

Appendix A: Detailed Inventory of CMP Roadways and Intersections

Appendix A

Detailed Inventory of CMP Roadways and Intersections

The following pages describe the functional classifications and numbers of lanes of the California State Highways within San Mateo County and the other roadways and intersections included in the 1997 CMP Roadway System. The information described here was collected by conducting field surveys and recording data. The numbers of lanes and roadway types are described for the following State Highways:

| | |
|----------|--|
| SR 1 | Between the county lines of Santa Cruz and San Francisco Counties; |
| SR 35 | Between the San Francisco and Santa Clara County lines; |
| SR 82 | Between the county lines of Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties; |
| SR 84 | From SR 1 to the Alameda County line; |
| SR 92 | From SR 1 to the Alameda County line; |
| U.S. 101 | Between the county lines of Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties; |
| SR 109 | From Kavanaugh Drive to SR 84; |
| SR 114 | From U.S. 101 to Bayfront Expressway (SR 84); |
| I-280 | Between the county lines of Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties; and |
| I-380 | Between I-280 and North Access Road (east of U.S. 101). |

The numbers of lanes and classifications of the other roadways and the lane configurations and signal phasings of the intersections included in the CMP network were also determined. This information was obtained from the cities in which the facilities are located and from field surveys.

SR 1

From the Santa Cruz County line north to Linda Mar Boulevard, SR 1 is a two-lane conventional highway. Between Linda Mar Boulevard and Westport Drive (just south of Sharp Park Road), SR 1 is a four-lane highway. North of Westport Drive, SR 1 is a four-lane freeway until it reaches its junction with SR 35, where it becomes a six-lane freeway. At its junction with I-280, SR 1 joins I-280 to travel north until John Daly Boulevard. SR 1 then continues northward, as a six-lane freeway, across the San Francisco County line.

SR 35

North of I-280 (near Crestmoor Drive in San Bruno), SR 35 is a two- to four-lane arterial and four-lane expressway which extends northward across the San Francisco County line. The variations in the numbers of lanes and roadway types are described briefly below.

- SR 35 is a four-lane expressway from the I-280 interchange north becoming a two-lane arterial south of San Bruno Avenue.
- SR 35 is a two-lane arterial to the signalized intersection of Sneath Lane, then a four-lane arterial north of Sneath Lane to Sharp Park Road, and a two-lane arterial north of Sharp Park Road to Hickey Boulevard.
- North of Hickey Boulevard, SR 35 becomes a four-lane arterial, and then a four-lane freeway as it passes through the SR 1 interchange.
- Approximately one mile north of the SR 1 interchange, SR 35 becomes a four-lane expressway, and continues as such into San Francisco County.

South of Bunker Hill Drive, SR 35 becomes a two-lane rural road. After a short section where SR 92 and SR 35 share the same roadway, SR 35 becomes Skyline Boulevard south to Santa Clara County.

SR 82 (*El Camino Real/Mission Street*)

SR 82 is a four- to six-lane arterial which extends north from the Santa Clara County line across the San Francisco County line. The following street segments are **not six lanes** wide:

| | |
|---|---|
| Roble Avenue to Glenwood Avenue | Four lanes |
| SR 84 overpass to Whipple Avenue | Four lanes |
| Whipple Avenue to F Street (in San Mateo) | Two lanes northbound, and three lanes southbound |
| F Street to 42nd Street | Four lanes |
| 42nd Street to Hillsdale Boulevard | Two lanes northbound, and three lanes southbound |
| East Third Avenue to south of Trousdale Drive | Four lanes |
| Hickey Boulevard to Mission Road | Four lanes |

Westlake Avenue to John Daly Boulevard

Four lanes

SR 84

SR 84 (Woodside Road) is a four-lane arterial between I-280 and SR 82 (except for a short segment between San Carlos Avenue and Santa Clara Avenue which is six-lanes wide). SR 84 is a four-lane expressway between SR 82 and Bay Road. East of Bay Road to U.S. 101, SR 84 is a six-lane expressway. At its junction with U.S. 101, SR 84 joins U.S. 101 to travel south until the Marsh Road exit, where SR 84 follows the Bayfront Expressway to the Dumbarton Bridge. The Bayfront Expressway is six-lane wide from Marsh Road to east of University Avenue.

SR 84 is a two-lane conventional highway from west of I-280 to SR 1. (Note: Signs on U.S. 101 still indicate Willow Road (SR 114) to be SR 84.)

SR 92

SR 92 is a four-lane freeway between I-280 and U.S. 101. SR 92 is a six-lane freeway between U.S. 101 and the Alameda County Line, across the San Mateo Bridge. West of I-280 to SR 1, SR 92 is a two-lane conventional highway.

U.S. 101

U.S. 101 is an eight- to ten-lane freeway in San Mateo County. The lane changes for this north/south facility are as follows:

- U.S. 101 is an eight-lane freeway from the Santa Clara County line to the Whipple Avenue interchange comprising six mixed-flow lanes and two High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes.
- U.S. 101 is an eight-lane freeway from the Whipple Avenue interchange to the San Francisco County line, with the following two exceptions:
 1. Between Marsh Road and Hillsdale Blvd, an auxiliary lane has been added in each direction.
 2. Northbound U.S. 101 is six lanes wide between the SR 92 and Kehoe Avenue off-ramps, and five lanes wide between the Kehoe Avenue and Third Avenue off-ramps. Southbound U.S. 101 remains four lanes wide.
 3. U.S. 101 is a ten-lane freeway from north of the Millbrae Avenue interchange ramps to south of the I-380 interchange ramps.

SR 109

University Avenue has been designated as SR 109 between SR 84 and Kavanaugh Drive. SR 109 is a four-lane arterial.

SR 114

Willow Road, which has been designated as SR 114 between U.S. 101 and Bayfront Expressway, is a four-lane arterial.

I-280

I-280 is a 6- to 12-lane freeway in San Mateo County. The variations in the number of lanes on this north/south facility are described below.

- * I-280 is an eight-lane freeway from the Santa Clara County line north to the I-280/SR 1 interchange in Daly City, with the following exceptions:
 1. Between Edgewood Road and the interchange with SR 92, I-280 contains five northbound and five southbound lanes. Each five-lane segment is approximately two miles long and signed: "Slow Vehicles Keep Right".
 2. Through the I-380 interchange, northbound I-280 has only three lanes, while southbound I-280 widens to include a fifth, auxiliary lane.
- * I-280 is a 12-lane freeway, north of the SR 1 interchange (south) to the SR 1 interchange (north).
- * I-280 is a six-lane freeway, north of its northern junction with SR 1 to the San Francisco County line, where the freeway widens to eight lanes.

I-380

I-380 is an east/west freeway which connects I-280 and U.S. 101, and extends east of U.S. 101 to provide access to the San Francisco International Airport. Between I-280 and U.S. 101, I-380 is four lanes wide in the westbound direction and three lanes wide in the eastbound direction. East of U.S. 101, I-380 is a freeway ramp, narrowing down to two lanes in each direction and terminating at North Access Road (by United Airlines Maintenance Facility.)

Other CMP Roadways

The CMP roadway system also includes three roadways which are not state highways. These arterials, all located in Daly City, are described briefly below:

- Mission Street is a four-lane arterial that extends from SR 82 (San Jose Avenue) to the northeast, across the San Francisco County line.
- Bayshore Boulevard is an arterial that extends southward from its junction with U.S. 101 in San Francisco County through Brisbane, where it becomes Airport Boulevard. The CMP network only includes the segment of Bayshore Boulevard between the San Francisco County line and Geneva Avenue. This segment is three lanes wide in the northbound direction and two lanes wide in the southbound direction.
- Geneva Avenue is a four-lane arterial that extends to the northwest from Bayshore Boulevard across the San Francisco County line to Mission Street.

CMP Intersections

The CMP roadway system also includes 16 intersections. These were not included in the 1991 CMP and were added for the 1993 CMP. The 16 intersections are:

Geneva Avenue and Bayshore Boulevard
SR 35 (Skyline Boulevard) and John Daly Boulevard
SR 82 (Mission Street) and John Daly Boulevard/Hillside Boulevard
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and San Bruno Avenue
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Millbrae Avenue
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Broadway
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Peninsula Avenue
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Ralston Avenue
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Holly Street
SR 82 (El Camino Real) and Whipple Avenue
SR 84 (Bayfront Expressway) and SR 109 (University Avenue)
SR 84 (Bayfront Expressway) and SR 114 (Willow Road)
SR 84 (Bayfront Expressway) and Marsh Road
SR 84 (Woodside Road) and Middlefield Road
SR 92 and SR 1
SR 92 and Main Street.

Appendix B: Traffic Level of Service Calculation Methods

Appendix B

Traffic Level of Service Calculation Methods

Level of service (LOS) is a term used to qualitatively describe the operating conditions of a roadway based on factors such as speed, travel time, maneuverability, delay, and safety. The level of service of a facility is designated with a letter, A to F, with A representing the best operating conditions and F the worst.

There are many methods available to calculate the levels of service for the various types of roadways and intersections that comprise San Mateo County's designated Congestion Management Program (CMP) system. The components of the CMP Roadway System include freeways, such as U.S. 101 and I-280; multilane highways; two-lane highways, such as State Route 1 (SR 1), south of Linda Mar; major arterials, such as SR 82 (El Camino Real); and major intersections. Operational analyses of specific weaving sections and ramp junctions have not been included in the CMP but may be added for subsequent CMPs.

AB 471 and AB 1963, the CMP legislation, require that methods of calculating levels of service defined either by the latest version of the *Highway Capacity Manual* (HCM) or by the Transportation Research Board's *Circular 212* be used for the analysis of CMP roadways. San Mateo County has been using the level of service methods specified in the HCM published in 1994 for freeways, multilane highways, two-lane highways, arterials, freeway weaving sections, ramp junctions, signalized intersections, and unsignalized intersections. The TRB's *Circular 212* describes methods for signalized and unsignalized intersections.

The level of service (LOS) calculation methods found in the 1994 HCM for freeways, multilane highways, two-lane highways, and arterials and the calculation for signalized intersections based on TRB's *Circular 212* method are described in this appendix.

Level of Service Calculation Methods

The methods selected to calculate levels of service for the roadway (freeway, multilane highway, two-lane highway, and arterial) segments and intersections included in the CMP network are described below:

Freeways

A freeway is defined as a divided highway facility with two or more lanes in each direction and full control of access and egress. It has no intersections; access and egress are provided by ramps at interchanges.

According to the *Highway Capacity Manual* (1994 HCM), the LOS of freeway segments is based on the density of vehicles, expressed in passenger cars per mile per lane. The LOS can also be evaluated with volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratios, average travel speeds, and maximum service flow rates. The specific LOS criteria for freeways are presented in Table B-1. Illustrations of the various levels of service are presented on Figure B-1.

The selected LOS method for freeway segments is based on calculating V/C ratios for each direction of travel, wherein the traffic volume for each segment is divided by the capacity of the segment. The volumes are obtained from counts for existing conditions or from a travel forecasting model for future conditions. The capacity is estimated as the number of lanes multiplied by 2,200 vehicles per hour per lane for four-lane freeway segments and 2,300 vehicles per hour per lane for segments with six or more lanes. The V/C ratios are calculated and related to LOS based on the relationships presented in Table B-1.

Another method of calculating a freeway segment's level of service is to determine the average travel speed from floating car runs. Descriptions of the average travel speeds for each LOS designation are also presented in Table B-1.

Multilane Highways

Multilane highways generally have posted speed limits of between 40 and 55 miles per hour (mph). They usually have four or six lanes, often with physical medians or two-way left-turn lane medians, although they may also be undivided (have no median). Unlike freeways, multilane highways are interrupted by intersections or driveways.

The level of service criteria for multilane highways are similar to the criteria for freeways. The specific criteria from the HCM are presented in Table B-2. The LOS calculation method is identical to the calculation method for freeways. The only difference is the range of V/Cs and speeds for each LOS designation. The maximum ideal lane capacity for a multilane highway segment is 2,200 vehicles per hour.

Two-Lane Highways

A two-lane highway is defined as a two-lane roadway with one lane for use by traffic in each direction. Passing of slower vehicles requires use of the opposing lane. As volumes or geometric constraints increase, the ability to pass decreases and platoons of vehicles are formed. The delay experienced by motorists also increases. The LOS for two-lane highways is based on mobility. The specific LOS criteria from the 1994 HCM are presented in Table B-3.

For two-lane highways, the selected method, based on V/Cs, takes into account the volume in both directions. The total volume is divided by the total capacity of 2,800 vehicles per hour. The corresponding V/C is correlated to a LOS based on the V/C ranges in Table B-3. Average travel speeds for each LOS designation are also presented in this table.

Table B-1
1994 HCM Level of Service Criteria for Basic Freeway Sections

| LOS | 70 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | | 65 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | | 60 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) |
| A | ⊙ 10.0 | ⋈ 70.0 | 0.318/0.304 | 700 | ⊙ 10.0 | ⋈ 65.0 | 0.295/0.283 | 650 | ⊙ 10.0 | 60.0 | 0.272/0.261 | 600 |
| B | ⊙ 16.0 | ⋈ 70.0 | 0.509/0.487 | 1,120 | ⊙ 16.0 | ⋈ 65.0 | 0.473/0.457 | 1,040 | ⊙ 16.0 | 60.0 | 0.436/0.412 | 960 |
| C | ⊙ 24.0 | ⋈ 68.5 | 0.747/0.715 | 1,644 | ⊙ 24.0 | ⋈ 64.5 | 0.704/0.673 | 1,548 | ⊙ 24.0 | 60.0 | 0.655/0.626 | 1,440 |
| D | ⊙ 32.0 | ⋈ 63.0 | 0.916/0.876 | 2,015 | ⊙ 32.0 | ⋈ 61.0 | 0.887/0.849 | 1,952 | ⊙ 32.0 | 57.0 | 0.829/0.793 | 1,824 |
| E | ⊙ 36.7/39.7 | ⋈ 60.0/58.0 | 1.000 | 2,200/2,300 | ⊙ 39.3/43.4 | ⋈ 56.0/53.0 | 1.000 | 2,200/2,300 | ⊙ 41.5/46.0 | 53.0/50.0 | 1.000 | 2,200/2,300 |
| F | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable | Variable |

^a Density in passenger cars per mile per lane.

^b Average travel speed in miles per hour.

^c Maximum volume-to-capacity ratio.

^d Maximum service flow rate under ideal conditions in passenger cars per hour per lane.

⊙ less than or equal to

⋈ greater than or equal to

Note: In table entries with split values, the first value is for four-lane freeways, and the second is for six- and eight-lane freeways.

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209* (Washington, D.C., 1994), pp. 3-9.

Table B-2
Level of Service Criteria for Multilane Highways

| LOS | 60 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | | 55 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | | 50 mph Free-Flow Speed | | | |
|-----|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) | Density ^a (pc/mi/ln) | Speed ^b (mph) | Maximum ^c V/C | MSF ^d (pcphpl) |
| A | ⊙ 12 | ⊢ 60 | 0.33 | 720 | ⊙ 12 | ⊢ 55 | 0.31 | 660 | ⊙ 12 | ⊢ 50 | 0.30 | 600 |
| B | ⊙ 20 | ⊢ 60 | 0.55 | 1,200 | ⊙ 20 | ⊢ 55 | 0.52 | 1,100 | ⊙ 20 | ⊢ 50 | 0.50 | 1,000 |
| C | ⊙ 28 | ⊢ 59 | 0.75 | 1,650 | ⊙ 28 | ⊢ 54 | 0.72 | 1,510 | ⊙ 28 | ⊢ 50 | 0.70 | 1,400 |
| D | ⊙ 34 | ⊢ 51 | 0.89 | 1,940 | ⊙ 34 | ⊢ 53 | 0.86 | 1,800 | ⊙ 34 | ⊢ 49 | 0.84 | 1,670 |
| E | ⊙ 40 | ⊢ 55 | 1.00 | 2,200 | ⊙ 41 | ⊢ 51 | 1.00 | 2,100 | ⊙ 43 | ⊢ 47 | 1.00 | 2,000 |
| F | > 40 ^e | < 55 ^e | - ^e | - ^e | > 41 ^e | < 51 ^e | - ^e | - ^e | > 43 ^e | < 47 ^d | - ^e | - ^e |

^a Density in passenger cars per mile per lane.

^b Average travel speed in miles per hour.

^c Maximum volume-to-capacity ratio.

^d Maximum service flow rate under ideal conditions in passenger cars per hour per lane.

^e Highly variable, unstable.

⊙ less than or equal to

⊢ greater than or equal to

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual*, Special Report 209 (Washington, D.C., 1994), pp. 7-8.

**Table B-3
Level of Service Criteria for General Two-Lane Highway Segments**

| LOS | % Time Delay | Avg. ^b Speed | V/C Ratio ^a | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|---------------------|-------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | Level Terrain | | | | | | Rolling Terrain | | | | | | Mountainous Terrain | | | | | | | |
| | | | % No-Passing Zone | | | | | | % No-Passing Zone | | | | | | % No-Passing Zone | | | | | | | |
| | | | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | Avg. ^b Speed | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 | Avg. ^b Speed | 0 | 20 | 40 | 60 | 80 | 100 |
| A | ⊙ 30 | ⊞ 58 | 0.15 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | ⊞ 57 | 0.15 | 0.10 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.03 | ⊞ 56 | 0.14 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 |
| B | ⊙ 45 | ⊞ 55 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.21 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.16 | ⊞ 54 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.13 | ⊞ 54 | 0.25 | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.10 |
| C | ⊙ 60 | ⊞ 52 | 0.43 | 0.39 | 0.36 | 0.34 | 0.33 | 0.32 | ⊞ 51 | 0.42 | 0.39 | 0.35 | 0.32 | 0.30 | 0.28 | ⊞ 49 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.28 | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.16 |
| D | ⊙ 75 | ⊞ 50 | 0.64 | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.57 | ⊞ 49 | 0.62 | 0.57 | 0.52 | 0.48 | 0.46 | 0.43 | ⊞ 45 | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.45 | 0.40 | 0.37 | 0.33 |
| E | > 75 | ⊞ 45 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | ⊞ 40 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.90 | ⊞ 35 | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 0.78 |
| F | 100 | < 45 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | < 40 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | < 35 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

^a Ratio of flow rate to an ideal capacity of 2,800 passenger cars per hour in both directions.

^b Average travel speed of all vehicles (in mph) for highways with design speed ⊞ 60 mph; for highways with lower design speeds, reduce speed by 4 mph for each 10-mph reduction in design speed below 60 mph; assumes that speed is not restricted to lower values by regulation.

⊙ less than or equal to

⊞ greater than or equal to

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209* (Washington, D.C., 1994), pp. 8-5.

Arterials

Levels of service for arterials are dependent on the arterial class denoted as Type I, II, or III. Type I arterials are principal arterials with suburban design, 1 to 5 signals per mile, no parking, and free-flow speeds of 35 to 45 miles per hour (mph). Type III arterials have urban designs, with 6 to 12 signals per mile, parking permitted, and are undivided with free-flow speeds of 25 to 35 miles per hour. Type II arterials fall between Type I and III and have free-flow speeds of 30 to 35 miles per hour.

The LOS for an arterial is based on maneuverability, delays, and speeds. As the volume increases, the probability of stopping at an intersection due to a red signal indication increases and the LOS decreases. The specific LOS criteria from the HCM are presented in Table B-4.

For the CMP, a calculation method based on V/C was selected. Volumes on each roadway segment in each direction are divided by the capacity, estimated to be 1,100 vehicles per hour per lane. The capacity was estimated based on a saturation flow rate of 1,900 vehicles per lane and the assumption that El Camino Real would receive 60 percent of the green time.¹ With the assumption that streets perpendicular to El Camino Real would receive 40 percent of each intersection's green time, the reduction in El Camino Real's capacity due to intersecting streets has been accounted for in the method used to analyze levels of service of arterial streets. Except for the 16 designated intersections, the operations of individual intersections, which are the locations where a street capacity is most constrained, are not analyzed for the CMP. Therefore, the levels of service presented for various roadway segments along El Camino Real are likely to be better than the level of service of individual intersections.

The V/C for arterials is correlated to LOS based on the information in Table B-5. The average speeds for each LOS designation are presented in Table B-4.

¹The estimated capacity for El Camino Real was calculated by multiplying 1,900 vehicles per hour per lane by 0.6, to arrive at 1,140 vehicles per hour per lane which was then rounded off to 1,100 vehicles per hour per lane.

Table B-4
Level of Service Criteria for Arterials

| Arterial Class | I | II | III |
|---------------------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| Range of Free-Flow Speeds (mph) | 45 to 35 | 35 to 30 | 35 to 25 |
| Typical Free-Flow Speed (mph) | 40 mph | 33 mph | 27 mph |

| Level of Service | Average Travel Speed (mph) | | |
|------------------|----------------------------|------|------|
| A | ≥ 35 | ≥ 30 | ≥ 25 |
| B | ≥ 28 | ≥ 24 | ≥ 19 |
| C | ≥ 22 | ≥ 18 | ≥ 13 |
| D | ≥ 17 | ≥ 14 | ≥ 9 |
| E | ≥ 13 | ≥ 10 | ≥ 7 |
| F | < 13 | < 10 | < 7 |

mph miles per hour

⊗ less than or equal to

≥ greater than or equal to

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209* (Washington, D.C., 1994), pp. 11-4.

**Table B-5
CMP Level of Service Criteria for Arterials^a Based on
Volume-to-Capacity Ratios**

| Level of Service | Description | V/C ^b |
|------------------|---|-------------------|
| A | Free-flow conditions with unimpeded maneuverability. Stopped delay at signalized intersection is minimal. | 0.00 to 0.60 |
| B | Reasonably unimpeded operations with slightly restricted maneuverability. Stopped delays are not bothersome. | 0.61 to 0.70 |
| C | Stable operations with somewhat more restrictions in making mid-block lane changes than LOS B. Motorists will experience appreciable tension while driving. | 0.71 to 0.80 |
| D | Approaching unstable operations where small increases in volume produce substantial increases in delay and decreases in speed. | 0.81 to 0.90 |
| E | Operations with significant intersection approach delays and low average speeds. | 0.91 to 1.00 |
| F | Operations with extremely low speeds caused by intersection congestion, high delay, and adverse signal progression. | Greater Than 1.00 |

^a For arterials that are multilane divided or undivided with some parking, a signalized intersection density of four to eight per mile, and moderate roadside development.

^b Volume-to-capacity ratio.

≥ greater than or equal to.

< less than.

Source: Transportation Research Board, *Highway Capacity Manual, Special Report 209* (Washington, D.C., 1994).

Signalized Intersections

The TRB *Circular 212* Planning method is the selected level of service calculation method for the designated intersections in the San Mateo County's CMP Roadway System. A signalized intersection's level of service, according to the method described in TRB *Circular 212*, is based on dividing the sum of the critical volumes by the intersection's capacity. This calculation yields the volume-to-capacity ratio (V/C). The critical movements are the combinations of through movements plus right-turn movements if there is no exclusive right-turn lane, and opposing left-turn movements that represent the highest per-lane volumes. Descriptions of levels of service for signalized intersections, together with their corresponding V/Cs, are presented in Table B-6.

Table B-6
Intersection Level of Service Definitions

| Level of Service | Interpretation | V/C Ratio |
|------------------|--|------------------|
| A | Uncongested operations; all queues clear in a single signal cycle. | Less Than 0.60 |
| B | Very light congestion; an occasional approach phase is fully utilized. | 0.60 to 0.69 |
| C | Light congestion; occasional backups on critical approaches. | 0.70 to 0.79 |
| D | Significant congestion on critical approaches, but intersection functional. Cars required to wait through more than one cycle during short peaks. No long-standing queues formed. | 0.80 to 0.89 |
| E | Severe congestion with some long-standing queues on critical approaches. Blockage of intersection may occur if traffic signal does not provide for protected turning movements. Traffic queue may block nearby intersections(s) upstream of critical approach(es). | 0.90 to 0.99 |
| F | Total breakdown, stop-and-go operation. | 1.00 and Greater |

In the TRB *Circular 212* method, the capacity of an intersection is based on an average saturation flow rate and percent lost time. The saturation flow rate is the maximum number of vehicles per lane that can pass a fixed point in one hour with 100 percent green time. The

average saturation flow rate measured in San Mateo County is 1,980 vehicles per hour of green per lane (vphgpl). The lost time is the time when vehicles are not entering the intersection due to changes in signal indications. Percent lost time is the lost time divided by the cycle length. The average percent lost time measured in San Mateo County for intersections with four or more phases is 12 percent. The intersection capacities, based on San Mateo County data, for signalized intersections with two, three, and four or more signal phases are presented in Table B-7. These capacities are used with the *Circular 212* Planning method to evaluate the levels of service for San Mateo County's CMP intersections.

Table B-7
Intersection Capacities

| Number of Signal Phases | Capacity (in vph) |
|----------------------------|----------------------|
| 2 | 1,850 |
| 3 | 1,760 |
| 4 or more | 1,700 |

Appendix C: Bay Area Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s Deficiency List

Final

DEFICIENCY LIST:

**PROGRAMS, ACTIONS AND IMPROVEMENTS
FOR INCLUSION IN CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
"DEFICIENCY PLANS"**

Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Planning Division
939 Ellis Street
San Francisco, CA 94109

For more information, contact David Marshall at (415) 749-4678.

Adopted by the District Board of Directors

November 4, 1992

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS
OF THE
BAY AREA AIR QUALITY MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

In the Matter of Adopting a)
Deficiency List for Use in)
Conjunction with County)
Congestion Management Programs)

RESOLUTION NO. 2119

WHEREAS, Section 65089 of the Government Code requires that a Congestion Management Program be developed and adopted for every county that includes an urbanized area;

WHEREAS, Deficiency Plans are a part of the Congestion Management Program process;

WHEREAS, Deficiency Plans must include a list of improvements, programs, or actions, and estimates of costs, that will measurably improve the level of service of the system and contribute to significant improvements in air quality;

WHEREAS, Section 65089.3 of the Government Code requires this District to establish and periodically revise a list of approved improvements, programs and actions which meet requirements included in the Section;

WHEREAS, District staff has prepared a proposed Deficiency List which comprises a list of programs, actions and improvements to be used by cities and counties in preparing Deficiency Plans, and a statement of policy the District will follow in updating the list and in considering items not included in the list but proposed for consideration in a Deficiency Plan;

1 WHEREAS, the proposed Deficiency List was discussed with
2 affected and interested parties and was revised in response to
3 comments received from such parties;

4 WHEREAS, District staff recommends that this Board adopt
5 the Deficiency List attached hereto; and

6 WHEREAS, this Board concurs with the recommendation of the
7 staff.

8 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that this Board hereby adopt
9 the proposed Deficiency List attached hereto comprising a list of
10 programs, actions and improvements for use in the preparation of
11 Deficiency Plans and a statement of policy the District will
12 follow in updating the list and in considering items not included
13 in the list but proposed for consideration in a Deficiency Plan.

14 The foregoing resolution was duly and regularly introduced,
15 passed and adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directo.
16 of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District on the Motion of


17 ///
18 ///
19 ///
20 ///
21 ///
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///


1 Director McPeak, seconded by Director McKenna,
2 on the 4th day of November 1992 by the following vote of the
3 Board:

4 AYES: Aramburu, Battisti, Britt, Campbell, Harberson, Harper,
5 Head, Hilligoss, McKenna, McPeak, Ogawa, Powers.
6


7
8
9 NOES: Hancock.

10
11
12
13 ABSENT: Achtenberg, Bruno, Cooper, Davis, Diridon, Eshoo, Fogarty.

14
15 
16 M. PATRICIA HILLIGOSS
17 Vice-Chairperson of the Board of Directors

18 ATTEST:
19 
20 PAUL BATTISTI
21 Secretary of the Board of Directors



27 Certified as a True Copy
28 
29 Carol D. Shalley
30 Clerk of the Boards
31

INTRODUCTION

This document contains the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's list of improvements, programs and actions for inclusion in Congestion Management Program Deficiency Plans. Deficiency Plans are a part of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) process. Under the CMP process, each urbanized county in California establishes a county wide road system consisting of all Interstates, state highways and major arterials, along with a Level of Service (LOS) standard.¹ When traffic conditions on a roadway segment or intersection falls below the LOS standard, the local jurisdiction is required to develop a Deficiency Plan. In some instances, cities and counties may be monitoring LOS based upon transportation models, attempting to predict conditions in the future. The intent is to develop plans for deficient segments prior to the actual occurrence of a deficiency.

The requirements for Deficiency Plans are set forth in Government Code Section 65089.3(b). The plans are to include four elements: A) an analysis of the cause of the deficiency; B) a list of improvements and their estimated costs which would enable the deficient road segment or intersection to maintain a LOS at the standard or better; C) a list of improvements, programs, or actions that will measurably improve the Level of Service of the road system and contribute to significant improvements in air quality; D) An action plan to implement either option B) or C) above, including a specific implementation schedule and a description of funding. The full text of Section 65089.3(b) is reprinted in Attachment 1.

The CMP statutes direct the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, as the air district for most of the nine-county Bay Area², to establish and periodically update a list of improvements, programs and actions which can be used by local governments in developing element C of the Deficiency Plans. The list should include items that " ... (i) measurably improve the level of service of the system ..., and (ii) contribute to significant improvements in air quality, such as improved public transit service and facilities, other rideshare programs and promotions, improved non-motorized transportation facilities, high occupancy vehicle facilities, and transportation control items." The statutes also state that "[i]f an improvement, program, or action is not on the approved list, it shall not be implemented unless approved by the local air quality management district."

¹ Level of Service, commonly abbreviated as LOS, is a method of measurement of congestion that compares actual or projected traffic volume with the maximum capacity of the facility under study. LOS ranges from A to F, with F describing the most congested conditions. Except in a few instances, the standard established in the CMPs of the nine Bay Area counties is LOS E. Some counties have designated LOS D for facilities located within undeveloped and rural areas.

² The Bay Area Air Quality Management District includes Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, the western part of Solano, and the southern part of Sonoma Counties.

Confusion has arisen over whether a city or county in its Deficiency Plan can recommend widening a "deficient" highway segment or expanding a "deficient" intersection to resolve a level of service deficiency. The CMP legislation provides for that option as noted in element B above. However, even when a jurisdiction knows in advance that it wants to opt for a "direct fix" to the problem, it still must prepare a Deficiency Plan because the segment has become deficient (determined through LOS monitoring). In that Deficiency Plan, the jurisdiction still must develop element C of the Plan that evaluates improvements, programs and actions contained on the BAAQMD's list.

The CMP process is largely directed at alleviating and avoiding peak-period roadway congestion. Because of this, the Deficiency List contains items intended to help reduce peak-period motor vehicle travel, although many items on the list will also work to reduce travel during other periods of the day. The Deficiency List does not contain certain "market-based" revenue and pricing measures (e.g., gas tax increase, higher bridge tolls, congestion pricing, smog fee, "pay as you drive" insurance, etc.). Each of these need (1) state enabling legislation prior to any city or county action to implement, and (2) a well-orchestrated regional implementation strategy to ensure success. For these reasons, the market-based measures are not appropriate for the Deficiency List at this time.³

In a region as large and diversified as the Bay Area, it would be difficult to identify improvements, programs and actions that individually work to "...measurably improve the level of service of the system...and contribute to significant improvements in air quality...". The items that have been included on our list work in some degree to improve roadway conditions and lessen air pollution. The degree to which each item does both varies: Some are very strong improvers of traffic congestion, but make small contributions in improvements to air quality; others help to improve air quality, but offer very little in the way of traffic relief; and then still others offer little in both categories, yet are very necessary as supporting measures.⁴ Because of this, emphasis should be given to the benefits derived from combining the various measures, viewing their effectiveness in terms of joint application.

³ The Deficiency List does include Parking Management (measure E6) through pricing strategies.

⁴ Certain measures included on the District's list focus on providing alternatives to the single occupant vehicle that will benefit the Region's air quality in the long term. Implementation of these measures as part of a deficiency plan may contribute to or cause localized congestion for motor vehicles (examples include Signal Preemption by Transit Vehicles [B11] and Bus Stop Bulbs [B12]). Without changes to State law, a jurisdiction could have to prepare a Deficiency Plan to remedy a level of service deficiency caused by implementation of a measure (or measures) on this list.

The following measures have been included in this initial Deficiency List, but will undergo further evaluation due to revised air pollutant emissions factors recently released by the California Air Resources Board (CARB):

- Accelerated implementation of the *2005 HOV Master Plan* (D3)
- Auxiliary Lanes of up to One Mile in Length Where HOV Lanes are Provided (F3)
- Signalization Improvements (F4)
- Computerized Traffic and Transit Control/Management on Arterials (F5)

These new emissions factors show that vehicles emit more Carbon Monoxide and Hydrocarbons at speeds greater than 35 miles per hour. Following: (1) resolution of the current debate among CARB, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Caltrans, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and MTC on emissions factors for vehicle speeds of 20-50 miles per hour, or (2) more technical information becoming available, BAAQMD staff will reassess the appropriateness of these measures for the Deficiency List. Furthermore, Ramp Metering (F2) has the potential to create Carbon Monoxide "hot spots" since vehicles must idle while waiting to enter the freeway. Queues that develop at metered freeway entrances can cause motorists to opt to take short trips on local arterials, resulting in more emissions for the entire trip than would have occurred had the motorist waited in the queue to take the trip via freeway. When more technical information on the air quality impacts of ramp metering becomes available, BAAQMD staff will reassess the appropriateness of these measures for the Deficiency List.

The BAAQMD will reevaluate the measures on this list following preparation of revised regional transportation/air quality planning documents designed to replace current planning documents of the same name:

- Regional Transportation Plan (1993)
- Ozone State Implementation Plan (to be prepared for Federal air quality standards) (1993)
- Bay Area 1994 Clean Air Plan (to be prepared for State air quality standards)

Although the statutes do not call for guidance on the implementation of the items on the Deficiency List, BAAQMD staff has provided some. The guidance is general in nature, and is directed towards providing a basis by which local jurisdictions, Congestion Management Agencies and other interested groups can determine the adequacy of a Deficiency Plan. The guidance is not intended to serve as a "cookbook" that specifies the degree to which each item shall be implemented in a particular jurisdiction. Experience gained through the implementation of the items on the list should help District staff in

updating and improving the list. Future versions may contain actions specific to certain Counties or municipalities.

Section I is the District's draft list of programs, actions and improvements to be used by cities and counties in preparing Deficiency Plans. **California law mandates that cities and counties select measures from the list in Section I when preparing Deficiency Plans.**

Section II contains the *policy* the BAAQMD will follow in updating the list and for considering items not included on the list but proposed for inclusion in a Deficiency Plan.

Appendix A presents the BAAQMD's guidance on how the draft Deficiency List should be implemented by local governments. **Information in Appendix A is advisory. California law does not specify the scope or quantity of measures on the list necessary to mitigate or "offset" a level of service deficiency.**

This document was prepared by David Marshall and Michael Murphy, Senior Planners, Planning Division / Environmental Review Section.

SECTION I
LIST OF PROGRAMS, ACTIONS, AND IMPROVEMENTS
FOR INCLUSION IN DEFICIENCY PLANS

Cities/Counties/CMAAs' use is mandatory (required by California law)

The items that comprise the list of programs, actions and improvements that cities and counties can incorporate into Deficiency Plans are described below. Each description indicates whether the item is most suitable for local implementation, county wide or corridor level implementation.

Although the items have been grouped into six categories, many are complementary and their individual effectiveness will be increased if undertaken together. For instance, the success and advantages of High Occupancy Vehicle lanes will be enhanced if preferential treatment of buses, carpools and vanpools is designed into parking areas, local arterials and freeway on- and off-ramps.

Each category is preceded with a listing of the Transportation Control Measures (TCM) from the '91 *Clean Air Plan* that will be directly implemented or in some fashion be supported by the items on the list. The development and implementation of Deficiency Plans is not viewed as the main avenue for the implementation of the TCMs in the '91 *Clean Air Plan*. Clearly though, implementation of system-wide improvements through Deficiency Plans can only benefit the success of the strategies set forth in the TCMs.

A. BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN MEASURES

A1. Improved Roadway Bicycle Facilities and Bike Paths. Roadways could be improved to provide increased safety and convenience for bicyclists. Improvements include:

- widening shoulders or curb side pavement
- lane re-striping and/or removal of on-street parking to create a wider outside (right) lane for bicycles thus reducing bicycle and automobile conflicts
- installing, marking and/or modifying sensitivity of detection loops at intersections to trigger light changes and allow bicycles to clear the intersection
- completing and expanding Class I bike paths and Class II bicycle lanes that are in the circulation elements of general plans

Caltrans standards shall be followed in designing and constructing bicycle improvements. This measure is suitable for both local and system-wide implementation.

A2. Transit and Bicycle Integration. This measure is intended to increase the number of bus and train routes capable of transporting bicycle riders, as well as improving interconnection between the two modes. Communities in San Mateo, Santa Clara and San Francisco Counties could work with the CALTRAIN Joint Powers Board to allow bicycles on CALTRAIN and to assure peak period bicycle accommodation on the new California cars (when acquired). Communities within the BART service area could work with BART to better accommodate bicycles during commute periods through downtown Oakland and San Francisco, as well as shortening or eliminating the periods during which bicycles are barred from the BART system. An alternative could be to provide special peak-period BART runs in the commute direction that accommodate bicycles. Communities, working with relevant transit districts, could work to increase the number of bus routes and rail services allowing access to bicyclists, as well as providing increased numbers of bicycle lockers (for regular users) and racks that allow use of the U-Bar style locks (for occasional users) at transit transfer centers and other interconnection points. This measure should be implemented on a system-wide basis since most transit service is on a multi-city basis. Local governments that operate their own transit service should implement this measure locally.

A3. Bicycle Lockers and Racks at Park and Ride Lots. Park and ride lots accessible to bicycles should contain bicycle lockers (for regular users) and racks that allow use of the U-Bar style locks (for occasional users). Jurisdictions will have to include in their Deficiency Plans the initial number of storage spaces and criteria for installing additional spaces. Communities can also consider establishing "Bike and Ride" lots: areas along major transit routes designated for bicycle storage only, separate from automobile parking lots. This measure can be implemented on a local basis.

A4. Bicycle Facilities And Showers At Developments. As part of any new office/industrial/commercial/school/special generator and multi-family (four or more units) residential development generating more than 50 person trips per day, cities and counties could require the inclusion of bicycle storage facilities and, for office/industrial/commercial/school/special generator developments employing more than 100 employees, showering and changing rooms. Bicycle storage facilities include bicycle lockers and racks (must allow use of the U-Bar style locks) which are located close to the main entrances or inside of buildings. Existing sites should add bicycle storage facilities and, for developments/buildings/sites employing more than 100 employees, showering and changing rooms where feasible. This measure can be implemented on a local basis.

A5. Improved Pedestrian Facilities. It is the general practice for new development to include sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities. However, efforts can be made to improve and expand upon current requirements and practices to make walking a more integral part of the transportation system. City and county zoning ordinances and design standards should be revised as appropriate to ensure safe, convenient and direct pathways for pedestrians between their residences, shopping and recreational areas, and work sites. Other efforts include requiring, where appropriate, the provision of walkways in commercial and residential areas linking building entrances to street sidewalks and crossings, and linking building entrances to adjacent building entrances and activity centers. Communities can also require continuous and clearly marked pathways across parking lots between sidewalks and building entrances. A preferable approach is to locate entrances and building fronts along street sidewalks, with parking spaces at the sides and rears of buildings. This measure is suitable for local implementation. (See also Land Use Measures [E8].)

A6. Pedestrian Signals. To encourage more walk trips, pedestrian signals should be added on major arterials to enhance safety. This measure should be implemented locally.

A7. Lighting for Pedestrian Safety. Communities can require and install adequate lighting for sidewalks, bus stops, bicycle parking areas and vehicle parking lots to create conditions that are safe for pedestrians. There may be special hardware requirements that must be met for implementation of this measure in proximity to facilities sensitive to light pollution (e.g., Lick Observatory). This measure is suitable for local implementation.

B. TRANSIT (Includes bus, rail and ferry services)

B1. Improvement of Bus, Rail and Ferry Transit Services. This measure is directed at improving public and private transit service. Cities, counties and employers will need to (1) work with the relevant transit districts and private operators to identify appropriate routes for reducing headways, extending service, improving transfers, and coordinating project design and services to new development; and (2) contribute financially toward both capital and operating costs of service improvements. Emphasis should be placed on providing service that will reduce peak period automobile trips (e.g., express and commuter bus/rail/ferry service). Service expansion should be coordinated with the relevant Short Range Transit Plan(s) and also support local and regional trip reduction efforts. This measure should be implemented on a system-wide basis.

B2. Expansion of Rail Transit Service. This measure is directed at extending or expanding rail transit beyond the projects included in MTC's New Rail Starts Program

outlined in MTC Resolution 1876. Emphasis should be placed on expanding rail service to corridors not included in Resolution 1876 that will experience rapid growth in peak period automobile trips. Cities and counties will need to work with local, regional, state and federal transportation agencies to define projects and establish institutional arrangements to construct and operate the services, and fund operating costs. This measure can be implemented locally and on a system-wide basis, and should be considered in conjunction with Improvement of Bus, Rail and Ferry Transit Services (B1).

B3. Expansion of Ferry Services. Freeways, bridges and transit connections around and across San Francisco Bay are heavily congested. High speed ferry service offers an efficient and comfortable transportation alternative. New or enhanced service should focus on peak period travel when congestion is greatest. An example would be to provide high speed commuter ferry service between Vallejo and the San Francisco Ferry Terminal as a reliever of peak period congestion on I-80 in Contra Costa and Alameda counties. This measure should be implemented on a corridor or system-wide basis.

B4. Preferential Treatment for Buses and In-Street Light Rail Vehicles (LRVs). This measure includes strategies that give preference to buses and in-street light rail vehicles, including transit stops at building entrances, bus shelters, LRV platform boarding areas, direct HOV to HOV connecting lanes and ramps, exclusive bus/LRV lanes, bypass lanes at metered freeway ramps, including reserved lanes around any queues that may form on connecting streets or at congested off-ramps. These strategies should be a part of a coordinated regional and/or county HOV system, with individual communities assisting with changes that affect local streets or development review/approval. This measure can be implemented both locally and on a system-wide basis.

B5. Transit Information and Promotion. This measure is intended to work with the Transit and Bicycle Integration (A2), Stricter Travel Demand Management/Trip Reduction Ordinances (E1) and Public Education Programs (E2). Cities and counties can:

- advertise the availability of transit in their communities
- post transit schedules at bus stops
- enhance access to transit via non-motorized modes-(e.g., bicycling and walking)
- provide for special accommodation of clean fuel/electric vehicles at rail and ferry stations (e.g., preferential parking and free electric outlets)

Cities and counties must coordinate their recommendations with relevant organizations such as local transit district(s), MTC, RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, Inc., Berkeley TRiP,

San Benito Rideshare, Santa Clara County's Commuter Network, Santa Cruz Share-a-Ride, Solano Commuter Information¹ and the BAAQMD for enhancements to existing programs or implementation of new programs. Promotional activities should be directed at all trips, including those for shopping, recreation, commuting and school. This measure can be implemented both locally and on a system-wide basis.

B6. Transit Pricing Strategies to Encourage Ridership and, where applicable, Reduce Transit Vehicle Crowding. Pricing incentives and alternative fare structures can encourage ridership and, where necessary, reduce transit vehicle crowding. These incentives and strategies include subsidy from alternative revenue sources to reduce fares, zonal fares, peak hour fares, elimination of discounts for elder citizens who travel at peak times and free or reduced cost transit on "Spare the Air" day.² Transit pricing changes should ideally be done in conjunction with service improvements. Communities can work with neighboring cities and transit agencies to identify and subsidize appropriate incentive programs. This measure, especially appropriate for cities or counties that operate their own transit system, should be implemented on a system-wide basis.

B7. Transit Fare Subsidy Programs. These programs generally are implemented at employment sites in the form of direct employer subsidy of employee transit fares, usually with some monthly or yearly ceiling. Where cities/counties require employers to subsidize transit fares to meet trip reduction requirements, such programs must also equally subsidize persons who use non-motorized modes (e.g., bicycle or walk). Other subsidy programs could be directed towards school, recreational and shopping trips. This program can be implemented locally for a city or county's own employees, or a city or county can include a transit fare subsidy requirement for employers in its local trip reduction ordinance, or a city or county can condition new development to include such programs as a part of the city or county's development approval process.

B8. Transit Centers. To assist current and potential riders in obtaining route information, schedules, and passes, cities and counties would establish (or provide funds for transit agencies to establish) transit centers. The centers can be patterned after Berkeley TRiP. Another option is a mobile, clean fueled/electric "commute store" that would visit activity

¹ San Benito County, Santa Cruz County and eastern Solano County are outside the BAAQMD's jurisdiction. Reference is made to services offered in these jurisdictions since they are considered within the commute shed of the greater Bay Area.

² Depending on how the strategies are constructed, they have potential to significantly impact operating revenue. Any proposal should fully evaluate the impact on operating revenue and identify replacement revenue to cover any potential loss to the transit operator(s). "Spare the Air" day occurs when the BAAQMD forecasts that atmospheric conditions on the following day are likely to result in an exceedance of the health based State ozone standard. Major employers and the media are notified to advise employees and the general public that activities contributing to ozone formation should be limited.

centers and employment sites to disseminate transit, ridesharing, and non-motorized travel information (e.g., maps of bike routes, bicycle commuter handbooks, and city walking guides). A second option is to install electronic kiosk centers, which are able to dispense tickets, route information, and in some cases, assist with ride matching operations. Another option is to franchise out the centers to mailbox services, photocopying centers, or other such establishments. Centers could also be established at community centers. Centers should be established at all major transit transfer points. This measure can be implemented both locally and on a system-wide basis.

B9. Improved and Expanded Timed Transfer Programs. Shortening the time passengers wait when transferring between buses, from bus to train or vice-versa, and between transit systems is an important improvement to transit service. Working with the relevant transit districts, cities and counties would need to identify the best locations for timed transfers and which routes would be best suited for schedule adjustments. Current plans to institute timed transfers should be considered for accelerated implementation. This measure should be implemented on a system-wide basis.

B10. Improved and Expanded Fare Coordination. Through the encouragement of MTC, BART and several Bay Area transit operators have developed a fare card that is used to debit fares on BART and also serve as a semi-monthly "flash pass" on major Bay Area bus systems. Each month more people purchase this card, demonstrating the public's desire for a simplified Bay Area transit fare structure. MTC is working diligently with transit operators to test and implement a "universal" fare card. Cities and counties can work in partnership with MTC, CMAs and relevant transit districts to develop and implement fare coordination agreements, and contribute financially to the necessary hardware, software, equipment maintenance and, where applicable, operator subsidies.

B11. Signal Preemption by Transit Vehicles. Transit vehicles could be equipped with preemption devices that hold or trigger a green light in order to avoid delays at intersections. Since implementation of this measure could be highly disruptive to traffic flow in an optimally timed, signalized corridor, and thus increase emissions, affected local governments should work closely with transit agencies to implement signal preemption only where most appropriate. This measure should be implemented on a system-wide or corridor basis.

B12. Bus Stop Bulbs. A strategy to improve passenger pickup and off-loading is to extend sidewalks across the parking lane to the first through traffic lane. Such an extension is called a bus stop bulb. With bus stop bulbs, buses are not delayed merging back into traffic after stops, and cars are prevented from blocking the stops, both of which improve bus travel time.³ Some transit agencies prefer bus turn outs (which remove the

bus from the traffic stream for passenger loading to minimize delay to motorists and allow the bus to reenter the traffic stream only when an adequate gap in traffic becomes available), while others prefer neither bus turn outs nor bus bulbs. Cities or counties that want to implement Bus Stop Bulbs (B11) should work closely with their respective transit agency(ies). The District does not consider bus turn outs as an appropriate alternative to bus stop bulbs since turn outs favor single occupant vehicles and lengthen bus travel times. This measure can be implemented both locally and on a system-wide basis.

B13. School Bus Transit Service. This measure is directed at establishing school bus services in school districts where bus service has been reduced or eliminated. Reinstating or expanding school bus service would provide an alternative to many students who drive to school or are driven to school by others. Reinstating or expanding school bus service would also provide capacity on existing public bus services for commuters displaced by student riders. Cities and counties will need to work with school districts to establish arrangements for funding the service. This measure would be implemented locally or system-wide.

C. CARPOOLING, BUSPOOLING, VANPOOLING, TAXIPOOLING, JITNEYS, CASUAL CARPOOLING AND OTHER SHARED RIDES (Ridesharing)

C1. Preferential Treatment for Shared Ride Vehicles. This measure includes strategies that give preference to carpools, buspools, vanpools, taxipools, jitneys and other shared rides, including reserved parking spaces next to building entrances, transit stops at building entrances, direct HOV to HOV connecting lanes and ramps, bypass lanes at metered freeway ramps, including reserved lanes around any queues that may form on connecting streets or at congested off-ramps. These strategies should be a part of a coordinated regional and/or county HOV system, with individual communities assisting with changes that affect local streets or development review/approval. This measure can be implemented both locally or on a system-wide basis.

C2. Increased use of Commuter/Employer Services. To increase the number of carpools and vanpools, commuters and employers should be encouraged to use the free computerized ridematching services provided by RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, Inc., Berkeley TRiP, San Benito Rideshare, Santa Clara County's Commuter Network, Santa Cruz Share-a-Ride and Solano Commuter Information.³ RIDES maintains a database that serves commuters in the nine Bay Area counties and several outlying counties. RIDES'

³ San Benito County, Santa Cruz County and eastern Solano County are outside the BAAQMD's jurisdiction. Reference is made to services offered in these jurisdictions since they are considered within the commute shed of the greater Bay Area.

database is electronically linked to ridesharing programs in San Benito County, Santa Clara County, Santa Cruz County, Solano County and the City of Berkeley as well as to ridesharing programs of several Bay Area employers. As an integral part of cities' and counties' trip reduction efforts, employers of all sizes should encourage their employees to take advantage of these services. In addition, employer services offered by RIDES, Santa Clara County's Commuter Network, Solano Commuter Information and Berkeley TRiP could serve as an integral part of training, education and outreach efforts for employee transportation coordinators. This measure can be implemented locally or on a system-wide basis.

D. HIGH OCCUPANCY VEHICLE (HOV) FACILITIES

D1. Preferential Treatment for HOVs. See measures B4 and C1.

D2. Bus and Carpool/Buspool/Vanpool/Taxipool Priority Lanes on Local Arterials. This measure is aimed at providing time savings for buses and car/bus/van/taxipools on local arterials. Many peak period commute trips occur on congested local streets. Provision of the Priority lanes during the commute periods will act as an incentive for ridesharing. In some instances, this measure can be combined with Restrictions on Curb-Side Deliveries and On-Street Parking (F11) to provide lanes without taking away mixed flow capacity. (However, streets with existing or planned bicycle lanes should not have the parking lane converted, as this could cause conflicts between bicyclists and motor vehicles.) Cities and counties incorporating this measure in their Deficiency Plan should indicate how any proposed priority lanes will supplement or otherwise support any county-wide or regional HOV plans. This measure should be implemented on a system-wide basis.

D3. Accelerated Implementation of the 2005 HOV Master Plan. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Caltrans, and the California Highway Patrol (CHP) have identified a regional system of High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes. Some of the projects have already been programmed for funding and completion by 1995. The remainder are assumed for completion by 2005. Communities can place a greater priority on these projects so that they can be constructed before the year 2005. For areas, such as Solano County, which are not included in the *2005 HOV Master Plan*, emphasis can be placed on developing HOV lanes identified in another study, such as the *I-80 Strategic Plan*. Cities and counties should work with MTC, Caltrans and the CHP to evaluate HOV lanes on freeway segments not included in the *2005 HOV Master Plan*.

The technical analysis accompanying the *2005 HOV Master Plan* indicated that successful HOV lanes require support facilities, such as park and ride lots, express bus service and exclusive HOV bypass lanes and connecting ramps. It is recommended that Deficiency

Plans incorporating this measure focus on providing support facilities for HOV lanes. Some, such as by-pass lanes and connecting ramps, would be constructed at the time the HOV lane is constructed. Others, such as park and ride lots and improved transit service should be implemented prior to the opening of the HOV facility. This measure can largely be implemented on a system-wide basis, although supporting actions can be done on a local basis. (See note on page 3 regarding this measure.)

D4. HOV to HOV Facilities. Local government work with Caltrans and CMAs to identify and program for construction ramps that provide a direct connection between HOV facilities. This could significantly reduce travel time for HOVs that otherwise would be required to negotiate a very slow merge across three or four lanes of single occupant vehicle (SOV) traffic twice in order to exit one freeway and enter another. This measure can be implemented on a system-wide basis.

D5. Direct HOV Lane Entrance/Exit Ramps to Arterials and Special Generators. Where high volumes of HOVs would benefit from direct access to freeway or expressway HOV lanes, direct HOV ramps should be provided for (1) arterials that provide access to major activity centers and (2) connecting roadways to special generators (e.g., airports, stadiums, universities, military facilities, etc.). This measure could be implemented region-wide or locally.

E. OTHER TCMS, RELATED MEASURES.

E1. Stricter Travel Demand Management/Trip Reduction Ordinance. As part of a Deficiency Plan, a city or county will modify their mandated Trip Reduction Ordinance to include requirements *beyond* those either currently identified or recommended in their county's CMP. After the adoption of the BAAQMD's Employer-Based Trip Reduction Rule, jurisdictions would revise their programs to go *beyond* the requirements embodied in the District's rule and other local trip reduction requirements, where applicable. This program can be implemented locally.

E2. Expanded Public Education Programs. A Public Education program should be an essential part of any Deficiency Plan. Jurisdictions can include educational materials regarding air quality and congestion relief and the use of the automobile with programs dealing with waste recycling, water conservation, etc. The conservation of air quality and the efficient use of the transportation system are messages compatible with other waste reduction and resource conservation programs. Public education programs might include the following topics:

- health effects of air pollution and traffic congestion
- the air pollution effects of older cars and cars that are out of tune
- list of available low emission vehicles (electric, natural gas, methanol, etc.) and their sellers
- the air pollution effects of cold starts and short trips
- the benefits of linking trips for shopping, errands, recreation, work, particularly during the afternoon on weekdays and during the weekend
- the role of alternative means of transportation in improved regional air quality, local congestion relief, and reduced energy use
- the benefits of compact development, particularly near transit stations
- the benefits of leaving the car at home at least one or two days a week
- the benefits of taking feeder buses, bicycling or walking to regional rail or bus transfer centers and other destinations
- advertising the location, cost and availability of discount transit tickets
- educational materials designed for use in school curricula

The BAAQMD has already begun a public education program for the region. Materials developed as part of the program will be available to cities and counties. RIDES for Bay Area Commuters, Inc., Berkeley TRiP, San Benito Rideshare, Santa Clara County's Commuter Network, Santa Cruz Dial-a-Ride, and Solano Commuter Information each provide a variety of public information and services available to cities, counties, CMAs, transit agencies, employers and other transportation agencies/organizations.⁴ Educational materials should also be developed for planning and zoning commissions and governing boards that make land use and transportation decisions impacting air quality. This program can be implemented locally.

E3. Child Care Facilities at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots. Many commuters need to drop off and pickup their children at child care. The intent of this measure is for jurisdictions to facilitate the location of child care facilities at, or more likely, close to employment sites, major transit centers (e.g., BART, CalTrain and Santa Clara Light Rail stations, and park and ride lots. The intent is to shorten or eliminate the automobile portion of the commute trip. Jurisdictions and employers may need to provide financial incentives to operators of such facilities. This program can be implemented locally. (See also Land Use Measures [E8].)

⁴ San Benito County, Santa Cruz County and eastern Solano County are outside the BAAQMD's jurisdiction. Reference is made to services offered in these jurisdictions since they are considered within the commute shed of the greater Bay Area.

E4. Retail Services at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots. Trips could be eliminated and perceived transit waiting time would be reduced if retail services (e.g., automated bank teller machines (ATMs), dry-cleaners, coffee shops, book stores, etc.) were offered in conjunction with employment sites, transit centers and park and ride lots. Jurisdictions could provide incentives for and work with transit operators to encourage development at or in immediate proximity to areas where people wait to take a bus or train. Activity at or near a transit center or park and ride lot would also enhance safety and thus increase patronage. (See also Land Use Measures [E8].)

E5. Telecommuting Centers and Work-at-Home Programs. Under this measure, jurisdictions and employers would facilitate through discussions with major employers:

- the creation of centers in their communities for telecommuting
- implementation of programs that allow employees to work at home

Businesses would rent space in the center for their employees to work, being connected by telephone wires to the main office and/or allow their employees where appropriate to work at home one or two (or more) days per week. This program can be implemented locally.

E6. Parking Management. This is a broad measure, overlapping with measures dealing with employer-based trip reduction and traffic flow improvements. Jurisdictions can implement parking charges, restrict parking during peak hours along busy corridors, require preferential parking for carpools and vanpools at major activity centers, require shared parking arrangements at developments, land bank parking space, establish automobile free zones, parking standards in zoning ordinances to discourage vehicle trips (e.g., establish maximum parking ratios rather than minimum ratios, revise minimum ratios to require fewer spaces, etc.). This program can be implemented locally.

E7. Parking "Cash-Out" Program/Travel Allowance. AB 2109 (Katz, Ch. 92-0554) requires employers of 50 persons or more who provide a parking subsidy⁵ to employees to offer a parking cash-out program. Under a parking cash-out program, the employer offers to provide a cash allowance to an employee equivalent to the parking subsidy that the

⁵ "Parking subsidy" is defined as the difference between the out-of-pocket amount paid by an employer on a regular basis in order to secure the availability of an employee parking space and the price, if any, charged to an employee for use of that space.

employer would otherwise pay to provide the employee with a parking space.⁶ Employees who wish to continue to drive will receive a parking space in lieu of the cash allowance. Employees who forego the use of parking can use the travel allowance for any purpose, including subsidizing the use of alternative transportation modes. Employers may also offer transit passes or ridesharing subsidies as all or part of the travel allowance to help reduce the tax impact on employees.⁷

As part of a deficiency plan, a city or county could pass an ordinance, amend its trip reduction ordinance, or work with employers to implement parking cash-out programs that go beyond this new State requirement.⁸ Examples include:

- include employers with fewer than 50 employees
- include employers that own their own parking spaces, using the market rate for parking in the area as the cost of parking and the amount of the cash travel allowance
- require or encourage building owners to separate the cost of parking from the cost of leasing office space, thereby facilitating/requiring parking cash-out programs in multi-tenant office complexes
- implement a parking cash-out program at city/county employment sites as a model for other employers

This program, which should be implemented locally, must be designed to minimize any adverse impact on parking in neighborhoods adjacent to the participating employment sites.

E8. Land Use Measures. Land use exerts a strong influence on travel patterns and transportation mode choice. Site design strategies (e.g., clustering and minimizing walk distance to transit) also influence mode choice. Strategies which local governments can undertake include revising general plan policies and land use designations, zoning ordinances and design standards to provide for:

⁶ AB 2109 also requires cities and counties in which a commercial development will implement a parking cash-out program which is included in a CMP pursuant to subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 65089 or a deficiency plan pursuant to Government Code Section 65089.3 to grant that development an appropriate reduction in the parking requirements otherwise in effect for new commercial development.

⁷ Under State and Federal law a cash travel allowance is considered gross income and is therefore taxable. Transit subsidies and some other ridesharing subsidies are not taxable up to varying amounts, depending upon State or Federal tax law.

⁸ To meet the requirements of this Deficiency List, cities and counties must require that the employer program not be designed to disproportionately favor use of any alternative mode (e.g., giving a travel allowance to the employee in the form of a "Commute Check" that can be used for public transit only, and offering no equivalent monetary benefit for those who rideshare, bicycle or walk).

- phase development to occur near current transit service (i.e., infill)
- mixed land uses where residences, work places and services are located close enough together to minimize the need for private motorized transportation between them⁹
- pedestrian oriented design, such as sidewalks, adequate crosswalks on major streets, building entries near sidewalks rather than behind parking lots, and convenient transit stops
- affordable housing near major employment sites
- incentives for infill development
- higher densities at transit stops and along major transit lines
- sites for alternative fuel vehicle fueling facilities

This measure can be implemented both locally and on a system-wide basis. (See also Improved Pedestrian Facilities [A5], Child Care Facilities at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots [D3] and Retail Services at or close to Employment Sites, Transit Centers and Park and Ride Lots [D4].)

F. TRAFFIC FLOW IMPROVEMENTS.

F1. Preferential Treatment of HOVs. See measure B4 and C1.

F2. Ramp Metering. Caltrans District 4 is currently working on a comprehensive ramp metering program for the region's freeways. Ramp metering must include bypass lanes for buses and carpools. Jurisdictions placing this measure in their Deficiency Plans must show how they will work with Caltrans and MTC to help fund and assist in expediting the implementation of ramp metering on freeway ramps within their community. Solano County would coordinate with any ramp metering plans developed by Caltrans, District 10. This measure would be implemented on a system-wide basis. (See note on page 3 regarding this measure.)

F3. Auxiliary Lanes of Up to One Mile in Length Where HOV Lanes are Provided. This measure would allow the addition of freeway auxiliary lanes between interchanges of not more than one mile in length (i.e., in locations with closely spaced interchanges) to promote ease of HOV lane access and egress and provide for safe merging of conflicting

⁹ Cities and counties, prior to zoning for or approving housing or other sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, hospitals or convalescent facilities) near industry should consider the nature of activity that may occur and whether that activity does/could pose a risk of nuisance (e.g., odors) or potential public health problems. Similar care should be taken when considering locating industry or related land uses near residences and other sensitive receptors. BAAQMD Planning Division staff is available in such cases to advise cities and counties of appropriate action and mitigation strategies (e.g., buffer zones) where feasible.

traffic. This measure is for *freeways only* (not expressways), since expressway auxiliary lanes would diminish the safety of bicyclists. This measure would be implemented on a system-wide basis. (See note on page 3 regarding this measure.)

F4. Signalization Improvements. Jurisdictions would be expected to improve signal timing and sequencing to smooth traffic flow and increase average speeds during the peak periods. Jurisdictions could identify roadways to undergo signalization improvements, as well as a timetable for doing so. Jurisdictions that have planned improvements can use those programs. Signalization improvements should be coordinated with any programs to improve signalization and preemption advantages for transit vehicles. This measure would be implemented on a system-wide basis. (See note on page 3 regarding this measure.)

F5. Computerized Traffic and Transit Control/Management on Arterials. This measure includes installing traffic sensors, closed circuit television, low wattage "highway-advisory radio" broadcasts, and centrally controlled changeable message signs on local arterials to convey current traffic and transit information. This driver and transit rider information system will supply travelers with real-time traffic and transit information to assist them in planning routes and times of travel. This will be especially helpful in reducing congestion from surges of traffic such as special events, sporting events and parades. (See note on page 3 regarding this measure.)

F6. Turn Lanes at Intersections. This measure would be applicable on arterials where placement of a maximum of one left turn lane and/or a maximum of one right turn lane per approach would significantly reduce average stopped delay at an intersection. Double left- or double-right turn lanes would not be appropriate at intersections or freeway/arterial on/off ramps since these create an unfriendly environment for trips by non-motorized modes (pedestrian, bicycle and other travel).¹⁰ This measure would be implemented locally.

¹⁰ An exception to the double turn lane restriction for arterial/arterial intersections would be appropriate only in cases where all of the following criteria are met: (1) the curb to curb distance remains the same for all approaches after changes to intersection geometry; (2) the width of the median (if any), which serves as pedestrian refuge, is not reduced to accommodate changes to intersection geometry; (3) the signal cycle length is reduced so pedestrians have more frequent opportunities to cross the intersection; (4) the minimum green time in each phase (for pedestrian crossing) is maintained or increased; and (5) the width of the right most through lane is maintained or increased from its width prior to changes to intersection geometry (for bicyclists' safety).

F7. Turn Restrictions at Intersections. This measure consists of restricting turns at some intersections throughout the day or during peak periods only. This measure can be implemented locally.

F8. Reversible Lanes. This measure is applicable on arterials in areas of employment concentration, where congestion occurs in the inbound direction in the morning and the outbound direction during the afternoon. It consists of temporarily increasing the capacity of the congested direction, with the reversed lane dedicated as an exclusive lane for buses, carpools and vanpools. This program can be implemented locally.

F9. One Way Streets. In areas of high traffic volumes, jurisdictions can convert roadways to one-way streets. This measure has been employed in many of the larger central business districts within the Bay Area. Jurisdictions using this measure should identify streets to be converted to one-way and an implementation schedule. However, streets should not have the parking lane taken away where this would cause conflicts between bicyclists and motor vehicles by decreasing the lane area for bicyclists.¹¹ This program can be implemented locally.

F10. Targeted Traffic Enforcement Programs. Where double parking, parking in bus stops, "gridlock" or illegal use of HOV lanes pose a problem, jurisdictions can provide additional parking and traffic enforcement to help manage congestion. This program can be implemented locally.

F11. Restrictions on Curb Side Deliveries and On-Street Parking. This measure is intended as a peak hour measure. The intent is to handle peak flows without adding permanent capacity to the roadway. It is expected that this measure would be used in conjunction with measures to provide arterial HOV lanes or transit priority lanes facilities. In some instances, restrictions may only apply to one-side or for a portion of a roadway/arterial, depending on the peak-flow. This measure may also be useful in handling congestion around commercial areas during their peak period. Jurisdictions may require that all deliveries be made at the rear of buildings, if space and building lot design allows. This program can be implemented locally.

¹¹ A combination bus and bike lane would be acceptable since the frequency of buses is limited.

SECTION II
BAAQMD ADMINISTRATION OF DEFICIENCY LIST

DISTRICT REVIEW OF MEASURES NOT ON THE APPROVED LIST

Section 65089.3(b)(1)(c) of the State Government Code requires that any programs, actions or improvements included in a **Deficiency Plan** which are not taken from the adopted District list may not be implemented unless approved by the District.¹ To facilitate the timely review of such measures the following procedures should be followed.

(1) The District's Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO) and the appropriate Congestion Management Agency should be notified concurrently at the earliest practicable date of any local government's intent to seek District approval of an unlisted measure.

(2) A complete description of the proposed measure(s) should be submitted to the District and the appropriate CMA concurrently. We recommend that the submittal include all documentation demonstrating the effectiveness of the proposed measure in reducing VMT on the CMP system. The District will inform the local government in writing within thirty days if additional information is needed. Review of the measure(s) will not commence until all needed information has been received by the District.

(3) Once all relevant information has been received regarding the measure(s), the District Board of Directors, upon receiving a recommendation from the APCO, will either approve or disapprove the measure(s) within ninety (90) days. The APCO will notify the local government and the applicable Congestion Management Agency concurrently in writing of the reasons for the determination.

BIENNIAL UPDATE OF LIST

The list will be updated every two years, immediately following the period during which Congestion Management Agencies make their determinations that local governments conform (or do not conform) to requirements of the CMP legislation. Changes to the measures on the list or to the procedures governing their implementation will be adopted by the District's Board of Directors at a regularly scheduled meeting. Drafts of any changes will be available for public review at least two months prior to the Board taking action. District staff will continue its regular, ongoing consultative process with CMAs, MTC, Caltrans and ARB through the Clean Air/Congestion Management Working Group.

¹ Following adoption of this Deficiency List by the BAAQMD Board of Directors, California Congestion Management Program (CMP) law does not prohibit cities, counties, CMAs and Caltrans from continuing to manage congestion by including in their **Capital Improvements Programs** traffic flow improvements that are thought to have a long term detrimental effect on air quality (e.g., freeway, expressway, and arterial widening for single occupant vehicles and intersection improvements of any geometry). The law does however preclude cities and counties from placing in a **Deficiency Plan** any program, action or improvement not on this Deficiency List, unless approved by the BAAQMD according to administrative procedures outlined in this section.

Attachment 1

Excerpts from Government Code of the State of California (as amended in 1992 by the California Legislature [AB 2109/AB 3093]).

65089.3

- (a) The agency shall monitor the implementation of all elements of the congestion management program. Annually, the agency shall determine if the county and cities are conforming to the congestion management program, including, but not limited to, all of the following:
- (1) Consistency with levels of service and performance standards, except as provided in subdivisions (b) and (c).
 - (2) Adoption and implementation of a trip reduction and travel demand ordinance.
 - (3) Adoption and implementation of a program to analyze the impacts of land use decisions, including the estimate of the costs associated with mitigating these impacts.
- (b) (1) A city or county may designate individual deficient segments or intersections which do not meet the established level of service standards if, prior to the designation, at a noticed public hearing, the city or county has adopted a Deficiency Plan which shall include all of the following:
- (A) An analysis of the causes of the deficiency.
 - (B) A list of improvements necessary for the deficient segment or intersection to maintain the minimum level of service otherwise required and the estimated costs of the improvements.
 - (C) A list of improvements, programs, or actions, and estimates of costs, that will (i) measurably improve the level of service of the system, as defined in subdivision (b) of Section 65089, and (ii) contribute to significant improvements in air quality, such as improved public transit service and facilities, improved non-motorized transportation facilities, high occupancy vehicle facilities, parking cash-out programs, and transportation control measures. The air quality management district or the air pollution control district shall establish and periodically revise a list of approved improvements, programs, and actions which meet the scope of this paragraph. If an improvement, program, or action is on the approved list and has not yet been fully implemented, it shall be deemed to contribute to significant improvements in air quality. If an improvement, program, or action is not on the approved list, it shall not be implemented unless approved by the local air quality management district or air pollution control district.
 - (D) An action plan, consistent with the provisions of Chapter 5 (commencing with Section 66000) of Division 1 of Title 7, that shall be implemented, consisting of improvements identified in paragraph (B), or improvements, programs, or actions identified in paragraph (C), that are found by the agency to be in the interest of the public's health, safety and welfare. The action plan shall include a specific implementation schedule.
- (2) A city or county shall forward its adopted Deficiency Plan to the agency. The agency shall hold a noticed public hearing within 60 days of receiving the Deficiency Plan. Following the hearing, the agency shall either accept or reject the Deficiency Plan in its entirety, but the agency may not modify the Deficiency Plan. If the agency rejects the plan, it shall notify the city or county of the reasons for that rejection.

APPENDIX A

Cities/Counties/CMAs' use is advised (not required by California law)¹

Procedures for the implementation of the list of programs, actions and improvements developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District in response to the Congestion Management legislation is outlined below. The items listed in Section I provide a wide range of options from which communities can choose during the development of a Deficiency Plan. One of the key issues that will confront the preparers of Deficiency Plans is how many of the items from the list must be included in a particular plan.

The responsibility for determining the adequacy of a Deficiency Plan rests with the Congestion Management Agencies. The CMAs can either accept or reject a Deficiency Plan, but may not modify it. The CMAs will be responsible for developing appropriate criteria for determining the adequacy of Deficiency Plans submitted by the communities. To assist the CMAs with this task, we have included a methodology for assessing whether or not enough of the items from the list have been included in a Deficiency Plan.

The approach that we have chosen revolves around the offsetting of a deficient facility's contribution to congestion and air quality. A Deficiency Plan is adequate if it includes sufficient items from the District's list to offset over the system the increased amount of vehicle miles travelled (VMT) on the deficient facility due to its operation at LOS F rather than LOS E.² The basic steps in the process are described below.

STEP 1 - Identify v/c Ratio That Must be Mitigated:

Use the county wide transportation model to identify the volume to capacity (v/c) ratio of the deficient segment. The amount by which this v/c ratio exceeds (or is projected to exceed) the upper limit of the Congestion Management level of service standard (e.g., 0.99 for LOS E) is the v/c ratio increment that must be mitigated through implementation of items on the BAAQMD's list.

¹ The next few years will offer a number of opportunities for cities and counties to examine different ways of choosing deficiency strategies as they come up with plans mitigating congestion on parts of the network that have failed the Level of Service (LOS) test. We urge cities, counties and CMAs to encourage experimentation in alternative methods to match LOS deficiencies with congestion management and air quality strategies and remedies.

² The BAAQMD acknowledges that not every measure on the Deficiency List will reduce VMT (see Introduction). Some measures do more to improve congestion than air quality (e.g., traffic flow improvements, HOV lanes involving highway widening, etc. These measures have been included on the Deficiency List because they support other air beneficial measures (e.g., an HOV lane supports ridesharing) or encourage jurisdictions to implement low cost, cost effective strategies to enhance personal/vehicular mobility (e.g., lane re-striping and signs for one-way streets/reversible lanes to increase vehicle throughput and lane re-striping and signs to create wide outside lanes for bicycles).

Let's say the forecast v/c ratio is 1.12 (LOS F) and the v/c ratio necessary to achieve the county wide LOS Standard is 0.99 (upper limit of LOS E). This would mean that mitigation items would need to be identified that offset a v/c ratio 'deficiency' of 0.13.

STEP 2 - Translate the v/c Ratio Deficiency to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)

Consider the segment of U.S. 101 from Novato to Petaluma in Marin and Sonoma Counties.³ This segment of U.S. 101 is approximately seven miles in length and hypothetically both Marin and Sonoma Counties' transportation models agree its projected northbound traffic volume in the 2000 PM Peak Hour is 4,039.

$$0.13 \times 7 \times 4,039 = 3,675 \text{ VMT}$$

Thus, 3,675 VMT would need to be mitigated through items from the BAAQMD list.

STEP 3 - Identify Items that Offset the VMT Deficiency

The BAAQMD has prepared a list of Deficiency Plan mitigation items that improve traffic conditions and benefit air quality throughout the Bay Area. The city, county or CMA preparing a Deficiency Plan may choose any of these items, individually or in combination. Since we recognize certain items may be more effective at reducing VMT in a given geographic area, we have outlined two options to assess the adequacy of Deficiency Plan items:

Option 1: Use Region wide Effectiveness Data. The data contained in Table 1 reflect region wide effectiveness of various TCMs in the '91 Clean Air Plan.⁴ (This table is forthcoming; not included in this draft.) The proportion of the Deficiency Plan Item (or '91 Clean Air Plan TCM) defined in Table 1 that the local government identifies funding for in the Deficiency Plan and implements (or effects implementation) prior to the end of the 7-Year CIP horizon year is the proportion of VMT reduction for which credit can be taken. Detail on applying Option 1 is presented below under "Examples."

Option 2: Exercise County wide Transportation Model. The VMT reduction effects of certain Deficiency Plan Items (e.g., transit improvements) may be analyzed more accurately using a county wide transportation model. Certain Deficiency Plan Items (e.g., new bicycle lockers) could not be analyzed using a county wide transportation model.

³ This segment of U.S. 101 currently operates at LOS F, and as allowed by statute, both Marin and Sonoma counties have established a LOS standard of F for the segment. Thus this is not a segment for which a Deficiency Plan will be required. Both the example selected and the numbers used are intended for illustration only.

⁴ "Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analyses of Effectiveness and Costs," prepared for the BAAQMD by Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis, Inc., July 1991 (revised October 1991). Copies of this report are available from the BAAQMD upon request.

Examples of Option 1

1. Provide funding for the BAAQMD-delegated Region wide Trip Reduction Rule to apply to 61,000 additional employees in Marin and Sonoma Counties (beyond requirements of the rule).

The rule was assumed in the '91 Clean Air Plan to apply to 3 Million employees.
 $61,000/3,000,000 = 0.02033$ (just over 2%)

1999 VMT (Daily) = 110,856,000
Effectiveness of TCM at reducing VMT = 3.2% (from Table 1)

$110,856,000 \times 0.032 = 3,547,392$ daily VMT reduced by implementation of rule throughout Bay Area, or 354,739 peak-hour VMT (estimated at 10% of daily)

$354,739 \text{ VMT} \times 2.033\% = 7,212$ VMT reduced during the peak hour as a result of implementing the Deficiency Plan Item

2. Provide support for RIDES staff to inform 5,000 employees at Hamilton Field about commute alternatives

The TCM was assumed to apply to 250,000 employees.
 $5,000/250,000 = 0.02$ (2%)

1999 VMT (Daily) = 110,856,000
Effectiveness of TCM at reducing VMT = 0.18% (from Table 1)

$110,856,000 \times 0.0018 = 199,541$ daily VMT reduced by implementation of program throughout Bay Area, or 19,954 peak-hour VMT (estimated at 10% of daily)

$19,954 \text{ VMT} \times 2\% = 399$ VMT reduced during the peak hour as a result of implementing the Deficiency Plan Item. This would mean that 40 of the 5,000 informed about commute alternatives traveling during the peak hour actually shift modes, assuming an average trip length of 10 miles.

3. Fund Phase II bus service expansion at \$12.88 Million/yr. The CMAs would spearhead member local governments in the 101 Corridor entering into a service agreement with the Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District to provide additional service in the U.S. 101 Corridor from Santa Rosa to San Francisco.

The TCM was assumed to implement new bus service costing \$140 Million/yr.

$$12.88/140 = .092 \text{ (9.2\%)}$$

1999 VMT (Daily) = 110,856,000

Effectiveness of TCM at reducing VMT = 0.4% (from Table 1)

$110,856,000 \times 0.004 = 443,424$ daily VMT reduced by implementation of service expansion throughout Bay Area, or 44,342 peak-hour VMT (estimated at 10% of daily)

$44,342 \text{ VMT} \times 9.2\% = 4,079 \text{ VMT}$ reduced during the peak hour as a result of implementing the Deficiency Plan Item.

Summary of Examples

The items in Examples 1 or 3 would be adequate to offset the required 3,675 peak hour VMT reduction. The item selected for Example 2 would not be sufficient to offset the required VMT reduction. Thus, additional Deficiency Plan items would need to be identified in conjunction with the item in Example 2.

Content of Deficiency Plans

Each Deficiency Plan should show the amount of VMT⁵ to be offset, the data it was derived from, and how each item selected from the BAAQMD's list contributes to the offsetting of the VMT increment. All calculations done should be clearly presented.

saved as C:\USER\DM\DEFICIEN\ DRAFT\ST.DOC

⁵ Recognizing that all information in Appendix A of this list is advisory and not required by California law, CMAs may elect to use surrogate measures of deficiency in lieu of VMT (e.g., vehicle trips, average vehicle speed, etc.), especially where level of service monitoring conducted by the CMA and/or its cities does not produce data necessary for calculating v/c ratios and VMT (e.g., "floating car" speed surveys).

Table 1

1997 Deficiency Measure Effectiveness (to be used for improvements implemented by 2000)

| Deficiency Measure | Related CAP TCM | Description | Quantity | Percentage Region Wide Daily VMT Reduced | Amount Region Wide Daily VMT Reduced |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| A1 | 9 | Bicycle Plan Impl Ph I | \$3 M/yr. TDA Article 3 | 0.01 | 11,890 |
| | 9 | Bicycle Plan Impl Ph II | \$5 M/yr. developer mt/TRO | 0.02 | 23,781 |
| A2 | 5, 9 | Transit/Bicycle Integration | | No information available | |
| A3 | 9 | Bike Lockers/Racks @ PNR Lots | | No information available | |
| A4 | 9, 16 | Bike Facilities/Showers | | No information available | |
| A5 | 16 | Impr Pedestrian Facilities | | No information available | |
| A6 | 16 | Pedestrian Signals | | No information available | |
| A7 | 16 | Lighting for Ped Safety | | No information available | |
| B1 | 3 | Bus Service Exp Ph I | \$1 M/yr. | 0.17 | 202,135 |
| | 3 | Rail Service Exp Ph II | \$100 M/yr. | 0.60 | 713,418 |
| | 3 | Bus Service Exp Ph II | \$140 M/yr. | 0.40 | 475,812 |
| | 4 | Rail Ext Ph II/MTC Reso 1876 | \$140 M/yr. | 0.70 | 832,322 |
| | 5 | Rail Access Impr Ph II | \$50 M/yr. | 0.30 | 356,709 |
| B2 | 6 | Intercity Rail Ph II | \$10 M/yr. | 0.04 | 47,561 |
| B3 | 7 | Reg Ferry Plan Impl | \$10 M/yr. | 0.03 | 35,671 |
| B4 | 8, 12, 16 | Pre Treatment Bus/LRT | | No information available | |
| B5 | 5, 13 | Transit Info/Promotion | | No information available | |
| B6 | 13 | Bus-Rail Xfer Subsidy | \$5 M/yr. | 0.05 | 59,452 |
| | 13 | Reduced Transit Fares | \$10 M/yr. | 0.10 | 118,903 |
| B7 | 13 | Employer Transit Subsidy | | No information available | |

| <u>Deficiency Measure</u> | <u>Related CAP TCM</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Quantity</u> | <u>Percentage Region Wide Daily VMT Reduced</u> | <u>Amount Region Wide Daily VMT Reduction</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| B8 | 13 | Transit Ticket Distrib | 50% employer subsidy for 10% workers | 0.06 | 71,342 |
| | 13 | Transit Stores | \$3 M/yr. | 0.02 | 23,781 |
| B9 | 13 | Improved Timed Xfers | | No information available | |
| B10 | 13 | Fare Coordination | Impr inter-dist wait times 10% | 0.05 | 59,452 |
| B11 | 12 | Transit Signal Preempt | \$2 M/yr. | 0.02 | 23,781 |
| B12 | 12, 16 | Bus Stop Bulbs | | No information available | |
| B13 | 10 | School Bus Services | \$5 M/yr. | 0.03 | 35,671 |
| | 10 | 50% Student Fare Subsidy | \$5 M/yr. | 0.02 | 23,781 |
| C1 | 15 | Ridesharing Toll Elimin | \$20 M/yr. | 0.30 | 356,709 |
| C2 | 1 | Employer Audits | \$750,000/yr. | 0.18 | 214,026 |
| D1 | 8 | Pref Treatment for HOVs | | No information available | |
| D2 | 12 | HOV Lanes on Arterials | | No information available | |
| D3 | 8 | HOV Sys Exp Ph II | \$50 M/yr. | 0.45 | 535,064 |
| D4 | 8 | HOV to HOV Facilities | | No information available | |
| D5 | 8 | Direct HOV Entr Ramps | | No information available | |
| E1 | 2 | TRO Stricter than BAAQMD Rule: | | | |
| | 2 | Employees at sites < 100 empls | 1,200,000 | 0.50 | 594,515 |
| | 2 | \$3.00 Worksite Parking Charge | 2,680,000 | 1.90 | 2,259,158 |
| E2 | 1 | ETC Training Materials | \$15,000/yr. | 0.02 | 23,781 |
| E3 | 16, 18 | Childcare Facilities | | No information available | |
| E4 | 16, 18 | Retail Services | | No information available | |
| E5 | 20 | Telecommuting | | No information available | |

| <u>Deficiency Measure</u> | <u>Related CAP TCM</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Quantity</u> | <u>Percentage Region Wide Daily VMT Reduced</u> | <u>Amount Region Wide Daily VMT Reduced</u> |
|---------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| E6 | 22 | Non-work Parking Charges | Min. \$0.80 hr./Empl. 100% transit subsidy | 4.20 | 4,963,929 |
| E7 | 15, 22 | Work Parking Charges/Cash Out | | No information available | |
| E8 | 16 | Indirect Source Ctrl | \$12 M/yr. Design mod. new/exist | 0.80 | 951,225 |
| | 18 | Incr Density nr Transit | 200 DUs @ Rail sta./rezoning | 0.05 | 59,452 |
| F1 | 8, 12, 16 | Pref Treatment Bus/LRT | | No information available | |
| F2 | 11, 12 | Ramp metering | | No information available | |
| F3 | 8 (as support) | Freeway Auxiliary Lanes | | No information available | |
| F4 | 12 | Signal Timing Ph I | | Thought to increase VMT | |
| | 12 | Signal Timing Ph II | | Thought to increase VMT | |
| F5 | 11 | CCTV/Incident Mgt | | Thought to increase VMT | |
| | 11 | Traffic Advisory Sys | | Thought to increase VMT | |
| F6 | 12 (as support) | Turn Lanes @ Intersections | | No information available | |
| F7 | 12 (as support) | Turn Restr @ Intersections | | No information available | |
| F8 | 12 (as support) | Reversible Lanes | | No information available | |
| F9 | 12 (as support) | One Way Streets | | No information available | |
| F10 | 12 (as support) | Targeted Traffic Enforcement | | No information available | |
| F11 | 12 (as support) | Delivery/Parking Restrictions | | No information available | |

Table 1 Assumptions and Notes

- (1) Percentage VMT reductions taken from Transportation Control Measures for the San Francisco Bay Area: Analyses of Effectiveness and Costs, Deakin, Harvey, Skabardonis Inc., July 1991 (revised October 1991). Data adjusted by BAAQMD staff for Deficiency List measures B13 and E1 based on additional information known about project/rule implementation as of October 1992.
- (2) Daily VMT in 1997 for Nine County Bay Area = 118,903,077
Source: Transportation Improvement Program for the Nine County San Francisco Bay Area, Volume III. Metropolitan Transportation Commission, September 23, 1992, Table A.1, p. III-B-74.
- (3) Use peak hour factor of roadway segment to calculate peak hour VMT reduction associated with each measure. If unknown, assume 10% for arterials and 8% for freeways/expressways.
- (4) Quantities involving a dollar expenditure per year are assumed to have a five year lifespan. For example, if City A wants to spend \$500,000 over 5 years toward the lease of space and staff to operate a transit store as a deficiency plan measure, City A would take credit for implementation of $\$500,000/\$15,000,000$ (or 3.3%) of that measure. Daily VMT would be reduced $23,781 \times 0.033$, or 785 VMT; peak hour VMT would be reduced $2,378 \times 0.033$, or 79 VMT. Deficiency plans that include measures involving ongoing operating costs would need to make a guarantee of continued funding as part of plan.

Appendix D: Guidelines for Deficiency Plan

Appendix D

Deficiency Plan Guidelines

Process

The processes for developing and approving deficiency plans are described on the following flow charts. Figure 7-1 describes the general deficiency plan process. Figure 7-2 depicts the deficiency identification process based on the biennial LOS monitoring process.

Figure 7-3 illustrates the process to be followed for development of two types of single-jurisdictional deficiency plans: location-specific and citywide. A location-specific deficiency plan is required for a deficiency at a single location wholly located within a single jurisdiction and caused by traffic from that jurisdiction. A citywide deficiency plan is required for deficiencies at several locations within a single jurisdiction all caused by traffic from that jurisdiction.

There are also two types of multi-jurisdictional deficiency plans, areawide and cross-county boundaries. An areawide deficiency plan is required for a deficiency located within San Mateo County and caused by traffic generated by more than one jurisdiction, all located within San Mateo County and for a deficiency located within San Mateo County caused by a traffic generator located within San Mateo County and owned by a jurisdiction outside of San Mateo County. The process for areawide deficiency plans is illustrated on Figure 7-4.

A cross-county boundary deficiency plan would be applicable for a deficiency with significant traffic contributions from other counties. These types of deficiency plans are not required by the law because they can be resolved by the exclusion of interregional traffic. It is C/CAG's intent to work with CMAAs of contributing counties to jointly develop deficiency plans for these locations. The process for cross-county boundary deficiency plans is presented on Figure 7-5.

Figure 7-1

DEFICIENCY PLAN GENERAL PROCESS




Figure 7-2

IDENTIFICATION OF DEFICIENCY AND TYPE OF DEFICIENCY PLAN (BIENNIAL MONITORING PROCESS)





Figure 7-3

DEVELOPMENT OF LOCATION-SPECIFIC OR CITYWIDE DEFICIENCY PLAN



LEGEND





-  MTC ACTIONS
-  LOCAL ACTIONS
-  CCAG ACTIONS
-  DECISIONS

Figure 7-4

DEVELOPMENT OF AREAWIDE DEFICIENCY PLAN




Figure 7-5

DEVELOPMENT OF CROSS COUNTY BOUNDARY DEFICIENCY PLAN




Figure 7-6 shows the process to be followed for C/CAG's approval of deficiency plans. Figure 7-7 presents the process for a local jurisdiction to appeal their involvement in a deficiency plan to C/CAG. Figure 7-8 illustrates the process for monitoring deficiency plans.

Deficiency Identification

The deficiency will be identified by the biennial level of service monitoring process (see Figure 7-2). Roadway segments or intersections on the CMP Roadway System whose existing LOS is F will be addressed in the Countywide Transportation Plan. An LOS deficiency may also be found to exist as a result of a monitoring program developed by a city or the County as part of the approval process for a local land use decision, as discussed in Chapter 6. The seven exclusions (see page 7-4) will be incorporated into the level of service calculations to determine whether a deficiency is occurring. Next, a select-link analysis will be conducted using the San Mateo Countywide Travel Demand Forecasting model to determine the origins of the traffic on the deficient roadway segments or intersections. A jurisdiction will be considered to be contributing to the deficiency if the amount of traffic at the deficiency and generated within its boundaries is greater than 10 percent of the capacity of the deficient location.¹

If only one jurisdiction is causing the deficiency, then it can either develop a location-specific deficiency plan or a citywide deficiency plan, if there are several deficiencies within that jurisdiction. If more than one jurisdiction is causing the deficiency, either an areawide or cross-county boundary deficiency plan would be required.

Development of Deficiency Plans


The steps to develop the four types of deficiency plans are outlined on Figures 7-3 through 7-5. If a jurisdiction must prepare a deficiency plan, the draft deficiency plan must address these following points:

- ! Each deficiency's cause and magnitude must be described.
- ! Actions to be considered should include those that remedy the specific deficiency or that improve the level of service on the CMP Roadway System overall.

¹The 10 percent of capacity threshold represents a Bay Area standard that was developed by the Bay Area CMA Association. It is based on the fact that 10 percent of capacity represents a change of one full level of service value. It was decided that if jurisdictions were contributing enough traffic to a specific location to change the level of service by one full value, then they should be required to participate in the deficiency plan preparation.

Figure 7-6

DEFICIENCY PLAN APPROVAL PROCESS



LEGEND





-  MTC ACTIONS
-  LOCAL ACTIONS
-  CCAG ACTIONS
-  DECISIONS

Figure 7-7

DEFICIENCY PLAN APPEALS PROCESS






Figure 7-8

DEFICIENCY PLAN MONITORING



LEGEND



MTC ACTIONS



LOCAL ACTIONS



CCAG ACTIONS



DECISIONS

- If actions are considered that are intended to improve the overall LOS on the CMP Roadway System, those actions listed in the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's guidelines for deficiency plans, and other possible actions identified by affected jurisdictions and approved by the BAAQMD should be given a suitability assessment. Suitable system actions should be evaluated at a sketch-planning level in order to identify their potential effects on systemwide traffic congestion and air quality. (In some cases, traffic operations analyses or model forecasts may be required.) If this option is selected, a post implementation level of service should be established for the deficient locations, for monitoring purposes.
- A detailed action plan should be developed, including descriptions of the selected actions, anticipated costs and related funding sources, and a corresponding implementation schedule.

Deficiency Plan Approval

The activities included in the deficiency plan approval process are presented on Figure 7-6. As shown on that figure, local jurisdictions and C/CAG (and its representatives) will be responsible for ensuring that any deficiency plans that have to be prepared will meet the requirements of the CMP. Once C/CAG determines that a deficiency exists, a deficiency plan must be developed within 12 months. The jurisdictions may elect to have the TAC and CMAQ review the draft version of deficiency plans. These groups will try to resolve technical issues and will work with representatives of the local jurisdiction so that the local jurisdiction develops a deficiency plan acceptable to that jurisdiction and C/CAG.

A final deficiency plan must be adopted by the affected local jurisdiction(s) at a noticed public hearing. That public hearing must be scheduled not later than 90 days following the receipt by the local jurisdiction of C/CAG's written notification of the conformance findings.

A final plan must be approved by C/CAG. C/CAG will approve or reject a deficiency plan within 60 days of receipt of the deficiency plan from the local jurisdiction. C/CAG cannot modify a deficiency plan. If C/CAG rejects a deficiency plan, it must specify why it was rejected.

Deficiency Plan Appeals Process

The appeals process, as shown on Figure 7-7, has been added to accommodate local jurisdictions that dispute that a deficiency is occurring or that they should be involved in the development of a deficiency plan. The local jurisdiction would first make that appeal to the TAC. Information supporting their position (additional traffic counts, information refuting results of select-link analysis, etc.) should be presented. The TAC will then make a recommendation to C/CAG whether or not the appeal has merit. C/CAG will then make a decision to either uphold the appeal and issue a finding of conformance or to require the local jurisdiction to prepare or contribute to the deficiency plan.

Deficiency Plan Monitoring

Deficiency plans will be monitored biennially by C/CAG, prior to undertaking the conformance determination for the CMP, to establish whether they are being implemented according to the schedule described in their specific action elements. The monitoring process is shown on Figure 7-8.

- b. Whether changes have occurred that require modifications of the original deficiency plan or schedule.

Each deficiency plan will include a schedule for implementation of the proposed actions. Compliance with the stated schedule will be monitored. A jurisdiction which is either not implementing the actions stipulated in the approved deficiency plan, or not adhering to the stated schedule, may be found by C/CAG to be in nonconformance. Once the action plan is implemented, the results of the monitoring will determine if the deficiency is still occurring. The evaluation may result in recommending changes to other elements of the CMP, such as the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) or Trip Reduction Ordinances (TROs). Action plans prepared as part of deficiency plans will be incorporated into future updates of the CMP.

Methodology

The scope of each deficiency plan's actions should match the severity of the problem being addressed. Extreme deficiencies will need more significant actions, while minor deficiencies may require the definition of only minor actions. The magnitude of the deficiency shall be influenced by the constraint(s) on capacity that prevent(s) a roadway or intersection from operating at its appropriate level of service.

Actions to resolve problems will fall into one of the following two categories: improvements designed to directly mitigate the specific deficiency, and improvements designed to improve the overall level of service on the CMP Roadway System and provide air quality improvements. Actions of the first type are intended to directly mitigate a deficiency. These include highway, transit, and transportation system improvements. Actions of the second type are intended to provide measurable improvements to air quality and level of service on the CMP Roadway System in cases where deficiencies on specific segments or at specific intersections cannot be mitigated directly. For these types of situations, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District has developed a list of available deficiency plan actions which are considered beneficial for air quality and congestion management. Jurisdictions may include actions other than those on this list, provided that they are reviewed and approved by the BAAQMD prior to adoption of the local deficiency plan. However, C/CAG has ultimate approval of the specific actions included in a deficiency plan.

When developing a deficiency plan, the most current BAAQMD list of actions must be considered. The current list was adopted by the BAAQMD on November 4, 1992, and is contained in Appendix C.

Deficiency plans should contain the following sections:

Introduction and Setting--a short description of the deficient roadway facility, including a map showing its location.

Deficiency Analysis - -an explanation of the likely causes of the deficiency, and a quantitative assessment of the magnitude of the deficiency.

Improvement List - - a list of the improvements necessary for the deficient segment or intersection to maintain (or attain) the Level of Service Standard and the estimated costs of the improvements.

Action List (Screening of Actions)--a listing of possible actions and a sketch-planning level evaluation of the most suitable actions.

Implementation Plan - -a description of the actions proposed for implementation, their costs, a schedule for their implementation and completion, and the definition of responsible parties.

Monitoring Program - -a description of the steps that the jurisdiction preparing the deficiency plan will take to monitor implementation of the actions included in the plan.

Appendix E: Descriptions of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)

transportation control measures

Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) are strategies to reduce vehicle emissions. The federal TCMs shown below were added over successive revisions to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). With the exception of the five new TCMs (A-E), the original set of 28 TCMs has been completed.

Federal TCMs in the State Implementation Plan

TCM Number **Federal Transportation Control Measure**

Original TCMs from 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan

| | |
|----------|---|
| TCM 1 | Reaffirm commitment to 28 percent transit ridership increase between 1978 and 1983 |
| TCM 2 | Support post-1983 improvements in the operators' five-year plans and, after consultation with the operators, adopt ridership increase target for the period 1983 through 1987 |
| TCM 3 | Seek to expand and improve public transit beyond committed levels |
| TCM 4 | High-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes and ramp metering |
| TCM 5 | Support RIDES efforts |
| TCM 6* | Continue efforts to obtain funding to support long-range transit improvements |
| TCM 7 | Preferential parking |
| TCM 8 | Shared-use park-and-ride lots |
| TCM 9 | Expand commute alternatives program |
| TCM 10 | Information program for local governments |
| TCM 11** | Gasoline Conservation Awareness Program (GasCAP) |
| TCM 12** | Santa Clara County commuter transportation program |

Contingency Plan TCMs Adopted by MTC in February 1990 (MTC Resolution 2131)

| | |
|---------|--|
| TCM 13 | Increase bridge tolls to \$1.00 on all bridges |
| TCM 14 | Bay Bridge surcharge of \$1.00 |
| TCM 15 | Increase state gas tax by 9 cents |
| TCM 16* | Implement MTC Resolution 1876, Revised — New Rail Starts |
| TCM 17 | Continue post-earthquake transit services |
| TCM 18 | Sacramento-Bay Area Amtrak service |
| TCM 19 | Upgrade Caltrain service |
| TCM 20 | Regional HOV System Plan |
| TCM 21 | Regional transit coordination |

(Continues on next page)

* Deleted by EPA action from 1999 Ozone Attainment Plan

** Deleted by EPA action from 1999 Ozone Attainment Plan, but retained in Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan

transportation control measures

| TCM Number | Federal Transportation Control Measure |
|-------------------|--|
| TCM 22 | Expand Regional Transit Connection ticket distribution |
| TCM 23 | Employer audits |
| TCM 24 | Expand signal timing program to new cities |
| TCM 25 | Maintain existing signal timing programs |
| TCM 26 | Incident management on Bay Area freeways |
| TCM 27 | Update MTC guidance on development of local Transportation Systems Management (TSM) programs |
| TCM 28 | Local TSM Initiatives |

New TCMs in 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan (Being Implemented)

| | |
|-------|--|
| TCM A | Regional Express Bus Program |
| TCM B | Bicycle/Pedestrian Program |
| TCM C | Transportation for Livable Communities |
| TCM D | Expansion of Freeway Service Patrol |
| TCM E | Transit access to airports |

The 19 proposed state Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the Draft 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy have been updated pursuant to the requirements of the California Clean Air Act (CCAA). The proposed TCMs include transit service improvements, rideshare programs, bicycle and pedestrian enhancements, and land-use, pricing, and traffic management strategies. The implementation steps outlined for each TCM include both near-term and long-term implementation. A full description of these state TCMs will be included in the *Draft 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy* publication, available in Summer 2005.

State TCMs Proposed in the Draft 2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy

| TCM Number | State Transportation Control Measure | Implementation Steps |
|------------|--|--|
| TCM 1 | Support voluntary employer-based trip reduction programs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide core support for employer programs, based on an assessment of employer needs and the level of employer interest. Potential support includes assistance in developing or enhancing employer programs, information and referrals, employer networks, and programs to recognize outstanding employer programs. • Support legislation to maintain and expand incentives for employer programs, such as tax deductions and/or tax credits for employer efforts to promote ridesharing, transit, and other commute alternatives • Seek legislation to create stronger voluntary programs for all employers or to require certain minimum elements for public employers |
| TCM 2 | Adopt employer-based trip reduction rule | <i>TCM deleted</i> — Health and Safety Code Section 40929 does not permit air districts to require mandatory employer-based trip reduction programs. |
| TCM 3 | Improve local and areawide bus service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replace worn-out transit buses with clean-fuel buses and retrofit existing diesel buses with diesel emission control technology • Sustain the existing Regional Express Bus Program • Assist further planning work on enhanced bus and Bus Rapid Transit concepts • Sustain transit service to airports • Restore local bus routes that were eliminated due to economic recession • Implement new Enhanced Bus and Bus Rapid Transit services and additional Lifeline Transit services, and expand of Regional Express Bus Programs as funds become available |
| TCM 4 | Upgrade and expand local and regional rail service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Upgrade and expand local and regional rail service • Implement MUNI Metro Third Street Light Rail initial operating segment from Downtown SF to Hunter's Point • Implement Caltrain Express/Rapid Rail Phase 1 ("Baby Bullet") to San Francisco • Extend Tasman East and Vasona light-rail transit (LRT) in Santa Clara County • Extend BART to Warm Springs, eBART to Eastern Contra Costa County, tBART to Livermore/Amador Valley and implement Silicon Valley Rapid Transit Corridor and an Oakland International Airport connector • Implement MUNI Metro Central Subway in San Francisco • Implement Caltrain Downtown Extension/rebuild TransBay Terminal • Implement Downtown East Valley LRT in Santa Clara County • Implement new Marin/Sonoma Commuter Rail Service between Cloverdale and a San Francisco-bound ferry service • Implement an additional Capitol Corridor peak-period commuter service between Vacaville and Oakland • Implement Dumbarton Rail Service connecting BART and Caltrain over a rebuilt Dumbarton rail bridge |
| TCM 5 | Improve access to rail and ferries | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop demonstration program for station car and bike station concepts at select regional transit centers • Determine long-term funding needs for existing shuttles and examine funding options • Implement Safe Routes to Transit to improve bicycle and pedestrian access • Complete Regional Transit Connectivity Plan • Develop a master plan for innovative secure bicycle storage strategies at key transit hubs |

(Continues on next page)

transportation control measures

| TCM Number | State Transportation Control Measure | Implementation Steps |
|------------|---|---|
| TCM 6 | Improve interregional rail service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement additional interregional rail service in Capitol (Auburn–Sacramento–Oakland–San Jose) Corridor and track enhancements • Implement additional Altamont Corridor Express rail service and track enhancements • Implement high-speed rail service between Los Angeles and the Bay Area |
| TCM 7 | Improve ferry service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct initial planning for new ferry service • Implement new high-speed low emission ferry to service Vallejo to San Francisco route • Expand existing ferry service between: Oakland/Alameda and San Francisco, and Larkspur and San Francisco • Implement new ferry service between Berkeley/Albany and San Francisco, and South San Francisco and San Francisco • Implement new intermodal transit hub at Vallejo Ferry Terminal • Expand berthing capacity at the San Francisco Ferry Terminal • Implement hydrogen fuel cell ferry demonstration project from Treasure Island to San Francisco • Assist ferry operators in converting vessel engines to lower emission engines • Study and potentially implement new service between Richmond, Hercules/Rodeo, Martinez, Redwood City and San Francisco; Port Sonoma and San Francisco; and Oakland and San Francisco airports |
| TCM 8 | Construct carpool/express bus lanes on freeways | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand existing HOV network, based on 2003 Transportation Improvement Program, where beneficial to air quality. Special attention should be paid to express bus operations to maximize benefits for transit. Monitor and adjust occupancy requirements and hours of operation to maximize air quality and mobility benefits. • Implement HOV support facilities such as park & ride lots at various locations • Implement additional HOV lanes and support infrastructure identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, where beneficial to air quality |
| TCM 9 | Improve bicycle access and facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund Regional Bicycle Plan and Safe Routes to Transit improvements • Continue Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) and Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding for bike improvements • Develop on-line bicycle mapping tool as part of the regional 511 traveler information number • Promote Bike to Work Week/Day • Encourage local jurisdictions to develop safe and convenient bicycle lane and route networks, provide secure bike racks and storage, and require bicycle access and amenities as conditions of approval of development projects • Encourage public education about bicycle safety for both bicyclists and motorists |
| TCM 10 | Youth transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage walking and bicycling to school through the Safe Routes to Schools Program • Establish special carpool formation services for parents, students and staff at Bay Area elementary and secondary schools • Replace school buses with clean-fuel vehicles • Offer transit ride discounts to youth and students |
| TCM 11 | Install freeway traffic management systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate traffic management features into new freeway construction projects • Maintain current level of Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) • Maintain 511 transit information service and improve and customer convenience • Extend ramp metering in major freeway corridors • Seek funding for full deployment of Caltrans' Traffic Operation System/Traffic Management Center project • Expand FSP to other routes and times of the day |
| TCM 12 | Arterial management measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain current technical assistance program for local jurisdictions that seek to retime signals, including the evaluation of bus priority treatments • Continue TFCA program to fund arterial management projects where air quality benefits can be demonstrated • Coordinate the timing of an additional 1,200 signals and continue updating timing plans • Work with bus operators to provide priority treatment along major bus routes |

| TCM Number | State Transportation Control Measure | Implementation Steps |
|------------|--|--|
| TCM 13 | Transit use incentives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement Translink® (universal fare card) on transit systems throughout the region • Implement improvements to the 511 transit information service • Encourage employers, transit operators, local governments and others to promote and expand employer-based transit subsidy programs like the Commuter Check and EcoPass programs • Improve signage at transit transfer hubs • Deploy real-time transit arrival information • Increase passenger amenities at transit hubs and stops • Complete Alameda and Contra Costa County transit centers identified in AC Transit's Comprehensive Service Plan |
| TCM 14 | Carpool and vanpool services and incentives | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain current programs of the Regional Ridesharing Program and increase efficiency in delivering services • Explore innovative concepts such as real-time ridematching and more formal pick-up/drop-off locations for casual carpoolers • Explore options for expanding medium-distance (15–30 miles) vanpools |
| TCM 15 | Local land-use planning and development strategies | <p>MTC will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement its 5-point transportation and land-use platform including a new planning grant program to fund station area plans around major transit facilities • Maintain funding for expanded TLC planning and capital grant programs and HIP program • Continue providing Transportation Planning and Land-Use Solutions (T-PLUS) funding to congestion management agencies to promote community revitalization projects • Utilize a Caltrans grant to examine opportunities for transit-oriented development along major transit corridors • Develop incentives and conditions to promote supportive land use policies around major new transit investments <p>BAAQMD will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to fund bicycle projects, traffic-calming, shuttles, low emission vehicles, trip reduction programs and other clean air projects through the TFCA program • Continue to provide technical assistance to local jurisdictions on air quality analyses in the environmental review process • Continue to encourage cities and counties to reduce emissions from sources other than motor vehicles including lawn and garden equipment, wood stoves and fireplaces, and residential and commercial uses <p>ABAG will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Periodically monitor and update its Smart Growth demographic projections • Promote multi-jurisdiction planning along select transit corridors to encourage transit-oriented development <p>MTC, ABAG and the BAAQMD will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop financial and other incentives and technical assistance to encourage innovative parking strategies such as reduced parking, parking fees, parking cash-out, shared parking and other parking programs • Pursue legislative changes to remove barriers and provide incentives for smart growth • Promote carsharing as a way to reduce parking requirements • Monitor indirect source mitigation programs in other regions for Bay Area feasibility • Provide technical assistance to local government agencies • Publicize noteworthy examples of local clean air plans, policies and programs, as well as endorse noteworthy development projects • Study opportunities to promote location efficient mortgages (LEMs) to encourage home purchases near transit |

(Continues on next page)

transportation control measures

| TCM Number | State Transportation Control Measure | Implementation Steps |
|------------|--|---|
| TCM 16 | Public education/ intermittent control measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue Spare the Air (STA) notices to media, employers, public agencies and individuals, with an emphasis on reactive organic gases (ROG) reductions, obeying freeway speed limits in electronic freeway signs and other outreach efforts • Expand STA notices to add emphasis on ROG reductions, obeying freeway speed limits, and discouraging use of pleasure craft • Expand the Clean Air consortium to include cities and counties, as well as other public agencies • Target major commercial airports and their tenants for greater participation in the STA program • Increase coordination between the Bay Area's STA program with the San Joaquin Valley's STA program • Continue public education program on the proper maintenance and operation of motor vehicles to reduce air pollution • Study effectiveness and costs of free transit on Spare the Air days • Explore possible legislative approaches to formalize and strengthen episodic approaches |
| TCM 17 | Conduct demonstration projects | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote demonstration projects to develop new strategies to reduce motor vehicle emissions. Potential projects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Low and zero emission vehicles (LEV) and refueling infrastructure – Parts replacement program for middle-aged cars – Heavy duty diesel vehicle idling – Carsharing • Monitor Phase 1 projects and expand depending on effectiveness and resources available |
| TCM 18 | Implement transportation pricing reform | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocate for legislative authority to develop and promote revenue measures for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Congestion pricing on bridges – High-occupancy/toll lanes – Regional and state gas tax increases of up to \$.50 per gallon – Regional vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fees – Taxes on diesel fuel – Emissions-based vehicle registration fees |
| TCM 19 | Improve pedestrian access and facilities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and comment on general/specific plan policies to promote development patterns that encourage walking and circulation policies. Emphasize pedestrian travel and encourage amending zoning ordinances to include pedestrian-friendly design standards. • MTC will continue to fund local pedestrian improvement projects through the TLC program, and support the Pedestrian Safety Task Force and associated pedestrian safety programs. • TFCA program will continue to fund pedestrian improvement projects to reduce motor vehicle trips and emissions. • Continue to identify and fund planning projects that enhance pedestrian movement in neighborhoods, downtowns and near transit stops • Continue funding specific improvements through a variety of funding sources • Support Safe Routes to Schools |
| TCM 20 | Promote traffic-calming measures | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote traffic-calming measures • Fund traffic-calming projects such as pedestrian-exclusive streets, residential and neighborhood traffic calming measures, and arterial and major route traffic-calming measures • Include traffic-calming strategies in the transportation and land use elements of general and specific plans • Encourage area-wide traffic-calming plans and programs • Include traffic-calming strategies in capital improvements programs |

Appendix F: 2019 CMP Monitoring Report



Level of Service and Performance Measure Monitoring Report - 2019

October 2019

Submitted by:
CoPLAN – *The Planning Collaborative*
5508 Sandalwood
McKinney, TX 75070

October 10, 2019

City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County
County Office Building
555 County Center
Fifth Floor
Redwood City, California 94063
Attention: Jeffrey Lacap, Transportation Programs Specialist

Re: Level of Service and Performance Measure Monitoring Report - 2019

Dear Mr. Lacap:

CoPLAN, LLC. (CoPLAN) is pleased to submit the report for the 2019 Level of Service (LOS) and Performance Measure Monitoring to support of the 2019 Congestion Management Program for the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG).

CoPLAN conducted the 2019 study for C/CAG utilizing the latest technology for performing CMP studies. Our extensive and unique experience provides a cost-effective and cutting edge process to obtain and analyze traffic data. CoPLAN has developed a methodology including GPS and GIS over the past 15 years with exciting results. The addition of GIS linear reference systems has added a component that is unique to CoPLAN for network analyses. Over the last 4 update cycles, CoPLAN staff have developed a comprehensive database for C/CAG that now is integrated in GIS for easy access and historic comparisons.

C/CAG has taken a major step forward in having the ability to take the GIS data, in addition to the historic tables, and integrate the digital data with your travel demand model. The speeds, roadway attributes, etc. can be conflated with the model to produce a very robust and comprehensive system. This was not available in the past because the methodology used with tables and charts did not produce the value-added products of this 2019 study. CoPLAN will continue to support C/CAG to produce the best value that not only meets the intended LOS monitoring requirements to allow historic comparisons of this project, but produces the results in a form that can be used by many other areas within the county and by its members.

Sincerely,
CoPLAN, LLC

Steve Taylor
Project Manager

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|---|----|
| A. | Executive Summary | 1 |
| B. | Introduction | 2 |
| C. | Methodology | 5 |
| D. | Evaluation | 6 |
| E. | Roadway Level of Service (LOS) | 8 |
| F. | Reduction in Volumes Due to Interregional Trips | 18 |
| G. | Deficient CMP Segments | 19 |
| H. | Intersections..... | 22 |
| I. | 2019 Multit-Modal Performance Monitoring Program..... | 26 |
| J. | Trends and Next Steps | 29 |

Appendix A

Appendix B - Technical Appendix

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) has an established Congestion Management Program (CMP) to monitor the transportation network within the county. All roadways included in the CMP network are evaluated for conformity at least every two years.

The goal of the monitoring program is to improve the performance of the transportation system by identifying congested areas and related transportation deficiencies. This information is then used to help prioritize transportation funding decisions based on system performance, land use factors, multimodal characteristics, and other considerations.

This year's monitoring study was conducted in the spring 2019 with data collection between April and May including INRIX data on approximately 163.3 directional miles of freeways and arterials, 72-hour counts on 21 segments representing 301.4 centerline miles of arterials, and 16 intersection turning movement counts.

This is the third monitoring cycle during which the C/CAG has used commercially available travel speed data from INRIX integrated in a geographic information system (GIS) to monitor Level of Service (LOS) on the CMP network. The primary tasks completed as part of this study include:

- Conflation of travel time data to LOS Monitoring network
- LOS Analysis

With the 2019 monitoring cycle, C/CAG is calculating LOS based on two methodologies—Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 1994 and HCM 2010. This dual reporting facilitates historical comparisons while also reporting LOS based on the more current methodology. For freeways, only HCM 1994 LOS is reported, as the HCM 2000 methodology requires traffic volume information for all unique freeway segments and ramps. The HCM 2010 criteria was used only for the intersection LOS using the collected peak period turning movement counts analyzed in Synchro. Collection of comprehensive freeway traffic volumes is beyond the scope of the CMP monitoring effort.

B. INTRODUCTION

History of the Congestion Management Program

C/CAG has an established Congestion Management Program (CMP) to monitor the transportation network within the county. All roadways included in the CMP network are evaluated for conformity at least every two years by the agency, which is the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for San Mateo County. The goal of the monitoring program is to improve the performance of the transportation system by identifying congested areas and related transportation deficiencies. This information is then used to help prioritize transportation funding decisions in light of system performance, land use factors, multimodal characteristics, and other considerations.

This year's study was conducted in the spring of 2019 with travel time data from INRIX being used between April and May. The most recent assessment prior to this study was performed in April - May 2017. The primary tasks completed as part of this study include:

- Conflation of travel time data to LOS Monitoring network
- Level of Service Analysis

Study Background

This year's monitoring study was conducted in the spring 2019 with data sourced between April and May on approximately 163.3 directional miles of freeways and arterials, 72-hour counts on 21 segments representing 301.4 centerline miles of arterials, and 16 intersection turning movement counts. CMP legislation requires that state highways (including freeways) and principal arterials be included in the CMP network. The network must be useful to track the transportation impacts of land development decisions, as well as to help assess the congestion management implications of proposed transportation projects. C/CAG's network therefore includes numerous local thoroughfares since most urban traffic occurs on city arterials (rather than on the freeways). **Figure 1** shows the routes that were monitored.

All of the study roadways were evaluated during the AM and PM peak period between the hours of 7 AM - 9 AM and 4 PM - 7 PM. As in previous studies, both time periods are considered when determining the LOS to be reported. The directionality of the segment is not reported in many of the summary tables, but the worst LOS found for either direction for either AM or PM peak period is shown as the official result. In most cases, the PM period is the focus of the CMP since consistently, the PM period results in higher volumes, slower speeds, and more congestion. The methodology used included using INRIX travel time data, 72-hour traffic counts, and intersection turning movement counts.

The total directional miles and number of route segments for each roadway type are shown in **Table 1**.




Figure 1 – Spring 2019 CMP Monitored Routes

Table 1 – Total Study Miles Summary

| Roadway Type | Total Directional Miles |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Arterial / State Routes | 301.4 |
| Freeway | 163.3 |
| Total | 464.7 |

This monitoring report focused on the five performance measures established in the San Mateo County Congestion Management Program. These performance measures are:

1. Roadway Level of Service
 - a: Travel Time – Average Speed
 - b. 72-hour traffic counts – V/C for rural arterials
2. Intersection LOS
3. Travel Time for various modes (single occupant, carpools, and transit)
4. Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements
5. Ridership / Person Throughput for Transit

As noted, the “Roadway Level of Service and Intersection LOS” are the primary CMP performance measures; therefore, a mitigation plan is required if the resulting LOS is below the established minimum standard.

The following sections focus on each of the above performance measures with emphasis on the Roadway and Intersection LOS. The other items are included to provide some alternative views to help explain the changes in performance and the opportunities for improvement.

C. METHODOLOGY

Mapping of CMP Network

Global Positioning System (GPS)

Historically, CMP travel time runs were done manually. CoPLAN staff introduced the use of GPS and GIS to C/CAG in 2011.

All the roadways in the network were mapped using GPS technology in 2011 and 2013. With the introduction of INRIX datasets in 2015, the network attributes were carried over from those past cycles.

As first introduced in 2015, the travel speed data collection process was made more efficient by using data from INRIX in place of a small sample size of GPS travel time runs.

Travel Time Data

Travel time data was assembled from INRIX and conflated to the LOS Monitoring network.

Travel time data was conflated for the morning and afternoon peak periods on all applicable roadway segments; data were only used on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, or Thursdays, and school district spring break periods were avoided.

D. EVALUATION

LOS Analysis – HCM 1994

The tables in the Appendix highlight the 2019 CMP route segments that had LOS lower than the established standard during the AM or PM Peak by HCM 1994 standards directly from the travel time data or 72-hour counts. The CMP legislation allows for the reduction in volume for those interregional trips for those segments that have a LOS lower than the established standard; i.e. those trips that originate from outside the county and either pass through the county or have a destination within San Mateo County.

Other Performance Measures Results

Apart from average speeds aggregated to the CMP route segments level, intersection segment level average speeds were also calculated in 2019 for all routes. These results are available in the GIS tables provided to C/CAG.

With the use of INRIX data once again in this year's freeway travel time analyses, we have the opportunity to include various new performance measures for the region. In prior years, a small sample of travel time runs were made during a small window of time in the AM and PM peak period. One interesting new performance measure that can be evaluated is the **Duration of Congestion**, or amount of time below a certain speed / LOS within a segment. For example, **Figure 2** illustrates the 5-minute average speed for a 24-hour period between April and May of 2017 and 2019. The red line depicts the average speed, while the vertical lines represent the minimum and maximum speeds for each respective time interval (showing the variability of speed for each time slice). Further, on the horizontal axis, the shaded regions depict the corresponding LOS for the average speed for the freeway section. Therefore, one can see that the average speed in the southbound US 101 segment between SR 92 and Whipple falls into the LOS F range in the morning period around 6:30 AM both years, but remains at that LOS in 2019 for a longer period until around 11:00 AM vs. 9:00 in 2017. For the afternoon period, the average speed remains better than LOS F all afternoon, while at times over the 2 months.




Figure 2 – Spring 2017 vs Spring 2019 Duration of Congestion

E. ROADWAY LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS)

Traffic Flow

The Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) defines capacity as “...the maximum hourly rate at which persons or vehicles reasonably can be expected to traverse a point or a uniform section of a lane or roadway during a given time period under prevailing roadway, traffic, and control conditions.”

The vehicle capacity and operational characteristics of a roadway are a function of a number of elements including: the number of lanes and lane widths, shoulder widths, roadway alignment, access, traffic signals, grades, and vehicle mix. Generally, roadways with wider travel lanes, fewer traffic control devices, straight alignments, etc. allow faster travel speeds and therefore greater vehicle flow per unit time.

Level of Service

The HCM defines level of service (LOS) as “...a quality measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream, generally in terms of such service measures as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, and comfort and convenience.”

“Six LOS are defined for each type of facility that has analysis procedures available. Letters designate each level, from A to F, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. Each level of service represents a range of operating conditions and the driver’s perception of those conditions.”

In accordance with CMP legislation, the county and city governments are required to show that all CMP route segments within their jurisdiction are operating at or above the CMP traffic LOS standard. Section 65089(b)(1)(B) of the California Government Code states that “In no case shall the LOS standards established be below the LOS E or the current level, whichever is farthest from LOS A. When the level of service on a segment or at an intersection fails to attain the established level of service standard, a deficiency plan shall be adopted pursuant to section 65089.4.”

All freeway segments in the network, as included in **Figure 3**, were monitored using the INRIX travel time data, which allows for determination of LOS on the basis of average operating speed. C/CAG primarily uses the 1994 and 2000 HCM methodology to monitor LOS on the CMP network, as this methodology was utilized in the baseline monitoring cycle and is necessary to maintain historical comparisons, identify exempt segments, and monitor potential network deficiencies. The specific methodologies used for monitoring freeway and arterial segments are listed below per HCM definitions:

- **Freeway Segments (HCM 1994 - Chapter 3)** – All freeway segments were evaluated using the “basic freeway sections” methodology of HCM 1994 where the LOS for each freeway segment was determined using its average travel speed.

Freeway LOS was not calculated based on HCM 2000 methodology. In order to evaluate all freeway segments using the HCM 2000 methodology, the volumes on all freeway sections (mainline) with distinct characteristics (e.g., quantity of lanes), as well as on entrances and exits would be required. Changes to the methodology will be considered along with the next update cycle when the HCM 2010 may be incorporated. Until then, the methodology of previous updates was followed to maintain the historical context for comparisons of the results.

The routes that fall into this classification include:

- SR-92 from I-280 to Alameda County Line
 - US-101
 - I-280
 - I-380 from SR-92 to US-101
- **Multilane, Two-Lane and Arterial Segments (HCM 1994 – Chapters 7, 8, and 11)** – All non-freeway surface street segments were evaluated based on the volume to capacity ratio (V/C) dependant on the local free-flow speed, cross-section, number of lanes, % no-passing zones, and functional class.

Multilane and Two-Lane highways were evaluated primarily based on the current volumes as measured through 72-hour traffic counts at 21 locations throughout the county. These counts and resulting V/C were then compared to the applicable criteria in the HCM 1994 to determine the respective LOS.

Many arterial segments used by C/CAG for CMP purposes (called "CMP Segments") span several blocks and include multiple signals and/or stop controlled intersections. If an Intersection Segment is defined as a segment from one controlled intersection to the next, the CMP segments are a collection of consecutive Intersection Segments. INRIX segmentation, known as TMC segments, are many times longer or shorter than the desired limits for the CMP Segments. CoPLAN methodology of travel time estimation can calculate average speeds at the Intersection Segment level and these data can be aggregated to calculate the average speeds at the CMP segment level. The average speed on each CMP segment is computed as the ratio of total length of the segment to the sum of average travel time on each individual intersection segment within the CMP segment. The average travel time on each intersection segment is computed as the arithmetic mean of travel times of accumulated data within the TMC segment. The average speed thus accounts for time in motion and time spent at the signals or stop signs.

The routes that fall into this classification include:

- SR-1
- SR-35
- SR-82
- SR-84

- SR-92 from SR-1 to I-280
- SR-109
- SR-114
- I-380 from US-101 to Airport Access Road
- Mission Street
- Geneva Avenue
- Bayshore Boulevard

Table 2 shows the relationship between average travel speed and level of service for basic freeways according to HCM 1994. There are four (4) freeway categories based on the free-flow speed of the facility (ranging from 55-70 mph).

DRAFT



Figure 3 –2019 Routes and LOS Methodologies

Table 2 – Example LOS from Freeway with Free-Flow Speed of 65 mph (HCM 1994)

| Roadway Type | Basic Freeway |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| Free Flow Speed (mph) Range | 65 |
| A | ≥ 65 |
| B | ≥ 65 |
| C | ≥ 64.5 |
| D | ≥ 61 |
| E | ≥ 56/53 |
| F | < 56 |

Roadway Segment LOS Analysis Results

Table 3 summarizes the current year roadway segment LOS. Additionally, **Figures 4, 5, 6, and 7** illustrate the results graphically. As highlighted in **Table 3**, there are 19 segments found to be below the established minimum in each of the AM and PM peak periods. The 19 segments include:

- SR-35 between I-280 and SR 92 – AM and PM Periods
- SR-84 between SR-1 and Portola – PM Period
- SR-84 between I-280 and Alameda de las Pulgas – AM and PM Periods
- SR-84 between Willow and University – AM Period
- SR-92 between SR-1 and I-280 – AM and PM Periods
- SR-92 between I-280 and US 101 – AM and PM Periods
- SR-92 between US 101 and Alameda County Line – AM and PM Periods
- US-101 between SF County Line and I-380 – AM and PM Periods
- US-101 between I-380 and Millbrae – AM and PM Periods
- US-101 between Millbrae and Broadway – AM and PM Periods
- US-101 between Broadway and Peninsula – AM and PM Periods
- US-101 between SR-92 and Whipple – AM and PM Periods
- SR-109 between Kavanaugh and SR-84 – PM Period
- I-280 between SF County Line and SR-1 (north) – AM Period
- I-280 between SR-1 (north) and SR 1 (south) – AM Period
- I-280 between SR-1 (south) and San Bruno – AM and PM Periods
- I-280 between San Bruno and SR-92 – PM Period
- I-280 between SR-92 and SR-84 – AM and PM Periods
- I-280 between SR-84 and SC County Line – PM Periods

Table 3 includes a summary of the historic results since 1999. All results included in this update have consistently used the HCM 1994 for all roadway types and the HCM 2000 for the intersections. Variations in the LOS results may be explained through capital improvements, construction, or use of transit and other modes. The values included in

Table 3 reflects the lowest LOS for either direction; the worst-case LOS for the link in either direction during the respective peak periods.

DRAFT

Table 3 – CMP Roadway Segment Monitoring Results (Lowest LOS)

| 2019 CMP Roadway Segment Levels of Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Route | Roadway Segment | LOS Standard | 2019 LOS | | | | 2019 LOS ² | 2017 LOS ² | 2015 LOS ² | 2013 LOS ² | 2011 LOS ² | 2009 LOS ² | 2007 LOS ² | 2005 LOS ² |
| | | | AM Without Exemption | PM Without Exemption | AM With Exemption | PM With Exemption | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | San Francisco County Line to Linda Mar Blvd. | E | C | A | C | A | C | A | A | F ³ /F ⁴ | F ³ /B ⁴ | F ³ /F ⁴ | F ³ /F ⁴ | F ³ /F ⁴ |
| 1 | Linda Mar Blvd. to Frenchmans Creek Road | E | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D | D |
| 1 | Frenchmans Creek Road to Miramontes Road | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E |
| 1 | Miramontes Road to Santa Cruz County Line | D | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | B | B | B | B | C |
| 35 | San Francisco county Line to Sneath Lane | E | D | B | D | B | D | C | D | B | A | C | C | C |
| 35 | Sneath Lane to I-280 | F | F | F | A | F | F | F | F | F | F | E | F | F |
| 35 | I-280 to SR 92 | B | C | D | A | C | C | B | C ³ /A ⁴ | C ³ /B ⁴ | C ³ /B ⁴ | B | B | C/C |
| 35 | SR 92 to SR 84 | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B |
| 35 | SR 84 to Santa Clara County Line | E | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B | B |
| 82 | San Francisco County Line to John Daly Blvd | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 82 | John Daly Boulevard to Hickey Boulevard | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 82 | Hickey Boulevard to I-380 | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | C | A |
| 82 | I-380 to Trousdale Drive | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A |
| 82 | Trousdale Drive to 3 rd Avenue | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | A | A | A |
| 82 | 3 rd Avenue to SR 92 | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| 82 | SR 92 to Hillside Avenue | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | B |
| 82 | Hillside Avenue to 42 nd Avenue | E | A | B | A | B | C | C | B | B | B | B | B | B |
| 82 | 42 nd Avenue to Holly Street | E | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | A | A | B | B | A |
| 82 | Holly Street to Whipple Avenue | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | B | C | C | D | D |
| 82 | Whipple Avenue to SR 84 | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B | C | C | C |
| 82 | SR 84 to Glenwood Avenue | E | B | A | A | A | A | B | A | B | B | B | B | B |
| 82 | Glenwood Avenue to Santa Cruz Avenue | E | B | C | A | C | C | C | C | B | B | C | D | |
| 82 | Santa Cruz Avenue to Santa Clara County Line | E | D | D | B | D | D | B | B | B | A | B | B | C |
| 84 | SR 1 to Portola Road | C | C | D | C | D | D | B | D ³ /B ⁴ | C | C | C | C | C |
| 84 | Portola Road to I-280 | E | B | B | B | B | B | C | C | C | B | B | B | B |
| 84 | I-280 to Alameda de las Pulgas | C | E | E | E | E | E | D | D ³ /D ⁴ | D ³ /D ⁴ | D ³ /C ⁴ | C | D/A | C |
| 84 | Alameda de las Pulgas to U.S. 101 | E | D | E | D | E | E | D | D | D | E | E | E | E |
| 84 | U.S. 101 to Willow Road | D | C | B | C | B | B | C | C | B | E/E | C | B | |
| 84 | Willow Road to University Avenue | E | F | E | A | E | E | B | F ³ /B ⁴ | F ³ /B ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F/E | F/F | F/F |
| 84 | University Avenue to Alameda County Line | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F |
| 92 | SR 1 to I-280 | E | F | F | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | E |
| 92 | I-280 to U.S. 101 | D | F | F | E | D | E | E | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /F ⁴ | E ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /E ⁴ |
| 92 | U.S. 101 to Alameda County Line | E | F | F | A | F | F | C | F ³ /F ⁴ | E | F ³ /A ⁴ | A/B ³ | A/B ³ | A/B ³ |

Notes:

² The first value represents LOS without exemptions, and the second value represents LOS with exemptions.

³ Based on average speed from travel time surveys.

⁴ Exemptions applied to volume-to-capacity ratios estimated from average speeds.

"-" = not applicable. LOS standard is not violated. Therefore, exemptions were not applied.

LOS Standard violations (after application of exemptions) are highlighted in red

LOS based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual Methodology.

Table 3 (cont) – CMP Roadway Segment Monitoring Results (Lowest LOS)

| 2019 CMP Roadway Segment Levels of Service | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Route | Roadway Segment | LOS Standard | 2019 LOS | | | | 2019 LOS ³ | 2017 LOS ² | 2015 LOS ³ | 2013 LOS ³ | 2011 LOS ² | 2009 LOS ² | 2007 LOS ² | 2005 LOS ² |
| | | | AM Without Exemption | PM Without Exemption | AM With Exemption | PM With Exemption | | | | | | | | |
| 101 | San Francisco County Line to I-380 | E | F | F | D | D | E | F ³ /E ⁴ | E | F ³ /A ⁴ | D ³ | E ³ | D ³ | |
| 101 | I-380 to Milbrae Avenue | E | F | F | E | D | E | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | D ³ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | |
| 101 | Milbrae Avenue to Broadway | E | F | F | E | D | E | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | |
| 101 | Broadway to Peninsula Avenue | E | F | F | D | D | D | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | |
| 101 | Peninsula Avenue to SR 92 | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F ³ | F ³ | F ³ | |
| 101 | SR 92 to Whipple Avenue | E | F | F | C | E | E | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /E ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /E ⁴ | |
| 101 | Whipple Avenue to Santa Clara County Line | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F ³ | F ³ | F ³ | |
| 109 | Kavanaugh Drive to SR 84 (Bayfront Expwy.) | E | C | F | C | A | C | C | D | C | D | D | C | |
| 114 | U.S. 101 to SR 84 (Bayfront Expressway) | E | B | C | B | C | C | C | A | B | C | C | B | |
| 280 | San Francisco County Line to SR 1 (north) | E | F | E | E | E | E | E | E | E | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /A | E ³ | |
| 280 | SR 1 (north) to SR 1 (south) | E | F | E | E | E | E | D | E | E | A/B | E | E ³ | |
| 280 | SR 1 (south) to San Bruno Avenue | D | F | F | D | C | D | D | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /D ⁴ | E ³ /D ⁴ | F ³ /C ⁴ | F ³ /E ⁴ |
| 280 | San Bruno Avenue to SR 92 | D | D | E | D | B | D | A | C | B | D | E ³ /C ⁴ | A/B ³ | A/B ³ |
| 280 | SR 92 to SR 84 | D | F | E | B | A | B | A | E/C | C | A/B | D ³ | D ³ | D ³ |
| 280 | SR 84 to Santa Clara County Line | D | D | F | D | A | D | A | F ³ /A ⁴ | F ³ /A ⁴ | E ³ /A ⁴ | D ³ | D ³ | E ³ /C ⁴ |
| 380 | I-280 to U.S. 101 | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | F ³ | F ³ | E ³ |
| 380 | U.S. 101 to Airport Access Road | C | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | B ³ | D ³ /C | A ³ |
| Mission St | San Francisco County Line to SR 82 | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Geneva Ave. | San Francisco County Line to Bayshore Blvd. | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |
| Bayshore Blvd. | San Francisco County Line to Geneva Avenue | E | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A | A |

Notes:

² The first value represents LOS without exemptions, and the second value represents LOS with exemptions.

³ Based on average speed from travel time surveys.

⁴ Exemptions applied to volume-to-capacity ratios estimated from average speeds.

"-" = not applicable. LOS standard is not violated. Therefore, exemptions were not applied.

LOS Standard violations (after application of exemptions) are highlighted in red

LOS based on 1994 Highway Capacity Manual Methodology.




Figure 4 – AM LOS Results (before Exemptions)




Figure 5 – PM LOS Results (before Exemptions)




Figure 6 – AM CMP Segments with LOS Lower than Standard (before Exemptions)




Figure 7 – PM CMP Segments with LOS Lower than Standard (before Exemptions)

F. REDUCTION IN VOLUMES DUE TO INTERREGIONAL TRIPS

The CMP legislation allows for the reduction in volume for those trips that are interregional. In this case, “interregional” are those trips that originate from outside the county. That is those that either traverse the county or have a destination within the county. For those CMP segments found with a LOS below the standard, the county travel demand model is used to determine the proportion of the volume estimated to be from interregional travel. As shown in **Table 3**, there were 19 segments that had at least one direction in either the AM or PM peak period that had a lower LOS than the established standard. **Table 4** includes the resulting percentage of traffic from the travel demand model that is estimated to be interregional by segment.

Table 4 – Interregional Trips for Segments with LOS Lower than Standard

| Link | Segment | Time Period | AM Peak | | PM Peak | |
|--------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|
| | | | Direction | NB / WB | SB / EB | NB / WB |
| SR 35 | I-280 to SR 92 | AM NB/SB, PM NB/SB | 6.5% | 41.2% | 36.5% | 17.8% |
| SR 84 | SR 1 to Portola Rd | PM EB/WB | | | 0.0% | 0.0% |
| SR 84 | I-280 to Alameda de Las Pulgas | AM WB, PM EB/WB | 1.4% | | 1.2% | 62.4% |
| SR 84 | Willow to University Av | AM WB | 96.3% | | | |
| SR 92 | SR 1 to I-280 | AM EB/WB, PM EB/WB | 25.7% | 0.1% | 28.1% | 0.3% |
| SR 92 | I-280 to US 101 | AM EB/WB & PM EB/WB | 15.8% | 29.0% | 14.3% | 26.6% |
| SR 92 | US 101 to Alameda Co Line | AM WB, PM EB | 75.0% | | | 7.6% |
| US 101 | SF Co Line to I-380 | AM NB/SB & PM NB/SB | 21.6% | 98.3% | 18.7% | 95.4% |
| US 101 | I-380 to Millbrae Av | AM NB, PM NB/SB | 26.4% | | 28.5% | 60.4% |
| US 101 | Millbrae Av to Broadway | AM NB, PM NB/SB | 29.8% | | 31.4% | 47.5% |
| US 101 | Broadway to Peninsula Av | AM NB/SB, PM NB/SB | 32.5% | 54.1% | 35.3% | 38.5% |
| US 101 | SR 92 to Whipple Av | AM NB/SB, PM NB | 50.5% | 42.6% | 46.4% | |
| SR 109 | Kavanaugh Dr to SR 84 | PM NB | | | 78.4% | |
| I-280 | SF Co Line to SR 1 (north) | AM NB | 13.7% | | | |
| I-280 | SR 1 (north) to SR 1 (south) | AM NB | 16.1% | | | |
| I-280 | SR 1 (south) to San Bruno Av | AM SB, PM NB | | 83.1% | 43.6% | |
| I-280 | San Bruno Av to SR 92 | PM NB | | | 57.4% | |
| I-280 | SR 92 to SR 84 | AM SB, PM NB | | 59.2% | 80.7% | |
| I-280 | SR 84 to SC Co Line | PM NB | | | 94.5% | |

When applying reductions, they can be deducted directly for those where V/C is the performance measure used, but for those segments that use INRIX travel speed, a few extra steps are required to reflect the exemption. As mentioned earlier, freeway LOS is primarily determined based on density, but historically, the LOS Monitoring Study has made use of the LOS tables as included in the HCM 1994 that include reference speeds for given free-flow speeds and LOS. In order to reflect the reduction, the V/C must first be estimated from the same tables. This adds a level of error given that density is the preferred performance measure and the methodology is to use a secondary measure to estimate another secondary measure, take the reduction, and then reverse the calculation using the V/C and determine the adjusted LOS with the exemption.

G. DEFICIENT CMP SEGMENTS

After incorporating the reduction in volume for those segments found to have a LOS lower than the standard, while the AM peak period has 5 segments deficient, the PM peak period was found to have the same 4 segments deficient, as shown in **Figures 8 and 9**. Those include the following:

- PM – Northbound and Southbound SR-35 between I-280 and SR-92
- PM – Eastbound and Westbound SR-84 between SR-1 and Portola
- AM & PM – Westbound SR-84 between I-280 and Alameda de Las Pulgas
- AM – Westbound SR-92 between I-280 and US-101
- PM – Eastbound SR-92 between US-101 and Alameda County Line

While the worst LOS of either peak period has historically been presented in the summary table, the individual peak periods have been separated for improved analysis in the body of the report this year and not just in the appendix as in the past. The segments deficient in the PM period are also highlighted in Table 3.



Figure 8 – AM Deficient Segments after Exemption




Figure 9 – PM Deficient Segment after Exemption

H. INTERSECTIONS

Sixteen intersections were analyzed as part of the 2019 LOS Monitoring. These intersections have been included in previous studies since 1999 and are included in **Table 5** for reference. The performance measure for intersections is LOS, but different from freeways and highways, the HCM 2000 was used to determine the LOS. Turning movement counts were collected for each intersection during the AM and PM peak periods and modeled in Synchro. In addition to turning movement counts, pedestrian and bike counts were collected for the first time in 2019. The intersections were analyzed as if they were isolated (not coordinated or part of a signal system) and optimized given the current geometry. The modeled results provide an estimate of the optimized LOS and may not represent the actual conditions if the intersection is either using less than optimal phasing, splits or cycle length.

Table 5 includes the results for the 2019 study as well as those back to 2005 using the HCM 2000 methods. As highlighted in the table, all intersections are operating (under optimized signal timing) within established LOS standards. Intersections 1, 5, and 14 are operating at standard and should be monitored to avoid exceeding the established LOS standard. Intersections 11 and 13 are operating at LOS F which is the standard at those locations but should be evaluated for possible improvements.

Table 5 – Intersection LOS

| Int # | Intersection | LOS Standard | Peak Hour | 2000 HCM Method | | | | | | | | 2019 Standard Exceeded |
|-------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------------------------|
| | | | | 2019 LOS | 2017 LOS | 2015 LOS | 2013 LOS | 2011 LOS | 2009 LOS | 2007 LOS | 2005 LOS | |
| 1 | Bayshore & Geneva | E | AM | E | B | B | B | B | C | B | C | No |
| | | | PM | B | A | B | B | B | C | C | C | No |
| 2 | SR 35 & John Daly Blvd | E | AM | B | C | D | C | C | B | B | B | No |
| | | | PM | B | B | E | C | C | C | B | C | No |
| 3 | SR 82 & Hillside/John Daly | E | AM | B | B | C | C | B | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | C | C | C | C | C | D | C | D | No |
| 4 | SR 82 & San Bruno Ave | E | AM | C | B | C | C | C | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | C | C | C | C | C | D | D | D | No |
| 5 | SR 82 & Milbrae Ave | E | AM | E | D | D | E | F/D | E | E | E | No |
| | | | PM | E | D | E | D | E | D | E | E | No |
| 6 | SR 82 & Broadway | E | AM | B | A | B | B | B | B | B | B | No |
| | | | PM | A | A | B | B | B | A | B | B | No |
| 7 | SR 82 & Park-Peninsula | E | AM | C | B | C | C | C | B | B | B | No |
| | | | PM | C | B | C | C | C | B | B | B | No |
| 8 | SR 82 & Ralston | E | AM | C | C | C | C | C | D | D | E | No |
| | | | PM | C | C | C | D | C | D | D | E | No |
| 9 | SR 82 & Holly | E | AM | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | C | C | C | C | C | D | C | C | No |
| 10 | SR 82 & Whipple Ave | E | AM | C | C | C | C | C | C | C | D | No |
| | | | PM | D | D | C | C | C | D | D | D | No |
| 11 | University & SR 84 | F | AM | C | F | C | E | C | B | B | B | No |
| | | | PM | F | F | F | F | F | F | F | E | No |
| 12 | Willow & SR 84 | F | AM | D | C | D | D | C | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | E | F | F | F | E | F | F | E | No |
| 13 | SR 84 & Marsh Rd | F | AM | F | F | F | D | D | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | F | F | F | D | E | F | D | C | No |
| 14 | Middlefield & SR 84 | E | AM | D | E | C | D | C | D | D | D | No |
| | | | PM | E | E | D | D | D | D | D | D | No |
| 15 | SR 1 & SR 92 | E | AM | B | B | C | C | D | C | D | D | No |
| | | | PM | C | C | C | C | C | D | D | D | No |
| 16 | Main St & SR 92 | F | AM | B | B | C | B | C | C | C | C | No |
| | | | PM | B | B | B | B | B | C | C | C | No |

Figures 10 and 11 illustrate the finding for the intersection LOS. Each intersection is represented with two shapes. The larger one is the base and is the LOS Standard. The smaller shape in the middle is the resulting peak period LOS for the respective time period.




Figure 10 – AM Intersection LOS (Underlying Color is LOS Standard)




Figure 11 – PM Intersection LOS (Underlying Color is LOS Standard)

I. 2017 MULTI-MODAL PERFORMANCE MEASURE MONITORING PROGRAM

Beginning in 1995, the Transit LOS Standard element of the San Mateo County CMP was replaced with the Performance Measure element. Four Performance Measures were selected and incorporated in the 1997 CMP Update and used each update cycle through 2009. The four measures are used to measure the performance of the overall multi-modal transportation system, including non-automotive modes. They are:

- Level of service,
- Travel times from single-occupant automobiles, carpools, and transit,
- Pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and
- Ridership / person throughput for transit.

This section presents the 2019 measurements of these performance measures and includes the historic results for context.

Level of Service

The levels of service of the CMP corridors and segments are included in the previous sections of this monitoring report. The results show that two roadway segments exceeded the respective LOS standard following reflection of the interregional trips. For the 16 intersections included in the CMP network, all intersections were found to operate at or better than the established standard after incorporating exemptions.

Travel Times for Single-Occupant Automobiles, Carpools, and Transit

This multi-modal performance measure compares the travel time of the various modes available in the US 101 corridor from the Santa Clara County line to the San Francisco County line. Those include using the general purpose lanes, using the carpool lane for the limits available, or using transit via SamTrans or Caltrain.

The general-purpose travel times previously presented early in this report were the result of a 2-month average between April and May. Those included in Table 6 for the single occupant vehicle represent the calculated INRIX travel time using the average speed over each TMC segment for each 5-minute interval during each respective AM and PM peak period. The HOV travel times are based on 5 runs in the field for the limits of the HOV between the county line and Whipple summed with the INRIX results for the balance of the route to the San Francisco county line on the north. Therefore, the HOV portion represents a far smaller sample size than an average for the peak period over 2 months.

The current limits of the carpool lane in San Mateo County are from the Santa Clara County line to Whipple Avenue. For those that are able to use this lane during the peak hours, the remainder of the run will take place in the general purpose lane.

Travel times for those using transit include the option to access SamTrans route 398 along the US 101 corridor or Caltrain. The travel times for the transit options are represented based on the published

schedules. Actual data collection for these routes was not performed but is shown consistent with methods used in previous LOS monitoring studies.

The travel times for the various mode options are included in **Table 6** below. The table includes the respective travel times, listed by direction and peak periods, for the current reporting period as well as previous years back to 2009.

Table 6 – Average Travel Time in US 101 Corridor (in minutes)
Between San Francisco and Santa Clara County Lines

| Average Travel Time in US 101 Corridor (in minutes) (Between San Francisco and Santa Clara County Lines) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|----------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Mode | AM - Morning Commute Peak Period | | | | | | | | | | | | PM - Evening Commute Peak Period | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Northbound | | | | | | Southbound | | | | | | Northbound | | | | | Southbound | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 2017 | 2015 | 2013 | 2011 | 2009 | 2019 | 2017 | 2015 | 2013 | 2011 | 2009 | 2019 | 2017 | 2015 | 2013 | 2011 | 2009 | 2019 | 2017 | 2015 | 2013 | 2011 | 2009 |
| Auto - Single Occ. ¹ | 28 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 40 | 35 | 36 | 41 | 34 | 28 | 40 | 36 | 39 | 30 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 40 | 29 |
| Carpool - HOV Lane ² | 26 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 28 | 30 | 38 | 34 | 35 | 37 | 30 | 26 | 40 | 36 | 42 | 37 | 30 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 27 |
| Caltrain (Baby Bullet b/n Palo Alto and Menlo and Approximate north county line near Bayshore Station - but not stop on Baby Bullet) ³ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SamTrans Route KX (b/n Palo Alto Station and SFO then transfer to BART at SFO to County Line) ⁴ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 80 | 80 | 68 | 76 | 79 | - | - | 73 | 81 | 85 | - | - | 72 | 81 | 83 | 91 | 91 | 74 | 78 | 89 | | | | |

¹ - 2015, 2017, and 2019 Results based on Inrix avg speeds over each TMC for the full 3 month (March-May)
² - 2015, 2017, and 2019 HOV results are based on HOV field runs south of Whipple + Inrix avg speed for TMC north to SF county line
³ - Baby Bullet b/n Palo Alto and Menlo and Approximate north county line near Bayshore Station - but not stop on Baby Bullet.
⁴ - Route KX b/n RWC and SF(AM NB Only, PM SB Only) & 398 (b/n Palo Alto and Redwood City).

The AM and PM auto travel times in the general-purpose lanes have fluctuated slightly since 2009, while mixed results with some improving while others getting longer for 2019 as compared to 2017.

The carpool travel times also show mixed results as compared to 2017 from Whipple to the county line.

Caltrain has made minor changes to its schedules since 2009 on the Baby Bullet express that was introduced in 2005, thus the travel times have not changed too much since 2013 between the express stops of Palo Alto just south of the county line to the SF stop north of the county line since the last stop in San Mateo County is Millbrae.

Established in 2019, SamTrans Route 398 provides service from the Redwood City Transit City to San Francisco via El Camino Real and US-101 in the AM and PM peak periods.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

The purpose of this performance measure is to maintain a focus on non-vehicular alternatives. This should be reflected in connectivity to transit and other modes to not only make connections convenient, but safe and attractive. During the CMP update process, seven-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects are identified and evaluated. The top-ranked projects are forwarded to MTC to be evaluated in the regional process for State and Federal funding.

C/CAG developed the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan to address the planning, design, funding, and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian projects of countywide significance. The Plan includes a policy framework to guide and evaluate implementation of projects identified by the local implementing cities and the County. To maximize funding available for bikeway projects, the Plan emphasizes projects that improves safety, promote access to jobs, and located within high population as well as employment densities. The Plan also establishes geographical focus areas for countywide investment in pedestrian infrastructure. An update to the Plan is currently under development.

Ridership / Person Throughput for Transit

The purpose of this performance measure is to document the number of patrons using the available transit options. Within San Mateo County, there are three options including SamTrans, Caltrain, and BART. BART has six stations within San Mateo County: Daly City, Colma, South San Francisco, San Francisco International Airport, San Bruno, and Millbrae.

The 2019 transit ridership data for SamTrans, Caltrain, and BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit) is included in **Table 7**. As shown in Table 7 below, the 2019 transit ridership data indicates annual total ridership for SamTrans has decreased by 10% and Caltrain ridership decreased by 2% when compared to the CMP update 2017. Annual total ridership for BART decreased by 5% at the stations within San Mateo County. Overall annual total transit ridership decreased about 5% when compared with the previous 2017 CMP Update

Table 7 – Transit Ridership

| Transit Agency | Annual Total | | | Average Weekday | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| | FY 2019 | FY 2017 | FY 2015 | FY 2019 | FY 2017 | FY 2015 |
| SamTrans ¹ | 10,670,850 | 11,816,760 | 13,158,703 | 35,150 | 38,700 | 42,981 |
| Caltrain ² | 18,486,509 | 18,743,189 | 18,156,173 | 63,597 | 64,114 | 58,245 |
| BART (Colma, Daly City, South Francisco, San Bruno) ³ | 7,741,549 | 7,818,023 | 8,155,340 | 26,483 | 25,269 | 28,050 |
| BART (SFO & Millbrae) ³ | 11,261,768 | 12,102,872 | 12,614,731 | 37,687 | 39,989 | 40,741 |
| Combined Transit | 48,160,676 | 50,480,844 | 52,084,947 | 162,917 | 163,090 | 170,201 |

¹ Source: SamTrans End-of-Year Performance Report FY2019

² Source: Caltrain Website

³ Source: BART Staff

J. TRENDS AND NEXT STEPS

Overall between 2017 and 2019 there was just one area that showed improvements while there were a larger number of segments in other areas that worsened especially in the AM Peak Period. A few specifics to highlight that either improved a letter grade in LOS or over 10 mph faster travel time include the following:

- SR 84 between Portola and I-280

Similarly, for those that worsened a letter grade in LOS or slower by more than 10 mph include:

- SR 92 between SR-1 and I-280
- SR-109 between Kavanaugh Drive to SR 84 (Bayfront Expwy.)
- I-280 between SR 1 (north) to SR 1 (south)
- I-280 between San Bruno Avenue to SR 92

The LOS and Performance Measure Monitoring Report for many years has continued to use the 1994 Highway Capacity Manual as the basis for determining LOS for freeways, arterials and intersections. There have been a couple substantial updates to this manual over the years that not only changed the thresholds for determining LOS but also the methodology to be used over the last 15 years. With these changes have come new data sources that allow additional performance measures to be evaluated included travel time reliability and duration of congestion. Nationally, these performance measures are many times of more interest not only to planners and engineers but to drivers. A driver, many times is more concerned with the consistency or reliability with their travel time than they are with the actual conditions. That allows the driver to better plan their trip, departure time, and arrival time with some level of reliability.

It is recommended for the next update cycle, C/CAG transition to the current 2010 HCM.

APPENDIX A

AM and PM Roadway LOS Tabular Results

DRAFT

APPENDIX B

TECHNICAL APPENDIX

- The technical details, database and support documents are included in a separate geographic information system (GIS) deliverable

Appendix G: Status of Capital Improvement Projects

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS - DRAFT

| Program Year | Program | Type | Jurisdiction | Project Description | Amount | Funding Obligation Pending | Funding Fully Obligated | Under Construction | Completed |
|--------------|---------------|----------|---------------------|---|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | Burlingame | Burlingame Ave. and Broadway Distric | \$ 301,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STIP | Highway | Caltrans | Aux lane landscaping #700B - 2-yr plant establishmen | \$ 33,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | County of San Mateo | Crystal Springs Regional Trail South of Highway 92 | \$ 194,549 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | Daly City | Citywide Accessibility | \$ 420,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Half Moon Bay | Highway 1 Trail Extension - Seymour to Wavecrest Road | \$ 250,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | Half Moon Bay | Hwy 1 Bicycle Pedestrian Trail | \$ 420,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Menlo Park | Alpine Road Bike Lane Improvement | \$ 78,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STP | LSR | Menlo Park | 2010/11 Resurfacing | \$ 385,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | Bicycle | Redwood City | Skyway/Shoreline Bike Route (PE | \$ 38,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Redwood City | Brewster Avenue Bicycle Improvement | \$ 107,640 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | Bicycle | Redwood City | Skyway/Shoreline Bike Route | \$ 218,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | Redwood City | Bair Island Bay Trail Improvemem | \$ 337,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | San Bruno | Transit Corridor Pedestrian | \$ 265,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | San Bruno | Street Median and Grand | \$ 654,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STP | LSR | San Carlos | Pavement Rehab Program | \$ 319,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | San Carlos | East Side Community Transi | \$ 1,795,304 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Mateo | Downtown Bicycle Parking | \$ 98,783 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | San Mateo | El Camino Real Phase 1 Improvem | \$ 203,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Mateo | Bay to Transit Trail - Phase 1 | \$ 312,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | Bicycle | San Mateo | Delaware Street Bike Lane | \$ 545,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | San Mateo County | CSRT South of Dam Conversion | \$ 300,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STP | | San Mateo County | Resurfacing of Pescadero Creek Roac | \$ 985,011 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STIP | Highway | SMCTA | US 101/Willow Interchange Reconstruction | \$ 4,500,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | STIP | Highway | SMCTA/Pacifica | Hwy 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacemen | \$ 3,000,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | South San Francisco | Pedestrian Crossing Improvements at El Camino H.S | \$ 98,000 | | | | X |
| 2011/12 | CMAQ | | South San Francisco | Regional Gap | \$ 261,000 | | | | X |
| 2012/13 | STIP | Highway | C/CAG | San Mateo County Smart Corridor - Segment 2 | \$ 1,977,000 | | | | X |
| 2012/13 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Redwood City | Bike Route Sign/Detectors/Racks | \$ 42,792 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Burlingame | Ped/Bike Bridge Connection | \$ 136,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Caltrans | Reconstruct U.S. 101/Broadway interchange - Bike/ Ped components | \$ 3,613,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | Regional SR2S | SR2S | C/CAG | San Mateo County Safe Routes to School Program | \$ 1,905,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Pacifica | Replace San Pedro Creek Bridge over Route 1 - Bike/ Ped components | \$ 1,141,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | CMAQ | TLC | San Carlos | San Carlos PDA Connectivity Project | \$ 125,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | CMAQ | TLC | San Carlos | El Camino Real Lighting and Landscaping (Grand Boulevard Initiative) | \$ 182,000 | | | | X |
| 2013/14 | STIP | Highway | SMCTA | US 101/ Broadway Interchange | \$ 23,218,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Atherton | Atherton/Fair Oaks/Middlefield Maintenance project | \$ 285,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Belmont | 2014/15 Belmont Pavement Reconstruction Project | \$ 534,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Belmont | Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan | \$ 37,500 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Burlingame | Carolan Avenue Complete Streets Improvement Project | \$ 986,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | City of San Mateo | Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Upgrade | \$ 200,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | County of San Mateo | Semicircular Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Access Improvement Project, North Fair Oaks Area | \$ 320,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Daly City | Callan Boulevard and King Drive Resurfacing | \$ 560,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Daly City | Geneva Ave. Bike and Ped Improvement | \$ 375,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | East Palo Alto | Bike/Ped Access to Services | \$ 108,820 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Menlo Park | 2014-2015 Resurfacing of Federal Aid Routes | \$ 427,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Menlo Park | El Camino Real, Valaparaíso Avenue, Glenwood Avenue, and Middlefield Road Bike/Ped Safety | \$ 797,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Menlo Park | Citywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Enhancement | \$ 347,860 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Millbrae | 2014 Millbrae Street Repair Project | \$ 445,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Millbrae | Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan | \$ 62,500 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Pacifica | FY 2014-15 Linda Mar Boulevard Pavement Rehabilitation | \$ 431,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | TLC | Pacifica | Palmetto Avenue Streetscape | \$ 1,000,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Pacifica | Warning Lights Crosswalk | \$ 140,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Portola Valley | 2014/2015 Town of Portola Valley Resurfacing Project | \$ 224,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | Redwood City | 2014/2015 Town of Portola Valley Resurfacing Project | \$ 548,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Redwood City | Middlefield Road Streetscape Project | \$ 1,752,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Redwood City | Safe Routes to School Improvement | \$ 46,220 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | TLC | San Bruno | Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connectivity Improvement - Huntington Landscaping Improvement | \$ 735,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Bruno | Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan | \$ 100,000 | | | | X |

STATUS OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS - DRAFT


| Program Year | Program | Type | Jurisdiction | Project Description | Amount | Funding Obligation Pending | Funding Fully Obligated | Under Construction | Completed |
|--------------|-----------|----------|---------------------|--|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | San Carlos | Crestview Drive Pavement Rehabilitation-Phase 2 | \$ 412,000 | | | | × |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | TLC | San Carlos | San Carlos PDA Connectivity Project | \$ 725,000 | | | | × |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Carlos | N-S Bikeway Sign and Detector | \$ 83,500 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | STP | LSR | San Mateo | Street Rehabilitation in Priority Development Areas (PDA's) | \$ 270,000 | | | | × |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | TLC | San Mateo | North Central Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements | \$ 1,000,000 | | | | × |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Mateo | Bay to Transit Trail - Phase 1 | \$ 312,000 | | | | X |
| 2014/15 | CMAQ | TLC | South San Francisco | South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Project | \$ 150,000 | | | | × |
| 2014/15 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | South San Francisco | Pedestrian Crossing Improvem | \$ 98,000 | | | | X |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | TLC | Belmont | Ralston Avenue Pedestrian Route Improvements | \$ 250,000 | | | | × |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | Belmont | Old County Road Bike and Pedestrian Improvement Project | \$ 270,000 | | | | × |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | TLC | Daly City | John Daly Boulevard Streetscape Improvement | \$ 1,000,000 | | | | X |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | TLC | East Palo Alto | Bay Rd. Improvement Phase II and III | \$ 1,000,000 | | | | × |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | TLC | San Mateo | Citywide Crosswalk Improvement Project | \$ 368,000 | | | | × |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | Bike Ped | South San Francisco | SSF Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closure Project | \$ 357,000 | | | | × |
| 2015/16 | CMAQ | TLC | South San Francisco | South San Francisco Grand Boulevard Project | \$ 850,000 | | | | × |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Atherton | Middlefield and Oak Grove Complete Street Improvement | \$ 124,200 | | | | X |
| 2016/17 | STIP | Highway | C/CAG | Phase 2 (ENV) at SR 92/US 101 Interchange Vicinity | \$ 5,000,000 | | | | × |
| 2016/17 | STIP | Highway | C/CAG | US 101 High Occupancy/Express Lane Project | \$ 9,399,000 | | | | × |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | Daly City | Westmoof Ave to Guadalupe Parkway Bike and Ped Improvements | \$ 154,750 | | | | X |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Carlos | Hwy 101 Ped/Bike Overcrossing | \$ 400,000 | | | | X |
| 2016/17 | STIP | Highway | San Mateo | Phase 1 - SR 92 Improvement at SR 92/US El Camino Real Interchange | \$ 5,000,000 | | | | × |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Mateo | San Mateo Dr. Ped and Bike Improvement | \$ 400,000 | | | | X |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | San Mateo County | Bicycle Routes and Rule | \$ 21,050 | | | | X |
| 2016/17 | STIP | Highway | SMCTA | US 101/Willow Interchange Reconstruction | \$ 19,552,000 | | | | × |
| 2016/17 | TDA Art 3 | Bike Ped | South San Francisco | Linden Ave Complete Streets Safety Project | \$ 400,000 | | | | X |
| 2017/18 | STIP | Highway | C/CAG | Countywide ITS Project | \$ 4,298,000 | | | | × |

Appendix H: Measure A Program Strategic Plan



SAN MATEO COUNTY
**Transportation
Authority**

**Strategic Plan
2014-2019**



Board of Directors

Karyl Matsumoto, Chair

Representing SamTrans Board
South San Francisco Mayor

David Canepa, Vice Chair

Representing North County Cities
Daly City Mayor

Rosanne Foust

Representing South County Cities
Redwood City Vice Mayor

Carole Groom

Representing San Mateo County
Board of Supervisors

Don Horsley

Representing San Mateo County
Board of Supervisors

Terry Nagel

Representing Central County Cities
Burlingame Vice Mayor

Naomi Patridge

Representing Cities-at-Large
Half Moon Bay Council Member

Executive Staff

Executive Director

Michael J. Scanlon

Deputy CEO

Gigi Harrington

Deputy CEO

Chuck Harvey

Executive Officer, Planning and Development

April Chan

Executive Officer, Customer Service and Marketing

Rita Haskin

Executive Officer, Caltrain Modernization

Marian Lee

Executive Officer, Public Affairs

Mark Simon

Authority Secretary

Martha Martinez

General Counsel

Hanson Bridgett

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| From the Executive Director..... | 7 |
| Section 1 Introduction and Background | 9 |
| Section 2 Measure A Program 2009-2033 | 11 |
| 2.1 2004 Expenditure Plan Goals | 12 |
| 2.2 Program Category Details | 12 |
| 2.3 Accomplishments for Past Five Years | 14 |
| New Procedures and Plans..... | 14 |
| Key Projects Funded..... | 14 |
| 2.4 A Financial Look Ahead (2014-2019)..... | 15 |
| Forecasted Measure A Revenues | 15 |
| Measure A Financial Outlook | 16 |
| Section 3 Plan Development Process | 17 |
| 3.1 Review of Existing Project Selection and Implementation Processes | 18 |
| 3.2 Demographics and Travel Data..... | 18 |
| Demographic Trends | 18 |
| Travel Trends | 20 |
| Summary of Findings..... | 21 |
| 3.3 Stakeholder/Public Outreach | 22 |
| Stakeholder Meetings and Questionnaire..... | 22 |
| Summary of Stakeholder Feedback..... | 22 |
| Summary of Public Feedback..... | 23 |
| Section 4 Recommendations..... | 25 |
| 4.1 Program-wide Challenges and Opportunities | 26 |
| 4.2 Category Specific Issues and Recommendations | 27 |
| Section 5 Programming and Allocation Guidelines..... | 29 |
| 5.1 Program Participants | 30 |
| 5.2 Project Selection Approach..... | 31 |
| 5.3 Agreement-based..... | 32 |
| Transit: Accessible Services | 32 |
| Transit: BART | 32 |
| Local Streets and Transportation Program | 32 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Transit: Ferry | 32 |
| Transit: Dumbarton Rail Corridor | 32 |
| Programming and Allocations Process | 32 |
| 5.4 Plan-based | 33 |
| Alternative Congestion Relief Programs..... | 33 |
| Transit: Caltrain | 33 |
| Programming and Allocations Process | 33 |
| 5.5 Call for Projects | 33 |
| Transit: Shuttles..... | 33 |
| Highways | 34 |
| Grade Separations..... | 34 |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities..... | 34 |
| Funding Process | 34 |
| Section 6 Fund Management..... | 37 |
| 6.1 Measure A CIP and Funding Cycles | 38 |
| 6.2 Matching Funds..... | 38 |
| 6.3 Transportation Authority (TA) Consideration of Financing Backed by Sales Tax Revenues | 39 |
| 6.4 Special Circumstances for Advancing Funds | 39 |
| Section 7 Next Steps | 41 |
| Appendices..... | 43 |
| Appendix A. Glossary of Acronyms | 45 |
| Appendix B. Measure A Listed Projects | 47 |
| Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses..... | 49 |
| Appendix D. Detailed Project Selection Criteria..... | 59 |
| Appendix E. Federal, State and Local Funding Sources..... | 63 |
| Acknowledgments..... | 67 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: Program Category Details | 13 |
| Table 2: Annual New Measure A Revenues (FY2014-2019) | 15 |
| Table 3. Current and Projected Mode Share Trends | 21 |
| Table 4. Participants and Responsibilities | 30 |
| Table 5. Project Sponsors | 31 |
| Table 6. Project Selection Approach | 31 |
| Table 7. Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria..... | 35 |
| Table 8. Next Steps..... | 42 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1: 2004 Measure A Expenditure Plan..... | 12 |
| Figure 2: Annual New Measure A Revenues | 15 |
| Figure 3: Potential Funding Needs and Allocations for Pipeline Pedestrian/Bicycle, Grade Separation, and Highway Programs for 2014-2019..... | 16 |
| Figure 4: San Mateo County Population Change, 2010-2040 | 18 |
| Figure 5: Total Change in Population from 2010 to 2040 for San Mateo County by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) | 19 |
| Figure 6: Change in Employment from 2010 to 2040 for San Mateo County by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) | 20 |

From the Executive Director



This report, as is the case with any activity of the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA), is a testament to the farsightedness and civic-mindedness of the people of San Mateo County. Since 1988, this community has been willing to pay for transit and transportation programs – everything from freeway lanes to bicycle paths – that will maintain and improve the quality of life we hold so dear.

The TA and its supporting legislation have enjoyed overwhelming support at the ballot in 1988 and again in 2004. This support is, in reality, a remarkable show of understanding that as we all contribute, we all benefit. If the TA helps to fund metering lights or auxiliary lanes on US 101, it helps traffic on the freeway and on side streets, and improving traffic on a major roadway helps drivers everywhere. If the TA funds alternative projects, such as bicycle and pedestrian paths or ferries, it takes cars off the road and reduces pollution, to the benefit of someone who may never ride a bicycle, take a hike or ride a ferry.

The eagerness with which the public has supported the TA is reflected in the enthusiasm of the cities and the county in their pursuit of funding from the Measure A programs. If the projects and programs are the outcome of the TA's activities, the competition for funding for those projects and programs is the centerpiece of the TA's activities. And it is, to a significant degree, at the heart of this Strategic Plan, intended to direct the TA through 2019. We have gone through a detailed and critical analysis of how the TA delivers to our community – reaching out in an unprecedented manner to stakeholders, cities, transportation agencies, would-be sponsors and our ultimate constituency, the public we serve.

The result is the meticulously thoughtful raising of issues facing the TA and its delivery of the funds with which it is charged as steward. In an equally detailed and thoughtful manner, the Strategic Plan offers a series of recommendations to improve the interaction between the agency and those seeking funds for projects and programs.

We hope you find this Strategic Plan helpful in understanding the TA and its role in our community, and a useful guide to how best to make the fullest use of the resources available from the Measure A revenues.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "MJ Scanlon". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Michael J. Scanlon
Executive Director

Section 1: Introduction and Background



Section 1: Introduction and Background

In 1988, San Mateo County voters approved Measure A, a 20 year half-cent sales tax to fund and leverage additional funding for transportation projects and programs in San Mateo County. The approval of Measure A created the San Mateo County Transportation Authority (TA) to manage and administer the sales tax revenues generated. The TA is governed by a seven-member Board of Directors on the administration of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP). The Board of Directors sets the overall policy direction for the TA and is comprised of: two Board members appointed by the Board of Supervisors; four Board members representing the North County, Central County, South County and cities at-large, as appointed by the Cities Selection Committee; and one Board member appointed by the San Mateo County Transit District. The 15-member Citizens Advisory Committee, appointed by the Board, serves as a liaison between the public and the Board of Directors.

San Mateo County is one of 20 “self-help” counties in California that chose to tax itself in order to help address the county’s transportation needs. As a self-help county, the TA has been able to accelerate the completion of major projects by bridging funding gaps, leveraging other fund sources, and providing 100 percent of project funding, where necessary. The 1988 Sales Tax Measure expired on December 31, 2008.

In 2004, 75.3 percent of San Mateo County voters reauthorized the Measure A half-cent sales tax and a new TEP for an additional 25 years (2009 – 2033). The TEP describes programs and projects, as identified by the cities, local agencies and citizens of San Mateo County, and includes funding for multiple modes to help meet the county’s transportation needs.

The TEP requires the TA to develop a Strategic Plan and to update the Strategic Plan every five years.

This current plan is developed for 2014-2019.

The purpose of this planning update is to review and modify the policy framework, where appropriate, to help guide programming and allocation decisions for Measure A funds.

This update provides:

- Funding prioritization and evaluation criteria for the selection of candidate projects; and
- Procedures for sponsors to initiate and implement projects

It is essential to emphasize that this plan is a living document that will continue to evolve as the TA implements the Measure A program.

Section 2: Measure A Program 2009-2033



Section 2: Measure A Program 2009-2033

The 2009 – 2033 Measure A Program began on January 1, 2009, continuing to generate sales tax revenues in San Mateo County for transportation facilities, services and programs. The voter-approved TEP sets the program categories and percentage split of the sales tax revenues to each of the program categories described below.

Funding is identified for six primary program categories: Transit, Highways, Local Streets/ Transportation, Grade Separations, Pedestrian and Bicycle, and Alternative Congestion Relief Programs. Each category is designated for a percentage share of the total projected revenues, as illustrated in **Figure 1** below.

2.1 2004 Expenditure Plan Goals

The goals of the 2004 Expenditure Plan are to:

- Reduce commute corridor congestion
- Make regional connections
- Enhance safety
- Meet local mobility needs

2.2 Program Category Details

A description and purpose of each program category is described in **Table 1** on the next page. The Measure A program is estimated to generate \$1.5 billion (in 2004 dollars) over the life of the program.

Figure 1: 2004 Measure A Expenditure Plan




Table 1: Program Category Details

| Program Category | Description | Purpose | Estimated Sales Tax (in 2004 dollars) |
|--|--|---|--|
| Transit | | | |
| <i>Caltrain (16%)</i> | Existing commuter rail system providing train service in San Francisco, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties | Upgrade and expand Caltrain systemwide services/San Mateo County specific improvements; up to one-half of funds may be used to support operations | \$240.0 million |
| <i>Local Shuttles (4%)</i> | Transit services provided with vehicles that are typically larger than vans and smaller than buses | Meet local mobility needs and provide access to regional transit | \$60.0 million |
| <i>Accessible Services (4%)</i> | Targeted transportation services for people that have special mobility needs | Provide paratransit and other transportation services to eligible seniors and people with disabilities | \$60.0 million |
| <i>Ferry (2%)</i> | Transit service provided by vessels on waterways | Establish ferry services in San Mateo County | \$30.0 million |
| <i>Dumbarton Corridor (2%)</i> | A key corridor connecting the East Bay with the Peninsula identified for future commuter rail service | Construct stations and rail enhancements in East Palo Alto, Menlo Park and Redwood City | \$30.0 million |
| <i>BART (2%)</i> | Existing heavy rail system providing train services in San Francisco, San Mateo, Alameda and Contra Costa counties | Maintain and operate BART extension in San Mateo County | \$30.0 million |
| Highways | | | |
| <i>Key Congested Areas (17.3%)</i> | Highways in San Mateo County | Reduce congestion and improve safety on highways | \$260.0 million |
| <i>Supplemental Roadways (10.2%)</i> | Local, collector, arterial, state route roadways in San Mateo County | Reduce congestion and improve safety on roadways | \$153.0 million |
| Local Streets / Transportation (22.5%) | Transportation services, roadways owned and maintained by the cities and County of San Mateo | Improve and maintain local transportation facilities and services | \$337.5 million |
| Grade Separations (15%) | Eliminate at-grade railroad crossings/ upgrade existing grade separation | Improve safety and relieve local traffic congestion | \$225.0 million |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle (3%) | Pedestrians and bicycle facilities | Encourage walking and bicycling | \$45.0 million |
| Alternative Congestion Relief Programs (1%) | Commuter alternatives and Intelligent Transportation Systems | Efficient use of transportation network and reduce reliance on automobiles | \$15.0 million |

Note: Up to 1% of funds used for administration

The TEP outlines restrictions in the use of Measure A funds to target funding to transportation projects in San Mateo County and maximize the leveraging of other funding. The restrictions include:

- Measure A funds may not be used to supplant existing funds and resources on projects
- Measure A funds may be used only for transportation programs and projects as allowed in the TEP
- Measure A funds may be used only for projects within San Mateo County, with exception to system-wide Caltrain improvements, and other projects that minimally extend into adjacent counties

The TEP further provides that “listed” projects are to be included in each Strategic Plan. A listed project is a capital project that the TA has programmed Measure A funding from the Call for Projects selection approach or from a Special Circumstance request. The TA can de-program funding for a project, and thus remove a listed project from the Strategic Plan, if requested by the project sponsor or if a sponsor fails to meet its obligations under the terms and conditions of the funding agreement for the project.

An inventory of listed projects is contained in **Appendix B**. Note, the inventory of listed projects is not intended to be a comprehensive list of projects selected for funding from all of the Measure A programs, nor an inventory of all projects eligible for Measure A funds in the future. Going forward, the list in **Appendix B** will be updated as needed, and included in each subsequent Strategic Plan.

2.3 Accomplishments for Past Five Years

Over the past five years of the Measure A program, a number of accomplishments were achieved, as described below.

New Processes and Plans

The TA established the Call for Projects processes for selecting projects and allocating Measure A funds for the highway, grade separation, pedestrian/bicycle and shuttle programs. The TA also completed the New Measure A Program Short-range Highway Plan (2011-2021), the Shuttle Business Practices Guidebook, and helped fund the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.

Key Projects Funded

Measure A has funded a number of key projects throughout the county to meet the goals of the 2004 Expenditure Plan including:

- ***Transit***
 - Caltrain upgrades and improvements, such as:
 - Caltrain Modernization Program (CalMod) program with Electrification, Positive Train Control (PTC)
 - Ongoing Caltrain State of Good Repair projects
 - Shuttles: The TA helps fund a robust shuttle system to provide critical first-and last-mile access to regional transit and meet local mobility needs
 - Ferry: South San Francisco Ferry Terminal construction
- ***Highway***
 - Reconstruction of Broadway Interchange at U.S. 101 (Burlingame)
 - State Route 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Project (Pacifica)
 - U.S. 101 Auxiliary Lane Project, from Marsh Road to Embarcadero Road (Menlo Park to Palo Alto)
- ***Grade Separation*** - San Bruno Grade Separation Project
- ***Pedestrian/Bicycle***- Ralston Avenue/U.S. 101 pedestrian and bicycle bridge (Belmont)

- *Alternative Congestion Relief (ACR)*
 - Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance’s countywide transportation demand management (TDM) work programs
 - *Connect Redwood City* TDM effort focused in Redwood City

outlook for Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 through 2019 was performed as part of the development of the Strategic Plan. The following section details the forecasted annual revenues through FY 2019.

Forecasted Measure A Revenues

The budgeted FY 2015 sales tax revenue receipts are estimated to be \$72 million; each subsequent fiscal year estimate assumes a conservative 1.0 percent growth rate. **Table 2** below provides the estimated total revenues each year, and **Figure 2** provides the percentage breakdown for each category.

2.4 A Financial Look Ahead (2014-2019)


Although the Strategic Plan covers 2014- 2019 calendar years, financial projections are made by fiscal year. A review of the Measure A financial

Table 2: Annual Measure A Revenues (FY2014-2019)

| | FY2014* | FY2015 | FY2016 | FY2017 | FY2018 | FY2019 |
|---|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Projected Measure A Revenues (\$M) | \$72.0 | \$72.0 | \$72.7 | \$73.4 | \$74.2 | \$75.0 |

Note: Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 adopted budget is \$72 million. In addition, the currently available unprogrammed new Measure A balance is \$63 million.

Figure 2: Annual Measure A Revenues




Measure A Financial Outlook

The forecasted need for pipeline projects in the grade separation, highway, and pedestrian and bicycle categories, not including funding requests for new projects that may be proposed, could exceed \$500 million over the next five years, as shown in **Figure 3** below. Pipeline projects reflect those capital projects in these

three categories previously programmed and allocated Measure A funds, and whose sponsors are expected to request additional funding for project completion. The estimated Measure A receipts for these categories, estimated at \$167 million through Fiscal Year 2019, will be insufficient to deliver these projects through completion.

Figure 3: Potential Funding Needs and Allocations for Pipeline Pedestrian/Bicycle, Grade Separation, and Highway Programs for 2014-2019



Section 3: Plan Development Process



Section 3: Plan Development Process

This section describes the efforts that were undertaken to develop the Measure A Strategic Plan 2014-2019. These efforts included review of existing project selection and project implementation processes, demographics and travel data trend analysis, and stakeholder outreach.

3.1 Review of Existing Project Selection and Implementation Processes

A review of the existing project selection process, including an assessment of the evaluation criteria used to prioritize projects and an examination of the project initiation and implementation processes, were conducted to determine where improvements are needed.

3.2 Demographics and Travel Data

An analysis of the demographic data was conducted to better understand current and future population and employment growth

patterns and travel trends, including current and future mode share and trip growth, as projected changes could influence program policies.


Demographic Trends

In 2010, San Mateo County had 718,454 residents and 331,931 jobs. Between 2010 and 2040, San Mateo County is projected to increase in population by 25 percent and employment to increase by 34 percent.

Population by Age

From 2010 to 2040, the senior population (65 and older) is expected to almost double, an increase of more than 100,000 residents in that age group. This indicates that there will be growing pressure on transit and accessible services to meet the needs to the senior population in the next 25 years. **Figure 4** shows the total number of people by age group, as well as the percent increase from 2010 to 2040.

Figure 4: San Mateo County Population Change within Age Groups, 2010-2040




Note: Data based on Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2013

Population by Geography

Population growth is largely concentrated along the BART and Caltrain corridors as illustrated in **Figure 5** below. Most of the population growth in the county occurs after 2020: population increases by 52,754 residents (7 percent) from 2010 to 2020 and by 127,496 residents (17 percent) from 2020 to 2040.

Figure 6 illustrates the total change in employment growth from 2010 to 2040 by Travel Analysis Zones (TAZs). Areas with high employment growth are in close proximity to BART and Caltrain stations. A comparison of **Figure 5** (population change by geography) and **Figure 6** (employment change by geography) shows that several areas are expected to increase significantly in both employment and population.

Figure 5: Total Change in Population from 2010 to 2040 for San Mateo County by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)



Note: Data based on Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2013


Population and employment growth along transit corridors is based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projection of growth in Planned Development Areas (PDAs) near station areas and anticipated transit-oriented development (TOD). These projected population growth patterns support continued investment in transit access to Caltrain and BART.

Travel Trends

A comparison of 2013 mode share data and 2040 projections during peak periods shows

that transit mode share will increase from 8.0 percent in 2013 to 10.6 percent in 2040. Bicycling and walking mode shares are projected to increase from 12.4 percent in 2013 to 13.7 percent in 2040. These three non-automobile modes currently account for 20.4 percent of the total mode share in San Mateo County. **Table 3** summarizes 2013 and 2040 mode share data during peak periods (morning and evening peaks combined) for San Mateo County.

Figure 6: Change in Employment from 2010 to 2040 for San Mateo County by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ)



Note: Data based on Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2013

Trip Origins and Destinations

The number of trips that occur within San Mateo County is projected to increase by 19 percent between 2013 and 2040. However, the total number of trips that have an origin or destination in San Mateo County is projected to increase by 28 percent. The number of trips to and from San Francisco and Santa Clara Counties will increase by 45 percent from 2013 to 2040. Overall the total number of trips is growing at a faster rate than trips within the county. This may indicate a future trend with longer average trips and travel times.

Traffic Volumes on Major Highway Segments in San Mateo County

Selected highway segments from SR 92, SR 82, I-280, SR 84, and US 101 were evaluated from a countywide travel demand model to develop a snapshot of anticipated growth in traffic volumes on major San Mateo County roadways from 2013 to 2040. On average, traffic volumes on these segments are estimated to increase by 28 percent from 2013 to 2040.

Summary of Findings

The review of demographic and travel trends indicate the following:

- High growth in the number of seniors age 65 and older will put increased pressure on the provision of transit and accessible services in the upcoming years.
- The majority of the population and employment growth in the county will occur along the already congested north/south Highway 101 and Caltrain corridors. Providing multimodal solutions with focus on sustainable practices will be critical.
- The use of transit and pedestrian/bicycle modes will increase in the future, but travel by automobile will continue to be the primary mode of transportation. This suggests a balanced approach to transportation investment will be needed.
- The highway volume analysis indicates continued traffic volume growth on San Mateo County's key congested corridors and highlights that they will continue to be areas of concern in the next 25 years.

Table 3: Current and Projected Mode Share Trends for San Mateo County (Peak)*

| | Current (2013) | 2020 | 2040 | Difference (2013-2040) |
|--------------------|----------------|-------|-------|------------------------|
| Drive-alone | 49.7% | 50.4% | 48.2% | -1.5% |
| Carpool | 29.9% | 28.3% | 27.5% | -2.4% |
| Transit** | 8.0% | 8.9% | 10.6% | +2.6% |
| Bicycle | 2.0% | 2.0% | 2.3% | +0.3% |
| Walk | 10.4% | 10.4% | 11.4% | +1.0% |

Data from Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) travel model 2013, based on ABAG Projections 2011 that is in the process of being updated to incorporate inputs from the Plan Bay Area Regional Transportation Plan.

*Includes all peak-period trips (a combination of morning and evening peaks) starting or ending in San Mateo County

**Park-and-ride and kiss-and-ride trips are categorized as transit

3.3 Stakeholder/Public Outreach

The Strategic Plan update involved several methods of civic engagement: public stakeholder meetings, an online survey, and a series of public meetings held throughout the county following the release of a draft Strategic Plan update. A key aspect of the outreach program for the Strategic Plan update was to solicit stakeholder input focusing on key issues and how the process could be improved. Engaging stakeholders and the public included the following channels:

- TA website: dedicated page, www.smcta.com/strategicplan, and public meeting announcement on home page
- News releases and follow-up reminders to numerous entities including local media, neighborhood associations, community based organizations, chambers of commerce, mayors, city managers, public works directors, stakeholder outreach contacts, interested parties from prior Call for Projects processes and other TA outreach efforts

Public meeting notices for the Strategic Plan Update were also posted on the following media sites:

- Sustainable San Mateo County website
- San Mateo County Economic Development Association (SAMCEDA) Twitter
- TransForm website
- San Francisco Examiner news article
- Belmont City Manager's weekly update
- San Bruno Patch
- City of Pacifica City Focus
- Fix Pacifica blog
- City of South San Francisco news alerts

Stakeholder Meetings and Questionnaire

A series of stakeholder meetings were held to receive input regarding the existing project selection and implementation procedures for Measure A funds, and how they can be improved. TA staff met with the following stakeholder groups, which represented a wide range of perspectives and interests:

- City/County Association of Governments (C/CAG) Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
- C/CAG Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC)
- Caltrain Citizens Advisory Committee
- SamTrans Accessibility Advisory Committees
- SamTrans Citizens Advisory Committee
- SAMCEDA
- San Mateo County Paratransit Coordinating Council
- TA Citizens Advisory Committee

The following groups were unable to convene during this time period, but were invited to participate in the stakeholder questionnaire:

- Peninsula Traffic Congestion Relief Alliance
- Committee for Green Foothills
- Menlo Park Transportation Management Program
- C/CAG Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee (CMEQ)

Summary of Stakeholder Feedback

Stakeholder Meetings

Stakeholders were generally supportive of the current processes for project selection and initiation. Key comments received from stakeholders emphasized the importance and need for flexibility; input on project delivery with respect to sponsor implementation;

concerns regarding limited available funding to deliver large capital projects, and the ability to leverage external revenue sources; the integration of new concepts in light of regional and statewide initiatives; and the establishment of metrics to better determine how projects are meeting Measure A goals.

Stakeholder Questionnaire

The stakeholder questionnaire was distributed to the groups listed above. The stakeholders were asked about their assessment of the TA's performance, alignment of the TEP goals with the county's transportation needs, and preferences for focus on goals and performance measures. While stakeholders clearly indicated that the TEP goals were aligned with the county's needs, the key feedback from this survey included a preference for evaluation criteria to focus on project effectiveness, project need, and to give more consideration to Complete Streets and multimodal access, and finally to explore performance measures such as ridership, cost per traveler, safety, travel time savings, and emissions reduction.

Summary of Public Feedback

The Draft Strategic Plan was released on October 10th for a 30 day public comment period. During this time, four public meetings were held at different locations throughout the county, including Menlo Park (South County), Pacifica (Coastside), San Carlos (Central County) and South San Francisco (North County). The TA also presented the Draft Strategic Plan to the Menlo Park Chamber of Commerce, per request.

Public feedback can be summarized as follows:

- Ensure sufficient coordination with external stakeholders as part of a collaborative approach to solving transportation concerns/issues.
- Greater emphasis should be placed on Complete Streets in the TA's project selection criteria.
- Heightened importance of the pedestrian/bicycle and alternative congestion relief programs in addressing congestion relief and the desire for additional funding.
- The TA also received concerns regarding the Calera Parkway highway project in Pacifica; however, they are beyond the purview of the TA Strategic Plan. Project specific concerns will be addressed separately with the project sponsor.

A summary of stakeholder and public outreach comments and the TA's responses are provided in **Appendix C**.

Section 4: Recommendations



Section 4: Recommendations

Through the plan development and stakeholder outreach process, it was determined that the TA's current processes for project selection and project initiation and implementation generally work well. Project sponsors appreciated the flexibility of the program's project delivery. Some challenges and opportunities do exist, and they are either program-wide or category specific. These are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

4.1 Program-wide Challenges and Opportunities

The Strategic Plan development process identified four main program-wide challenges, which included the following:

Challenge/Opportunity #1 – Project Delivery:

Project delivery and coordination may be impacted by sponsor resources, expertise and funding.

Recommendation: At the onset of a project the sponsor shall coordinate with TA staff to determine the entity that is best suited to implement the project or program. This decision should be based on the size and complexity of the project/program, as well as available sponsor resources and expertise.

Challenge/Opportunity #2A – Integrate Sustainability into Strategic Planning Process:

Sustainability supports programs that build and maintain livable communities and transportation networks, foster social equity by expanding mobility options and providing transportation for residents with mobility impairments, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and environmental impacts by promoting alternative and active transportation options. Sustainability also can be attained through stronger focus on sustainable design, as well as construction methods.

The TA has an opportunity and obligation as stewards of the county to incorporate sustainability into the decision-making process while appropriately balancing other critical considerations.

Recommendation: Sustainability is already a component of the evaluation criteria in each Call for Projects, and the TA should work to refine the specific sustainability criteria that will be used to award projects, as appropriate.

Challenge/Opportunity #2B – Integrate Complete Streets into Strategic Planning Process:

Complete Streets is defined as “a transportation facility that is planned, designed, operated, and maintained to provide safe mobility for all users, including bicyclists, pedestrians, transit riders, and motorists appropriate to the function and context of the facility.” Complete Streets is also a key selection criterion in federal, state and local regional transportation funding programs. It is important to align the Measure A project selection criteria with these non-Measure A programs in order to maximize the leveraging of external funding sources.

Recommendation: For the highway and grade separation categories, project selection should consider Complete Streets, where contextually appropriate, to benefit all applicable travel modes to the extent feasible.

Challenge/Opportunity #3 – Call for Projects Alignment:

The current Call for Projects process may not align well with anticipated external grant opportunities, with respect to timing and selection criteria.

Recommendation: The Call for Projects processes should be reviewed periodically to make sure they coincide with the timing of external funding programs to better position sponsors to procure additional funds for their projects.

Challenge/Opportunity #4 – Metrics: There is a need to better establish metrics to ensure funded projects are meeting the goals of Measure A and to inform future investment decisions.

Recommendation: The TA should explore and develop improved metrics to determine if funded projects are meeting Measure A program goals. These metrics should be developed in a manner that allows a quantitative approach to evaluate project and program effectiveness. Where quantitative measures are difficult to obtain, qualitative measures should be considered.

4.2 Category Specific Issues and Recommendations

Challenge/Opportunity #1 – Highway and Grade Separation Programs: There is insufficient funding projected to be available through 2019 to deliver highway and grade separation projects that are already in the pipeline. There is a need to balance the delivery of pipeline projects with new projects to be selected for funding.

Recommendation: A Capital Improvement Program (CIP) should be developed for both the Highway and Grade Separation programs to assist in long-term financial planning.

Challenge/Opportunity #2 – Pedestrian/Bicycle Program: A number of stakeholders voiced concerns that 3 percent of Measure A funds is insufficient to meet the pedestrian and bicycle needs for the county. There is insufficient funding available to deliver projects that are already in the pipeline and ensure that funds are available to deliver a future mix of projects throughout the county. The 3 percent share was set by the TEP approved by the voters. Additionally, opportunities to fund pedestrian and bicycle projects are not limited to this program: Complete Streets improvements may be funded from other Measure A programs where appropriate, and external funding sources are also available for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Recommendation:

- A CIP should be developed to assist in long-term planning needs for large and complex capital projects.
- The Call for Projects cycle should be adjusted to coincide with regional and state funding programs for pedestrian/bicycle projects. This should better position sponsors to procure additional funds for their projects.

Challenge/Opportunity #3 – Shuttle Program:

SamTrans recently embarked on development of a Mobility Management Plan (MMP) to provide planning guidance for shuttles and other non-fixed-route mobility options. The TA has an opportunity to leverage this planning effort to improve shuttle service and productivity. To take full advantage of this opportunity it is essential to determine who is best suited to plan and administer the shuttle services, as there is a concern that some shuttle services are not as efficient as they should be. Existing performance benchmarks need to be evaluated and updated.

Recommendation: The TA is a funding partner of the SamTrans MMP, and will participate in and leverage this planning effort, including the update and revision of performance benchmarks to evaluate proposed and existing shuttle services. A minimum performance standard should be considered to determine if an existing or a proposed shuttle should be funded by the Measure A program. The TA should work with existing shuttle sponsors to provide guidance/recommendations to improve the productivity of under-performing shuttles. Failure to continuously meet minimum standards over a sustained period of time could result in a recommendation to discontinue funding in future funding cycles.

Challenge/Opportunity #4 – Alternative

Congestion Relief: The relatively small amount of money available to this program (1 percent) to fund commute alternatives and the planning and design of Intelligent Transportation Systems requires that funds be employed in a very efficient manner; this indicates that a coordinated plan of action to govern this program may be needed.

Recommendation: A countywide alternative congestion relief plan will be developed in conjunction with key external stakeholders. The countywide congestion relief plan will form the basis for initiating and selecting projects to be implemented under this program.

Section 5: Programming and Allocation Guidelines



5.0 Programming and Allocation Guidelines

Based on the steps taken to develop the Strategic Plan outlined in section 3.0 and the recommendations in section 4.0, the following guidelines provide a policy framework to inform the programming and funding allocation process for each of the programs or categories over the strategic plan horizon. This section discusses five basic elements of the process:

1. The participants and their respective responsibilities
2. The project selection approach for each program
3. Guidelines for agreement-based programs
4. Guidelines for plan-based programs
5. Guidelines for Call for Projects-based programs

5.1 Program Participants

The designated participants in the Measure A program are the project Initiator, the project sponsors, the project manager/operator and the Transportation Authority. **Table 4** defines the eligibility and the roles/responsibilities of each of the participants. Any party or entity may recommend or initiate a project by submitting it to an eligible sponsor. The expenditure plan identifies the eligible project sponsors as shown in **Table 5**. The sponsors have the ability to designate a project manager/operator. The TA is the agency created by the Measure A Expenditure Plan to administer the sales tax funds, and it has the overall responsibility for the Measure A Program.

Table 4: Participants and Responsibilities

| Participant | Eligibility | Roles and Responsibilities |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Project Initiator | Any person or entity | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend Project to Project Sponsor |
| Project Sponsor | Identified in expenditure plan for each program category | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submit Funding Request to the TA • Solidify Funding Plan • Coordinate with the TA to Identify Appropriate Implementing Agency • Submit Monitoring Reports • Sign Funding Agreements |
| Project Manager/Operator | As identified by the Project Sponsor in coordination with TA | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Project • Engineer Project • Construct Project • Operate Services • Sign Funding Agreements when Applicable |
| Transportation Authority | Identified in the expenditure plan as the manager/administrator of the Measure A program | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate and Prioritize Projects • Coordinate with Sponsor to Determine Implementation Lead • Program and Allocate Funds • Monitor Projects / Programs • Sign Funding Agreements |

Table 5: Project Sponsors

| Program Category | Project Sponsors |
|--|--|
| Transit Caltrain Local Shuttles Accessible Services Ferry Dumbarton Corridor BART | SamTrans, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board SamTrans SamTrans South San Francisco, Redwood City SamTrans SamTrans |
| Highways | Caltrans, Cities, San Mateo County, C/CAG |
| Local Streets/Transportation | Cities, San Mateo County |
| Grade Separations | SamTrans, Cities, San Mateo County, Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board |
| Pedestrian and Bicycle | Cities, San Mateo County |

5.2 Project Selection Approach

As part of the Strategic Plan 2009-2013 development, the TA approved a framework to select and fund projects for each funding category. **Table 6** shows the specific approach used for each program category or sub-category. The programs where project initiators or sponsors submit projects for consideration are governed by a Call for Projects. The TA will issue a formal Call for Projects request and then the project sponsors can elect to submit projects which are then reviewed and evaluated against specific selection criteria. Other program categories are governed by plans which are specifically prepared to identify and prioritize projects on a regional or countywide basis, or by agreements which are specified in the TEP or developed by the TA consistent with the provisions of the expenditure plan.

Table 6: Project Selection Approach

| |
|---|
| Agreement Based |
| Accessible Services BART Dumbarton Rail Corridor Ferry Local Streets & Transportation |
| Plan Based |
| Alternative Congestion Relief Caltrain |
| Call for Projects |
| Grade Separations Highway Pedestrian/Bicycle Shuttles |

5.3 Agreement-based

These programs and projects are not subject to a competitive project selection process governed by the TA. They include the following program categories or sub-categories:

- Transit: Accessible Services
- Transit: BART within San Mateo County
- Transit: Dumbarton Rail Corridor
- Transit: Ferry
- Local Streets and Transportation

Transit: Accessible Services

For the Transit: Accessible Services program, funding is committed to the continuation and expansion of paratransit services operated by SamTrans as Redi-Wheels and RediCoast. The TEP allows for other supplemental services to be funded within this program. To date, these services have not yet been identified by SamTrans. If such services are identified in the future, they will be considered for funding in this category.

Transit: BART

For the Transit: BART within San Mateo County program, as outlined in an agreement with BART, SamTrans and the TA, 2 percent of Measure A sales tax revenues will be allocated to BART on an annual basis.

Local Streets and Transportation Program

For the Local Streets and Transportation program, the TA is committed to providing 22.5 percent of Measure A funding to the cities and the County of San Mateo for local transportation facility maintenance and improvement. The specific amount for each entity is determined based on the following formula: 50 percent by population and 50 percent by road mileage within each jurisdiction. Annually, the TA will update the road miles and population figures based on California Department of Transportation and Department of Finance data.

Transit: Ferry

South San Francisco and Redwood City are the designated sponsors for ferry services. There is an agreement in place for the South San Francisco Ferry Terminal construction, which was completed in 2012. Operating performance standards were established as part of this agreement using MTC's requirements for the use of Regional Measure 2 (RM2) funds. The current service is being monitored in accordance with these requirements.

Transit: Dumbarton Rail Corridor

SamTrans is designated as sponsor for the Dumbarton Rail Corridor project. Completion of the environmental document for this project is on hold pending the identification of a funding plan.

Programming and Allocations Process

The programming and allocations process for the non-competitive programs and projects with committed funding are as follows:

1. Staff Recommendation- Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1 – June 30), the TA will estimate the amount of projected revenues available for the programs and projects. Based on these estimates, the TA staff will make a programming and allocation recommendation to the Board.
2. TA Board Consideration- The Board will consider the recommendations as part of the annual TA budgeting process. Board approval will allow staff to allocate the money and complete the annual funding commitment.
3. Funding Agreements- Entities in receipt of funds from the agreement-based programs receive funding based on the conditions in their respective funding agreements. The funding agreement outlines the understanding between the funding recipient and the TA regarding the amount of funding, purpose of the funds, payment terms, any applicable reporting requirements, and

other obligations connected to the receipt of funding. BART and recipients of Local Streets and Transportation Program funds receive funding directly from the County Controller.

5.4 Plan-based

The plan-based approach requires the development of a plan for the particular category, which would include a comprehensive list of capital and/or operating projects that need to be implemented to meet the goals of the particular category. The TA and the project sponsor would use the plan to aggressively leverage external funding to implement the entire program.

Alternative Congestion Relief Programs

The TA, in conjunction with its external stakeholders, will be preparing an Alternative Congestion Relief Plan that will serve as a basis for project evaluation and the selection process.

Transit: Caltrain

Caltrain is designated as the sole recipient in this category. At least 50 percent of the annual funding allocation from Measure A can be designated for capital projects and no more than 50 percent can be used for operations. The allocation of project funding will be based on the Caltrain Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP), which the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) is required to prepare in order to receive federal and state funding. The SRTP and the annual Caltrain budgeting process will provide the basis for determining funding allocations needed for Caltrain.

Programming and Allocations Process

The programming and allocations processes for plan-based programs and projects are as follows:

1. Staff Recommendation- Prior to the beginning of each fiscal year (July 1 – June 30), the eligible project sponsors within these categories will submit funding

requests to the TA, and the TA will consider such requests within the projected revenues available for these programs. TA staff will make a programming and allocation recommendation to the Board.

2. TA Board Consideration- The Board will consider the recommendations as part of the annual TA budgeting process. Board approval will allow staff to allocate the money and complete the funding commitment.
3. Funding Agreements- Prior to receiving any disbursements of funds, the receiving entity will need to execute a funding agreement with the TA. The standard funding agreement outlines the understanding between the funding recipient and the TA regarding the amount of funding, purpose of the funds, payment terms, any applicable reporting requirements, and other obligations connected to the receipt of funding.
4. Progress Report Submittals- Project Sponsors will be required to provide annual progress reports to monitor and document appropriate use of funds.

5.5 Call for Projects

Competitive programs are those in which new projects proposed within each program category will compete for Measure A funding. The competitive programs include:

- Transit - Shuttles
- Highways
- Grade Separations
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Transit: Shuttles

The upcoming MMP to be prepared by SamTrans will serve as a basis to refine the project evaluation and selection process.

Highways

The Highway program consists of two components:

1. Key Congested Areas (KCA) – Specific projects that are defined in the Measure A TEP.
2. Supplemental Roadway Projects (SR) – A partial list of candidate projects that are defined in the Measure A TEP and sponsors may put forward other projects through the Call for Projects process.

The TA Short Range Highway Plan (2011-2021) evaluated the status of candidate KCA and SR highway projects and assessed projected costs and funding availability to help strategize the implementation of the projects. This plan should be periodically updated and used as a guide to develop the highway program CIP.

Grade Separations

Candidate grade separation projects are identified in the TEP.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

A partial list of candidate projects is identified in the TEP.

Funding Process

The process for receiving funding for new projects is:

1. Call for Projects- The TA will issue a Call for Projects by program requesting Project Sponsor(s) to submit projects for Measure A funding consideration. The frequency of the Call for Projects will differ by program over the 25-year duration of Measure A. The specific funding cycles for the programs are to be determined based on funding availability, program need and program readiness. When scheduling a Call for Projects funding cycle, the TA shall consider the timing of the request in relationship to the timing of other federal, state, and

regional funding programs in order to maximize the opportunities for obtaining funds from these sources.

2. Project Evaluation and Prioritization- The TA assembles Project Review committees to evaluate project applications and proposals. The review is based on criteria outlined in the Call for Projects. There are six general categories of criteria that are considered for project evaluation and selection: Need, Policy Consistency, Readiness, Effectiveness, Sustainability, Funding Leverage as shown listed in **Table 7**. A more detailed listing of example criteria for the competitive funding categories is contained in **Appendix D**. The criteria for each of the competitive funding programs may be modified, subject to Board approval, to retain flexibility and account for new policy directives, initiatives and legislation that further promote TEP goals.

As a first step, the *Need* for a project must be established to be considered for funding. With that basis, the project will be reviewed for Policy Consistency. Is the project consistent with the goals of the TEP and the Countywide Transportation Plan? Does it support the policies of the sponsoring city's General Plan and Specific Plans? How does this project contribute to a larger public goal?

Readiness measures the level of public and stakeholder support and viability of the project to be funded and implemented. Key indicators include the quality of the planning process that occurred to define the project, stakeholder and public support, schedule and project status, and availability of resources to implement the project. Did the sponsor coordinate with the TA to identify the entity best suited to carry out project implementation?

Effectiveness criteria will be used to evaluate the performance merits of the project. If the TA invests in a major highway improvement, how much congestion will be relieved? If it invests in a grade separation, how much does it improve safety and reduce local traffic congestion? If the TA invests in a pedestrian/bicycle bridge, how many pedestrians and bicyclists are going to use it? If it invests in a new shuttle service, how many new riders are going to use it? Effectiveness criteria will help measure benefits against the cost for building and implementing these projects.

Sustainability assesses the impact a project may have on promoting practices that maintain and/or improve the environment on a long-term basis. What is the project’s impact on the immediate ecosystem as well as the greater environment? Can the impacts be mitigated? Does the project support transit-oriented development? Are land use and transportation decisions linked together to achieve efficient

transportation options? To what extent does the project support economic development? Sustainability principles and practices should be considered in the planning, implementation and operation of projects. The 2004 Expenditure Plan specifies that projects which support transit-oriented development will be given priority.

Funding Leverage measures the level of financial commitment to a project and includes consideration for the amount of private sector contribution. Has the sponsor committed matching funds to the project, and if so how much? Does the match include any contribution from the private sector?

While **Geographic and Social Equity** are not criteria for evaluating the merit of individual projects, the Measure A program is a countywide effort that should take into consideration a relative equitable distribution of investments.

Table 7: Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria

| Need | Policy Consistency | Readiness | Effectiveness | Sustainability | Funding Leverage |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| Project Justification | 2004 Expenditure Plan | Planning Process | Congestion Relief | Environmental Impact | Matching Funds |
| | Countywide Transportation Plan | Stakeholder Support | System Connectivity | Support Transit-Oriented Development | |
| | Regional and Local Plans | Funding Commitment | Ridership | Economic Development | Private Subsidy |
| | | | Safety | Complete Streets | |
| | | | Value | | |
| | | | Reliability | | |

3. Staff Recommendation- Based on review by the Project Review Committee, staff develops project funding recommendations for Board consideration. The recommendations are clearly anchored to the program-specific project evaluation and prioritization criteria.
4. TA Board Approval- The TA Board takes action on the programming of Measure A funding. This ensures commitment to the project. Either concurrent with the programming or in a separate action, the Board will allocate funding as part of the TA's annual budget approval process. This action ensures timely availability of funds.
5. Funding Agreements- Prior to receiving any disbursements of funds, the recipient is required to execute a funding agreement with the TA. The standard funding agreement outlines the understanding between the funding recipient and the TA regarding the amount of funding, purpose of the funds, payment terms, reporting requirements and other obligations connected to the receipt of funding.
6. Monitoring Report Submittals- In order to track progress and ensure appropriate and efficient use of Measure A funds, Project Sponsors are required to submit monitoring reports.
 - a. Capital Projects- For capital projects, Project Sponsors will be required to submit monitoring reports during design development and construction. The content of the reports will be focused on project scope, schedule and budget. Post-construction, the TA will monitor the use and effectiveness of the projects as part of performance metrics that will be used to confirm that plan goals are being met. This information will also be used to inform future investment decisions.
 - b. Operating Projects- For operating projects, Project Sponsors will be required to submit performance reports. Sample performance measures include service effectiveness, service quality and customer satisfaction. This monitoring program will assist the TA in justifying the continued funding for approved operating projects. If performance measures indicate less than acceptable performance, the TA will work with the Project Sponsor to set up a mitigation program and achieve improvements as a condition of continued funding from the Measure A Program.

Section 6: Fund Management



Section 6: Fund Management

In addition to defining the process for programming and funding allocation, the TA is charged with responsibly managing the Measure A transportation sales tax revenues and is actively involved with leveraging funds in order to achieve the goals of the 2004 Measure A Expenditure Plan. The TA will focus on programming and allocating funds to projects as money becomes available as well as maximizing matching funds to increase the total investment in San Mateo County transportation infrastructure and services. The TA will treat requests for the advancement of funds as exceptions to the rule. The advancement of funds must be justified with compelling reasons that offset the impact of financing fees and/or timing of funds to other projects.

6.1 Measure A CIP and Funding Cycles

The TA will develop a CIP to manage the influx of revenues and availability of matching funds with anticipated project expenditures for the competitive capital categories that are funded through the Call for Projects process. The CIP will serve as a basis for determining the specific Call for Projects cycle for each program category. The Call for Projects cycle may differ for each program category over the 25-year duration of Measure A. With the identification of prioritized projects and continued monitoring of local and countywide short- and long-term needs and program readiness, the CIP will be fine-tuned on an on-going basis.

6.2 Matching Funds

Navigating through the network of external funding and securing matching funds is complicated. While existing federal, state and local funding programs are subject to change, a representative summary of these sources that can be leveraged with Measure A funding is contained in **Appendices E1 - E3**. Regional funds are considered as local funds.

Federal

On July 6, 2012 President Obama signed into law a new two-year transportation authorization, entitled Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21) that replaced the former Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21). MAP-21 furthers several important goals, including safety, state of good repair, performance, and program efficiency. In an effort to streamline and simplify, it consolidated many funding programs.

MAP-21 was set to expire on September 1, 2014; however, an interim extension was granted to provide a short term funding solution. A long-term solution will require the passage of a new transportation act.

Highlighted in **Appendix E1** are numerous federal sources of funding available under MAP-21 for transportation projects. The majority of the sources are allocated following a competitive process. **Appendix E1** also identifies the purpose and administrator for each funding source.

State

Appendix E2 highlights key state sources of funding for transportation projects, and planning studies. Funding under the State Highway Operation and Protection Program, the Transportation Development Act, and State Transit Assistance Funds are allocated by formula. Other State funding programs are competitive either statewide or within the Bay Area region. Notable on this list is the State's Cap and Trade program. As part of its implementation of AB 32 (the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006), the California Air Resources Board has adopted regulations to establish a new cap-and-trade program to cap the emission of greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) statewide. The State Legislature adopted an FY 2014-15 state budget that included \$872 million in appropriations from cap-and-trade revenue in the budget year as well as percentage-based, continuously appropriated categorical programs

for future year revenues. Roughly 60 percent of future year revenues would be allocated in program areas of concern to the California Transportation Commission (CTC), including 15 percent for public transit capital and operating purposes, 20 percent for affordable housing and sustainable communities, and 25 percent for the proposed high-speed rail network.

Appendix E2 identifies the purpose and administrator for each State funding source.

Local

Appendix E3 highlights key local/regional sources of funding: County Transportation Sales Tax revenues, Gasoline Tax Subventions, Regional Bridge Tolls, Vehicle License Fees, and Developer Impact Fees, and Transportation Fund for Clean Air. **Appendix E3** also identifies the purpose and administrator for each funding source.

Potential New Sources

With escalating project costs and limited availability of transportation funding, project sponsors are encouraged to explore and identify non-traditional sources of funding, which is not without significant challenges. This is essential to meeting the transportation needs of the future and the growing need for transportation investments.

Non-traditional sources of funding include innovative financing, establishing new funding sources and developing public-private partnerships.

- Traditional and Innovative financing: Mechanisms to creatively finance major infrastructure projects by bonding or borrowing against future anticipated revenue streams. This may include Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 (TIFIA, a federal credit program), lease-financing of transit vehicles, and finding ways to use future funding sources as collateral.

- New funding sources: To increase the overall funding pool, it is necessary to generate additional dollars. Support for new sources and legislation such as high-occupancy toll lanes, additional bridge tolls, indexing of the state gas tax, tax assessment districts, and pursuit of a regional gas tax are some of the potential new sources and may require legislative action.
- Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs): PPPs are being suggested as potential solutions to funding shortfalls for the completion of projects. Generally, it is a partnership between a governmental entity and a private business venture in which the cost of a project may be partially funded by the PPP in exchange for a financial return to the private investors from a portion of the revenues generated by the project. Many types of PPPs exist and most approaches are tailored to specific projects.

6.3 TA Consideration of Financing Backed by Sales Tax Revenues

Per the TEP, the TA is authorized to bond for the purpose of advancing the commencement of or expediting the delivery of transportation programs and projects. The bonding capacity will be backed by future Measure A receipts. Consideration shall be given to weighing the benefits of timely implementation of programs and projects and avoiding escalating construction costs against the costs of bonding.

6.4 Special Circumstances for Advancing Funds

There will be special circumstances when Project Sponsors need to request Measure A funding outside the established funding processes discussed in Section 5 of this Plan. For justified special circumstances, the TA has the authority to make funds available earlier than the

collection of revenues. The overriding criteria to be used in the TA's deliberation of advancing funds include:

- Urgency
 - A project that calls for immediate construction to address a public safety need
 - A project that can realize significant cost savings if it can be constructed in an earlier timeframe
 - Loss of funding sources if the project is not constructed within a certain time frame
 - Expected escalation of project development and construction costs outpace the rate of growth of Measure A revenues
- Impact to the Measure A Program
 - Potential of the funding advance delaying other projects
 - Financial fees associated with advancing funds (the potential offsetting saving in implementation costs should be considered)

When a special circumstance arises, the TA Board will consider the request based on criteria identified above. If a decision is made to advance funds, specifics about exactly how the funds will be advanced will be determined at that time. In addition the TA should use the CIPs for each of the competitive programs to determine if advancing funds by either borrowing from other programs or using financing would be an economically and fiscally prudent means of delivering high priority projects at a lower cost (adjusted for inflation), as compared to waiting and implementing projects strictly on a pay as you go approach.

Section 7: Next Steps



Section 7: Next Steps

Based on the recommendations that were developed during the preparation of the strategic plan, implementation of the plan will include the key elements summarized in **Table 8** below:

Table 8: Next Steps

| Key Elements of the Strategic Plan Implementation | |
|---|---|
| 1. | Continue with the Call for Projects processes for shuttles, highway projects, grade separations and pedestrian/bicycle projects |
| 2. | Review the Call for Projects timing to better coincide with other regional, state and federal funding programs for each category |
| 3. | Develop CIPs for the highway, grade separation and pedestrian/bicycle programs to help better manage funding needs with projected revenues and to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better plan Measure A funding cycles and align with other external funding calls • Serve as an advocacy planning tool to better leverage external funding |
| 4. | Coordinate with key stakeholders responsible for the development of countywide and regional planning efforts to better assist with Measure A project selection processes |
| 5. | Refine the project selection criteria and evaluation process categories to place greater emphasis on Complete Streets and sustainability features |
| 6. | Require sponsor coordination with the TA to determine the entity best suited to implement submitted projects and programs as part of the funding application process in order to improve project delivery |
| 7. | Explore and consider debt financing as a vehicle to advance needed projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding advances would be backed by future Measure A receipts • Need to consider financing costs versus future construction cost increases |
| 8. | Explore and develop performance metrics to better determine if funded programs and projects meet Measure A goals, taking into consideration both quantitative and qualitative methodologies |

Appendices



Appendix A

Glossary of Acronyms

Appendix A. Glossary of Acronyms

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ABAG | Association of Bay Area Governments |
| ACR | Alternative Congestion Relief |
| ADA | American with Disabilities Act |
| ATP | Active Transportation Program |
| BAAQMD | Bay Area Air Quality Management District |
| BART | Bay Area Rapid Transit |
| CTC | California Transportation Commission |
| CalMod | Caltrain Modernization Program |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation |
| C/CAG | City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County |
| C/CAG BPAC | City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee |
| C/CAG CMEQ | City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Congestion Management and Environmental Quality Committee |
| C/CAG TAC | City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County Congestion Management Program Technical Advisory Committee |
| CEQA | California Environmental Quality Act |
| CFP | Call for Projects |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Program |
| CMAQ | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program |
| CTP | Countywide Transportation Plan |
| FHWA | Federal Highway Administration |
| FTA | Federal Transit Administration |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas Emissions |
| HSIP | Highway Safety Improvement Program |
| HOV | High Occupancy Vehicle |
| HSR | High Speed Rail |
| ITS | Intelligent Transportation Systems |
| JPB | Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board |
| KCA | Key Congested Areas |
| MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century |

Appendix A. Glossary of Acronyms (Continued)

| | |
|----------------|--|
| MMP | Mobility Management Plan |
| MTC | Metropolitan Transportation Commission |
| OBAG | One Bay Area Grant |
| OTS | Office of Traffic Safety |
| OPR | State Office of Planning and Research |
| PBID | Property-based Business Improvement District |
| PDA | Planned Development Area |
| PPPs | Public-Private Partnerships |
| PTC | Positive Train Control |
| RM2 | Regional Measure 2 |
| RTIP | Regional Transportation Improvement Program |
| RTP | Regional Transportation Plan |
| SAMCEDA | San Mateo County Economic Development Association |
| SHOPP | State Highway Operation and Protection Program |
| SOV | Single Occupant Vehicle |
| SR | State Route |
| SR | Supplemental Roadways |
| SRTP | Short Range Transit Plan |
| STA | State Transit Assistance |
| STIP | State Transportation Improvement Program |
| STP | Surface Transportation Program |
| TA | San Mateo County Transportation Authority |
| TAP | Transportation Alternatives Program |
| TAZ | Traffic Analysis Zone |
| TDA | Transportation Development Act |
| TDM | Transportation Demand Management |
| TEA-21 | Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century |
| TEP | Measure A Transportation Expenditure Plan |
| TFCA | Transportation Fund for Clean Air |
| TIFIA | Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 1998 |
| TIGER | Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery Discretionary Grant Program |
| TOD | Transit Oriented Development |
| US | United States Route |
| USDOT | United States Department of Transportation |
| VMT | Vehicle Miles Traveled |
| VTA | Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority |

Appendix B

Listed Projects

Appendix B. Measure A Listed Projects

| Highway Program | Grade Separation Program | Pedestrian and Bicycle Program |
|--|--|---|
| Holly Street/US 101 Interchange Modifications (San Carlos) | 25th Avenue (San Mateo) | Alpine Road at Arastradero Road and Portola Road at Farm Hill Road Shoulder Widening (Portola Valley) |
| I-380 Congestion Improvements (San Bruno and South San Francisco) | Broadway (Burlingame) | Alpine Road Bicycle Safety Improvement Project (County of San Mateo) |
| Sand Hill Road Signal Coordination and Interconnection (I-280 to Santa Cruz Avenue - Menlo Park) | Ravenswood Avenue (Menlo Park) | Brewster Avenue Pedestrian Improvements (Redwood City) |
| Skyline Boulevard (SR 35) Widening (I-280 to Sneath Lane - San Bruno) | South Linden Avenue (South San Francisco) and Scott Street (San Bruno) | Burlingame Avenue Downtown Pedestrian and Bicycle Project (Burlingame) |
| SR 1 Congestion, Throughput and Safety Improvements (Gray Whale Cove to Miramar - unincorporated San Mateo County) | | Burlingame East Side Bicycle Route Improvements |
| SR 1 Fassler Avenue to Westport Drive (Calera Parkway - Pacifica) | | Burlingame West Side Bicycle Route Improvements |
| SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvements (Main Street to Kehoe Avenue - Half Moon Bay) | | California Drive/Bellevue Avenue Bicycle-Pedestrian Roundabout (Burlingame) |
| SR 1 Safety and Operational Improvements (Poplar Street to Wavcrest Road - Half Moon Bay) | | East Palo Alto US 101 Pedestrian and Bicycle Overcrossing |
| SR 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement (Pacifica) | | El Camino Real/Angus Avenue Intersection Improvements (San Bruno) |
| SR 92 Safety/Operational Improvements (SR 1 to Pilarcitos Creek - Half Moon Bay) | | Half Moon Bay Main Street Bridge Bicycle Lanes |
| SR 92/El Camino Real (SR 82) Ramp Modifications (San Mateo) | | Haven Avenue Streetscape (Menlo Park) |
| SR 92/South Delaware Street Feasibility Study (San Mateo) | | Highway 1 Trail Extension - Ruisseau Francais Avenue to Roosevelt Blvd (Half Moon Bay) |
| Triton Drive Widening - Foster City Boulevard to Pilgrim Drive (Foster City) | | Hillsdale Boulevard/US 101 Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge (San Mateo) |
| University Avenue/ US 101 Interchange Improvements (East Palo Alto) | | Hillside Boulevard Improvements Phase I (Colma) |
| US 101 Auxiliary Lane Project (Oyster Point Boulevard - South San Francisco to San Francisco County line) | | Hudson Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements (Redwood City) |
| US 101 Broadway Interchange (Burlingame) | | John Daly Boulevard Streetscape Improvements (Daly City) |
| US 101 Candlestick Point Interchange (Brisbane) | | Lake Merced Boulevard In-pavement Crosswalk (Daly City) |
| US 101 HOV Lane project (Whipple Avenue - Redwood City to San Bruno Avenue - San Bruno) | | Menlo Park-East Palo Alto Connectivity Project |
| US 101 Woodside Road (SR 84) Interchange (Redwood City) | | Midcoast Multi-Modal Trail (County of San Mateo) |

Appendix B. Listed Projects (Continued)

| Highway Program | Grade Separation Program | Pedestrian and Bicycle Program |
|--|--------------------------|---|
| US 101/Peninsula Avenue/Poplar Avenue Interchange Area Safety Improvements (San Mateo) | | Notre Dame Avenue Street Improvement Project (Belmont) |
| US 101/Produce Avenue Interchange (South San Francisco) | | Pedro Point Headlands Trail (Pacifica) |
| US 101/SR 92 Interchange Area Improvements (San Mateo) | | Pilot Bike-Sharing Program (Redwood City) |
| US 101/Willow Road Interchange Improvements (Menlo Park and East Palo Alto) | | Redwood City Safe Routes to Schools |
| | | San Bruno Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connection |
| | | San Mateo Citywide Bicycle Striping and Signage |
| | | South San Francisco Sharrows and Striping Program |
| | | US 101 Ralston Avenue Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing (Belmont) |
| | | US 101/Holly Street Grade Separated Path (San Carlos) |
| | | Woodside School Safety Improvement Project |

Appendix C

Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses

Focused Interest Area: How is the TA doing in meeting the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) goals?

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|--|--|--|
| Goal 1: Reduce Commute Corridor Congestion | Better integration of transportation and land use is needed. | The TEP addresses smart growth principles by stating that project selection criteria include priority for transportation projects that support TOD. |
| | Developers and apartment managers are seeing a distinct demand for TOD, and alternative transportation improvements are a desired amenity for both millennials and “empty-nesters” to reduce congestion. | |
| | The goal should be reduced congestion at all times (not just at peak) and purposes (not just home-to-work) (e.g. schools, Coastside tourist traffic). | The goals of the TEP were approved by the San Mateo County voters. Any changes would require voter approval. While the reduction of commute corridor congestion is a TEP goal, the reduction of congestion during the off-peak and for non-home to work based trips is a consideration in the project selection criteria for the competitive Measure A funding programs. |
| | Focus on transportation demand management (TDM) and utilize communications technology to address congestion. | The Alternative Congestion Relief Program exclusively focuses on TDM and intelligent transportation systems (ITS). The accommodation of Complete Streets elements in other Measure A programs can also provide more focus on these areas. |
| | More money should go to alternative transportation programs (pedestrian/ bicycle, transit, alternative congestion relief and shuttles). | The share of sales tax revenues applied to each program category is established by the TEP. Any changes to the shares would require approval of the San Mateo County voters. |
| Goal 2: Make Regional Connections | BART and Caltrain are good for north-south connections but better east-west connections are needed: Coastside to Bay, and Peninsula to East Bay (especially for transit). | Many of the Measure A program categories can support transportation improvements that improve east-west connections |
| Goal 3: Enhance Safety | Complete pedestrian/bicycle networks are needed, not just segments; gaps are a safety issue. | Regional significance and completion of gaps are components of the effectiveness criteria for the Pedestrian and Bicycle Program |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Goal 3: Enhance Safety | In regard to the safety objective of improving and maintaining local streets, roads and other transportation facilities: add “for all users” (Complete Streets). | While the TEP goals and objectives were set by the San Mateo County voters, language addressing Complete Streets is included in this Strategic Plan Update |
| Goal 4: Local Mobility Needs | There is a desire to see the TA broaden its vision of “meeting local mobility needs”: include walking and biking; include partnerships with non-profit organizations; address the Coastsides unique transportation challenges. | In addition to the pedestrian and bicycle program, pedestrian and bicycle facilities can be funded as part of Complete Streets, where appropriate, from many other Measure A programs. Project sponsors are encouraged to partner with other entities, including non-profits, where applicable but the TEP specifically lists eligible program applicants. Project selection and prioritization criteria that include stakeholder support in the project readiness criteria and policy consistency account for community concerns. |
| What’s missing in the goals? | Sustainability: Adaptability to Change, Environmental Sensitivity, and Energy Efficiency | Sustainability is a project selection and prioritization criteria for the competitive Measure A programs. While the TEP goals were approved by the San Mateo County voters, the project prioritization criteria can be modified as needed to reflect changing conditions with each subsequent CFP. |

Focused Interest Area: Call for Projects Process

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Project Selection Criteria | The general criteria seem to be working; we don’t need to put a particular emphasis on one or the other. Weighting of the criteria should occur at the Call for Projects (CFP) stage and can vary program to program. | The project selection and prioritization criteria for the competitive Measure A programs can be modified as needed to account for new requirements and contemporary concepts that promote the TEP goals. Multimodal connectivity and public support are currently included in the project selection and prioritization criteria. |
| | Need to adapt to new requirements/ contemporary concepts, but it is difficult to pin down what changes are appropriate for the TA to make. | |
| | Consideration should be given to projects that connect to other modes and demonstrate public support. | |
| | Weighting is paramount in project evaluation: a “big ticket” project had better have a very large benefit. | Project effectiveness is part of the project selection and prioritization criteria. The consideration of costs and benefits are factors in the determination of project effectiveness |
| | Impact per dollar should be used to evaluate projects. | |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Project Selection Criteria | There is inherent unfairness in the TOD criterion – some communities don’t have TODs; this presents a geographic equity issue. | The TEP project selection criteria include priority for transportation projects that support TOD; however, the Measure A program is a countywide effort that takes into consideration investments throughout the County as part of geographic equity |
| | Plan Bay Area ties everything to TODs and PDAs – the Coastside is not as competitive for MTC funding opportunities, yet still has needs, and the region is vital to the county. There need to be other considerations to balance out the strong focus on PDAs/TOD. | |
| | TA funding decisions need to take into account which cities are proactively linking transportation and land use. | |
| | We need to better define geographic equity – we need to spend the money where it is most needed (by congestion, by road mileage, communities of concern). | Measure A addresses geographic equity on a program-wide basis. The project selection and prioritization criteria address concerns such as congestion and disadvantaged populations under the categories of project need and effectiveness |
| | Regarding geographic equity, we shouldn’t just automatically allocate everything equally – areas with little to no congestion should receive lower priority. | |
| | Given the doubling of the 65+ population, consideration needs to be given to improving safety and access to seniors and the disabled in the pedestrian and bicycle program. | This will be added as a consideration in the project effectiveness category for the project selection and prioritization criteria |
| | When evaluating transportation projects all alternatives should be considered, including solutions that consist of other transportation modes. | We concur that all viable alternatives should be considered as part of a sponsor due diligence when submitting a project for funding consideration. The TA will work with the project sponsor toward this effort. |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

Focused Interest Area: Call for Projects Process

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|---|--|---|
| Leveraging other federal state and regional funding sources | TA funding priorities need to align with MTC/Fed/State funding priorities (e.g. OBAG language) to become more competitive for discretionary funds. | Sufficient flexibility exists to modify the project selection and prioritization criteria with each Call for Projects process to better align with external funding agency policies and changing paradigms. Consideration of external funding calls, when sufficient advance notice is known, will be taken into account with the timing of future Measure A funding calls. |
| | Allow sufficient flexibility in TA policies so that they can align with changing paradigms such as Complete Streets. | |
| | Joint calls with C/CAG provide the ability to leverage other funding sources (e.g. San Mateo Shuttle Program with C/CAG). | |
| | Getting projects shovel-ready will make them more competitive for one-time funding opportunities. | |
| | Hold CFPs timed to allow jurisdictions to secure local funds that can then be leveraged to secure fed/state/regional funds. (time far enough in advance of major external calls). | |
| Sponsor Implementation | There is flexibility in the current process, and it is working fine – locals are responsible for garnering local support, while TA involvement is needed for larger multi-regional projects. | The TA will be taking a more active role coordinating project delivery decisions with project sponsors based on staffing resources, expertise and available funding. |
| | All project stakeholders need to agree based on what makes the most sense in terms of resources, expertise, and funding. | |
| | Cities should remain at the forefront of project delivery – they need to feel they have ownership of the project (especially public outreach). | |
| | Cities do not always have the skill set to deliver certain projects (grade separations, shuttles). | |
| | The right entity to deliver a project depends on the type of project and the dollar amount (i.e. a city is the best to deliver a \$100k pedestrian/bicycle project, but Caltrans may be the appropriate implementer for a multi-million dollar highway project). | |
| | The TA should take a more active role in advancing projects of regional priority/significance (i.e. a regional corridor). | |
| | The TA needs to look at the big picture to ensure that city-led projects are producing countywide benefits. | |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|--|--|--|
| Other program/ project delivery related comments | The role of the TA needs to be better-defined: is it just as the banker? | The TA administers the Measure A programs, including setting the policy framework to guide fund programming and allocation processes and decisions. |
| | A greater emphasis on pedestrian/bicycle funding is needed; “we need to go back to the voters to increase the share of funding available for pedestrians and bicyclists.” Bicycling as a mode share has gone up; we need to re-align funding with current trends. | <p>“The needs of the Measure A transportation programs far outweigh available revenues. An increase in the share of revenues for one program without an overall increase in the sales tax would result in the reduction of revenue available for one or more other Measure A programs. While funding for the pedestrian/bicycle program is capped at three percent, pedestrian and bicycle elements can be included in projects funded from other programs as part of Complete Streets. Sponsors are also encouraged to apply to other grant programs to help leverage Measure A funds for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.</p> <p>The Local Streets and Transportation Program is the only program that explicitly allows for maintenance. Enhancement projects currently are allowed under other Measure A programs. “</p> |
| | The projected mode share growth for bicyclists in relation to all transportation modes through 2040 in the Plan is very low (less than 2%) and the amount of funding for the pedestrian/bicycling program is limited, which can become a self-fulfilling prophecy. Other places such as San Francisco and Portland have a higher bicycling mode share today and there is no reason why San Mateo County can't have bicycle usage on par with other progressive localities. | |
| | If we are not able to increase the amount of funding in the Local Streets and Transportation Program for road maintenance, can we change the definition of a project in other related programs so that a rehabilitation or enhancement project could qualify as a new project? | |
| | Don't make decisions in a silo. All stakeholders should be consulted as part of a collaborative approach to solving transportation issues. | The TA proactively works with external stakeholders on programmatic transportation issues of regional significance including the following upcoming work efforts: 1) Participation with SamTrans in the development of the Mobility Management Plan (MMP), which will help determine the entities best positioned to provide cost effective shuttle service and update existing shuttle performance benchmarks; and 2) Partnering with C/CAG in its efforts to develop a capital improvement program (CIP) and performance measures for transportation projects as part of the update to the existing Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP). |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

Focused Interest Area: Performance Measures

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|---|---|--|
| <p>How best to measure the performance of the Measure A programs?</p> | <p>There needs to be better measurement to make sure we're delivering on the goals: how do we know if a project is actually reducing congestion? How do we know if investment in transit vs. highway is the best use of funds?</p> | <p>The TA will be exploring and developing programwide performance measures. Project level performance for the competitive Measure A programs will also be assessed against sponsor application responses to effectiveness criteria.</p> |
| | <p>There needs to be a plan to measure the baseline case vs after the project completion to determine effectiveness.</p> | |
| | <p>Collision data should be used to measure effectiveness of safety-related projects.</p> | |
| | <p>Metrics used to determine effectiveness of one mode may actually be detrimental to other modes (e.g. improved automobile throughput is considered positive for a highway project, but could be negative for pedestrian/bicycle safety).</p> | |
| | <p>If funding an alternative transportation mode, there's a need to know how much mode shift actually occurred as a result of the project; similarly, a highway project should demonstrate actual congestion reduction.</p> | |
| | <p>Look at congestion on a per capita basis – on the Coastside, the actual volume of cars is lower, but the per-lane congestion is similar.</p> | |
| | <p>Provide guidance to improve shuttles if they are not performing; pull funding in second year if no signs of improvement.</p> | |
| | <p>Measure travel time, increase in safety, mode shift after project delivery – were the projections met or not?</p> | |
| | <p>When developing performance measures for large capital projects, consider impacts to the local community during construction in addition to assessing conditions before and after project implementation.</p> | |
| | <p>Suggested performance measure to evaluate program success should include vehicle miles traveled (VMT), bicycle and pedestrian counts, participation in employer commute programs, reductions in collisions, reductions in emissions, ridership and user surveys.</p> | |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

Focused Interest Area: Contemporary Concepts

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| Complete Streets/ Sustainability | Should be encouraged when it can be accommodated. Not all projects can include Complete Streets elements; in that case, it should not affect scoring of the project. | The Strategic Plan Update incorporates language addressing the contemporary concepts of Complete Streets and Sustainability. Both of these concepts are currently included as considerations in the CFP project selection and prioritization criteria. In order to allow for flexibility, a strict cap for Complete Streets elements has not been set but the project sponsor is responsible for demonstrating the need and effectiveness for the respective program with its funding application. |
| | An unfunded state mandate per the Complete Streets Act. Need to include Complete Streets considerations due to regulatory requirements imposed on projects. | |
| | Complete Streets doesn't mean every street. If appropriate, then maybe something should be included. | |
| | We don't know what the flavor of the month regulatory agency requirement will be down the road; we need to remain flexible to changing requirements. | |
| | A cap should be set for how much of a highway project funding can go toward Complete Streets elements. If the Complete Streets portion exceeds the cap, funds need to come from the other relevant category (i.e. pedestrian/ bicycle program funds to fund the Complete Streets portion of highway project which exceeded the cap). | |
| | For the majority of projects, Complete Streets elements are not a major cost (e.g. striping a bicycle lane); keep it flexible. | |
| | There is a limited amount of funding; we need to make sure we are addressing project needs | |
| | Pedestrian/bicycle projects that are within a highway corridor should be eligible for highway funding. Highway funds should not be exclusively devoted to projects which primarily benefit motorists. | |
| | Just as highway widening is used to address congestion, alternative transportation modes are also a way to address congestion. | |
| | Sustainability is a regulatory requirement speaking to green features such as water quality, energy efficiency, and lighting. | |
| | The Strategic Plan should include stronger language regarding Complete Streets so it's not "business as usual" at the expense of non-motorized transportation modes. Highway, Grade Separation and Local Streets and Transportation Program funds should also be used for bicycle and pedestrian projects. | |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| Complete Streets/ Sustainability | We support the Plan recommendation to integrate Complete Streets in the evaluation criteria for the highway and grade separation programs. Incorporation of Complete Streets should also be incorporated into the Local Streets and Transportation Program as contingent upon cities for receiving funds. | Local Streets and Transportation Program funds are allocated directly to the cities and county by the State Board of Equalization for the improvement and maintenance of local transportation, including streets and roads. The cities and county determine the projects that are funded, which can include complete streets elements. Federal ADA law requires the provision of accessibility improvements with the rehabilitation/resurfacing of streets. |
| | The Alternative Congestion Relief (ACR) Program should include funds for active transportation encouragement. | Active transportation is an eligible use of ACR funds. ACR funds currently help fund Bike to Work day, bicycle education and bicycle parking programs. |

Appendix C. Stakeholder/Public Comments and TA Responses (Continued)

Focused Interest Area: Other Comments

| Topics | Detailed Comments | Response |
|--|--|--|
| Regional Governance | It would be desirable to identify a responsible agency to look at all transportation modes and consider gaps and opportunities to shift mode share for the major transportation corridors on the San Francisco Peninsula (e.g. 101, 280, El Camino and the Caltrain Corridor). | Comment noted. The C/CAG CTP sets policy to address all transportation modes as part of one system within San Mateo County and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) sets transportation policies covering the entire San Francisco Bay Area as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Plan Bay Area. |
| Transportation Mode Share Shift | We encourage the TA to proactively set goals for mode share to contribute to a shift from single occupancy vehicle (SOV) trips to active transportation and transit trips. We recommend a goal of at least a 10% bicycle mode share for all trips by 2040. | The TA encourages project sponsors to work with their constituents to submit projects that can have the greatest impact on reducing SOV trips. The update of the C/CAG CTP may be a more appropriate venue to discuss the potential inclusion of countywide mode share goals |
| SB 743, Proposed revisions on CEQA guidelines for analyzing transportation impacts | There is an opportunity to assess impacts for roadway and highway projects based on revised CEQA guidelines that focus on vehicle miles traveled (VMT). If the impacts are unfavorable, such projects may benefit from reconsideration. | Comment noted. The State Office of Planning and Research (OPR) released draft guidelines for determining the significance of transportation impacts, alternatives and mitigation measures that were out for public comment at the time this Plan was prepared. |
| San Mateo County VMT trends | Nationwide, VMT per capita has been on a downward trend. Transportation models continue to predict increasing vehicle travel. The TA should examine the assumptions in models used to predict travel demand in light of long term trends. | San Mateo County is projected to experience substantial population and employment growth out through the year 2040. It is possible to have a reduction in VMT per capita while experiencing an overall increase in VMT. The majority of all trips currently are and will continue to be made by automobiles as noted in the Demographic and Travel Data section of this Plan. |
| Proposed Calera Parkway Highway Project in Pacifica | Residents at the public outreach meeting in Pacifica and through separate e-mail correspondence have expressed concerns regarding the Calera Parkway project. | The purpose of the TA Strategic Plan is to set the policy framework that guides programming and allocation criteria, including funding prioritization and evaluation criteria for the selection of projects and procedures for sponsors to initiate projects. Project specific concerns should be directed to the project sponsor, which can choose to withdraw a project, and are beyond the venue of the Strategic Plan. |
| Listed Projects | Concern expressed that a listed project in the Strategic Plan will automatically continue to receive funding through project completion. | Listed projects do not receive funding priority for subsequent phases of work that have yet to be programmed or allocated. Applications to fund subsequent phases of a listed project are evaluated based on how well the respective project meets the program evaluation criteria. |

Appendix D

Detailed Project Selection Criteria

Appendix D. Detailed Project Selection Criteria

| Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria LOCAL SHUTTLES | |
|---|--|
| Requirements | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sponsor is SamTrans 2. Project is located in San Mateo County 3. Project is a shuttle service that meets local mobility needs or provides access to regional transit 4. Funding is for operations 5. Funding request does not supplant existing funds 6. Does not duplicate fixed-route bus service or other public shuttle service | |
| Example Project Prioritization Criteria | |
| Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides congestion relief in San Mateo County • Provides service to an area underserved by other public transit • Provides service to special populations (.e.g. low income/transit dependent, seniors, disabled, other) • Demonstrates stakeholder support |
| Policy Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA 2004 Expenditure Plan • Countywide Transportation Plan • Community Based Transportation and Lifeline Plans • City General Plan, Specific Plan, other local plans • Grand Boulevard Initiative Guiding Principles • MTC Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) • Americans with Disabilities Act |
| Readiness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Solid service plan in place describing how the shuttle service will be delivered, including a marketing and oversight plan • Solid funding plan in place • Results from a public planning process |
| Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ridership • Operating cost per passenger • Passengers per service hour • Reduces single occupant vehicle (SOV) trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) • Improves access to major transit hubs and transit services |
| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports jobs and housing growth with an emphasis on transit oriented development/ economic development • Use of clean fuel vehicles for service • Shuttles accommodate bicycles • Demonstrated cost savings through sharing of resources |
| Funding Leverage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of matching fund contribution • Private sector contribution |

Appendix D. Detailed Project Selection Criteria (Continued)

| Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN | |
|---|--|
| Requirements | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sponsor is San Mateo County or a city in San Mateo County 2. Project is located in San Mateo County 3. Project encourages walking and/or bicycling 4. Funding is for project development and/or construction of facilities 5. Funding request does not supplant existing funds | |
| Example Project Prioritization Criteria | |
| Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets commuter and/or recreational purpose • Fulfills an identified pedestrian and/or bicycle need • Safety improvement/enhancement |
| Policy Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TA 2004 Expenditure Plan • Countywide Transportation Plan • San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan • City Bicycle or Pedestrian Plan • City General Plan, Specific Plan, other local plans • Grand Boulevard Initiative Guiding Principles • MTC Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) • Americans with Disabilities Act |
| Readiness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Results from a public planning process • Demonstrates stakeholder support • Has a solid funding plan • Project status |
| Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides connectivity to pedestrian and bicycle system • Closes gap in countywide pedestrian and bicycle network • Enhances connectivity to schools, transit stations, and other activity centers • Value: Benefit relative to the amount of funding requested (high impact, low cost projects – “bang for the buck”) • Accommodates multiple transportation modes (pedestrian and bicycle) • Serves a low income/transit dependent or other special needs population |
| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduces emissions and improves air quality • Includes low environmental impact/green development • Improves links for pedestrian and/or bicycle access between TOD, transit and other high use activity centers • Supports livable, walkable and healthy communities • Integral transportation component that can support existing economic activity and help spur new economic development in the immediate vicinity |
| Funding Leverage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of matching fund contribution • Private sector contribution |

Appendix D. Detailed Project Selection Criteria (Continued)

| Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria GRADE SEPARATIONS | |
|---|---|
| Requirements | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sponsor is SamTrans, San Mateo County, city in San Mateo County or the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board 2. Project is located in San Mateo County 3. Project is one of 46 candidate grade separation projects listed in the 2004 Expenditure Plan 4. Funding is for project development and/or construction of facilities 5. Funding request does not supplant existing funds 6. Project must be consistent with the Caltrain/High Speed Rail (HSR) blended system | |
| Example Project Prioritization Criteria | |
| Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantitative assessment based on the California Public Utilities Commission Grade Separation Priority List Index Formula • Description of need with respect to Caltrain and the local jurisdiction • Identified safety issue • Identified traffic issue |
| Policy Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project recognized in state and/or regional planning documents • Project is referenced in county planning documents • Project is referenced in local planning documents |
| Readiness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project status and schedule • Ease and speed of implementation • Results from a public planning process • Demonstrates stakeholder support • Has a solid funding plan |
| Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety and traffic benefit • Regional benefit to the Caltrain system • Cost effectiveness • Impact of alignment with neighboring crossings, where applicable |
| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project accommodates multiple transportation modes (Complete Streets), where contextually appropriate and to the extent feasible • Project supports transit oriented development • Supports economic activity and spurs new economic development in the vicinity • Includes green construction practices and design elements |
| Funding Leverage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of matching fund contribution • Private sector contribution |

Appendix D. Detailed Project Selection Criteria (Continued)

| Project Selection and Prioritization Criteria HIGHWAY | |
|---|---|
| Requirements | |
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sponsor is Caltrans, C/CAG, San Mateo County or a city in San Mateo County 2. Project is located in San Mateo County 3. Project is one of 11 specific projects within the 5 identified Key Congestion Areas listed in the 2004 Expenditure Plan or a Supplemental Roadway project, which is intended to reduce congestion and improve throughput along critical congested corridors. 4. Funding is for project development and/or construction of facilities 5. Funding request does not supplant existing funds | |
| Example Project Prioritization Criteria | |
| Need | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current congestion • Projected congestion • Located in a Countywide Transportation Plan Priority Corridor (high or very high) • Identified safety issue |
| Policy Consistency | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project recognized in regional planning documents • Project is referenced in county planning documents • Project is referenced in local planning documents |
| Readiness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project status and schedule • Ease and speed of implementation • Results from a public planning process • Demonstrates stakeholder support • Has a solid funding plan |
| Effectiveness | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability to relieve congestion • Performance improvement • Ability to address safety issue • Regional significance • Demonstrates coordination with adjacent projects/integration of inter-related projects • Cost effectiveness |
| Sustainability | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is primarily an operational improvement rather than infrastructure expansion • Project accommodates multiple transportation modes (Complete Streets), where contextually appropriate and to the extent feasible • Project supports transit oriented development • Supports economic activity and spurs new economic development in the vicinity • Includes green construction practices and design elements |
| Funding Leverage | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Percent of matching fund contribution • Private sector contribution |

Appendix E

Funding Sources

Appendix E1. Federal Funding Sources

| Funding Source* | Purpose | Administrator |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Formula Program | Purchase of buses, trains, ferries, vans, and other capital improvement, and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) required paratransit service. Distributed through the regional Transit Capital Priorities process. | FTA/MTC |
| FTA Section 5337 State of Good Repair | Under MAP-21, replaces the fixed guideway modernization program (Section 5309). Funding is limited to fixed guideway systems (including rail, bus rapid transit, and passenger ferries) and buses operating in high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes. Projects are limited to capital projects required to maintain systems in a state of good repair. | FTA/MTC |
| FTA Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program | Provides capital assistance for new and replacement buses, related equipment, and facilities. Part of the Transit Capital Priorities process. | FTA/MTC |
| FHWA – STP | To preserve and improve conditions and performance on any Federal-aid highway, bridge and tunnel projects on any public road, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and transit capital projects, including intercity bus terminals. Portion of funds included in OneBayArea Grant program. | FHWA/ MTC |
| FHWA – CMAQ | Transportation projects that improve air quality and relieve congestion. Portion of funds included in OneBayArea Grant program. | FHWA / Caltrans / MTC |
| FTA Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Capital Investment Grants (New Starts, Small Starts and Core Capacity) | Capital support for light rail, rapid rail, commuter rail, automated fixed guideway systems, or a busway/high occupancy vehicle (HOV) facility, or an extension of any of these. Under MAP-21, includes “core capacity” projects on existing rail lines to improve capacity of the corridor. | FTA |
| Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) | Eligible activities consist of Transportation Alternatives, Recreational Trails, Safe Routes to School, Planning/Design/ Construction of roadway in right of way of former highways. Set aside of the apportionment of several fund programs. | Caltrans |
| Highway-Rail Grade Crossings Program/ HSIP | Develop and implement safety improvement projects to reduce the number and severity of accidents at public highway-rail grade crossings, including signing and pavement markings at crossings, active warning devices, crossing surface improvements, sight distance improvements, grade separations, and the closing and consolidation of crossings. | FHWA / Caltrans |

Appendix E1. Funding Sources (Continued)

| Funding Source* | Purpose | Administrator |
|--|---|---------------|
| Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary Grant Program | The TIGER Discretionary Grant program provides a unique opportunity for the DOT to invest in road, rail, transit and port projects that promise to achieve critical national objectives. | USDOT |
| Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) | California's Local HSIP focuses on infrastructure projects with nationally recognized crash reduction factors (CRFs). | Caltrans |
| FTA Section 5312 Research, Development, Demonstration, and Deployment | To support research activities that improve the safety, reliability, efficiency, and sustainability of public transportation by investing in the development, testing, and deployment of innovative technologies, materials, and processes. | FTA |
| FTA Section 5312 Low or No Emission Vehicle Deployment Program | The main purpose of the LoNo Program is to deploy the cleanest and most energy efficient U.S.-made transit buses that have been largely proven in testing and demonstrations but are not yet widely deployed in transit fleets. The LoNo Program provides funding for transit agencies for capital acquisitions and leases of zero emission and low-emission transit buses, including acquisition, construction, and leasing of required supporting facilities such as recharging, refueling, and maintenance facilities. | FTA |
| Transit-oriented Development (TOD) Planning Pilot | Provides funding to advance planning efforts that support transit-oriented development (TOD) associated with new fixed-guideway and core capacity improvement projects that focuses growth around transit stations. | FTA |

*Note: Funding sources presented in no particular order

Appendix E2. State Funding Sources

Appendix E2. State Funding Sources

| Funding Source* | Purpose | Administra- tor |
|--|--|------------------------------|
| State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP) | State highway rehabilitation projects | Caltrans |
| Transportation Development Act (TDA) | Transit capital and operating expenses | MTC |
| State Transit Assistance Funds (STA) | Transit capital and operating expenses | MTC |
| State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) / Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) | Roadway and transit capital improvement projects, road rehabilitation, interregional improvements | Caltrans/ MTC |
| Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) | Safety projects, with pedestrian/bicycle safety a priority. | Caltrans OTS |
| Active Transportation Program (ATP) | Consolidation of previous bicycle and pedestrian funding programs and is designed to promote active modes of transportation, such as walking and biking, and to ensure disadvantaged communities share fully in the program. | California |
| California Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant Program | Funds a wide range of transportation planning studies that promote a balanced comprehensive multimodal transportation system. Consists of Strategic Partnerships and Sustainable Communities grants. Replaces former environmental justice, community based and transit planning grant activities, which are eligible under the new program. | Caltrans |
| Cap and Trade Program | Reduction of the region's transportation-related emissions by: Support Communities of Concern (25% of revenues); Supports Transit Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program, Transit Operating and Efficiency Program, OneBayArea Grant program; Climate Initiatives Program, including Safe Routes to Schools, and goods movement projects. | Various State Agencies |
| Proposition 1B | General obligation bonds for various programs: transportation corridor improvements, trade infrastructure and port security projects, school bus retrofit and replacement, state transportation improvement program, transit and passenger rail improvements, state-local partnership transportation projects, transit security projects, local bridge seismic retrofit projects, highway-railroad grade separation and crossing improvement projects, state highway safety and rehabilitation projects, and local street and road improvement, congestion relief, and traffic safety. | California |
| Section 190 Program | Provides funding to projects that either alter or reconstruct existing grade separations, construct new grade separations to eliminate existing at-grade crossings or relocate roadways to eliminate at-grade crossings, thereby improving safety and expediting the moment of vehicles. Eligible projects must first be nominated to the California Public Utilities Commission's Grade Separation Priority List. | Caltrans |

*Note: Funding sources presented in no particular order

Appendix E3. Local/Regional Funding Sources

Appendix E3. Local/Regional Funding Sources

| Funding Source* | Purpose | Administrator |
|---|---|---|
| OneBayArea Grant Program | Integrates the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law and Sustainable Communities Strategy; provides funding investments in surface transportation for a wide variety of programs including mass transit, highway, local road and bicycle and pedestrian projects. | MTC |
| Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) | Funds regional competitive and county funding categories. Implementation of the most cost-effective projects in the Bay Area which will decrease motor vehicle emissions and improve air quality. | Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) |
| Other County Sales Tax Revenues | Transportation improvements per the guidance from sales tax statutes | Counties |
| Gasoline Tax Subventions | Local streets and road maintenance and rehabilitation | Cities and Counties |
| Regional Bridge Tolls | Projects that mitigate and relieve traffic congestion on the bridges (AB 664, 2%-5%, Regional Measure 2) | MTC |
| Measure M Vehicle Registration Fee | \$10 per year vehicle registration fee in San Mateo County funds local streets and roads, transit operations, senior transportation, ITS/Smart Corridors, Safe Routes to Schools, and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System / Municipal Regional Permits | C/CAG |
| Developer Impact Fees | Cost to local government of a new development, including roads, sidewalks, sewers, and utilities | Local Governments |
| Property-based Business Improvement District (PBID) / Other Assessments | Generally downtown improvements and services associated with businesses. | Local Governments |

*Note: Funding sources presented in no particular order

Acknowledgements

San Mateo County Transportation Authority

Project Team

April Chan, Executive Officer, Planning & Development
Joe Hurley, Director, Transportation Authority Program
Joel Slavit, Manager, Programming and Monitoring
Pete Rasmussen, Planner
William Hurrell, CDM Smith
Terri O'Connor, CDM Smith

Staff/Consultant Support

Seamus Murphy, Director, Government and Community Affairs
Eva Goode, Director, Grants
Christiane Kwok, Manager, Market Research and Development
Sheila Tioyao, Manager, General Ledger
Jim McKim, Project Manager
Brent Tietjen, Public Affairs Specialist
Shirley Rosales, Executive Assistant
Brian Soland, CDM Smith
Kelly Clonts, CDM Smith
Ted Huynh, CDM Smith
David Chew, CDM Smith
Paula Hirsch, CDM Smith
Nancy Whelan, Nancy Whelan Consulting
Shannon Gaffney, Nancy Whelan Consulting
Mary Pryor, Nancy Whelan Consulting
Adrian Filice, Nancy Whelan Consulting

Citizens Advisory Committee

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Barbara Arietta, Chair | Laurie Simonson, Vice Chair |
| John Baker | Diana Bautista |
| Jim Bigelow | John Fox |
| Richard Hedges | Randall Hees |
| Jeff Londer | Daina Lujan |
| Doris Maez | Lawrence Shaine |
| April Vargas | William Warhurst |
| Jim Whitemore | |

Appendix I: Land Use Guidelines and Compliance Monitoring

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTING THE LAND USE COMPONENT OF THE CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

All land use changes or new developments that require a negative declaration or an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and that are projected to generate a net (subtracting existing uses that are currently active) 100 or more trips per hour at any time during the a.m. or p.m. peak hour period, must be reported to C/CAG within ten days of completion of the initial study prepared under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Peak period includes 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. **Peak hour is defined as the hour when heaviest daily traffic volume occurs and generally occurs during morning and afternoon commute times. Traffic counts are obtained during AM and PM peak periods and the volume from the heaviest hour of AM or PM traffic is used to define peak hour for those time periods. The highest number of net trips resulting from AM or PM peak hour will be used. Net trips are calculated by subtracting trips for existing uses from those generated by the new project.** Although projects that generate less than 100 peak hour trips are not subject to these guidelines, local jurisdictions are strongly encouraged to apply them to all projects, particularly where the jurisdiction has determined that the impacts of the project will have an adverse effect on traffic in that jurisdiction.

These guidelines are not intended to establish a Countywide **threshold** of significance of 100 peak hour trips for CEQA purposes. The determination of what level of traffic results in a significant impact is left in the first instance to the local jurisdiction. These guidelines do contemplate, however, that all trips resulting from projects that are reviewed by C/CAG and fall under these guidelines will be mitigated, whether or not it rises to a level of significance under CEQA.

Local jurisdictions must ensure that the developer and/or tenants will reduce the demand for all new peak hour trips (including the first 100 trips) projected to be generated by the development. The local jurisdiction can select one or more of the options that follow or may propose other methods for mitigating the trips. It is up to the local jurisdiction working together with the project sponsor to choose the method(s) that will be compatible with the intended purpose of the project and the community that it will serve. The options identified in these guidelines are not intended to limit choices. Local jurisdictions are encouraged to be creative in developing options that meet local needs while accomplishing the goal of mitigating new peak hour trips. The additional measures that are not specifically included in these guidelines should be offered for review by C/CAG staff in advance of approving the project. Appeals to the decisions by C/CAG staff will be taken to the full C/CAG Board for consideration.

The Congestion Management Program roadway network includes all state highways and selected principal arterials. When considering land use projects, local jurisdictions may either require that mitigation for impacts to the Congestion Management Program roadway network be finally determined and imposed as a condition of approval of the project, or may conditionally approve such project, conditioned on compliance with the requirements to mitigate the impacts to the Congestion Management Program roadway network. In those instances where conditional approval is given, a building permit may not be issued for the project until the required mitigation is determined and subsequently imposed on the project.

Some of the choices for local jurisdictions include:

1. Reduce the scope of the project so that it will generate less than 100 net peak hour trips.
2. Build adequate roadway and/or transit improvements so that the added peak hour trips will have no measurable impact on the Congestion Management Program roadway network.
3. If a local jurisdiction currently collects traffic mitigation fees, any portion of the fees that are used to mitigate the impacts of the project's traffic on the Congestion Management Program roadway network will count as a credit toward the reduction in the demand for trips required under the Congestion Management Program. The developer may also contribute a one-time only payment of \$20,000 per peak hour trip (including the first 100 trips) to a special fund for the implementation of appropriate transportation demand management system measures at that development. These funds will be used to implement transportation demand management programs that serve the development making the contribution.
4. Require the developer and all subsequent tenants to implement Transportation Demand Management programs that have the capacity to fully reduce the demand for new peak hour trips. The developer/tenants will not be held responsible for the extent to which these programs are actually used. **The developer shall pay for a monitoring program for the first three years of the development. The purpose of the monitoring program is to assess the compliance of the project with the final TDM plan.** The following is a list of acceptable programs and the equivalent number of trips that will be credited as reduced. Programs can be mixed and matched so long as the total mitigated trips is equal to or greater than the new peak hour trips generated by the project. These programs, once implemented, must be on going for the occupied life of the development. Programs may be substituted with prior approval of C/CAG, so long as the number of **mitigated trips** is not **reduced**. Additional measures may be proposed to C/CAG for consideration. Also there may be special circumstances that warrant a different amount of credit for certain measures. For example, a developer may elect to contract with the Alliance or another provider of TDM services to meet this requirement. These situations can also be submitted to C/CAG in advance for consideration. It is up to each local jurisdiction to use its best judgment to determine the extent to which certain measures are "reasonable and effective." For example, there will be a point where additional showers will not result in more people riding bicycles or walking to work.
5. Adopt Congestion Management Program guidelines for projects within its jurisdiction and submit those guidelines for approval by C/CAG. The local jurisdiction would then apply these guidelines to the appropriate level of project and provide an annual report describing affected projects and guidelines applied. C/CAG would review the jurisdiction's efforts on an annual basis and could require amendments to the jurisdiction's guidelines if the jurisdiction's guidelines were not meeting Congestion Management Program goals.

6. Adopt the C/CAG guidelines for application to the appropriate level of project in the jurisdiction, and submit an annual report describing affected projects and guidelines applied. C/CAG would review the jurisdiction's efforts on an annual basis and could require amendments to the jurisdiction's guidelines if the jurisdiction's guidelines were not meeting Congestion Management Program goals.
7. Negotiate with C/CAG staff for other acceptable ways to mitigate the trips for specific developments on a case-by-case basis.
8. **C/CAG recognizes that for retail or special uses appropriate TDM measures may be difficult to implement. Please contact C/CAG to develop appropriate measures for these types of projects.**

Transportation

| <u>Demand Management Measure</u> | <u>Number of Trips Credited</u> | <u>Rationale</u> |
|--|---|---|
| Secure bicycle storage | One peak hour trip will be credited for every 3 new bike lockers/racks installed and maintained. Lockers/racks must be installed within 100 feet of the building. | Experience has shown that bicycle commuters will average using this mode one-third of the time, especially during warmer summer months. |
| Showers and changing rooms. | Ten peak hour trips will be credited for each new combination shower and changing room installed. An additional 5 peak hour trips will be credited when installed in combination with at least 5 bike lockers | 10 to 1 ratio based on cost to build and the likelihood that bicycle utilization will increase. |
| Operation of a dedicated shuttle service during the peak period to a rail station or an urban residential area. Alternatively the development could buy into a shuttle consortium. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each peak-hour round trip seat on the shuttle. Increases to two trips if a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is also in place. Five additional trips will be credited if the shuttle stops at a child-care facility enroute to/from the worksite. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (one seat in a shuttle equals one auto trip reduced); utilization increases when a guaranteed ride home program is also made available. |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Charging employees for parking. | Two peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot charged out at \$20 per month for one year. Money shall be used for TDM measures such as shuttles or subsidized transit tickets. | Yields a two-to-one ratio |
| Subsidizing transit tickets for employees. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each transit pass that is subsidized at least \$20 per month for one year. One additional trip will be credited if the subsidy is increased to \$75 for parents using transit to take a child to childcare enroute to work. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (one transit pass equals one auto trip reduced). |
| Subsidizing pedestrians/bicyclists who commute to work. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each employee that is subsidized at least \$20 per month for one year. | Yields a one-to-one ratio (One pedestrian/bicyclist equals one auto trip reduced). |
| Creation of preferential parking for carpoolers. | Two peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot reserved. | Yields a two-to-one ratio (one reserved parking spot equals a minimum of two auto trips reduced). |
| Creation of preferential parking for vanpoolers. | Seven peak hour trips will be credited for each parking spot reserved. | Yields a seven-to-one ratio (one reserved parking spot equals a minimum of seven auto trips reduced). |
| Implementation of a vanpool program. | Seven peak hour trips will be credited for each vanpool arranged by a specific program operated at the site of the development. Increases to ten trips if a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is also in place. | The average van capacity is seven. |

Operation of a commute assistance center, offering on site, one stop shopping for transit and commute alternatives information, preferably staffed with a live person to assist building tenants with trip planning.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each feature added to the information center; and an additional one peak hour trip will be credited for each hour the center is staffed with a live person, up to 20 trips per each 200 tenants. Possible features may include:

- Transit information brochure rack
- Computer kiosk connected to Internet
- Telephone (with commute and transit information numbers)
- Desk and chairs (for personalized trip planning)
- On-site transit ticket sales
- Implementation of flexible work hour schedules that allow transit riders to be 15-30 minutes late or early (due to problems with transit or vanpool).
- Quarterly educational programs to support commute alternatives

This is based on staff's best estimate. Short of there being major disincentives to driving, having an on site TDM program offering commute assistance is fundamental to an effective TDM program.

Survey Employees to examine use and best practices.

Three peak hour trips will be credited for a survey developed to be administered twice yearly

This is based on staff's best estimate with the goal of finding best practices to achieve the mode shift goal.

Implementation of a parking cash out program.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each parking spot where the employee is offered a cash payment in return for not using parking at the employment site.

Yields a one-to-one ratio (one cashed out parking spot equals one auto trip reduced).

Implementation of ramp metering.

Three hundred peak hour trips will be credited if the local jurisdiction in cooperation with CalTrans, installs and turns on ramp metering lights during the peak hours at the highway entrance ramp closest to the development.

This is a very difficult and costly measure to implement and the reward must be significant.

Installation of high bandwidth connections in employees' homes to the Internet to facilitate home telecommuting

One peak hour trip will be credited for every three connections installed. This measure is not available as credit for a residential development.

Yields a one-to-**three** ratio.

Installation of video conferencing centers that are available for use by the tenants of the facility.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for a center installed at the facility.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Implementation of a compressed workweek program.

One peak hour trip will be credited for every 5 employees that are offered the opportunity to work four compressed days per week.

The workweek will be compressed into 4 days; therefore the individual will not be commuting on the 5th day.

**Flexitime:
Implementation of an alternate hours workweek program.**

One peak hour trip will be credited for each employee that is offered the opportunity to work staggered work hours. Those hours can be a set shift set by the employer or can be individually determined by the employee.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provision of assistance to employees so they can live close to work.

If an employer develops and offers a program to help employees find acceptable residences within five miles of the employment site, a credit of one trip will be given for each slot in the program.

This assumes that a five-mile trip will generally not involve travel on the freeways.

Implementation of a program that gives preference to hiring local residents at the new development site.

One peak hour trip will be credited for each employment opportunity reserved for employees recruited and hired from within five miles of the employment site.

This assumes that a five-mile trip will generally not involve travel on the freeways.

Provision of on-site amenities/accommodations that encourage people to stay on site during the workday, making it easier for workers to leave their automobiles at home.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for each feature added to the job site. Possible features may include:

- banking
- grocery shopping
- clothes cleaning
- exercise facilities
- child care center

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provide use of motor vehicles to employees who use alternate commute methods so they can have access to vehicles during breaks for personal use.

Five peak hour trips will be credited for each vehicle provided.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provide use of bicycles to employees who use alternate commute methods so they can have access to bicycles during breaks for personal use.

One peak hour trip will be credited for every four bicycles provided.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Provision of child care services as a part of the development

One trip will be credited for every two child care slots at the job site. This amount increases to one trip for each slot if the child care service accepts multiple age groups (infants=0-2yrs, preschool=3&4 yrs, school-age=5 to 13 yrs).

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Developer/property owner may join an employer group to expand available child care within 5 miles of the job site or may provide this service independently

One trip will be credited for each new child care center slot created either directly by an employer group, by the developer/property owner, or by an outside provider if an agreement has been developed with the developer/property owner that makes the child care accessible to the workers at the development.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

Join the Alliance's guaranteed ride home program.

Two peak hour trips will be credited for every 2 slots purchased in the program.

Experience shows that when a Guaranteed Ride Home Program is added to a TDM program, average ridership increases by about 50%.

Combine any ten of these elements and receive an additional credit for five peak hour trips.

Five peak hour trips will be credited.

Experience has shown that offering multiple and complementary TDM components can magnify the impact of the overall program.

Work with the Alliance to develop/implement a Transportation Action Plan.

Ten peak hour trips will be credited.

This is based on staff's best estimate.

The developer can provide a cash legacy after the development is complete and designate an entity to implement any (or more than one) of the previous measures before day one of occupancy.

Peak hour trip reduction credits will accrue as if the developer was directly implementing the items.

Credits accrue depending on what the funds are used for.

Encourage infill development.

Two percent of all peak hour trips will be credited for each infill development.

Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet).

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| Encourage shared parking. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for an agreement with an existing development to share existing parking. | Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet). |
| Participate in/create/sponsor a Transportation Management Association. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | Generally acceptable TDM practices (based on research of TDM practices around the nation and reported on the Internet). |
| Coordinate Transportation Demand Management programs with existing developments/employers. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| For employers with multiple job sites, institute a proximate commuting program that allows employees at one location to transfer/trade with employees in another location that is closer to their home. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each opportunity created. | Yields a one-to-one ratio. |
| Pay for parking at park and ride lots or transit stations. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each spot purchased. | Yields a one-to-one ratio. |

Additional Measures for Residential Developments

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Develop schools, convenience shopping, recreation facilities, and child care centers in new subdivisions. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each facility included. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Provision of child care services at the residential development and/or at a nearby transit center | One trip will be credited for every two child care slots at the development/transit center. This amount increases to one trip for each slot if the child care service accepts multiple age groups (infants, preschool, school-age). | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Make roads and streets more pedestrian and bicycle friendly. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each facility included. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Revise zoning to limit undesirable impacts (noise, smells, and traffic) instead of limiting broad categories of activities. | Five peak hour trips will be credited. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Create connections for non-motorized travel, such as trails that link dead-end streets. | Five peak hour trips will be credited for each connection made. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Create alternative transportation modes for travel within the development and to downtown areas - bicycles, scooters, electric carts, wagons, shuttles, etc. | One peak hour trip will be credited for each on-going opportunity created (i.e. five bicycles/scooters/wagons = five trips, two-seat carts = two trips, seven passenger shuttle = seven trips). | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Design streets/roads that encourage pedestrian and bicycle access and discourage automobile access. | Five trips will be credited for each design element. | This is based on staff's best estimate. |
| Install and maintain | Five trips will be credited for each | This is based on staff's best |

alternative
transportation kiosks.

kiosk.

estimate.

Install/maintain safety
and security systems
for pedestrians and
bicyclists.

Five trips will be credited for each
measure implemented.

This is based on staff's best
estimate.

Implement jitneys/
vanpools from
residential areas to
downtowns and transit
centers.

One trip will be credited for each
seat created.

Yields a one-to-one ratio.

Locate residential
development within
one-third mile of a
fixed rail passenger
station.

All trips from a residential
development within one-third mile
of a fixed rail passenger station
will be considered credited due to
the location of the development.

This is based on staff's best
estimate.

The local jurisdiction must also agree to maintain data available for monitoring by C/CAG, that supports the on-going compliance with the agreed to trip reduction measures.

City County Association of Governments Congestion Mangement Program 2019 Update

Land Use Impact Analysis Program Compliance

| Jurisdiction | Project | Measures Taken | C/CAG Compliance |
|---|---|--|--|
| City of East Palo Alto | EPACenter Arts at 1950 Bay Road | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | None - Project does not generate 100+ trips in the am or pm peak hours |
| San Mateo County Manager's Office, Project Development Unit | County Government Center Campus Development Project | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan to be reviewed by C/CAG |
| City of Redwood City | Design Tech High School | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Redwood City | 1180 Main St | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Brisbane | Sangamo Therapeutics | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Brisbane | Sierra Point | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Redwood City | 40 Middlefield | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of Menlo Park | Trio Projects | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |
| City of San Carlos | 993 Laurel Street | Acknowledges C/CAG CMP policies; lists C/CAG as a responsible agency | TDM Plan approved by C/CAG |

Appendix J: Regional Transportation Plan Projects

San Mateo County Projects included in Plan Bay Area 2040

Source: <http://projects.planbayarea.org/>

| rtpid | title | agency | system | mode | What would this project/program do? | By when is this project anticipated to be open? | How much does this project/program cost? | How much of the project/program cost was included in previous plans? | How much of the project/program is covered in the plan period? |
|------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 17-06-0015 | Construct auxiliary lanes (one in each direction) on U.S. 101 from Marsh Road to Embarcadero Road | Caltrans | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Add northbound and southbound auxiliary lanes. | 2015 | 79 | 79 | 0 |
| 17-06-0001 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Program | | Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility | BikePed | Projects in this category are new bicycle (on-street and off-street) and pedestrian facilities, and facilities that connect existing network gaps, including but not limited to new multi-purpose pedestrian/bicycle bridges over US 101 and sidewalk gap closures | On-going through 2040 | 247 | 21 | 226 |
| 17-06-0027 | Implement supporting infrastructure and Automated Transit Signal Priority to support SamTrans express rapid bus service along El Camino Real | San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) | Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility | BikePed | This project will institute necessary infrastructure and Automated Transit Signal Priority necessary to accommodate express rapid bus service along the length of El Camino Real from Palo Alto to Daly City. | 2040 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17-06-0016 | Improve access to and from the west side of Dumbarton Bridge on Route 84 connecting to U.S. 101 per Gateway 2020 Study - Phased | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Improve access to /from the west side of Dumbarton Bridge (Route 84 connecting to U.S. 101) per Gateway 2020 Study (Phased implementation of short term projects. Environmental phase only for long term projects). | 2040 | 39 | 3 | 36 |
| 17-06-0009 | Improve operations at U.S. 101 near Route 92 - Phased | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | US 101 operational improvements near Route 92. Project may have phased construction. | 2025 | 258 | 2 | 256 |
| 17-06-0010 | Improve U.S. 101/Woodside Road interchange | Redwood City | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Modifies the Woodside Road Interchange at US 101. | 2023 | 171 | 7 | 164 |
| 17-06-0008 | Add northbound and southbound modified auxiliary lanes and/or implementation of managed lanes on U.S. 101 from I-380 to San Francisco County line | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Add northbound and southbound modified auxiliary lanes and/or implementation of a managed lane on U.S. 101 from I-380 to San Francisco County line. | 2024 | 222 | 5 | 217 |
| 17-06-0019 | State Route 92-82 (El Camino) Interchange Improvement | San Mateo (City) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Widen the existing ramps and reconfigure the existing interchange from a full cloverleaf to a partial cloverleaf. Pedestrian and bicycle improvements would be included as part of the project. | 2018 | 30 | 25 | 5 |
| 17-06-0012 | U.S. 101 Interchange at Peninsula Avenue | San Mateo (City) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Construct southbound on and off ramps to US 101 at Peninsula Ave to add on and off ramps from southbound 101. | 2023 | 89 | 9 | 80 |
| 17-06-0011 | US 101 Produce Avenue Interchange | South San Francisco | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Construct a new interchange on US 101 at Produce Avenue, connecting Utah Avenue on the east side of US 101 to San Mateo Avenue on the west side of US 101. This will allow for reconfiguration of the existing southbound ramps at Produce Ave and Airport Blvd, as well incorporation of the northbound off- and on- ramps at S. Airport Blvd into the interchange design. | 2024 | 146 | 10 | 136 |
| 17-06-0025 | US 101/University Ave. Interchange Improvements | East Palo Alto | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | On University Avenue across US-101, between Woodland Avenue and Donohoe Street; Add bike lanes and sidewalk and modify the NB and SB off-ramps to eliminate pedestrian/bicycle conflicts and improve traffic operations. | 2019 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 17-06-0007 | Modify existing lanes on U.S. 101 to accommodate a managed lane | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Modify existing lanes to accommodate an HOV lane from Whipple to San Francisco County Line and/or an Express Lane from approximately 2 miles south of the Santa Clara County Line to San Francisco County Line. Work may include shoulder modification, ramp modifications, and interchange modifications to accommodate an extra lane. Work will be phased. | 2020 | 365 | 15 | 350 |
| 17-06-0034 | Construct Route 1 (Calera Parkway) northbound and southbound lanes from Fassler Avenue to Westport Drive in Pacifica | Pacifica | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | The Calera Parkway project will widen Highway 1 from four lanes to six lanes, from approximately 1,500 feet south of Fassler Avenue to approximately 2,300 feet north of Reina Del Mar Avenue, a distance of 1.3 miles, and will add a 16'-6" wide landscaped median between concrete barriers from San Marlo Way to Reina Del Mar Avenue | 2021 | 58 | 9 | 49 |
| 17-06-0013 | Reconstruct U.S. 101/Broadway interchange | | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Reconstructs the US 101/Broadway interchange. | 2017 | 83 | 83 | 0 |
| 17-06-0024 | Reconstruct U.S. 101/Sierra Point Parkway interchange (includes extension of Lagoon Way to U.S. 101) | Brisbane | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Reconstruct a partial interchange and provide improved access to Brisbane, Bayshore Blvd and proposed Brisbane Baylands project. Lagoon Way extension connects to the reconstructed interchange and provides improved access to Brisbane, Daly City, and the pending 600-acre Brisbane Baylands development. | 2030 | 17 | 8 | 9 |
| 17-06-0014 | Reconstruct U.S. 101/Willow Road interchange | Menlo Park | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | The project proposes to reconstruct the existing US 101/Willow Road (Route 114) interchange within the existing alignment to a partial cloverleaf interchange. Project includes class I bike paths and class II bike lanes. | 2018 | 80 | 60 | 20 |
| 17-06-0020 | Hwy 1 operational & safety improvements in County Midcoast (acceleration/deceleration lanes; turn lanes; bike lanes; pedestrian crossings; and trails) | San Mateo County | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Operational and safety improvements for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, along the Highway 1 corridor between Half Moon Bay and Pacifica. This could include acceleration lanes, deceleration lanes, turn lanes, bike lanes, enhanced crossings, and trail network improvements. | 2020 | 29 | 4 | 25 |
| 17-06-0035 | I-280 improvements near D Street exit | Daly City | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Improve the on and off-ramps and approaches for I-280 near the D Street exit in Daly City | 2025 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17-06-0023 | Route 1 Improvements in Half Moon Bay | Half Moon Bay | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | In Half Moon Bay, On Route 1: improve safety and reduce congestion by providing protected left and right turn lanes, warranted traffic signals, two through lanes only at signalized intersections, bike lanes, pathways, bus stops, traffic signal interconnects, safety lighting, median and channelization improvements. | 2019 | 19 | 10 | 9 |
| 17-06-0032 | Route 1 San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement and Creek Widening Project | Pacifica | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Replace San Pedro Creek Bridge on CA 1 with a longer bridge and widen the creek channel for 100 year storm flow capacity. Provide for a class 1 multi-purpose trail on the eastern side. | 2015 | 14 | 14 | 0 |
| 17-06-0017 | Route 101/Holly St Interchange Access Improvements | San Carlos | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | The proposed project would convert the existing full cloverleaf configuration to a partial cloverleaf design by eliminating two of the existing loop off-ramps of the interchange, and realign the diagonal on- and off-ramps into signalized T-intersections with local streets. A new pedestrian and bicycle over crossing will be constructed in the south side of Holly Street Interchange. | 2019 | 34 | 1 | 33 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|--|---|-----------------------------|---------|---|-----------------------|-----|----|-----|
| 17-06-0037 | Widen Millbrae Avenue between Rollins Road and U.S. 101 southbound on-ramp and resurface intersection of Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road | Millbrae | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Widen Millbrae Avenue between Rollins Road and US101 Southbound On Ramp and resurface the intersection of Millbrae Avenue and Rollins Road. | 2019 | 11 | 0 | 11 |
| 17-06-0033 | Widen Route 92 between SR 1 and Pilarcitos Creek alignment, includes widening of travel lanes and shoulders | Half Moon Bay | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Widens shoulders and travel lanes to standard widths. Straighten curves at few locations. | 2025 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| 17-06-0036 | Widen Skyline Boulevard (Route 35) to 4-lane roadway from I-280 to Sneath Lane - Phased | San Bruno | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Widens Skyline Blvd. (SR 35) between I-280 and Sneath Lane. It is currently the last portion of what is otherwise a four lane roadway along Skyline Blvd. The project widens approximately 1.3 miles of the roadway into four lanes. | 2021 | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| 17-06-0038 | Construct a 6-lane arterial from Geneva Avenue/Bayshore Boulevard intersection to U.S. 101/Candlestick Point interchange - Environmental phase | Brisbane | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Planning and environmental analysis of a 6-lane arterial from the Geneva Avenue at Bayshore Boulevard to 101/Candlestick Interchange. Grade separation at the Caltrain and Tunnel Ave, Class II bike lanes, on-street parking (travel lanes during peak periods), and sidewalks. Sections will be reserved for an exclusive lane BRT facility that connects to the Bayshore Multimodal Station and provides through service to BART Balboa Station. | N/A | 17 | 1 | 16 |
| 17-06-0002 | County Safety, Security and Other | | Other | Program | Projects in this category address safety and security needs of San Mateo County including county-wide implementation of Safe Routes to School Program | On-going through 2040 | 41 | 1 | 40 |
| 17-06-0006 | County-wide Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Traffic Operation System Improvements | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Installation of transportation system management improvements such as Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) elements and TOS equipment throughout San Mateo County. | On-going through 2040 | 93 | 0 | 93 |
| 17-06-0030 | Environmental Clearance and Design of the Redwood City Ferry Terminal and Service | Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) | Public Transit Facility | Transit | Planning and environmental analysis of the construction of a new ferry terminal, purchase of 3 new high-speed ferry vessels, and operation of new ferry service between Redwood City and San Francisco. | N/A | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| 17-06-0021 | Environmental Studies for 101/Candlestick Interchange | Brisbane | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Planning and environmental analysis of the reconstruction of 101/Candlestick Interchange to full all-directional interchange with a single point cross street connection. Project would provide all-direction ramp movements controlled by new signalized intersections at the cross street connections. Interchange would join an improved Harvey Way to the east, and would join the Geneva Avenue Extension to the west. Accommodate E/W crossing of planned BRT facility. | N/A | 25 | 5 | 20 |
| 17-06-0039 | Grade Separations | | Other | Program | This project includes grade separations of the Caltrain right of way at approximately 2 to 3 high priority locations in San Mateo County, including 25th Avenue. This project is based on San Mateo County's Measure A grade separation category. | On-going through 2040 | 265 | 5 | 260 |
| 17-06-0004 | Minor Roadway Expansions | | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | This category includes roadway capacity increasing projects (new roadways, widening or extensions of existing roadways) on minor roads such as Blomquist Street, California Drive, Railroad Avenue, Manor Drive, and Alameda de las Pulgas | On-going through 2040 | 58 | 1 | 57 |
| 17-06-0026 | Implement incentive programs to support transit-oriented development | San Mateo City/County Association of Governments (CCAG) | Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility | BikePed | Implement an incentive programs to support transit-oriented developments in San Mateo County. | On-going through 2040 | 106 | 0 | 106 |
| 17-06-0031 | Implement Redwood City Street Car - Planning Phase | Redwood City | Public Transit Facility | Transit | Planning and environmental analysis of Redwood City Street Car Construction and Implementation | N/A | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 17-06-0018 | Improve local access at I-280/I-380 from Sneath Lane to San Bruno Avenue to I-380 - Environmental only | San Bruno | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Environmental assessment of local access improvements at the existing I-280 / I-380 interchange located in the City of San Bruno. The project would provide access to I-380 from the two main east-west secondary roads of Sneath Lane and San Bruno Avenue. | N/A | 32 | 0 | 32 |
| 17-06-0028 | Make incremental increase in SamTrans paratransit service - Phase | San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) | Public Transit Facility | Transit | Expansion of curb-to-curb paratransit fleet and service for eligible users, compliant with ADA requirements, based on projected future demand. | On-going through 2040 | 377 | 0 | 377 |
| 17-06-0003 | Multimodal Streetscape | | Bicycle/Pedestrian Facility | BikePed | Projects in this category implement multimodal or complete streets elements, including but not limited to projects along facilities such as El Camino Real, Bay Road, Ralston Avenue, University Avenue, Middlefield Road, Palmetto Avenue, Mission Street, Geneva Avenue, and Carolan Avenue | On-going through 2040 | 289 | 14 | 275 |
| 17-06-0005 | Roadway Operations | | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | County-wide Implementation of non-capacity Increasing local road Intersection modifications and channelization countywide County-wide implementation of local circulation improvements and traffic management programs countywide | On-going through 2040 | 64 | 0 | 64 |
| 17-06-0022 | Westbound slow vehicle lane on Route 92 between Route 35 and I-280 - Environmental Phase | San Mateo County | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Planning and environmental analysis of a westbound slow vehicle lane on Route 92 between Route 35 and I-280 | N/A | 25 | 0 | 25 |
| 17-06-0029 | Add new rolling stock and infrastructure to support SamTrans bus rapid transit along El Camino Real- Phase | San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) | Public Transit Facility | Transit | This project will institute new rolling stock and infrastructure necessary to accommodate BRT along El Camino Real | 2040 | 228 | 0 | 228 |
| 17-06-0040 | Extend Blomquist Street over Redwood Creek to East Bayshore and Bair Island Road | | Street/Highway Facility | Auto | Redwood City Blomquist Street Extension and Blomquist Bridge over Redwood Creek | 2020 | 28 | 19 | 9 |

Appendix K: Checklist for Modeling Consistency

MTC Checklist for Modeling Consistency for CMPs

2011 Submittal

Prepared for City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County

In cooperation with the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority

October 24, 2011

Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide the checklist of deliverables requested by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to establish that the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) travel demand models apply a regionally consistent model set for the development of travel demand forecasts. The specific checklist of product deliverables was defined by MTC in the *2011 County Congestion Management Plans: Updated MTC Guidance and Review Process Resolution No. 3000, Revised*, Attachment B. The required checklist products are provided in the following sections.

Product 1

Description of the C/CAG Model

The current C/CAG model had its origin in the corridor model developed for the Grand Boulevard Initiative (GBI) Multi-model Corridor Study by the Santa Clara VTA in 2009. The GBI study evaluated the impacts of enhanced transit service (bus rapid transit) and enhanced developed strategies in the El Camino Real corridor to transform an existing auto-oriented commercial transportation corridor into a more transit-oriented, mixed-use transportation corridor. The GBI model was essentially the VTA Countywide model with added zone and network detail to improve upon what was network and zone detail based on the MTC regional models for San Mateo County. The basis for the network and zone refinements applied within San Mateo County was the C/CAG Countywide models originally developed in the mid-1990s.

For the updated C/CAG model development, the GBI model was revised to produce an updated base year 2005 calibration and validation with selected model enhancements. These enhancements included calibration of the auto ownership models to American Community Survey (ACS) 2005 county-level data, addition of bicycle network infrastructure (bike lanes and paths) in the networks, travel time skims, mode choice and bicycle assignments and development of a toll modeling procedure to estimate

express lane vehicle volumes. The model was validated to year 2005 screenline volumes for the AM and PM peak periods and to year 2005 observed transit boardings.

Consistency with MTC Model

As noted previously, the C/CAG model was designed to be consistent with the previous MTC Travel Demand Model forecasting system BAYCAST-90 model. This section provides a general overview of the C/CAG models and also describes several basic modeling characteristics that are shared between the models.

Transportation Analysis Zones (TAZ's) — The current CMP model has a more refined zone system in San Mateo County and Santa Clara County than the MTC regional models. Additional zones were added to more accurately reflect and support the added roadway network and to provide more detail in transit rich corridors and dense central business districts. In all, an additional 156 zones were added in San Mateo County and an additional 1,122 zones were added in Santa Clara County. The new model maintains the use of MTC's zone system in the remaining seven Bay Area counties, but enlarges the full model region and zones to include Santa Cruz, San Benito, Monterey, and San Joaquin Counties.

Highway Network and Transit Network — The roadway network used by the C/CAG model includes additional detail in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The current CMP model also includes detailed stop, station and route detail in the transit network for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, and maintains the MTC roadway and transit networks in the remaining Bay Area counties. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) provided the basis for roadway networks in Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties and the San Joaquin County COG provided roadways for San Joaquin County, however, the detailed networks was simplified to match the coarser zone structure in each of those four added counties. Express lane facilities, representing the MTC 'Backbone' express lanes system for 2035, were also coded in the network with a toll facility indicator based on the highway corridor segment and the direction of travel. Differential toll facility codes were required in order to apply specific toll rates to optimize utilization of the express lanes to preserve level-of-service for free carpool users. The C/CAG model also includes a representation of the bicycle network infrastructure in the base year and 2035 forecast year for San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Francisco and southern Alameda Counties, explicitly representing existing and future bike lanes and bike paths in travel time development, mode choice and bicycle assignments.

Capacities and Speed — The current C/CAG model incorporates the area type and assignment group classification system published by MTC in BAYCAST-90. Input free-flow speeds for expressways are slightly lower in the C/CAG models to more accurately match the travel time for the expressway segments during model validation and improve the assignment match of estimated to observed expressway volumes.

Trip Purposes — The current C/CAG model uses the same trip purposes used in the BAYCAST-90 model and also uses additional trip purposes not modeled by MTC. C/CAG model trip purposes include the following:

- Home-based work trips
- Home-based shop and other trips
- Home-based social/recreation trips
- Non-home-based trips
- Home-based school: grade school, high school, and college trips
- Light, medium and heavy duty internal to internal zone truck trips

The C/CAG model uses MTC BAYCAST-90 trip generation equations for trip production and trip attraction functions for all trip purposes listed above. In order to address special markets not included in the MTC trip purposes, the C/CAG model includes several additional trip purposes beyond those modeled by MTC, including:

- Air-passenger trips to San Francisco International (SFO) Airport and San Jose/Mineta International Airport (SJC) and
- Light, medium and heavy-duty external truck trips

Market Segments — The C/CAG model adopts the BAYCAST-90 disaggregate travel demand model four income group market segments for the home-based work trip purpose in trip generation, distribution and mode choice. In addition, the C/CAG model also maintains the three workers per household (0, 1 and 2+ workers) and three auto ownership markets (0, 1 and 2+ autos owned) used in the MTC worker/auto ownership models. Trips by peak and off-peak time period are also stratified in the trip distribution, mode choice and highway and transit assignment models.

External Trips — The C/CAG model uses a different approach for incorporating inter-regional commuting estimates than MTC. For external zones coincident with the MTC model, MTC interregional vehicle volumes were applied for base year 2000 and adjusted to the future by assuming a 1 percent growth rate per year. For external gateways from San Joaquin County and Santa Cruz, Monterey and San Benito Counties, the incorporation of those counties as internal modeled areas obviated the development of external vehicle volumes for those areas of the C/CAG models.

Pricing — The C/CAG model uses MTC pricing assumptions for transit fares, bridge tolls, parking charges, and auto operating costs as assumed in the current MTC Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Sustainable Community Strategies (SCS) update. All prices are expressed in year 1990 dollar values in the models. The C/CAG model also uses regional express lane toll charges for the AM and PM peak periods that are based on optimizing the level-of-service in the carpool lanes. Depending on the level of utilization, these toll charges would vary by direction, time of day and by specific corridor.

Auto Ownership — The current C/CAG model applies BAYCAST-90 for auto ownership models to estimate the number of households with 0, 1, and 2+ autos by four income groups in each traffic analysis zone. Walk to transit accessibility measures were incorporated in the auto ownership models consistent with MTC BAYCAST-90 to more logically associate low auto ownership households with transit services. The auto ownership models were recently calibrated to the 2005-2009 American Community Survey to match workers per household and auto ownership by county.

Mode Choice — The mode choice models for BAYCAST-90 include the use of nested structures for most trip purposes, however, explicit estimation of nested structures to consider transit submodes were not included in the model specification.¹ The C/CAG model adds a nesting structure for transit submodes of local bus, express bus, Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), light rail, heavy rail and commuter rail underneath the MTC BAYCAST-90 nested structures. Consistent with the BAYCAST-90, mode choice coefficients are preserved by constraining the model to the BAYCAST-90 parameters, except those in transit submode structure.² The C/CAG model includes a transit submode nest for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), which is an emerging transit technology in the region. Submode constants for BRT were developed from a market analysis and state preference survey that compared the relative tradeoffs between bus, light rail and hypothetical BRT service. The resulting BRT constants were between the calibrated submode constants applied to local bus service and light rail service, implying that BRT service is perceived as more attractive than local bus service, but not as attractive as light rail service.

Peak Hour and Peak Periods for Highway Assignments —The highway assignments produce AM and PM peak hour volumes, AM and PM peak period volumes (5 AM to 9 AM and 3 PM to 7 PM, respectively – each coincident with the time periods of operation for carpool lanes), midday volumes (9 AM to 3 PM) and evening volumes (7 PM to 5 AM). The four time period volumes are then added together to develop daily vehicle volumes.

Vehicle and Transit Assignments — The current C/CAG model incorporates a methodology analogous to the MTC “layered,” equilibrium assignment process, which distinguishes standard mixed-flow lanes from high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes. The equilibrium assignment process used in the current CMP model is functionally equivalent to the MTC methodology. The C/CAG model includes additional vehicle classes in the highway assignments for park-and-ride vehicles and drive-alone and carpool toll vehicles.

Drive-alone and carpool toll vehicles for AM and PM peak periods are estimated using a toll model post-processor that estimates toll volumes based on a comparison of the non-toll and toll travel times and costs. This procedure assumes that toll choice occurs after the decision to choose auto versus transit has already been considered, and therefore does not influence transit mode choice. A toll choice constant for drive-alone and carpool modes was developed based on a calibration of toll volumes estimated by application of the toll model to the I-680 Express Lane facility and comparison of estimated to observed express lane volumes. It should be noted that by 2035, in order to maintain the operational feasibility of implementing regional express toll lanes, it was assumed that only 3+ occupant carpools

¹ A nested structure partitions the alternatives into groups (nests) of similarity. The groups can be further generalized into subgroups (subnests) and so on, which has the form of an inversed tree.

would be allowed to travel in the carpool lanes for free. This was assumed for all carpool facilities in the C/CAG model region.

In the current CMP model, transit passengers are assigned with a methodology analogous to that used by MTC, with separate assignments for each transit submode and access mode. Assignments are also performed separately for peak and off-peak conditions. A total of eighteen separate transit assignments are run to cover the full combination of transit submode and access modes as well as to estimate transit ridership for air-passengers and external home-based work transit trips from the San Joaquin (ACE, BART and San Joaquin SMART bus) and AMBAG (Caltrain and Monterey Express) model regions.

Model Validation with 2005 Traffic and Transit Volumes — The current C/CAG model is validated to year 2005 traffic volumes for county-level screenlines and specific major transportation facilities. Two time periods are validated for county screenlines: AM peak period (5 AM to 9 AM) and PM peak period (3 PM to 7 PM). Peak hour validation was performed for US 101 and SR 82 (El Camino Real) using traffic counts provided by Caltrans. Daily transit boardings were validated for the year 2005 at the system level for major regional transit operators (Caltrain, BART, MUNI, VTA and AC Transit) and at the route level for SamTrans express and local routes.

Product 2

Description of Demographic Forecasts

The C/CAG model uses the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Projections 2009 data series for the base year 2005 and the ABAG Current Regional Plans scenario as the basis for the 2035 long-range forecasts for San Mateo County, as provided by MTC at the MTC 1454 zone level. The MTC zone level allocations were sub-allocated to the smaller C/CAG zones (including finer zones for both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties) based on local development information and parcel level data. As such, the C/CAG socioeconomic data inputs are consistent at both the MTC zone level and the ABAG census tract level, however, slight differences do exist in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties due to rounding errors resulting from the allocation process. Key ABAG land use variables used in the San Mateo C/CAG models do not differ by more than one percent at the county level for any of the 9 MTC region counties. No differences exist at the census tract level outside of San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties for any of the remaining MTC counties.

Product 3

ABAG County-Level Estimates for Population, Households, Jobs, and Employed Residents Year 2005, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

ABAG Projections 2009

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 795,792 | 338,923 | 553,073 | 388,097 |
| San Mateo | 721,890 | 260,066 | 337,344 | 318,599 |
| Santa Clara | 1,762,986 | 595,720 | 872,820 | 733,989 |
| Alameda | 1,505,308 | 543,776 | 730,264 | 705,906 |
| Contra Costa | 1,023,390 | 368,323 | 379,021 | 459,606 |
| Solano | 421,600 | 142,039 | 150,513 | 194,903 |
| Napa | 133,695 | 49,256 | 70,690 | 64,102 |
| Sonoma | 479,203 | 181,786 | 220,442 | 237,700 |
| Marin | 252,605 | 103,188 | 135,473 | 122,204 |
| Bay Area | 7,096,469 | 2,583,077 | 3,449,640 | 3,225,106 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 795,792 | 338,923 | 553,073 | 388,097 |
| San Mateo | 721,900 | 260,072 | 337,313 | 319,235 |
| Santa Clara | 1,762,957 | 595,716 | 872,248 | 733,965 |
| Alameda | 1,505,308 | 543,776 | 730,264 | 705,906 |
| Contra Costa | 1,023,390 | 368,323 | 379,021 | 459,606 |
| Solano | 421,600 | 142,039 | 150,514 | 194,903 |
| Napa | 133,695 | 49,256 | 70,690 | 64,102 |
| Sonoma | 479,203 | 181,786 | 220,442 | 237,700 |
| Marin | 252,605 | 103,188 | 135,473 | 122,204 |
| Bay Area | 7,096,450 | 2,583,079 | 3,449,038 | 3,225,718 |

Percent Difference

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|--------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| San Mateo | 0.00% | 0.00% | -0.01% | 0.20% |
| Santa Clara | 0.00% | 0.00% | -0.07% | 0.00% |
| Alameda | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Contra Costa | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Solano | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Napa | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Sonoma | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Marin | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Bay Area | 0.00% | 0.00% | -0.02% | 0.02% |

Product 3, continued**ABAG County-Level Estimates for Population, Households, Jobs, and Employed Residents
Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)****MTC Tour-based Models**

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 980,071 | 417,997 | 698,793 | 472,195 |
| San Mateo | 893,067 | 322,624 | 442,850 | 392,101 |
| Santa Clara | 2,433,531 | 827,254 | 1,212,948 | 1,054,001 |
| Alameda | 1,958,248 | 705,343 | 906,300 | 963,499 |
| Contra Costa | 1,323,390 | 480,474 | 469,462 | 603,803 |
| Solano | 504,331 | 171,284 | 173,057 | 220,100 |
| Napa | 148,517 | 54,642 | 86,961 | 71,000 |
| Sonoma | 572,443 | 212,784 | 262,078 | 258,396 |
| Marin | 269,179 | 110,673 | 147,872 | 102,999 |
| Bay Area | 9,082,777 | 3,303,075 | 4,400,321 | 4,138,094 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 980,071 | 417,997 | 698,793 | 472,195 |
| San Mateo | 893,066 | 322,620 | 442,858 | 392,097 |
| Santa Clara | 2,433,551 | 827,261 | 1,212,959 | 1,054,016 |
| Alameda | 1,958,248 | 705,343 | 906,300 | 963,499 |
| Contra Costa | 1,323,390 | 480,474 | 469,462 | 603,803 |
| Solano | 504,331 | 171,284 | 173,057 | 220,100 |
| Napa | 148,517 | 54,642 | 86,961 | 71,000 |
| Sonoma | 572,443 | 212,784 | 262,078 | 258,396 |
| Marin | 269,179 | 110,673 | 147,872 | 102,999 |
| Bay Area | 9,082,796 | 3,303,078 | 4,400,340 | 4,138,105 |

Percent Difference

| County | Population | Households | Jobs | Employed Residents |
|---------------|------------|------------|-------|--------------------|
| San Francisco | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| San Mateo | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Santa Clara | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Alameda | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Contra Costa | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Solano | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Napa | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Sonoma | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Marin | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| Bay Area | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

Product 4

Identification of Differences between CMA and ABAG Census Tract Level

C/CAG socioeconomic data inputs are consistent at both the MTC zone level and the ABAG census tract level for the Current Regional Plans scenario for the year 2035. The MTC zone level data was provided by MTC subsequent to a meeting of the Regional Model Working Group³. Data at the MTC zone level in San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties was allocated to the smaller San Mateo C/CAG model zones using local land use development patterns, however, MTC zone level, and by default ABAG census-tract level, control totals were preserved in the allocation process.

³ Provided by email from MTC to the Regional Model Working Group members on March 25, 2011.

Product 5

Region-Level Auto Operating Cost, Key Transit Fares and Bridge Tolls Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Pricing Assumption | 2035 Value in 2000 dollars | 2035 Value in 2010 dollars |
|------------------------------|---|---|
| Auto Operating Cost per Mile | \$0.222 | \$0.280 |
| Bridge Tolls | Toll schedule starting July 1, 2012 | Toll schedule starting July 1, 2012 |
| Transit Fares | --- | --- |
| Muni Local Bus | \$1.606 | \$2.000 |
| AC Transit Local Bus | \$1.606 | \$2.000 |
| VTA Local Bus | \$1.606 | \$2.000 |
| SamTrans Local Bus | \$1.606 | \$2.000 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Pricing Assumption | 2035 Value in 2000 dollars ⁴ | 2035 Value in 2010 dollars ⁵ |
|---|---|---|
| Auto Operating Cost per Mile ⁶ | \$0.24 | \$0.30 |
| Bridge Tolls | Toll schedule starting July 1, 2010 | Toll schedule starting July 1, 2010 |
| Transit Fares | --- | --- |
| Muni Local Bus | \$1.55 | \$1.97 |
| AC Transit Local Bus | \$1.55 | \$1.97 |
| VTA Local Bus | \$1.55 | \$1.97 |
| SamTrans Local Bus | \$1.55 | \$1.97 |

⁴ Source for Inflation Rates : http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

⁵ Source for Inflation Rates : http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm

⁶ Source: *Plan/Bay Area: Technical Summary of Predicted Traveler Responses to First Round Scenarios, Technical Report*, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, March 22, 2011, p.14.

Product 6

Highway Network and Transit Network — The roadway network used by the San Mateo C/CAG model includes additional detail in both San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties. The current CMP model also includes detailed stop, station and route detail in the transit network for San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties, and maintains the MTC roadway and transit networks in the remaining Bay Area counties. The Association of Monterey Bay Area Governments (AMBAG) provided the basis for roadway networks in Monterey, San Benito, and Santa Cruz counties and the San Joaquin County COG provided roadways for San Joaquin County, however, the detailed networks was simplified to match the coarser zone structure in each of those four added counties. Express lane facilities, representing the MTC 'Backbone' express lanes system for 2035, were also coded in the network with a toll facility indicator based on the highway corridor segment and the direction of travel. Differential toll facility codes were required in order to apply specific toll rates to optimize utilization of the express lanes to preserve level-of-service for free carpool users.

For model consistency reporting purposes, the San Mateo C/CAG models assume committed project as defined in the MTC 2035 Regional Transportation Plan in San Mateo County and all other counties, with the exception that HOV lanes are assumed on US 101 from Whipple Road north the San Mateo/San Francisco County line by conversion of the auxiliary lanes. The 2035 forecasts produced by the San Mateo C/CAG models also assumes that only 3+ person carpools are allowed to travel in the carpool lanes without a charge for the entire model region. The C/CAG model includes a representation of the bicycle network infrastructure in the base year and 2035 forecast year for San Mateo, Santa Clara, San Francisco and southern Alameda Counties, explicitly representing existing and future bike lanes and bike paths in travel time development, mode choice and bicycle assignments.

Product 7

Households by Number of Automobiles, by County

Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| County | Zero | One | Two + | Total | Zero | One | Two + | Total |
|---------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| San Francisco | 132,684 | 192,192 | 116,364 | 441,240 | 30.1% | 43.6% | 26.4% | 100.0% |
| San Mateo | 18,812 | 116,608 | 198,216 | 333,636 | 5.6% | 35.0% | 59.4% | 100.0% |
| Santa Clara | 62,264 | 268,396 | 528,788 | 859,448 | 7.2% | 31.2% | 61.5% | 100.0% |
| Alameda | 86,828 | 235,696 | 415,844 | 738,368 | 11.8% | 31.9% | 56.3% | 100.0% |
| Contra Costa | 19,860 | 153,448 | 317,904 | 491,212 | 4.0% | 31.2% | 64.7% | 100.0% |
| Solano | 10,868 | 50,216 | 121,300 | 182,384 | 6.0% | 27.5% | 66.5% | 100.0% |
| Napa | 4,044 | 19,240 | 37,200 | 60,484 | 6.7% | 31.8% | 61.5% | 100.0% |
| Sonoma | 14,996 | 68,860 | 146,316 | 230,172 | 6.5% | 29.9% | 63.6% | 100.0% |
| Marin | 6,992 | 43,332 | 72,116 | 122,440 | 5.7% | 35.4% | 58.9% | 100.0% |
| ALL | 357,348 | 1,147,988 | 1,954,048 | 3,459,384 | 10.3% | 33.2% | 56.5% | 100.0% |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| County | Zero | One | Two + | Total | Zero | One | Two + | Total |
|---------------|---------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|--------|
| San Francisco | 130,076 | 170,563 | 117,323 | 417,962 | 31.1% | 40.8% | 28.1% | 100.0% |
| San Mateo | 25,297 | 113,422 | 183,777 | 322,496 | 7.8% | 35.2% | 57.0% | 100.0% |
| Santa Clara | 73,775 | 250,650 | 501,913 | 826,338 | 8.9% | 30.3% | 60.7% | 100.0% |
| Alameda | 116,722 | 257,910 | 330,664 | 705,296 | 16.5% | 36.6% | 46.9% | 100.0% |
| Contra Costa | 33,991 | 159,328 | 287,157 | 480,476 | 7.1% | 33.2% | 59.8% | 100.0% |
| Solano | 8,270 | 49,035 | 113,991 | 171,296 | 4.8% | 28.6% | 66.5% | 100.0% |
| Napa | 2,771 | 17,703 | 34,167 | 54,641 | 5.1% | 32.4% | 62.5% | 100.0% |
| Sonoma | 13,600 | 75,388 | 123,801 | 212,789 | 6.4% | 35.4% | 58.2% | 100.0% |
| Marin | 5,004 | 41,293 | 64,354 | 110,651 | 4.5% | 37.3% | 58.2% | 100.0% |
| ALL | 409,506 | 1,135,292 | 1,757,147 | 3,301,945 | 12.4% | 34.4% | 53.2% | 100.0% |

Product 8
Number of Trips by Tour Purpose
Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Purpose | Tour-based | Share |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Work | 9,095,396 | 30.2% |
| University | 674,228 | 2.2% |
| School | 3,182,584 | 10.6% |
| At-Work | 2,146,148 | 7.1% |
| Eat Out | 1,269,852 | 4.2% |
| Escort | 2,878,708 | 9.6% |
| Shopping | 4,323,304 | 14.3% |
| Social | 921,024 | 3.1% |
| Other | 5,650,824 | 18.7% |
| ALL | 30,142,068 | 100.0% |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Purpose | Trip-based | Share |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Home-based Work | 6,257,144 | 23.3% |
| Home-based Shopping/Other | 7,481,587 | 27.9% |
| Home-based Social-Recreational | 3,211,923 | 12.0% |
| Non-home-based | 7,417,766 | 27.7% |
| Home-based College | 576,940 | 2.2% |
| Home-based High School | 558,042 | 2.1% |
| Home-based Elementary School | 1,316,026 | 4.9% |
| ALL | 26,819,428 | 100.0% |

Product 9

Average Trip Distance by Tour Purpose Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Tour Purpose | Average Trip Distance, Miles |
|---------------------|---|
| Work | 10.40 |
| University | 6.84 |
| School | 3.96 |
| At-Work | 3.35 |
| Eat Out | 5.42 |
| Escort | 4.34 |
| Shopping | 4.20 |
| Social | 4.87 |
| Other | 5.00 |
| All | 6.25 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Trip Purpose | Average Trip Distance, Miles |
|--------------------------------|---|
| Home-based Work | 12.80 |
| Home-based Shopping/Other | 6.91 |
| Home-based Social-Recreational | 7.45 |
| Non-home-based | 6.75 |
| Home-based College | 10.52 |
| Home-based High School | 4.85 |
| Home-based Elementary School | 4.06 |
| ALL | 8.20 |

Product 10

Journey to Work, County-to-County Usual Workplace Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Origin County | San Francisco | San Mateo | Santa Clara | Alameda | Contra Costa | Solano | Napa | Sonoma | Marin | All |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|
| San Francisco | 358,844 | 55,696 | 5,884 | 31,312 | 7,080 | 708 | 312 | 1,112 | 12,428 | 473,376 |
| San Mateo | 82,972 | 206,644 | 63,104 | 29,564 | 4,416 | 324 | 156 | 516 | 5,152 | 392,848 |
| Santa Clara | 12,508 | 57,712 | 915,460 | 71,272 | 4,960 | 196 | 80 | 72 | 780 | 1,063,040 |
| Alameda | 119,536 | 70,684 | 130,732 | 558,332 | 68,668 | 3,272 | 1,240 | 1,068 | 12,576 | 966,108 |
| Contra Costa | 64,288 | 16,448 | 17,164 | 139,560 | 315,164 | 18,848 | 5,512 | 2,596 | 19,012 | 598,592 |
| Solano | 11,408 | 2,212 | 1,108 | 15,512 | 31,900 | 126,024 | 17,728 | 5,572 | 8,060 | 219,524 |
| Napa | 2,020 | 484 | 176 | 2,556 | 4,408 | 7,428 | 44,116 | 7,844 | 3,104 | 72,136 |
| Sonoma | 4,948 | 1,204 | 212 | 1,844 | 1,988 | 2,196 | 8,172 | 215,416 | 20,828 | 256,808 |
| Marin | 20,756 | 3,992 | 512 | 6,240 | 4,676 | 1,052 | 872 | 6,544 | 58,796 | 103,440 |
| Bay Area | 677,280 | 415,076 | 1,134,352 | 856,192 | 443,260 | 160,048 | 78,188 | 240,740 | 140,736 | 4,145,872 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Origin County | San Francisco | San Mateo | Santa Clara | Alameda | Contra Costa | Solano | Napa | Sonoma | Marin | All |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------|---------|---------|-----------|
| San Francisco | 352,045 | 48,851 | 17,360 | 22,807 | 6,088 | 716 | 578 | 2,434 | 11,508 | 462,387 |
| San Mateo | 86,314 | 229,097 | 52,114 | 21,146 | 2,910 | 721 | 194 | 1,824 | 2,254 | 396,574 |
| Santa Clara | 18,879 | 61,803 | 934,384 | 58,247 | 6,404 | 2,571 | 580 | 4,993 | 2,925 | 1,090,785 |
| Alameda | 124,842 | 60,321 | 93,259 | 605,272 | 60,016 | 6,869 | 1,618 | 6,525 | 14,239 | 972,960 |
| Contra Costa | 63,679 | 9,479 | 14,024 | 110,362 | 354,358 | 16,113 | 4,175 | 3,790 | 20,254 | 596,234 |
| Solano | 10,779 | 2,117 | 1,626 | 11,086 | 24,916 | 134,855 | 13,836 | 5,871 | 7,383 | 212,470 |
| Napa | 1,202 | 333 | 249 | 929 | 1,827 | 5,091 | 55,957 | 4,167 | 1,279 | 71,035 |
| Sonoma | 5,443 | 738 | 745 | 1,210 | 1,368 | 1,676 | 2,897 | 220,959 | 20,267 | 255,302 |
| Marin | 20,699 | 1,661 | 552 | 2,765 | 2,208 | 587 | 389 | 4,570 | 68,789 | 102,220 |
| Bay Area | 683,882 | 414,400 | 1,114,313 | 833,823 | 460,095 | 169,199 | 80,225 | 255,133 | 148,897 | 4,159,967 |

Product 11
Region-Level Mode Share by Tour Purpose
Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Tour Purpose | Automobile | Walk | Bicycle | Transit | All Modes |
|--------------|------------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Work | 81.8% | 5.3% | 1.5% | 11.3% | 100.0% |
| University | 63.7% | 13.8% | 1.3% | 21.2% | 100.0% |
| School | 69.6% | 20.7% | 1.6% | 8.1% | 100.0% |
| At-Work | 69.4% | 29.3% | 0.7% | 0.6% | 100.0% |
| Eat Out | 81.1% | 15.4% | 1.3% | 2.3% | 100.0% |
| Escort | 93.8% | 5.7% | 0.3% | 0.2% | 100.0% |
| Shopping | 87.0% | 10.0% | 1.1% | 2.0% | 100.0% |
| Social | 78.7% | 15.8% | 1.7% | 3.8% | 100.0% |
| Other | 85.6% | 10.2% | 1.5% | 2.7% | 100.0% |
| All Purposes | 81.7% | 11.2% | 1.3% | 5.8% | 100.0% |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Trip Purpose | Automobile | Walk | Bicycle | Transit | All Modes |
|--------------------------------|------------|-------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Home-based Work | 83.5% | 3.4% | 1.3% | 11.8% | 100.0% |
| Home-based Shopping/Other | 84.1% | 9.9% | 0.7% | 5.3% | 100.0% |
| Home-based Social-Recreational | 81.2% | 10.7% | 3.6% | 4.5% | 100.0% |
| Non-home-based | 82.5% | 12.9% | 0.9% | 3.7% | 100.0% |
| Home-based College | 66.6% | 9.3% | 5.3% | 18.8% | 100.0% |
| Home-based High School | 55.5% | 21.4% | 4.4% | 18.7% | 100.0% |
| Home-based Grade School | 52.9% | 31.2% | 6.3% | 9.6% | 100.0% |
| All Purposes | 80.7% | 12.5% | 1.7% | 5.1% | 100.0% |

Product 12

Region-Level VMT and VHT by Facility Type and Time Period Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

VMT

| Time Period | Facility Type | | | | | All Facilities |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| | Freeways | Expressways | Major Arterials | Collectors | Other | |
| Early AM (3 a.m. - 6 a.m.) | 5,504,092 | 544,464 | 1,158,156 | 381,730 | 354,247 | 7,942,689 |
| AM Peak (6 a.m. - 10 a.m.) | 26,675,579 | 2,918,973 | 9,919,154 | 3,048,868 | 3,437,135 | 45,999,709 |
| Midday (10 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 26,067,097 | 3,063,934 | 10,925,935 | 3,047,571 | 4,407,032 | 47,511,570 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 28,630,722 | 3,380,237 | 12,261,677 | 3,558,105 | 4,461,626 | 52,292,367 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 3 a.m.) | 17,572,988 | 1,820,157 | 5,900,622 | 1,744,592 | 2,237,126 | 29,275,485 |
| Daily | 104,450,478 | 11,727,765 | 40,165,545 | 11,780,866 | 14,897,167 | 183,021,820 |

VHT

| Time Period | Facility Type | | | | | All Facilities |
|----------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|---------|----------------|
| | Freeways | Expressways | Major Arterials | Collectors | Other | |
| Early AM (3 a.m. - 6 a.m.) | 90,089 | 11,137 | 34,596 | 13,125 | 22,837 | 171,784 |
| AM Peak (6 a.m. - 10 a.m.) | 565,113 | 69,017 | 331,877 | 119,925 | 208,660 | 1,294,591 |
| Midday (10 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 461,465 | 65,853 | 357,347 | 118,317 | 254,178 | 1,257,160 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 600,243 | 80,725 | 419,721 | 147,321 | 256,638 | 1,504,646 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 3 a.m.) | 294,320 | 37,677 | 183,263 | 61,581 | 129,425 | 706,267 |
| Daily | 2,011,229 | 264,408 | 1,326,803 | 460,269 | 871,738 | 4,934,448 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

VMT

| Time Period | Facility Type | | | | | All Facilities |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| | Freeways | Expressways | Major Arterials | Collectors | Other | |
| AM Peak (5 a.m. - 9 a.m.) | 23,254,078 | 2,296,635 | 7,889,177 | 1,803,260 | 4,748,694 | 39,991,844 |
| Midday (9 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 33,882,129 | 2,808,072 | 9,945,821 | 2,488,415 | 7,186,680 | 56,311,117 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 28,035,161 | 3,460,308 | 12,253,081 | 3,003,551 | 6,555,756 | 53,307,857 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 5 a.m.) | 21,284,834 | 1,507,476 | 4,050,705 | 1,024,120 | 1,024,120 | 28,891,255 |
| Daily | 106,456,202 | 10,072,491 | 34,138,784 | 8,319,346 | 19,515,250 | 178,502,073 |

VHT

| Time Period | Facility Type | | | | | All Facilities |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|---------|----------------|
| | Freeways | Expressways | Major Arterials | Collectors | Other | |
| AM Peak (5 a.m. - 9 a.m.) | 557,271 | 77,891 | 294,386 | 100,785 | 195,611 | 1,225,944 |
| Midday (9 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 655,232 | 86,735 | 369,138 | 141,306 | 292,117 | 1,544,528 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 812,268 | 127,094 | 524,676 | 199,404 | 284,232 | 1,947,674 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 5 a.m.) | 345,015 | 41,581 | 139,328 | 44,753 | 129,816 | 700,493 |
| Daily | 2,369,786 | 333,301 | 1,327,528 | 486,248 | 901,776 | 5,418,639 |

Product 13

Region-Level Average Speed (VMT/VHT) by Facility Type and Time Period Year 2035, Current Regional Plans (v 0.1)

MTC Tour-based Models

| Time Period | Freeways | Facility Type | |
|----------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | All Other Facilities | All Facilities |
| Early AM (3 a.m. - 6 a.m.) | 61.1 | 29.9 | 46.2 |
| AM Peak (6 a.m. - 10 a.m.) | 47.2 | 26.5 | 35.5 |
| Midday (10 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 56.5 | 27.0 | 37.8 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 47.7 | 26.2 | 34.8 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 3 a.m.) | 59.7 | 28.4 | 41.5 |
| Daily | 51.9 | 26.9 | 37.1 |

San Mateo C/CAG Trip-based Models

| Time Period | Freeways | Facility Type | |
|---------------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------|
| | | All Other Facilities | All Facilities |
| AM Peak (5 a.m. - 9 a.m.) | 41.7 | 25.0 | 32.6 |
| Midday (9 a.m. - 3 p.m.) | 51.7 | 25.2 | 36.5 |
| PM Peak (3 p.m. - 7 p.m.) | 34.5 | 22.3 | 27.4 |
| Evening (7 p.m. - 5 a.m.) | 61.7 | 21.4 | 41.2 |
| Daily | 44.9 | 23.6 | 32.9 |

Appendix L: Traffic Impact Analysis Policy

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*

**Policy on Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)
To Determine Traffic Impacts on the Congestion
Management Program (CMP) Roadway Network
Resulting From Roadway Changes, General Plan
Updates, and Land Use Development Projects**

August 10, 2006

Section I

INTRODUCTION

As the Congestion Management Agency for San Mateo County, C/CAG is responsible for maintaining the performance and standards of the Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadway network. The CMP roadway network is of countywide significance, and their performance must be preserved.

Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is the term used in the study of the expected effects of projects and land use decisions on transportation facilities. The study's purpose is to determine whether the transportation system can accommodate the traffic generated by the projects or land use decisions. And to help decision makers to make improvements needed to the roadways, bike routes, sidewalks, and transit services affected by the project. This helps decision makers determine whether to approve the project and what conditions to impose on the project.

This document includes the following sections:

- Section I: Introduction
- Section II: Definition & Purpose
- Section III: Policy
 1. Roadway Modification Projects
 2. General Plan and Specific Plans
 3. Land Use Development Projects
- Section IV: Scope and Parameters of Traffic Impact Analysis
- Section V: Definition of CMP Impact

Section II

DEFINITION & PURPOSE

Definition

This document states policy and establishes procedures to determine cumulative capacity impacts on the CMP roadway network (impacts on the quality of traffic services) from the following three types of projects:

1. **Roadway modification projects:**
 - a. Projects that change the traffic capacity of CMP roadway.
 - b. Projects near the CMP roadway and impact the CMP roadway network.
2. **General Plan and Specific Plans.**
 - a. New General Plan or General Plan updates which include land use changes that would cause an impact on the CMP roadway network.
 - b. Specific Plans, Specific Area Plans, Precise Plans, which include land use changes that would cause an impact on the CMP roadway network.
3. **Land use development project.**

Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to ensure uniform procedures for performing Traffic Impact Analysis to evaluate impacts on the CMP roadway resulting from land use and project decisions in San Mateo County.

The intent of this policy is to preserve acceptable performance on the CMP roadway network, and to establish community standards for consistent system-wide transportation review. Preservation of CMP roadway and intersection performance will require an evaluation of the near and long term impacts of General Plan updates, land use development proposals, as well as proposed roadway modifications that will either reduce the capacity of the CMP network, or cause additional traffic on the CMP network.

It is not intended that the Traffic Impact Analysis guided by this document will provide all information required for California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) purposes. Traffic impact analysis to determine traffic impacts on the CMP network may be conducted as part of the CEQA process.

This policy will be reviewed and integrated into the 2007 Congestion Management Program for San Mateo County. It will be reviewed subsequently in two years.

Section III **POLICY**

This policy provides an avenue to assess the cumulative traffic impacts on the Congestion Management (CMP) roadway network, of General Plan decisions made by local jurisdictions. It provides direction to local jurisdictions on how to analyze CMP traffic impacts resulting from roadway changes or land use decisions, determine feasible and appropriate mitigations.

Land use development proposals and proposed roadway modifications must be consistent with the jurisdiction's adopted General Plan, unless the proposal is to be amended into the General Plan before final approval by the jurisdiction. Local jurisdictions must evaluate traffic impacts of proposed revisions to their jurisdiction-wide General Plans and Specific Area Plans on the CMP network.

1. Roadway Modification Projects

Project sponsor, in consultation with C/CAG staff, shall determine if a roadway modification project on or near a CMP roadway will have potential near-term and long-term traffic impacts on the CMP roadway network. Section 4, *Scope and Parameters of Traffic Impact Analysis*, and more specifically the definition of impacts in Section 5, *Definition of CMP Impacts* should be used in developing initial thresholds (e.g. change in intersection or lane volumes) to determine significant traffic impacts on a CMP roadway.

If initial assessment indicates that significant traffic impact on the CMP network may result from the proposed project, its sponsor must conduct traffic impact analysis consistent with this policy to determine traffic impacts on the CMP roadway system. Moreover, a travel demand forecasting model must be used to determine long-term traffic impacts if the project is to modify the CMP roadway. See "Travel Demand Forecasting" requirements below. For near term analysis, if the travel demand forecasting model does not provide the level of detail desired, then the use of manual assignment models, micro-simulation models or other tools to provide a more detailed and informative analysis of a roadway project is acceptable.

Mitigation:

Proposed roadway changes to the CMP roadway that are determined to have a CMP traffic impacts for current or future years cannot be considered in conformity with the Congestion Management Program unless mitigated to no CMP impact. This mandatory mitigation requirement applies only to roadway projects on the CMP network. More latitude is provided for mitigating impacts to the CMP network that result from local land use decisions as described in sections 2 and 3 of this policy.

CMP traffic impacts could be mitigated through modifications of the proposed project. The level of service analysis or simulation can often be used to identify elements of the project that, if modified, will reduce the project impacts.

Mitigation measures may also include roadway improvements, operational changes, or a provision for alternate routes. For example, adding a turn lane at the intersection, modifying or eliminating on street parking may improve travel times. All mitigation measures shall first be discussed with and reviewed by C/CAG staff.

This policy does not prohibit a local jurisdiction from mitigating impacts on local streets that result from congestion on a CMP roadway.

2. General Plan and Specific Plans

Project sponsor, in consultation with C/CAG staff, shall determine if a General Plan change or a Specific Plan will have potential traffic impacts on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadway network. Jurisdictions must conduct travel demand forecasting and traffic impact analysis to determine long term cumulative traffic impacts on the CMP roadway system. See “Travel Demand Forecasting” requirements below. For scope and parameters of traffic impact analysis, see Section 4. For definition of traffic impacts on the CMP system, see Section 5. If a jurisdiction makes small and incremental amendments to its General Plan to include land use changes, and that each individual land use change would not have CMP traffic impact, then flexibility is provided that the travel demand forecasting model needs to be run every two years to account for the cumulative list of projects and site specific General Plan changes.

Mitigation:

General Plan updates or Specific Plans that are determined to have CMP traffic impacts must consult C/CAG staff to identify feasible mitigations.

Cumulative development traffic impacts identified in the evaluation of a jurisdiction may be mitigated in a variety of ways. Clearly, revising the allowable land use intensities is the most direct way to mitigate traffic impacts to the CMP network. However, it is recognized that this may not be consistent with the jurisdiction’s economic development plans. As alternatives, the jurisdiction may adopt a trip reduction policy that requires new development to make measurable reductions in their trip generation. These trip reduction requirements should be incorporated in the standard Conditions of Approval. The local jurisdiction should also implement a plan to monitor or sample actual trip generation to ensure that the trip reduction conditions are being met following project occupancy. Alternatively, jurisdictions may elect to provide capital improvements to reduce the traffic impact of cumulative development. To be viable, this type of mitigation must include a reliable funding mechanism such as a traffic mitigation fee program that includes, at a minimum, partial funding for the impacted CMP roadways. Where the impact is on the freeway system it will usually not be feasible to fully fund a needed improvement through a local fee. However, the fee program should provide a minimum of funding that would meet likely local share requirements, if approved by the jurisdiction.

All mitigation measures shall first be discussed with and reviewed by C/CAG staff before they are included in the report.

3. Land Use Development Projects

Project sponsor shall comply with the “Land Use Impact Analysis Program” guidelines in the latest Congestion Management Program (CMP) for San Mateo County. Project sponsors shall consult C/CAG staff regarding land use development projects that are determined to have traffic impacts on the CMP roadway network.

Mitigations:

Adopted General Plan trip reduction requirements should ultimately be implemented at the project level through Conditions of Approval. As with the General Plan mitigations, the trip reduction program should include a plan for monitoring trip generation and procedures to determine if established targets are met or exceeded. The option to reduce the intensity of a project to eliminate significant impacts to the CMP network should also be considered. If physical mitigation is desired, the jurisdiction should determine whether the project can and should be required to construct the mitigation project or whether funding the project’s pro rata share is appropriate, and paid to the jurisdiction.

Travel Demand Forecasting Requirements

It is the intent of this policy that the cumulative traffic impacts to the CMP roadway system be evaluated consistently throughout the County. Toward this end, the C/CAG Countywide Travel Demand Forecasting Model must be used to forecast traffic demand for the analysis of the long-term cumulative traffic impacts of CMP roadway modification projects, General Plan updates, and Specific Area Plans.

Long Term Cumulative Analysis

The long-term cumulative analysis must be based on C/CAG or C/CAG derivative model forecasts. C/CAG will periodically update the model to provide travel demand forecasts under a 15 to 20 year planning horizon. This does not, necessarily require individual cumulative model runs for each land use development project. For example, a project that is consistent with the City’s existing General Plan may not require a new model run. Previous General Plan consistent model results can be used. The alternative methods used for near term analysis or individual development projects as described in the next section may be used to modify the existing model results to illustrate conditions with and without the proposed project. If alternative methods are used to modify cumulative model forecasts, comparison must be made with long-range C/CAG model forecasts to ensure consistency. This type of minor adjustments to the C/CAG model results is permitted for individual land use development projects or minor changes to an existing General Plan. However new C/CAG model runs are required at least every two years¹, for

¹ The biennial update of the C/CAG model runs can be postponed until they are needed for the analysis of a

Specific Plans and for major General Plan updates. Updating the C/CAG model runs is necessary to ensure that the cumulative impacts both within each jurisdiction as well as from neighboring jurisdictions are represented in the model results.

A C/CAG derivative model that is consistent with the C/CAG model may also be used; however, it must be reviewed and approved by C/CAG staff in advance. Derivative models must be updated periodically to maintain a 15 to 20 year planning horizon. Approval of a C/CAG derivative model includes the demonstration to C/CAG staff that the model yields similar output as the C/CAG model given the same input assumptions. In addition, the land use assumptions and transportation network assumptions incorporated in a C/CAG derivative model must be consistent with the most recent C/CAG model in order to be eligible for consideration. The C/CAG Countywide Travel Demand Forecasting Model runs must be reviewed by C/CAG. C/CAG may hire its travel demand model consultant to conduct the review, and costs incurred will be borne by the project sponsor.

Near Term Analysis

The use of C/CAG Countywide Travel Forecasting Model or a C/CAG derivative model is not mandatory for near term analysis of projects. The use of methodologies that are widely accepted by the traffic engineering profession such as applying established growth factors to existing traffic volumes, manual assignment models (e.g. TRAFFIX) are also allowable for these analysis scenarios. However, alternative methods for near term impact or individual development project analysis do not replace the requirement for a long-term cumulative impact analysis consistent with this Traffic Impact Analysis Policy.

C/CAG Review for Conformance

For roadway modification projects, C/CAG staff shall review for consistency with this Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) policy and determine conformity with the Congestion Management Program (CMP).

For General Plan updates, Specific Plans, and land use development projects, C/CAG staff shall review TIA reports for consistency with this TIA policy. This review shall not constitute approval or disapproval of the project that is the subject of the report. C/CAG does not have the authority to approve or reject projects. That decision rests with the lead agency. However, the CMP establishes community standards and guidelines for consistent system-wide transportation review and provides comments to the lead agency on the TIA report based on staff review. Compliance with the Congestion Management Program may be enforced through the withholding of apportionments under Section 2105 of the Streets & Highways Code as well as declaring a local agency ineligible for future transportation funds.

development, planning or CMP roadway project. Therefore, in communities with limited development activity, the two-year-old model runs need only be updated when there is a land use or roadway project to be analyzed.

Section IV

SCOPE AND PARAMETERS FOR TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSIS (TIA)

Project sponsors must initiate consultation between the lead agency, C/CAG, Caltrans (if applicable), and those preparing the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) before commencing work on the study to establish the appropriate traffic impact analysis scope. At a minimum, the TIA should include the following:

A. Boundaries of the TIA

The boundaries of a TIA must not only include the immediate project area but also areas outside of the project area that may be impacted by the project. For example, the boundaries of an arterial segment, for analysis purposes, may be defined as at least one signalized intersection beyond the project limits on either end. If modification to a segment between intersections will affect the up-stream or down-stream intersection, then average travel time or average travel speed for a segment covering the up- and down-stream intersections must be analyzed.

Boundaries of a TIA must be agreed upon by the lead agency and C/CAG before commencing work on the analysis. Consultation with Caltrans is recommended, if applicable. However, if the project proposes to change a State owned facility, then the boundaries of analysis must be agreed upon by Caltrans as well.

B. Traffic Analysis Scenarios

Consultation between the lead agency, C/CAG, Caltrans (if applicable), and those preparing the TIA is recommended to determine the appropriate scenarios for the analysis. The following scenarios should be addressed as a minimum:

- Existing background condition (includes already approved developments and roadway network changes)
- Existing condition plus Project
- Future (15² to 20 year horizon) background without Project (no-build)
- Future (20 year horizon) background condition plus project

C. Analysis Period

Consultation between the lead agency, C/CAG, Caltrans (if applicable), and those preparing the TIA is recommended to determine the appropriate analysis periods. The TIA shall include, at a minimum, an analysis of transportation conditions in the AM and PM peak hours.

2 20-year Model forecasts are assumed to be updated every 5 years so forecast horizon may be as short as 15 years.

D. Facilities To Be Included In the Analysis

1. A CMP intersection shall be included in a TIA if it is expected to be impacted by the proposed project.
2. A non-CMP intersection that is along a CMP segment shall be included in a TIA if it is expected to be impacted by the proposed project.
3. A freeway segment shall be included in a TIA if it is expected to be impacted by the proposed project.
4. A CMP arterial segment shall be included in a TIA if it is expected to be impacted by the proposed project.

E. Report Format

Traffic Impact Analysis reports must present findings for the various analysis scenarios and analysis periods as described above in the following units of measurement:

| | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|
| Intersections: | LOS and delay time |
| Freeway segments: | LOS and volume-to-capacity ratio |
| Arterial segments: | LOS and average travel speed |

Section V

DEFINITION OF CMP IMPACT

A project is considered to have a CMP impact if it causes one or more of the following:

1. CMP Intersection currently in compliance with the adopted LOS standard:

- A. A project will be considered to have a CMP impact if the project will cause the CMP intersection to operate at a level of service that violates the standard adopted in the current Congestion Management Program (CMP).
- B. A project will be considered to have a CMP impact if the cumulative analysis indicates that the combination of the proposed project and future cumulative traffic demand will result in the CMP intersection to operate at a level of service that violates the standard adopted in the current Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the proposed project increases average control delay at the intersection by four (4) seconds or more.

2. CMP Intersection currently not in compliance with the adopted LOS standard:

A project is considered to have a CMP impact if the project will add any additional traffic to the CMP intersection that is currently not in compliance with its adopted level of service standard as established in the CMP.

3. Freeway segments³ currently in compliance with the adopted LOS standard:

- A. A project is considered to have a CMP impact if the project will cause the freeway segment to operate at a level of service that violates the standard adopted in the current Congestion Management Program (CMP).
- B. A project will be considered to have a CMP impact if the cumulative analysis indicates that the combination of the proposed project and future cumulative traffic demand will result in the freeway segment to operate at a level of service that violates the standard adopted in the current Congestion Management Program (CMP) and the proposed project increases traffic demand on the freeway segment by an amount equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity, or causes the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent.

4. Freeway segments currently not in compliance with the adopted LOS standard:

A project is considered to have a CMP impact if the project will add traffic demand equal to one (1) percent or more of the segment capacity or causes the freeway segment volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio to increase by one (1) percent, if the freeway segment is

³ Freeway segments are as defined in the Congestion Management Program Monitoring Program and are directional.

currently not in compliance with the adopted LOS standard.


5 CMP Arterial Segments:

The analysis of arterial segments is only required when a jurisdiction proposes to reduce the capacity of a CMP designated arterial through reduction in the number of lanes, adding or modifying on-street parking, or other actions that will affect arterial segment performance.


A project is considered to have a CMP impact if it causes mid-block queuing, parking maneuver resulting in delays or other impacts that result in any segment intersection to operate at a level of service that violates the adopted LOS standard set for the nearest CMP intersection.

Analysis of the segment using a calibrated micro-simulation model may be required by C/CAG staff to evaluate non-intersection impacts of the proposed project. CMP impact is determined if, based on the micro-simulation model, the average travel speed for the arterial segment is reduced by 4 miles per hour (mph) or more. Segments with average speeds that indicate LOS E or worse (based on Exhibit 15-2, HCM2000) cannot be modified by local jurisdictions if the proposed modifications would further reduce travel speeds on the segment.


To determine CMP impact on a CMP Intersection




To determine CMP impact on a Freeway Segment



To determine CMP impact on Arterial Segment



Flow chart for traffic impacts on the congestion management program (CMP) roadway network



Appendix M: Measure M Implementation Plan

Measure M Implementation Plan

FY 2017-2021

Adopted by the C/CAG Board
May 12, 2016



PURPOSE OF THE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Measure M Implementation Plan describes the various programs identified in the Expenditure Plan in more detail and established percentages of funds allocated to each of the Countywide Transportation Programs. The Implementation Plan also identifies specific projects and programs under each category that would be eligible to receive funds along with identifying the targeted performance measures for each activity. The Implementation Plan, which requires adoption by the C/CAG Board, is developed at the onset of the 25-Year Measure M Program and is updated every 5 years. This Implementation Plan covers the period from FY 2017 to FY 2021.

COLLECTION OF THE FEE

The \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) will be collected for a period of 25 years, beginning on May 2, 2011 and ending on May 1, 2036. Beginning approximately July 2011 and every month thereafter for the duration of the fee, the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) will issue C/CAG a monthly check for revenues collected from the prior month. The estimated revenue is \$6.7 million annually and \$33.5 million over the initial 5-year implementation period. This amount takes into consideration the DMV's administrative fee charge of approximately \$0.005 (one-half of a cent) for each check issued to C/CAG.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY (FY 2017 - 2021)

As indicated in the approved Measure M Expenditure Plan up to 5% of the proceeds is allocated for administration with 50% of the net revenue allocated to the Local Streets and Roads category and 50% of the net revenue allocated to the Countywide Transportation Programs which includes the following programs: Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation, Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors, Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS), and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Regional Permit.

The FY 2017–2021 Implementation Strategy is as follows:

| PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION (Up to 5%) |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Allocation of funds to be taken off the top.▪ A portion of the funds will be used for routine program administration activities.▪ Any unused administration funds would be redistributed to the Local Streets and Roads and/or Countywide Program categories as appropriate. |

LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (50% of Net Revenue)

- Allocations to local jurisdictions (20 cities and the County) for congestion mitigation and stormwater pollution mitigation programs.
- Allocation to be on a cost reimbursement basis utilizing a distribution formula consisting of 50% population and 50% road miles for each jurisdiction modified for a minimum guaranteed amount of \$75,000 for each jurisdiction. (Exhibit A)
- Allocations will be made two times a year, at a minimum every 6 months.
- Jurisdictions have the flexibility on use of the funds between the categories and projects; therefore, there are no requirements to split the funds evenly between the categories.
- Measure M should not be used to supplant existing city general funds.

| Category | Programs/Projects Description | Performance Measure |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| Traffic Congestion Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local Shuttles/transportation ▪ Road resurfacing/reconstruction ▪ Deployment of local Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) ▪ Roadway operations (e.g., restriping, signal timing / coordination, signage) ▪ Replacement and/or upgrading of traffic signal hardware and/or software | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of passengers transported ▪ Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved ▪ Number of ITS components installed/ implemented ▪ Miles/fraction of miles of roads improved ▪ Number of units replaced and/or upgraded |
| Stormwater Pollution Prevention | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Street Sweeping ▪ Roadway storm inlet cleaning ▪ Street side runoff treatment ▪ Auto repair shop inspections ▪ Managing runoff from street/parking lot ▪ Small capital projects such as vehicle related runoff management/controls ▪ Capital purchases for motor vehicle related runoff management/controls | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Miles of streets swept ▪ Number of storm inlets cleaned ▪ Square feet of surfaces managed ▪ Number of auto repair shops inspected ▪ Square feet of surfaces managed annually ▪ Number of projects implemented ▪ Number of pieces of equipment purchased and installed |

| LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS (Continue) | | |
|---|---|--|
| Category | Programs/Projects Description | Performance Measure |
| Stormwater Pollution Prevention (Cont'd) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Additional used oil drop off locations ▪ Motor vehicle fluid recycling programs ▪ Installation of new pervious surface median strips in roadways ▪ Municipal Regional Permit Compliance Activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of locations implemented/ operated; oil quantity collected ▪ Number of programs implemented/ operated; fluid quantity collected ▪ Square footage of new pervious surface median strips installed ▪ Identification of permit provision(s) and compliance activities performed |

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (50% of Net Revenue)

- Allocations for the four (4) Countywide Programs are as follows:
 - Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation - 22%
 - Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) and Smart Corridors - 10%
 - Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) Infrastructure - 6%
 - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) for administration and projects - 12%
- Allocation to be on a cost reimbursement basis.
- Up to a maximum of 4% may be transferred between the ITS/Smart Corridors, SR2S, and NPDES/MRP within the 5-year period taking into consideration actual expenditures, unused allocations, program shortfalls, and program needs.
- The ITS and NPDES projects to be selected by a competitive “call for project” process.
- The Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation programs to be sponsored by SamTrans or Caltrain. Proposed projects to be submitted to C/CAG annually for approval.
- The SRTS Infrastructure Program to be administered by the C/CAG. Funds will also be provided to County Office of Education (COE) as match for non-infrastructure projects.
- The ITS/Smart Corridors and NPDES/MRP Programs to be administered by C/CAG

| Category | Programs/Projects Description | Performance Measure |
|---|--|--|
| Transit Operations and/or Senior Transportation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SamTrans Paratransit operations and maintenance (Caltrain projects are also eligible) ▪ Senior Mobility Management projects that complement paratransit (e.g., Mobility Ambassadors, Van Sharing) ▪ Senior Mobility Education (e.g. Senior Mobility Guide, Website Management) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Operating costs and fare revenue; Usage; Operating Efficiency; Reliability and Safety; Customer satisfaction; Cost effectiveness ▪ Hours of service per month; number of trips per month; and number of individuals who ride in a given month ▪ Frequency of in-person presentations; number of individuals participated; increased activity on web page |

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (Continue)

| Category | Programs/Projects Description | Performance Measure |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| ITS and Smart Corridors | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Deployment of projects having regional and countywide significance▪ Maintenance and operations of the Smart Corridors specific equipment located within the San Mateo County jurisdictions' right-of-way | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Number of ITS components installed and implemented▪ Number of instances and duration that the equipment (directional signs, CCTV, communications, power supply line and equipment) is inoperable; Operability and activation of equipment |
| SRTS | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ San Mateo County SRTS Program includes infrastructure and non-infrastructure (education, outreach, encouragement, and evaluation activities) | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Number of schools participating in the Program; Number of projects (infrastructure and non-infrastructure) implemented |

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS (Continue)

| Category | Programs/Projects Description | Performance Measure |
|-----------------|--|---|
| NPDES and MRP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Street and Road Repair and Maintenance ▪ Green Street projects ▪ Control mobile sources ▪ Public outreach events ▪ Trash load reduction and hot spot cleanup ▪ Vehicle brake pad pollution impacts ▪ Municipal Regional Permit Compliance Activities | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of guidance documents developed; area/length of roadways managed ▪ Number of projects completed, area of impervious surface managed with low impact development measures ▪ Number of guidance documents developed, outreach events or materials distributed, or mobile source properly managed ▪ Number of materials/events developed, distributed, and/or attended; Number of people contacted ▪ Number of guidance documents developed; quantity of area addressed by trash management measures; amount of trash loading reduced/prevented through implementation of management measures ▪ Number of guidance documents developed and/or quantity of pollutants addressed by management measures ▪ Identification of permit provision(s) and compliance activities performed |


EXHIBIT A

The table below provides an estimated distribution for the Local Streets and Roads allocation based a formula consisting of 50% population and 50% road miles for each jurisdiction modified for a minimum guaranteed amount of \$75,000 for each jurisdiction.

| Jurisdiction | % of Total Allocation | Estimated Net Annual Revenue | Estimated Net 5-Year Revenue |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Atherton | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| Belmont | 3.30% | \$104,950 | \$524,750 |
| Brisbane | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| Burlingame | 3.92% | \$124,650 | \$623,250 |
| Colma | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| Daly City | 9.71% | \$309,000 | \$1,545,000 |
| East Palo Alto | 2.99% | \$95,300 | \$476,500 |
| Foster City | 3.13% | \$99,750 | \$498,750 |
| Half Moon Bay | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| Hillsborough | 2.80% | \$89,000 | \$445,000 |
| Menlo Park | 4.49% | \$143,000 | \$715,000 |
| Millbrae | 2.71% | \$86,400 | \$432,000 |
| Pacifica | 4.82% | \$153,500 | \$767,500 |
| Portola Valley | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| Redwood City | 8.96% | \$285,350 | \$1,426,750 |
| San Bruno | 4.69% | \$149,100 | \$745,500 |
| San Carlos | 3.98% | \$126,750 | \$633,750 |
| San Mateo | 11.00% | \$350,000 | \$1,750,000 |
| South San Francisco | 7.13% | \$226,800 | \$1,134,000 |
| Woodside | 2.35% | \$75,000 | \$375,000 |
| San Mateo County | 12.22% | \$388,950 | \$1,944,750 |
| Total | 100.00% | \$3,182,500 | \$15,912,500 |

Notes:

1. Population totals are updated based on the State of California Department of Finance estimates (2015)
2. Figures may be slightly off due to rounding off errors.
3. Assumes constant annual revenue over the 5-year Implementation Plan period.



MEASURE M

IMPROVING SAN MATEO COUNTY



5 YEAR PERFORMANCE REPORT | FISCAL YEARS 2012-2016

\$10 VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE



M E A S U R E M

Measure M, sponsored by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) and approved by the voters of San Mateo County in 2010, imposes an annual fee of ten dollars (\$10) on motor vehicles registered in San Mateo County for transportation-related traffic congestion and water pollution mitigation programs. The revenue is estimated at \$6.7 million annually over a 25 year period. Per the Expenditure Plan, 50% of the net proceeds will be allocated to the 20 cities and County for local streets and roads and 50% will be used for countywide transportation programs such as transit operations, regional traffic congestion management, water pollution prevention, and safe routes to school.



LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS:
\$16.9 MILLION



TRANSIT OPERATIONS/SENIOR
MOBILITY: **\$7.4 MILLION**



SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL:
\$2.0 MILLION

INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM
(ITS)/SMART CORRIDOR: **\$3.4 MILLION**



NPDES AND MUNICIPAL REGIONAL PERMIT
ADMIN AND PROJECTS: **\$4.1 MILLION**



**FISCAL YEARS
2011-12 THROUGH 2015-16**

Revenue

Collection of the \$10 Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF) commenced in May 2011. As part of the initial 5 Year Implementation Plan, the annual program budget is estimated at \$6.7 million with average monthly revenue of \$560,000. The actual revenue received during the five year period of Fiscal Years 2011-12 through 2015-16 is \$36.1 million with an average monthly revenue of approximately \$586,000. The following table summarizes the actual revenue received by C/CAG through Fiscal Year 2015-16, and accrued interest income for each fiscal year to date. Interest is accumulated and is reallocated to the countywide programs in future years. The amount allocated to the various program categories is the total revenue received, excluding interest earned and after subtracting 5% from the top for program administration, as summarized below.

| REVENUE | TOTAL TO DATE | FY 2011-12 ¹ | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Total VRF Collected | \$36,220,414 | \$7,981,296 | \$6,849,938 | \$6,981,050 | \$7,155,362 | \$7,252,769 |
| DMV Fees | (\$73,183) | (\$59,063) | (\$3,425) | (\$3,491) | (\$3,578) | (\$3,626) |
| To C/CAG | \$36,147,231 | \$7,922,233 | \$6,846,513 | \$6,977,559 | \$7,151,784 | \$7,249,143 |
| Interest ² | \$140,525 | \$24,342 | \$15,403 | \$45,226 | \$26,711 | \$28,843 |
| TOTAL REVENUE | \$36,287,756 | \$7,946,575 | \$6,861,916 | \$7,022,785 | \$7,178,495 | \$7,277,986 |

Administration

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Program Administration 5% | \$1,807,362 | \$396,112 | \$342,326 | \$348,878 | \$357,589 | \$362,457 |
| County Assessors Election Costs | (\$549,527) | (\$549,527) | | | | |
| Net Available for Programs | \$33,790,343 | \$6,976,594 | \$6,504,187 | \$6,628,681 | \$6,794,195 | \$6,886,685 |

1. FY 2011-12 Revenue includes fees collected in May and June 2011 2. Interest not included in distribution

| ALLOCATION | TOTAL TO DATE | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Jurisdiction 50% | \$16,895,171 | \$3,488,297 | \$3,252,094 | \$3,314,341 | \$3,397,097 | \$3,443,343 |
| Local Streets and Roads (Traffic Congestion Management/ Stormwater Pollution Prevention) | | | | | | |
| Programs | | | | | | |
| Countywide Transportation Programs 50% | \$16,895,171 | \$3,488,297 | \$3,252,094 | \$3,314,341 | \$3,397,097 | \$3,443,343 |
| Transit Operations/ Senior Programs 22% | \$7,433,875 | \$1,534,851 | \$1,430,921 | \$1,458,310 | \$1,494,723 | \$1,515,071 |
| ITS / Smart Corridor 10% | \$3,379,034 | \$697,659 | \$650,419 | \$662,868 | \$679,419 | \$688,669 |
| Safe Routes to School 6% | \$2,027,421 | \$418,596 | \$390,251 | \$397,721 | \$407,652 | \$413,201 |
| NPDES and MRP Admin and Projects 12% | \$4,054,841 | \$837,191 | \$780,502 | \$795,442 | \$815,303 | \$826,402 |
| PROGRAM TOTAL | \$33,790,343 | \$6,976,594 | \$6,504,187 | \$6,628,681 | \$6,794,195 | \$6,886,685 |

ALLOCATION AND EXPENDITURE

Program Administration

Funds allocated under this category pays for program management and administration activities. Over the 5-Year period, out of \$1,807,362 reserved for administration, \$579,012 has been spent, which is approximately 30% of the available allocation (or 1.5% of the total revenue). Per the adopted Measure M 5-Year Implementation Plan, unexpended allocation for program administration will be reallocated to the countywide programs in future years, similar to the accumulated interest.


| | | REVENUE | EXPENDITURE | BALANCE |
|---------------------------------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Administration (Excl. Interest) | 5% | \$1,807,362 | (\$579,012) | \$1,228,350 |

Local Streets and Roads / Countywide Transportation Programs


Net funds available over the 5-Year period for distribution, after subtracting five percent for program administration, and the actual expenditure for each program category is summarized in the table and pie chart below.

| PROGRAMS | % | REVENUE | EXPENDITURE | ENCUMBRANCE | TO BE ALLOCATED |
|---------------------------|-----|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| Local Streets and Roads | 50% | \$16,895,171 | (\$15,137,534) | (\$1,757,637) | \$0 |
| Transit Operations/Senior | 22% | \$7,433,875 | (\$7,000,000) | (\$433,875) | \$0 |
| ITS / Smart Corridor | 10% | \$3,379,034 | (\$900,000) | (\$900,000) | \$1,579,034 |
| Safe Routes to School | 6% | \$2,027,421 | (\$1,642,290) | (\$385,131) | \$0 |
| NPDES and MRP | 12% | \$4,054,841 | (\$3,955,776) | (\$99,065) | \$0 |
| TOTAL | | \$33,790,342 | (\$28,635,600) | (\$3,575,708) | \$1,579,034 |

The balance indicated for Local Streets and Roads are allocations to be distributed to the jurisdictions. The balances for the countywide programs are encumbered for future projects.



PROGRAM ALLOCATION



Local Streets and Roads

Funds for local streets and roads are allocated to jurisdictions to reimburse expenditures related to traffic congestion management or stormwater pollution prevention related activities. Allocations are issued biennially for funds collected from July to December and from January to June of each fiscal year, after funds are collected for each six-month period. For the 5-Year period, C/CAG has allocated \$16.9 million with \$14.4 million claimed by the local jurisdictions. Sixty one percent (61%) of the total distribution has reimbursed jurisdictions for street resurfacing and congestion management related projects with 39% of the funds used to reimburse stormwater pollution prevention related activities such as street sweeping, storm drain inlet cleaning, and Municipal Regional Permit (MRP) compliance. The total allocations and reimbursements (through November 30, 2016) over the 5-Year period are as follows.

| JURISDICTION | % | ALLOCATION | REIMBURSEMENT | | |
|---------------------|-------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | | | STORMWATER | TRAFFIC | TOTAL |
| ATHERTON | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$93,485 | \$304,673 | \$398,158 |
| BELMONT | 3.29% | \$555,162 | \$90,601 | \$464,561 | \$555,162 |
| BRISBANE | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$230,700 | \$167,458 | \$398,158 |
| BURLINGAME | 3.95% | \$667,141 | \$164,757 | \$502,384 | \$667,141 |
| COLMA | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$41,241 | \$117,606 | \$158,847 |
| DALY CITY | 9.62% | \$1,624,479 | \$ - | \$1,624,479 | \$1,624,479 |
| EAST PALO ALTO | 3.06% | \$517,310 | \$ - | \$64,709 | \$64,709 |
| FOSTER CITY | 3.12% | \$526,773 | \$42,291 | \$484,482 | \$526,773 |
| HALF MOON BAY | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$ - | \$317,011 | \$317,011 |
| HILLSBOROUGH | 2.81% | \$474,726 | \$32,056 | \$390,512 | \$422,568 |
| MENLO PARK | 4.50% | \$759,659 | \$357,371 | \$402,288 | \$759,659 |
| MILLBRAE | 2.74% | \$462,109 | \$330,322 | \$81,015 | \$411,337 |
| PACIFICA | 4.84% | \$816,971 | \$313,522 | \$247,871 | \$561,393 |
| PORTOLA VALLEY | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$93,317 | \$143,000 | \$236,317 |
| REDWOOD CITY | 8.82% | \$1,490,420 | \$1,062,450 | \$264,217 | \$1,326,667 |
| SAN BRUNO | 4.76% | \$804,354 | \$374,945 | \$429,409 | \$804,354 |
| SAN CARLOS | 4.03% | \$681,335 | \$165,119 | \$441,357 | \$606,476 |
| SAN MATEO | 11.02% | \$1,861,054 | \$598,277 | \$1,262,777 | \$1,861,054 |
| SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO | 7.17% | \$1,211,262 | \$213,556 | \$997,706 | \$1,211,262 |
| WOODSIDE | 2.36% | \$398,158 | \$78,588 | \$319,570 | \$398,158 |
| SAN MATEO COUNTY | 12.15% | \$2,053,468 | \$1,570,989 | \$256,864 | \$1,827,853 |
| TOTAL | 100% | \$16,895,171 | \$5,853,587 | \$9,283,948 | \$15,137,534 |

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Transit Operations/Senior Mobility Programs


Funds for this category are currently used for paratransit (disabled and senior) service including Senior Mobility programs. C/CAG provides the San Mateo County Transit District (SamTrans) \$1.4 million annually to partially fund the RediWheels and Senior Mobility programs. SamTrans’ annual paratransit service budget is \$15.4 million. The programs are summarized as follows:

The Senior Mobility Program promotes and coordinates community transit; provides rides through community-based transportation; encourages the use of transit; provides information and assistance of older drivers; and promotes improvements to remove barriers to pedestrian activities by older adults.

The RediWheels program is a fixed-route paratransit service for persons with disabilities who cannot independently use regular SamTrans bus service. The RediWheels service is provided on the bayside of the County (RediCoast on the coast side). SamTrans offers paratransit customers a financial incentive to use the services by allowing ADA (American with Disabilities Act) certified customers and personal care attendants to ride all regular fixed-route SamTrans trips without paying a fare.

Performance measures to assess effectiveness of the RediWheels program regarding ridership and contractor are provided below.

REDIWHEELS
Program Performance



Data reflect entire RediWheels Program

| SHUTTLE SERVICE | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 |
|--------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Revenue Hours | 12,284 | 12,986 | 13,387 | 14,615 | 14,906 |
| Ridership (one way trips) | 22,094 | 22,453 | 23,053 | 24,317 | 26,634 |
| Individual Riding ¹ | 1,963 | 2,012 | 2,062 | 2,170 | 2,240 |
| Cost Per Rider | \$46.22 | \$47.69 | \$52.15 | \$48.30 | \$48.82 |

| CONTRACTOR | FY 2011-12 | FY 2012-13 | FY 2013-14 | FY 2014-15 | FY 2015-16 |
|--|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Productivity (Passengers/hr.) [Std. 1.7] | 1.7 | 1.73 | 1.72 | 1.66 | 1.79 |
| On Time Performance [90%] | 88.7% | 89.5% | 90.5% | 89% | 90% |
| Complaints per thousand riders [2.5] | 0.70 | 0.68 | 0.72 | 0.67 | 0.64 |
| Telephone hold time (minutes) [1.5] | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 1.3 |

1. Number of enrolled individual RediWheels users who rode

Data reflect entire RediWheels Program

Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)/ Smart Corridor

Funds are being accumulated under this program category to be used for the San Mateo County Smart Corridor project construction and maintenance in addition to funding other countywide ITS projects. The Smart Corridor project deploys and integrates ITS elements, including communication network, signal system upgrade, signage and close circuit cameras along state routes (El Camino Real) and major local streets enabling Caltrans and local cities to implement strategies to manage recurring and non-recurring traffic congestion to reduce delays and improve mobility. The completed project segments are located from I-380 to the Santa Clara County line and includes local arterials connecting US 101 and SR 82 (El Camino Real).

A total of \$900,000 of Measure M was spent towards the design and construction of the \$35 million Smart Corridor project. For other ITS projects within the County, an assessment will be performed to identify needs for San Mateo County for the next years and beyond.



| PARTICIPATION | TOTAL |
|--------------------|-------------|
| School Districts | 18 |
| Individual Schools | 133 |
| Students | Over 57,700 |

| ACTIVITIES/EVENTS | TOTAL |
|----------------------------|-------|
| Educational Bicycle Rodeos | 735 |
| Assemblies and Classes | 3,090 |
| Encouragement Events | 2,769 |
| Walk and Bike Audits | 181 |
| Route Maps | 194 |

Safe Routes to School (SRTS)


The San Mateo County SRTS Program is a countywide effort to promote activities that increase the number of students walking, biking and carpooling to schools as ways of reducing traffic congestion around schools and improving air quality with the co-benefit of promoting students' health and fitness. The program has focused on non-infrastructure project outreach activities such as education, encouragement, and evaluation. C/CAG subcontracts to the San Mateo County Office of Education for the day-to-day program management. The overall SRTS Program, funded by a combination of STP/CMAQ and matching funds from Measure M, is budgeted at approximately \$1 million annually with 25% reserved for administration and indirect costs and 75% of the funds provided to the schools in the form of grants.

Funding is provided to schools for non-infrastructure projects such as outreach and education activities and walkability/bikability audits. Typical non-infrastructure projects include walking and bicycle audits and student education such as bike rodeos, safety assemblies, pedestrian safety, and development of educational videos. Schools are also implementing walking school buses, bike trains/carpools, and parking lot management. Encouragement events include Walk and Roll Wednesdays/Fresh Air Fridays, Bike to School Day, Walk to School Day, and various contests.

Measure M funds also support small capital infrastructure projects located on school sites such as signage, safety measures within school parking lots, bike lockers/racks, and other improvements addressing bicyclist and pedestrian access to/from school as well as promoting safe driving practices. Through the first five years of the Program (FY 2011-12 through FY 2015-16), \$3.5 million in grants have been awarded to schools, an average of \$705,000 per year. A summary of participants and types of activities provided are as follows:

C/CAG partnered with the San Mateo-Foster City School District and City of San Mateo to facilitate and fund the design and construct of the Laurel Elementary School Sustainable Stormwater and Safe Routes to School Project. The project, which demonstrates an integrated approach of merging safe routes to school improvements and stormwater pollution prevention management, included construction of infrastructures within and around the school to improve access for children walking or bicycling to school as well as vehicle movements, at the same time incorporating elements for the capture and treatment of stormwater runoff from impervious areas such as streets and parking lots, Increased landscaping and trees resulting in a more aesthetically pleasing environment.

SRTS MODE SPLIT TO SCHOOL (2012-2015)



National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/Municipal Regional Permit (MRP)

Funds accumulating under this program category are designated for pollution mitigation programs and projects, as allowed under Measure M's authorizing legislation, Government Code Section 65089.20. The C/CAG Board authorized unrestricted use of these funds for Municipal Regional Permit compliance activities in May 2012. As such, these funds are being directed toward countywide compliance activities through C/CAG's Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program, primarily for technical consultant costs for regulatory compliance support programs. Use of funds varies from year to year based on the level of technical support needed to meet each year of Municipal Regional Permit compliance. Measure M funds supplement other revenue to the Countywide Water Pollution Prevention Program and generally cover half of the Countywide Program's consultant costs each year.

C/CAG utilizes Measure M funding, \$4 million from FY 2012-13 to FY 2015-16 (approximately \$1 million annually) for consultant support in meeting Municipal Regional Permit requirements which includes the following technical support activities: Water quality monitoring, Mercury/PCBs controls, Trash load reduction, Public information and outreach, General education/training/guidance/regional involvement & coordination, and Annual reporting.

Overall, Measure M funds in this program category have helped ensure C/CAG's member agencies stay in compliance with requirements in the MRP. C/CAG performs all of the mandated water quality monitoring in San Mateo County, the majority of stormwater-related public education and outreach, and significant efforts to support member agencies in achieving mandated reductions in mercury and PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls), trash, and urban pesticides. In addition, Measure M funds support C/CAG's consultant efforts to educate and train member agency staffs in implementing their local stormwater control programs, as well as support annual reporting of regional, countywide, and local stormwater management efforts.

In 2015-16, C/CAG also began supporting its member agencies with requirements to develop Green Infrastructure Plans and a countywide Stormwater Resource Plan, including applications for state grant funds. Many of these efforts would have to be eliminated or significantly reduced without Measure M funds.



**ABOUT CITY/COUNTY
ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF
SAN MATEO COUNTY (C/CAG)**

C/CAG deals with issues that affect the quality of life in general; transportation, air quality, stormwater runoff, hazardous waste, solid waste and recycling, and land use near airports.

C/CAG operates as a Joint Powers Authority and has membership that includes each of the 20 cities and the County in San Mateo County.

AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION:

ALUCP - Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY (CMA):

Congestion Management Program

Countywide Transportation Plan

INTEGRATED SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT

LOCAL TASK FORCE:

Integrated Solid Waste Management Planning

PROGRAM MANAGER FOR AB434 40% FUNDS

(TRANSPORTATION FUND FOR CLEAN AIR):

Expenditure Program for San Mateo County


PROGRAM MANAGER FOR NATIONAL POLLUTANT

DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES):

Stormwater Management Plan



555 COUNTY CENTER, 5TH FLOOR | REDWOOD CITY, CA 94063 | (650) 599-1406 | WWW.CCAG.CA.GOV



Appendix N: MTC Guidance for Consistency of Congestion Management Programs with the Regional Transportation Plan

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Planning Committee**

June 14, 2019

Agenda Item 2b

MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised – Congestion Management Program Policy

Subject: Approval of revisions to MTC’s Congestion Management Program Policy to inform the Bay Area’s County Transportation Agencies (CTAs) (also known as “Congestion Management Agencies” or “CMAs”) on how MTC intends to make a finding of consistency between each prepared 2019 Congestion Management Program (CMP) and Plan Bay Area 2040, the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Background: CMPs were established by State law in 1990 with the intention of creating a cooperative context for transportation planning by cities and their respective CTAs. A primary intent of CMPs is to monitor county multi-modal transportation networks and identify improvements to the performance of these multi-modal systems. The CMPs primary performance measure is vehicle delay presented as Level of Service (LOS) A through F.

The CMPs are prepared biennially (odd years). However, CMPs are not required in a county if a majority of local governments representing a majority of the population adopt resolutions electing to be exempt from this requirement (AB 2419 (Bowler) Chapter 293, Statutes of 1996). Jurisdictions throughout the state have chosen to opt out of the CMP process as provided for in the law, including San Diego, Fresno, Santa Cruz, and San Luis Obispo counties. Los Angeles County began the opt out process in 2018. MTC has encouraged local consideration of the opt out process, noting that the CMP legislation is outdated and the CMP’s primary measure – LOS – has largely been superseded by other statewide priorities to reduce vehicle miles (“VMT”) and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Instead, MTC has encouraged CTAs to focus limited planning resources on Countywide Transportation Plans (CTP) as a more flexible, comprehensive, and inclusive planning process to identify and reflect local funding priorities, and to focus on coordination with MTC staff on the Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Revisions to the Guidelines

Staff revised Attachments A and B of MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised, to reflect updated federal and state regulatory settings and the adoption of Plan Bay Area 2040, to clarify how MTC will make a finding of consistency between each prepared CMP and Plan Bay Area 2040, to update the Travel Demand Modeling Checklist, to reference the latest release of the Highway Capacity Manual, and to reflect minor updates to descriptive language.

MTC’s Responsibility

For each prepared CMP, MTC’s responsibilities include making a finding of consistency between the CMP and the RTP/SCS (currently “Plan Bay Area 2040”), evaluating the consistency and compatibility of the CMPs in the Bay Area, and including CMP projects into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). For counties that opt out of preparing a CMP, MTC will work directly with the respective CTA to reflect project priorities from an adopted

Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and are consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040 for RTIP funding.

Next Steps

In fall 2019, CTAs will submit their 2019 CMP and their respective project priorities for consideration into the 2020 RTIP. MTC will then begin its consistency review before submitting the final 2020 RTIP priorities to the California Transportation Commission by December 15, 2019. See Table 1 for a summary of the 2019 CMP review process.

Issues:

The CMP legislation and ensuing process is outdated and its primary measure – LOS – is out of step with more recent statewide guidance. In response, MTC envisions a future redrafting of the CMP Policy in advance of the 2021 CMPs to re-assess what it means to be consistent with the RTP/SCS. There are two primary ways in which CTA's develop short and long-range transportation project priorities to support regional planning and programming efforts, the CMP and the CTP. Currently, six of the nine Bay Area counties prepare both a CMP and CTP, and the two counties that are not required to prepare CMPs prepare CTPs. Given this redundancy, MTC may want to seek legislative action to revisit the CMP statutes and one modern comprehensive planning process, as the CTP are also established under state statute.

Recommendation:

MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised, delegates to this Committee the responsibility for approving revisions to the CMP Guidance (MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised). Staff recommends that the Committee approve the revisions to Attachments A and B of MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised, for the purpose of providing guidance for the development of the 2019 CMPs consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Table 1: 2019 CMP Schedule
Attachment B: MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised



Therese W. McMillan

Table 1. 2019 CMP Review Process and Schedule

| Date | Activity | Responsible Party |
|-------------------|--|---|
| June 14, 2019 | Approval of updates to CMP Policy | MTC's Planning Committee |
| October 2019 | CMAs submit 2019 CMP, RTIP projects summary listings, and identification of projects requiring project-level performance measure analysis to MTC. Deadline to submit Complete Streets Checklist for new projects. | CTAs |
| October 2019 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submittal of CMPs for counties that prepare CMPS • Review of consistency of CMPs with Plan Bay Area 2040 (RTP/SCS) | MTC staff |
| November 2019 | Final Project Programming Request (PPR) forms due to MTC. Final RTIP project listing and performance measure analysis due to MTC. Final PSR (or PSR equivalent), Resolution of Local Support, and Certification of Assurances due to MTC (final complete applications due) | CTAs |
| December 11, 2019 | Programming & Allocations scheduled review of RTIP and referral to Commission for approval | MTC's Programming & Allocations Committee |
| December 15, 2019 | 2020 RTIP due to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) (PAC approved project list will be submitted) | MTC staff |
| December 18, 2019 | MTC's scheduled Consistency Findings on 2019 CMPs MTC's scheduled approval of the 2020 RTIP | MTC Commission |

Date: June 25, 1997
W.I.: 30.5.10
Referred By: WPC
Revised: 06/11/99-W 05/11/01-POC
06/13/03-POC 06/10/05-POC
05/11/07-PC 05/08/09-PC
06/10/11-PC 07/12/13-PC
10/09/15-PC 06/14/19-PC

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3000, Revised

This resolution revises MTC's Guidance for Consistency of Congestion Management Programs with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

This resolution supersedes Resolution No. 2537

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on June 11, 1999, to reflect federal and state legislative changes established through the passage of the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century and SB 45, respectively. In addition, the Modeling Checklist has been updated.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on May 11, 2001, to reflect state legislative changes and to reference updated demographic and forecast data.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on June 13, 2003, to reflect state legislative changes, 2001 RTP goals and policies, and to reference updated demographic and forecast data.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on June 10, 2005, to reflect the updated RTP goals, as per Transportation 2030, and to reference updated demographic and forecast data.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on May 11, 2007, to reflect federal legislative changes established through the passage of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA), and to reference new State Transportation Control Measures and updated demographic and forecast data.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on May 8, 2009, to reflect MTC's new RTP (Transportation 2035 Plan), an updated Travel Demand Modeling Checklist, and revised Resolution 3434 and TOD policy.

ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 3000, Revised

Page 2

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on June 10, 2011, to reflect the new regional coordinated land use and transportation planning process as directed through SB 375, an updated Travel Demand Modeling Checklist, the newly released Highway Capacity Manual 2010, the Bay Area 2010 Ozone Strategy, and updates to the table noting achievement of the Transit Oriented Development requirements by Resolution No. 3434 transit extension project.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on July 12, 2013, to reflect the new RTP (Plan Bay Area) and the statutory requirements in MAP-21 for RTP and air quality conformity requirements.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on October 9, 2015, to reflect the final Plan Bay Area document, revisions to the Modeling Consistency Requirements and Transportation Control Measures, and to include minor updates to descriptive language.

Attachments A and B of this resolution were revised on June 14, 2019, to reflect updated federal and state regulatory settings and the Bay Area's new RTP/SCS (Plan Bay Area 2040), clarifications to the manner in which MTC will make a finding of consistency with PBA 2040, revisions to the Travel Demand Modeling Checklist, the newly released Highway Capacity Manual 2016, and to include minor updates to descriptive language.

Date: June 25, 1997
W.I.: 30.5.10
Referred By: WPC

Re: Congestion Management Program Policy.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 3000

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Sections 66500 et seq; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 65080 requires each transportation planning agency to prepare a regional transportation plan and a regional transportation improvement program directed at the achievement of a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 65089 requires a designated local agency in each urbanized county to develop, adopt, and periodically update a congestion management program for the county and its included cities unless a majority of local governments in a county and the county board of supervisors elect to be exempt; and requires that this congestion management program be developed in consultation, among others, with the regional transportation planning agency; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 65089.2 requires that, for each congestion management program prepared, the regional transportation planning agency must make a finding that each congestion management program is consistent with the regional transportation plan, and upon making that finding shall incorporate the congestion management program into the regional transportation improvement program; and

WHEREAS, Government Code § 65082 requires that adopted congestion management programs be incorporated into the regional transportation improvement program approved by MTC; and

WHEREAS, MTC has adopted a Congestion Management Program Policy (MTC Resolution 2537, Revised) to provide guidance for all the counties and cities within the region in preparing their congestion management programs; and,

WHEREAS, MTC's Congestion Management Program Policy needs to be updated from time to time to provide further guidance, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts the Congestion Management Program Policy, as set forth in Attachments A and B to this resolution, which are incorporated herein by reference; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the MTC Work Program Committee is delegated the responsibility for approving amendments to Attachments A and B; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that this resolution shall be transmitted to the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies for use in preparing their congestion management programs; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that MTC Resolution No. 2537, Revised is hereby superceded.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Jane Baker, Chairwoman

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on June 25, 1997.

Date: June 25, 1997
W.I.: 30.5.10
Referred By: WPC
Revised: 06/11/99-W 05/11/01-POC
06/13/03-POC 06/10/05-POC
05/11/07-PC 05/08/09-PC
06/10/11-PC 07/12/13-PC
10/09/15-PC 06/14/19-PC

Attachment A
Resolution No. 3000
Page 1 of 13

**GUIDANCE FOR CONSISTENCY OF
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS
WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

June 2019

Title Page

**GUIDANCE FOR CONSISTENCY OF
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS
WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | |
|-------------|---|-----------|
| I. | INTRODUCTION..... | 4 |
| | A. Purpose of This Guidance..... | 4 |
| | B. Legislative Requirement for Congestion Management Programs..... | 4 |
| | C. The Role of CMPs in the Regional Transportation Planning Process..... | 5 |
| II. | MTC’s ROLE & RESPONSIBILITIES | 5 |
| | A. MTC's Responsibilities Regarding CMPs | 5 |
| | B. The RTP Regulatory Setting..... | 5 |
| | C. Consistency Findings with the RTP/SCS | 6 |
| | 1) The RTP/SCS (“Plan Bay Area 2040”)..... | 6 |
| | 2) Consistency with the MTC Travel Demand Modeling Databases and Methodologies | 9 |
| | 3) Consistency with pertinent Air Quality Plans..... | 11 |
| | D. Consistency and Compatibility of the Programs within the Region..... | 11 |
| | E. Incorporation of the CMP Projects into the RTIP | 12 |
| III. | CMP PREPARATION & SUBMITTAL TO MTC..... | 13 |
| | A. CMP Preparation..... | 13 |
| | B. Regional Coordination..... | 13 |
| | C. Submittal to MTC | 13 |
| | D. MTC Consistency Findings for CMPs..... | 13 |

Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|---|
| AB | Assembly Bill |
| ABAG | Association of Bay Area Governments |
| BAAQMD | Bay Area Air Quality Management District |
| BCDC | Bay Conservation and Development Commission |
| CFR | Code of Federal Regulations |
| CIP | Capital Improvement Program |
| CMA | Congestion Management Agency |
| CMP | Congestion Management Program |
| CTC | California Transportation Commission |
| FAST | Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act |
| GHG | Greenhouse Gas (CO ₂) |
| HCM | Highway Capacity Manual |
| ITIP | Interregional Transportation Improvement Program |
| LOS | Level of Service |
| MPO | Metropolitan Planning Organization |
| MTC | Metropolitan Transportation Commission |
| MTP | Metropolitan Transportation Plan |
| PCA | Priority Conservation Area |
| PDA | Priority Development Area |
| RMWG | Regional Model Working Group |
| RTIP | Regional Transportation Improvement Program |
| RTP/SCS | Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy |
| RTPA | Regional Transportation Planning Agency |
| SB | Senate Bill |
| TCM | Transportation Control Measures |
| TOD | Transit Oriented Development |
| TPA | Transit Priority Area |
| UGB | Urban Growth Boundary |

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of This Guidance

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) statutes establish specific requirements for the content and development process for CMPs; the relationship between CMPs and the regional transportation planning process; Congestion Management Agency (CMA) monitoring and other responsibilities; and, the responsibilities of MTC as the Bay Area's Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) and Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). CMPs are not required to be prepared in counties where a majority of local governments representing a majority of the county's population and the Board of Supervisors adopt resolutions requesting to be exempt from this requirement (AB 2419 (Bowler) Chapter 293, Statutes of 1996). The following Guidance is for those counties that prepare a CMP following state statutes. For counties that opt out of preparing a CMP, MTC will work directly with the appropriate county transportation agencies to establish project priorities for funding.

CMP statutes specify responsibilities for MTC as the Bay Area's RTPA/MPO. These responsibilities include: reviewing the consistency between each CMP and the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) – which encompasses the Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) demonstrating how the region could achieve state greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction targets; evaluating the consistency and compatibility of the CMPs in the Bay Area; and, including CMP projects into the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

The purpose of this Guidance is to focus on MTC's role in determining consistency between the CMPs and the region's RTP/SCS (herein also referred to as "Plan Bay Area 2040").

B. Legislative Requirement for Congestion Management Programs

CMPs were established as part of a bi-partisan legislative package in 1989 and approved by the voters in 1990. This legislation also increased transportation revenues and changed state transportation planning and programming processes. The specific CMP provisions were originally chartered by the Katz-Kopp-Baker-Campbell Transportation Blueprint for the Twenty-First Century by AB 471 (Katz); (Chapter 106, Statutes 1989). They were revised by AB 1791 (Katz) (Chapter 16, Statutes of 1990), AB 3093 (Katz) (Chapter 2.6, Statutes of 1992), AB 1963 (Katz) (Chapter 1146, Statutes of 1994), AB 2419 (Bowler) (Chapter 293, Statutes of 1996), AB 1706 (Chapter 597, Statutes of 2001), and SB 1636 (Figueroa) (Chapter 505, Section 4, Statutes of 2002), which defines and incorporates "infill opportunity zones." The provisions regarding establishing new "infill opportunity zones" have now expired, but established infill opportunities zones are still subject to the statutes.

CMP statutes establish requirements for local jurisdictions to receive certain gas tax subvention funds. Additionally, CMPs play a role in the development of specific project proposals for the RTIP.

C. The Role of CMPs in the Regional Transportation Planning Process

CMPs can play a role in the countywide and regional transportation planning processes (although these functions can be achieved without an official CMP as well):

- CMPs can be used to identify near-term projects to implement the long-range vision established in a countywide transportation plan.
- Through CMPs, the transportation investment priorities of the multiple jurisdictions in each county can be addressed in a countywide context.
- CMPs can be used to establish a link between local land use decision making and the transportation planning process.
- CMPs can be used as a building block for the federally required Congestion Management Process¹.

II. MTC's ROLE & RESPONSIBILITIES

A. MTC's Responsibilities Regarding CMPs

MTC's direct responsibilities under CMP statutes are concentrated in the following provisions:

“The regional agency shall evaluate the consistency between the program (i.e., the CMP) and the regional transportation plans required pursuant to Section 65080. In the case of a multicounty regional transportation planning agency, that agency shall evaluate the consistency and compatibility of the programs within the region. (Section 65089.2 (a))

The regional agency, upon finding that the program is consistent, shall incorporate the program into the regional transportation improvement program as provided for in Section 65082. If the regional agency finds the program is inconsistent, it may exclude any project in the congestion management program from inclusion in the regional transportation improvement program. (Section 65089.2(b))

It is the intent of the Legislature that the regional agency, when its boundaries include areas in more than one county, should resolve inconsistencies and mediate disputes which arise between agencies related to congestion management programs adopted for those areas.” Section 65089.2.(d)(1))

B. The RTP Regulatory Setting

Federal Requirements

The primary federal requirements regarding RTPs are addressed in the metropolitan transportation planning rules in Title 23 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 450 and 500 and Title 49 CFR Part 613. These federal regulations have been updated to reflect the

¹See the following link for more information on the federal Congestion Management Process, https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/plan4ops/focus_areas/cmp.htm

metropolitan transportation planning regulations called out in 2015's federal transportation bill, Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST). Under FAST, the U.S. Department of Transportation requires that MPOs, such as MTC, prepare long-range Metropolitan Transportation Plans (MTPs) and update them every four years if they are in designated "nonattainment" or "maintenance" areas for federal air quality standards.

State Requirements

California Government Code Section 65080 sets forth the state's requirements for RTPs. Section 65080 requires MPOs located in air quality nonattainment regions update their RTPs at least every four years.

The regional agencies, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), assist MTC in addressing the requirements flowing from California's Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act (Sustainable Communities Act, SB 375, Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008), which requires each of the state's 18 metropolitan areas, including the Bay Area, to reduce GHG emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. The mechanism for achieving these reductions is the preparation of an SCS.

State RTP Guidelines

The California Transportation Commission (CTC)'s RTP Guidelines, last updated in 2017, tie together federal and state regulations and CTC policy direction to guide the development of RTPs. CTC programming policy prohibits the allocation of funds to projects that are not consistent with an adopted RTP.

Section 65080 of the Government Code, as amended by SB 375, states that the RTP shall contain four distinct elements:

- A Policy Element that reflects the mobility goals, policies and objectives of the region;
- A Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as established through SB 375;
- An Action Element that identifies programs and actions to implement the RTP; and
- A Financial Element that summarizes the cost of implementing the projects in the RTP in a financially constrained environment.

C. Consistency Findings with the RTP/SCS

MTC's findings for the consistency between CMPs and the RTP/SCS focus on four areas:

- Consistency with the RTP/SCS goals, growth pattern, and supporting transportation investment strategy;
- Consistency with the MTC travel demand modeling database and methodologies; and,
- Consistency with federal and state air quality plans.

1) The RTP/SCS ("Plan Bay Area 2040")

Plan Bay Area 2040, adopted in 2017, along with its predecessor – Plan Bay Area – grew out of SB 375 and serves as the Bay Area's MTP and RTP/SCS. Plan Bay Area 2040 integrates the

region’s SCS into the RTP. Plan Bay Area 2040 was prepared by MTC in partnership with ABAG, BAAQMD, and BCDC and in collaboration with Caltrans, the nine county-level CMAs or substitute agencies, over two dozen Bay Area transit operators, and numerous transportation stakeholders and the public. Plan Bay Area 2040 achieves and exceeds the Bay Area’s regional GHG reduction targets set forth by CARB and was prepared in compliance with the CTC’s RTP Guidelines.

Goals and Targets

Plan Bay Area 2040 incorporates a set of seven goals and thirteen performance targets – one of those being CARB’s GHG emissions reduction target – as quantifiable measures against which progress may be evaluated in addressing the major challenges facing the region, as shown in Table 1. CMAs should consider these goals and targets when preparing their CMPs.

To determine whether a CMP is consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040, MTC *will* first qualitatively evaluate whether the CMP is supportive or in conflict with the Plan Bay Area 2040’s goals and targets shown in Table 1, below. MTC *will not* evaluate whether each CMP achieves Plan Bay Area 2040’s adopted targets.

Table1. Plan Bay Area 2040 Performance Targets

| Goal | # | Target |
|--|----------|---|
| Climate Protection | 1 | Reduce per-capita GHG (CO ₂) emissions from cars and light duty trucks by 15% <i>Statutory - Source: California Air Resources Board, as required by SB 375</i> |
| Adequate Housing | 2 | House 100% of the region’s projected growth by income level without displacing current low-income residents and with no increase in in-commuters over the Plan baseline year |
| Healthy & Safe Communities | 3 | Reduce adverse health impacts associated with air quality, road safety, and physical inactivity by 10% |
| Open Space & Agricultural Preservation | 4 | Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries (UGBs)) |
| Equitable Access | 5 | Decrease the share of lower-income residents’ household income consumed by transportation and housing by 10% |
| | 6 | Increase the share of affordable housing in PDAs, transit priority areas (TPAs), or high-opportunity areas by 15% |
| | 7 | Do not increase the share of low- and moderate-income renter households in PDAs, TPAs, or high-opportunity areas that are at risk of displacement |
| Economic Vitality | 8 | Increase by 20% the share of jobs accessible within 30 minutes by auto or within 45 minutes by transit in congested conditions |

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---|
| | 9 | Increase by 38% the number of jobs in predominantly middle-wage industries |
| | 10 | Reduce per-capita delay on the Regional Freight Network by 20% |
| Transportation System Effectiveness | 11 | Increase non-auto mode share by 10% |
| | 12 | Reduce vehicle operating and maintenance costs due to pavement conditions by 100% |
| | 13 | Reduce per-rider transit delay due to aged infrastructure by 100% |

Unless noted, the Performance Target increases or reductions are for 2040 compared to a year 2005 baseline.

Growth Pattern

In addition to reducing GHG emissions, SB 375 requires that the SCS promote compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development, and identify how the region could house its current and projected population. To meet the goals of SB 375, and the GHG reduction targets, Plan Bay Area 2040 largely reflects the foundation and regional growth pattern established in the original Plan Bay Area. Plan Bay Area 2040’s core strategy is “focused growth” in existing communities along the existing transportation network. This strategy builds upon existing community characteristics and leverages existing infrastructure. Key to implementing the focused growth strategy are Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) identified, recommended, and approved by local governments.

- **Priority Development Areas (PDAs) -**
 These existing neighborhoods are nominated locally, served by public transit, and include areas that are or will be walkable and bikeable and close to public transit, jobs, schools, shopping, parks, recreation and other amenities.
- **Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs) -**
 These regionally significant open spaces which have a broad consensus for long-term protection but which face nearer-term development pressures.

In addition, MTC has adopted a Transportation and Land Use Platform that calls for supportive land use plans and policies to support transit extensions in Res. 3434. Further, MTC has adopted a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) Policy, as part of Res. 3434, that establishes specific housing thresholds for these extensions, requires station area plans and establishes corridor working groups. These regional policies and specific projects within the county should be recognized in the CMP (attached as Attachment B, Appendix C).

As a second check to determine whether a CMP is consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040, MTC will qualitatively evaluate whether the CMP is supportive versus in conflict with the Plan Bay Area 2040’s growth strategy.

Investment Strategy

Plan Bay Area 2040’s focused growth strategy is supported by a robust, multi-modal transportation investment strategy that enables the Bay Area to exceed its regional GHG

reduction targets. The Plan develops a blueprint for short- term and long-term transportation investments to support the plan’s focused growth strategy. Investment priorities reflect a primary commitment to “Fix It First,” a key emphasis area in the original Plan Bay Area as well.

Approximately 90 percent of Plan Bay Area 2040’s investments focus on operating, maintaining and modernizing the existing transportation system. Plan Bay Area 2040 also directs almost two-thirds of future funding to investments in public transit, mostly to ensure that transit operators can sustain existing service levels through 2040.

- **Operate + Maintain:** This strategy includes projects that replace transit assets, pave local streets and state highways, and operate the transit system.
- **Modernize:** This strategy includes projects that improve the existing system without significantly increasing the geographical extent of the infrastructure. Electrifying Caltrain and portions of the express lane network are two major investments in this category.
- **Expand:** This strategy includes projects that extend fixed-guideway rail service or add lanes to roadways. Extending Caltrain to downtown San Francisco and BART into Silicon Valley, as well as implementing express lanes on U.S.101 in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties, are major investments in this category.

Regional Transit Expansion Program

The Regional Transit Expansion Program –adopted by the Commission as Resolution 3434– calls for a nearly \$18 billion investment in new rail and bus projects that will improve mobility and enhance connectivity for residents throughout the Bay Area. Further, Plan Bay Area 2040 identifies modernization and expansion projects to increase transit capacity in core locations of the Bay Area, including the transbay corridor, peninsula corridor, within San Francisco, and within Santa Clara County. This includes projects such as extending BART to San Jose and Santa Clara, extending Caltrain to downtown San Francisco, extending VTA’s light rail on the Capitol Expressway and Vasona lines, and extending SMART to Larkspur and Windsor.

RTP Financial Requirements and Projections

Under the federal transportation authorization (FAST), the actions, programs and projects in the RTP must be fiscally constrained, meaning their costs cannot exceed the forecast of public and private revenues that are reasonably expected to be available. While CMPs are not required by legislation to be fiscally constrained, recognition of financial constraints, including the costs for maintaining, rehabilitating, and operating the existing multi-modal system and the status of specific major projects, will strengthen the consistency and linkage between the regional planning process and the CMP. The CMA may submit project proposals for consideration by MTC in developing future fiscally constrained RTPs.

As a final check to determine whether a CMP is consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040, MTC will verify whether the CMP’s CIP is consistent with the Plan Bay Area 2040’s adopted investment strategy. The scope, schedule, and cost estimates of regionally-significant projects must be consistent with Plan Bay Area 2040’s adopted project list, and non-regionally significant projects must align with a programmatic category in Plan Bay Area 2040’s adopted project list.

2) Consistency with the MTC Travel Demand Modeling Databases and Methodologies

MTC's statutory requirements regarding consistent databases are as follows:

The agency, (i.e., the CMA) in consultation with the regional agency, cities, and the county, shall develop a uniform data base on traffic impacts for use in a countywide transportation computer model . . . The computer models shall be consistent with the modeling methodology adopted by the regional planning agency. The data bases used in the models shall be consistent with the data bases used by the regional planning agency. Where the regional agency has jurisdiction over two or more counties, the data bases used by the agency shall be consistent with the data bases used by the regional agency. (Section 65089 (c))

MTC desires the development and implementation of consistent travel demand models, with shared input databases, to provide a common foundation for transportation policy and investment analysis.

The Bay Area Partnership's Regional Model Working Group (RMWG) serves as a forum for sharing data and expertise and providing peer review for issues involving the models developed by or for the CMAs, MTC, and other parties. The MTC Checklist for Modeling will be used to guide the consistency assessment of CMA models with the MTC model.

The Checklist is included in Attachment B, and addresses:

- Demographic/econometric forecasts;
- Pricing assumptions;
- Network assumptions;
- Travel demand methodologies; and,
- Traffic assignment methodologies.

Level of Service Methodology

CMP statutory requirements regarding level of service are as follows

“Level of service (LOS) shall be measured by Circular 212, by the most recent version of the Highway Capacity Manual, or by a uniform methodology adopted by the agency that is consistent with the Highway Capacity Manual.” (Section 65089 (b))

The most recently adopted highway capacity manual is Highway Capacity Manual, Sixth Edition: A Guide for Multimodal Mobility Analysis, or HCM 2016, or HCM6, was released in 2016. This edition incorporates the latest research on highway capacity, quality of service, *Active Traffic and Demand Management*, and travel time reliability.

Over the last several years, the State of California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) has been in the process of developing an alternative to the LOS approach as it relates to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in response to SB 743 (Steinberg, 2013). OPR's proposed alternative is an assessment of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). In December 2018, the California Natural Resources Agency certified and adopted the CEQA Guidelines update package, including the Guidelines section implementing SB 743 (§ 15064.3).

3) Consistency with pertinent Air Quality Plans

Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) are identified in the federal and state air quality plans to achieve and maintain the respective standards for ozone and carbon monoxide. The statutes require that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the CMP conform to transportation related vehicle emission air quality mitigation measures. CMPs should promote the region's adopted TCMs for federal and state air quality plans. In addition, CMPs are encouraged to consider the benefits of GHG reductions in developing the CIP, although GHG emission reductions are not currently required in federal and state air quality plans.

A reference to the lists of federal and state TCMs is provided in Attachment B. The lists may be updated from time to time to reflect changes in the federal and state air quality plans.

In particular, TCMs that require local implementation should be identified in the CMP, specifically in the CIP.

CMPs are also required to contain provisions pertaining to parking cash-out.

The city or county in which a commercial development will implement a parking cash-out program that is included in a congestion management program pursuant to subdivision (b), or in a deficiency plan pursuant to Section 65089.4, shall grant to that development an appropriate reduction in the parking requirements otherwise in effect for new commercial development. (2) At the request of an existing commercial development that has implemented a parking cashout program, the city of county shall grant an appropriate reduction in the parking requirements otherwise applicable based on the demonstrated reduced need for parking, and the space no longer needed for parking purposes may be used for other appropriate purposes. (Section 65089 (d))

As of January 1, 2010, cities, counties and air districts were given the option to enforce the State Parking Cash-Out statutes (Section 43845 of the Health and Safety Code), as per SB 728 (Lowenthal). This provided local jurisdictions with another tool to craft their own approaches to support multi-modal transportation systems, address congestion and greenhouse gases.

D. Consistency and Compatibility of the Programs within the Region

The CMP statutes require that, in the case of a multi-county regional transportation agency, that agency shall evaluate the consistency and compatibility of the CMPs within the region. Further, it is the Legislature's stated intention that the regional agency (i.e., MTC in the San Francisco Bay Area) resolve inconsistencies and mediate disputes between or among CMPs within a region.

To the extent useful and necessary, MTC will identify differences in methodologies and approaches between the CMPs on such issues as performance measures and land use impacts.

The CMP statutes also require that the CMA designate a system of highways and roadways which shall be subject to the CMP requirements. Consistency requires the regional continuity of the CMP designated system for facilities that cross county borders.

To determine whether a CMP is consistent with the system definition of adjoining counties, MTC will review the draft CMPs to determine whether adjacent counties have the same designations of cross border facilities.

E. Incorporation of the CMP Projects into the RTIP

State transportation statutes require that the MTC, in partnership with the state and local agencies, develop the RTIP on a biennial cycle. The RTIP is the regional program for state and federal funding, adopted by MTC and provided to CTC for the development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In 1997, SB 45 (Statutes 1997, Chapter 622) significantly revised State transportation funding policies, delegating project selection and delivery responsibilities for a major portion of funding to regions and counties. Subsequent changes to state law (AB 2928 – Statutes 2000, Chapter 91) made the RTIP a five-year proposal of specific projects, developed for specific fund sources and programs. The RTIP is required to be consistent with the most recently adopted RTP (Plan Bay Area 2040).

The CMP statutes establish a direct linkage between CMPs that have been found to be consistent with the RTP, and the RTIP. MTC will review the projects in the CIP of the CMP for consistency with the RTP. MTC's consistency findings for projects in the CMPs will be limited to those projects that are included in the RTP, and do not extend to other projects that may be included in the CMP. Some projects may be found consistent with a program or programmatic category in the RTP. MTC, upon finding that the CMP is consistent with the RTP, shall incorporate the CMP's program of projects into the RTIP, subject to specific programming and funding requirements. If MTC finds the CMP inconsistent, it may exclude any project in the program from inclusion in the RTIP. Since the RTIP must be consistent with the RTP, projects that are not consistent with the RTP will not be included in the RTIP. MTC may include certain projects or programs in the RTIP which are not in a CIP, but which are in the RTP. In addition, SB 45 requires projects included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) to be consistent with the RTP.

MTC will establish funding bid targets for specific funds, based upon the fund estimate as adopted by the CTC. Project proposals can only be included in the RTIP within these funding bid targets. MTC will also provide information on other relevant RTIP processes and requirements, including coordination between city, county, and transit districts for project applications, schedule, evaluations and recommendations of project submittals, as appropriate for the RTIP.

As per CTC's Guidelines, MTC will evaluate the projects in the RTIP based on specific performance indicators and measures as established in the RTP and provide this evaluation to the CTC along with the RTIP. CMAs are encouraged to consider the performance measures in Plan Bay Area when developing specific project proposals for the RTIP; more details will be provided in the RTIP Policies and Procedures document, adopted by MTC for the development of the RTIP.

III. CMP PREPARATION & SUBMITTAL TO MTC

A. CMP Preparation

If prepared, the CMP shall be developed by the CMA in consultation with, and with the cooperation of, MTC, transportation providers, local governments, Caltrans, and the BAAQMD, and adopted at a noticed public hearing of the CMA. As established in SB 45, the RTIP is scheduled to be adopted by December 15 of each odd numbered year. If circumstances arise that change this schedule, MTC will work with the CMAs and substitute agencies in determining an appropriate schedule and mechanism to provide input to the RTIP.

B. Regional Coordination

In addition to program development and coordination at the county level, and consistency with the RTP, the compatibility of the CMPs with other Bay Area CMPs would be enhanced through identification of cross county issues in an appropriate forum, such as Partnership and other appropriate policy and technical committees. Discussions would be most beneficial if done prior to final CMA actions on the CMP

C. Submittal to MTC

To provide adequate review time, draft CMPs should be submitted to MTC in accordance to a schedule MTC will develop to allow sufficient time for incorporation into the RTIP for submittal to the California Transportation Commission. Final CMPs must be adopted prior to final MTC consistency findings.

D. MTC Consistency Findings for CMPs

MTC will evaluate consistency of the CMP every two years with the RTP that is in effect when the CMP is submitted; for the 2019 CMP the RTP in effect will be Plan Bay Area 2040. MTC will evaluate the consistency of draft CMPs when received, based upon the areas specified in this guidance, and will provide staff comments of any significant concerns. MTC can only make final consistency findings on CMPs that have been officially adopted.

Date: June 25, 1997
W.I.: 30.5.10
Referred By: WPC
Revised: 06/11/99-W 05/11/01-POC
06/13/03-POC 06/10/05-POC
05/11/07-PC 05/08/09-PC
06/10/11-PC 07/12/13-PC
10/09/15-PC 06/14/19-PC

Attachment B
Resolution No. 3000
Page 1 of 17

Attachment B to MTC Resolution No. 3000 consists of:

- Appendix A Federal and State Transportation Control Measures
- Appendix B Checklist for Modeling Consistency for CMPs
- Appendix C MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects
(MTC Resolution No. 3434, revised 09/24/08)
- Appendix D MTC's Resolution No. 3434 Transit Oriented Development
(TOD) Policy, revised 10/24/07

Title Page

Appendix A: Federal and State Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)

Federal TCMs:

For a list and description of current Federal TCMs, see the “Federal Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard” adopted Oct. 24, 2001, and “2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide, Updated Maintenance Plan for Ten Federal Planning Areas,” approved January 30, 2006.

The current Federal TCMs have been fully implemented. Refer to the "Final Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the Plan and the Proposed Final 2015 Transportation Improvement Program" at http://files.mtc.ca.gov/pdf/final_pba_and_2015_tip_air_quality_conformity_analysis.pdf (page 19) for the specific implementation steps in the advancement of these Federal TCMs.

State TCMs:

For a list and description of current State TCMs, see “Bay Area 2010 Ozone Strategy,” or subsequent revisions as adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management.

CMAQ Evaluation and Assessment Report:

MTC participated in a federal evaluation and assessment of the direct and indirect impacts of a representative sample of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) – funded projects on air quality and congestion levels. The study estimated the impact of these projects on emissions of transportation related pollutants, including carbon monoxide (CO), ozone precursors – oxides of nitrogen (NO_x), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), particulate matter (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}), and carbon dioxide (CO₂) for information purposes, as well as on traffic congestion and mobility. There is also additional analysis of the selected set of CMAQ-funded projects to estimate of the cost effectiveness at reducing emissions of each pollutant. This report may be of interest to CMAs; it is available on line at:

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/cmaqpgs/safetealu1808/index.htm>

or from the MTC/ABAG Library.

Appendix B: MTC Checklist for Modeling Consistency for CMPs

Overall approach

MTC's goal is to establish regionally consistent model "sets" for application by MTC and the CMAs. In the winter of 2010/2011, MTC implemented *Travel Model One* – an "activity-based" model – to replace the previous trip-based modeling tool – *BAYCAST-90* – that had been in place for the past two decades. *Travel Model One* has seen incremental updates since its implementation. Additionally, MTC has been developing the next generation of its activity-based model, called *Travel Model Two*, although it is not yet ready for application. Because the CMAs use a variety of modeling tools, these guidelines must accommodate a framework in which trip-based and activity-based models can be aligned. The approach therefore consists of a checklist to adjudge consistency across model components.

Checklist

This checklist guides the CMAs through their model development and consistency review process by providing an inventory of specific products to be developed and submitted to MTC, and by describing standard practices and assumptions.

Because of the complexity of the topic, the checklist may need additional detailed information to explain differences in methodologies or data. Significant differences will be resolved between MTC and the CMAs, taking advantage of the Regional Model Working Group (RMWG). Standard formats for model comparisons will be developed by MTC for use in future guidelines.

Incremental updates

The CMA forecasts must be updated every two years to be consistent with MTC's forecasts. Alternative approaches to fully re-running the entire model are available, including incremental approaches through the application of factors to demographic inputs and/or trip tables. Similarly, the horizon year must be the same as the TIP horizon year. However, interpolation and extrapolation approaches are acceptable, with appropriate attention to network changes. These alternatives to re-running the entire model should be discussed with MTC before the CMP is adopted by the CMA.

Defining the MTC model sets

The MTC model sets referred to below are defined as those in use on December 31st of the year preceding the CMP update.

Key Assumptions

Please report the following information.

A. General approach:

Discuss the general approach to travel demand modeling by the CMA and the CMA model's relationship to *BAYCAST-90*, *Travel Model One* or *Travel Model Two*.

Product: 1) Description of the above.

B. Demographic/economic/land use forecasts:

Both base and forecast year demographic/economic/land use (“land use”) inputs must be consistent – though not identical – to *Plan Bay Area 2040*’s traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level land use data provided by MTC/ABAG. Specifically, if CMAs wish to reallocate land use within their own county (or counties), they must consult with the affected city (or cities) as well as with MTC/ABAG. Further, the resulting deviation in the subject county (or counties) should be within the ranges specified by MTC/ABAG for the following variables: population, households, jobs, and employed residents. Outside the subject county (or counties), the land use variables in the travel analysis zones used by the county must match either MTC/ABAG’s estimates exactly when aggregated/disaggregated to census tracts or the county-in-question’s estimates per the revision process noted above (e.g. Santa Clara county could use the revised estimates San Mateo developed through consultation with local cities and MTC/ABAG). Forecast year demand estimates should use the *Plan Bay Area 2040* land use data. CMAs may also analyze additional, alternative land use scenarios that will not be subject to consistency review.

Products: 2) A statement establishing that the differences between key ABAG land use variables (i.e., population, households, jobs, and employed residents), and those of the CMA do not differ by more than one percent at the county level for the subject county. A statement establishing that no differences exist at the TAZ-level outside the county between the MTC/ABAG forecast or the MTC/ABAG/CMA revised forecast.

3) A table comparing the MTC/ABAG land use estimates with the CMA land use estimates by county for population, households, jobs, and employed residents for both the base year and the horizon year.

4) If land use estimates within the CMA’s county are modified from MTC/ABAG’s projections, agendas, discussion summaries, and action items from each meeting held with cities, MTC, and/or ABAG at which the redistribution was discussed, as well as before/after census-tract-level data summaries and maps.

C. Pricing assumptions:

Use MTC’s automobile operating costs, transit fares, and bridge tolls or provide an explanation for the reason such values are not used.

Product: 5) Table comparing the assumed automobile operating cost, key transit fares, and bridge tolls to MTC’s values for the horizon year.

D. Network assumptions:

Use MTC's regional highway and transit network assumptions for the other Bay Area counties. CMAs should include more detailed network definition relevant to their own county in addition to the regional highway and transit networks. For the CMP horizon year, to be compared with the TIP interim year, regionally significant network changes in the base case scenario shall be limited to the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects subject to inclusion in the TIP.

Product: 6) Statement establishing satisfaction of the above.

E. Automobile ownership:

Use *Travel Model One* automobile ownership models or forecasts or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

Product: 7) County-level table comparing estimates of households by automobile ownership level (zero, one, two or more automobiles) to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

F. Tour/trip generation:

Use *Travel Model One* tour generation models or forecasts or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

Product: 8) Region-level tables comparing estimates of trip and/or tour frequency by purpose to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

G. Activity/trip location:

Use *Travel Model One* activity location models or forecasts or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

Products: 9) Region-level tables comparing estimates of average trip distance by tour/trip purpose to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

10) County-to-county comparison of journey-to-work or home-based work flow estimates to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

H. Travel mode choice:

Use *Travel Model One* models or forecasts or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

Product: 11) Region-level tables comparing travel mode share estimates by tour/trip purpose to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

I. Traffic assignment:

Use *Travel Model One* models or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

Products: 12) Region-level, time-period-specific comparison of vehicle miles traveled and vehicle hours traveled estimates by facility type to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

13) Region-level, time-period-specific comparison of estimated average speed on freeways and all other facilities, separately, to MTC's estimates for the horizon year.

Alternatively, CMAs may elect to utilize MTC zone-to-zone vehicle trip tables, adding network and zonal details within the county as appropriate, and then re-run the assignment. In this case, only Products 12 and 13 are applicable.

Appendix C: MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects

Note that Resolution No. 3434, Revised, is reproduced below with the TOD Policy attached as Appendix D to Resolution No. 3000; other associated appendices are not attached here – the other appendices are available upon request from the MTC library.

Date: December 19, 2001
W.I.: 12110
Referred by: POC
Revised: 01/30/02-C 07/27/05-C
04/26/06-C 10/24/07-C
09/24/08-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3434, Revised

This resolution sets forth MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects.

This resolution was amended on January 30, 2002 to include the San Francisco Geary Corridor Major Investment Study to Attachment B, as requested by the Planning and Operations Committee on December 14, 2001.

This resolution was amended on July 27, 2005 to include a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy to condition transit expansion projects funded under Resolution 3434 on supportive land use policies, as detailed in Attachment D-2.

This resolution was amended on April 26, 2006 to reflect changes in project cost, funding, and scope since the 2001 adoption.

This resolution was amended on October 24, 2007 to reflect changes in the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy in Attachment D-2.

This resolution was amended on September 24, 2008 to reflect changes associated with the 2008 Strategic Plan effort (Attachments B, C and D).

Further discussion of these actions are contained in the MTC Executive Director's Memorandum dated December 14, 2001, July 8, 2005, April 14, 2006, October 12, 2007 and September 10, 2008.

Date: December 19, 2001
W.I.: 12110
Referred by: POC

RE: Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 3434, Revised

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution No. 1876 in 1988 which set forth a new rail transit starts and extension program for the region; and

WHEREAS, significant progress has been made in implementing Resolution No. 1876, with new light rail service in operation in San Francisco and Silicon Valley, new BART service extended to Bay Point and Dublin/Pleasanton in the East Bay, and the BART extension to San Francisco International Airport scheduled to open in 2002; and

WHEREAS, MTC's long range planning process, including the Regional Transportation Plan and its *Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century*, provides a framework for comprehensively evaluating the next generation of major regional transit expansion projects to meet the challenge of congestion in major corridors throughout the nine-county Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 3357 as the basis for assisting in the evaluations of rail and express/rapid bus projects to serve as the companion follow-up program to Resolution No. 1876; and

WHEREAS, local, regional, state and federal discretionary funds will continue to be required to finance an integrated program of new rail transit starts and extensions including those funds which are reasonably expected to be available under current conditions, and new funds which need to be secured in the future through advocacy with state and federal legislatures and the electorate; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transit Expansion program of projects will enhance the Bay Area's transit network with an additional 140 miles of rail, 600 miles of new express bus routes, and a 58% increase in service levels in several existing corridors, primarily funded with regional and local sources of funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC recognizes that coordinated regional priorities for transit investment will best position the Bay Area to compete for limited discretionary funding sources now and in the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts a Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects, consistent with the Policy and Criteria established in Resolution No. 3357, as outlined in Attachment A, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this program of projects, as set forth in Attachment B is accompanied by a comprehensive funding strategy of local, regional, state and federal funding sources as outlined in Attachment C, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the regional discretionary funding commitments included in this financial strategy are subject to the terms and conditions outlined in Attachment D, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and, be it further

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Sharon J. Brown, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on December 19, 2001.

Appendix D: MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects - TOD Policy

Res. No. 3434, TOD Policy (Attachment D-2), revised October 24, 2007, is shown below; other associated Res. 3434 appendices are available upon request from the MTC library.

Date: July 27, 2005
W.I.: 12110
Referred by: POC
Revised: 10/24/07-C

Attachment D-2
Resolution No. 3434
Page 10 of 7

MTC RESOLUTION 3434 TOD POLICY FOR REGIONAL TRANSIT EXPANSION PROJECTS

1. Purpose

The San Francisco Bay Area—widely recognized for its beauty and innovation—is projected to grow by almost two million people and one and a half million jobs by 2030. This presents a daunting challenge to the sustainability and the quality of life in the region. Where and how we accommodate this future growth, in particular where people live and work, will help determine how effectively the transportation system can handle this growth.

The more people who live, work and study in close proximity to public transit stations and corridors, the more likely they are to use the transit systems, and more transit riders means fewer vehicles competing for valuable road space. The policy also provides support for a growing market demand for more vibrant, walkable and transit convenient lifestyles by stimulating the construction of at least 42,000 new housing units along the region's major new transit corridors and will help to contribute to a forecasted 59% increase in transit ridership by the year 2030.

This TOD policy addresses multiple goals: improving the cost-effectiveness of regional investments in new transit expansions, easing the Bay Area's chronic housing shortage, creating vibrant new communities, and helping preserve regional open space. The policy ensures that transportation agencies, local jurisdictions, members of the public and the private sector work together to create development patterns that are more supportive of transit.

There are three key elements of the regional TOD policy:

(a) Corridor-level thresholds to quantify appropriate minimum levels of development around transit stations along new corridors;

(b) Local station area plans that address future land use changes, station access needs, circulation improvements, pedestrian-friendly design, and other key features in a transit-oriented development; and

(c) Corridor working groups that bring together CMAs, city and county planning staff, transit agencies, and other key stakeholders to define expectations, timelines, roles and responsibilities for key stages of the transit project development process.

2. TOD Policy Application

The TOD policy only applies to physical transit extensions funded in Resolution 3434 (see Table 1). The policy applies to any physical transit extension project with regional discretionary funds, regardless of level of funding. Resolution 3434 investments that only entail level of service improvements or other enhancements without physically extending the system are not subject to the TOD policy requirements. Single station extensions to international airports are not subject to the TOD policy due to the infeasibility of housing development.

**TABLE 1:
 RESOLUTION 3434 TRANSIT EXTENSION PROJECTS SUBJECT TO CORRIDOR THRESHOLDS**

| Project | Sponsor | Type | Threshold met with current development? | Meets TOD Policy (with current + new development as planned)? |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|---|
| BART East Contra Costa Rail Extension (eBART) (a) Phase 1 Pittsburg to Antioch (b) Future phases | BART/ CCTA | Commuter Rail | No No | Yes No |
| BART – Downtown Fremont to San Jose/ Santa Clara (a) Fremont to Berryessa (b) Berryessa to San Jose/ Santa Clara | (a) BART (b) VTA | BART Extension | No No | Not yet determined; planning is underway Not yet determined |
| AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 | AC Transit | Bus Rapid Transit | Yes | Yes |
| Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal | TJPA | Commuter Rail | Yes | Yes |
| MUNI Third Street LRT Project Phase 2 – New Central Subway | MUNI | Light Rail | Yes | Yes |
| Sonoma-Marin Rail (a) Phase 1 downtown San Rafael to downtown Santa Rosa (b) Futures phases tbd | SMART | Commuter Rail | No | Not yet determined; planning is underway Not yet being planned |
| Dumbarton Rail | SMTA, ACCMA, VTA, ACTIA, Capitol Corridor | Commuter Rail | No | Not yet determined; planning is underway |
| Expanded Ferry Service to Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay, Hercules, Richmond, and South San Francisco; and other improvements* | WTA | Ferry | No | Line specific |

** Ferry terminals where development is feasible shall meet a housing threshold of 2500 units. MTC staff will make the determination of development feasibility on a case by case basis.*

3. Definitions and Conditions of Funding

For purposes of this policy “regional discretionary funding” consists of the following sources identified in the Resolution 3434 funding plan:



FTA Section 5309- New Starts
FTA Section 5309- Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary
FTA Section 5309- Rail Modernization
Regional Measure 1- Rail (bridge tolls)
Regional Measure 2 (bridge tolls)
Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
Interregional Transportation Improvement Program-Intercity rail
Federal Ferryboat Discretionary
AB 1171 (bridge tolls)
CARB-Carl Moyer/AB434 (Bay Area Air Quality Management District) ¹

These regional funds may be programmed and allocated for environmental and design related work, in preparation for addressing the requirements of the TOD policy. Regional funds may be programmed and allocated for right-of-way acquisition in advance of meeting all requirements in the policy, if land preservation for TOD or project delivery purposes is essential. No regional funds will be programmed and allocated for construction until the requirements of this policy have been satisfied. See Table 2 for a more detailed overview of the planning process.

4. Corridor-Level Thresholds

Each transit extension project funded in Resolution 3434 must plan for a minimum number of housing units along the corridor. These corridor-level thresholds vary by mode of transit, with more capital-intensive modes requiring higher numbers of housing units (see Table 3). The corridor thresholds have been developed based on potential for increased transit ridership, exemplary existing station sites in the Bay Area, local general plan data, predicted market demand for TOD-oriented housing in each county, and an independent analysis of feasible development potential in each transit corridor.

¹ The Carl Moyer funds and AB 434 funds are controlled directly by the California Air Resources Board and Bay Area Air Management District. Res. 3434 identifies these funds for the Caltrain electrification project, which is not subject to the TOD policy.

| TABLE 2: REGIONAL TOD POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS FOR TRANSIT EXTENSION PROJECTS | | |
|---|---|--|
| Transit Agency Action | City Action | MTC/CMA/ABAG Action |
| All parties in corridors that do not currently meet thresholds (see Table 1) establish Corridor Working Group to address corridor threshold. Conduct initial corridor performance evaluation, initiate station area planning. | | |
|  | | |
| Environmental Review/ Preliminary Engineering/ Right-of-Way | Conduct Station Area Plans | Coordination of corridor working group, funding of station area plans |
| <i>Step 1 Threshold Check: the combination of new Station Area Plans and existing development patterns exceeds corridor</i> | | |
| Final Design | Adopt Station Area Plans. Revise general plan policies and zoning, environmental reviews | Regional and county agencies assist local jurisdictions in implementing station area plans |
| <i>Step 2 Threshold Check: (a) local policies adopted for station areas; (b) implementation mechanisms in place per adopted Station Area Plan by the time Final Design is completed.</i> | | |
|  | | |
| Construction | Implementation (financing, MOUs) Solicit development | TLC planning and capital funding, HIP funding |

| TABLE 3: CORRIDOR THRESHOLDS HOUSING UNITS – AVERAGE PER STATION AREA | | | | | |
|---|-------|------------|-------------------|---------------|-------|
| Project Type | BART | Light Rail | Bus Rapid Transit | Commuter Rail | Ferry |
| Housing Threshold | 3,850 | 3,300 | 2,750 | 2,200 | 2,500 |
| <p><i>Each corridor is evaluated for the Housing Threshold. For example, a four station commuter rail extension (including the existing end-of-the—line station) would be required to meet a corridor-level threshold of 8,800 housing units.</i></p> <p><i>Threshold figures above are an average per station area for all modes except ferries based on both existing land uses and planned development within a half mile of all stations. New below market rate housing is provided a 50% bonus towards meeting housing unit threshold.</i></p> <p><i>* Ferry terminals where development is feasible shall meet a housing threshold of 2500 units.</i></p> <p><i>MTC staff will make the determination of development feasibility on a case by case basis.</i></p> | | | | | |

Meeting the corridor level thresholds requires that within a half mile of all stations, a combination of existing land uses and planned land uses meets or exceeds the overall corridor threshold for housing (listed in Table 3);

Physical transit extension projects that do not currently meet the corridor thresholds with development that is already built will receive the highest priority for the award of MTC's Station Area Planning Grants.

To be counted toward the threshold, planned land uses must be adopted through general plans, and the appropriate implementation processes must be put in place, such as zoning codes. General plan language alone without supportive implementation policies, such as zoning, is not sufficient for the purposes of this policy. Ideally, planned land uses will be formally adopted through a specific plan (or equivalent), zoning codes and general plan amendments along with an accompanying programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as part of the overall station area planning process. Minimum densities will be used in the calculations to assess achievement of the thresholds.

An existing end station is included as part of the transit corridor for the purposes of calculating the corridor thresholds; optional stations will not be included in calculating the corridor thresholds.

New below-market housing units will receive a 50 percent bonus toward meeting the corridor threshold (i.e. one planned below-market housing unit counts for 1.5 housing units for the purposes of meeting the corridor threshold. Below market for the purposes of the Resolution 3434 TOD policy is affordable to 60% of area median income for rental units and 100% of area median income for owner-occupied units);

The local jurisdictions in each corridor will determine job and housing placement, type, density, and design.

The Corridor Working Groups are encouraged to plan for a level of housing that will significantly exceed the housing unit thresholds stated here during the planning process. This will ensure that the Housing Unit Threshold is exceeded corridor-wide and that the ridership potential from TOD is maximized.

5. Station Area Plans

Each proposed physical transit extension project seeking funding through Resolution 3434 must demonstrate that the thresholds for the corridor are met through existing development and adopted station area plans that commit local jurisdictions to a level of housing that meets the threshold. This requirement may be met by existing station area plans accompanied by appropriate zoning and implementation mechanisms. If new station area plans are needed to meet the corridor threshold, MTC will assist in funding the plans. The Station Area Plans shall be conducted by local governments in coordination with transit agencies, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), MTC and the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).

Station Area Plans are opportunities to define vibrant mixed use, accessible transit villages and quality transit-oriented development – places where people will want to live, work,

shop and spend time. These plans should incorporate mixed-use developments, including new housing, neighborhood serving retail, employment, schools, day care centers, parks and other amenities to serve the local community.

At a minimum, Station Area Plans will define both the land use plan for the area as well as the policies—zoning, design standards, parking policies, etc.—for implementation. The plans shall at a minimum include the following elements:

- Current and proposed land use by type of use and density within the ½ mile radius, with a clear identification of the number of existing and planned housing units and jobs;
- Station access and circulation plans for motorized, non-motorized and transit access. The station area plan should clearly identify any barriers for pedestrian, bicycle and wheelchair access to the station from surrounding neighborhoods (e.g., freeways, railroad tracks, arterials with inadequate pedestrian crossings), and should propose strategies that will remove these barriers and maximize the number of residents and employees that can access the station by these means. The station area and transit village public spaces shall be made accessible to persons with disabilities.
- Estimates of transit riders walking from the half mile station area to the transit station to use transit;
- Transit village design policies and standards, including mixed use developments and pedestrian-scaled block size, to promote the livability and walkability of the station area;
- TOD-oriented parking demand and parking requirements for station area land uses, including consideration of pricing and provisions for shared parking;
- Implementation plan for the station area plan, including local policies required for development per the plan, market demand for the proposed development, potential phasing of development and demand analysis for proposed development.
- The Station Area Plans shall be conducted according to the guidelines established in MTC's Station Area Planning Manual.

6. Corridor Working Groups

The goal of the Corridor Working Groups is to create a more coordinated approach to planning for transit-oriented development along Resolution 3434 transit corridors. Each of the transit extensions subject to the corridor threshold process, as identified in Table 1, will need a Corridor Working Group, unless the current level of development already meets the corridor threshold. Many of the corridors already have a transit project working group that may be adjusted to take on this role. The Corridor Working Group shall be coordinated by the relevant CMAs, and will include the sponsoring transit agency, the local jurisdictions in the corridor, and representatives from ABAG, MTC, and other parties as appropriate.

The Corridor Working Group will assess whether the planned level of development satisfies the corridor threshold as defined for the mode, and assist in addressing any deficit in meeting the threshold by working to identify opportunities and strategies at the local level. This will include the key task of distributing the required housing units to each of the affected station sites within the defined corridor. The Corridor Working Group will continue with corridor evaluation, station area planning, and any necessary refinements to

station locations until the corridor threshold is met and supporting Station Area Plans are adopted by the local jurisdictions.

MTC will confirm that each corridor meets the housing threshold prior to the release of regional discretionary funds for construction of the transit project.

7. Review of the TOD Policy

MTC staff will conduct a review of the TOD policy and its application to each of the affected Resolution 3434 corridors, and present findings to the Commission, within 12 months of the adoption of the TOD policy.