



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, August 29, 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 August 2016 C/CAG Board meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Definition of “proximate access” as it relates to PDAs in the OBAG 2 Program• Received – Information on the OBAG 2 BPIP call for projects• Received – Information on the OBAG 2 TLC Program call for projects | Information (Lacap) | No Materials |
| 3. Approval of minutes of June 27, 2016 meeting. | Action (Garbarino) | Pages 1 – 3 |
| 4. Receive a presentation on the San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program School Year 15-16. | Information (Vallez-Kelly) | Handouts |
| 5. Receive a presentation on the Smart Mobility Project. | Information (Raney) | Handouts |
| 6. Receive the revision to the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework. | Information (Higaki) | Pages 4 – 6 |
| 7. Receive the Board approved definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program. | Information (Higaki) | Pages 7 – 9 |
| 8. Review and Recommend Approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program Call for Projects. | Action (Higaki) | Pages 10 – 29 |
| 9. Executive Director Report. | Information (Wong) | No Materials |



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

10. Member comments and announcements. Information
(Garbarino)
11. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date: Action (Garbarino)
September 26, 2016

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 June 27, 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. Issues from the June 2016 C/CAG Board meeting

C/CAG Staff Jeff Lacap provided updates on items that were previously brought to the CMEQ committee and been brought to the Board meeting thereafter.

3. Approval of minutes of April 25, 2016 meeting.

Motion: To approve the minutes of the April 25, 2016 meeting, O'Connell/Roberts. Motion carried unanimously.

4. Receive a presentation on the Mobility As A Service (MaaS) Project.

Item was removed from the agenda.

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).

C/CAG Staff Jean Higaki presented the proposed scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program. The Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) had reviewed the proposed scoring criteria and their proposed modifications, which included PDA distance criterion and match fund criterion, were also presented to the CMEQ Committee.

The CMEQ Committee recommended approval of the criteria (with the changes proposed by the TAC) along with the following modification:

- Modify the support criterion to read "Project has council approval **and/or** community support"

Motion: To approve the scoring criteria for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program, O'Connell/Keener. Motion carried unanimously.

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).

Jean Higaki presented on the proposed "proximate access" definition of which a project would need to meet at least one of the six categories in order to be considered as a PDA project, which was vetted through the C/CAG committees and adopted by the C/CAG Board under OBAG 1.

The CMEQ Committee agreed with the modification from the TAC Committee regarding Item No. 2 (“The project is within ½ mile radius of a PDA boundary”), raising the ½ mile radius to 1 mile, siting the first and last mile issue.

Motion: To approve the definition of “proximate access” as it relates to Priority Development Areas (PDAs) in the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program, Lewis/Aguirre. Motion carried unanimously.

7. Review and comment on the Preliminary Draft San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (Information).

In a past meeting, it was determined that the CMEQ Committee would assume the role of the Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) for the San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) update. C/CAG Staff John Hoang announced this is the 2nd PAC meeting. The draft report was given to the PAC members and asked them to provide comments by July 18.

John introduced Bill Loudon from DKS Associates to go over the executive summary, the framework and policies of the CTP, and the remaining tasks of the project, which include public outreach and another review of the CTP draft by the PAC.

Members had questions regarding the equity analysis, the members of the various agencies that make up CTP project team, and what types of comments from the PAC that will be the most beneficial.

8. Executive Director Report (Information).

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

1. San Mateo County Closing the Job-Housing Gap Task Force – The Board of Supervisors is having a study session to explore ways to generate revenue for affordable housing. Sandy encouraged CMEQ members to attend.
2. Lobby Day– Sandy provided a recap of when C/CAG visited Sacramento in June and spoke with various state legislators and government officials about the transportation issues and stormwater funding in San Mateo County.
3. Update on US-101 Managed Lanes.

9. Member comments and announcements (Information).

Member Garbarino informed the Committee that the TA has extended the recruitment period for their Citizen Advisory Committee.

10. Adjournment and establishment of next meeting date.

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 pm.

The next regular meeting was scheduled for August 29, 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 June 27, 2016 meeting:

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

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2016

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

From: Jean Higaki, C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Receive the revision to the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG CMEQ receives the revision to the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Framework.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

Federal funds are allocated by 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 of 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. General highlights of the adopted OBAG 2 program and jurisdictional eligibility requirements are attached.

The proposed OBAG 2 framework proposal was presented to the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) on April 21, 2016 and the Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on April 25, 2016 respectively. The C/CAG Board adopted the proposed framework at the May 12, 2016 meeting.

Subsequent to the C/CAG Board's adoption of the framework, the federal Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act provided an additional \$72 million in STP/ CMAQ funds to the region (MTC). MTC in turn has proposed that \$32 million be distributed to the counties based on the OBAG 2 county distribution formula.

C/CAG will receive an additional \$2.69 million for the county share. On August 11, 2016 the Board adopted the following revisions to the OBAG 2 framework.

	Board Approved on 5/12/16	Board Approved on 8/11/16
Local Street and Roads (LSR) Maintenance and Rehabilitation*	\$11M	\$12.1M
Planning and Outreach	\$4.6M	\$5.08M
Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)	\$5.4M	\$5.9M
Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP)	\$5.4M	\$5.9M
Safe Routes to School (SRTS)	\$2.3M	\$2.6M
Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) Program (required by statute)	\$892,000	\$892,000

* See attachment for revised LSR details.

Eligibility Requirements

Anti-Displacement Requirement – When MTC adopted Resolution 4202 in November 2015, MTC staff was directed to develop anti-displacement policy recommendations. On July 27, 2016 the MTC adopted the following requirement in order to be eligible for OBAG 2 funds:

“All cities and counties must adopt a surplus land resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC. The resolution must verify that any disposition of surplus land undertaken by the jurisdiction complies with the State Surplus Land Act, as amended by AB 2135, 2014. MTC will issue guidance to assist cities and counties in drafting a resolution to meet this requirement. This guidance will be posted on the OBAG 2 website: <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2>.”

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.

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

ATTACHMENTS

1. Funding for OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program

**San Mateo C/CAG
OBAG 2 Local Streets and Roads Preservation Program**

CITY / COUNTY	Board Approved Distribution on 5/12/16 (Rounded to 1,000)	Board Approved Distribution on 8/11/16 (Rounded to 1,000)
Atherton	\$220,000	\$240,000
Belmont	\$408,000	\$446,000
Brisbane	\$120,000	\$131,000
Burlingame	\$499,000	\$546,000
Colma*	\$100,000	\$100,000
Daly City	\$1,144,000	\$1,252,000
East Palo Alto	\$363,000	\$398,000
Foster City	\$385,000	\$421,000
Half Moon Bay	\$177,000	\$193,000
Hillsborough	\$357,000	\$390,000
Menlo Park	\$565,000	\$619,000
Millbrae	\$338,000	\$370,000
Pacifica	\$586,000	\$641,000
Portola Valley	\$176,000	\$192,000
Redwood City	\$1,105,000	\$1,209,000
San Bruno	\$587,000	\$643,000
San Carlos	\$503,000	\$550,000
San Mateo	\$1,391,000	\$1,522,000
South San Francisco	\$897,000	\$982,000
Woodside	\$211,000	\$231,000
SM County (Urban)	\$936,000	\$1,024,000
Total	\$11,068,000	\$12,100,000

* Increased to minimum allowed grant size.

**Highly encourage small jurisdictions under \$250,000 to merge projects
Encourage merging into any competitive call application (B/P or TLC)**

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2016

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

From: Jean Higaki, C/CAG Transportation Systems Coordinator

Subject: Receive the Board approved 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@smc.gov)

RECOMMENDATION

That the C/CAG CMEQ receive the Board approved 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.

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

Under OBAG 1, the definition of “proximate access” with six categories was vetted through the C/CAG committees and adopted by the C/CAG Board.

At the May 26, 2016 meeting, the C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) recommended approval of the OBAG 1 adopted definition.

On June 16, 2016, the Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC) recommended approval of the adopted OBAG 1 definition with a recommended modification to the second category. The CMP TAC recommended raising the ½ mile radius of a PDA boundary to 1 mile.

On June 27, 2016 the C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) recommended approval of the definition of proximate access as modified by the CMP TAC and shown above.

On August 11, 2016 the C/CAG Board approved the definition of proximate access to a PDA with modifications recommended by the CMP TAC and CMEQ as shown below.

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 ~~half~~ one 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.

ATTACHMENTS

1. MTC Examples of Proximate Access from OBAG 1

MTC Examples of Proximate Access From OBAG 1

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

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

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: August 29, 2016

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

From: Sandy Wong, Executive Director

Subject: Review and Recommend Approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program Call for Projects.

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

RECOMMENDATION

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

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

The previous version of the OBAG 2 TLC scoring criteria has been reviewed by the CMEQ on June 27, 2016. However, on July, 27, 2016 the MTC Commission required the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to develop specific scoring criteria related to housing and anti-displacement policies enacted by local jurisdictions for projects in PDAs. In addition, the MTC adopted an anti-displacement requirement which is described on the attached "OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements."

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.

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.

Subsequent to the C/CAG Board’s adoption of the framework, the federal Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act provided additional STP/ CMAQ funds resulting in an additional \$2.69 million for the county share. On August 11, 2016 the C/CAG Board adopted the revised OBAG 2 framework. The revised framework would increase the TLC allocation amount from \$5,421,000 to \$5,926,000.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

\$5,926,000 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 the revised screening requirements and scoring criteria for this program.

Below is the tentative schedule for the TLC program:

Action	Tentative Dates
Call for Projects approved by the Board	September 8, 2016
Call for Projects Issued to the Agencies/ Public	Mid - September 2016
Workshop held for project applicants	Last week September 2016
Application due date	November 18, 2016
Screening of applications	November 2016
Selection panel meeting	January 2017
Project list presented to CMP TAC	March/ April 2017
Project list presented to CMEQ	March/ April 2017
Project list approved by the Board	May 2017
Project list to MTC	June 2017
Project submissions due in FMS	Late Summer 2017

Committee Review

A previous version of scoring criteria for the TLC program was 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 recommended modifications.

The scoring criteria modified by the CMP TAC were presented to the C/CAG Congestion Management & Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ) on June 27, 2016. The CMEQ committee further revised the scoring criteria.

New Changes

On July 27, 2016, the MTC Commission adopted revisions to the project selection requirements for the county program that requires the CMAs to adopt a specific scoring methodology for selecting projects within PDAs or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) that rewards jurisdictions “with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies.”

Two options are being presented for consideration by the CMP TAC and CMEQ to address the anti-displacement scoring methodology requirement. These two options are highlighted in the attached scoring criteria table.

On August 18, 2016, the CMP TAC recommended to approve Option 1. This option awards projects located in PDAs or Transit Priority Areas (TPA) one to five points, based on the number of affordable housing preservation strategies and or community stabilization policies adopted and applying to that PDA.

The MTC Commission also approved a change to the Congestion Management Compliance Checklist which in turns resulted in a minor change to the Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities criterion. The change is as follows:

- Modify Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities criterion from “If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center **and or** improvements are consistent with the Air District’s Planning Healthy Places guidelines”

ATTACHMENTS

1. OBAG 2 Eligibility and Requirements
2. Preservation Strategies/ Community Stabilization Policy (examples)
3. TLC Draft Scoring Criteria
4. TLC Draft Application
5. TLC Call for Projects Announcement

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:

Anti-Displacement Requirement – When MTC adopted Resolution 4202 in November 2015, MTC staff was directed to develop anti-displacement policy recommendations. On July 27, 2016 the MTC adopted the following requirement in order to be eligible for OBAG 2 funds:

“All cities and counties must adopt a surplus land resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC. The resolution must verify that any disposition of surplus land undertaken by the jurisdiction complies with the State Surplus Land Act, as amended by AB 2135, 2014. MTC will issue guidance to assist cities and counties in drafting a resolution to meet this requirement. This guidance will be posted on the OBAG 2 website: <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2>.”

At this time the resolution requirement shall not apply to charter cities unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the Act.

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.

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

Preservation Strategies/ Community Stabilization Policy (examples)

Dedicated affordable housing or actions to prevent or mitigate displacement of existing tenants due to escalating rents

- 1 Just Cause Eviction Ordinance
- 2 Rent Stabilization or Rent Control
- 3 Rent review board and/or mediation
- 4 Mobile Home Rent Control
- 5 SRO (Single-Room Occupancy) Preservation
- 6 Condominium Conversion Regulations
- 7 Foreclosure Assistance
- 8 Locally Required Relocation Assistance (all Federal projects have relocation requirement)
- 9 Minimum Lease Terms for rentals
- 10 Voluntary (“Good Behavior”) Rent Program
- 11 Rental Repair and Rehabilitation Program
- 12 Landlord-Tenant Fair Housing Counseling
- 13 Tenant Anti-Harassment Policies
- 14 Source of Income Non-Discrimination Ordinance

“Transit priority area” means “an area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that is existing or planned, if the planned stop is scheduled to be completed within the planning horizon included in a Transportation Improvement Program adopted pursuant to Section 450.216 or 450.322 of Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations.”

“Major transit stop” means “a site containing an existing rail transit station, a ferry terminal served by either a bus or rail transit service, or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with a frequency of service interval of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.” Other relevant definitions are contained in the new Public Resource Code Section 21099.

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

Program Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create enjoyable and safe multi modal experiences. • Facilitate multi modal mobility. • Enhance connections between alternative modes of transportation. • Enhancements that support community based transportation that brings vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high density neighborhoods, and transit corridors. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation (e.g. no landscape only projects)</p>	
Eligible Types of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Streetscape improvements such as improved sidewalks, street furniture and fixtures, pedestrian scaled lighting, way finding signage, landscaping, and bicycle pedestrian treatments that focus on high-impact, multi-modal improvements. Project must contain multi-modal elements (no beautification/ landscape only projects). • Complete streets improvements such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossings, pedestrian street lighting, pedestrian medians and refuges. • Transit station improvements (plaza, station access, bike parking), transit access projects (connecting housing to jobs and mixed land use to transit). • Transportation Demand Management project such as car sharing, vanpooling coordination and information, and Clipper related projects. <p>Note: TLC projects must facilitate multimodal transportation</p>	
Fund Source		
CMAQ fund source	Project must be for new or expanded transportation project. Maintenance projects are not allowed.	
Scoring Criteria		
	Maximum Score	
Location in relation to a Priority Development Area	Projects are located in a PDA or in Proximity to a PDA (Note: MTC mandates that 70% of all OBAG funds are to be located in a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA) (In a PDA =10pts, within 1/4 mi of a PDA=8pts , within 1/2 mi of a PDA = 5pts, within 1 mi of a PDA or in proximate access to a PDA = 2pts)	10
RHNA/ Housing Production	Jurisdiction formula based on MTC OBAG distribution factors, which is based on population, RHNA, and housing production. (1-5)	5
Location in a BAAQMD CARE Communities	If project is in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center or improvements implement "Best Practices" as identified by 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 or serves a COC = 3pts)	5
Affordable Housing	Located in a PDA that has affordable housing preservation or creation strategies and community stabilization policies. (1-5) Project is located in a PDA or Transit Priority Area (TPA) that has affordable housing preservation strategies and/ or community stabilization policies. (1-2 policies = 2 pts, 3-6 policies = 3 pts, 7-9 policies = 4 pts,10-14 policies = 5 pts) or (1-2 policies = 4 pts, 3-6 policies = 6 pts, 7-9 policies = 8 pts,10-14 policies = 10 pts) drop design from 10 pts to 5 pts	5 Option 1 (1-5) Option 2 (1-10)
User Benefit	Project has a high need (3 points) Project is a safety project (4 points) Project is expected to have high use (4 points) Project is expected to have a high return on investment (3 points) Project meets the intent and goals of the program (5 points)	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 (4 points)	16
Support	Project has council approval and/ or community support. (1-5)	5
Match Funds	Project exceeds the minimum match for the project (11.47% minimum) - (1-10)	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%). (1-10)	10 Option 1 - (1-10) Option 2 - (1-5)

C/CAG ONE BAY AREA GRANT 2 PROGRAM (OBAG 2)
Transportation for Livable Communities
(TLC) Program

APPLICATION FOR FISCAL YEARS 2017/2018 - 2021/2022

Section 1: General Project Information

1) General Project Information

Sponsor Agency:

Implementing Agency:

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

Note:

- Maximum amount that can be awarded per project is \$1,000,000.
- The maximum allowable grant fund per jurisdiction is \$1,500,000 (for BPIP and TLC combined).

2) Single point of contact for all Federal Aid projects in your agency:

Name:

Title:

Agency:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

Section 2: Project Description

Project
Description:



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



Section 3: Screening Requirements

1) **Required attachment for all capital projects, map(s) that include the following elements (Please limit size to 11x17):**

- Project location in relation to an ABAG approved Priority Development Area (PDA). Include the PDA name and map the ABAG PDA boundary. Include measurements if supporting a “proximate access” claim.
- If project meets the definition of “proximate access” to a PDA, show details on a map and describe how it meets the definition on Question 4.
- Attach a proposed project sketch or conceptual layout. For example; a location indicator map may be more appropriate for a pedestrian countdown signal head project while a conceptual layout is applicable for a trail or bike lane installation. If multiple types of improvements are proposed throughout the project limits (e.g. a combination of Class 1 and Class 3 bicycle facilities), clearly indicate the limits of each type of improvement on the map.

- Differentiate existing and new facilities, as applicable (e.g. bikeways, sidewalks, crosswalks, traffic signals, etc.) If this project is closing a gap, clearly illustrate how the project will achieve this.
- Show nearby transit facilities, activity centers and regional connectors (to the extent feasible).

2) Required for all projects, fill out Complete Streets online project and checklist information at

http://completestreets.mtc.ca.gov/external_user_sessions/new

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

What is the inputted Project Name?

What is the inputted Checklist Name?

3) Required for all projects, fill out and attach the “One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) Checklist for Local Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202” found at <http://ccag.ca.gov/obag-2-call-for-projects/>.

- Yes – The checklist is attached.
- No – The checklist will be completed prior to C/CAG approval of award.

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

- Yes – Project location is shown relative to PDA on the required map.
- No

a. If not, is this project within proximate access to an ABAG approved PDA?

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

Indicate how the project meets at least one of the definition of proximity to a PDA:

No

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

5) Project Cost by Phase

Please fill in the funding table below.

	Requested OBAG Funds	Indicate Local Cash Match and/ or Toll Credits (minimum 11.47%)	Other Project Funds	Total Project Funds
Preliminary Engineering				
Construction Capital				
Construction Support				
Total				

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

Yes

No

Describe the source of "Other Project Funds":

Section 4: Scoring Criteria

1) Is project in a BAAQMD defined CARE community or freight transportation center? See <http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/community-air-risk-evaluation-care-program>

- Yes
- No

a) Do improvements implement “Best Practices” as identified by the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines? See http://www.baaqmd.gov/~media/files/planning-and-research/planning-healthy-places/php_may20_2016-pdf.pdf?la=en

Describe the “Best Practices” utilized.

2) Is this project identified in a Community Based Transportation Plan developed in San Mateo County or in the Countywide Transportation Plan for Low Income Communities? See <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/plans-projects/other-plans/community-based-transportation-plans> or <http://cqaq.ca.gov/programs/transportation-plans/>

- Yes
If yes, please site the planning document and strategy number
- No

a) Is this project located in or does this project serve a Community of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC or locally identified as part of Community Based Transportation Plans? See <http://mtc.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=6395becf-f0324b7c9aa2887cc46ada11>

- Yes

Please describe how this projects serves a COC or the CBTP community

- No

3) Is this project located in a PDA or TPA that has affordable housing preservations strategies and/ or community stabilization policies?

- Yes

If yes, please list the policies in place and provide verification (e.g. web links or ordinance/ resolution numbers).

- No

4) Describe the user benefit of the proposed project.

Describe the following:

- Project need
- Expected use
- Expected return on investment.

a) Is this project a safety project?

Yes

If yes, please describe/substantiate the safety problem to be addressed.

No

Describe how the project meets the goals and intent of the program

5) Is this project identified in an adopted planning document (e.g. bike plan, pedestrian plan, station area plan, transit plan, or other area planning document)?

Yes

If yes, please provide the plan names, adopted date, and page number. Provide a web link if available.

No

6) Does this project provide connectivity or improve transportation choices?

Describe how the project improves access to housing/ jobs/ high quality transit.

Describe how the project addresses a gap in a bicycle or pedestrian network.

Describe how the project encourages multi modal access with a "complete streets" approach.

Please describe if the project is located in dense job centers, near transit, or near housing with reduced parking requirements or travel demand management (TDM) programs? And/ or describe how the project improves transportation choices for all income levels?

7) Does this project have local community support and/ or council approval?

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

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

- No

8) Readiness

Is this project located entirely within the sponsor's right of way? Is the project expected to need utility relocations?

- Yes
- No

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

Is this project near the coast, bay front, refuge, or other environmentally sensitive areas? Does this project require agreements with other jurisdictions or regulatory agencies? Is the project's schedule dependent on the progress of another project?

Yes

If yes, list expected studies/ permits or environmental issues? Describe any project dependencies.

No

Is this project designed?

Yes

If yes, indicate and substantiate status (e.g. 35%, 65%, 90%). Indicate if the design has been reviewed by Caltrans design or Caltrans permit office.

No

9) Please input the project schedule

	Date
Planning Complete	
Environmental Studies	
NEPA and CEQA Approval	
R/W Certification	
Complete PS&E	
Obtain E-76 from Caltrans	
Ready to Advertise	
Contract Award	

Note: Half of all OBAG2 funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 31, 2020. All Preliminary Engineering (PE) and non-infrastructure funds must be programmed and obligated no later than January 31, 2018. All remaining OBAG2 funds must be submitted for construction obligation by January 1, 2023.

DRAFT

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

One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program Call for Projects: Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

**Fiscal Years 2017/2018 -
2021/2022**

Issued September 12, 2016

The San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) is pleased to announce a Call for Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) projects under Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Program.

The TLC Program is a component of OBAG 2. For the Fiscal Year 2017/2018 - 2021/2022 there is a total of \$5,926,000 in Federal Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds available on a competitive basis for this program.

The minimum grant amount is set at \$250,000. The maximum grant amount per project is \$1,000,000. The maximum amount that can be allocated per agency is \$1,500,000 for both the TLC and the Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP) combined. Project applicants are limited to Caltrans recognized Local Public Agencies (LPAs) in San Mateo County such as Cities and Towns, the County of San Mateo, the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans), the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) or the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (SMCTA). For a listing of eligible local agencies see: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist4/ola/contact/sm.pdf>.

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.

Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program

The TLC Program is a transportation funding program that aims to fund a wide range of improvements and facilities that support and promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile. The program is intended to support community based transportation projects that will reduce 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.

The TLC Program helps to construct these amenities in an effort to revitalize public spaces and promote and enhance alternative transportation such that citizens will be more inclined to utilize alternative transportation as a result of the built environment being made safer and more attractive to use. These enhancements should encourage citizens to visit downtowns, retail corridors and transit corridors without the use of the single-occupant automobile.

Proximate Access to Priority Development Areas (PDA)

MTC requires that a minimum of 70% of all OBAG funds be invested in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). A project lying outside the limits of a PDA may count towards the minimum if it directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA.

The following definition of “proximate access to a PDA” for OBAG was approved by the C/CAG Board of Directors on August 11, 2016. 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 (ie. a road, sidewalk, or bike lane that leads directly into a PDA); or
2. The project is within one mile 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 station 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.

Jurisdiction and Project Requirements

Selected projects will be subject to federal, state, and regional delivery requirements as noted in MTC Resolution No. 3606.

- Jurisdiction must be in compliance with the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy requirements at the time of project application.
- Jurisdiction must comply with all FHWA and Caltrans Local Assistance and MTC project delivery and reporting requirements.
- Every recipient of funds will need to identify a current single point of contact (SPOC) for the implementation of all FHWA administered funds within that jurisdiction. This person must have sufficient knowledge in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out.
- Jurisdiction must provide a minimum FHWA required local match of 11.47%.
- 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)
- Jurisdiction is to submit a “resolution of local support” prior to programming. The template for the resolution of local support can be found at: http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/Resolution_Local_Support.docx
- Jurisdiction is to input project information into the MTC Fund Management System (FMS) project application no later than August 15, 2017.

Please see the attached C/CAG OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidelines for eligibility, program goals, screening requirements, and scoring criteria. Adhere to the information stated in the scoring criteria in your application. Applications should be no more than 20 pages. Please submit **6 hard copies** (one reproducible) and 1 electronic copy. Applications must be completed using the Microsoft Word project application form posted at http://www.ccag.ca.gov/Call4prj_rfp.html.

Applications are due by **November 18, 2016 by 5:00 p.m.** Please send your hard copies to:

Jean Higaki, C/CAG
555 County Center, 5th Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Additional information regarding regional OBAG requirements and policies can be found at: http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/RES-4202_approved.pdf.

For any questions regarding the OBAG2 program or application process, please contact Jean Higaki at 650-599-1462 or jhigaki@smcgov.org.