

# 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, February 19, 2015**  
**San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>**  
**1250 San Carlos Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Dining Room**  
**San Carlos, California**

**\*\* MEETING LOCATION – 4<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR DINING ROOM \*\***

### 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 (Feb. 2015):   |               | No materials |
|    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved – Agreement Amendment with Iteris Corp. for Smart Corridor System Integration/Video System Management for \$80,022 and time extension to June 30, 2015.</li><li>• Approved – FY 2015/16 TFCA County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County</li><li>• Approved – Funding for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle in FY15 &amp; FY16 for \$94,182 and Agreement with SMCTA to contribute \$38,000 to the project</li><li>• Approved – Amendment with Jacobs Engineering Group for the 2015 CMP traffic monitoring services for \$64,050.36</li><li>• Approved – MOU with SMCTA and SamTrans for Countywide Transportation Plan update</li><li>• Adopted –PDA Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program project list</li><li>• Approved – Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program for \$4,414,272</li><li>• Approved – Appointments of Eric Reed (Belmont) and Karen Ervin (Pacifica) as Elected Official members and Jeffrey Tong (San Bruno), Andrew Boone (EPA), Meredith Schneider (Woodside) and Matthew Self (Unincorporated County) as public members to the BPAC.</li></ul> |               |              |
| 3. | Approval of the minutes from January 15, 2015   | Hoang         | Page 1-4     |
| 4. | Solicitation of Letters of Interest for the Measure A Highway Capital Improvement Program (CIP) (information)   | Slavit (TA)   | Oral Report  |
| 5. | Receive a presentation on the San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Feasibility Study (Information)   | Wong          | Page 5-9     |
| 6. | Receive information about the upcoming Active Transportation Program Cycle 2 call for projects (Information)  | Barton        | Page 10-11   |
| 7. | Regional Project and Funding Information (Information)  | Higaki        | Page 12-14   |
| 8. | Executive Director Report   | Wong          | No materials |
| 9. | Member Reports  | All           |              |

---

<sup>1</sup> For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 260, 295, 390, 391, KX or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

<b>2015 TAC Roster and Attendance</b>			
<b>No.</b>	<b>Member</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Jan</b>
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning	
7	VACANT	Caltrans	
8	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x
9	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x
10	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering	
11	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x
12	Mo Sharma	Half Moon Bay Engineering	
13	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x
14	Jeff Moneda	Foster City Engineering	x
15	Jesse Quirion	Menlo Park Engineering	
16	Chip Taylor	Millbrae Engineering	
17	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	
18	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	x
19	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	x
20	Jay Walter	San Carlos Engineering	x
21	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering	x
22	James Hinkamp	San Mateo County Planning	x
23	Brian McMinn	South San Francisco Engineering	
24	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x
25	Paul Nagengast	Woodside Engineering	x
26	Kenneth Folan	MTC	

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

**January 15, 2015  
MINUTES**

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Co-chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, January 15, 2015.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jim Bigelow - C/CAG CMEQ; Joel Slavit – TA; Pete Rasmussen – TA; Ellen Barton – San Mateo County; Jean Higaki, Wally Abrazaldo – C/CAG; Tom Madalena – C/CAG; John Hoang – C/CAG and others not noted

**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 November 20, 2014.**

Approved.

**4. Development of the Measure A Highway CIP and Next Highway Call for Projects**

Joel Slavit, SMCTA Manager, reported that the TA is starting work on developing a CIP and plan to issue a solicitation for letter of interests requesting project information from potential project sponsors including budget, scope, and schedule. TA is tentatively planning to release a call for projects in May 2015 with applications due by the end of June. The draft list of recommended project would be presented to the TA Board in September and final list in October. It is anticipated that this project list will help CCAG plan for the upcoming 2016 STIP development.

Member Nagengast asked whether highways include off-ramps and park-and-ride lots. Response was that any proposed project will be competing against congestion relieving projects already identified in the Key Congested Corridor and Supplemental Roadways and other proposed projects. Member Oskoui asked whether arterial projects need to tie into the freeway system? Response was that the project sponsors will need to explain how the project would relief regional congestion.

Member Murtuza requested clarification on which type of projects the TA is looking for in the call for projects in addition to projects that have already been identified. Response was that one factor for consideration includes project readiness for projects that are already listed as well as new project. Murtuza indicated that there are many projects already on the list and with fixed amount of money available, prioritizing the project may be challenging. Slavit indicated that the TA did not want to preclude any new projects. Slavit added that the TA will be asking for resolutions of support from the cities for the TA Highway Program therefore cities should plan to go to council before June 2015.

**5. Review and recommend approval of the funding recommendation for the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle for FY 2014/2015 and FY 2015/2016 in an amount of \$94,182 in Measure A Transportation funds through the San Mateo County Shuttle Program Joint Call for Projects and of the agreement between C/CAG and the San Mateo County Transportation Authority in an amount not to exceed \$38,000**

Tom Madalena reported staff's recommendation to fund the Bayshore Technology Park shuttle. This shuttle project was deferred for funding at the request of the project sponsor (Alliance) to allow additional time for addressing service overlaps. The revised service plan was accepted. Comments and questions were as follows:

Member Walter asked about ridership, shuttle route, and cost to the riders. Response was that the shuttle will serve the Bridgepark technology park in Redwood Shores. There is no cost for the riders. The employers are contributing fifty percent match for the cost of the shuttle. Member Willis asked whether a reduction of fuel surcharge was factored into the cost considering the recent decline in gasoline prices. Staff responded that there was no surcharge, just a flat rate and that the program is on a cost reimbursement basis.

**6. Review and recommend approval of the C/CAG Priority Development Area Parking Policy Technical Assistance Program list of projects**

Wally Abrazaldo reported that there were two applications for the program and one project, City of South San Francisco Downtown Parking District Study, was recommended for funding in the amount of \$97,000. Since the program is undersubscribed by \$245,000, another call for projects is being re-issued as of now and will be opened indefinitely until all remaining funds are awarded. Cities can submit new applications anytime and applications will be reviewed as they are received.

**7. Receive results of commercial speed data (INRIX) evaluation for the Congestion Management Program level of service and performance monitoring**

John Hoang and Steve Taylor (consultant) presented on the results of the study to determine the feasibility of using INRIX data for the upcoming 2015 Congestion Management Program (CMP). The study compared historical floating car travel time runs collected as part of the 2013 CMP monitoring with historical INRIX data for the same period. The result indicated an average difference of 4.2% for the freeway network. The study recommended that CCAG transition to the INRIX analysis methodology for the next CMP monitoring. Discussions were as follows:

Member Walter asked about the cost of using the INRIX data compared to the previous method. Response was that CCAG receives the data free of charge from MTC. Co-Chair Hurley asked about fees involved in mining, manipulating, and analyzing the data for various purposes. Response is that data is delivered in a GIS environment and can be analyzed in a databased form. Member Oskoui asked whether the data includes non-freeway data as well. Response was that data is available for local streets but may not be as robust as on freeways however over time, future data may have more sample size with increased data points.

Member Murtuza asked how HOV data is separated from mixed flow lane data. Response was that INRIX performs that analysis to look at the disparity in speeds and exclude the faster speeds from the HOV lane from the mix flow lane calculations. For the CMP, HOV lane data will be collected manually outside of INRIX. The data is available in real time and archive format. C/CAG would analyze the archive data for the CMP. Member Murtuza asked whether local agencies can request the data for certain segments. Response was that post-processed

INRIX data in a GIS or database format results from the CMP analysis can be provided to cities in smaller localized segments. There is a lot of value from the data for other types of analyses.

The cost and effort to transition to using INRIX data was included as part of this assessment project, including segmentation and correlating the CMP data to the INRIX data. For the CMP work, the difference in cost between performing five travel time runs versus using INRIX data will be minimal. To account for accidents in the aggregated INRIX dataset, a statistical analysis for travel time reliability will be performed to check for consistency or variability between similar time periods. Member Manzi indicated we should look at an annual time frame in addition to the spring period, including seasonal periods.

**8. Review and recommend approval of the Fiscal Year 2015/16 Expenditure Plan for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for San Mateo County**

John Hoang reported that the next TFCA County Program is budgeted at \$1,128,240.41 which includes allocations of \$601,000 to SamTrans for the peak period BART shuttle service and \$472,300 to the Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance for the countywide Voluntary Trip Reduction Program.

**9. Review and recommend approval of projects to be funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) under the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program for a total amount of \$4,414,272**

Jean Higaki reported that six projects were awarded STA funds for a total of \$2,364,704, a SamTrans sponsored fixed route bus procurement project was awarded JARC funds in the amount of \$714,609 and another SamTrans project was awarded \$1,230,533 in Prop 1B funds. The remaining \$104,426 was given to SamTrans for Lifeline transit operations. It was clarified that although SamTrans didn't originally applied for the JARC funds, SamTrans was granted the funds.

**10. Regional Project and Funding Information**

Jean Higaki reported that cities should take timely actions to meet the MTC and Caltrans deadlines for project obligation and delivery. There will be an ATP (Active Transportation Program) call for projects in March. There are new MTC deadlines for Complete Streets and Housing Element. The deadline for housing element certification was extended to May 31, 2015. Guidelines have not been released yet to address the scenario where cities missed the deadline.

**11. Executive Director Report**

Sandy Wong, Executive Director, reported on the following items:

- The State Strategic Council is scheduled to adopt guidelines on affordable housing and sustainable community on how to distribute funds.
- The Express Lane feasibility study is wrapping up and staff will present the results to the TAC next month.
- The C/CAG Board received a presentation last month on Community Choice Aggregate effort from the County. The Board of Supervisors has retained a consultant that will outreach to the cities and communities in the next months. The intent is to form to an energy district and give the public a choice in using greener and cleaner energy source.
- The Stormwater Committee meeting has been canceled.

- MTC has published the Top 10 works congested corridor and San Mateo County made it to the list (NB 101 from Woodside to 92).
- The development of the CTP is in progress using the MTC adopted guidelines.

Member Walter asked about the progress and anticipated end of the Smart Corridor. Member Oskoui also added that presentations to the city councils will need to be done and cities should be provided with talking points.

## **12. Member Reports**

Co-Chair Porter reported that there are discussions about formation of countywide flood control district, led by Supervisor Pine. A subcommittee of city managers have been formed consisting of the cities of San Mateo, Daly City, Pacifica, Portola Valley, as well as Foster City to discuss either forming a new county flood control district or using the current Flood Control District although the District. The plan is to look for a revenue measure possibly through parcel taxes and bonds.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** February 19, 2015  
**To:** CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Sandy Wong, Executive Director  
**Subject:** Receive a presentation and provide comment on the San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Feasibility Study

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at (650) 599-1409)

---

## **RECOMENDATION**

That the CMP TAC receive a presentation and provide comment on the San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Feasibility Study.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Total cost for this feasibility study is \$80,000, shared by C/CAG and MTC on a 50/50 basis. C/CAG share of the funding is from the Transportation Fund.

## **BACKGROUND**

On May 8, 2014, the C/CAG Board authorized a joint effort with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to conduct traffic analysis for Express Lanes on US 101 from the Santa Clara County Line to I-380.

This Feasibility Study focuses only on traffic analysis to evaluation traffic operational benefits of express lanes. It does not consider all other issues such as inter-agency coordination, equity, policies, required legislation, maintenance, enforcement, toll technology, and revenue projection, etc.

Concept 1 of the Feasibility Study assumes to convert a carpool lane to express. While a carpool lane exists from Santa Clara County Line to Whipple Ave, a new carpool lane will need to be added north of Whipple, which is being proposed by a separate project currently underway. That separate project will require some widening of the freeway, but not for the entire segment.

Concept 2 of the Feasibility Study assumes to convert an existing general purpose lane to express.

## **ATTACHMENT**

San Mateo US 101 Express Lane Feasibility Study (Executive Summary)

*Full report is available on the C/CAG website at:*

<http://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-program-technical-advisory-committee/>

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2012, a Staged Hybrid HOV Lane Study was completed that analyzed the feasibility of extending the HOV lane on US 101 from Whipple Avenue in Redwood City to I-380 in San Bruno, a distance of approximately 13 miles. The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) is moving forward on a Project Study Report – Project Development Support (PSR-PDS) for the project. The purpose of this study is to perform a preliminary high level conceptual feasibility assessment of two express lane options for the same segment of US 101, to help determine if these additional options might have some fatal flaws that might preclude them from meriting further detailed analyses.

The two concepts are:

- Concept 1: HOV-to-Express Lane Conversion (Hybrid HOT). This concept assumes the same freeway cross section as the proposed Staged Hybrid HOV Lane option from the feasibility study (which involves limited lane additions to the freeway), and converts the HOV Lane into an Express Lane.
- Concept 2: Optimized Express Lane (Convert HOT). This concept retains the current freeway cross section (i.e. no additional widening), and converts the number one (leftmost) general purpose lane directly into an Express Lane.

## ASSUMPTIONS AND APPROACH

Since this was a conceptual feasibility study to determine if the two concepts had potential fatal flaws that might preclude them from consideration for further analysis, the general approach for this study was to use available data, information, and traffic models from the 2012 study, so that the new results can be compared to the older results on a consistent basis. This includes applying the previous 2040 traffic forecast developed for the Staged Hybrid HOV Lane for Concept 1, and extrapolating the previous 2030 convert HOV lane traffic forecast to 2040 conditions, for Concept 2. In addition, traffic operations analysis was focused primarily along the US 101 mainline, with a high-level assessment of other major roadways using information produced by the C/CAG travel demand model.

The study began with an assessment of available capacity in the HOV/express lane to carry additional tolled single occupancy vehicles. Next, freeway traffic operations analysis was conducted using previously calibrated FREQ models for the two concepts.

A secondary assessment was then conducted to determine what demand shifts would be necessary under Concept 2 to achieve the same freeway performance improvements as Concept 1, should the objective of the reviewing agencies be to maintain the performance benefits expected under Concept 1. Using the operations analysis results, a sensitivity analysis was conducted to estimate the needed mode, route and time shifts for Concept 2 to achieve freeway performance that is similar to Concept 1.

Finally, preliminary conceptual cost estimates for both concepts were developed for comparison purposes.



## KEY FINDINGS

Under both concepts there is not a great deal of excess capacity in the express lane during the AM and PM peak periods that could be sold to single occupant vehicles. In general, available capacity for tolled vehicles would occur during the shoulder peak hours, such as before 7 AM, after 9 AM, before 3:30 PM, and after 6:30 PM. In addition, some sections of the express lane would have no capacity for the entire peak period. Availability for tolled vehicles is summarized as follows:

- Northbound AM: up to 450 vph (for 2 hours out of the 4 hour AM peak period).
- Northbound PM: up to 280 vph (for 2 hours out of the 5 hour PM peak period).
- Southbound AM: up to 870 vph (for 2 hours out of the 4 hour AM peak period), not available south of Holly Street.
- Southbound PM: up to 200 vph (for 2 hours out of the 5 hour PM peak period), not available south of Holly Street.

In terms of freeway operations results, compared to the Staged Hybrid HOV Lane option that is currently in the PSR-PDS stage, Concept 1 would provide improvements for the mixed-flow lanes. Concept 2 would result in both longer queues and higher delays for the mixed-flow lanes in most cases. Exhibit 1 provides a summary of US 101 corridor-focused mobility performance results for Year 2040 conditions.

**Exhibit 1: 2040 Freeway Corridor Performance Comparison**

Performance Measures	2040 Baseline	2040 Staged Hybrid HOV	Concept 1 - Hybrid HOT	Concept 2 - Convert HOT	Concept 1 vs Staged Hybrid HOV	Concept 2 vs Staged Hybrid HOV
VMT – vehicle miles of travel	4,925,100	5,145,600	5,166,500	4,836,400	0.4%	-6.0%
VHT – vehicle hours of travel	196,000	187,000	184,000	187,400	-1.6%	0.2%
VHD – vehicle hours of delay	120,400	107,800	104,400	113,000	-3.2%	4.7%
PMT – person miles of travel	5,197,700	5,839,900	5,901,700	5,573,000	1.1%	-4.6%
PHD – person hours of delay	120,600	109,200	105,800	113,400	-3.2%	3.8%
Average vehicle speed (MPH)	25.1	27.5	28.1	25.8	2.1%	-6.2%
Average person speed (MPH)	25.9	29.3	30.0	28.0	2.3%	-4.6%

Source: FREQ analysis, both HOV and mixed-flow lanes, AM and PM peak periods combined.

In summary, comparing Concept 1 to the 2040 Staged Hybrid HOV lane option:

- Overall US 101 freeway productivity would be slightly improved with a 0.4% increase in VMT, and a 1.1% increase in PMT.
- Vehicle hours of travel and vehicle hours of delay would be reduced by 1.6% and 3.2%, respectively.
- Average peak period speeds for both vehicle and person trips would be increased more than 2%.

Comparing Concept 2 to the 2040 Staged Hybrid HOV lane option:

- Overall US 101 freeway productivity would be degraded with a 6% decrease in VMT, and 5% decrease in PMT. This is primarily related to the reduced capacity through the corridor, as well as the predicted effect of the reduced capacity on future peak period traffic demand for the US 101 freeway.
- Vehicle hours of travel and vehicle hours of delay would be increased by 0.2% and 4.7%, respectively.
- Average peak period speeds for both vehicle and person trips would be reduced by 4% to 6%.

In terms of the time it would take to travel the entire length of study corridor on the mixed-flow lanes, Concept 2 would result in longer travel times of about 20 minutes than under Concept 1 in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour, and up to about 99 more minutes than under Concept 1 during the PM peak hour. In the southbound direction, Concept 2 would require about 55 minutes longer during the AM peak hour. Travel times would be reduced by 31 minutes during the PM peak hour.

To achieve the same improved freeway performance with Concept 2 as is predicted for Concept 1, ways must be found to discourage approximately 6,250 vehicle trips during the AM and 1,160 vehicle trips during the PM peak period from using the US 101 freeway. This is above and beyond the demand shifts already forecasted by the C/CAG demand model due to the freeway capacity constraints implicit in Concept 2.

Based on existing information provided by BART, Samtrans and Caltrain, both BART and Caltrain are near or have reached capacity during the peak commute time periods. Alternate routes, such as El Camino Real and I-280 may not have the spare capacity to accommodate additional route shifts. Assuming all trip reductions on US 101 would be shifted to buses as a worst case assessment, up to 38 additional express buses would be required during the AM peak hour, and up to 14 additional express buses during the PM peak hour to accommodate these trip reductions on US 101.

Preliminary cost estimates were developed for both concepts and are summarized as follows:

- Concept 1: approximately \$259 million, which includes costs associated with building the HOV lane (\$156 million), and with conversion from HOV to express lane (\$103 million).
- Concept 2: approximately \$346 million, which includes costs associated with conversion from an existing mixed-flow lane to express lane (\$108 million), and required operations and maintenance cost for additional transit services (\$238 million, over a 20-year period). Potential capital cost required to provide these additional services were not included in this cost estimate.

In summary, Concept 1 would provide potential traffic operational benefits for the corridor, while for Concept 2, there would be higher costs associated with providing the level of transit services required to match the freeway travel time improvements provided by Concept 1. In addition, Concept 2 would also result in increased traffic demands on other major roadways within the county, including El Camino Real and I-280.

## FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

This study was a conceptual feasibility study designed to identify potential fatal flaws with either Concept 1 or Concept 2 that might suggest one or both should be dropped from further study. As such, this conceptual study was conducted as cost-effectively as possible by using information from previous studies, with the objective to conduct a comparison on a consistent basis with the 2012 Staged Hybrid HOV Lane study.

Based on this conceptual study, Concept 1 demonstrated better overall benefit than Concept 2, in terms of overall travel time on the US 101 mainline as well as total costs. If project budget allows, further analysis, as listed below, may provide a more comprehensive analysis to better inform decision makers.

During the study, it was discovered that there were some limitations in primarily using information from previous studies, for example, there was no feedback process between the travel demand model and the operations analysis model on travel times, which may have artificially resulted in low demand volumes on US 101 under concept 2, and in turn, the operations analysis could understate its potential effects. Also, existing traffic conditions on US 101 has changed since the 2012 study, for example, in the southbound direction during the PM peak period, additional bottlenecks have arisen along the study corridor, which in turn, could result in further operational impacts for Concept 2. Based on this initial evaluation, further analyses are suggested:

- Update existing conditions analysis and previously calibrated traffic operations models for US 101;
- Update traffic forecasts using the current bi-county C/CAG-VTA model;
- Conduct traffic operations analysis for US 101 and assess potential impacts on other alternate routes;
- Provide cost estimates to potential capital costs associated with the additional transit services for Concept 2, and also provide detailed logistics for the provision of additional transit (i.e. additional park-and-ride facilities, shuttle services to and from transit centers, etc.);
- Origin/Destination analysis of transit trips;
- Assess potential effects of private company shuttles along US 101, and their effects on future needs for additional transit busses in the corridor;
- Develop O&M (operations and maintenance) costs, and revenue analysis of the proposed express lane options.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** February 19, 2015  
**To:** Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Ellen Barton, Active Transportation Program Coordinator  
**Subject:** Receive information on the upcoming Call for Projects for Cycle 2 of the Active Transportation Program

(For further information please contact Ellen Barton at 599-1420)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMP TAC receive information on the upcoming Call for Projects for Cycle 2 of the Active Transportation Program (ATP)

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

Caltrans - Division of Local Assistance, in conjunction with the California Transportation Commission (CTC), is planning an ATP Cycle 2 Workshop to gather input on the next draft of the 2015 ATP Application form and supporting documents.

### **Workshop Details:**

**Workshop:** ATP Cycle 2 Application and supporting documents  
**Date/Time:** February 25th from 9:30 am to 3:00 pm (with a lunch break from 11:30 to 12:30)  
**Location:** Caltrans HQ Building (1120 N Street Sacramento, 95814)  
Conference Room 2116  
**Call-In #/code:** (866) 707-4366    **Participant Passcode:** 6010587

ATP stakeholders are encouraged to continue reviewing the Caltrans draft Application for Cycle 2, Caltrans draft LAPG Chapter 22 - interim Guidelines, and other program information. These documents are located on the Caltrans ATP website at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html>

Caltrans intends to share revised drafts of the Application Form and Chapter 22 with stakeholders on February 20<sup>th</sup>, giving stakeholders the opportunity to review the revisions prior to the February 25<sup>th</sup> workshop.

In analysis of Cycle One ATP grant awards, it was noted that a significantly larger percentage (87%) of funds was awarded to projects serving disadvantaged communities in contrast to the target percentage identified in the guidelines (25%). The definition of disadvantaged communities is defined by the state. This limited the competitive standing of several communities in the Bay Area including some jurisdictions in San Mateo County in the process. Comments addressing this concern may be appropriate to bring to the ATP Cycle 2 Workshop.

Questions about the workshop may be directed to Ted Davini, Caltrans Division of Local Assistance, (916) 653-4335 or [ted.davini@dot.ca.gov](mailto:ted.davini@dot.ca.gov).

The Cycle 2 Call for Projects will be released on March 26, 2015 and applications to the statewide competitive selection process will be due to Caltrans on May 31, 2015.

#### Additional Background on ATP Cycle 1

California's Active Transportation Program (ATP) was established by Senate Bill 99, and the corresponding budget bills that fund the program are Senate Bill 95 and Assembly Bill 101. ATP was signed into law by Governor Jerry Brown in September 2013. ATP rolls most of California's existing state and federal sources of funding for trails, biking, and walking into one competitive grant fund. The creation of one larger program is expected to raise the profile of active transportation projects in the state, and streamline the process for financing biking and walking infrastructure by reducing administrative costs. Cycle 1 of the ATP was awarded in a two-phase process in 2014. The state competitive call was issued in the spring and the MTC regional call was issued in the summer.

The ATP bill directs the program to “be designed and developed to fund projects that encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking.” The bill also states that the goals of the program are to:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users.
- Reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity.
- Provide environmental mitigation that supports and encourages active transportation.

The Cycle 2 call for projects draft guidelines are being developed and it is expected that the state and regional application process will be combined to reduce confusion. In 2014, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) administered 50% of the grant funds through a statewide competitive process. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) in urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000 were eligible for 40% of ATP funds. Smaller urban and rural regions were eligible for 10% of the funds.

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 19, 2015  
To: C/CAG CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator  
Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information.

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

---

### RECOMMENDATION

Regional Project and Funding Information

### FISCAL IMPACT

None.

### SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

### BACKGROUND

C/CAG staff routinely attends meetings hosted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and receives information distributed by the MTC pertaining to Federal funding, project delivery, and other regional policies that may affect local agencies. Attached to this report includes relevant information from MTC.

- FHWA policy for inactive projects - The current inactive list is attached. Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm>

Caltrans provides their policy for the management of Inactive Obligations at:

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

- Calls for Projects – The following is a listing of program “calls for projects” that are either currently advertised or that will be advertised in the near future:
  - Active Transportation Program – CTC is presenting the draft guidelines for public comment. It is estimated that a call for projects will be issued March 26, 2015.
  - A strategic growth council (SGC) workshop is scheduled in the bay area on Thursday, February 12, 2015 at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 101 8th Street, Oakland. It will be comprised of an informational presentation and overview on the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program, including requirements to submitting a concept proposal. Small group or one-on-one consultation with AHSC Program staff will also be available to discuss project eligibility. Concept proposal are due

to HCD by February 19, 2015. Full applications are due March 11, 2015. To register for a workshop or request consultation, see

[http://sgc.ca.gov/docs/AHSC\\_Technical\\_Assistance\\_Workshop\\_Notice.pdf](http://sgc.ca.gov/docs/AHSC_Technical_Assistance_Workshop_Notice.pdf)

- Miscellaneous MTC/ Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

Section 106 workshop:

Caltrans is holding an information-sharing workshop on Section 106 procedures and the First Amended Programmatic Agreement to be held at the Park View Room (15-700) in the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Building at 111 Grand Ave., Oakland, CA 94612 on March 3, 2015 from 1 – 4 PM. If you are interested in participating in the workshop please RSVP to Ms. Thelma Riel either by phone (510) 286-5240 or by e-mail at [Thelma.Riel@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Thelma.Riel@dot.ca.gov) by February 24th, 2015.

Cycle 7 Local HSIP Webinar

Caltrans is holding a Cycle 7 Local HSIP webinar on Thursday, February 26, 2015 from 9:00 am – 11:30 am website is: <https://connectdot.connectsolutions.com/cahsip/>

Log in as ‘Guest’

Audio call in number is: 1-888-684-8852

Call-in number Access code: 3336319

Caltrans is anticipating a call for projects for HSIP Cycle 7 in April.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Caltrans Inactive list generated on 1/06/15

Inactive Obligations  
Local, State Administered/Locally Funded and Rail Projects

Updated on 01/06/2015

Project No (newly added projects highlighted in GREEN)	Status	Agency/District Action Required	State Project No	Prefix	Agency	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Last Action Date	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal
5029027	Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	0400021108L	BPMP	Redwood City	VARIOUS BRIDGES IN CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	2/14/2014	6/22/2011	2/14/2014	2/14/2014	30,000.00	26,559.00	12,911.12	13,647.88
5029032	Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	0414000103L	BPMP	Redwood City	MAIN ST, VETERANS BLVD, AND MAPLE ST OVER REDWOOD CREEK, BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	3/21/2014	3/21/2014		3/21/2014	26,250.00	23,239.00	0	23,239.00
5196030	Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 02/20/2015	04924505L	CML	Daly City	MISSION STREET, PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	3/19/2014	8/1/2006	3/19/2014	3/19/2014	2,864,426.00	2,295,300.00	1,881,014.92	414,285.08
5438011	Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	0400021118L1	HPLUL	East Palo Alto	BAY ROAD: CLARKE/ILLINOIS TO COOLEY LANDING (BAY TRAIL), ROAD WIDEN, RESURFACE, STREETScape, BIKE LANE	3/13/2014	4/4/2012	3/13/2014	3/13/2014	1,206,250.00	1,064,000.00	182,789.66	881,210.34
6014011	Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 02/20/2015	04099928L	HP21L	San Mateo County Transit District	MISSION ST FR JDALY BLVD TO PARKVIEW AVE, PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS	3/13/2014	11/11/2010	3/13/2014	3/13/2014	1,669,784.00	700,000.00	544,294.44	155,705.56
5029030	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0412000272L1	SRTSL	Redwood City	CHARTER ST BETWEEN STAMBAUGH AND SPRING, CROSSWALK, BULB OUT, CURB RAMP	5/19/2014	4/26/2012	5/19/2014	10/10/2014	577,293.00	577,293.00	11,093.82	566,199.18
5196038	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0414000098L	STPL	Daly City	CALLAN BLVD: HICKEY BLVD TO WEMBLEY DR AND KING DR: VERDUCI DR TO GELLERT BLVD, ROAD RESURFACING	6/8/2014	6/8/2014		10/10/2014	892,702.00	562,000.00	0	562,000.00
5267015	Future	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 05/20/2015	04925879L	CML	San Carlos	OLD COUNTY RD, EAST SAN CARLOS, BIKE PATH, SIDEWALK WIDEN, LANDSCAPE	6/10/2014	1/11/2011	6/10/2014	6/10/2014	3,280,034.00	2,221,000.00	884,611.22	1,336,388.78
5267020	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0414000255L	CML	San Carlos	ON EL CAMINO REAL (SR82) FROM BUSH ST TO ARROYO AVE, PED LIGHT, TREE PLANT, SIDEWALK IMPROVE, MEDIAN	4/27/2014	4/27/2014		12/15/2014	585,631.00	479,677.00	0	479,677.00
5350020	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0414000311L	STPL	Pacifica	LINDA MAR BLVD BETWEEN DE SOLO DR TO ADOBE DR, PAVEMENT REHABILITATION	6/8/2014	6/8/2014		8/20/2014	508,695.00	431,000.00	0	431,000.00
5390005	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0414000258L	STPL	Portola Valley	ALPINE RD, CORTE MADERA RD, AND PORTOLA RD, ASPHALT OVERLAY	4/27/2014	4/27/2014		4/27/2014	324,635.00	224,000.00	0	224,000.00
6014005	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	04924619L	HPLUL	San Mateo County Transit District	EL CAMINO REAL, PE - MEDIAN LANDSCAPING/IRRIGA	6/3/2014	4/15/2007	6/3/2014	6/3/2014	1,097,325.00	877,860.00	723,709.94	154,150.06
6014015	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0414000282L	TCSP	San Mateo County Transit District	EL CAMINO REAL GRAND BLVD, STREETScape IMPROVEMENT	5/16/2014	5/16/2014		5/16/2014	412,552.00	365,232.00	0	365,232.00
22X0001	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2015	0413000406L	ER	Portola Valley	5500 BLOCK OF ALPINE ROAD, STITCH PIER 62' LENGTH AT 30' DEEP	5/15/2014	5/15/2014		5/15/2014	295,000.00	261,164.00	0	261,164.00