

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside

1:15 p.m., Thursday, September 20, 2012
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, 4th Floor Dining Room
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 (Sep): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Funding agreement with City of San Carlos for constructing a green street treatment retrofit project on Bransten Rd for \$300,000• Approved – Funding agreement with San Mateo County Dept. of Housing for cooperative pursuit of housing solutions and cost sharing for consulting and staff support for FY 12/13 for \$125,000• Approved – Authorization of stormwater pollution prevention expenditure programs for accumulated countywide \$4 VRF• Approved – Agreement with Kimley-Horn and Assoc. to provide Smart Corridor traffic signals software/hardware, 5 year maintenance, and professional services for \$1.5M• Approved – Definition of “proximate access” to a PDA as it relates to the OBAG Program | Hoang | No materials |
| 3. | Approval of the Minutes from Aug 30, 2012 | Hoang | Page 1-6 |
| 4. | Review and recommend approval of a Call for Projects for the OneBayArea Grant Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds consisting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program (Action) | Higaki | Page 7-26 |
| 5. | Recommend Outcome of the Highway Program Project List (Action)
<i>(The TA will provide material in advance of the TAC Meeting)</i> | Chung (TA) | |
| 6. | Regional Project and Funding Information (Information) | Higaki | Page 27-50 |
| 7. | Trash Reduction Issues (Information – as needed) | Fabry | No materials |
| 8. | Executive Director Report | Napier | No materials |
| 9. | Member Reports | All | |

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

2012 TAC Roster and Attendance

Member	Agency	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jul	Aug 16	Aug 30
Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x	x	x	x	x		x
Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x		x	x	x	x	x
Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning		x					
Lee Taubeneck	Caltrans			x	x		x	x
Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Robert Ovardia	Daly City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x	x	x		x	x	x
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		x
Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Chip Taylor	Menlo Park Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ron Popp	Millbrae Engineering	x		x	x	x	x	x
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	
Peter Vorametsanti	Redwood City Engineering	x	x	x	x		x	
Klara Fabry	San Bruno Engineering	x	x		x	x		
Larry Patterson	San Mateo Engineering		x	x	x	x	x	x
Steve Monowitz	San Mateo County Planning	x			x			x
Dennis Chuck	South San Francisco Engineering	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Gerry Beaudin	South San Francisco Planning	n/a	n/a	n/a	x	x	x	x
Paul Nagengast	Woodside Engineering	x	x	x	x	x		
Kenneth Folan	MTC							

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

**August 30, 2012
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 4th Floor Dining Room, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Hurley called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, August 30, 2012.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jim Bigelow – CCAG CMEQ; Jean Higaki – C/CAG; John Hoang – C/CAG; Leticia Alvarez – Belmont; Jessica Manzi – RWC; Brian McMinn – SSF; Jim McKim – TA; Celia Chung – TA; Aidan Hughes – TA; Bret Swain – EPA; Mike Chan – TA; April Chan – SamTrans; Paul Krupka – Krupka Consulting

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

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

As noted on Agenda.

3. Approval of the Minutes from August 16, 2012.

Approved.

4. Release of Draft Highway Recommendations List

Copies of the presentation and draft recommendation list were handed out at the meeting (list attached). Aidan Hughes from the TA presented on the Measure A Highway Call for Projects process and results.

Key discussion items are summarized as follows:

- Funds that are programmed and allocated to specific projects are available to the project sponsors upon execution of a cooperative agreement with the TA.
- The evaluation panel consisted of TA staff, Matt Todd (Alameda CTC), and Ron Moriguchi (Caltrans). The funding assignment task was completed by TA staff.
- The TA Advisory Board members who oversaw the project selection process were Directors Groom, Foust, and Patridge.
- For projects with design and planning phases, the TA will be developing additional guidelines, as needed, to address the recent OBAG Complete Streets requirements. For cities with projects on the state right-of-way, Member Taubeneck indicated that Caltrans will provide guidance on Complete Streets through the standard cooperative process.
- Aidan indicated that he will mention comments from the TAC as well as reflecting observations of what was discussed during this meeting to the TA Board.
- The TA will consider the TAC inputs in developing policy for timeliness use of funds, which includes referring to previous inputs from the TAC as a starting point.

- The projects that were not funded performed poorly against the evaluation criteria. Member Ovadia and others requested that a copy of the evaluation criteria and scoring results be made available to the project sponsors.
- Aidan mentioned that one of the reasons a project would receive partial funding may be due to the uncertainty of the cost estimate of the later phases of the request.
- The TA will have separate conversations with individual project sponsors that either did not receive funding or received partial funding.
- Unallocated funds of around \$23M will be rolled over to the next call for projects, expected to be next spring. TA will develop “lessons learned” from the current call and incorporate into the next call for projects.
- The draft recommendation list will be made public today (August 30th).
- The TAC’s comments on the draft recommendation list need to be submitted to the TA by September 13th for incorporation into the final recommendations to the TA Board meeting planned for October. Comments will be conveyed to the Board. Any comments that the TAC can provide on the process will also be helpful.
- Clarifications were made that projects submitted for TA funding were not part of a countywide CIP project list.
- Member Patterson indicated that the C/CAG sponsored SR 92 Delaware Feasibility Study will need to be discussed that the San Mateo City Council.
- Member Patterson proposed that the TAC recommend advancing the program outcome as outlined, subject to the TA conversing with project sponsors who either did not receive funds or received partial funds for their respective projects. Member Breault countered that the TAC only received the resulting list and were not involved with the evaluation process and that the TA has utilized the TAC more as an advisory role rather than a technical role in evaluation of the projects. It was decided that the motion to support advancing the program outcome be postponed until the next TAC meeting in September. Member Ovadia mentioned that the extra time to review the criteria and scores will be beneficial for the project sponsors and indicated that it would be good if a more open process similar to the C/CAG BPAC’s scoring process be implemented in the future.

5. Regional Project and Funding Information

Jean Higaki reported that cities with federal earmarks will need to obligate or else will lose the funds.

6. Trash Reduction Issues (as needed)

None.

7. Executive Director Report

Sandy Wong, Deputy Director, mentioned that Rich Napier, Executive Director, has been out of the office the past weeks on vacation and tending to family priorities and is expected to be back in the office next week. Member Ovadia sent along the TAC members’ condolences to Rich.

8. Member Reports

None.

End of Meeting at 11:15 p.m.

ATTACHMENT A: Measure A Highway Call for Projects: DRAFT RECOMMENDATION LIST

Sponsor	Project	Overall Project Description	Total Measure A Hwy request (\$1,000s)	Recommendation (\$1,000s)			Project Scope Phases/Conditions	Funding Track
				A = B + C Total (ALLOCATE+PROGRAM)	B (Program and ALLOCATE)	C PROGRAM only (conditional allocation)		
A. RECOMMENDED FUNDING AS REQUESTED								
Brisbane	US 101 Candlestick Point interchange	A new compact diamond interchange at US 101 and Geneva Avenue (proposed extension); close Harney Way on/off ramps.	\$400	\$400	\$400		Supplemental studies for the PSR	OM
Burlingame	US 101 Broadway interchange	New seven-lane Broadway overcrossing including bike lanes and sidewalks; reconfiguration of existing on/off ramps; ramp meter installation.	\$36,000	\$36,000	\$36,000		Construction	OM
C/CAG	Staged US 101 HOV Lane project (Whipple to San Bruno)	Evaluation of a 13-mile hybrid of new HOV lane segments and auxiliary lane segments (to allow for conversion of left-hand mixed-low lane to HOV), based on ROW opportunities/constraints.	\$2,000	\$2,000		\$2,000	Program \$2,000 for PID/PSR (planning studies); allocation conditional on C/CAG Board resolution or policy supporting re-evaluation (or adoption) of HOV policy.	SR
C/CAG	US 101 Auxiliary lane	US 101 Auxiliary lane between Oyster Point Blvd interchange and the San Francisco County line	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000		PID/PSR	OM
C/CAG	SR 92 Delaware Feasibility Study	Evaluation of potential on/off ramp closures, reconfiguration of west side of SR92/US101 interchange, and local access issues	\$300	\$300	\$300		Preliminary planning	KCA
C/CAG	US 101/SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements	Evaluation of improvements for US-101 between Third Ave and Ralston interchanges (4.8 miles) and SR92 between I-280 and Foster City Blvd. (5.9 miles)	\$500	\$500	\$500		Preliminary planning	KCA
Foster City	Triton Drive widening	Add a second east-bound lane on Triton Dr between Foster City Blvd and Pilgrim Dr.; modifications to Metro Center Blvd between SR 92 and Foster City Blvd.	\$650	\$650	\$650		Construction	SR
Half Moon Bay	Poplar - Wavecrest: SR 1 safety and operational improvements	Create left-turn lanes at all intersections, add traffic signals, traffic calming and roadway widening	\$3,500	\$3,500		\$3,500	Program \$300 for Design: allocation conditional on Caltrans approval of PID/PSR and environmental clearance; Program \$3,200 for Construction: allocation conditional on Design completion.	KCA
Half Moon Bay	Main - Kehoe: SR 1 safety and operational improvements	Create left-turn and right-turn lanes at street intersections, add traffic signals, roadway widening	\$3,500	\$3,500		\$3,500	Program \$300 for Design: allocation conditional on Caltrans approval of PID/PSR and environmental clearance; Program \$3,200 for Construction: allocation conditional on Design completion.	KCA
Menlo Park	US 101 at Willow Rd interchange improvements	Interchange improvements	\$500	\$500	\$500		Consultant support for Environmental phase, pending clarification of existing Measure A allocation	OM

ATTACHMENT A: Measure A Highway Call for Projects: DRAFT RECOMMENDATION LIST

Sponsor	Project	Overall Project Description	Total Measure A Hwy request (\$1,000s)	Recommendation (\$1,000s)			Project Scope Phases/Conditions	Funding Track
				A = B + C	B	C		
				Total (ALLOCATE+PROGRAM)	(Program and) ALLOCATE	PROGRAM only (conditional allocation)		
Menlo Park	Sand Hill Rd signal coordination and interconnect	Traffic signal interconnection, adaptive traffic signal coordination, fiber optic cable and video surveillance installation on Sand Hill Road between I-280 and Santa Cruz Ave.	\$1,300	\$1,300	\$1,300		Construction	SR
Pacifica	SR 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement	Widen San Pedro Creek under the new bridge to eliminate flood hazards. New bridge includes Class I bike/pedestrian path.	\$3,500	\$3,500	\$3,500		Environmental \$100; Design \$170; ROW \$50; Construction \$3,200	KCA
Pacifica	SR 1 Fassler-Westport (Calera)	Widen existing 4-lane Highway 1 to 6 lanes between Fassler Ave and Reina Del Mar Ave (1.3 miles).	\$4,000	\$4,000		\$4,000	Program \$4,000 for Design: allocation conditional on City Council adopting EIR (environmental clearance).	SR
Redwood City	US 101 Woodside Road (SR 84) Interchange	Replace current loop interchange/substandard ramps configuration with standard diagonal or hook ramps; convert 5-legged intersection at Broadway/Woodside Rd to 4-way intersection; Blomquist/Seaport intersection improvements.	\$8,910	\$8,910	\$3,420	\$5,490	Allocate \$3,420 for environmental; Program \$5,490 for design - allocation conditional on environmental clearance	OM
San Bruno / SSF	I-380 congestion improvements	Technically determine improvements for I-380 corridor.	\$500	\$500	\$500		Preliminary planning	SR
San Carlos	Holly St/ US 101 interchange modifications	Convert current L-10 cloverleaf interchange to Type L-9 partial cloverleaf interchange by eliminating SW and NE quadrant ramps and realigning diagonal on- and off-ramps; add one lane and one -HOV lane to NB on-ramp; add one lane to NB off-ramp; add a grade-separated bike/pedestrian bike path through the interchange.	\$3,000	\$3,000		\$3,000	Program \$1,500 for environmental: allocation conditional on Caltrans approval of PSR/PID; Program \$1,500 for design: allocation conditional on environmental clearance	SR
City of San Mateo	SR 92 / El Camino Real ramp (SR82) modifications	Convert current L-10 cloverleaf interchange to Type L-9 partial cloverleaf interchange by eliminating 2 loop ramps and creating 2 diagonal ramps with signalized intersections at El Camino Real.	\$2,200	\$2,200	\$600	\$1,600	Allocate \$500 for environmental and \$100 for project management/oversight support for environmental; Program \$1,500 for design and \$100 for design support/oversight: allocation conditional on environmental clearance	KCA
A. SUBTOTAL			\$71,760	\$71,760	\$48,670	\$23,090		

ATTACHMENT A: Measure A Highway Call for Projects: DRAFT RECOMMENDATION LIST

Sponsor	Project	Overall Project Description	Total Measure A Hwy request (\$1,000s)	Recommendation (\$1,000s)			Project Scope Phases/Conditions	Funding Track
				A = B + C	B	C		
				Total (ALLOCATE+PROG RAM)	(Program and) ALLOCATE	PROGRAM only (conditional allocation)		
B. RECOMMENDED FUNDING LESS THAN REQUESTED								
East Palo Alto	University Ave/ US 101 interchange improvements	Stage 2A: New SB Palo-Alto-bound off-ramp; and widen north-side University Ave overcrossing for minimum corner sight distance and include shoulders/bike lanes and sidewalks. Stage 2B: widen south-side University overcrossing to include shoulders/bike lanes and sidewalks.	\$6,000	\$5,000	\$1,800	\$3,200	Allocate \$1,800 for the construction of Stage 2A off-ramp; Program \$3,200 for the Stage 2A north-side overcrossing widening: allocation conditional on TA review of cost-benefits associated with auto vs bike/pedestrian modes.	KCA
Half Moon Bay	SR 92 safety / operational improvements Half Moon Bay	Widening of shoulders and travel lanes to current standards, as well as sight improvements along SR 92 from 0.6 miles east of SR 1 to Pilarcitos Creek.	\$900	\$600	\$600		Preliminary planning	KCA
San Bruno / SSF	Skyline Blvd (SR 35) - widening from I-280 to Sneath Lane	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes	\$14,250	\$850	\$850		Preliminary Planning \$100; PID/PSR \$250; Environmental \$500	SR
City of San Mateo	US 101 Peninsula Ave /Poplar Ave Interchange Area safety improvements	Construction of a raised median on Poplar Ave between Idaho and US-101 (option 2A); bicycle and pedestrian improvements for the neighborhood east of Peninsula/101 interchange; Evaluation (Project Study Report) of the Peninsula/101 and Poplar/101 partial interchanges for safety and access improvements	\$3,000	\$2,500	\$1,500	\$1,000	Allocate \$1,500 for the design, environmental and construction of Option 2A median improvements; Program \$1,000 for the PSR allocation conditional on City Council resolution commitment to PSR	KCA
County of San Mateo	Hwy 1 (Mid Coast) Congestion, throughput and safety improvements	Hwy 1 between Gray Whale Cove and Miramar (7 miles): pedestrian crossings, left-turn lanes and medians at six locations.	\$1,500	\$500	\$500		Preliminary planning \$250; PID/PSR \$250	SR
South San Francisco	US 101 Produce Ave interchange	New 101 overcrossing connecting Utah Ave to San Mateo Ave; reconfigure existing SB ramps at Produce Ave and Airport Blvd; incorporate NB on-/off-ramps at S. Airport Blvd.	\$4,000	\$500	\$500		PID/PSR	SR
B. SUBTOTAL			\$29,650	\$9,950	\$5,750	\$4,200		

ATTACHMENT A: Measure A Highway Call for Projects: DRAFT RECOMMENDATION LIST

Sponsor	Project	Overall Project Description	Total Measure A Hwy request (\$1,000s)	Recommendation (\$1,000s)			Project Scope Phases/Conditions	Funding Track
				A = B + C	B	C		
				Total (ALLOCATE+PROGRAM)	(Program and) ALLOCATE	PROGRAM only (conditional allocation)		
C. NOT RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING								
							Phases requested	
Belmont	Ralston Ave Corridor Study and Improvements	Ralston Ave between US 101 and SR 92 (4 miles): Evaluation of existing intersections' Level of Service; walkability analysis; evaluate existing bike lanes for complete streets compatibility	\$120	\$0	\$0	\$0	Preliminary planning	
County of San Mateo	Bike facility improvements on Alpine at 280	Addition of a new green-colored bicycle lane by relocating/resurfacing existing travel lane on SB Alpine Road with attendant signage to delineate travel and bicycle lanes.	\$175	\$0	\$0	\$0	Construction	
Daly City	Traffic Signal System and Traffic Signal Controller Upgrade	Upgrade City traffic signal system by replacing old equipment, connecting traffic controllers to central traffic system and retiming signals.	\$115	\$0	\$0	\$0	Construction	
Millbrae	Millbrae Ave & Rollins Rd intersection improvements	Add second right-turn lane on NB Rollins Rd at Millbrae Ave intersection, and reconfigure intersection.	\$1,430	\$0	\$0	\$0	Environmental; Design; Construction.	
C. SUBTOTAL			\$1,840					

TOTAL (A+B+C) \$103,250 \$81,710 \$54,420 \$27,290

PSR: Project Study Report
 PID: Project Initiation Document

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 20, 2012

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

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Review and recommend approval of a Call for Projects for the OneBayArea Grant Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds consisting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review and recommend approval of a Call for Projects for the OneBayArea Grant Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds consisting of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

FISCAL IMPACT

Not applicable.

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Approximately \$11 million of Federal OBAG Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds is available.

- Approximately, \$6.5 million available for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program
- Approximately, \$4.5 million available for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

If a program is under subscribed, C/CAG board has the flexibility to make adjustments to the total amount of funds for each of these programs.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION

On May 17, 2012 the joint Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) adopted Resolution No. 4035 outlining the “OneBayArea Grant.

For San Mateo County, there will be approximately the following amounts of federal funds:

- \$8 million – Surface Transportation Program (STP)
- \$13 million - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)
- \$2 million - State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE)

Note: Federal Safe Routes to School Funds are not part of OBAG.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) and State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE)

At the August 9, 2012 the C/CAG board approved of the framework for Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for Local Streets and Roads. On June 9, 2011, the C/CAG board approved a funding commitment of the State Transportation Improvement Program-Transportation Enhancement (STIP-TE) towards the construction of a “Grand Boulevard” project on the El Camino Real. Consequently, STP and STIP-TE funds will not be open to competition.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ)

Approximately \$13 million of OBAG is federal CMAQ funds. Projects applying for funds must meet both OBAG and CMAQ eligibility requirements. Eligible project types consist of bicycle /pedestrian improvements and transportation for livable communities (TLC). It is proposed that the CMAQ funds be split between two programs, \$6.5 million for bicycle /pedestrian improvements and \$6.5 million for TLC. Approximately \$2 million of the \$6.5 million in TLC funds will be set aside for commitments made under the C/CAG 5th Cycle Transit Oriented Development (TOD) program leaving \$4.5 million available for a call for projects.

Below is the proposed call for projects schedule for the Bicycle/ Pedestrian and TLC programs:

	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Program	Transportation for Livable Communities
Action	Date	Date
Public Workshop* at the BPAC meeting	September 27, 2012	September 27, 2012
Public Workshop*	October 11, 2012	October 11, 2012
Call for Projects approved by the Board	October 11, 2012	October 11, 2012
Call for Projects Issued to the Agencies/ Public	October 15, 2012	October 15, 2012
Workshop held for project applicants	Early November 2012	Early November 2012
Application due date	December 14, 2012	December 14, 2012
Applications to TLC Selection Committee		December 22, 2012
Applications to BPAC Committee	December 22, 2012	
TLC selection committee meeting to select TLC projects		January 2013
BPAC project selection process	Jan - March 2013	
Present TLC Project list to the TAC & CMEQ		February/ March 2013
Present Project list to the Board	May 2013	May 2013
Project list to MTC	Mid May 2013	Mid May 2013
Project submissions due in FMS	Mid July 2013	Mid July 2013

* Public workshops are to inform the public of funding availability, to solicit project interest, and to comply with MTC public outreach requirements.

Screening Requirements and Scoring Criteria

Because the funding is subject to both federal CMAQ requirements and MTC resolution 4035, the project is subject to all Federal, State, and Regional requirements and deadlines. Projects must also follow all FHWA, Caltrans Local Assistance, and MTC delivery procedures.

MTC requires a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in ABAG recognized Priority Development Areas (PDAs). This may result in lower scoring projects, inside of a PDA, being funded over higher scoring projects outside of PDAs.

MTC also requires that half of all OBAG funds be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2015. All Preliminary Engineering (PE) funds must be submitted for obligation by January 1, 2015. All remaining OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2016. Projects that cannot meet this deadline should not apply for OBAG funding.

As part of the OBAG guidelines MTC requires that staff develop evaluation criteria for projects that place an emphasis on supporting projects in PDAs with high housing growth, projects that support multi-modal access, projects located in Communities of Concern (COC), projects in affordable housing PDAs, and mitigation projects in PDAs that overlap with Air District “Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE)” Communities.

Attached, is a list of minimum screening requirements and scoring criteria for the Bicycle /Pedestrian Improvements Program and the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. The minimum screening requirements are directives from either FHWA or MTC. As mentioned above, scoring criteria are generated from an OBAG compliance checklist that Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) must complete to demonstrate compliance with, the MTC PDA Growth Strategy.

Project Selection Process

The applications screening requirements, and scoring criteria for each program are identical however project sponsors should not apply to multiple programs for one project. Instead, project sponsors should review the program goals typical project types associated with each program and submit an application for the most suitable program. Applications will be screened for duplication.

The C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) will score projects for the Bicycle /Pedestrian Improvements Program. It is expected that a project selection committee, composed of staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District, and C/CAG will score projects for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.

Public Outreach

C/CAG will be expected to inform stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comment on project ideas and to “assist” community –based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in having project submitted for funding.

To comply with outreach requirements, C/CAG plans on utilizing committee and board meetings to allow for public input. C/CAG will host a public workshop at the September BPAC meeting and on October 11, 2012 to inform the public about funding opportunities, to solicit project ideas, and to adhere to MTC outreach policy. Staff has also performed additional outreach through informational mailings and emails to approximately 140 community based organizations.

As C/CAG is not a potential project sponsor, staff will direct/ refer any public entities, with project ideas, to partner with a local jurisdiction (Cities/ County).

ATTACHMENTS

1. Draft C/CAG OBAG Call For Projects Guidelines
2. Draft C/CAG OBAG Call For Projects Announcement
3. Draft Application for C/CAG OBAG Program
4. MTC OBAG Formula Factors and Distribution Within County

Overall OBAG and CMAQ Eligibility		C/CAG OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Call for Projects Guidelines Fiscal Years 2013/2014 – 2015/2016	
MTC OBAG Program Goals	MTC's funding approach to better integrate the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. OBAG program goals direct funding to reward local agencies that support regional land-use and housing policies.		
70% of OBAG Funds spent in PDAs	MTC requires a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in ABAG approved Priority Development Areas (PDAs).		
Timely Use of Funds	Countywide, half of all OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2015. All Preliminary Engineering (PE) funds must be submitted for obligation by January 1, 2015. All remaining OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2016.		
Single Point of Contact	Every recipient of funds will need to identify a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA administered funds within that agency. This person must have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out.		
Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements		Transportation for Livable Communities	
Program Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourage active transportation. Build out the bicycle and pedestrian network. Reduce vehicle trips. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Create enjoyable and safe multi modal experiences. Facilitate multi modal mobility. Enhance connections between alternative modes of transportation. Enhancements that create a "sense of place" to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. 	
Eligible Types of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks, or areas for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest. Permanent bicycle racks. Other improvements include bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. Signal modification for bicycle detection. Secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas Outreach and educational programs. <p>* Note: Fund source is intended to reduce vehicle trips and must not fund exclusively recreational projects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A combination of streetscape improvements such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, way finding signage, landscaping, and bicycle pedestrian treatments that create a "sense of place." Other improvements include bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. Streetscape improvements should strengthen the connections and facilitate the use of alternate modes of transportation. Storm water management as part of a streetscape project (drainage, costs associated with on-site storm water management, permeable pavement). 	
Minimum Screening Requirements			
CMAQ	Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed.		
Construction Phase	Project cannot be a design only project. Project funds may cover some design cost but project must include a fully funded construction phase. Non-infrastructure projects (e.g. Educational and Outreach) are federally categorized as a construction phase.		
Map project location in relation to a PDA	All project locations must be mapped. Projects not located directly in a PDA must show where project is located in proximity to a PDA. See attached definition of "proximate access to a PDA". See scoring criteria for further information.		
Online Complete Street Checklist	The Complete Streets online checklist must be completed for each project application.		
Minimum Local Match	Federally required 11.47% of total project cost in local funds (non-federal).		
Local Match Limitations	No "In-kind" match allowed. The minimum cash match is required for each "obligated" phase.		
Eligible Applicants	Federally recognized local agencies in San Mateo County (e.g. Cities, County, San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District)		
Minimum/ Maximum Grant Size	Minimum \$250,000*. Maximum allowable grant funds per jurisdiction is \$1,000,000 (for both programs).		
Housing Element	Applicant agency is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-14 RHNA prior to January 31, 2013. A city may also provide a time extension approval from the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee, however funds will not be programmed until the housing element is approved by HCD.		
Complete Streets Resolution or Letter	Applicant agency must address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. C/CAG will accept a letter of certification from jurisdiction's whose general plan is in compliance with the Complete Streets Act of 2008.		
Scoring Criteria			Maximum Score
Location in relation to a Priority Development Area	Projects are located in a PDA or in Proximity to a PDA (Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all OBAG funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA) (In a PDA -10pts, In proximate access to a PDA -5pts)		10
	Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production.		1 to 5
	Project is located in or near an affordable housing PDA. Project accessibility to public transit, especially "high-quality" transit. Project improves access to employment centers.		10
Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities	If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community, mitigation measures are in place to reduce resident exposure to particulate matter.		-2 to 2
Community of Concern	Project location in relation to Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community based Transportation Plans. Project is identified in one of the Community Based Transportation Plans developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities. (Project is in a CBTP -10pts, Project is located in a COC -5pts)		10
User Benefit	Project has a high need, is expected to have high use, and is expected to have a high return on investment.		13
Safety	Project is a safety project.		5
Planning	Project is listed in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, or area planning document).		5
Connectivity	Project connects housing/ jobs/ transit or project connects a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network. Project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach.		10
Support	Project has council approval and community support.		5
Match Funds	Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47-20% -2pts, 21-30%-5pts, 30%-40 -7 pts, 40%+ -10pts)		10
Readiness	Project is free of Right of Way complications (project has secured encroachment permits, or is entirely on city property)		5
	Project has secured all regulatory agency permits (e.g. BCDC, RWQCB, CCC, USFWS)		5
	Project is designed (1-5)		5

* In a unique situation the C/CAG Board has the discretion to fund a project between \$100,000 - \$250,000

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*

OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program Call for Projects

**Fiscal Years 2012/2013 - 2015/2016
Issued October 15, 2012**

The City/County Association Governments (C/CAG) of San Mateo County is pleased to announce a call for Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement projects under the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program.

The TLC Program and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program are components of OBAG. For the Fiscal Year 2012/2013 - 2015/2016 cycle, there is a total of approximately \$11,000,000 of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds available on a competitive basis under OBAG. The minimum grant amount is set at \$250,000 and the maximum amount that can be allocated per agency is \$1,000,000, for both the TLC Program and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program. Project applicants are limited to Local Public Agencies (LPAs) such as cities/towns in San Mateo County, the County of San Mateo, the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) or the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA). See <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/ola/contact/sm.pdf> for listing of eligible local agencies.

For the OneBayArea Grant call for projects, there are two categories of eligible project types. These two categories types are Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program. Project sponsors should not submit the same project to both programs. Project sponsors should review the program goals associated with each program and submit an application to the most suitable program for the particular project. Applications will be screened for duplication.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

The TLC Program is a transportation funding program that aims to improve the built environment to promote alternative transportation as well as create inviting public spaces. The program is intended to fund capital projects that support community-based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy into downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods and transit corridors, enhancing their amenities and ambiance while making them places where people want to live, work and visit.

The TLC Program uses federal transportation funds to financially assist local jurisdictions to construct projects that include amenities such as wider sidewalks, curb bulb outs, pedestrian scale

street furniture, pedestrian scale street lighting, crosswalks, storm water management and other streetscape enhancements. The program helps to construct these amenities in an effort to revitalize public spaces and promote and enhance alternative transportation such that citizens will be more inclined to utilize alternative transportation as a result of the built environment being made safer and more attractive to use. These enhancements should encourage citizens to visit downtowns, retail corridors and transit corridors without the use of the single-occupant automobile.

There is approximately \$4,500,000 available through the TLC Program.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program support bicycle and pedestrian projects in San Mateo County. This program is designed to build upon and enhance the San Mateo County bicycle network and pedestrian environment to encourage the use of active transportation such as walking or bicycling. The goal of this program is to continue to build out bicycle and pedestrian improvements to better connect San Mateo County to local destinations and the multimodal transportation network. This program aims to improve air quality by reducing vehicle trips and projects must not be exclusively recreational in nature as they should be commute oriented as required for eligibility for federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program may fund a wide variety of bicycle and pedestrian improvements such as Class I, II, and III bicycle facilities, bicycle education, outreach, bicycle sharing and parking, sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges, user safety and supporting facilities, and traffic signal actuation.

There is approximately \$6,500,000 available through the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program.

Proximate Access to Priority Development Areas (PDA)

The OBAG Program is a new funding approach that better integrates the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Subsequently, MTC requires that a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). A project lying outside the limits of a PDA may count towards the minimum if it directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA. Please see the definition of "proximate access to a PDA".

The following definition of "proximate access to a PDA" for OBAG is to be approved by the C/CAG Board of Directors on September 13, 2012:

1. Project provides direct access to a PDA...example, a road, sidewalk, or bike lane that leads directly into a PDA; or
2. Project is within ½ mile of a PDA boundary. (Modified from C/CAG's existing Transit Oriented Development Program (TOD)); or
3. Project is located on a street that hosts a transit route, which directly leads to a PDA; or
4. Project is located within ½ mile of one or more stops for two or more public or shuttle bus lines, or within ½ mile of a rail station or regional transit station, that is connected to a PDA. (Modified from LEED.); or
5. Project provides a connection between a Transit Oriented Development (TOD), as defined

- by C/CAG, and a PDA. (A C/CAG TOD is defined as a permanent high-density residential housing with a minimum density of 40 units per net acre, located within one-third (1/3) of a mile from a Caltrain or BART station or on a frontage parcel of the El Camino Real/Mission Street in San Mateo County.); or
6. Project is a bicycle/ pedestrian facility that is included in an adopted bicycle/pedestrian plan within San Mateo County and is a part of a network that leads to a PDA.

Jurisdiction and Project Requirements

Selected projects will be subject to federal, state, and regional delivery requirements as noted in MTC Resolution No. 3606. See http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf.

- Jurisdiction must be in compliance with the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy requirements at the time of project application.
- Jurisdiction must comply with all FHWA and Caltrans Local Assistance and MTC project delivery and reporting requirements.
- Every recipient of funds will need to identify a single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA administered funds within that jurisdiction. This person must have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out.
- Jurisdiction must provide a minimum FHWA required local match of 11.47%.
- Jurisdiction must submit a complete package for funding obligation by January 1st of the year programmed. Example, a project programmed in FY 2014/15, must submit a complete package for obligation by January 1, 2015. The failure to meet these deadlines may result in the de-programming and redirection of grant funds to other projects.
- Jurisdiction is to submit a “resolution of local support” prior to programming. Template for the resolution is found at:
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAO/STP_CMAO_LocalSupportReso.doc
- Jurisdiction is to input project information into the MTC Fund Management System (FMS) project application, prior to programming.

Please see the attached C/CAG OBAG Call for Projects Guidelines for eligibility and scoring criteria and adhere to the information stated in the scoring criteria in your application. Applications should be no more than 20 pages. For the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program, please submit 16 hard copies (one reproducible) and 1 electronic copy. For the TLC Program, please submit 6 hard copies (one reproducible) and 1 electronic copy. Applications must be completed using the Microsoft Word project application form posted at http://www.ccag.ca.gov/Call4prj_rfp.html.

Applications are due December 14, 2012 by 5:00 p.m., attention Tom Madalena.

Tom Madalena
C/CAG
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Additional information regarding regional OBAG requirements and policies can be found at:
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/onebayarea/RES-4035_approved.pdf.

For any questions regarding the program or application process please contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462 or jhigaki@smcgov.org or Tom Madalena, at 650-599-1460 or tmadalena@smcgov.org.

555 County Center, 5th Floor, Redwood City, CA 94063 PHONE: 650.599.1462 FAX: 650.361.8227

**C/CAG ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAM
APPLICATION FOR FISCAL YEARS 2012/2013 - 2015/2016**

Section 1: General Project Information

1) General Project Information

Sponsor Agency:

Implementing Agency:

Funds Requested
Minimum \$250,000
Maximum \$1,500,000:

2) Choose only one of the following programs to apply to.

- Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program

3) Single point of contact for all Federal Aid projects in your agency.

Name:

Title:

Agency:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

Section 2: Project Description

Project
Description:



Project
Location/Limits:
*(Include streets,
cross streets,
and project
limits, as
appropriate)*



Section 3: Screening Requirements

1) **Required attachment for all capital projects, map(s) that include the following elements (Please limit size to 11X17):**

- Project location in relation to an ABAG approved Priority Development Area (PDA). Include the PDA name and map the ABAG PDA boundary. Include measurements if supporting a “proximate access” claim.
- If project meets the definition of “proximate access” to a PDA, show details on map and describe how it meets the definition per Question 4.
- Proposed project. If multiple types of improvements are proposed throughout the project limits (e.g. a combination of Class 1 and Class 3 bicycle facilities), clearly indicate the limits of each type of improvement on the map.
- Differentiate existing and new facilities, as applicable (e.g. bikeways, sidewalks, crosswalks, traffic signals, etc.) If this project is closing a gap, clearly illustrate how project achieves this.

- Nearby transit facilities, activity centers and regional connectors (to the extent feasible).

2) Required for all projects, fill out Complete Streets online project and checklist information at <http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov/>

- Create and fill out information for a new project
- Create and fill out information for a new checklist. Associate new checklist to the newly created project.

What is the inputted Project Name?

What is the inputted Checklist Name?

3) Is this project located within the boundary of an ABAG approved PDA?

- Yes – Indicate project location relative to PDA on required map.
- No

4) Is this project in proximate access to PDA?

- Yes – Please see attached definition of “proximate access to a PDA” and include documentation that supports this claim on attached map.

Description of connection or proximity to a PDA:

- No

Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA.

5) Project Cost by Phase

Please fill in the funding table below.

	Requested OBAG Funds	Local Match (minimum 11.47%)	Other Project Funds	Total Project Funds
Preliminary Engineering				
Construction Capital				
Construction Support				
Total				

Is this still a viable project if partially funded? Please explain below.

- Yes
- No

Describe the source of "Other Project Funds":

6) General Plan Housing Element

Is the jurisdiction's Housing Element of the General Plan been adopted and certified by the State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-14 RHNA?

- Yes - Please attach supporting documentation of HCD approval. Skip next question.
- No

If no, will the Housing Element be adopted and certified by January 31, 2013?

- Yes
- No – Please attach extension approval documentation from the Joint MTC Planning/ ABAG Administrative Committee

Note: a jurisdiction without either a HCD approved housing element or an approved extension from the Joint MTC Planning/ ABAG Administrative Committee is ineligible to apply for funding.

7) Complete Streets Requirements

Is your jurisdiction's General Plan compliant with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008?

- Yes - Please attach a letter certifying that the general plan complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. Skip next question.
- No

If no, is an MTC compliant Complete Streets Resolution adopted by your jurisdiction?

- Yes - Please attach a copy of the adopted Complete Streets resolution.
- No – A Complete Streets Resolution will be adopted by Jan 31, 2013 and submitted to C/CAG.

Note: a jurisdiction without either a General Plan compliant with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 or a Complete Streets Resolution adopted by 1/31/13 is ineligible to receive funding.

Section 4: Scoring Criteria

1) Is this project located near an affordable housing PDA?

- Yes

List the PDA and describe how the agency preserves affordable housing in this PDA

- No

2) Is this project located near transit, especially "high-quality" transit?

- Yes

Describe the transit system and how the project improves access.

- No

3) Does this project improve access to employment centers?

Yes

Describe how the project improves access to employment centers.

No

4) Is this project located in a Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Impacted Community? See <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Planning-and-Research/CARE-Program.aspx>

Yes

No

If yes, are mitigation measures in place to reduce exposure to particulate matter?

Yes

Describe the mitigation measures.

No

5) Is this project identified in a Community Based Transportation Plan developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities? See <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/cbtp/> or http://www.ccag.ca.gov/plans_reports.html

Yes

If yes, please site the planning document and strategy number

No

Is this project located in or does this project serve a Community of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of a Community Based Transportation Plan? See http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/snapshot/0_COC_Reference_Map_11_17.pdf

Yes

Please describe how this projects serves a COC

No

6) Describe the user benefit of the proposed project.

Describe the project need, the expected use, and expected return on investment.

7) Is this project a safety project?

Yes

If yes, please describe the safety features of this project

No

8) Is this project identified in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, or specific area plan)?

Yes

If yes, please provide the plan names, adopted date, and page number.

No

9) Does this project provide connections to housing/ jobs/ transit or does the project connect gaps in the bicycle or pedestrian network?

Yes

If yes, please describe the connections.

No

10) Does this project have “Complete Streets” multi modal components?

Yes

Describe the multiple components of this projects multi modal design.

No

11) Does this project have local community involvement in the planning process leading to the project and local support and/ or council approval?

Yes – Attach any supporting documentation (e.g. letters of support).

If yes, please describe the community involvement and/ or evidence of local support.

No

Readiness

12) Is this project’s schedule dependent on the progress of another project?

Yes

If yes, please describe.

No

13) Is this project located entirely within the sponsor's right of way?

Yes

No

If no, please list if any permits and/ or easements been identified and/or acquired?

14) Is this project expected to involve utility relocation above that of utility cover adjustments?

Yes

If yes, please list if any identified utility relocations?

No

15) Is this project near the coast, bay front, refuge, or other environmentally sensitive areas?

Yes

If yes, list expected studies/ permits or environmental issues?

No

16) Does this project require agreements with other jurisdictions or regulatory agencies?

Yes

If yes, list expected agreements?

No

17) Is this project partially designed?

Yes

If yes, indicated status (e.g. 35%, 65%, 90%) and indicated if the design has been reviewed by Caltrans.

No

18) Please input the project schedule

	Date
FHWA OBAG Program Approval	9/15/2013
Planning Complete	
Field Review/ Begin Environmental Studies	
NEPA and CEQA Approval	
R/W Certification	
Complete PS&E	
Obtain E-76 from Caltrans	
Ready to Advertise	
Contract Award	

Note: Half of all OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2015. All Preliminary Engineering (PE) funds must be submitted for obligation no later than January 1, 2015. All remaining OBAG funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2016.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) OBAG Formula Factors and Distribution Within County

April 2012

County	Population		Very Low + Low Income	2007-2011 RHNA			1999-2006 Housing Production			
	2010 Population	Intra-County		Intra-County	Total Units	Intra-County	Very Low + Low	Intra-County	Total Units	Intra-County
SAN MATEO COUNTY										
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%
SAN MATEO TOTAL:	718,451	100.0%	6,169	100.0%	15,738	100.0%	1,468	100.0%	9,286	100.0%
SANTA CLARA COUNTY										
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%
SANTA CLARA TOTAL:	1,781,642	100.0%	23,445	100.0%	60,338	100.0%	12,217	100.0%	48,893	100.0%
SOLANO COUNTY										
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%
SOLANO TOTAL:	413,344	100.0%	5,034	100.0%	12,985	100.0%	1,952	100.0%	15,435	100.0%
SONOMA COUNTY										
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%
SONOMA TOTAL:	483,878	100.0%	5,398	100.0%	13,650	100.0%	5,110	100.0%	18,209	100.0%
Bay Area Total	7,150,739	100.0%	83,940	100.0%	214,500	100.0%	39,513	100.0%	182,121	100.0%

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: September 20, 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

- MAP 21 – The new federal Surface Transportation Act, known as “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century” or MAP-21 was signed in to law on July 6, 2012. Given the major changes inherent in MAP-21, a measured approach to implementation is proposed which will allow time to receive additional guidance from the Federal Department of Transportation. In response to MAP-21 the state developed implementing legislation: SB 1027. This information is attached.

- Federal Aid Announcements – The following are general announcements related to Fed-Aid projects.
 - "Revised Form FHWA-1273 for Federal-aid Construction Contracts" has been posted at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DLA_OB/DLA_OB.htm.
The revised Form FHWA-1273 dated May 1, 2012 shall be physically included in the contract of all Federal-aid construction projects authorized on or after August 9, 2012; and of all Federal-aid construction projects advertised on or after September 1, 2012.
 - An Updated Sample Notice to Bidders and Special Provisions has been posted on the at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/sam_boil/sam_boil.htm
New FHWA-1273, May 1, 2012, and new Race Conscious DBE Specification Language have been updated in the Sample Notice to Bidders and Special Provisions. The new FHWA-1273 must be used on all Federal-aid projects authorized after August 9, 2012 and or advertised after September 1, 2012. The new race conscious specifications must be used on all Federal-aid projects authorized after July 1, 2012 and or advertised after August 17, 2012.
 - Denix Anbiah, Chief, Division of Local Assistance has issued a letter to all cities and counties informing them that federal funds are available under MAP-21 to rehabilitate and replace deficient bridges and to fund bridge preventive maintenance activities. Caltrans will continue to use existing procedures to program these projects under MAP-21. For details, please see the letter at this link: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/>
 - A New Quarterly Program Status Report and the SR2S Program Delivery Requirements is posted at: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/sr2s_delivery_status.htm
The Department of Transportation (Caltrans) is now requiring local agencies to meet specific delivery timelines for the state-legislated SR2S Program. Agencies with existing SR2S projects that are not meeting these timelines will not be able to compete for additional funds until their projects are back on schedule.
- Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification Listing – In accordance with section 2108.1 of the Streets and Highway Code, MTC requires cities and counties submitting pavement maintenance and rehabilitation projects for funding to utilize a Pavement Management Program (PMP). The status of the PMP certifications is attached. Jurisdictions should recertify or extend their PMP certification before the expiration date.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Obligation Status list generated on 9/10/2012
2. Inactive list generated on 9/11/12
3. MAP-21 Information and State Legislation
4. PMP Certification Status generated on 9/5/12

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
 Local Highway Bridge Program (HBP) Report
 Fiscal Years : FY 11/12
 September 10, 2012

PDWG 09/17/12: Item 3A(iii)

San Mateo County

Projects Listed Under Group Listing VAR991007

County	Sponsor	Project Name	FMS ID	Fund Code	Prefix	Federal Proj ID	Fund No.	Bridge No.	Phase	Appn FY	Prog FY	Program Amount	Oblig Date	Oblig Amount	Remaining Balance
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	BRIDGE NO. 35C0025, MAIN ST OVER	5224.00	HBP-T4-L		5357006	3561	35C0025	ROW	11/12	11/12	88,530			88,530
San Mateo	San Mateo	Bermuda Drive Bridge Rehabilitation (35C0077)	5190.00	HBP-T4-L	BRLS	5102033	3428	35C0077	PE		09/10	72,595	02/17/2012	72,595	0
San Mateo	San Mateo	Bermuda Drive Bridge Rehabilitation (35C0077)	5190.00	HBP-T4-L	BRLS	5102033	3428	33C0077	PE		10/11	60,200	02/17/2012	60,200	0
San Mateo	San Mateo	Bermuda Drive Bridge Rehabilitation (35C0077)	5190.00	HBP-T4-L		5102033	3428	35C0077	PE		11/12	199,193			199,193
San Mateo	San Mateo Co	PM00041, Bridge Preventive Maintenance	5287.00	HBP-T4-L	BPMP	5935062	3466	PM00041	PE	11/12	11/12	88,530	03/16/2012	88,530	0
San Mateo	SSF	Bridge No. PM00049 Bridge Preventive	5200.00	HBP-T4-L		5177026	3609	PM00049	CON	11/12	11/12	169,004			169,004
San Mateo	SSF	Bridge No. PM00049 Bridge Preventive	5200.00	HBP-T4-L	BPMP	5177026	3609		PE		11/12	4,648	06/12/2012	26,790	-22,142
San Mateo	Woodside	Portola Rd Bridge Replacement (35C0055)	5469.00	HBP-T4-L	BRLS	5333012	3790	35C0055	PE		11/12	167,109	03/16/2012	167,109	0
San Mateo	Woodside	Mountain Home Rd Bridge Rehab (35C0122)	5470.00	HBP-T4-L	BHLS	5333013	3793	35C0122	PE		11/12	95,106	03/16/2012	95,106	0
San Mateo	Woodside	Kings Mountain Rd Bridge Rehab (35C0123)	5471.00	HBP-T4-L	BHLS	5333014	3791	35C0123	PE		11/12	119,595	03/16/2012	119,595	0
San Mateo County Totals												1,064,510		629,925	434,585

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

PDWG 09/17/12: Item 3A(iv)

Fiscal Years: FY 11/12
September 10, 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	
San Mateo County																	
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	HSIPL	5196037	12/13	11/12	33,300			06/01/12	33,300		
San Mateo	Menlo Park	Safe Routes to Hillview Middle School	CON	REG090001	SRTS-T3-1	5112.00	SRTSL	5273017	10/11	11/12			127,600	05/10/12		117,600	10,000
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	Redwood City	Hoover Elementary SRTS	PE	REG090001	SRTS-T4-3	5526.00	SRTSL	5029(030)	11/12	11/12			56,500	04/26/12			56,500
San Mateo	Redwood City	Redwood City School District Safe Walking/Cycling	CON	REG090001	SRTS-T4-3	5542.00	SRTSLNI	5029029	11/12	11/12			204,000	05/22/12		204,000	
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			17,500	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	HSIP	5267017	12/13	11/12	171,000			06/01/12	171,000		
San Mateo	Woodside	Woodside School's Safety Improvement Project	PE	REG070009	HSIP-T4-4	5314.00	HSIPL	5333015	11/12	11/12	36,000			07/06/12	36,000		
San Mateo County Totals											700,188	0	405,600	697,162	0	349,100	59,526

Quarterly Review of Inactive Obligations
 Local, State Administered Locally Funded and Rail Projects
 (Review Period 04/01/2012- 06/30/2012)

Updated on 09/11/2012		Inactive Projects (Review period: 04/01/2012-06/30/2012)										Updated on 09/11/2012		Inactive Projects (Review period: 04/01/2012-06/30/2012)						
Project No	LOOK AHEAD	Agency/District Action Required	State Project No	Prefix	District	County	Agency	RTPA	MPO	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal	3-Tier Criteria	Project No
6097004	INACTIVE	Contact DLAE.	04928470L	STPLX	04	SM	San Francisco International Airport	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	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	3,301,726.00	323,134.00	2,978,592.00	TIER 1	6097004
5376001	6 MONTH	Invoice being processed by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	04923418L	BRLZ	04	SM	Brisbane	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	TUNNEL AVENUE BR (BR. NO. 35C-0124), BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	10/7/2011	5/30/2000	10/7/2011	Q120,Q100,L1CE,L1C0,H100	15,015,505.00	11,976,023.00	11,322,327.70	653,695.30	TIER 1	5376001
5273017	INACTIVE	Invoice being processed by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	04924751L	SRTS	04	SM	Menlo Park	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	SANTA CRUZ AVE: LEMON AVE TO SAN MATEO AVE, INSTALL CROSSWLK, PED SFTY,AND	7/22/2009	10/30/2007	7/22/2009	LU20	133,000.00	133,000.00	15,400.00	117,600.00	TIER 2	5273017

Moving Forward with MAP-21 *August 8, 2012*

The new federal Surface Transportation Act, known as “Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century” or MAP-21 was signed in to law on July 6, 2012. Prior to this overhaul of federal surface transportation laws, the last major changes at the federal level occurred with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA, pronounced Ice-Tea), more than 20 years ago. Given the major changes inherent in MAP-21, a measured approach to implementation is in order. A measured approach will also allow time to receive additional guidance from the Federal Department of Transportation. The bullets below detail the highlights of the Administration’s proposal for MAP-21.

- Funding levels remain the same as Federal Fiscal Year 2012 at \$3.5 billion.
- The Administration’s proposal focuses on maintaining a status quo funding level for overall funding – ensuring that the State and Local Agencies each receive a total share of funding consistent with total funding received under prior federal acts.
- One cannot view each program in isolation because of the dramatic restructuring of programs and funding included in MAP-21. Many programs were eliminated or combined, and new programs were created. The significant changes to programs and program eligibility add to the challenge of creating a funding plan that maintains current total funding levels.
- The proposal retains the existing funding splits between the State and the Locals/Regions - approximately \$2.2 Billion State (62%), approximately \$1.3 billion for Locals/Regions (38%). Changes in this split in the next two years could result in projects that are almost ready to go to construction being removed from the program due to lack of funding.
- Allows for a transitional period recognizing that the regions and the State already have projects programmed against these funds under existing rules:
 - Continues the current level of RSTP funding.
 - Continues the current level of SHOPP program.
 - Continues the current level of Bridge funding for both state and local bridges. The program would continue to be administered by the state.
 - Continues the flow of CMAQ and MP apportionments to regions using existing formulas.
 - Divides the HSIP program as required in MAP-21 after setting aside funds for SRTS.
 - Continues the Safe Routes to School program which would remain administered by the state.
 - Transportation Alternatives Program funding would continue under the STIP formula after setting aside \$5 million for Recreational Trails.
- Legislative changes are not necessary to allow apportionment of funds within California, provided that the state pursues a “status quo” approach discussed above.
- MAP-21 includes and inflation increased to apportionments for FFY 2014. Increases will be applied to programs and all splits.
- Working groups are being established to discuss potential program changes that will take into account federal guidance and performance measurements for MAP-21. The intention is to have a first draft of proposed legislation in early 2013. There will need to be a transition period to implement any program changes.

Compared to Current SAFETEA-LU Extension

SAFTEA-LU FFY 2012		\$*M		State		Local	
Program							
IM		575		575			
NH		727		727			
HBP		550		248		303	
STP		721		270		451	
BIP		25		25			
EB		182		182			
Subtotal		2,780		2,027		753	
CMAQ		468				468	
MP		42				42	
HSIP		134		67		67	
RRXing		15		7		7	
SRTS		21				21	
RT		5		5			
TE		78		78			
TOTAL		3,544		2,185		1,359	38%

MAP-21 FFY 2013		\$*M		State		Local	
Program							
NHP		1,897		1,897			
Bridges on NHS are eligible under NHPP or STP							
Bridges off-system are eligible under STP							
STP		873		436		436	
Equity Bonus funds discontinued, funding inherent in other programs							
Subtotal		2,770		2,334		436	
CMAQ		445				445	
MP		48				48	
HSIP		209		104		104	
SRTS may be funded from HSIP or TA, or STP							
TAP		72		36		36	
TOTAL		3,544		2,474		1,069	30%

MAP-21 Rev. FFY 2013		\$*M		State		Local	
Program							
NHP		1,897		1,670			
NHS Bridges							228
Bridges on NHS are eligible under NHPP or STP							
Bridges off-system are eligible under STP							
Off-system Bridges							75
STP		873		347		451	
Subtotal		2,770		2,017		753	
CMAQ		445				445	
MP		48				48	
HSIP		209		94		94	
SRTS							21
SRTS may be funded from TA, HSIP, or STP							
TAP		72		67			
Recreational Trails							5
TOTAL		3,544		2,183		1,361	38%

Notes:

- 1-Consolidation of programs under MAP-21 provides flexibility for new programs to fund projects previously funded under discontinued SAFETEA-LU programs.
- 2-MAP-21 includes an inflation increase to apportionments for FFY 2014. Increases will be applied to all programs and all splits.
- 3-Highway Bridge work may be funded under new programs such as STP or NHPP with performance targets that if not met, would result in penalties to NHPP funds.
- 4-Funds set aside from the NHPP and STP for the local bridges will be managed by the Department, with the advice of the Highway Bridge Program Advisory Committee, in order to meet the Performance Measures and avoid penalties.
- 5-The Local share shown represents subvention funds to Local Assistance that are voted as a lump-sum item by the CTC annually, with the exception of MP.
- 6-The TAP is proposed for distribution through the STIP formula, to fund programmed TE projects.
- 7-State Highway System projects or Local projects may be funded from State or Local shares if programmed by the MPOs/voted by the CTC.
- 8-Penalty under 23 USC 164 (+/- \$70M) and State Planning and Research take down (2% from each program for a total of +/- \$70M) is not included in these estimates.
- 9-Estimates are preliminary and based current available data.
- 10-For on-system bridges not on NHS, State may exchange NHPP with STP.

From: William Ridder <Ridder@sjcog.org>
To: "CalRTPA@yahoogroups.com" <CalRTPA@yahoogroups.com>
CC: "Martinez, Erica" <Erica.Martinez@asm.ca.gov>
Date: 08/27/12 10:57 AM
Subject: [CalRTPA] FW: MAP-21 state legislation introduced.
Attachments: SKMBT_28312082409290.pdf

Dear All:

On Friday we introduced MAP-21 state implementing legislation: SB 1027. The proposal addresses the following categories: STP, CMAQ, HSIP and TA. After hearing many discussions, it's clear that while MAP-21 provides a lot of flexibility, our core priorities for these funds have not radically changed. The bill provides one potential roadmap for implementing our federal transportation funds. The bill is a marker for a broader and more robust conversation. I am sure that there are some aspects of the bill that you will like and other aspects that will benefit from more discussion. As such, the bill is not intended to move forward in the last days of session, but rather its purpose is to serve as a visual roadmap for a collective conversation with stakeholders and the Legislature.

Please send me your questions, comments, concerns, complaints, etc.

I look forward to helping good things happen with these funds next year.

Erica--
Office of Speaker John A. Perez
916 319 2465

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 1
 Substantive

AMENDMENTS TO SENATE BILL NO. 1027
 AS AMENDED IN ASSEMBLY JULY 3, 2012

Amendment 1

In the title, in line 1, strike out “relating to the Budget Act of 2012” and insert:

to amend Sections 182.6, 182.7, 2331, 2333, 2333.5, 2370, 2371, 2372, 2373, and 2374 of, to amend the heading of Chapter 7.5 (commencing with Section 2370) of Division 3 of, and to add Sections 182.51, 2375, 2376, 2377, 2378, 2379, 2380, and 2381 to, the Streets and Highways Code, relating to transportation

Amendment 2

On page 1, before line 1, insert:

SECTION 1. Section 182.51 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

182.51. (a) Commencing with the 2012–13 federal fiscal year, of the federal Surface Transportation Program funds apportioned to California that remain after funding from this source transportation planning responsibilities with a 2 percent set aside and off-system bridge activities described in subsection (b)(2) of Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code with a set aside equivalent to 15 percent of the amount of funds that were apportioned to the state for the federal Highway Bridge Program for the 2008–09 federal fiscal year, the department shall, pursuant to federal law, apportion 62.5 percent of the funds to metropolitan planning organizations and transportation planning agencies as provided in Section 182.6. The funds apportioned under this subdivision shall be treated as regional surface transportation program funds and shall be subject to the processes and requirements of Section 182.6.

(b) The remaining 37.5 percent of federal Surface Transportation Program funds apportioned to California that may be expended pursuant to federal law in any area of the state shall be available for obligation and expenditure by the department in any area of the state.

(c) Notwithstanding Sections 182 and 182.5, Sections 188, 188.8, and 825 do not apply to the funds described in subdivision (a).

SEC. 2. Section 182.6 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

182.6. (a) Notwithstanding Sections 182 and 182.5, Sections 188, 188.8, and 825 do not apply to the expenditure of an amount of federal funds ~~equal to~~ required to be apportioned to metropolitan planning organizations and transportation planning agencies pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 182.51, including the amount of federal funds apportioned to the state pursuant to that portion of subsection (b)(3) (b)(2) of Section 104, subsections (a) and (c) of Section 157, and subsection (d) of Section 160 of Title 23 of the United States Code that is allocated within the state subject to subsection (d)(3) (d)(1) of Section 133 of that code. These funds ~~shall be~~ are known as the regional surface transportation program funds. The department, the transportation planning agencies, the county transportation commissions, and the metropolitan planning



RN1223512

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 2
 Substantive

organizations may do all things necessary in their jurisdictions to secure and expend those federal funds in accordance with the intent of federal law and this chapter.

(b) ~~(1)~~ The regional surface transportation program funds shall be apportioned by the department to the metropolitan planning organizations designated pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code and, in areas where none has been designated, to the transportation planning agency designated pursuant to Section 29532 of the Government Code. The funds shall be apportioned in the manner and in accordance with the formula set forth in subsection ~~(d)(3)~~ ~~(d)(1)~~ of Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code, except that the apportionment shall be among all areas of the state. ~~Funds~~

(2) ~~Funds~~ apportioned under this ~~subdivision~~ section shall remain available for three federal fiscal years, including the federal fiscal year apportioned.

(c) Where county transportation commissions have been created by Division 12 (commencing with Section 130000) of the Public Utilities Code, all regional surface transportation program funds shall be further apportioned by the metropolitan planning organization to the county transportation commission on the basis of relative population.

In the Monterey Bay region, all regional surface transportation program funds shall be further apportioned, on the basis of relative population, by the metropolitan planning organization to the regional transportation planning agencies designated under subdivision (b) of Section 29532 of the Government Code.

(d) The applicable metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, or transportation planning agency shall annually apportion the regional surface transportation program funds for projects in each county, as follows:

(1) An amount equal to the amount apportioned under the federal-aid urban program in federal fiscal year 1990–91 adjusted for population. The adjustment for population shall be based on the population determined in the 1990 federal census except that no county shall be apportioned less than 110 percent of the apportionment received in the 1990–91 fiscal year. These funds shall be apportioned for projects implemented by cities, counties, and other transportation agencies on a fair and equitable basis based upon an annually updated five-year average of allocations. Projects shall be nominated by cities, counties, transit operators, and other public transportation agencies through a process that directly involves local government representatives.

(2) An amount not less than 110 percent of the amount that the county was apportioned under the federal-aid secondary program in federal fiscal year 1990–91, for use by that county.

(e) The department shall notify each metropolitan planning organization, county transportation commission, and transportation planning agency receiving an apportionment under this section, as soon as possible each year, of the amount of obligation authority estimated to be available for program purposes.

The metropolitan planning organization and transportation planning agency, in cooperation with the department, congestion management agencies, cities, counties, and affected transit operators, shall select and program projects in conformance with federal law. The metropolitan planning organization and transportation planning agency shall submit its transportation improvement program prepared pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code to the department for incorporation into the state transportation improvement program not later than August 1 of each even-numbered year beginning in 1994.

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 3
 Substantive

(f) Not later than July 1 of each year, the metropolitan planning organizations, and the regional transportation planning agencies, receiving obligational authority under this article shall notify the department of the projected amount of obligational authority that each entity intends to use during the remainder of the current federal fiscal year, including, but not limited to, a list of projects that will be obligated by the end of the current federal fiscal year. Any federal obligational authority that will not be used shall be redistributed by the department to other projects in a manner that ensures that the state will continue to compete for and receive increased obligational authority during the federal redistribution of obligational authority. If the department does not have sufficient federal apportionments to fully use excess obligational authority, the metropolitan planning organizations or regional transportation planning agencies relinquishing obligational authority shall make sufficient apportionments available to the department to fund alternate projects, when practical, within the geographical areas relinquishing the obligational authority. Notwithstanding this subdivision, the department shall comply with subsections ~~(d)(3)~~ (d)(1) and (f) of Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(g) A regional transportation planning agency that is not designated as, nor represented by, a metropolitan planning organization with an urbanized area population greater than 200,000 pursuant to the 1990 federal census may exchange its annual apportionment received pursuant to this section on a dollar-for-dollar basis for nonfederal State Highway Account funds, which shall be apportioned in accordance with subdivision (d).

(h) (1) If a regional transportation planning agency described in subdivision (g) does not elect to exchange its annual apportionment, a county located within the boundaries of that regional transportation planning agency may elect to exchange its annual apportionment received pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) for nonfederal State Highway Account funds.

(2) A county not included in a regional transportation planning agency described in subdivision (g), whose apportionment pursuant to paragraph (2) of subdivision (d) was less than 1 percent of the total amount apportioned to all counties in the state, may exchange its apportionment for nonfederal State Highway Account funds. If the apportionment to the county was more than 3 ½ percent of the total apportioned to all counties in the state, it may exchange that portion of its apportionment in excess of 3 ½ percent for nonfederal State Highway Account funds. Exchange funds received by a county pursuant to this section may be used for any transportation purpose.

(i) The department shall be responsible for closely monitoring the use of federal transportation funds, including regional surface transportation program funds to assure full and timely use. The department shall prepare a quarterly report for submission to the commission regarding the progress in use of all federal transportation funds. The department shall notify the commission and the appropriate implementation agency whenever there is a failure to use federal funds within the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(j) The department shall provide written notice to implementing agencies when there is one year remaining within the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) ~~of this section~~.

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 4
 Substantive

(k) Within six months of the date of notification required under subdivision (j), the implementing agency shall provide to the department a plan to obligate funds that includes, but need not be limited to, a list of projects and milestones.

(l) If the implementing agency has not met the milestones established in the implementation plan required under subdivision (k), prior to the end of the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (2) of subdivision (b), the commission shall redirect those funds for use on other transportation projects in the state.

(m) Notwithstanding subdivisions (g) and (h), regional surface transportation program funds available under this section exchanged pursuant to Section 182.8 may be loaned to and expended by the department. The department shall repay from the State Highway Account to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund all funds received as federal reimbursements for funds exchanged under Section 182.8 as they are received from the Federal Highway Administration, except that those repayments are not required to be made more frequently than on a quarterly basis.

(n) Prior to determining the amount for local subvention required by this section, the department shall first deduct the amount authorized by the Legislature for increased department oversight of the federal subvented program.

SEC. 3. Section 182.7 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

182.7. (a) Notwithstanding Sections 182 and 182.5, Sections 188, 188.8, and 825 do not apply to the expenditure of an amount of federal funds equal to the amount of federal funds apportioned to the state pursuant to ~~subsection (b)(2)~~ (b)(4) of Section 104 of Title 23 of the United States Code. These funds shall be known as the congestion mitigation and air quality program funds and shall be expended in accordance with Section 149 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The department, the transportation planning agencies, and the metropolitan planning organizations may do all things necessary in their jurisdictions to secure and expend those federal funds in accordance with the intent of federal law and this chapter.

(b) ~~The congestion mitigation and air quality program funds, including any funds to which subsection (c) of Section 110 of Title 23 of the United States Code, as added by subdivision (a) of Section 1310 of Public Law 105-178, applies, shall be apportioned by the department to the metropolitan planning organizations designated pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code and, in areas where none has been designated, to the transportation planning agency established by Section 29532 of the Government Code. The All funds apportioned to the state pursuant to Section 104(b)(4) of Title 23 of the United States Code shall be apportioned to metropolitan planning organizations and transportation planning agencies responsible for air quality conformity determinations in federally designated air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas within the state in the manner and in accordance with the formula set forth in subsection (b)(2) of Section 104 of Title 23 of the United States Code. Funds apportioned as follows:~~

(1) The department shall apportion these funds in the ratio that the weighted nonattainment and maintenance population in each federally designated area within the state bears to the total of all weighted nonattainment and maintenance area populations in the state.

(2) Subject to paragraph (3), the weighted nonattainment and maintenance area population shall be calculated by multiplying the population of each area in the state

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 5
 Substantive

that is a nonattainment area or maintenance area as described in Section 149(b) of Title 23 of the United States Code for ozone or carbon monoxide by the following factors:

(A) A factor of 1.0, if, at the time of apportionment, the area is a maintenance area.

(B) A factor of 1.0, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a marginal ozone nonattainment area under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7511 et seq.).

(C) A factor of 1.1, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a moderate ozone nonattainment area under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7511 et seq.).

(D) A factor of 1.2, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a serious ozone nonattainment area under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7511 et seq.).

(E) A factor of 1.3, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as a severe ozone nonattainment area under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7511 et seq.).

(F) A factor of 1.4, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is classified as an extreme ozone nonattainment area under Subpart 2 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7511 et seq.).

(G) A factor of 1.0, if, at the time of the apportionment, the area is not a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone, but is classified under Subpart 3 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide.

(H) A factor of 1.0, if, at the time of apportionment, an area is designated as a nonattainment area for ozone under Subpart 1 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7512 et seq.).

(3) If, in addition to being designated as a nonattainment or maintenance area for ozone as described in paragraph (2), any county within the area is also classified under Subpart 3 of Part D of Title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 7512 et seq.) as a nonattainment or maintenance area described in paragraph (2) for carbon monoxide, the weighted nonattainment or maintenance area population of the county, as determined under subparagraphs (A) to (F), inclusive, or subparagraph (H) of paragraph (2), shall be further multiplied by a factor of 1.2.

(4) Funds allocated under this subdivision shall remain available for three federal fiscal years, including the federal fiscal year apportioned. Notwithstanding the foregoing, the formula for distributing apportionments made to metropolitan planning organizations and transportation planning agencies eligible for funding according to subsection (b)(2) of Section 104 of Title 23 of the United States Code shall, for the 2007 and 2008 federal fiscal years, provide apportionments for the Monterey Bay and Santa Barbara regions such that each shall receive 50 percent of its 2005 apportionment in federal fiscal year 2007 and 25 percent of its 2005 apportionment in federal fiscal year 2008.

(c) Notwithstanding subdivision (b), where county transportation commissions have been created by Division 12 (commencing with Section 130000) of the Public Utilities Code, all congestion mitigation and air quality program funds shall be further apportioned by the metropolitan planning organization to the county transportation commission on the basis of relative population within the federally designated air quality nonattainment and maintenance areas after first apportioning to the

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 6
 Substantive

nonattainment and maintenance areas in the manner and in accordance with the formula set forth in ~~subsection (b)(2) of Section 104 of Title 23 of the United States Code~~ subdivision (b).

In the Monterey Bay region, all congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program funds shall be further apportioned, on the basis of relative population, by the metropolitan planning organization to the regional transportation planning agencies designated under subdivision (b) of Section 29532 of the Government Code.

(d) The department shall notify each metropolitan planning organization, transportation planning agency, and county transportation commission receiving an apportionment under this section, as soon as possible each year, of the amount of obligational authority estimated to be available for expenditure from the federal apportionment. The metropolitan planning organizations, transportation planning agencies, and county transportation commissions, in cooperation with the department, congestion management agencies, cities and counties, and affected transit operators, shall select and program projects in conformance with federal law. Each metropolitan planning organization and transportation planning agency shall, not later than August 1 of each even-numbered year beginning in 1994, submit its transportation improvement program prepared pursuant to Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code to the department for incorporation into the state transportation improvement program.

(e) Not later than July 1 of each year, the metropolitan planning organizations and the regional transportation planning agencies receiving obligational authority under this section, shall notify the department of the projected amount of obligational authority that each entity intends to use during the remainder of the current federal fiscal year, including, but not limited to, a list of projects that will use the obligational authority. Any federal obligational authority that will not be used shall be redistributed by the department to other projects in a manner that ensures that the state will continue to compete for and receive increased obligational authority during the federal redistribution of obligational authority. If the department does not have sufficient federal apportionments to fully use excess obligational authority, the metropolitan planning organization or transportation planning agency relinquishing obligational authority shall make sufficient ~~apportionments~~ funding available to the department to fund alternate projects, when practical, within the geographical areas relinquishing the obligational authority. Notwithstanding this subdivision, the department shall comply with subsection (f) of Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(f) The department shall be responsible for closely monitoring the use of federal transportation funds, including congestion management and air quality funds to assure full and timely use. The department shall prepare a quarterly report for submission to the commission regarding the progress in use of all federal transportation funds. The department shall notify the commission and the appropriate implementation agency whenever there is a failure to use federal funds within the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (4) of subdivision (b).

(g) The department shall provide written notice to implementing agencies when there is one year remaining within the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (4) of subdivision (b).

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 7
 Substantive

(h) Within six months of the date of notification required under subdivision (g), the implementing agency shall provide to the department a plan to obligate funds that includes, but need not be limited to, a list of projects and milestones.

(i) If the implementing agency has not met the milestones established in the implementation plan required under subdivision (h), prior to the end of the three-year apportionment period established under paragraph (4) of subdivision (b), the commission shall redirect those funds for use on other transportation projects in the state.

(j) Congestion mitigation and air quality program funds available under this section exchanged pursuant to Section 182.8 may be loaned to and expended by the department. The department shall repay from the State Highway Account to the Traffic Congestion Relief Fund all funds received as federal reimbursements for funds exchanged under Section 182.8 as they are received from the Federal Highway Administration, except that those repayments are not required to be made more frequently than on a quarterly basis.

(k) Prior to determining the amount for local subvention required by this section, the department shall first deduct the amount authorized by the Legislature for increased department oversight of the federal subvented program.

SEC. 4. Section 2331 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2331. The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act-A Legacy for Users of 2005 (Public Law 109-059), also known as SAFETEA-LU, elevated the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) to a core program (23 U.S.C. Sec. 148). SAFETEA-LU authorized appropriations for programs relating to highway safety improvements that can reduce the number of fatal and serious injury accidents. The federal Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21; Public Law 112-141), continued the core HSIP program includes two set-aside programs: the railway-highway crossing program (23 U.S.C. Sec. 130) and the high-risk rural roads program (23 U.S.C. Sec. 148(f)). The purpose of this chapter is to implement these programs in this state. The commission, the department, boards of supervisors, and city councils are authorized to do all things necessary in their respective jurisdictions to secure and expend federal funds in accordance with the intent of ~~that federal act~~ law and this chapter, and to coordinate with local law enforcement agencies' community policing efforts.

SEC. 5. Section 2333 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2333. In each annual proposed budget prepared pursuant to Section 165, there shall be included an amount equal to the estimated apportionment available from the federal government for the programs described in Sections 2331 and 2333.5. The commission may allocate a portion of those funds each year for use on city streets and county roads, as permissible by federal law. It is the intent of the Legislature that the commission allocate the total funds received from the federal government under Section 148 of Title 23 of the United States Code in approximately equal amounts between state highways and local roads, to the extent permissible by federal law and after providing for a set aside for the Safe Routes to School Program described in Section 2333.5 that is equal to California's 2011-12 federal fiscal year apportionment for the Safe Routes to School Program as previously authorized under Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU. To the extent that certain activities eligible under the Safe Routes to School Program as it existed under SAFETEA-LU are not eligible for funding under the HSIP Program as it exists under MAP-21, the department shall allocate a like

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 8
 Substantive

amount of replacement funds from any other federal funds available for obligation and expenditure by the department, including, but not limited to, Surface Transportation Program funds pursuant to subdivision (b) of Section 182.51. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the share of any railroad of the cost of maintaining railroad crossing protection facilities funded, in whole or in part, by funds described in Section 2331 shall be the same share it would be if no federal funds were involved and the crossing protection facilities were funded pursuant to an order of the Public Utilities Commission pursuant to Section 1202 of the Public Utilities Code; and in case of dispute, the Public Utilities Commission shall determine that share pursuant to this section.

SEC. 6. Section 2333.5 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2333.5. (a) The department, in consultation with the Department of the California Highway Patrol, shall establish and administer a "Safe Routes to School" construction program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects to be funded in federal fiscal years 2012–13 and 2013–14, and as may be continued by federal law in subsequent years, as provided by the set aside from HSIP and otherwise in Section 2333.

(b) The department shall award grants to local governmental agencies under the program based on the results of a statewide competition that requires submission of proposals for funding and rates those proposals on all of the following factors:

- (1) Demonstrated needs of the applicant.
- (2) Potential of the proposal for reducing child injuries and fatalities.
- (3) Potential of the proposal for encouraging increased walking and bicycling among students.
- (4) Identification of safety hazards.
- (5) Identification of current and potential walking and bicycling routes to school.
- (6) Use of a public participation process, including, but not limited to, a public meeting that satisfies all of the following:
 - (A) Involves the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others.
 - (B) Identifies community priorities and gathers community input to guide the development of projects included in the proposal.
 - (C) Ensures that community priorities are reflected in the proposal.
 - (D) Secures support for the proposal by relevant stakeholders.
- (7) Benefit to a low-income school, defined for purposes of this section to mean a school where at least 75 percent of students are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program.

(c) Any annual budget allocation to fund grants described in subdivision (b) shall be in addition to any federal funding received by the state that is designated for "Safe Routes to School" projects pursuant to Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU or any similar program funded through a subsequent transportation act.

(d) Any federal funding received by the state that is designated for "Safe Routes to School" projects shall be distributed by the department under the competitive grant process, consistent with all applicable federal requirements.

(e) Prior to the award of any construction grant or the department's use of those funds for a "Safe Routes to School" construction project encompassing a freeway, state highway, or county road, the department shall consult with, and obtain approval from,

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 9
 Substantive

the Department of the California Highway Patrol, ensuring that the “Safe Routes to School” proposal complements the California Highway Patrol’s Pedestrian Corridor Safety Program and is consistent with its statewide pedestrian safety statistical analysis.

(f) The department is encouraged to coordinate with law enforcement agencies’ community policing efforts in establishing and maintaining the “Safe Routes to School” construction program.

(g) In the development of guidelines and procedures governing this program, the department shall fully consider the needs of low-income schools.

SEC. 7. The heading of Chapter 7.5 (commencing with Section 2370) of Division 3 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

CHAPTER 7.5. FEDERAL FUNDS FOR TRANSPORTATION ~~ENHANCEMENTS~~ ALTERNATIVES

SEC. 8. Section 2370 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2370. As used in this chapter, the following terms have the following meanings:

(a) “Community conservation corps” shall have the same meaning as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code.

(b) “Transportation ~~enhancement~~ alternatives project” means a project constructed or undertaken with funds made available to the state pursuant to Section ~~133(b)(8)~~ 213 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

SEC. 9. Section 2371 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2371. (a) The department, in consultation with community conservation corps, the California Conservation Corps, the commission, regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions or authorities, and congestion management agencies, shall develop criteria that give priority in the selection of projects to the sponsors of eligible projects that partner with, or commit to employ the services of, a community conservation corps or the California Conservation ~~Corp~~ Corps to construct or undertake the project.

(b) Regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions or authorities, and congestion management agencies, when selecting candidates for transportation ~~enhancement~~ alternatives projects, shall utilize the criteria in subdivision (a) that give priority in the selection of projects to the sponsors of eligible projects that partner with, or commit to employ the services of, a community conservation corps or the California Conservation Corps to construct or undertake the project.

SEC. 10. Section 2372 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2372. The department, regional transportation planning agencies, county transportation commissions or authorities, or congestion management agencies shall be authorized to enter into cooperative agreements, grant agreements, or procurement contracts with community conservation corps pursuant to the simplified contract requirements authorized by Section 18.36(j) of Title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations in order to enable community conservation corps to utilize transportation ~~enhancement~~ alternatives project funds.

SEC. 11. Section 2373 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2373. The commission, when developing guidelines for the state transportation improvement program and the state highway operations and protection program, shall include guidance to encourage the allocation of funds for transportation ~~enhancement~~

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 10
 Substantive

alternatives projects to qualified community conservation corps and the California Conservation Corps as partners with applicants that commit to employ the services of corps members in the construction of those projects.

SEC. 12. Section 2374 of the Streets and Highways Code is amended to read:

2374. The criteria prepared pursuant to subdivision (a) of Section 2373 and the guidelines prepared pursuant to Section 2371 relative to the allocation of funds for transportation ~~enhancement~~ alternatives projects to qualified community conservation corps and the California Conservation Corps shall further the purposes of this chapter.

SEC. 13. Section 2375 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2375. Projects or activities eligible to be funded under this chapter as transportation alternatives projects may include any eligible projects or activities under Title 23 of the United States Code, including the following:

(a) Transportation alternatives, as defined in Section 101 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(b) The federal Recreational Trails Program under Section 206 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(c) The federal Safe Routes to School Program under Section 1404 of the SAFETEA-LU (23 U.S.C. Sec. 402; Public Law 109-59).

(d) Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former interstate system routes or other divided highways.

SEC. 14. Section 2376 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2376. For each of the 2012–13 and 2013–14 fiscal years, the department shall allocate the funds reserved by the United States Secretary of Transportation from the state's apportionments to implement transportation alternatives projects as provided in this section:

(a) (1) Fifty percent in each fiscal year shall be allocated to, and may be obligated by, metropolitan transportation organizations in proportion to their relative shares of the population of the state in the following areas:

(A) In urbanized areas of the state with an urbanized area population of over 200,000.

(B) In areas of the state other than urban areas with a population greater than 5,000 and less than or equal to 200,000.

(C) In other areas of the state.

(2) Fifty percent may be obligated in any area of the state.

(b) Funds attributed to an urbanized area under paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) may be obligated in the metropolitan area established under Section 134 of Title 23 of the United States Code that encompasses the urbanized area.

(c) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of subdivision (a), the amount of funds that the department is required to obligate under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) shall be obligated in urbanized areas described in that subparagraph based on the relative population of the areas.

(d) The allocation of funds required under subdivision (a) shall be after the deduction of a set aside equal to the amount of the funds apportioned to the state for federal fiscal year 2009 under Section 104(h)(2) of Title 23 of the United States Code to be obligated for projects relating to recreational trails under Section 206 of Title 23 of the United States Code. The state shall return 1 percent of those set aside funds to the United States Secretary of Transportation for the administration of that program

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
 RN 12 23512 PAGE 11
 Substantive

as provided in Section 2380. The state shall also comply with the provisions of the administration of the recreational trails program under Section 206 of Title 23 of the United States Code, including the use of apportioned funds described under subsection (d)(3)(A) of that section.

SEC. 15. Section 2377 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2377. (a) The department or metropolitan planning organization, as applicable, shall each develop a competitive process to allow eligible entities to submit projects for funding that achieve the objectives of eligible projects and activities.

(b) "Eligible entity" means all of the following:

- (1) A local government.
- (2) A regional transportation authority.
- (3) A transit agency.
- (4) A natural resource or public land agency.
- (5) A school district, local educational agency, or school.
- (6) A tribal government.
- (7) Any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for or oversight of transportation or recreational trails, other than a metropolitan planning organization or the state, that the state determines to be eligible, consistent with the goals of this section.

(c) For funds suballocated to metropolitan planning areas for urbanized areas of the state with an urbanized area population of over 200,000, the metropolitan planning organization shall select projects carried out within the boundaries of the applicable metropolitan planning area, in consultation with the department.

(d) Notwithstanding subdivisions (a) and (c), where county transportation commissions have been created by Division 12 (commencing with Section 130000) of the Public Utilities Code, all transportation alternatives funds shall be further suballocated by the metropolitan planning organization to the county transportation commission on the basis of relative population and the county transportation commission shall develop the competitive selection process.

SEC. 16. Section 2378 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2378. For funds suballocated to a metropolitan planning area under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) of subdivision (a) of Section 2376, the metropolitan planning organization or county transportation commission created by Division 12 (commencing with Section 130000) of the Public Utilities Code shall select projects carried out within the boundaries of the applicable metropolitan planning area, in consultation with the department.

SEC. 17. Section 2379 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2379. Beginning with the 2012–13 fiscal year, if on August 1 of that fiscal year the unobligated balance of available funds reserved by the state under Section 213 of Title 23 of the United States Code exceeds 100 percent of the reserved amount in a fiscal year, the department may thereafter obligate the amount of excess funds for any eligible activity, as follows:

- (a) An activity that is eligible to receive funding under Section 2375.
- (b) An activity for which the United States Secretary of Transportation has approved the obligation of funds for any state under Section 149 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

SEC. 18. Section 2380 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

86209

08/24/12 12:07 AM
RN 12 23512 PAGE 12
Substantive

2380. (a) The department shall obligate an amount of funds reserved under Section 213 of Title 23 of the United States Code equal to the amount of the funds apportioned to the state for the 2009–10 fiscal year under Section 104(h)(2) of Title 23 of the United States Code for projects relating to recreational trails under Section 206 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

(b) The department shall return 1 percent of those funds to the United States Secretary of Transportation for the administration of that program.

(c) The department shall comply with the provisions of the administration of the federal Recreational Trails Program under Section 206 of Title 23 of the United States Code, including the use of apportioned funds described under subsection (d)(3)(A) of that section.

SEC. 19. Section 2381 is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

2381. The state may opt out of the federal Recreational Trails Program under subsection (f) of Section 213 of Title 23 of the United States Code if the Governor notifies the United States Secretary of Transportation not later than 30 days prior to apportionments being made for any fiscal year.

Amendment 3

On page 1, strike out lines 1 and 2

- 0 -



[Home](#) | [Products](#) | [Events](#) | [News](#) | [Publications](#) | [Clients](#) | [Support](#) | [FAQs](#) | [P-TAP](#)

[P-TAP](#) [PMP Certification](#)

Pavement Management Program Certification Listing

In accordance with section 2108.1 of the Streets and Highway Code, MTC requires cities and counties submitting pavement maintenance and rehabilitation projects for funding to utilize a Pavement Management Program (PMP).

Section 2108.1 of the Streets and Highway Codes says:

By July 1, 1990, the City, County, State Cooperation Committee in the department shall develop and adopt a pavement management program to be utilized on local streets or highways that receive funding under the state transportation improvement program. The pavement management program shall be transmitted to every county or city for possible adoption or incorporation into an existing pavement management program. The City, County, State Cooperation Committee shall solicit recommendations from transportation planning agencies and any other entity the committee deems appropriate.

Based on the recommendation of the joint City, County, State Cooperation Committee, the MTC will grant certification to a jurisdiction when all of the following applies:

1. The Pavement Management Program used by the jurisdiction is capable of completing all the following:
 - Storing inventory data for all roads within the jurisdiction
 - Assessing the pavement condition based on distress information
 - Identifying all pavement sections that need rehabilitation or replacement
 - Calculating budget needs for rehabilitating or replacing deficient pavement sections
2. The jurisdiction completes all the following:
 - Reviews and updates the inventory information for all roads every two years. The review will include checking for road network completeness along with checking for the accuracy of the existing management sections.
 - Completes inspection of pavement sections for arterial and collector routes in the system every two years, and residential routes every 5 years.
 - Calculates budget needs for rehabilitating or replacing deficient pavement sections for the current year and the next three years.

To be certified please submit the following to MTC:

1. Your jurisdiction's latest updated pavement management database. If you are not using MTC PMP, please submit items #2 and #3 only. If you are using an MTC PMP software program please submit all files associated with the version of StreetSaver you are using. If you need assistance in accessing these files, please contact your [PMP coordinator](#).
2. The following 3 budget scenarios reports: 1) a report showing sections selected for treatment over the next five years based on

your jurisdiction's annual budget estimates, 2) a report showing what would need to be done to maintain your jurisdiction's existing PCI, and 3) a scenario depicting a five-point increase of your jurisdiction's current PCI over the next five years. *(These types of reports are typically generated as part of the Pavement Management Technical Assistance Program (P-TAP) projects.)*

3. A signed letter by the Public Works Director, or equivalent department head, stating that all of the requirements in parts 1 and 2 above have been met. ["Sample letter"](#)

MTC will post certification status updates of Bay Area jurisdictions on this page the first day of every month. The updated certification will have an expiration date two years from the date when the last inspection of arterials and collectors in your network was completed.

Temporary exemptions from the certification process

* A jurisdiction may apply for a one-year extension if the department head submits a letter stating that reinspection will occur within one year. Extensions may not continue beyond three years from the last major inspection date.

** A jurisdiction, whose certification is expiring, may apply for pending status if it is in the process of inspecting its network. You must notify the MTC in writing of your request for pending status, and include a reasonable date when inspections will be completed, or your certification will be considered expired. **Jurisdictions who received a pending status because of their participation with P-TAP 12 had until April 30, 2012 to submit their documentation or will be reverted back to 24 months after the "Last Major Inspection" date.** P-TAP 13 awardees have until April 30, 2013 to submit their documentation or be reverted back to 24 months after the "Last Major Inspection" date. Certified Status will reflect "Yes" until the original expiration date and will revert to "Pending" with the P-TAP round listed in the Certification Expiration Date if the jurisdiction is a current P-TAP awardee.

NOTE: Failure to submit your PMP Certification letter and/or extension request by the above deadlines and/or your Certification Expiration Date will result in a lapse in compliance and any Pending status will revert back to its original expiration date.

The information should be forwarded to your [PMP Contact](#).

Last Updated: September 5, 2012

[Alameda County](#) [Contra Costa County](#) [Marin County](#) [Napa County](#) [San Francisco County](#)

[San Mateo County](#) [Santa Clara County](#) [Solano County](#) [Sonoma County](#)

Note: An *italicized* status represents a certification expected to expire in ~ 60 days.

Alameda County

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
County of Alameda	11/30/2011	Yes	12/01/2013
Alameda	09/30/2010	Yes(P13)	10/01/2012
Albany	08/31/2011	Yes	09/01/2013
Berkeley	03/30/2011	Yes	04/01/2013
Dublin	10/31/2010	Yes(P13)	11/01/2012
<i>Emeryville</i>	<i>10/31/2010</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>11/01/2012</i>

Mill Valley	07/31/2010	Pending	P-TAP 13
Novato	10/31/2011	Yes	11/01/2013
Ross	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
San Anselmo	03/31/2011	Yes	04/01/2013
San Rafael	11/30/2011	Yes	12/01/2013
Sausalito	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
Tiburon	06/30/2010	Pending	P-TAP 13

» [Back to Top](#)

Napa County

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
Napa County	09/30/2011	Yes	10/01/2013
American Canyon	08/31/2011	Yes	09/01/2013
Calistoga	12/31/2010	Yes(P13)	01/01/2013
Napa	04/30/2012	Yes	05/01/2014
<i>St. Helena</i>	<i>08/31/2010</i>	<i>No</i>	<i>09/01/2012</i>
Yountville	08/31/2011	Yes	09/01/2013

» [Back to Top](#)

San Francisco County

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
San Francisco	08/31/2011	Yes(P13)	09/01/2013

» [Back to Top](#)

San Mateo County

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
San Mateo County	10/31/2010	Yes(P13)	11/01/2012
Atherton	10/31/2010	Yes(P13)	11/01/2012
Belmont	08/30/2010	Pending	P-TAP 13
Brisbane	11/30/2010	Yes(P13)	12/01/2012
Burlingame	06/30/2011	Yes	07/01/2013
Colma*	07/31/2010*	Yes*	08/01/2013*
Daly City	01/31/2012	Yes	02/01/2014
East Palo Alto*	08/31/2010*	Yes*	09/01/2013*
Foster City	12/31/2011	Yes	01/01/2014
<i>Half Moon Bay</i>	<i>10/31/2010</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>11/01/2012</i>
Hillsborough*	06/30/2010*	Yes*	07/01/2013*
Menlo Park	10/31/2011	Yes	11/01/2013

PDWG 09/17/12: Item 6A

Millbrae	12/31/2011	Yes	01/01/2014
Pacifica	02/29/2012	Yes	03/01/2014
Portola Valley	08/31/2009	Pending	P-TAP 13
Redwood City	09/30/2011	Yes	10/01/2013
San Bruno	12/31/2011	Yes	01/01/2014
<i>San Carlos</i>	<i>09/30/2010</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>10/01/2012</i>
San Mateo	12/31/2010	Yes(P13)	01/01/2013
South San Francisco	11/30/2011	Yes	12/01/2013
<i>Woodside</i>	<i>09/30/2010</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>10/01/2012</i>

» [Back to Top](#)**Santa Clara County**

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
Santa Clara County	09/30/2011	Yes	10/01/2013
Campbell	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
Cupertino	07/31/2010	Pending	P-TAP 13
Gilroy	10/31/2008	Pending	P-TAP 13
Los Altos	08/31/2011	Yes	09/01/2013
Los Altos Hills	06/30/2010	Pending	P-TAP 13
Los Gatos	05/31/2011	Yes	06/01/2013
Milpitas	06/30/2011	Yes	07/01/2013
<i>Monte Sereno</i>	<i>10/31/2010</i>	<i>Yes</i>	<i>11/01/2012</i>
Morgan Hill	01/31/2012	Yes	02/01/2014
Mountain View	09/30/2010	Yes(P13)	10/01/2012
Palo Alto	11/30/2010	Yes	12/01/2012
San Jose	02/29/2012	Yes	03/01/2014
Santa Clara	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
Saratoga	12/31/2010	Yes	01/01/2013
Sunnyvale	02/28/2011	Yes	03/01/2013

» [Back to Top](#)**Solano County**

Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection	Certified	Certification Expiration Date
Solano County	02/29/2012	Yes	03/01/2014
Benicia	01/31/2011	Yes(P13)	02/01/2013
Dixon	09/30/2011	Yes	10/01/2013
Fairfield	11/30/2010	Yes(P13)	12/01/2012
Rio Vista	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
Suisun City	08/31/2012	Yes	09/01/2014
Vacaville	07/31/2011	Yes	08/01/2013
Vallejo	11/30/2011	Yes	12/01/2013