yes	17	10/1/2016
San Mateo	Menlo Park	4/30/2016	Yes	16	5/1/2018
San Mateo	Millbrae	7/31/2014	Yes	15	8/1/2016
San Mateo	Pacifica	7/31/2015	Yes	16	8/1/2017
San Mateo	Portola Valley	8/31/2012	No	16	9/1/2014
San Mateo	Redwood City	12/31/2014	Yes	15	1/1/2017
San Mateo	San Bruno*	7/31/2013	No	16	8/1/2015
San Mateo	San Carlos	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	San Mateo	11/30/2015	Yes	16	12/1/2017
San Mateo	San Mateo County	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	South San Francisco	7/31/2013	No	16	8/1/2015
San Mateo	Woodside	10/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
Santa Clara	Campbell	9/30/2013	No	16	10/1/2015
Santa Clara	Cupertino	8/31/2014	Yes	17	9/1/2016
Santa Clara	Gilroy	6/30/2014	Yes	17	7/1/2016
Santa Clara	Los Altos	9/30/2013	No	16	10/1/2015
Santa Clara	Los Altos Hills*	6/30/2014	Yes	15	7/1/2017
Santa Clara	Los Gatos	12/31/2012	No	16	1/1/2015
Santa Clara	Milpitas	8/31/2014	Yes	15	9/1/2016
Santa Clara	Monte Sereno	5/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
Santa Clara	Morgan Hill	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017