

# 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, April 19, 2012**  
**San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>**  
**1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium**  
**San Carlos, California**

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- |  |               |              |
|--|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).   | Porter/Hurley | No materials |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No items (Board Retreat in April)</li></ul>   | Hoang         | No materials |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from March 15, 2012   | Hoang         | Page 1-3     |
| 4. TA Highway Call for Project Update (Information)  | Chung         | No materials |
| 5. 1998 Measure A Highway Program: Active Projects (Information)   | Chung         | Page 4-6     |
| 6. Measure M Annual Program Update (Information)   | Hoang         | Page 7-13    |
| 7. Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 3 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$3,000,199 (Action) | Higaki        | Page 14-16   |
| 8. Regional Project and Funding Information (Information)  | Higaki        | Page 17-53   |
| 9. Executive Director Report   | Napier        | No materials |
| 10. Member Reports   | All           |              |

---

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

<b>2012 TAC Roster and Attendance</b>			
<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Feb</b>	<b>Mar</b>
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x
Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x	
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning		x
Lee Taubeneck	Caltrans		
Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x
Robert Ovadia	Daly City Engineering	x	x
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x
Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay Engineering	x	x
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering		
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x
Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	x	x
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering		x
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning	x	
Dennis Chuck	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x
Paul Nagengast	Woodside Engineering	x	x
Kenneth Folan	MTC		

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

**March 15, 2012  
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Auditorium. Co-chair Hurley called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, March 15, 2012.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Rich Napier – C/CAG; Matt Fabry – C/CAG; John Hoang – C/CAG; Jim Bigelow – C/CAG CMEQ; Celia Chung – SMCTA

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

None.

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

The issues noted on the agenda included items from the February C/CAG Board meeting.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from February 16, 2012.**

Approved.

**4. Proposed Guidelines for the Highway Program Call for Projects**

Celia Chung from the TA presented the proposed Call for Projects process highlighting the Measure A funding tracks (original, new KCA, and new SR), role of project sponsors, requirement of Council resolutions, and prioritization approach. Some questions and concerns were addressed as follows:

- “Original Measure” (OM) funds remains in the OM track and will be programmed accordingly by phase and timeliness of the active OM projects.
- The six projects in the Original Measure that are identified as “inactive” are not being cancelled. Those projects would require a sponsor and will then be eligible to apply for new Measure A funding only.
- A four week application process seems too short, especially if cities are required to obtain Council resolutions for submitting a project. It was requested that the process be extended to a minimum of eight weeks.
- The TA’s position is that it prefers to be in a role of a funding agency rather than project sponsor and recommends cities take the lead in sponsoring projects. Cities that are concerned that they may not be sponsor projects due to limited resources can hire consultants to assist.
- Local match is not required for this round.

**5. Provide Feedback on Potential Countywide Process to Increase Funding for Stormwater Compliance Activities**

Matt Fabry presented on the need for a countywide effort to increase funding for Countywide program, including the possibility of utilizing the mail out ballot process, and requested input. Discussions were as follows:

- The main concern for cities is not necessarily operations and maintenance but rather re-investing in an aging infrastructure network.
- Burlingame was successful in assessing \$150 per property for water/sewers improvements. Menlo Park is considering a similar property assessment and there are concerns that individual cities' effort to impose fees to maintain infrastructure may conflict with the countywide MRP effort.
- The current countywide program assesses \$16.50 per year on each parcel.
- Combining the MRP and infrastructure components on one countywide ballot may not work because capital improvements are area specific

In general, the TAC expressed interest in the potential countywide property assessment for water pollution prevention program.

#### **6. Review Committee Structure for Countywide Stormwater Program**

Matt Fabry presented the current committee structure and requested feedback. Some suggestions and concerns were as follows:

- Likes reconstituting the NPDES Committee. One option is to create a subcommittee of the CMP TAC which would comprise of both engineering and planning and have the subcommittee report back to the TAC.
- All cities need to be at the table.
- There are already too many meetings and another suggestion was to request C/CAG to re-designate the CMP TAC to include NPDES and expand the TAC to include all cities.
- Have the NPDES meetings quarterly.
- There's difficulty for cities to engage the planning departments in NPDES issues.
- The size of the committee needs to be managed or else it will not be productive.
- One challenge to get cities to engage with the meeting is that there is no money involved.

#### **7. Regional Project and Funding Information**

Sandy Wong indicated that updates are included in the staff report.

#### **8. Executive Director Report**

Rich Napier, Executive Director, indicated that the Smart Corridors project received \$5.7 million in additional TLSP funds and is anticipated to receive \$3.7 million additional funding from the CMIA program. Member Patterson inquired about the status of selecting the software for the Smart Corridors. Napier indicated that C/CAG is in negotiations right now.

C/CAG intends on keeping the membership fees the same as last year. C/CAG will based the fees on updated population figures as of January 1, 2012 therefore there may be slight changes to the actual amount.

Member Ovadia asked for an update to the One Bay Area Grant. Sandy Wong, Deputy Director, indicated that C/CAG has been communicating with MTC, focusing on Cycle 1 and Cycle 2 commitments already made to the cities. Richard Napier indicated that the current OBAG program and numbers does not work for us at this point and C/CAG is continuing discussions. Ovadia thanked C/CAG staff for following up.

**9. Member Reports**

Member Hurley announced that there will be a workshop next Wednesday for the \$7.5M Shuttle Call for Projects. Concurrence letters from SamTrans will be due April 2<sup>nd</sup> and applications due 4/16/2012. .

End of Meeting at 2:55 p.m.

**San Mateo County Transportation Authority  
Staff Report**

**Date:** April 19, 2012  
**To:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Celia Chung, SMCTA  
**Subject:** 1998 Measure A Highway Program: Active Projects  
  
(For further information or questions contact Celia Chung at 508-6466)

---

**ACTION**

This item is presented for information and discussion only

**SIGNIFICANCE**

During the presentation on the Highway Call for Projects (CFP) at their March 15 meeting, TAC members requested information on the list of active Original Measure Highway projects' total cost estimates, allocated funds and funding shortfalls.

**BACKGROUND**

The San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) will be issuing a Highway CFP for both 1988 and 2004 Measure A Highway Program funds this spring. In advance of the Highway CFP, the TA Board reprogrammed \$21 million from six 1988 Measure A highway projects which were found to be inactive, at their April 5 2012 meeting. This list is shown in Attachment A. (The inactive projects will be eligible for future funding through the 2004 Measure A Highway Program.)

The reprogrammed funds will be made available for allocation to other active 1988 Measure A Highway projects through the upcoming Highway CFP. This information is shown in Attachment B.

**Attachment A: 1988 Measure A Inactive Highway Projects and Reprogrammed Funds**

Approved by TA Board: April 5, 2012

Project Title	Reprogrammed Funds	Lead Agency	Other Stakeholder Agencies	CPN#	1988 TEP#	Issue	Inactive Project Criteria*		
							Is previous phase/ deliverable <5 years old?	Deliverable/ phase currently being completed?	
SR 92 -- Route 35 to I-280 (Provide truck climbing lane)	\$ 8,881,015	Caltrans	Half Moon Bay, San Mateo Co	654	II.3.C	ROW, environmental mitigation, and lack of consensus on design	No	No	
SR 92 - Half Moon Bay to Pilarcitos Creek (Curve correction, widen shoulders, provide turning lanes, and meet Caltrans standards for curve radii)	\$ 10,445,152	TA	Half Moon Bay, San Mateo Co, Caltrans	652	II.3.C	Environmental mitigation, bridge upgrade	No	No	
Bayfront Expressway from Marsh Road to Woodside Road (widen to 4 lanes)	\$ 331,400	TA	Redwood City, Menlo Park, San Mateo Co, Caltrans	656	II.4.C	TA Board Resolution 2001-2 suspended project work.	No	No	
SR 84 (Woodside Rd) -- Widen 101-El Camino (Widen from 4-6 lanes)	\$ 764,263	RWC	Caltrans	769	II.4.D	Design considerations (external impacts, lack of consensus)	No	No	
I 280: Improve SB connection from Route 1 to Serramonte Blvd (Improve NB SR 1 to SB I-280)	\$ 344,045	TA	Daly City, Colma, So SF, Caltrans	754	II.5.B	ROW impacts	No	No	
Improve Access and Transitions at 280/380 Interchange	\$ 1,025,771	TA	San Bruno, Caltrans	753	II.5.C	Scope change focused on local access rather than regional improvement	No	No	
<b>Total \$</b>							<b>21,791,646</b>		

\* Projects are defined as inactive if the following two criteria apply: (1) the last deliverable for the project is more than 5 years old, and (2) there is no deliverable/phase of work currently being completed for the proposed project.

## Attachment B: Active Highway Projects eligible for additional 1988 Measure A funds

(\$1000s)

CPN	1988 TEP#	Project	Location	Status	Total Estimated Cost <sup>1</sup>	1988 Measure A Allocation <sup>2</sup>	Other Funds <sup>3</sup>	Funding Shortfall
615	II.1.A	SR1-- Fassler -Westport (Calera)	Pacifica	PA/ED	\$45,000	\$5,573	\$6,900	\$32,527
621	II.2.B.b	US 101/Broadway interchange	Burlingame	Design	\$75,000	\$23,518	\$23,218	\$28,264
622	II.2.B.c	US 101/Willow interchange	Menlo Park, East Palo Alto	PA/ED	\$57,000	\$5,000	\$28,951	\$23,049
625	II.2.B.f	US 101/Candlestick interchange	Brisbane	PSR	\$192,000	\$1,011		\$190,989
723, 724	II.2.C	US 101 - Auxiliary lanes: Oyster Point -SF County Line	Brisbane, S. San Francisco	AA	\$55,500	\$2,172		\$53,328
733	II.3.B	SR 92: Auxiliary lane improvements 101-280	San Mateo, County	PSR	\$174,500	\$1,145		\$173,355
768	II.4.D	US 101/ SR 84 Woodside interchange	Redwood City	PA/ED	\$66,100	\$7,200		\$58,900
N/A	II.1.B	SR1 -- within Half Moon Bay city limits	Half Moon Bay	AA	\$16,000			\$16,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$554,000</b>	<b>\$32,846</b>	<b>\$52,169</b>	<b>\$468,985</b>

1. 2010 dollars

2. As currently budgeted in the TA Budget

3. Based on the program year in the draft 2012 STIP.

Additional project information available at:

[http://www.smcta.com/quarterly\\_report.asp](http://www.smcta.com/quarterly_report.asp)



# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 19, 2012  
**To:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** John Hoang  
**Subject:** Measure M Annual Program Update  
(For further information contact John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMP TAC receive the Measure M Annual Program update.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Approximately \$6.7 million annually

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Measure M - \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The C/CAG sponsored Measure M, approved by the voters of San Mateo County in 2010, impose an annual fee of ten dollars (\$10) on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County for transportation-related traffic congestion and water pollution mitigation programs. The revenue is estimated at \$6.7 million annually over a 25 year period. Per the Expenditure Plan, 50% of the net proceeds will be allocated to cities/County for local streets and roads and 50% will be used for countywide transportation programs such as transit operations, regional traffic congestion management, water pollution prevention, and safe routes to school.

A 5-Year Implementation Plan, approved by the C/CAG Board on March 10, 2011, established the percentage breakdown and estimated revenue for the respective categories and programs as follows:

<b>Category / Programs</b>	<b>Allocation</b>	<b>Annual Revenue (Million)</b>	<b>5-Year Revenue (Million)</b>
▪ Program Administration	5%	\$0.34	\$1.70
▪ Local Streets and Roads	50% of net revenue	\$3.18	\$15.90
▪ Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation*	22%	\$1.40	\$7.00
▪ Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors*	10%	\$0.64	\$3.18
▪ Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S)*	6%	\$0.38	\$1.90
▪ National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Regional Permit (MRP)*	12%	\$0.76	\$3.82
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$6.70</b>	<b>\$33.50</b>

\* *Countywide Transportation Programs (50% of net revenue)*

The allocations for the Countywide Transportation Programs are derived based on anticipated needs and estimated implementation cost to fund each respective programs and projects, annually and over the 5-Year implementation period. It is the intent that each Countywide Transportation programs and projects will be evaluated at the end of each year to determine whether the initial funding level (allocations) was adequate or whether it requires adjustments based on the actual expenditures incurred during the previous year.

The Measure M Annual Program Update for 2012 is attached.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

- Measure M Annual Program Update - April 2012

**MEASURE M - \$10 VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE**

**ANNUAL PROGRAM UPDATE**

April 2012

**REVENUE**

Collection of the \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) commenced in May 2011. The annual program budget estimates about \$6.7M in revenue. The Fiscal Year 2011-12 includes the fees collected in May and June 2011 therefore the total revenue for the fiscal year will be higher. Five percent (5%) of the revenues are allocated for Program Administration off the top with the net amount distributed to the Local Streets and Roads and Countywide Transportation Programs. The following table summarizes the revenue collected as of April 3, 2012, and distribution amounts to the various program categories.

<b>REVENUE</b>		<b>Total to Date</b>
<b>Total VRF Collected</b>		\$ 5,048,702.91
<b>DMV fees</b>		\$ (57,596.45)
<b>To C/CAG</b>		\$ 4,991,106.46
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>		
<b>Program Administration</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>\$ 249,555.32</b>
<b>Net Available</b>		<b>\$ 4,741,551.14</b>
<b>Local Streets and Roads</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>\$ 2,370,775.57</b>
Traffic Congestion		
Stormwater Pollution Prevention		
<b>Countywide Transportation Programs</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>\$ 2,370,775.57</b>
Transit Operations/Senior Programs	22%	\$ 1,043,141.25
ITS / Smart Corridors	10%	\$ 474,155.11
Safe Routes to School	6%	\$ 284,493.07
NPDES and MRP admin and projects	12%	\$ 568,986.14
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 4,741,551.14</b>

The total revenue indicated above is for vehicle registration fees collected only and does not include any interest income that has accrued during this period. The DMV fees, which are recurring administration fees, include the initial \$55,072.30 set-up cost.

## DISTRIBUTION

### Program Administration

Funds allocated for administration pays for program management and administration. The funds are also used to reimburse the cost of the November 2, 2010, election and cost of setting up the process for collection of the \$10 motor vehicle registration fee. The cost for the San Mateo County Assessors Election Office was \$549,527.25. That cost was paid for by AB1546 (\$4 VRF) funds therefore will be repaid to the AB1546 account at the end of the fiscal year.

### Local Streets and Roads

For the Fiscal Year 2011-12, an allocation in the amount of \$2,113,377.73 was issued to the local jurisdictions in February 2012. Funds for this initial allocation were collected during the period from May 2011 to December 2011 (or 1<sup>st</sup> Half FY 2011-12).

Jurisdiction	% of Total Allocation*	FY 2012 1st Half
ATHERTON	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
BELMONT	3.29%	\$ 69,443.90
BRISBANE	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
BURLINGAME	3.95%	\$ 83,451.06
COLMA	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
DALY CITY	9.62%	\$ 203,202.34
EAST PALO ALTO	3.06%	\$ 64,709.09
FOSTER CITY	3.12%	\$ 65,892.80
HALF MOON BAY	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
HILLSBOROUGH	2.81%	\$ 59,382.43
MENLO PARK	4.50%	\$ 95,023.98
MILLBRAE	2.74%	\$ 57,804.16
PACIFICA	4.84%	\$ 102,193.02
PORTOLA VALLEY	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
REDWOOD CITY	8.82%	\$ 186,433.21
SAN BRUNO	4.76%	\$ 100,614.75
SAN CARLOS	4.03%	\$ 85,226.61
SAN MATEO	11.02%	\$ 232,794.91
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	7.17%	\$ 151,513.97
WOODSIDE	2.36%	\$ 49,804.66
SAN MATEO COUNTY	12.15%	\$ 256,863.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 2,113,377.73</b>

Future biennial allocations will be for funds collected for 6-month periods, from July to December and January to June. The next allocation (2<sup>nd</sup> Half FY 201-12) will be issued in September 2012.

## **Countywide Transportation Programs**

### Transit Operations/Senior Mobility Programs

The San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) will be using Measure M funding to cover costs related to paratransit (disabled and senior) service provided by SamTrans. For FY 2011-12, SamTrans' total paratransit budget is \$14M. The programs under consideration for FY 2011-12 are Senior Mobility and RediWheels. The two programs are described as follows.

The Senior Mobility Program provides the following services:

- Community Transit – promote/coordinate community shuttles
- Community-Based Transportation – provide rides through a network of coordinated transportation providers and maximize existing vehicle resources
- Encouraging Use of Transit – provide through volunteer Mobility Ambassadors
- Information and Assistance – provide guides, mobility assessments and trip planning, and older driver safety programs
- Taxicab Services – promote acquisition of accessible taxi vehicles
- Walking – promote improvements to remove barriers to pedestrian activities by older adults

The RediWheels program is a fixed-route paratransit service for persons with disabilities who cannot independently use regular SamTrans bus service. The RediWheels service is provided on the bayside of the County (RediCoast on the coast side). SamTrans offers paratransit customers a financial incentive to use the services by allowing ADA (American with Disabilities Act) certified customers and personal care attendants to ride all regular fixed-route SamTrans trip without paying a fare.

A funding agreement is being developed between C/CAG and SamTrans for approximately \$1.4M annually, providing \$125,000 for Senior Mobility and \$1.2M for RediWheels. C/CAG is working with SamTrans to execute the funding agreement this quarter. Payment for the programs described above will be on a reimbursement basis for expense incurred during FY 2011-12.

### Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/Smart Corridors

Funds are being accumulated under this program category to be used for the San Mateo County Smart Corridors project construction and maintenance in addition to funding other countywide ITS projects.

The Smart Corridors project deploys and integrates ITS elements, including communication network, signal system upgrade, signage and close circuit cameras along state routes (El Camino Real) and major local streets enabling Caltrans and local cities to implement strategies to manage recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion to reduce delays and improve mobility. The project is located from I-380 to the Santa Clara County line and includes local arterials connecting US 101 and SR 82 (El Camino Real).

Of the current \$33M budget for the remaining construction phases, approximately \$3.5M is budgeted as local funds, which is provided through a combination of AB1546 (\$4 VRF) and Measure M. These local funds are used as leverage for additional funds. Construction of the Smart Corridors is expected to be completed in April 2013. An annual maintenance program will be developed for the Smart Corridors.

For other ITS projects in the County, an assessment will be performed before the end of the fiscal year to prioritize needs for ITS for San Mateo County for the next year and beyond.

### Safe Routes to School (SR2S)

The San Mateo County Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program is a new countywide effort to promote activities that increase the number of students walking, biking and carpooling to schools as ways of promoting students' health and fitness, in addition to reducing traffic congestion around schools and improving air quality. The program focuses on non-infrastructure project outreach activities such as education, encouragement, and evaluation.

The San Mateo County Office of Education (COE) is managing the San Mateo County SR2S program on behalf of C/CAG. Work on the program officially commenced in July 2011. During the first half of FY 11-12, COE staff performed outreach to various school districts, cities, and other agencies throughout the county providing information regarding type of projects available to schools and funding process.

The SR2S program is established as a non-competitive grant program. Up to \$15,000 has been set aside per school. A system for implementing grants and action plans was established that require schools and districts to develop action plans to address their needs and followed up by submitting proposed projects to support their plans. Proposals are reviewed by the COE and revised accordingly prior to approval. Once the project is approved for funding, schools are required to enter into contracts with COE.

As of February 2012, 59 schools have participated in the grant program with the majority of the projects involving performance of systematic walking and bicycle audits to assess conditions, identify priority needs/issues, and develop recommendations. The audits also engage students, parent leaders, school officials, and other community members and inform about traffic, safety and environmental issues related to the schools.

Two committees have been established to oversee and guide the development of the SR2S Program. The Policy Advisory Committee comprises of COE, C/CAG, County Health System, school officials, cities, and other interested parties. This committee guides the development and implementation of the SR2S Program. An Operations Committee comprises of officials from schools that are participating in the program, COE, and C/CAG and serves as a forum to discuss specific project performance and issues. The committees meet once every quarter. The next meetings are scheduled for May 2012.

The current San Mateo County SR2S Program is a 2-Year (FY 11-12 to FY 12-13) \$2M program, funded by \$1.42M STP/CMAQ with the remaining from Measure M. The next step will be to work with COE to evaluate FY 11-12 program at the conclusion of the school year and plan for the FY 12-13 program.

### National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/Municipal Regional Permit (MRP)

Funds accumulating under this program category are designated for pollution mitigation programs and projects, as allowed under Measure M's authorizing legislation, Government Code Section 65089.20. C/CAG staff is working with legal counsel to develop a revised Expenditure Plan for C/CAG Board consideration that would allow unrestricted use of this category of funds for all mandated compliance activities in the Municipal Regional Permit (MRP). This represents a significant change from the \$4 VRF, which was more restricted by its authorizing legislation to programs and projects that directly addressed the pollution impacts from vehicles and transportation infrastructure. Should the C/CAG

Board adopt a revised Expenditure Plan allowing unrestricted use of these funds for MRP compliance, these funds would be directed toward countywide compliance activities through C/CAG's Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program. Approval of unrestricted use of these would also allow the local jurisdictions to use any portion of their annual allocations under the Local Streets and Roads portion of funding for MRP compliance activities, rather than just specific activities such as street sweeping or catch basin inlet cleaning, as is the current practice with the \$4 VRF.

In the event there is an accumulation of Measure M funds in this program category that are not needed for MRP compliance activities, C/CAG staff anticipates using the funds to either further expand C/CAG's Green Streets and Parking Lots Program or to assist local jurisdictions with MRP compliance efforts, such as providing funding for trash capture devices. Determining whether surplus funds are available will likely not be possible until the MRP is reissued and C/CAG can estimate countywide compliance costs for the next five-year permit term. C/CAG staff anticipates, however, using accumulated \$4 VRF for these types of programs where a clear nexus to pollution impacts from vehicles and transportation infrastructure can be shown.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 19, 2012

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

**From:** Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

**Subject:** Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 3 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$3,000,199.

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

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC review and recommend approval of the projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 3 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$3,000,199.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$3,000,199 is available in State Transit Assistance (STA), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

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

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Lifeline Transportation program is an MTC program that C/CAG administers for San Mateo County. The purpose this program is to fund projects or fill needs identified through the community-based transportation planning efforts that improve the mobility of low-income residents. A call for projects was issued on January 3, 2012 and applications were due on February 17, 2012.

For this cycle, twenty applications were received. The program was oversubscribed with \$5,433,466 being requested and approximately \$3,000,199 available. There is a 20% or 50% local match required, depending on the fund source and project type, and the sponsor agency must be able to receive state or federal funds. Project sponsors who are not eligible to receive state or federal funds require a pass through agreement with an eligible entity.



For the selection of projects, C/CAG staff organized a selection committee composed of Juda Tolmasoff from the County Legislative office, Corinne Goodrich from San Mateo Transit District, Cathleen Baker from the MTC Policy Advisory Council, Drennen Shelton from MTC, and Tom Madalena from C/CAG. This committee convened on March 15, 2012 to finalize scoring of the applications and to identify the best-fit of fund sources to projects. The committee recommended fully funding eight projects and partially funding five projects. All funds were exhausted.

There is a possibility that a small amount of additional STA funds may be made available to the lifeline program (~\$85,000). If that occurs, the panel recommended fully funding the North Fair Oaks On-Demand Shuttle and the Menlo Park Belle Haven Community shuttle. Any remaining funds would be directed to transit capital related components of the City of San Mateo North Central Infrastructure improvement project.

The funding recommendation and identified fund source will be presented to the CMEQ committee in April and the C/CAG board for approval in May. Once approved, the recommendation will be sent to MTC for adoption in late June.

For JARC and STP funded projects, MTC will allocate funding or execute funding agreements with each project sponsor based the identified funding source. For STA funded projects, pass through funding agreements will be executed between SamTrans and the project sponsor. As administrator, C/CAG staff will be responsible for reviewing quarterly reports and invoices submitted by the project sponsors, prior to reimbursement by MTC or SamTrans.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Proposed Cycle 3 Lifeline Transportation Program

### Proposed Cycle 3 Lifeline Transportation Program

Agency	Project	STA funds	STP funds	JARC funds	Total \$ To Be Funded	Total \$ Requested	Notes
SamTrans	Fixed Route 17	\$407,048			\$407,048	\$407,048	
Peninsula Family Services	Ways to Work Auto Loans for purchase or repair of vehicles.			\$375,000	\$375,000	\$375,000	
Redwood City	Middlefield/ Wooside Rd (SR 84) Intersection improvements		\$339,924		\$339,924	\$500,000	
City of San Mateo	North Central Ped Infrastructure Improvements		\$339,924		\$339,924	\$500,000	
SamTrans	Coast Service On-Demand	\$300,000			\$300,000	\$300,000	
San Mateo Human Services Agency	Provide Bus passes and tickets for low income families	\$300,000			\$300,000	\$300,000	Pass through needed
City of South San Francisco	Community Learning Center Public Transportation Workshops	\$210,000			\$210,000	\$210,000	Pass through needed
City of Menlo Park	Midday Shuttle Belle Haven Community and other communities	\$204,253			\$204,253	\$258,000	Pass through needed
Redwood City	North Fair Oaks On-Demand Shuttle	\$204,253			\$204,253	\$222,927	Pass through needed
City of East Palo Alto	Weekday Community Shuttle			\$123,368	\$123,368	\$123,368	
City of East Palo Alto	Weekday Evening Shuttle			\$76,871	\$76,871	\$76,871	
San Mateo Human Services Agency	Provide Taxi Vouchers for low income program participants			\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	
City of East Palo Alto	Weekend Shuttle			\$59,557	\$59,557	\$59,845	
City of San Bruno	Transit Corridor Ped and Bike Connection				\$0	\$500,000	
SamTrans	Fixed Route 281				\$0	\$460,000	
San Mateo Medical Center	Dental School Shuttle Transportation				\$0	\$342,763	
City of Belmont	Bike/ Ped Improvements on Old County Road between southern city limit and Ralston.				\$0	\$245,000	
City of Millbrae	Class III Bike Routes throughout the City				\$0	\$220,000	
City of East Palo Alto	Youth Shuttle				\$0	\$135,344	
City of East Palo Alto	Midday Shopper Shuttle				\$0	\$92,300	
HEAL Project	Transportation to School Farm				\$0	\$45,000	

Available Source \$	\$1,625,554	\$679,848	\$694,796	\$3,000,198	\$5,433,466
<b>Sum of awarded funds</b>	\$1,625,554	\$679,848	\$694,796	\$3,000,198	
Left over \$	0	0	0	0	

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 19, 2012  
**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](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/office-bulletins/ob11-03.pdf)

- **Obligation Status of Projects as of 4/4/2012** – The deadline to submit packages for obligation of FY 11/12 was February 1, 2012. All STP/ CMAQ funded projects should be obligated (E-76) by April 30, 2012 to comply with the MTC regional deadline. Attached is the obligation status for projects in San Mateo County. Local Safety Program (HSIP, HRRR, SRTS) obligation status is also attached. The deadline requirements for Caltrans Local Safety Programs can be found at:  
<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/requirements201109-final.pdf>

- 2013 TIP Development – MTC is developing the 2013 TIP between April 13, and May 10, 2012. MTC will not allow for submissions or edits after 5:00 p.m. on May 10<sup>th</sup>. C/CAG must review and submit projects for local agencies by or before May 10, 2012, therefore, we request that local agencies complete updates of their projects and notify us to submit their projects by **May 8, 2012** at the latest. C/CAG will not promise that project updated after May 8<sup>th</sup> will be submitted to MTC. Attached is a primer on how to update your projects in FMS for submission.
- OneBayAreaGrant (OBAG) – MTC has released additional revisions in early April to the OBAG per comments received. Please note that there are several planning requirements that are needed to be eligible to receive any OBAG funds in this upcoming cycle. Also note changes requiring complete streets submission at the time of project application.
- Federal Aid Announcements – The following are general announcements related to Fed-Aid projects.
  - The Department has updated the Local Assistance Highway Bridge Program. The new project lists replace the prior lists that are on the local assistance web site. There are lists for recommended individually programmed projects and lists for projects that are recommended for grouped programming. The following is a link to the lists by region:  
[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/HBP\\_FSTIP.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/hbrr99/HBP_FSTIP.html)
  - In preparation for the upcoming HSIP and HRRR calls-for-projects, Caltrans Division of Local Assistance has prepared the attached flyer for distribution to all California local agencies. See attachment.
  - Caltrans is conducting an Availability and Disparity Study to assist Caltrans and local governments in implementing their Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE) programs. There is a public hearing scheduled at the District 4 auditorium on 5/8/12 from 10 a.m.-12 p.m. Caltrans is receiving testimonies and comments, no later than Friday, June 8, 2012. For more information contact Anna Silva, Disparity Study Project Manager, at (916) 324-0964 or [Anna\\_Silva@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Anna_Silva@dot.ca.gov). This is geared toward contractors and vendors.
- Local Streets and Roads Need Assessment – Attached is a survey request from the League of California Cities and County Engineers Association of California.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Inactive Project List generated on 4/05/2012
2. Obligation Status of Projects as of 4/4/2012
3. HSIP and HRRR calls-for-projects flyer
4. 2013 TIP Development instructions
5. OBAG revisions
6. League of California Cities Needs Assessment

Quarterly Review of Inactive Obligations  
 Local, State Administered Locally Funded and Rail Projects  
 (Review Period 01/01/2012- 03/31/2012)

Updated on 04/05/2012		Inactive Projects (Review period: 01/01/2012-03/31/2012)												
Project No	LOOK AHEAD	<b>Agency Action Required</b>  Submit invoice or justification to District by 05/25/2012.	State Project No	Prefix	District	County	Agency	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	
5267015	INACTIVE		Submit invoice to District by 05/25/2012.	04925879L	CML	04	SM	San Carlos	OLD COUNTY RD, EAST SAN CARLOS, BIKE PATH, SIDEWALK WIDEN, LANDSCAPE	1/11/2011	1/11/2011		L400	\$3,280,034.00
6097004	3 MONTH		Submit invoice to District by 05/25/2012.	04928470L	STPLX	04	SM	San Francisco International Airport	UPPER LEVEL VIADUCT (BR NO 35C-0133), BRIDGE RAIL REPLACEMENT	6/21/2011	12/5/1997	6/21/2011	Q240,33D0	\$3,729,501.00

STP-CMAQ Obligation Status Report

Fiscal Years: FY 11/12

April 04, 2012

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Phase	TIP ID	Status	Fund Code	Fed Project Data		Appn FY	Prog FY	Fund Programming Information			Obligation Information			Balance Remaining	
							Prefix	ID			STP Amt	CMAQ Amt	Total Amt	Date	STP Amt	CMAQ Amt		Total Amt
<b>San Mateo County</b>																		
San Mateo	Burlingame	Burlingame Ave. and Broadway Districts	CON	SM-110008	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-CO	CML	5171(019)	11/12	11/12		301,000	301,000				301,000	
San Mateo	Daly City	Daly City - Citywide Accessibility	CON	SM-110009	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-CO	CML	5196(036)	11/12	11/12		420,000	420,000	03/16/12		420,000	420,000	
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	Highway 1 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail	CON	SM-110027	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-RBP-CO	CML	5357(007)	11/12	11/12		420,000	420,000	03/16/12		420,000	420,000	
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Menlo Park 2010/11 Resurfacing of	CON	SM-110014	ACTIVE	STP-T4-1-LSR-CO	STPL	5273(021)	11/12	11/12	385,000		385,000				385,000	
San Mateo	Redwood City	Bair Island Bay Trail Improvements	CON	SM-110025	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-RBP-CO	CML	5029(023)	11/12	11/12		337,000	337,000				337,000	
San Mateo	Redwood City	Skyway/Shoreway Bike Route	CON	SM-110026	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-RBP-CO	CML	5029(028)	11/12	11/12		218,000	218,000	03/16/12		159,000	159,000	
San Mateo	Redwood City	Skyway/Shoreway Bike Route	PE	SM-110026	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-RBP-CO	CML	5029(028)	11/12	11/12		38,000	38,000	10/18/11		38,000	38,000	
San Mateo	SSF	South San Francisco: Regional Gap	CON	SM-110023	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-RBP-CO	CML	5177(027)	11/12	11/12		261,000	261,000	02/03/12		261,290	261,290	
San Mateo	SamTrans	SAMTRANS: Preventive Maintenance	CON	SM-030023	ACTIVE	STP-T4-1-RSI	FTASTP	6014(014)	11/12	11/12	13,288,913		13,288,913	02/14/12	13,288,913		13,288,913	
San Mateo	San Bruno	San Bruno Street Medians and Grand	CON	SM-110011	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-CO	CML	5226(018)	11/12	11/12		654,000	654,000	02/17/12		654,000	654,000	
San Mateo	San Bruno	San Bruno Transit Corridor Ped	CON	SM-110012	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-CO	CML	5226(019)	11/12	11/12		263,000	263,000	02/17/12		263,000	263,000	
San Mateo	San Carlos	San Carlos Pavement Rehab Program	CON	SM-110019	ACTIVE	STP-T4-1-LSR-CO	STPL	5267(016)	11/12	11/12	319,000		319,000	03/16/12	319,000		319,000	
San Mateo	San Carlos	East Side Community Transit	CON	SM-110028	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-REG	CML	5267(015)	11/12	11/12		1,795,304	1,795,304	03/22/12		1,795,304	1,795,304	
San Mateo	San Mateo	Delaware Street Bike Lane and	CON	SM-110007	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-REG	CML	5102(038)	11/12	11/12		545,000	545,000	02/28/12		545,000	545,000	
San Mateo	San Mateo	El Camino Real Phase I Improvement	CON	SM-110010	ACTIVE	CMAQ-T4-1-TLC-CO	CML	5102(039)	11/12	11/12		503,000	503,000	02/28/12		485,000	485,000	
San Mateo	San Mateo Co	Resurfacing of Pescadero Creek Road	CON	SM-110035	ACTIVE	STP-T4-1-LSR-FAS	STPL	5935(061)	11/12	11/12	985,011		985,011	02/16/12	985,011		985,011	
<b>San Mateo County Totals</b>											<b>14,977,924</b>	<b>5,755,304</b>	<b>20,733,228</b>		<b>14,592,924</b>	<b>5,040,594</b>	<b>19,633,518</b>	<b>1,099,710</b>

Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
 Local Safety Program (HSIP, HRRR, SRTS) Obligation Status Report

Fiscal Years: FY 11/12  
 April 04, 2012

County	Sponsor	Project Name	Phase	TIP ID	Fund Code	FMS ID	Fed Project Data		Appn FY	Prog FY	Fund Programming Information			Obligation Information			Balance Remaining
							Prefix	ID			HSIP Amt	HRRR Amt	SRTS Amt	Date	HSIP Amt	HRRR Amt	
<b>San Mateo County</b>																	
San Mateo	Atherton	Valparaiso at Hoover In-Roadway Lighted Crosswalk	CON	REG070009	HSIP-T4-3	5126.00	HSIPL	5261007	12/13	11/12	27,900			06/30/11	27,585		315
San Mateo	Atherton	Valparaiso at Hoover In-Roadway Lighted Crosswalk	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-3	5126.00	HSIPL	5261007		10/11	393			12/11/11	393		
San Mateo	Daly City	Gellert Blvd. Bicycle Lanes	CON	REG070009	HSIP-T4-3	5101.00	HSIP	5196034	12/13	11/12	88,650			04/04/11	87,109		1,541
San Mateo	Daly City	Hickey Blvd/Callan Blvd Signal Modifications	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-4	5279.00			12/13	11/12	33,300						33,300
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Safe Routes to Hillview Middle School	CON	REG090001	SRTS-T3-1	5112.00		5273017	10/11	11/12			127,600				127,600
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Menlo Park: Oak Grove Ave./Merrill St.	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-4	5315.00	HSIPL	5273022	11/12	11/12	5,445			12/28/11	4,950		495
San Mateo	SSF	Sister Cities Blvd Guardrail Project	CON	REG070009	HSIP-T4-3	5110.00	HSIPL	5177024	12/13	11/12	270,000			03/16/12	270,000		
San Mateo	SSF	Grand Avenue/Magnolia Avenue Traffic Signal	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-4	5317.00	HSIPL	5177028	12/13	11/12	67,500			10/24/11	66,825		675
San Mateo	SSF	Los Cerritos School West Orange Ave Improvements	PE	REG090001	SRTS-T4-3	5403.00	SRTSL	5177029		11/12				03/22/12		27,500	-10,000
San Mateo	San Carlos	SR 82 and Belmont Ave Crosswalk Improvements	CON	REG070009	HSIP-T4-3	5080.00			12/13	11/12	171,000						171,000
San Mateo	Woodside	Woodside School's Safety Improvement Project	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-4	5314.00			11/12	11/12	14,810						14,810
<b>San Mateo County Totals</b>											<b>678,998</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>145,100</b>	<b>456,862</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>27,500</b>	<b>339,736</b>

# It's time to start planning for the 2012 HSIP and HRRR Call-for-Projects!



## WHO should apply?

- A city, county or federally recognized tribal government who can assume responsibility and accountability for federal-aid highway funds.

## WHAT funding is available?

- This will be Caltrans' largest local safety call-for-projects ever!
- The total available federal funding is expected to be between \$100 - \$150 million.
- Caltrans will be looking to fund multiple applications from each local agency.
- Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) and High Risk Rural Road Program (HRRR) Federal funds will be combined into one Call-for-Projects.
- The maximum funding an agency can receive from this Call is expected to be the greater of the following two limits:
  - between \$1.5-\$2 million in federal funding, OR
  - 1.5 to 2 times the ratio of (agency's population) / (State's population) times the total funding for the Call.
- The minimum federal funds for each application is expected to be \$100,000.

## WHEN is the Call going to happen?

- The Call is planned to begin in April 2012
- The applications are expected to be due in July 2012.

## WHERE can I find more information?

- Caltrans has posted "lessons learned" from the last call-for-projects on its website at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/summary-of-results.htm>
- A new Local Roadway Safety Manual for California Local Road Owners will be posted on the HSIP website by the beginning of the Call-for-Projects. This manual is intended to support the upcoming call-for-projects.
- ❖ ***Caltrans is currently finalizing the Guidelines, Application Form, Application Instructions, HSIP & HRRR websites, and the SafeTREC TIMS-Benefit/Cost Calculator for this Call. These documents will be posted on the websites by the time the Call is announced (before the end of April 2012).***

## WHY should my agency start preparing now?

- All applications will compete based on their Benefit to Cost ratio (B/C Ratio). Locations/corridors with the highest B/C ratios will likely yield safety projects with the best chances for funding. Local agency safety practitioners need to start analyzing their roadway networks now to identify their high crash locations/corridors.
  - Applications will not be 'accepted' for projects with a B/C ratio less than one.
  - The minimum B/C 'to receive funding' will be determined after the applications are evaluated on statewide and District basis.
- Agencies that don't have access to crash data or need a way to assess their high crash concentrations, should consider using the UC Berkeley, SafeTREC-TIMS website. <http://tims.berkeley.edu/>
- Agencies that have a Safety Program Delivery Flag when the applications are due will not be allowed to submit applications for new funding. The latest status reports are available at: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/delivery\\_status.htm](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/delivery_status.htm)
  - ***Assessing your existing projects and meeting the safety program deliverables now will ensure that you are eligible to apply for HSIP/HRRR funding in July.***





**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

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

## *Memorandum*

TO: Partnership Programming and Delivery Working Group  
Partnership Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: April 12, 2012

FR: Sri Srinivasan, Programming and Allocations Section

RE: Primer on 2013 TIP Development and Schedule

The federally required Transportation Improvement Program or TIP, is a comprehensive listing of all Bay Area surface transportation projects that are to receive federal funding or are subject to a federally required action, or are considered regionally significant for air quality conformity purposes. The 2011 TIP was adopted by the Commission on October 27, 2010 and approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on December 14, 2010. It is valid through December 13, 2014. MTC is required by the State to prepare and adopt an updated TIP every two years. Therefore, it is time to develop a new TIP. The 2013 TIP will cover the four-year period of FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16.

Because it takes several months to prepare a new TIP, the 2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is set to go into a lockdown on Thursday, April 05, 2012. This is necessary to provide the time necessary to conduct the required Air Quality conformity analysis and determination, provide sufficient time for public participation, provide sufficient time for Caltrans, FHWA and FTA review and approval, and to ensure the data is consistent as we move from the current 2011 TIP to the new updated 2013 TIP. This memo is a primer on the TIP development process. The draft schedule is attached (Attachment 1).

The 2013 TIP will be developed using FMS. If members of your staff would like additional training in using FMS, please contact us as soon as possible and we will arrange a training session.

Developing the 2013 TIP entails reviewing of all your current TIP projects, and informing us of:

1. Which projects are completed and should be archived (ideally, this process should been completed by December 30, 2010. This will reduce the number of projects that you have to review)
2. Which projects need to be continued into the new TIP;
3. Which transit funds programmed in the prior year and not yet included in a FTA grant. Please change the program year but leave the Apportion year (Appn Year) as is.
4. Any changes to existing projects (scope, funding, contact person, phase change, schedule delays etc);

5. Updated project costs. Federal regulations require that the project listings reflect the latest estimates of the total project cost including all local funds, and costs of each phase. All costs must be escalated to the year of expenditure;
6. Justification of the sources of funds for those funds programmed in the TIP with “Other local funds” in excess of two million dollars;
7. Ensuring that the RTP Long Range Plan funds (RTP-LRP) funds are not programmed within the four-year TIP period (FY2012-13 through FY15-16)

For the new TIP to be federally approved, the TIP has to be a conforming TIP. Air Quality (AQ) conformity refers to a set of federal regulations that require metropolitan planning organizations such as MTC to assess the impact of the projects in the TIP on the region’s air quality. Hence lists of any new projects or new non-exempt project phases (such as the addition of the ROW or CON phase) should have been submitted to MTC before the deadline of **Friday, March 30, 2012**. This deadline is for new non - exempt projects and addition of non-exempt project phases not in the current 2011 TIP, but will need to be in the 2013 TIP.

CMAs are advised to coordinate the timely project review by counties and cities within their jurisdiction. As a reminder, cities and counties do not have submittal rights in the FMS application, as such CMAs are required to submit projects on behalf of the cities and counties. Transit operators can access the system directly.

To reduce the need of future TIP revisions, CMAs, transit operators and project sponsors need to ensure that all entries are complete and correct before submitting them. Do not “submit” a project until you are sure that the review of that project is completed. You can “save and exit” the project and return to complete and submit it at a later date.

Projects will be available for review starting **Friday, April 13, 2012**. Please complete the process as soon as possible, **BUT NO LATER THAN 5:00 PM on Thursday, May 10, 2012**. When your review is complete, please inform Sri Srinivasan via email.

The Draft 2013 TIP and the draft air quality conformity analysis will be released for public review on Friday, June 22, 2012, with a public hearing scheduled for Wednesday, July 13, 2012. In order to accommodate this schedule, **no edits will be accepted after Thursday May 10, 2012**.

The listing for each project available for your review will show how the project currently appears in our 2011 TIP including any pending revisions. All fields in the application are editable. Please make revisions only where necessary.

You can look at all the details of the project using the project detail report in FMS. Attachment 2 is a step-by-step tutorial on the process of generating the “Project Detail Report.”

Once you are ready to begin project the review and edit process (**After Friday, April 13, 2012, and before Thursday, May 10, 2012**), you should follow the following steps:

1. Go to the FMS site;
2. Sign in and click on the “Universal Application” tab;

3. Choose “Resume In-process Application” - this will allow you to see the latest version of all your projects in an editable format; and
4. Begin your project review.

Please focus your review on the following elements (Attachment 3 shows a process flowchart of the TIP clean up):

- Are the projects properly described in the TIP? - Review project name and project description to ensure that the name, limits and scope are accurate. Kindly use the examples shown on the right hand as sample format.
- Are the dollar amounts, fund sources and programming years correct? - In most cases, particularly for federal and state funding, the fund sources and amounts in prior years should not be changed, since they reflect official MTC programming actions.

Please revise local fund sources and amounts to reflect total project costs or updated total project costs. For local funds that are greater than \$2 million, kindly attach a resolution of local support. This is very critical to ensuring that the projects are fully funded and the TIP is fiscally constrained.

All projects must show the total cost for the project as described in the TIP listing, including any costs outside the four-year period of the TIP. Any funds outside the four-year TIP period (beyond FY 2015-16) that are not yet committed should be coded with the RTP-LRP fund code (as long as it is specified in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)). Additionally, there should not be any RTP-LRP within the four years of the TIP. (The data clean up to address RTP-LRP within the four-year TIP period should have been completed as of Friday, January 27, 2012.)

All costs must be escalated to the year of expenditure and please ensure that the total project cost in the TIP does not exceed the cost shown in the RTP.

- Is the appropriate RTP ID being used? Please ensure that the TIP project is referencing the correct T-2035 RTP project - the project description in the TIP is consistent with that of the RTP description as well as the cost. The cost of the project shown in the TIP should be within the RTP cost.
- Are all funded phases reflected in the project listing? As part of the regulations requiring that project listings show the total project costs, federal guidance requires that all funded phases be reflected accurately in the project listing. If a project listing does not show any amount programmed for a capital phase, (ROW or CON) a TIP amendment and perhaps a new conformity analysis may be required to amend a capital phase into the TIP if necessary in the future. Therefore, you must show all project phases (even if funded with local resources) in your project listings if they are not listed already.

Funds for a project phase must be listed in the same year, which is the year of allocation/obligation for that phase (e.g. ENV, PS&E, PE, ROW or CON). Exceptions are for pre-approved corridor projects (as listed in the RTP), annual ongoing service/operations projects (such as the Freeway Service Patrol), multi-year program of projects (such a various streets and roads rehabilitation, or bus rehabilitation/replacement

programs), or projects with multiple segments (in which case the project description must include a statement noting the number of segments such as segments 1 through 3).

- Should the project be included in the 2013 TIP or can the project be archived? Are any projects completed, fully obligated (FHWA projects) or in an approved or pending FTA grant? Are any projects listed more than once?

If all federal or state funding for the project have been awarded, obligated or the project has been completed, or if all project funding is prior to FY2012-13 and if no further federal action is anticipated for the project, the project can be archived and removed from the TIP. This is important, as completed projects must be reported to FHWA, and the list we provide is the list of 'Archived' projects.

If the project is not yet completed and you would like it to be included in the new 2013 TIP for informational purposes, even though all funds are in prior year (before FY 2012-13), select the "No, project is not complete" box, and use the "submit" button.

In addition, you are requested to justify the need for retaining these projects in the TIP. For projects with delay in phases etc, sponsors are requested to update the project delivery milestones; update the phase years in the funding and point out projects (via email) that will cross the AQ analysis year of FY2014-15.

- Complete the Project level conformity questions or POAQC questions on the Air Quality page.
- The project listings show the latest version of the project including pending revisions. Please check your projects to ensure that pending revisions are shown correctly.
- Is the project on schedule? Have there been any delays? Sponsors are requested to review the project delivery milestones as well the years the various phases are programmed in the TIP. If there is a schedule delay and the phase goes beyond the analysis year of FY2014-15, sponsors should have notified MTC via email, by **Friday, March 30, 2012**. This is especially important for AQ non-exempt projects.
- Review the location information entered as part of the TIP. This information is helpful when your legislator asks us for the information.
- In addition to federally funded projects, the TIP must also include regionally significant locally funded projects.

Review your agency's capital improvement program for FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 to determine if your locally funded projects must be included in the TIP. A locally funded project is considered regionally significant if it impacts air quality in the Bay Area or if it will require any federal agency action. For example, addition of an interchange to the interstate system, which is capacity increasing or a project that requires federal permits would need to be shown in the TIP.

To propose a new regionally significant project, go to the “Universal Application” tab of FMS and propose a new project for each of your new regionally significant projects, so we can include them in the TIP. If these projects impact Air Quality, they are due to MTC by Friday March 30, 2012.

5. After your review, update the contact information section and submit the project to MTC for review and inclusion into the 2013 TIP. Projects not submitted by Thursday, May 10, 2012 will not be included into the 2013 TIP.

If you have any funding specific question(s) please contact the following MTC staff persons:

FHWA Funds including: STP/CMAQ, FHWA Earmarks	Craig Goldblatt	(510) 817-5837
FTA Funds including: Section 5307/5309/AB664, FTA Earmarks	Glen Tepke	(510) 817-5781
State and Regional Funds including: STIP/TE, TCRP, CMIA, TCIF, RM2 – Highway	Kenneth Kao	(510) 817-5768
FTA Funds including: Section 5310/5311/5316/5317	Kristen Mazur	(510) 817-5789
Proposition 1B – PTMISEA and SLPP	Kenneth Folan and Adam Crenshaw	(510) 817-5804 (510) 817-5794
RM2 – Transit	Shruti Hari	(510) 817-5960
Questions on Project Level Conformity /POAQC process	Stephanie Hom	(510) 817-5756
2013 TIP Development and Fund Management System (FMS)	Sri Srinivasan and Adam Crenshaw	(510) 817-5793 (510) 817-5794

We appreciate your help updating the TIP. Time spent now getting the TIP entries correct will save time in the future by minimizing additional changes, preventing additional air quality conformity analyses, and avoiding potential project delivery delays.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

- Attachment 1: Draft TIP Development Schedule
- Attachment 2: Process of generating the Project Detail Report
- Attachment 3: Process flowchart for TIP Data Clean-up

We appreciate your help updating the TIP. Time spent now getting the TIP entries correct will save time in the future by minimizing additional changes, preventing additional air quality conformity analyses, and avoiding potential project delivery delays.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this request.

- Attachment 1: Draft TIP Development Schedule
- Attachment 2: Process of generating the Project Detail Report
- Attachment 3: Process flowchart for TIP Data Clean-up

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership TFWG\Transit Finance WG\2012\12 Memos\04\_April\08c\_Primer on 2013 TIP Development and Schedule.doc

<b>Metropolitan Transportation Commission</b>	
<b>2013 Transportation Improvement Program Development (TIP)</b>	
<b>Attachment 1: Tentative 2013 TIP Development Schedule</b>	
<b>Tuesday, February 07, 2012</b>	
<b>Proposed Milestone Dates</b>	<b>Milestone</b>
<b>Friday, March 30, 2012</b>	<b>Deadline to submit non-exempt project changes (including Capital Phases) to be included in 2013 TIP</b>
Friday, March 30, 2012	Last day to submit changes to current FTIP for Revision 11-23 (Administrative Modification) using FMS
Friday, March 30, 2012	Last day to submit new projects for current FTIP for the last FTIP Amendment
<b>Thursday, April 05, 2012</b>	<b>FMS Locked Down - No more changes to 2011 FTIP - Start of 2013 FTIP Development</b>
Friday, April 13, 2012	Start of review and update by project sponsors and CMAs
Thursday, April 26, 2012	Review of conformity approach by AQCTF for the 2013 FTIP
Wednesday, May 09, 2012	Final 2011 FTIP Amendment released for public comment
<b>Thursday, May 10, 2012</b>	<b>Completion of project review by sponsors and CMAs</b>
Wednesday, June 13, 2012	PAC Meeting - authorize public hearing and release Draft 2013 FTIP & AQ Conformity
Friday, June 22, 2012	Begin of Public Review Period for 2013 FTIP and Conformity Analysis
Wednesday, July 11, 2012	Public Hearing on Draft FTIP and AQ Conformity Analysis
Thursday, August 09, 2012	End of Public Review Period for Draft FTIP and Conformity Analysis
Thursday, August 23, 2012	Review of Final Draft Conformity Analysis by AQCTF
Wednesday, September 12, 2012	PAC review of Final 2013 FTIP and Final Conformity analysis and referral to Commission
<b>Wednesday, September 26, 2012</b>	<b>Final 2013 FTIP and Final Air Quality Conformity analysis approved by Commission</b>
<b>Friday, September 28, 2012</b>	<b>2013 FTIP submitted to Caltrans</b>
Monday, October 01, 2012	Deadline for Final FTIP to Caltrans
Monday, October 08, 2012	Start of FSTIP Public Participation (Statewide Public Review Process)
Monday, October 29, 2012	End of FSTIP Public Participation (Statewide Public Review Process)
Thursday, November 15, 2012	FSTIP submitted to FHWA/FTA
Monday, December 17, 2012	Final FHWA/FTA Approval of 2013 TIP / AQ Conformity Analysis

## Attachment 2: Process of generating the Project Detail Report

The Project Detail Report can be generated following the steps below:

- 1) Log into FMS and go to the Project Search Page
- 2) Select the project / Choose a list of projects based on specific search criteria: In the case of the example, the choices are Alameda County and Alameda City
- 3) The list of active projects are as shown below

Select a Report Generate report Refresh Print Data

Results: 4

Map it	TIP ID	FMS ID	Version	Project Name	County	Sponsor	Status
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA070022</a>	<a href="#">189.00</a>	<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">Park St Streetscape</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA070049</a>	<a href="#">3797.00</a>	<a href="#">2</a>	<a href="#">Signal Coordination: 8th St, Otis Dr, &amp; Park St.</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA090017</a>	<a href="#">4157.00</a>	<a href="#">1</a>	<a href="#">Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA990054</a>	<a href="#">450.00</a>	<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">Tinker Avenue Reconfiguration</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>

- 4) Select a project/projects (By checking the box/boxes to the left of the “Map it” icon) – highlighted below.

Select a Report Generate report Refresh Print Data

Results: 4

Map it	TIP ID	FMS ID	Version	Project Name	County	Sponsor	Status
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA070022</a>	<a href="#">189.00</a>	<a href="#">5</a>	<a href="#">Park St Streetscape</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA070049</a>	<a href="#">3797.00</a>	<a href="#">2</a>	<a href="#">Signal Coordination: 8th St, Otis Dr, &amp; Park St.</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA090017</a>	<a href="#">4157.00</a>	<a href="#">1</a>	<a href="#">Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<a href="#">ALA990054</a>	<a href="#">450.00</a>	<a href="#">8</a>	<a href="#">Tinker Avenue Reconfiguration</a>	<a href="#">ALA</a>	<a href="#">Alameda</a>	<a href="#">ACTIVE</a>



5) Select the Project Detail Report from the drop down menu

The screenshot shows a web application interface with a report selection dropdown menu and a table of project details. The dropdown menu is open, showing options: "Select a Report", "Project Listing 2009 TIP", "Project Authorization", and "Project Detail Report". The "Project Detail Report" option is selected. Below the dropdown is a table with columns: ID, Version, Project Name, County, Sponsor, and Status. The table contains four rows of project data. The "Generate report" button is highlighted with a red box.

		ID	Version	Project Name	County	Sponsor	Status	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		ALA070022	189.00	5	Park St Streetscape	ALA	Alameda	ACTIVE
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		ALA070049	3797.00	2	Signal Coordination: 8th St, Otis Dr, & Park St.	ALA	Alameda	ACTIVE
<input type="checkbox"/>		ALA090017	4157.00	1	Fruitvale Avenue Rail Bridge Seismic Retrofit	ALA	Alameda	ACTIVE
<input type="checkbox"/>		ALA990054	450.00	8	Tinker Avenue Reconfiguration	ALA	Alameda	ACTIVE

6) Press on the Generate Report buttons highlighted above.



TO: Partnership Programming and Delivery Working Group  
Partnership Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: April 12, 2012

FR: Alix Bockelman, Director Programming and Allocations

RE: Update on Proposed OneBayArea Grant — Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ Funding

## Background

Staff presented the initial OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) proposal to the MTC Planning Committee / ABAG Administrative Committee on July 8, 2011. At that meeting, the committee directed that staff release the proposal for public review. On January 13, 2012 staff recommended revisions to the OBAG proposal to the Joint Committee addressing comment letters and other concerns expressed by stakeholders, transportation agencies and local jurisdictions at various meetings (Bay Area Partnership working groups; Policy Advisory Council; ABAG Executive Board; ABAG Planning Committee; Regional Advisory Working Group, Regional Bicycle Working Group; and Plan Bay Area workshops). Committee memoranda and comment letters received to date can be viewed on the MTC website at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/onebayarea/>.

## Additional OBAG Policy Program Revisions

At their January meeting, the Joint Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee members were generally supportive of the staff recommended revisions to the OBAG grant program and requested more clarity and adjustments which are outlined below as additional staff recommended revisions. Staff is also recommending to add one year to the OBAG funding cycle to address regional delivery, as described in item #1 below.

**1. Add a Fourth Year of Funding to Cycle 2:** Project sponsors and MTC staff are experiencing delivery challenges because of insufficient lead time for projects to go through the federal aid process. Sponsors need a minimum of 36 months, and ideally 48 months from the time of program adoption to proceed through the federal-aid process and deliver the projects especially for less traditional projects such as the Climate Initiatives and Safe Routes to School (SR2S) projects.

Recommended Revision: To ensure the region does not lose federal funds due to extended delivery timelines, staff is recommending adding a fourth year of funding to Cycle 2 / OBAG funding which allows the region to better manage the use of federal funds. This adds approximately \$70 million in funding that would go to CMAs for project selection. Funding to the regional programs also increases proportionately. Attachment 1 lays out the proposed new funding levels.

**2. Increase Priority Development Area Flexibility:** Staff had recommended that a project outside of a priority development area (PDA) count towards the required PDA minimum expenditure if it directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA. Further definition was requested.

Recommended revision: Rather than establishing a regional definition of “proximate access”, staff recommends that the CMAs make the determination for projects to count toward the PDA minimum that

are not otherwise geographically located within a PDA. CMAs would need to map projects and designate which projects are considered to support a PDA along with policy justifications. This analysis would be subject to public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions. This should allow decision makers, stakeholders, and the public to understand how an investment outside of a PDA is to be considered to support a PDA and to be credited towards the PDA investment minimum threshold requirements. MTC staff will evaluate and report to the Commission on how well this approach achieves the OBAG objectives prior to the next programming cycle. MTC staff has prepared illustrative examples of projects that may count toward the PDA minimum based on direct connection or proximate access (see Attachment 2).

**3. North Bay Priority Conservation Areas Pilot Program:** There were requests to allow other counties to participate in the pilot outside of the four North Bay counties and an extensive discussion about which priority conservation area components (i.e. farm to market transportation projects versus open space acquisition / access) should be eligible given the limited funds in this program.

Recommended revision: Implement this program as a regionally competitive program with first priority going to the North Bay counties of Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma. Eligible projects would include planning, land/easement acquisition, open space access projects, and farm-to-market capital projects. Priority would be given to projects that can partner with state agencies, regional districts and private foundations to leverage outside funds, particularly for land acquisition and open space access. Funding leveraged by MTC and ABAG beyond the \$5 million program (not including sponsor-provided match) could grow the program budget and open up consideration of projects outside of the North Bay counties. Program guidelines will be developed over the next several months. Prior to the call for projects, a meeting will be held with stakeholders to discuss the program framework and project eligibility. The program guidelines will be approved by the Commission following those discussions. Note that tribal consultation for Plan Bay Area highlighted the need for CMAs in Sonoma and Marin to involve tribes in PCA planning and project delivery.

**4. Affordable Housing Production and Preservation:** Concerns were expressed that the proposed OBAG fund distribution at the county level does not explicitly recognize an individual jurisdiction's performance in producing affordable housing. Further, MTC was asked to consider specific requirements for local jurisdictions to adopt policies to encourage affordable housing production and preservation.

Recommended revision: MTC will expect CMAs to distribute funds at the county level in a way that balances a variety of objectives, including low-income housing production. The following three measures are intended to support CMA decisions related to low-income housing production and protection of affordable housing.

- a) In order to facilitate a discussion among the constituent jurisdictions within a county as part of the project selection process, MTC is publishing data for each county, showing each jurisdiction's contribution to the county's fund distribution based on a formula which includes low-income housing factors (See Attachment 3). For future cycles, staff recommends that housing production data be revised to incorporate the most up-to-date jurisdiction information.
- b) CMAs would be required to develop and approve a PDA Growth Strategy that addresses affordable housing strategies (see Attachment 4). The PDA Growth Strategy will be due to MTC and ABAG by October 2012. By that date, CMAs will have completed an inventory of affordable housing policies currently enacted by each local jurisdiction. By October 2013, CMAs would work with their respective jurisdictions to formulate affordable housing strategies and identify which, if any, policies/ordinances are

recommended to promote and preserve affordable housing in PDAs. To support the CMAs and local jurisdictions in these efforts, MTC and ABAG will coordinate with related work conducted through the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant awarded to the region in fall 2011. Based on this information and recommendations in the PDA growth strategy, MTC would consider linking the release of future cycle funding (subsequent to FY 2015-16) on local progress to enact locally developed affordable housing policies. MTC expects the share of funding attributable to affordable housing production to increase in future cycles.

c) MTC and ABAG's PDA Planning Grant Program will place an emphasis on affordable housing production, and preservation in funding agreements with grantees.

**5. Performance and Accountability:** Staff had recommended streamlining the performance and accountability requirements in recognition of the considerable lead time required to implement these requirements as a condition for receiving OBAG funds. The two requirements due by July 1, 2013 are the Complete Streets Act of 2008 compliant general plan circulation element and a 2007-14 RHNA compliant general plan housing element approved by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD). Some of the committee members reported that the time and resources involved for a general plan amendment made the Complete Streets Act deadline in many cases impractical; and others believed that HCD approval process in some cases can be very unpredictable.

Recommended revision: The following provides additional flexibility to jurisdictions to meet these requirements:

a) To be eligible for OBAG funds, a jurisdiction will need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets ordinance no later than October 1, 2012. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement by already having a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 or by its adoption by the October 1, 2012 deadline. Staff will provide minimum requirements based on best practices for the ordinances.

b) A jurisdiction is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and approved by HCD for 2007-14 RHNA prior to July 1, 2013. If a jurisdiction submits its housing element to HCD on a timely basis but is facing obstacles in the HCD review process, a waiver may be given by the Joint MTC Planning/ABAG Administrative Committee based on a consideration of the circumstances involved.

**6. Lessons Learned:** MTC staff will report on the outcome of the CMA project selection process in late 2013. This information will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Mix of project types selected;
- Projects funded within PDAs and outside of PDAs and how proximity and direct connections were used and justified through the county process;
- Complete streets elements that were funded;
- Adherence to the performance and accountability requirements; and
- Amount of funding to various jurisdictions and how this related to the distribution formula that includes population, RHNA housing allocations and housing production, as well as low-income housing factors.
- Public participation process.

The CMAs will also be required to present their PDA Growth Strategy to the Joint MTC Planning/ABAG Administrative Committee in November or December 2012.

**7. Safe Routes to School Regional Program:** The committee discussed whether the funding for the MTC Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S) should be increased from \$10 million to \$17 million. In Cycle 1, \$15 million was made available to the counties by formula for a three-year period and \$2 million was directed to a regionally competitive Creative Grant Program.

Recommended revision: Staff recommends that the Regional Safe Routes to School Program be funded at \$5 million annually for the four-year period consistent with Cycle 1 but that the regionally competitive program be discontinued. In addition CMAs may choose to provide additional funds to the SR2S program through county OBAG investments.

**8. Pavement Technical Assistance Program:** The Local Streets and Roads Working Group requested additional funding to continue to carry out the Pavement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP).

Recommended revision: Staff recommends increasing the PTAP program funding level by \$4 million to a revised total of \$7 million. This funding level allows for the reinspection of the majority of each jurisdiction's local street and road network every other year which will result in updated asset management data needed to complete regional condition summaries and needs analyses for planning and programming purposes. In response to Tribal Consultation for Plan Bay Area, staff recommends that PTAP also be made available to assist tribes in conducting road condition inventories on tribal lands within the Bay Area.

### Next Steps

The staff proposal has relied to date, on the current 2007-14 Regional Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA) for the proposed OBAG fund distribution. We intend to use the new RHNA 2014-2022 that will be available in May. Staff will revise the county level funding distribution, as appropriate, based on the new RHNA figures. In July, ABAG will finish its consideration of new PDA designation applications, and MTC staff will provide final PDA definitions and maps at that time.

After further discussions with stakeholders and working group committees, staff will prepare Final Cycle 2/OBAG Programming Policies for presentation to the Joint MTC Planning Committee/ABAG Administrative Committee in May and referral to the Commission for final approval. If approved, staff will start working on OBAG Program implementation in June.

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4 - New Act\T4 - STP-CMAQ\T4 Cycle Programming\T4 Second Cycle\One Bay Area Grant\Committee Memoranda\Working Group Update 04-2012\OBAG Revisions\_memo\_3-28-12.doc

# Attachment 1

## OneBayArea Proposal

### New Act Cycle 2 Program

#### April 2012

### Cycle 2 Funding Commitments

Program Categories (millions \$ - rounded)		4-Year Total	January 2012 Proposal *	Augmentation	4-Year Total
<b>Regional Program</b>					
1	Regional Planning Activities	\$7	\$5	\$2	\$7
2	Regional Operations	\$105	\$74	\$31	\$105
3	Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI)	\$96	\$66	\$31	\$96
4	Pavement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP)	\$7	\$3	\$4	\$7
5	Priority Development Area (PDA) Plans	\$30	\$25	\$5	\$30
6	Climate Initiatives	\$20	\$10	\$10	\$20
7	Safe Routes To School (SR2S)	\$20	\$10	\$10	\$20
8	Transit Capital Rehabilitation	\$150	\$125	\$25	\$150
9	Transit Performance Initiative (TPI)	\$30	\$30		\$30
10	Priority Conservation Area (PCA)	\$5	\$5		\$5
<b>Regional Program Total:**</b>		<b>\$470</b>	<b>\$353</b>	<b>\$117</b>	<b>\$470</b>
					60%

\* Without Lifeline and transit payback which have been advanced and funded in Cycle 1

County Program		4-Year Total	January 2012 Proposal	Augmentation	4-Year Total
<b>One Bay Area Grant (OBAG)</b>					
1	Alameda	\$61			
2	Contra Costa	\$46			
3	Marin	\$10			
4	Napa	\$7			
5	San Francisco	\$38			
6	San Mateo	\$25			
7	Santa Clara	\$84			
8	Solano	\$20			
9	Sonoma	\$24			
<b>OBAG Total:**</b>		<b>\$320</b>	<b>\$250</b>	<b>\$70</b>	<b>\$320</b>
					40%

<b>Cycle 2 Total Total:**</b>	<b>\$790</b>	<b>\$604</b>	<b>\$186</b>	<b>\$790</b>
-------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

\*\* Amounts may not total due to rounding

## 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
<b>Road Rehabilitation Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>
<b>Bicycle / Pedestrian Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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).</li> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>
<b>Safe Routes to Schools</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>
<b>County TLC Program</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For enhancement / streetscape elements, the following projects may be supportive of PDAs although outside of their limits:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PDA corridor gap closure (El Camino Real segments between PDAs in Sunnyvale and Santa Clara)</li> <li>PDA connection to a nearby significant transit node (North Berkeley BART station to University Avenue PDA)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Attachment 3: OBAG Formula Factors and Distribution Within County**  
**April 2012**

County	Population		2007-2011 RHNA				1999-2006 Housing Production			
	2010 Population	Intra-County Share	Very Low + Low Income Units	Intra-County Share	Total Units	Intra-County Share	Very Low + Low Units	Intra-County Share	Total Units (capped)	Intra-County Share
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>										
Alameda	73,812	4.9%	811	4.6%	2,046	4.6%	336	6.7%	952	3.0%
Albany	18,539	1.2%	107	0.6%	276	0.6%	15	0.3%	160	0.5%
Berkeley	112,580	7.5%	752	4.3%	2,431	5.4%	496	9.9%	1,269	4.0%
Dublin	46,036	3.0%	1,753	9.9%	3,330	7.4%	506	10.1%	3,832	12.2%
Emeryville	10,080	0.7%	360	2.0%	1,137	2.5%	187	3.7%	777	2.5%
Fremont	214,089	14.2%	2,235	12.7%	4,380	9.7%	503	10.0%	2,971	9.5%
Hayward	144,186	9.5%	1,251	7.1%	3,393	7.6%	57	1.1%	2,602	8.3%
Livermore	80,968	5.4%	1,698	9.6%	3,394	7.6%	461	9.2%	3,746	11.9%
Newark	42,573	2.8%	417	2.4%	863	1.9%	0	0.0%	314	1.0%
Oakland	390,724	25.9%	3,998	22.7%	14,629	32.6%	1,300	25.8%	7,733	24.7%
Piedmont	10,667	0.7%	23	0.1%	40	0.1%	0	0.0%	9	0.0%
Pleasanton	70,285	4.7%	1,804	10.2%	3,277	7.3%	530	10.5%	2,391	7.6%
San Leandro	84,950	5.6%	596	3.4%	1,630	3.6%	108	2.1%	870	2.8%
Union City	69,516	4.6%	952	5.4%	1,944	4.3%	232	4.6%	1,852	5.9%
Alameda County Unincorporated	141,266	9.4%	876	5.0%	2,167	4.8%	303	6.0%	1,878	6.0%
<b>ALAMEDA TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,510,271</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17,633</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>44,937</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,034</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>31,356</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>										
Antioch	102,372	9.8%	855	7.9%	2,282	8.4%	838	13.2%	4,459	13.8%
Brentwood	51,481	4.9%	1,152	10.6%	2,705	10.0%	614	9.7%	4,073	12.6%
Clayton	10,897	1.0%	84	0.8%	151	0.6%	84	1.3%	219	0.7%
Concord	122,067	11.6%	1,065	9.8%	3,043	11.2%	286	4.5%	2,319	7.2%
Danville	42,039	4.0%	326	3.0%	583	2.2%	141	2.2%	721	2.2%
El Cerrito	23,549	2.2%	152	1.4%	431	1.6%	5	0.1%	185	0.6%
Hercules	24,060	2.3%	217	2.0%	453	1.7%	164	2.6%	792	2.5%
Lafayette	23,893	2.3%	190	1.8%	361	1.3%	17	0.3%	194	0.6%
Martinez	35,824	3.4%	427	3.9%	1,060	3.9%	0	0.0%	424	1.3%
Moraga	16,016	1.5%	120	1.1%	234	0.9%	21	0.3%	86	0.3%
Oakley	35,432	3.4%	339	3.1%	775	2.9%	461	7.3%	1,208	3.7%
Orinda	17,643	1.7%	118	1.1%	218	0.8%	0	0.0%	157	0.5%
Pinole	18,390	1.8%	132	1.2%	323	1.2%	40	0.6%	172	0.5%
Pittsburg	63,264	6.0%	545	5.0%	1,772	6.5%	628	9.9%	2,513	7.8%
Pleasant Hill	33,152	3.2%	265	2.4%	628	2.3%	164	2.6%	714	2.2%
Richmond	103,701	9.9%	730	6.7%	2,826	10.4%	1,293	20.4%	2,229	6.9%
San Pablo	29,139	2.8%	60	0.6%	298	1.1%	284	4.5%	494	1.5%
San Ramon	72,148	6.9%	1,889	17.4%	3,463	12.8%	564	8.9%	4,447	13.8%
Walnut Creek	64,173	6.1%	758	7.0%	1,958	7.2%	179	2.8%	1,477	4.6%
Contra Costa County Unincorporated	159,785	15.2%	1,413	13.0%	3,508	13.0%	549	8.7%	5,436	16.8%
<b>CONTRA COSTA TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,049,025</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,837</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>27,072</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>6,332</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>32,319</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>MARIN COUNTY</b>										
Belvedere	2,068	0.8%	9	0.5%	17	0.3%	0	0.0%	9	0.2%
Corte Madera	9,253	3.7%	104	5.6%	244	5.0%	0	0.0%	99	2.0%
Fairfax	7,441	2.9%	35	1.9%	108	2.2%	0	0.0%	18	0.4%
Larkspur	11,926	4.7%	145	7.9%	382	7.8%	13	1.0%	53	1.1%
Mill Valley	13,903	5.5%	128	6.9%	292	6.0%	97	7.6%	170	3.4%
Novato	51,904	20.6%	446	24.1%	1,241	25.4%	824	64.4%	2,582	52.2%
Ross	2,415	1.0%	14	0.8%	27	0.6%	0	0.0%	21	0.4%
San Anselmo	12,336	4.9%	45	2.4%	113	2.3%	0	0.0%	70	1.4%
San Rafael	57,713	22.9%	469	25.4%	1,403	28.7%	112	8.8%	1,184	23.9%
Sausalito	7,061	2.8%	75	4.1%	165	3.4%	22	1.7%	73	1.5%
Tiburon	8,962	3.6%	57	3.1%	117	2.4%	7	0.5%	151	3.0%
Marin County Unincorporated	67,427	26.7%	320	17.3%	773	15.8%	204	15.9%	521	10.5%
<b>MARIN TOTAL:</b>	<b>252,409</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,847</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,882</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,279</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,951</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>NAPA COUNTY</b>										
American Canyon	19,454	14.3%	285	19.6%	728	19.6%	174	21.3%	1,323	31.3%
Calistoga	5,155	3.8%	28	1.9%	94	2.5%	18	2.2%	78	1.8%
Napa	76,915	56.4%	761	52.4%	2,024	54.6%	528	64.6%	2,397	56.6%
St. Helena	5,814	4.3%	51	3.5%	121	3.3%	20	2.4%	124	2.9%
Yountville	2,933	2.1%	31	2.1%	87	2.3%	2	0.2%	67	1.6%
Napa County Unincorporated	26,213	19.2%	297	20.4%	651	17.6%	75	9.2%	244	5.8%
<b>NAPA TOTAL:</b>	<b>136,484</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,453</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>3,705</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>817</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>4,233</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>										
<b>SAN FRANCISCO TOTAL:</b>	<b>805,235</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>12,124</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>31,193</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,304</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>17,439</b>	<b>100.0%</b>



**Attachment 3: OBAG Formula Factors and Distribution Within County**  
**April 2012**

County	Population		2007-2011 RHNA				1999-2006 Housing Production			
	2010 Population	Intra-County Share	Very Low + Low Income Units	Intra-County Share	Total Units	Intra-County Share	Very Low + Low Units	Intra-County Share	Total Units (capped)	Intra-County Share
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>										
Atherton	6,914	1.0%	33	0.5%	83	0.5%	0	0.0%	5	0.1%
Belmont	25,835	3.6%	156	2.5%	399	2.5%	44	3.0%	317	3.4%
Brisbane	4,282	0.6%	157	2.5%	401	2.5%	8	0.5%	108	1.2%
Burlingame	28,806	4.0%	255	4.1%	650	4.1%	0	0.0%	104	1.1%
Colma	1,792	0.2%	26	0.4%	65	0.4%	73	5.0%	74	0.8%
Daly City	101,123	14.1%	473	7.7%	1,207	7.7%	33	2.2%	416	4.5%
East Palo Alto	28,155	3.9%	247	4.0%	630	4.0%	212	14.4%	719	7.7%
Foster City	30,567	4.3%	191	3.1%	486	3.1%	88	6.0%	533	5.7%
Half Moon Bay	11,324	1.6%	108	1.8%	276	1.8%	106	7.2%	356	3.8%
Hillsborough	10,825	1.5%	34	0.6%	86	0.5%	15	1.0%	84	0.9%
Menlo Park	32,026	4.5%	389	6.3%	993	6.3%	0	0.0%	215	2.3%
Millbrae	21,532	3.0%	177	2.9%	452	2.9%	0	0.0%	262	2.8%
Pacifica	37,234	5.2%	108	1.8%	275	1.7%	10	0.7%	179	1.9%
Portola Valley	4,353	0.6%	29	0.5%	74	0.5%	15	1.0%	61	0.7%
Redwood City	76,815	10.7%	726	11.8%	1,856	11.8%	106	7.2%	465	5.0%
San Bruno	41,114	5.7%	382	6.2%	973	6.2%	325	22.1%	378	4.1%
San Carlos	28,406	4.0%	235	3.8%	599	3.8%	0	0.0%	208	2.2%
San Mateo	97,207	13.5%	1,195	19.4%	3,051	19.4%	210	14.3%	1,771	19.1%
South San Francisco	63,632	8.9%	641	10.4%	1,635	10.4%	192	13.1%	1,310	14.1%
Woodside	5,287	0.7%	17	0.3%	41	0.3%	0	0.0%	41	0.4%
San Mateo County Unincorporated	61,222	8.5%	590	9.6%	1,506	9.6%	31	2.1%	1,680	18.1%
<b>SAN MATEO TOTAL:</b>	<b>718,451</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>6,169</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15,738</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,468</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>9,286</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>										
Campbell	39,349	2.2%	321	1.4%	892	1.5%	37	0.3%	617	1.3%
Cupertino	58,302	3.3%	570	2.4%	1,170	1.9%	48	0.4%	1,339	2.7%
Gilroy	48,821	2.7%	536	2.3%	1,615	2.7%	516	4.2%	2,577	5.3%
Los Altos	28,976	1.6%	164	0.7%	317	0.5%	40	0.3%	261	0.5%
Los Altos Hills	7,922	0.4%	46	0.2%	81	0.1%	32	0.3%	83	0.2%
Los Gatos	29,413	1.7%	254	1.1%	562	0.9%	86	0.7%	402	0.8%
Milpitas	66,790	3.7%	1,110	4.7%	2,487	4.1%	701	5.7%	3,318	6.8%
Monte Sereno	3,341	0.2%	22	0.1%	41	0.1%	19	0.2%	76	0.2%
Morgan Hill	37,882	2.1%	566	2.4%	1,312	2.2%	556	4.6%	2,335	4.8%
Mountain View	74,066	4.2%	959	4.1%	2,599	4.3%	123	1.0%	1,484	3.0%
Palo Alto	64,403	3.6%	1,233	5.3%	2,860	4.7%	344	2.8%	1,397	2.9%
San Jose	945,942	53.1%	13,073	55.8%	34,721	57.5%	8,301	67.9%	26,114	53.4%
Santa Clara	116,468	6.5%	2,207	9.4%	5,873	9.7%	758	6.2%	4,763	9.7%
Saratoga	29,926	1.7%	158	0.7%	292	0.5%	61	0.5%	539	1.1%
Sunnyvale	140,081	7.9%	1,781	7.6%	4,426	7.3%	112	0.9%	2,167	4.4%
Santa Clara County Unincorporated	89,960	5.0%	445	1.9%	1,090	1.8%	483	4.0%	1,421	2.9%
<b>SANTA CLARA TOTAL:</b>	<b>1,781,642</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>23,445</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>60,338</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>12,217</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>48,893</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>										
Benicia	26,997	6.5%	246	4.9%	532	4.1%	182	9.3%	413	2.7%
Dixon	18,351	4.4%	295	5.9%	728	5.6%	0	0.0%	1,017	6.6%
Fairfield	105,321	25.5%	1,435	28.5%	3,796	29.2%	249	12.8%	3,812	24.7%
Rio Vista	7,360	1.8%	389	7.7%	1,219	9.4%	39	2.0%	1,391	9.0%
Suisun City	28,111	6.8%	282	5.6%	610	4.7%	80	4.1%	1,004	6.5%
Vacaville	92,428	22.4%	1,222	24.3%	2,901	22.3%	778	39.9%	4,406	28.5%
Vallejo	115,942	28.0%	1,123	22.3%	3,100	23.9%	553	28.3%	2,965	19.2%
Solano County Unincorporated	18,834	4.6%	42	0.8%	99	0.8%	71	3.6%	427	2.8%
<b>SOLANO TOTAL:</b>	<b>413,344</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,034</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>12,985</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>1,952</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>15,435</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>										
Cloverdale	8,618	1.8%	132	2.4%	417	3.1%	163	3.2%	423	2.3%
Cotati	7,265	1.5%	103	1.9%	257	1.9%	114	2.2%	520	2.9%
Healdsburg	11,254	2.3%	119	2.2%	331	2.4%	188	3.7%	516	2.8%
Petaluma	57,941	12.0%	874	16.2%	1,945	14.2%	451	8.8%	1,144	6.3%
Rohnert Park	40,971	8.5%	602	11.2%	1,554	11.4%	760	14.9%	2,124	11.7%
Santa Rosa	167,815	34.7%	2,516	46.6%	6,534	47.9%	1,929	37.7%	7,654	42.0%
Sebastopol	7,379	1.5%	60	1.1%	176	1.3%	5	0.1%	121	0.7%
Sonoma	10,648	2.2%	128	2.4%	353	2.6%	179	3.5%	684	3.8%
Windsor	26,801	5.5%	328	6.1%	719	5.3%	332	6.5%	1,881	10.3%
Sonoma County Unincorporated	145,186	30.0%	536	9.9%	1,364	10.0%	989	19.4%	3,142	17.3%
<b>SONOMA TOTAL:</b>	<b>483,878</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,398</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>13,650</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,110</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>18,209</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Bay Area Total</b>	<b>7,150,739</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>83,940</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>214,500</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>39,513</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>182,121</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4 - New Act\T4 - STP-CMAQ\T4 Cycle Programming\T4 Second Cycle\One Bay Area Grant\OBAG IntraCounty Distribution.xls\IntraCounty 03-19-2012

## Attachment 4

### PDA Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Growth Strategy is to ensure that each CMA's transportation investments will support and encourage development in the region's PDAs. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. CMAs should incorporate necessary planning, infrastructure and funding for PDAs, as described below:

**(1) Engagement with Local Jurisdictions** – CMAs are to develop a process to regularly engage local planners, public works staff and encourage community participation throughout the planning process and in determining implementation priorities.

**(2) Planning** - Review existing plans and participate in new planning work<sup>1</sup>

- Review adopted land use plans - Specific, precise, or community plans for PDAs (or general plans with adopted transit-supportive zoning), particularly those with programmatic EIRs, contain details about circulation and access, pedestrian guidelines, parking and other development-related standards that can help to determine appropriate investments. These plans have undergone significant community involvement and have been adopted by Planning Commissions & City Councils.
- Take an inventory of transportation, infrastructure and implementation sections in land use plans for jurisdiction priorities and cost estimates for transportation infrastructure projects that serve or provide proximate access to PDAs. These may include streetscapes, bike, pedestrian, transit and road improvements, transit station improvements, connectivity projects and transportation demand management projects, including parking structures. For any TOD parking structure project, it is strongly recommended that a cost/benefit analysis be conducted using pricing, unbundling/cash-out, shared parking, shuttles and other locally appropriate TDM strategies to ensure it is built at an appropriate scale and well-managed.
- Inventory jurisdiction affordable housing policies, strategies, zoning and ordinances designed to encourage affordable housing production and/or preserve existing affordable housing. The three broad objectives for the housing policies are to promote housing production overall, ensure that housing units (planned and built) are balanced across income levels, and to avoid displacement of existing residents of the PDAs.

The policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently does not provide for a mix of income-levels, the policies should be aimed at promoting affordable housing. If the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, the policies should be aimed at community stabilization.

Starting in October 2013 and for subsequent updates, PDA Growth Strategies will assess existing and future affordable housing needs and make appropriate recommendations to fill gaps in local policies to achieve these goals. This analysis will be coordinated with related work conducted through the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant awarded to the region in fall 2011.

- Review ABAG/MTC PDA Assessment results for details about PDA infrastructure needs and priorities<sup>2</sup>
- Consider non-transportation infrastructure projects, such as sewer and utility upgrades or site assembly/land banking, as they are often a necessary prerequisite for TOD development projects in PDAs. Facilitate funding exchanges (federal for local dollars) when possible to address these funding gaps.

<sup>1</sup> MTC & ABAG staff are available to assist with the review and inventory of adopted land use plans

<sup>2</sup> In 2009, MTC/ABAG staff conducted an assessment of planned PDAs and their future development needs. Jurisdictions were asked to estimate infrastructure needs and associated costs.

- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Assist MTC and ABAG staff with oversight to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans.
- Help develop protocols with MTC, ABAG and Air District staff to assess emissions, as well as related mitigation strategies, as part of regional PDA Planning Program.
- Potential PDAs that do not have adopted plans, call on regional agency staff to assist in the identification of planning and future transportation infrastructure needs.

**(3) Funding** - Develop guidelines for evaluating OBAG projects that improve multi-modal transportation connections to housing, jobs and commercial activity, considering the following criteria:

- **Projects in High Impact Areas** - Assessment of the **project area** in which a project is located should be a key component for investment consideration. Key factors defining high impact project areas include;
  - a. Housing – PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units and percentage change), including RHNA income allocations,
  - b. Jobs in proximity to housing and transit (both current levels and those included in the SCS),
  - c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
  - d. Consistency with regional TLC design guidelines or design that encourages multi-modal access: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart\\_growth/tlc/2009\\_TLC\\_Design\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc/2009_TLC_Design_Guidelines.pdf)
- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC see: <http://geocommons.com/maps/110983>
- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies or policies
- **PDAs that overlap with Air District CARE Communities and/or are in proximity to freight transport infrastructure** - Consider projects located in PDAs with highest exposure to PM and Toxic Air Contaminants. Employ best management practices to mitigate exposure and determine where non-motorized investments would best support additional housing production.

II) RHNA Coordination – Given the OBAG connection to RHNA:

- Monitor development of Housing Elements/zoning updates supportive of RHNA.

**Process/Timeline**

CMA/MTC amend current funding agreements with PDA Growth Strategy tasks/language	Spring 2012
OBAG adopted by MTC	May 23, 2012
Updated CMA agreements ready for signature	July 1, 2012
CMA's develop PDA Growth Strategy	May - October 2012
PDA Growth Strategy Presentations by CMA's to Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee	November 2012 – December 2012
CMA's program OBAG funds	May 2012 – April 2013
CMA's amend PDA Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local affordable housing policies	October 2013
CMA's submit annual progress reports related to PDA Growth Strategies, including status of jurisdiction progress on development/adoption of housing elements and complete streets ordinances.	October 2013, Ongoing

J:\PROJECT\Smart Growth\MTC funding programs\OBAG\PDA Growth Strategy\PDA Growth Strategy\_draft 3\_23.doc



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: Partnership Programming and Delivery Working Group  
Partnership Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: April 12, 2012

FR: Sean Co

WI: 1114

RE: OneBayArea Complete Streets Ordinance

To satisfy the OneBayArea Grant complete streets requirement, staff proposed that agencies could amend their general plan to comply with the 2008 Complete Streets Act of California by July 2013. Based on feedback from local agencies that the timing of a general plan amendment was not feasible, staff is proposing that agencies may adopt a complete streets ordinance as an additional option to meet the OBAG complete streets requirement.

Attached are proposed elements that the complete streets ordinances must include. To be eligible for OBAG, agencies must have an adopted ordinance by October 2012. The proposed criteria are minimum requirements and agencies are encouraged to adopt an ordinance that fits with the context of their geographic area in order to best accommodate the needs of all roadway users. Attachment 1 is an example of a recent ordinance from the City of Baldwin Park, California that can be referenced as a model to guide in development of the complete streets ordinance.

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership PDWG\2012 PDWG\12 PDWG Memos\02\_Apr 12 LSRPDWG\05b.i\_OBAG\_Complete Streets Ordinance.doc

## Proposed One Bay Area Grant Complete Streets Ordinance Guidance

The following are a set of proposed elements that shall be included in a local ordinance. Agencies are encouraged to develop the best ordinance that fits within the context of their local area and to go beyond the items listed below to accommodate all users of the roadway network.

1. **Serve all Users** - The ordinance serves to establish guiding principles and practices so transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to encourage walking, bicycling and transit use while promoting safe and accessible operations for all users. The intention is to create a network of safe bicycle and pedestrian facilities that serve all transportation users.
2. **All Projects/Phases** - The policy will apply to all roadway projects including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or changes in the allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use.
3. **Context Sensitivity** - Projects will be planned and implemented with sensitivity to local conditions in both residential and business districts as well as urban, suburban and rural areas. This includes working with residents and merchants to ensure that a strong sense of place is maintained in project planning, design and construction of complete streets projects.
4. **Plan Consultation** –All local bicycle, pedestrian and/or transit plans and any other plans that affect the roadway will be consulted for consistency with the project.
5. **Street Network/Connectivity** - The transportation system will provide a connected network of facilities accommodating all modes of travel. This includes looking for opportunities for repurposing rights-of-ways to enhance connectivity for cyclists, pedestrians and transit users. A well connected network will include non-motorized connectivity to schools, parks, commercial areas, civic destinations and regional non-motorized networks on both publically owned roads/land and private developments (or redevelopment areas).
6. **BPAC Consultation** - Input shall be solicited from local Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) in an early project development phase to verify bicycling and pedestrian needs for projects. (MTC Resolution 875 requires that cities of 10,000 or more create and maintain a BPAC in order to receive TDA-3 funds.)
7. **Evaluation** – City will establish a methodology to collect data and indicate how the jurisdiction is evaluating their implementation of complete streets implementation overall. Evaluation should include (at a minimum) an annual report to the governing body of the jurisdiction including a list of streets (with a map), improvements made, and miles of new facilities that resulted from the policy. For example tracking the number of miles of bike lanes and sidewalks, numbers of streets crossings, signage etc.
8. **Complete Streets in all Departments** –The policy must cover work by every department in the jurisdiction and pertain to all types of projects, including transportation, new development, utilities, etc. as there are potential Complete Streets opportunities for each of these project types.

Ordinance must work cooperatively with adjacent and other jurisdictions such as school districts to maximize opportunities for connectivity and cooperation.


9. **Leadership Approval** –Projects be approved by a lead engineer, and if projects seek Complete Streets exemptions, there must be an explanation of why accommodations for all modes were not included in the project and signed off by the lead engineer and/or director.

Please see the National Complete Streets Coalition for more information on policy elements:

<http://www.completestreets.org/changing-policy/policy-elements/>

Attachment 1: City of Baldwin Park Complete Streets Policy

J:\PROJECT\Ped and Bike\Complete Streets Update\local CS ordinance.docx

<p><b><u>City of Baldwin Park</u></b> Administrative Policy # 027</p>	<p><b><u>Date:</u></b> Approved by: City Council <u>7/20/11</u></p>
<p><b><u>SUBJECT:</u></b>  Complete Streets Policy</p>	<p><b>Authority:</b> Public Works Department &amp; Community Development Department</p>  <p>Mayor, Manuel Lozano</p>

*The objective of this policy is to establish guiding principles and practices so transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use while promoting safe operations for all users.*

The City of Baldwin Park will create a safe and efficient transportation system that promotes the health and mobility of all Baldwin Park citizens and visitors by providing high quality pedestrian, bicycling, and transit access to all destinations throughout the city, and will design its streets for people, with beauty and amenities. The City of Baldwin Park will provide for the needs of drivers, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities in all planning, design, construction, reconstruction, retrofit, operations, and maintenance activities and products.

The City of Baldwin Park will enhance the safety, access, convenience, and comfort of all users of all ages and abilities. The City understands that children, seniors, and persons with disabilities will require special accommodations.

***STREET NETWORK / CONNECTIVITY***

(A) The City of Baldwin Park will design, operate and maintain a transportation network that provides a connected network of facilities accommodating all modes of travel.

(B) The City will actively look for opportunities to repurpose rights-of-way to enhance connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit.

(C) The City will focus non-motorized connectivity improvements to services, schools, parks, civic uses, regional connections and commercial uses.

(D) The City will require large new developments and redevelopment projects to provide interconnected street networks with small blocks.

## ***JURISDICTION***

(A) This Complete Streets Policy is intended to cover all development and redevelopment in the public domain and all street improvement assessment districts within Baldwin Park, but will also focus on regional connectivity.

(B) Every City Department including Administration, Public Works, Community Development, Recreation and Community Services, and Police, will follow the policy.

(C) The City requires all developers and builders to obtain and comply with the City's standards.

(D) The City requires agencies that Baldwin Park has permitting authority over, including, but not limited to, water agencies, electrical utilities, gas and petroleum utilities, communications utilities, and service contractors to comply with this policy.

(E) The City will work closely with Los Angeles County, Caltrans, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and the Southern California Association of Governments to promote compliance.

(F) The City encourages agencies not under Baldwin Park's jurisdiction, including, but not limited to, the Baldwin Park Unified School District, to satisfy this policy.

## ***PHASES***

The City of Baldwin Park will apply this Complete Streets policy to all roadway projects, including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or changes in the allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use. Complete Streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance and operation activities over time.

## ***EXCEPTIONS***

Complete Streets principles and practices will be included in street construction, reconstruction, repaving, and rehabilitation projects, as well as other plans and manuals, except under one or more of the following conditions:

(A) A project involves only ordinary or emergency maintenance activities designed to keep assets in serviceable condition such as mowing, cleaning, sweeping, spot repair, concrete joint repair, or pothole filling, or when interim measures are implemented on temporary detour or haul routes.

(B) The City Council exempts a project due to excessive and disproportionate cost of establishing a bikeway, walkway or transit enhancement as part of a project.



(C) The Director of Public Works and the Manager of Community Development jointly determine the construction is not practically feasible or cost effective because of significant or adverse environmental impacts to waterways, flood plains, remnants of native vegetation, wetlands, or other critical areas, or due to impacts on neighboring land uses, including impact from right of way acquisitions.

(D) Unless otherwise determined by the City Council, the Director of Public Works and the Manager of Community Development jointly determine it is not practically feasible or cost effective to implement the provisions of this policy through public or private project design or manuals or other plans.

Exceptions described in (B) and (C), above, will be documented and be made available for public access at least 21 days prior to decision. Exceptions described in (A) and (D), above, will be documented.

### ***DESIGN***

Additionally, Baldwin Park's City Council declares it is the City of Baldwin Park's policy to:

(A) Adopt new Complete Streets Design Guidelines to guide the planning, funding, design, construction, operation, and maintenance of new and modified streets in Baldwin Park while remaining flexible to the unique circumstances of different streets where sound engineering and planning judgment will produce context sensitive designs.

(B) Incorporate the Complete Streets Design Guidelines' principles into all City plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs as appropriate.

(C) Provide well-designed pedestrian accommodations on all streets and crossings. Pedestrian accommodations can take numerous forms, including but not limited to traffic signals, roundabouts, bulb-outs, curb extensions, sidewalks, buffer zones, shared-use pathways, and perpendicular curb ramps, among others.

(D) Provide well-designed bicycle accommodations along all streets. Bicycle accommodations can take numerous forms, including but not limited to the use of bicycle boulevards, striping, slow streets, low auto volume streets, traffic calming, signs, and pavement markings, among others.

(E) Where physical conditions warrant, landscaping shall be planted whenever a street is newly constructed, reconstructed, or relocated.

### ***CONTEXT SENSITIVITY***

(A) The City of Baldwin Park will plan its streets in harmony with the adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.

(B) The City will solicit input from local stakeholders during the planning process.

(C) The City will integrate natural features, such as waterways, and other topography into design of our streets.

(D) The City will design streets with a strong sense of place. We will use architecture, landscaping, streetscaping, public art, signage, etc. to reflect the community and neighborhood.

(E) The City will coordinate street improvements with merchants along retail and commercial corridors to develop vibrant and livable districts.

(F) The City will practice sustainable storm water management strategies.

### **PERFORMANCE MEASURES**

The City will evaluate this Complete Streets Policy using the following performance measures:

1. Total miles of on-street bikeways defined by streets with clearly marked or signed bicycle accommodation
2. Total miles of streets with pedestrian accommodation (goal – all)
3. Number of missing or non-compliant curb ramps along City streets (goal – 0)
4. Number of new street trees planted along City streets
5. Percentage of new street projects that are multi-modal
6. Number and severity of pedestrian-vehicle and bicycle-vehicle crashes
7. Number of pedestrian-vehicle and bicycle-vehicle fatalities (goal – 0)
8. Track Fitnessgram data of Baldwin Park Unified School District students
9. Sales tax revenue

The City will identify funds and create a methodology to collect data related to those performance measures.

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

(A) *Advisory Group.* The City will establish an inter-departmental advisory committee to oversee the implementation of this policy. The committee will include members of Public Works, Community Development, Recreation and Community Services, and the Police Departments from the City of Baldwin Park. The committee may include representatives from the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, representatives from the bicycling, disabled, youth and elderly community, and other advocacy organizations, as relevant. This committee will meet quarterly and provide a written report to City Council evaluating the City's progress and advise on implementation.

(B) *Inventory.* The City will maintain a comprehensive inventory of the pedestrian and bicycling facility infrastructure integrated with the City's database and will prioritize projects to eliminate gaps in the sidewalk and bikeways networks.

(C) *Capital Improvement Project Prioritization.* The City will reevaluate Capital Improvement Projects prioritization to encourage implementation of bicycle, pedestrian, and transit improvements.

(D) *Revisions to Existing Plans and Policies.* The City of Baldwin Park will incorporate Complete Streets principles into: the City's Circulation Element, Transportation Strategic Plan, Transit Plan, Traffic Safety Master Plan, Specific Plans, Urban Design Element; and other plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs.

(E) *Other Plans.* The City will prepare, implement, and maintain a Bicycle Transportation Plan, a Pedestrian Transportation Plan, a Safe Routes to School Plan, an Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan, and a Street Tree and Landscape Master Plan.

(F) *Storm Water Management.* The City will prepare and implement a plan to transition to sustainable storm water management techniques along our streets.

(G) *Staff Training.* The City will train pertinent City staff on the content of the Complete Streets principles and best practices for implementing the policy.

(H) *Coordination.* The City will utilize inter-departmental project coordination to promote the most responsible and efficient use of fiscal resources for activities that occur within the public right of way.

(I) *Street Manual.* The City will create and adopt a Complete Streets Design Manual to support implementation of this policy.

(J) *Funding.* The City will actively seek sources of appropriate funding to implement Complete Streets.



**METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION**

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

## *Memorandum*

TO: Partnership Programming and Delivery Working Group  
Partnership Local Streets and Roads Working Group

DATE: April 12, 2012

FR: Sean Co

RE: Proposed Complete Streets Changes

### **Background**

In 2006 MTC adopted Resolution 3765, Routine Accommodations (currently known as “complete streets”) policy. The policy outlined guidance on how bicyclists and pedestrians should be accommodated in road project planning and design. The resolution also established a checklist which was used by project sponsors and Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committees (BPACs) to disclose and review how local agencies considered complete streets in individual road projects during the design and funding process.

### **Summary of Changes**

The proposed changes to the complete streets policy changes are based on feedback received by MTC in prior funding cycles. The updated requirements affect MTC’s existing policy (Resolution 3765), requirements for complete streets at the jurisdictional level in the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) are related but separate from this policy change. See below for more information on OBAG.

1. MTC Complete Streets Reporting- All new road projects programmed into the TIP will report on specific metrics that help to determine how complete streets are being implemented in the region. This reporting could include such information such as lane miles of bikeways, number of bulb outs etc.
2. Checklist Process and Revisions – The checklist will be required at the time CMAs issue their call for project. It is expected that this will apply for the forthcoming OBAG call for projects. The checklist questions will be revised based on feedback from project sponsors (May 2012).

### **OBAG Complete Streets**

The draft guidelines for OBAG released in January included a requirement that jurisdictions have a complete streets element as part of their General Plan that complies with the California Complete Streets Act by July 2013. Based on feedback from partners, MTC staff will allow cities and counties to adopt a complete streets ordinance if a General Plan amendment is not feasible to meet this requirement.

### **Complete Streets Reporting**

Data will be collected on complete streets elements that are included in projects funded by MTC for inclusion in a regional report of projects. This data could include specific details about

capital improvements such as miles of bikeways added, length of sidewalks added, number of bulb outs added and other project details.

### **Completing the Checklist**

Project sponsors will be required to fill out the complete streets checklist as in prior funding cycles. Based on feedback from CMAs and BPACs there will be some minor changes to the checklist and process:

1. The checklist will be required at the time CMAs issue their call for projects. This will enable BPACs to review the checklists and provide feedback to project sponsors before CMAs and MTC program the projects.
2. Revisions to the checklist questions will be applied to make the checklist less redundant.

### **CMA Checklist Exemption**

While the Complete Streets Policy applies to all MTC funded projects, staff will be working towards an exemption process to the checklist for CMAs that have adopted policies in which projects submitted for funding are reviewed to ensure all users are accommodated. This exemption policy will not apply to OBAG but staff will work on developing guidance with the CMAs and advisory working groups in time for the next programming cycle. Below is an example of the types of elements that may be required for an exemption:

1. Complete Streets policy description- An MOU or director's policy that describes engineering review of projects for mandatory complete street elements has been conducted by the CMA prior to submitting projects to MTC.
2. BPAC review- Timeframe on when the BPAC has reviewed the project either as part of the current programming cycle or in a prior review such as part of the development of a bike plan. The intent is for BPAC's to review projects before a project has begun the project development process and to be informed in the decision making process. Information that would be included in the checklist must be made accessible to the public.
3. Reporting to MTC-Periodic reports to MTC that include, lists of projects reviewed by BPACs, types of complete streets improvement and projects receiving exemptions.

### **Training Opportunities**

MTC will be offering technical training for agency staff to assist in delivering projects that include bicycle, pedestrian and transit accommodation. The subject material can be tailored to the target audience ranges from technical design to policy development and implementation. Staff is soliciting input on the training that can be offered to local agencies.

### **Next Steps**

MTC's Complete Street Policy is being updated to apply for the release of One Bay Area Grant guidelines that are expected to be finalized in May. The following are expected timeline for the items to be updated as part of the policy.

MTC Complete Streets Checklist Revisions (May 2012)

OBAG Guidance for local agency Complete Streets Policy (May - July 2012)

Checklist integration into FMS (October 2012)

Guidelines for CMAs Exemption from Checklist (May 2013)



April 2, 2012

NAME

TITLE

AGENCY

ADDRESS #1

ADDRESS #2

**SUBJECT: 2012 CALIFORNIA STATEWIDE LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS NEEDS ASSESSMENT**

«GreetingLine»:

**Your help in responding to our survey in 2010 made a difference! We are asking for your help again in updating the information you provided two years ago.**

As you may know, the Fiscal Year 2010-11 Statewide Needs Assessment Report identified a funding shortfall of over \$79 billion for local streets and roads pavement and non-pavement needs. The report assisted CSAC and League staff to advocate against, and avoid what could have been devastating cuts to local transportation funding, over several state budget cycles (a copy of the final report is available at [www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org](http://www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org)).

In addition to deterring negative policies and budget decisions, we will be using the findings of this assessment to emphasize the importance of *increasing* funding for maintenance of our local streets and roads. Towards this goal, this year's needs assessment will include the development of a marketing plan to help us better communicate the findings to legislators and the public.

As in the past, this project is being funded through contributions from stakeholders. Regional Transportation Planning Agencies have been asked to sponsor fifty percent of the cost of the 2012 assessment and the update in 2014, with cities and counties sharing equally in the remaining cost. It is essential that each agency contribute toward this project in order to demonstrate how critical this issue is to sustaining our state's transportation infrastructure.

An ongoing effort is needed to update the local streets and roads needs on a regular, consistent basis, much like the State does in preparing the State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP). Nichols Consulting Engineers, Chtd. (NCE), will assist us in performing the 2012 update of the Statewide Needs Assessment.

### **YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE!**

We need your immediate assistance on the following items:

1. To ensure a widespread dissemination of this request, this letter has been sent to the City Manager/County Administrative Officer, Public Works Director, City/County Engineer, and Finance Director. We recognize that the data may come from multiple sources, so we ask

your agency to coordinate among yourselves to ensure that the most recent and accurate information is entered. Please provide NCE with your agency's contact information if you are not the appropriate contact. This person(s) should be able to provide all the information requested in the survey. We need information on two main areas:

- a. Technical - pavement and safety, regulatory and traffic needs.
  - b. Financial - projected funding revenues/expenditures.
2. Fill out the online survey at [www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org](http://www.SaveCaliforniaStreets.org). Instructions for filling out the survey are enclosed. Your agency's login and password are:

Login: XXXX Password: XXXX
-------------------------------

It is essential that we have this data no later than May 15, 2012. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact:

Ms. Margot Yapp, P.E. Vice President/Project Manager Nichols Consulting Engineers, Chtd. 501 Canal Blvd, Suite I Pt. Richmond, CA 94804 (510) 215-3620 myapp@ncenet.com
---

We appreciate your help in providing this information.

Very truly yours,

Daniel Woldesenbet, President  
 County Engineers Association of California  
 Director of Public Works  
 County of Alameda

Randy Breault, President  
 Public Works Officers Department  
 League of California Cities  
 Director of Public Works/City Engineer  
 City of Brisbane

Enclosures: Fact Sheet  
 Instructions for Online Survey