



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

**AGENDA**  
**Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ)**  
**Committee**

**Date:** Monday, June 27, 2016  
**Time:** 3:00 p.m.  
**Place:** San Mateo City Hall  
330 West 20th Avenue, San Mateo, California  
Conference Room C (across from Council Chambers)

PLEASE CALL Jeff Lacap (650-599-1455) IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND

- |  |                                     |              |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.  | Presentations are limited to 3 mins |              |
| 2. Issues from the May and June 2016 C/CAG Board meeting:  | Information (Lacap)                 | No Materials |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approved - Agreements with BAAQMD for FY16/17 TFCA funds for \$1,277,039.76</li> <li>• Approved – Agreement with Commute.org for FY16/17 TFCA funds for Countywide Trip Reduction Program for \$525,000</li> <li>• Approved – Agreement with SamTrans for FY16/17 TFCA funds for shuttle services, bike racks on buses, and San Carlos Shuttle projects for \$431,988</li> <li>• Approved – Agreement with SamTrans for Measure allocation for FYs16/17-17/18 for \$2.8M</li> <li>• Approved – Agreement with SMCOE for the Countywide SRTS Program for FY 16/17 for \$564,711</li> <li>• Approved – C/CAG 2016-17 Program Budget and Fees</li> </ul> |                                     |              |
| 3. Approval of minutes of March 28, 2016 meeting.  | Action (Garbarino)                  | Pages 1 – 4  |
| 4. Receive a presentation on the Mobility As A Service (MaaS) Project.   | Information (Raney)                 | Handouts     |
| 5. Review and recommend approval of the scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program.   | Action (Higaki)                     | Pages 5 - 12 |



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

- |   |                         |               |
|---|-------------------------|---------------|
| 6. Review and recommend approval of the definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program. | Action (Higaki)         | Pages 13 – 15 |
| 7. Review and comment on the Preliminary Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan   | Action (Hoang)          | Pages 16 - 22 |
| 8. Executive Director Report.   | Information (Wong)      | No Materials  |
| 9. Member comments and announcements.   | Information (Garbarino) |               |
| 10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date:<br><b>August 29, 2016</b>   | Action (Garbarino)      |               |

**NOTE: All items appearing on the agenda are subject to action by the Committee. Actions recommended by staff are subject to change by the Committee.**

**NOTE: *Persons with disabilities who require auxiliary aids or services in attending and participating in this meeting should contact Mima Guilles at 650 599-1406, five working days prior to the meeting date.***

Other enclosures/Correspondence - None

**CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEE ON CONGESTION  
MANAGEMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (CMEQ)**

**MINUTES  
MEETING OF April 25, 2016**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Garbarino in Conference Room C at City Hall of San Mateo at 3:00 p.m. Attendance sheet is attached.

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

None.

**2. Approval of minutes of March 28, 2016 meeting.**

*Motion: To approve the Minutes of the March 28, 2015 meeting, Koelling/Bonilla. Motion carried unanimously.*

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

C/CAG Staff Jean Higaki presented the proposed framework of the OBAG 2 program highlighting changes from OBAG 1 including shifting of regional programs to the county, update of Complete Streets requirements, housing element adoption requirements, and anti-displacement policy.

Under this framework, the proposed allocation of funding for Local Street and Roads (LSR) Program would be on a formula basis utilizing population data and road miles rather than a competitive call for projects done in past cycles. Public Works staff prefers the formula basis for LSR allocation funding under OBAG 2. The Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program would continue to be a competitive call for projects.

Committee members had questions regarding an anti-displacement requirement that MTC is still working on and delaying the release of call for projects of OBAG 2 programs. Member Aguirre responded by saying jurisdictions will be required to create a policy that will have to address the issue of anti-displacement within their own plans. Other committee members had questions regarding technical issues under the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program and clarification of what types of projects are applicable under the TLC program.

*Motion: To approve the of the Proposed One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework, Stone/O'Connell. Motion carried unanimously.*

**4. Review and recommend approval of the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan (Fiscal Year 2017- 2021) (Action).**

C/CAG Staff John Hoang presented information on the revised proposed framework for the Measure M – 5-Year Implementation Plan indicating that all the allocations will remain the same from the original 5-Year Plan including the Transit Operations/Senior Mobility program that would remain the same at 22%.

Committee members had questions regarding local shuttles, enforcement of discharge from mobile carwashes and concrete trucks, and program metrics of Traffic Congestion Management and Stormwater Pollution Prevention.

*Motion: To approve the Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan, Lewis/O’Connell. Motion carried unanimously.*

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

C/CAG Staff Tom Madalena presented the project list of the FY 16/17 & FY 17/18 cycle of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) and C/CAG Shuttle Program. Staff received applications from 11 sponsors which encompass 40 separate shuttles. The total amount requested was approximately \$9,300,000 of the available \$10,000,000. Staff convened a Shuttle Evaluation Panel on March 17, 2016 to evaluate and score the shuttle program applications.

There are two projects that are on the project list that are being deferred at this time. The Coastside Beach Shuttle is being deferred due to a request from the sponsor, the County of San Mateo, so that they can better coordinate the route and schedule with existing transit service and the community. The Millbrae Shuttle was not recommended for funding by the Shuttle Evaluation Panel due to significant overlap with SamTrans bus service and not meeting the minimum program requirements.

Tom concluded by mentioning that leftover money from this cycle will be carried forward to the following cycle in two years.

*Motion: To approve the project list for funding under the C/CAG and San Mateo County Transportation Authority Shuttle Program for FY 2016/2017 and FY 2017/2018, Bonilla/Stone. Motion carried unanimously.*

**6. Receive information on the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan development (Information).**

C/CAG Staff John Hoang presented the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) development. In February 2016, C/CAG executed a Memorandum of Understanding with project partners San Mateo County Transportation Authority and SamTrans to complete the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan. DKS Associates has been retained to complete the CTP. In addition to the Project Team, a Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) would also be established. It was determined that the CMEQ Committee would assume the role of the PAC.

John introduced Bill Loudon and Robert Vance from DKS Associates to present the project objectives, CTP visions and goals, project schedule, and future tasks to complete the CTP.

Members had questions regarding how to provide comments to the DKS Associates and C/CAG staff. All comments received throughout the CTP development process will be recorded in a master list. Responses will be provided for each comment and the master list will be made available to the full PAC for follow up discussions, as appropriate.

**7. Receive information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3 (Information).**

C/CAG Staff Eliza Yu presented information on the Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 3. On April 15, 2016, the ATP Call for Projects was issued concurrently for both the statewide and regional program where CTC released the Final Adopted ATP Cycle 3 Guidelines, Application and Evaluation Scoring Rubric. Applications at the statewide and regional level are both due on June 15, 2016.

**8. Executive Director Report (Information).**

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided the following update:

1. US-101 Carpool/Express Lane Project – the project is currently gaining momentum and will start the formal environmental process soon. Private partners are working with public agencies on the donation of \$3 million dollars to help supplement the funding for the environmental phase.
2. STIP Update – CTC is scheduled to adopt the 2016 STIP at their May meeting. Staff has received information that CTC will not recommend any new projects. The US-101 Carpool/Express Lane Project is considered a new project. C/CAG has sent a letter to CTC to reconsider the project status of the US-101 Carpool project. Two additional projects that have been affected by the STIP are the Willow/101 Interchange project and the El Camino Real/92 Intersection project. Both projects are ready to go to construction, but cannot move forward due to reduction in the STIP.

**9. Member comments and announcements (Information).**

Member Lewis has informed the Committee that the Town of Atherton will begin work on the Marsh Road Channel project in May and will take 8-12 weeks to complete.

**10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:06 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for May 23, 2016.

2016 C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee Attendance Report													
Agency	Representative	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Alicia Aguirre	•			•								
City of Belmont	Charles Stone	•			•								
Town of Atherton	Elizabeth Lewis			•	•								
City of San Bruno	Irene O'Connell	•		•	•								
City of Burlingame	Emily Beach	(n/a)		•	•								
Environmental Community	Lennie Roberts			•	• (3:03pm)								
City of Pacifica	Mike O'Neill	•		•	•								
City of South San Francisco	Richard Garbarino	•		•	•								
Public	Steve Dworetzky	• (3:18pm)											
City of Millbrae	Wayne Lee			•									
City of San Mateo	Rick Bonilla			•	•								
City of Pacifica	John Keener	•		•	•								
Agencies with Transportation Interests	Adina Levin	•			•								
Business Community	Linda Koelling	•		•	•								
Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (Caltrain)	Liz Scanlon	•		•									
San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans)	Doug Kim	•		•									

**Staff and guests in attendance for the April 25, 2016 meeting:**

Sandy Wong, John Hoang, Jean Higaki, Eliza Yu, Tom Madalena, Jeff Lacap - C/CAG Staff  
 Bill Loudon, Robert Vance - DKS Associates

## **C/CAG AGENDA REPORT**

Date: June 27, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

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

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

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Not applicable.

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

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

### **BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

## Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

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

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

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

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

## Screening Requirements and Scoring Criteria

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

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

MTC requires that at least half of all OBAG 2 funds be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2020. Remaining OBAG 2 funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2023.

Preliminary Engineering (PE) funds are expected to be obligated in the first year of programming (January 31, 2018). Projects that cannot meet this deadline should not apply for OBAG 2 funding.

Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) must demonstrate compliance with MTC’s Resolution 4202 by screening and evaluating projects using specific factors. MTC guidelines requires that CMAs



develop evaluation criteria for projects that place an emphasis on supporting projects in PDAs with high housing growth, projects that support multi-modal access, projects located in Communities of Concern (COC), projects in affordable housing PDAs, mitigation projects in PDAs that overlap with Air District “Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE)” Communities, and anti-displacement criteria. MTC is in the process of developing an anti-displacement policy which will be incorporated into this program.

### Project Selection Process

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

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

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

### Committee Review

The proposed scoring criteria for the TLC program were presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) on June 16, 2016. The CMP TAC recommended approval of the scoring criteria with the following modifications (also highlighted and shown on the attachments).

- Add a larger point range to the location in relation to a PDA criterion relative to distance from a PDA (e.g. 1/4mi, 1/2 mi, 1mi, versus within in a PDA and within proximate access to a PDA.
- Reduce the Community of Concern criterion to 5 points and increase the user benefit criterion by 5 points.
- Reduce the Support criterion to 5 points and increase the design criterion by 5 points.
- Modify the Match Fund criterion to be a sliding scale versus point ranges.

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

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

**ATTACHMENTS**

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

## OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements

### Highlights of the MTC OBAG 2 adopted proposal:

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

### Eligibility Requirements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Program Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create enjoyable and safe multi modal experiences.</li> <li>• Facilitate multi modal mobility.</li> <li>• Enhance connections between alternative modes of transportation.</li> <li>• Enhancements that support community based transportation that brings vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors.</li> </ul> <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation (e.g. no landscape only projects)</p>	
Eligible Types of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streetscape improvements such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, way finding signage, landscaping, and bicycle pedestrian treatments that focus on high-impact, multi-modal improvements. Project must contain multi-modal elements (no beautification/ landscape only projects).</li> <li>• Complete streets improvements such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges.</li> <li>• Transit station improvements (plaza, station access, bike parking), transit access projects (connecting housing to jobs and mixed land use to transit).</li> <li>• Transportation Demand Management project such as car sharing, vanpooling coordination and information, and Clipper related projects.</li> </ul> <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation</p>	
<b>Fund Source</b>		
CMAQ fund source	Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed.	
<b>Scoring Criteria</b>		
	<b>Maximum Score</b>	
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, <u>within 1/4 mi of a PDA=8pts, within 1/2 mi of a PDA = 5pts, within 1 mi of a PDA = 2pts, in proximate access to a PDA= 5pts</u> )	10
RHNA/ Housing Production	Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production. (1-5)	5
	Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels	2
Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities	If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center and improvements are consistent with the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines. (0-2)	2
Community of Concern	Project location in relation to Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community based Transportation Plans. Project is identified in one of the Community Based Transportation Plans developed in San Mateo County or the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities. (Project is in a CBTP or Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities = 5pts, Project is located in a COC = 3pts)	<del>10</del> 5
Affordable Housing	Located in a PDA that has affordable housing preservations or creation strategies and community stabilization policies. (1-5)	5
User Benefit	Project has a high need (2 3 points) Project is a safety project (3 4 points) Project is expected to have high use (3 4 points) Project is expected to have a high return on investment (2 3 points) Project meets the intent and goals of the program (4 5 points)	<del>14</del> 19
Planning	Project is listed in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, station area plan, transit plan, or other area planning document). (1-5)	5
Connectivity/ Improves Transportation Choices	Project connects or improves access to housing/ jobs/ "high quality" transit (4 points) Project connects a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network. (4 points) Project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach. (4 points) Project is located in or near dense job centers, in proximity to transit, and housing with reduced parking requirements and travel demand Management (TDM) programs or Project improves transportation choices for all income levels (2 points)	14
Support	Project has council approval and community support. (1- <del>10</del> 5)	<del>10</del> 5
Match Funds	Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47% minimum) - (1-10) -20%=2pts, 21-30%=5pts, 30-40%=7 pts, 40%+= <del>10pts</del> )	10
Readiness	Project is free of Right of Way complications (project has secured encroachment permits, or is entirely on city property). (1-4)	4
	Project has secured all required regulatory agency permits (e.g. BCDC, RWQCB, CCC, USFWS). (1-4)	4
	Project is designed (0-100%). (1-5-10)	5 10

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

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

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

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 27, 2016

To: C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

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

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

---

### RECOMMENDATION

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

### FISCAL IMPACT

None

### SOURCE OF FUNDS

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

### BACKGROUND

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

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

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

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

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

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

The latest PDA boundary delineation map can be found at: [http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive\\_maps/](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive_maps/).

The C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) recommended approval of the definition above on May 26, 2016 and Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) recommended approval of the above definition on June 16, 2016 with a recommended modification to the second category. The CMP TAC recommended raising the ½ mile radius of a PDA boundary to 1 mile siting the first and last mile issue.

The CMP TAC also requested that staff research to see if there is evidence to support raising the ½ mile PDA radius to 1 mile. Sources addressing the first and last and last mile are generally related to transit access vs PDAs. Per Federal Transit Administration’s (FTA) definition, of a “ physical or functional relationship to public transportation”, transit access sheds are ½ mile radius for pedestrians improvements and 3 miles for bicycle improvements.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

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



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

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

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

## C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: June 27, 2016  
To: Congestion Management and Environmental Quality (CMEQ) Committee  
From: John Hoang  
Subject: Review and comment on the Preliminary Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan

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

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the CMEQ Committee, in its role as the Policy Advisory Committee for the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan, review and comment on the Preliminary Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

\$185,000

### **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

C/CAG Transportation Fund; San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA); SamTrans

### **BACKGROUND**

C/CAG, along with project partners the TA and SamTrans, is in the process of developing the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040 (CTP). The CTP is intended to provide a long-range comprehensive transportation planning document that establishes a framework to systematically address transportation goals and objectives and promote consistency between transportation plans and programs within San Mateo County.

The project began in February 2016 and development of the CTP is guided by a Project Team, comprised of key staff from C/CAG, TA, SamTrans, and Caltrain. The CMEQ Committee, designated as the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC), serves in an advisory role to ensure that the CTP is developed in a comprehensive manner taking into consideration shared goals and varying perspectives.

At the April 25, 2016, meeting (PAC Meeting #1), the PAC was provided an update of the CTP development process including a review of the draft vision, goal, and policies for the following transportation categories: Land Use and Transportation Linkage, Roadway System, Bicycle and Pedestrians, Public Transportation, Transportation System Management, Parking, Modal Connectivity, and Goods Movement, as well as financial considerations. Individual comments were received and addressed accordingly as indicated in the attached summary.

For this meeting, PAC Meeting #2, a preliminary draft CTP is being provided to the PAC for review and discussion.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

1. Summary of PAC comments on draft CTP Vision, Goal, and Policies
2. Preliminary Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan

*Document provided under separate cover and also available for download at:*

<http://ccag.ca.gov/committees/congestion-management-and-environmental-quality-committee/>

San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments  
as of 6/13/2016

No.	Prev. Page	Comment on Draft Report	Response
1	4-6	Page 1-1: I believe the Vision statement for Land Use is a little difficult to understand. This is what is written, "A San Mateo County that is safe and convenient for all people on foot, by bicycle, via public transportation, and with an automobile to places people wish to go." Suggested: A San Mateo County that is safe and convenient for all people whether traveling on foot, by bicycle, via public transportation, or in an automobile, to reach places they wish to go.	Statement revised
2	4-6	Enhance Rural Communities - I don't agree with either of those two statements. Our transportation system is strapped financially; we are barely serving residents in high density areas, how can we ensure service to those in rural areas and still protect them from growth-inducing transportation projects.	Statement revised
3	4-6	Page 1-1: Vision: The Vision statement is an incomplete sentence. Suggested addition: "A San Mateo County transportation system..."	Statement revised
4	4-6	Page 1-1: Concentrate Development, first bullet: Suggest deleting "within the County of San Mateo's urban/rural boundary" as the urban/rural boundary is only applicable in the Coastal Zone, so reference is not relevant to 90% of the county. Revised policy would read: "Concentrate new development in urban areas, particularly those designated as "Priority Development Areas."	Statement revised
5	4-7	(page 1-2) Parking Management I don't understand what it means to "unbundle" parking costs from the cost of housing and commercial space.	Moved to Parking Section and added footnote with definition
6	4-7	Page 1-2: Housing Supply: Suggest adding new category after Housing Supply: Jobs/Housing Equation: and include the following bullet points: "Promote the creation of enough ownership and rental housing units at prices affordable to meet the needs of existing or potential households who work in the County" "Strongly encourage the creation of housing units in or near jurisdictions which have an excess of jobs." "Strongly encourage the creation of jobs in or near jurisdictions which have an excess of housing units." "Discourage creation of jobs in or near jurisdictions which have an excess of jobs over housing." (per 2001 CTP, page 1.8).	A new section was added to address the housing/job balance
7	4-7	Page 1-2: Development Standards: Please delete the third bullet which references "Smart Codes and "Form-Based Codes" as these are controversial concepts not well suited to San Mateo County where cities and the county prefer to designate land uses and densities in zoning districts. Adoption of these codes could actually work to the detriment of efforts to encourage affordable housing along transit corridors.	Statement revised
8	4-7	Page 1-2: Development Standards, fourth bullet: It is not clear what "universal design" entails, and how it would achieve the desired goal of achieving access to housing and transportation facilities. "Universal design" would seem to imply a cookie-cutter approach when in fact more creativity is needed to accomplish a successful transition from our existing suburban pattern of development into a more compact, transit oriented one.	Statement revised

San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments  
as of 6/13/2016

No.	Prev. Page	Comment on Draft Report	Response
9	4-7	Page 1-2: Parking Management: This section appears to be duplicative of the more extensive discussion in Section 8; perhaps it isn't needed here. It is notable that reduced parking standards for housing and commercial uses can result in increased congestion due to drivers circling around the block or idling alongside the curb waiting for a parking space to become available, particularly as our population ages and some folks can't walk longer distances to access services, shops, or other amenities.	Section moved to Parking chapter
10	4-7	Page 1-2: Quality Public Places and Spaces: I was glad to see this included, as people are drawn to beautiful, well designed public spaces, and will avoid run down or otherwise unattractive areas. I would suggest rewording the title: "Attractive, Engaging Public Places and Spaces".	Statement revised
11	5-8	Page 2-1: Roadway System Vision: Suggested adding some implementation items to the Vision, so it would read: "A roadway system that contributes to the socio-economic and environmental health of San Mateo County through improving mobility, reducing traffic congestion, improving air quality, and increasing reliability and safety." (per 2001 CTP, page 1.1)	Statement was retained to be consistent with how other visions are described.
12	5-9	For the roadway system and financial, please consider "induced demand" when assessing the outcomes of roadway system capacity expansion	Added statement underpolicies for roadways to give consideration to the VMT-inducing impact of roadway projects
13	5-9	for 101 as a major corridor, consider corridor mode share among all modes solo driving, rail, public bus, private shuttle, carpool, etc.) and strategies to shift travelers to sustainable modes	This is addressed in the Executive Summary as a major initiative and in the narrative of the report
14	5-9	(Page 2-1) Roadway system The second bullet under Improve the Efficiency of the existing roadway...I would add the words (or something close) When possible or feasible. * When possible, provide auxiliary lanes on freeways...	Statement revised
15	5-9	With regards to Roadways, we should be focused on studying better ways to integrate the road system. Funding for that is essential yet lawmakers seem to continue the "band-aid" solutions with construction HOV lanes north/south so the public has to continue to pay for poor policies towards congestion management. The recent diversion of funds from studying the 92/101 interchange to creating the new HOV lane on 101 was in my opinion a very big mistake.	Comment noted
16	5-9	Page 2-1: Improve the efficiency of the existing roadway system: suggest adding "interchange improvements and ramp metering" to the list of improvements	Added intersections reference; Ramp metering is addressed in the TSM/ITS chapter
17	5-9	Page 2-1: Enhance safety for travel by motorized modes: suggest adding "and intersections" after "roadways". I would also like to see Roundabouts specifically included as they reduce overall intersection accidents by up to 75%, and fatalities by 90%.	Statement revised and reference to roundabouts was added

**San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments**  
as of 6/13/2016

No.	Prev. Page	Comment on Draft Report	Response
18	6-6	(Page 3-1) Vision – It says, “A San Mateo County in which walking...(I believe you mean bicycling), same in Goal.	Statement revised
19	8-10	Page 5-5: Public Transportation Vision, Goals and Policies: There is no mention of Ferries, yet they are part of our transportation system.	A section was added to the report that discsses the ferry service
20	8-10	Page 5-5: Develop Improved Service Efficiency... : Avoid or minimize transit service duplication within target markets of the SMC public transportation system: This deserves more discussion, as the policy may work against gaining even more use of public transit especially when the provision of transit by private providers is a factor. For some target markets, the more transit providers will gain greater overall benefits.	Statement revised; access to private shuttles addressed in Modal Connections; park-and-ride addressed in Parking chapter
21	8-11	For Public Transit, continue to explore potential role of transportation networks, improvements to on-demand service technologies, and autonomous technologies as they develop.	Addressed in the Executive Summary under Challenges and Opportunities; On-demand technologies addressed in TSM and Modal Connections
22	10-4	For Transportation Demand Management create a policy encouraging jurisdictions to set goals and to publicly report performance	Added policy to support local jurisdictions in creating TDM goals
23	12-9	For Parking, encourage and support community education on effective practices for parking policy and parking management (e.g., the relationships between parking pricing, traffic, and housing affordability)	Added policy to encourage sharing of parking practices among local jurisdictions
24	12-9	(Page 8-1) I would add a bullet point that addresses installation of electric charging stations.	Added reference to electric charging
25	12-9	Page 8-1: Parking Policies, see comments on Parking Management above. If parking requirements are reduced, the parking demand in downtowns or along transit corridors will either spill over onto adjacent (often residential) streets and there can also be increased numbers of people circling the block multiple times or otherwise stopped in strategic locations to wait for a parking space to open up. The aging population in the county has a greater need to park in close proximity to shopping, medical appointments, and other services. The reduced parking concept may be more applicable to heavily urbanized cities where transit is convenient and people can rely on other modes of transportation.	This is addressed in the narrative in more detail
26	12-9	Page 8-1: Foster Emplacement of Solar Panels...Please change “Foster Emplacement” to	Statemet revised
27	12-9	“Install” or “Locate” as “emplacement” is associated with military weaponry.	Statemet revised
28	12-10	Page 8-2: Promote Installation of “Smart” Parking Meters... Please delete reference to	Statemet revised
29	12-10	Redwood City, as it seems out of place in a policy document.	Statemet revised
30	12-10	Page 8-2: Reduce On-Street Parking Along El Camino Real: Please change this title to “Reduce On-Street Parking Along Key Transit Corridors and Downtown Areas”. This policy needs a better explanation of the goal of providing more capacity for vehicles and bicycles and should include adversely impacting businesses.	Statement revised

San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments  
as of 6/13/2016

No.	Prev. Page	Comment on Draft Report	Response
31	15-5	For Financial, consider updating allocations for active transportation to be compatible with current and planned mode share, also considering state mode share policies. Support extension of Caltrain grade separation funding which is about to be exhausted.	The CTP proposes a balanced approach for transportation modes and recognizes that certain funding programs have required uses
32	15-5	Page 11-6: Support the protection of the existing infrastructure: In the last sentence, please spell out the term SHOPP as is done with other acronyms in this section.	Statement revised
33	15-5	Page 11-7: Financial Vision: Priority of the STIP towards state Highway Improvement Projects: The text is unclear as to the impact of the proposed directing of STIP funds towards roads and highways upon the transit program, particularly in light of the statement that the entire transit program is nearly twice the size of the roads program.	STIP funds are used to leverage other funds (including federal sources) for the highway program. The transit program has other funding programs outside of STIP.
34	General	The East/West transportation linkage is extremely lacking and with continued reduction of bus service in those residential areas, we have achieved limited to no success in getting people on to public transportation. This is an important element to reducing/managing congestion. Not everyone wants to live on the El Camino nor should they be forced to. This needs clarity as to how this will be addressed	East-west connections are discussed in the Roadway chapter and in policies for public transportation.
35	General	The Bay Regional Plan is flawed without the necessary infrastructure in place in our counties. Perhaps we should be planning the transportation linkage before more housing is built	Comment noted
36	General	It is a mistake to think that higher density residential areas will control the congestion and I am very much against the idea of priority development areas. If an efficient and effective public transportation system was in place, we wouldn't be constantly pushed to think our environment would be better if we lived in higher density housing	Comment noted
37	General	Finally, I can't help but observe that one of the primary purposes of the CMEQ is to reduce congestion, which is getting to be a bigger and bigger challenge every year! People who must use our transportation system to get to work every day, are increasingly spending more and more time trying to get from Point A to Point B, and the rest of our residents find themselves avoiding peak congestion times for whatever reasons they need to go somewhere. This is significantly affecting many people's quality of life.	Comment noted
38	Global	(Page 3-1) The paragraph that is written above the Vision statement could be taken out of this and every other section that has it and be re-written as an over-arching Vision Statement – I don't think you need to repeat the same statement that "Progress toward improvement of the overall transportation system..."	Will revise

**San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (SMCTP) - Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) Comments  
as of 6/13/2016**

No.	Prev. Page	Comment on Draft Report	Response
39	vi	The PowerPoint presentation, under Challenges and Opportunities, included “Trips in and out of the County — Requires Regional Approach”. I would suggest adding “Trips through the County” to these categories as through trips have historically been a significant percentage of the work related trips in-and out- of the County. It would also be helpful to show the data over time on the market share of Auto, Transit, Bicycle, and Walk to Work/Work at Home.	The Settings chapter has statistics on the mode share for different trip types and the forecast of trips by mode