

C/CAG

CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

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

**1:15 p.m., Thursday, February 16, 2017
San Mateo County Transit District Office¹
1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium
San Carlos, California**

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

1.	Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).	Porter/Hurley	No materials
2.	Issues from the last C/CAG Board meetings (Feb 17): <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Approved – Appointments of Sean Rose (Woodside) and Ray Razavi (Half Moon Bay) to the CMP TAC• Approved – Appointments of Marty Hanneman (Atherton) and Denice Hutten (Half Moon Bay) to the Stormwater Committee• Approved – Appointment of Sue Vaterlaus (Pacifica), Mark Addiego (SSF), Diane Papan (San Mateo), Lisa Gauthier (EPA), Dave Pine (County of San Mateo) to the C/CAG San Mateo Countywide Water Coordination Committee• Adopted – San Mateo County Stormwater Resource Plan• Adopted – San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040 (SMCTP 2040)	Hoang	No materials
3.	Approval of the minutes from January 19, 2017	Hoang	Page 1-3
4.	Recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) (Action)	Higaki	Page 4-6
5.	Regional Project and Funding Information (Information)	Yu	Page 7-18
6.	Executive Director Report	Wong	No materials
7.	Member Reports	All	

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

2017 TAC Roster and Attendance			
No.	Member	Agency	Jan
1	Jim Porter (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	x
2	Joseph Hurley (Co-Chair)	SMCTA / PCJPB / Caltrain	x
3	Afshin Oskoui	Belmont Engineering	x
4	Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	x
5	Syed Murtuza	Burlingame Engineering	x
6	Bill Meeker	Burlingame Planning	
7	Sandy Wong	C/CAG	x
8	Brad Donohue	Colma Engineering	x
9	John Fuller	Daly City Engineering	x
10	Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	x
11	Jeff Moneda	Foster City Engineering	x
12	Paul Willis	Hillsborough Engineering	x
13	Ray Razavi	Half Moon Bay	n/a
14	Justin Murphy	Menlo Park Engineering	x
15	Ray Chan	Millbrae Engineering	
16	Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering	x
17	Jessica Manzi	Redwood City Engineering	
18	Jimmy Tan	San Bruno Engineering	
19	Jay Walter	San Carlos Engineering	x
20	Brad Underwood	San Mateo Engineering	
21	Ray Towne	South San Francisco Engineering	x
22	Billy Gross	South San Francisco Planning	x
23	Sean Rose	Woodside Engineering	x
24	vacant	MTC	
25	vacant	Caltrans	

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

January 19, 2017
MINUTES

The meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices located at 1250 San Carlos Avenue, 2nd Floor Auditorium, San Carlos, CA. Vice Chair Porter called the meeting to order at 1:15 p.m. on Thursday, January 19, 2017.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Jean Higaki, John Hoang, Eliza Yu (C/CAG); Bill Loudon, Paul Krupka, Adina Levin, Richard Chiu (Daly City), Saber Sawary (Redwood City), Pamela Kwan (TA), Steven Machida (San Mateo), Michael Tanner (BART), and other attendees not signed in.

1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.

None.

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

Approved.

3. Approval of the Minutes from September 15, 2016.

Approved.

4. Review and recommend approval of the Draft Final San Mateo Countywide Transportation Plan 2040

John Hoang presented the Draft Final SMCTP 2040 including an overview of the development process, public outreach process, summary of comments received and responses, key changes to the document as a result of the comments, and summary of the equity analysis chapter.

Member Breault requested clarification on the community of concern and where they are located. Response was that the plans that were developed were specific to those communities but the larger definition is established by MTC. Member Murtuza inquired whether community of concern definition is open to modification. Response was that MTC would make the determination. Member Oskoui inquired about BART's comments in relations to Caltrain. Staff indicated that BART comments did not pertain to extending down the peninsula but rather focused on Intermodal Station and the Transbay crossing.

Public member Adina Levin, representing Friends of Caltrain and other groups, would like to see outcome that are sustainable and equitable, including inclusion of metrics and targets and a follow-up process as well as addressing equity issue.

Clarification was made that a separate process and effort will be undertaken to follow up on developing more details on metric targets and goals. The item was recommended for approval.

5. State Highway System Performance Assessment

Joel Slavit, Manager of Programming and Monitoring from the TA, presented on the State Highway System Congestion and Safety Performance, a study that was a collaborative effort between TA and C/CAG. The purpose of the assessment was to understand regional congestion & safety hot spots in San Mateo County and included analysis of Congestion measured by Total Delay, Percentage of Free-flow Speed, and Travel Time, and Safety (total fatalities/injuries and collision rates)

Public member Adina Levin, indicated that the report is informative in relations to the 101 managed lane project. In addition to vehicle hours delay, consideration should be made for person throughput (person hour of delay).

Member Murtuza asked about the next steps. Response was that there is no consideration to factor the result into a prioritization process but rather is provided as information. The Highway Program has a number of other criteria for consideration and the next step will be to look at how to move the program forward. Vice-Chair Hurley added that the goal is to identify all data points to help make informed decisions.

6. Receive information and conduct discussion regarding a potential Regional Measure 3

Sandy Wong, C/CAG Executive Director, provided information on the potential Regional Measure 3 (RM3) (bridge tolls) initiated by the MTC. Legislation will be required to enable a ballot measure for implementation of RM3. MTC will be gathering a list of projects for the proposed expenditure plan. We need to begin compiling a list of projects for San Mateo County.

Discussions were as follows:

- RM3 need more projects that are located in San Mateo County
- There are needs on the US-101 corridor
- Proposed project has to have a nexus to the bridge toll revenue
- There is a need to include funding for maintenance for current roadways and infrastructure
- The timing of RM3 is good and funding for projects such as the 92/101 Interchange can be generated by bonding off bridge toll revenue
- The CMP TAC will be helpful in prioritizing projects for San Mateo County
- At the local level, cities need to be allowed to decide which projects to fund and not be restricted by MTC

7. Regional Project and Funding Information

Eliza Yu provided information on the FHWA inactive projects as listed on the Caltrans' site, project delivery deadlines, Annual Obligation Plan Project Status, Suspension of Caltrans Authority under NEPA Assigned Waiver of Immunity Expiration, and HSIP Cycle 8 Awarded Project and Programming Requirements. Other information includes the PMP Certification status, 2016 Regional Pavement Condition Update, and ATP Cycle 3 Regional Projects Update.

Member Oskoui pointed out that the distribution of funds result from the ATP Cycle 3 is not favorable to San Mateo County therefore we need to have a discussion to improve. Member Wong indicated that C/CAG is working on addressing that issue and welcomes input from members.

8. Executive Director Report

None.

9. Member Reports

Member Walter reported that transportation related bills AB1, SB1 totals upwards of \$6 billion for highway maintenance, which includes local streets and roads. The League of Cities Public Works Officers Group is asking letters of support from city councils and resolution to support the legislations moving forward.

Meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 16, 2017

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

From: Jean Higaki, Transportation System Coordinator

Subject: Recommend approval of the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

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

RECOMMENDATION

That the CMP TAC review and recommend that the Board approve the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) list of projects for submission to Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

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. 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. Subsequent to the C/CAG Board's adoption of the framework MTC revised Resolution 4202, in the summer of 2016, to add funds from the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act and to add anti-displacement requirements.

The C/CAG Board adopted a revised framework on August 11, 2016. On September 8, 2016 the Board approved a call for projects for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Program and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvement Program (BPIP). The call for projects for both programs was issued on September 12, 2016.

\$5,926,000 was made available for competition in the Transportation for Livable Communities Program to fund a wide range of improvements and facilities that support and promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile. The minimum and maximum grant size was set at \$250,000 and \$1,000,000 per project, respectively. A maximum allowable total grant

per jurisdiction was set at \$1,500,000 (for BPIP and TLC combined).

TLC funded projects 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).

The TLC funding application due date was November, 18, 2016. Staff received seven applications. One project application in Belmont did not meet the minimum screening criteria as it did not include a construction component making it ineligible for the fund source. The program was undersubscribed by \$1,219,000 with a total request of \$4,707,000 from eligible projects.

A Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) scoring panel comprised of staff from the San Mateo County Transportation Authority, San Mateo County Transit District, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Caltrans, and C/CAG scored and ranked the TLC Program applications. The TLC scoring panel recommended funding all eligible projects at this time.

The recommendation from the CMP TAC and the CMEQ committee will be forwarded to the C/CAG Board for a final recommendation to the MTC. Upon C/CAG Board recommendation to MTC, project sponsors will start the process of programming their projects.

The C/CAG Board will have discretion to shift funding between the programs. Staff suggests that the CMP TAC have a discussion regarding the undersubscribed funds.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Funding recommendation for the One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

One Bay Area Grant 2 (OBAG 2) Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) Funding Recommendation

Ranking	Agency	Project Name	In PDA or proximate access	Requested Funds	Total Recommended for Funding
1	Colma	Mission Rd Bike/Ped Improvements	In PDA	\$500,000	\$500,000
2	South San Francisco	Grand Boulevard Initiative	In PDA	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
3	San Mateo City	Laurie Meadows Ped/ Bike Safety Improvements	In PDA	\$987,000	\$987,000
4	Burlingame	Broadway PDA Lighting Improvements	In PDA	\$720,000	\$720,000
5	Half Moon Bay	Poplar Complete Streets	3, 6	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000
6	San Carlos	Ped Enhancements Arroyo/ Cedar and Hemlock/ Orange	2, 4	\$500,000	\$500,000
7	Belmont	O'Neill Ave. Ped/Bike Undercrossing	In PDA	\$350,000	\$0
			Total	\$5,057,000	\$4,707,000

Total Available	\$5,926,000
Total Funds Recommended	\$4,707,000
Total Funds Remaining	\$1,219,000

C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

Date: February 16, 2017
To: C/CAG Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (CMP TAC)
From: Eliza Yu, Transportation Programs Specialist
Subject: Regional Project and Funding Information

(For further information, contact Eliza Yu at 650-599-1453 or eyu@smcgov.org)

RECOMMENDATION

Regional project and funding information.

FISCAL IMPACT

None

SOURCE OF FUNDS

N/A

BACKGROUND

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

FHWA policy for inactive projects

The current inactive list is attached (Attachment 1). Project sponsors are requested to visit the Caltrans site regularly for updated project status at:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm>

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

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

Miscellaneous MTC/Caltrans Federal Aid Announcements

1. Pavement Management Program (PMP) Certification – The current PMP certification status listing is attached (Attachment 2). Jurisdictions without a current PMP certification are not eligible to receive regional funds for local streets rehabilitation and will have projects removed from MTC’s obligation plans until their PMP certification is in good standing. Jurisdictions who are currently in P-TAP Cycle 17 have their certification status listed as “pending” and are given an expiration date of April 30, 2017. This is to allow jurisdictions who are in the process of updating their PMP certifications for P-TAP

Cycle 18 enough time to send MTC a city signed certification letter for an extension. Certification letters must be received by MTC no later than April 30, 2017 to ensure that their PMP certifications will not lapse between P-TAP Cycle 17 and 18. Contact Christina Hohorst, PTAP Manager, at (415) 778-5269 or chohorst@mtc.ca.gov if you need to update your certification.

2. Transportation Improvement Plan – Phase 1 Implementation (Attachment 3)

There are two primary requirements in the new metropolitan planning rule for incorporating performance into the TIP: (1) that the TIP “makes progress towards achieving [MTC’s adopted] performance targets” and (2) that the TIP includes, “to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP towards achieving the performance targets” in the RTP. To meet these requirements, MTC has established nine targets that are planned to be incorporated in the first implementation effort, as shown in Attachment 3.

MTC identified four approaches to collect data and/or conduct analysis on how to best respond to each of these nine targets: (1) Qualitative Questions, (2) Sponsor Submission & MTC Compilation, (3) MTC Analysis Using Existing Tools, and (4) MTC Analysis Using New Tools. MTC recommends merging Approaches 1 and 2 by analyzing the impact of the TIP on roadway safety targets using qualitative questions and the impact of the TIP on transit asset management targets using sponsor submission of benefits.

MTC also proposes that projects submitted for inclusion in the 2019 TIP will include performance data in order to collect data needed for Phase 1 targets. New questions on roadway safety and infrastructure condition will be added to FMS to assist MTC in collecting this data, as shown in Attachment 3.

3. Plan Bay Area 2040 Update – Action Plan

MTC and ABAG are currently in the process of developing an Action Plan for the Plan Bay Area 2040 Update. The Action Plan will “identify concrete near- and medium-term action items for MTC, ABAG, and other stakeholders to make meaningful progress on the Plan’s performance targets.” The Action Plan will focus on areas where Plan Bay Area 2040 is moving off trajectory, including housing affordability, displacement risk, and access to jobs.

Policies developed for this Action Plan may potentially tie future transportation funds to locally adopted policies. MTC plans to develop the Action Plan outline by February of 2017 and will solicit feedback from stakeholders by either April or May of 2017. The timeline for the development of the Action Plan is as follows:

February 2017	Develop Outline for Action Plan
Early April 2017	Draft Plan Bay Area 2040 (including Draft Action Plan) and EIR released
Early April – Late May 2017	Public Comment Period (public hearings and open houses will be held at this time)
June 2017	Presentation of Outreach Feedback Received
Late Summer 2017	Certify/Adopt Final Plan (including Action Plan) and EIR

4. FTA Section 5310 Call for Projects

Caltrans is currently soliciting projects for the Federal Transportation Administration’s (FTA) Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities Program (Section 5310). The goal of the Section 5310 program is to improve mobility for seniors and individuals with disabilities

throughout the country by removing barriers to transportation services and expanding the transportation mobility options available. 55% of available funding will be set aside for traditional projects that include mobility management, vehicles, and other equipment. The deadline to apply is by March 1st at 5:00pm. For more information, please visit MTC's Call for Projects – Funding Opportunities webpage at <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/calls-projects-funding-opportunities>.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Caltrans Inactive Obligation Project List for San Mateo County as of February 2, 2017
2. MTC's PMP Certification Status of Agencies within San Mateo County as of February 10, 2017
3. MTC's LSRPDWG January 2017 Memo on Federal Performance Reporting – Phase I TIP Implementation

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

Updated on
02/02/2017

Status	Agency Action Required	Agency	Description	Last Expenditure Date	Last Action Date	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
Inactive	Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately.	Redwood City	VARIOUS BRIDGES IN CITY OF REDWOOD CITY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	2/17/2015	2/17/2015	\$30,000	\$26,559	\$13,250	\$13,309.26
Inactive	Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately.	Menlo Park	VALPARAISO AVE, GLENWOOD AVE, EL CAMINO REAL, MIDDLEFIELD RD INSTALL: BIKE LANE, SIGNS, DISPLAY, SIGNALS, PEDESTRIAN PATH		10/29/2015	\$564,007	\$498,783	\$0	\$498,783.00
Inactive	Carry over project. Provide status update to DLAE immediately.	Woodside	MOUNTAIN HOME RD OVER BEAR CREEK; 0.3 MI SOUTH OF SR 84, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	9/24/2015	9/24/2015	\$107,428	\$95,106	\$84,207	\$10,898.86
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Redwood City	BRIDGE PARKWAY OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	2/24/2016	2/24/2016	\$75,000	\$66,398	\$32,437	\$33,961.14
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Redwood City	BRIDGE PARKWAY(RIGHT) OVER MARINE WORLD LAGOON, EAST OF MARINE WORLD PARKWAY, PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	2/24/2016	2/24/2016	\$75,000	\$66,398	\$32,437	\$33,961.14
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Redwood City	MAIN ST, VETERANS BLVD, AND MAPLE ST OVER REDWOOD CREEK, BRIDGE PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE	2/24/2016	2/24/2016	\$26,250	\$23,239	\$458	\$22,781.25
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Daly City	JOHN DALY BOULEVARD FROM MISSION STREET TO DELONG STREET PEDESTRIAN AND BIKE FACILITIES IMPROVEMENTS		3/2/2016	\$3,335,069	\$1,290,000	\$0	\$1,290,000.00
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Millbrae	MILLBRAE DOWNTOWN AND EL CAMINO REAL CORRIDOR, MILLBRAE PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA SPECIFIC PLAN	3/8/2016	3/8/2016	\$650,000	\$500,000	\$2,800	\$497,200.09
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Millbrae	MILLBRAE AVE FROM EL CAMINO REAL (SR82) TO SR101 , AND MAGNOLIA AVE. FROM TAYLOR BLVD TO LACRUZ AVE. ROAD REHABILITATION		3/10/2016	\$595,358	\$445,000	\$0	\$445,000.00
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	East Palo Alto	UNIVERSITY OVERCROSSING US 101 BIKE PED PATH	2/26/2016	8/19/2016	\$950,000	\$760,000	\$240,000	\$520,000.00
Inactive	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2017	Caltrans	SR 92 AND EL CAMINO REAL (SR82), UPGRADE INTERCHANGE	3/28/2016	3/28/2016	\$3,986,801	\$1,966,800	\$1,767,803	\$198,997.26
Future	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 05/19/2017	Menlo Park	WILLOW RD - MIDDLEFIELD TO HAMILTON, UPGRADE SIGNALS	6/9/2016	6/9/2016	\$253,000	\$202,400	\$106,206	\$96,193.60
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Redwood City	MULTIPLE SCHOOLS IN REDWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, NON INFRASTRUCTURE, SRTS EDUCATION	6/9/2016	6/9/2016	\$204,000	\$204,000	\$176,260	\$27,740.17
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Redwood City	WHIPPLE AND VETERANS, ROAD REHABILITATION	4/1/2016	4/1/2016	\$999,648	\$548,000	\$246,180	\$301,819.80
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Woodside	PORTOLA RD IN THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE IN SAN MATEO COUNTY, 0.25 MI E OF SR 84, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT	4/7/2016	4/7/2016	\$188,760	\$167,109	\$83,969	\$83,140.23
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Woodside	KINGS MOUNTAIN RD OVER WEST UNION CREEK; 0.05 MI EAST OF TRIPP RD, BRIDGE REHABILITATION	4/7/2016	4/7/2016	\$135,090	\$119,595	\$86,713	\$32,882.01
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Pacifica	LINDA MAR BLVD BETWEEN DE SOLO DR TO ADOBE DR, PAVEMENT REHABILITATION	5/27/2016	5/27/2016	\$508,695	\$431,000	\$377,224	\$53,775.54
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	East Palo Alto	FORDHAM ST/PURDUE AVE, BAY RD BETWEEN NEWBRIDGE ST AND GLORIA WAY, , PULGAS AVE/RUNNYMEDE ST, PULGAS AVE BETWEEN O'CONNOR ST AND MYRTLE ST. CONST SIDEWALKS, RAMPS, INSTALL CROSSWALK LIGHTING	5/19/2016	5/19/2016	\$697,715	\$579,700	\$42,000	\$537,700.00
Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/19/2017	Woodside	PORTOLA RD REPLACE CULVERT , HEAD WALL, TRASH RACK	5/3/2016	5/6/2016	\$105,687	\$93,565	\$26,453	\$67,112.23

PMP Certification Status Listing of San Mateo County as of February 10, 2017

PMP Certification
February 10, 2017

Expired
Expiring within 60 days
Certified

* "Last Major Inspection" is the basis for certification and is indicative of the date the field inspection was completed.

County	Jurisdiction	Last Major Inspection*	Certified	P-TAP Cycle	Certification Expiration Date
San Mateo	Atherton	8/31/2016	Yes	17	9/1/2018
San Mateo	Belmont*	11/30/2014	Yes	15	12/1/2017
San Mateo	Brisbane	7/31/2016	Yes	17	8/1/2018
San Mateo	Burlingame	1/31/2016	Yes	16	2/1/2018
San Mateo	Colma	9/30/2015	Yes	16	10/1/2017
San Mateo	Daly City	12/31/2014	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	East Palo Alto	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	Foster City	8/31/2015	Yes	16	9/1/2017
San Mateo	Half Moon Bay	12/31/2015	Yes	16	1/1/2018
San Mateo	Hillsborough	9/30/2014	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	Menlo Park	4/30/2016	Yes	16	5/1/2018
San Mateo	Millbrae*	7/31/2014	Yes	15	8/1/2017
San Mateo	Pacifica	7/31/2015	Yes	16	8/1/2017
San Mateo	Portola Valley	9/30/2015	Yes	16	10/1/2017
San Mateo	Redwood City*	12/31/2014	Yes	15	1/1/2018
San Mateo	San Bruno	6/30/2015	Yes	16	7/1/2017
San Mateo	San Carlos	8/31/2016	Yes	17	9/1/2018
San Mateo	San Mateo	11/30/2015	Yes	16	12/1/2017
San Mateo	San Mateo County	8/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017
San Mateo	South San Francisco	10/31/2015	Yes	16	11/1/2017
San Mateo	Woodside	10/31/2013	Pending	17	4/30/2017

(*) Indicates One-Year Extension. Note: PTAP awardees are ineligible for a one-year extension during the cycle awarded.

(^) Indicates previous P-TAP awardee, but hasn't fulfilled requirement; must submit certification prior to updating to current P-TAP award status.

Note: Updated report is posted monthly to:

http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/PMP_Certification_Status_Listing.xlsx



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
TEL 415.778.6700
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Transit Asset Management Subcommittee

DATE: December 14, 2016

FR: Dave Vautin and Mallory Atkinson

RE: Federal Performance Reporting – Phase I TIP Implementation

This memorandum provides an update on recent federal performance measure actions and proposes an approach for the incorporating requirements into MTC's planning and programming processes.

Rulemaking Status

- **Safety performance measures rule finalized (March).** Caltrans has until summer 2017 to set roadway safety targets; within six months of Caltrans targets adoption, MTC must set its first safety targets, updating these targets every year going forward.
- **System performance measures proposed rule issued (April).** Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issued a proposed rule for congestion, reliability, goods movement, and air quality performance measures, with a heavy emphasis on vehicle throughput. FHWA is anticipated to release the final rule in 2017.
- **State and metro planning rule finalized (May).** FHWA and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) released the joint final rule on statewide and metropolitan planning, which provides the overarching framework for the new performance requirements.
- **Transit asset management rule finalized (July).** FTA issued its final transit asset management rule, which includes performance measures for vehicles, guideway, facilities, and equipment. Similar to the highway safety performance measures, transit asset management targets will be required annually. Staff has been engaging transit providers in the region to develop a framework for complying with the final TAM/NTD rule.

A current summary of the federally-required performance measures is provided in **Attachment A**.

Implementation

The final rule on statewide and metropolitan planning included a two-year phase-in provision, which means that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have until mid-2018 to fully integrate federal performance measures into the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). This means that the **2019 TIP** and the **2021 RTP** will be the first MTC program and plan that must incorporate new federal performance requirements.

Item 3-Federal Performance Reporting – Phase I TIP Implementation

TAM-SC: December 14, 2016

Page 2 of 4

TIP Requirements

There are two primary requirements in the new metropolitan planning rule for incorporating performance into the TIP (§ 450.326). For all federally-required targets, MTC must show that the TIP “makes progress towards achieving [MTC’s adopted] performance targets” and that the TIP includes, “to the maximum extent practicable, a description of the anticipated effect of the TIP towards achieving the performance targets” in the RTP. These two requirements deal with the issues of directionality and magnitude – MTC must show that it is moving in the right direction based on the package of TIP projects slated for completion, and MTC must also do its utmost to describe how much of an impact the projects will make on the target.

Phase 1 Targets

For the 2019 TIP (anticipated for adoption in mid-2018), only those targets that are expected to be effective by summer 2018 are required to be incorporated. Currently, this includes 9 targets under two topic areas that will need to be incorporated in this first implementation effort (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Phase 1 Targets

MAP-21 GOALS & PROGRAMS	GENERAL MEASURES IN MAP-21	PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEVELOPED BY FHWA/FTA	
Roadway Safety HSIP	Number of Fatalities on Roads	1. Total number of road fatalities	FINAL
	Rate of Fatalities on Roads	2. Road fatalities per VMT	FINAL
	Number of Serious Injuries on Roads	3. Total number of serious injuries on roads	FINAL
	Rate of Serious Injuries on Roads	4. Serious injuries on roads per VMT	FINAL
	Non-Motorized Safety on Roads	5. Combined total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	FINAL
Infrastructure Condition Transit NTAMS	State of Good Repair for Public Transit Assets	6. Percentage of revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark (ULB) by asset class	FINAL
		7. Percentage of facilities within a condition rating below fair	
		8. Percentage of rail guideway directional route-miles with performance restrictions	
		9. Percentage of non-revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their ULB	

Recommended Approach

Staff identified four general approaches to collect data and/or conduct analysis to respond to the questions of TIP directionality and magnitude for each target. **Attachment B** describes the various approaches, which range from qualitative to development of new performance analysis tools. Note that each approach requires additional information or data submissions from project sponsors.

Staff recommends analyzing the impact of the TIP on roadway safety targets using qualitative questions (Approach 1) and the impact of the TIP on transit asset management targets using sponsor submission of benefits (Approach 2).

Ultimately, the asset management measures are easier to quantify and verify as they are based on the mileage and quantity of infrastructure, while the safety measures are much more difficult as they relate to the specific benefits associated with improvements. Over the long term, a more quantitative approach to evaluate safety may be recommended.

In addition to describing the impact of the TIP, staff believes it would be appropriate to also show background forecasts that may increase or decrease benefits beyond the TIP. For example, for transit asset management, it would be beneficial to run TERM-Lite to understand the background worsening conditions as infrastructure ages, and then add in TIP and non-TIP investments to generate the most realistic forecast of future conditions. This would be beneficial in explaining why the TIP may yield forecasted benefits but the annually-reported results might still be going in the opposite direction. This is not required under the federal rule, but it might help create a stronger nexus between the performance monitoring reporting required under MAP-21/FAST and the performance forecast that will need to be incorporated in the TIP.

Data Requirements

To collect data needed for Phase 1 targets, MTC proposes that projects submitted for inclusion in the 2019 TIP will include performance data. MTC's Fund Management System (FMS) would be expanded with a new Performance module where questions required for MAP-21/FAST compliance would be listed, regardless of project size.

For Phase 1 targets, we propose to add the following questions to add to FMS:

1) Roadway Safety

- Is improving roadway safety the primary purpose or goal of this project? – **Yes/No**
Only projects whose primary purpose is reducing traffic collisions should mark Yes. Note that roadway safety includes all roads and all modes; however, if this is a safety project targeted to improve safety on board transit vehicles or at transit stations, please mark No.
- What impact will the project have on fatalities from roadway crashes for users of all modes of transportation? – **Significant Reduction/Moderate Reduction/Minimal or Adverse Impact**
- What impact will the project have on serious injuries from roadway crashes for users of all modes of transportation? – **Significant Reduction/Moderate Reduction/Minimal or Adverse Impact**
- What impact will the project have on the combination of fatalities and serious injuries from roadway crashes, specifically for bicyclists and pedestrians? – **Significant Reduction/Moderate Reduction/Minimal or Adverse Impact**

2) Infrastructure Condition (Transit Asset Management)

- How many revenue vehicles currently past your agency's useful life benchmark will this project replace with new vehicles or rehabilitated vehicles, and what class of vehicles are being replaced? – **integer value(s) required, by asset class**
- How many non-replacement revenue vehicles will this project add to your agency fleet, and what class of vehicles are being purchased? – **integer value(s) required, by asset class**

Item 3-Federal Performance Reporting – Phase I TIP Implementation

TAM-SC: December 14, 2016

Page 4 of 4

- How many facilities will be upgraded from poor or marginal conditions to adequate or better conditions, and what class of facilities are being upgraded? – **integer value(s) required, by asset class**
- How many new (i.e., non-replacement) facilities will be constructed, and what class of facilities do those relate to? – **integer value(s) required, by asset class**
Poor or marginal conditions are defined as less than 3.0 on the TERM scale; adequate or better conditions are defined as 3.0 or better on the TERM scale.
- How many directional route-miles of rail track that currently have performance restrictions (e.g., slow zones) will be improved as a result of this project to an extent that eliminates aforementioned performance restrictions? – **one-decimal precision required**
- How many new (i.e., non-replacement) directional route-miles of rail track will be constructed? – **one-decimal precision required**
- How many non-revenue vehicles currently past your agency’s useful life benchmark will this project replace with new vehicles or rehabilitated vehicles? – **integer value required**
- How many non-replacement non-revenue vehicles will this project add to your agency fleet? – **integer value required**

Next Steps

The timeline for incorporating the performance of Phase 1 targets is outlined below. This schedule will be updated and expanded to reflect additional phases of performance target implementation when those rules are finalized.

Table 2. Phase 1 Implementation Schedule

December – January 2016	Seek input from Partnership working groups on proposed approach; finalize approach
Winter – Spring 2017	Incorporate approach into FMS; conduct necessary testing
Fall 2017 – Winter 2018	Project submissions for 2019 TIP data; collect necessary data for Phase 1 targets; performance analysis
Summer 2018	Adopt 2019 TIP

J:\PROJECT\Funding\Transit Asset Management\Meetings\TAM Meeting Archive\2016-12-15 TAM Sub Committee\TIP_Performance.docx

Summary of Federally-Required Performance Measures (page 1 of 2)

MAP-21 GOALS & PROGRAMS	GENERAL MEASURES IN MAP-21	PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEVELOPED BY FHWA/FTA	
Safety HSIP TSOP	Number of Fatalities on Roads	1. Total number of road fatalities	FINAL
	Rate of Fatalities on Roads	2. Road fatalities per VMT	FINAL
	Number of Serious Injuries on Roads	3. Total number of serious injuries on roads	FINAL
	Rate of Serious Injuries on Roads	4. Serious injuries on roads per VMT	FINAL
	Non-Motorized Safety on Roads	5. Combined total number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries	FINAL
	Safety of Public Transit Systems	Transit safety performance measure TBD	
Infrastructure Condition NHPP NTAMS	Pavement Condition on the IHS	6. Percentage of pavements on the IHS in good condition* 7. Percentage of pavements on the IHS in poor condition*	
	Pavement Condition on the NHS	8. Percentage of pavements on the non-IHS NHS in good condition* 9. Percentage of pavements on the non-IHS NHS in poor condition*	
	Bridge Condition on the NHS	10. Percentage of NHS bridges classified in good condition* 11. Percentage of NHS bridges classified in poor condition*	
	State of Good Repair for Public Transit Assets	12. Percentage of revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their useful life benchmark (ULB) by asset class (example below) a. 40-foot bus b. 30-foot bus c. Light rail vehicle d. etc. 13. Percentage of facilities within a condition rating below fair 14. Percentage of rail guideway directional route-miles with performance restrictions (example below) a. Light rail guideway b. Heavy rail guideway c. Streetcar guideway d. etc. 15. Percentage of non-revenue vehicles that have met or exceeded their ULB	FINAL

* = draft; comment period closed

Table 1: Summary of Federally-Required Performance Measures (page 2 of 2)

MAP-21 GOALS & PROGRAMS	GENERAL MEASURES IN MAP-21	PERFORMANCE MEASURES DEVELOPED BY FHWA/FTA
System Reliability NHPP	Performance of the Interstate System	16. Percentage of IHS mileage providing reliable travel times* 17. Percentage of IHS mileage where peak hour travel times meet expectations*
	Performance of the NHS	18. Percentage of non-IHS NHS mileage providing reliable travel times* 19. Percentage of non-IHS NHS mileage where peak hour travel times meet expectations*
Freight Movement and Economic Vitality NHFP	Freight Movement on the Interstate System	20. Percentage of IHS mileage providing reliable truck travel times* 21. Percentage of IHS mileage uncongested* (>50 mph)
Congestion Reduction CMAQ	Traffic Congestion	22. Annual hours of excessive delay per capita* (<35 mph)
Environmental Sustainability CMAQ	On-Road Mobile Source Emissions	23. Total emissions reductions from CMAQ-funded projects by pollutant* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. PM_{2.5} b. PM₁₀ c. CO d. VOC e. NO_x
	N/A	24. Greenhouse gas emissions measure TBD* (not specified; violates USC 23.150(c)(2)(C) as established in MAP-21)
Reduced Project Delivery Delays	<i>none</i>	<i>none</i> (neither MAP-21 nor FAST included performance measures for this goal)

* = draft; comment period closed

Incorporating Performance Management into the TIP

Discussion of Various Approaches

Approach 1: Qualitative Questions

Add qualitative questions to FMS about project goals and directionality of project impacts, summarizing TIP impact in terms of the number and total dollar value of projects that are focused on federally-identified measures and goals.

Pros: requires the least amount of sponsor and staff time; relatively straightforward

Cons: no quantification of benefits; sponsor submissions may not be fully consistent

Approach 2: Sponsor Submission + MTC Compilation

Add quantitative questions to FMS about the magnitude of annual project benefits or disbenefits for a given performance measure; MTC staff would conduct a high-level review of results and sum them up to develop a measurement of TIP impact overall for that measure.

Pros: works best for easily-quantifiable measures that require no forecasting; relies on sponsors to provide detailed data; incorporates data from all projects in TIP

Cons: high risk for inconsistencies between sponsors if forecast data is required

Approach 3: MTC Analysis Using Existing Tools

Use existing models run for TIP conformity or other reporting purposes – e.g., Travel Model One for roadway projects and TERM-Lite for transit asset projects – to estimate performance benefits associated with the TIP investment package.

Pros: ensure consistency across projects; leverages same tool as used for other RTP and performance target work

Cons: multiple TIP coding or runs may be required to quantify benefits for one-year targets; benefits from non-capacity-increasing projects will not be captured in travel model

Approach 4: MTC Analysis Using New Tools

Enhance existing models or build new models or sub-models to estimate the performance benefits associated with the TIP investment package.

Pros: ensure consistency across projects; could be used for RTP analyses as well; would improve methodologies and benefit other MTC projects; “gold standard” approach

Cons: requires significant additional staff time and/or consultant resources to conduct research on a variety of topic areas; multiple TIP coding or runs may be required to quantify benefits for one-year targets; even an improved consistent methodology will still have limitations with regards to specific projects