| | |
|---|---|
| Date: | May 17, 2012 |
| W.I.: | 1512 |
| Referred by: | Planning |
| Revised: | 10/24/12-C 11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C<br>01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C 05/22/13-C<br>09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 12/18/13-C<br>01/22/14-C 02/26/14-C 03/26/14-C<br>04/23/14-C 05/28/14-C 06/25/14-C<br>07/23/14-C 09/24/14-C 12/17/14-C<br>03/25/15-C 05/27/15-C 06/24/15-C<br>07/22/15-C 09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C<br>11/18/15-C 12/16/15-C |


ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4035, Revised

This resolution adopts the Project Selection Policies and Programming for federal Surface Transportation Authorization Act following the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA), and any extensions of SAFETEA in the interim. The Project Selection Policies contain the project categories that are to be funded with various fund sources including federal surface transportation act funding available to MTC for its programming discretion to be included in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The resolution includes the following attachments:

Attachment A – Project Selection Policies
Attachment B-1 – Regional Program Project List
Attachment B-2 – OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Project List

Attachment A (page 13) was revised on October 24, 2012 to update the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy (Appendix A-6) and to update county OBAG fund distributions using the most current RHNA data (Appendix A-1 and Appendix A-4). The Commission also directed $20 million of the $40 million in the regional PDA Implementation program to eight CMAs and the San Francisco Planning Department for local PDA planning implementation**.** Attachment B-1 and B-2 were revised to add new projects selected by the Solano Transportation Authority and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and to add projects under the Freeway Performance Initiative and to reflect the redirection of the $20 million in PDA planning implementation funds.

Attachment A (pages 8, 9 and 13) was revised on November 28, 2012 to confirm and clarify the actions on October 24, 2012 with respect to the County PDA Planning Program.

Attachment A (page 12) was revised on December 19, 2012 to provide an extension for the Complete Streets policy requirement. Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to add new projects selected by the Solano Transportation Authority, Sonoma County Transportation Authority and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; add funding for CMA Planning activities; and to shift funding between two San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency projects under the Transit Performance Initiatives Program.

Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised on January 23, 2013 to add new projects selected by various Congestion Management Agencies and to add new projects selected by the Commission in the Transit Rehabilitation Program.

As referred by the Programming and Allocations Committee, Attachment B-1 and Appendix A-2 were revised on February 27, 2013 to add Regional Safe Routes to School programs for Alameda and San Mateo counties, and to reflect previous Commission actions pertaining to the Transit Capital Rehabilitation Program, and to reflect earlier Commission approvals of fund augmentations to the county congestion management agencies for regional planning activities. As referred by the Planning Committee, Attachments A and B-1 were revised to reflect Commission approval of the regional Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning and Implementation program and Priority Conservation Area (PCA) program.

As referred by the Programming and Allocations Committee, Attachments B-1 and B-2 and Appendix A-2 to Attachment A were revised on May 22, 2013 to shift funding between components of the Freeway Performance Initiative Program with no change in total funding; and split the FSP/Incident Management project into the Incident Management Program and FSP/Callbox Program with no change in total funding; and redirect funding from ACE fare collection equipment to ACE positive train control; and add new OBAG projects selected by the Contra Costa Transportation Authority, Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency, City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (CCAG), and the Solano Transportation Authority, including OBAG augmentation for CCAG Planning activities.

Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised on September 25, 2013 to add new projects selected by various Congestion Management Agencies in the OneBayArea Grant, Regional Safe Routes to School, and Priority Conservation Area Programs.

Attachment A, Attachments B-1 and B-2 and Appendix A-2 to Attachment A were revised on November 20, 2013 to add new projects and make grant amount changes as directed by various Congestion Management Agencies in the OneBayArea Grant Program. Also the deadline for jurisdictions' adoption of general plans meeting the latest RHNA was updated to reflect the later than scheduled adoption of Plan Bay Area.

Attachment B-1 to the resolution was revised on December 18, 2013 to add an FPI project for environmental studies for the I-280/Winchester I/C modification.

Attachment B-2 was revised on January 22, 2014 to adjust project grant amounts as directed by various Congestion Management Agencies in the OneBayArea Grant Program, including changes as a result of the 2014 RTIP.

Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised on February 26, 2014 to add six OBAG projects selected by the CMA's, make adjustments between two Santa Clara OBAG projects, and add three PDA Planning Program projects in Sonoma County.

Attachment B-1 was revised on March 26, 2014 to add 15 projects to the Transit Performance Initiative Program and 3 projects in Marin County to the North Bay Priority Conservation Area Program.

On April 23, 2014, Attachment B-1 was revised to add 13 projects to the Priority Conservation Grant Program, revise the grant amount for the BART Car Exchange Preventative Maintenance Project in the Transit Capital Rehabilitation Program, and add three projects to the Climate Initiatives Program totaling $14,000,000.

As referred by the Planning Committee, Attachment B-1 was revised on May 28, 2014 to reflect Commission approval of the selection of projects for the PDA Planning Technical Assistance and PDA Staffing Assistance Programs.

As referred by the Programming and Allocations Committee, Attachment A and Attachment B-2 were revised on May 28, 2014 to change the program delivery deadline from March 31, 2016 to January 31, 2017, and to adjust two projects as requested by Congestion Management Agencies in the OneBayArea Grant Program.

On June 25, 2014, Attachment B-1 was revised to add an additional $500,000 to the Breuner Marsh Project in the regional PCA Program and to identify a transportation exchange project (Silverado Trail Phase G) for the Soscol Headwaters Preserve Acquisition in the North Bay PCA Program, and to Redirect $2,500,000 from Ramp Metering and Traffic Operations System (TOS) elements to the Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS), within the Freeway Performance Initiatives (FPI) Program.

On July 23, 2014, Attachment B-1 was revised to redirect $22.0 million from the Cycles 1 & 2 Freeway Performance Initiatives (FPI) Programs and $5 million from other projects and savings to the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent System.

On September 24, 2014, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to add 5 projects totaling $19M to the Transit Performance Initiative Program (TPI), to shift funding within the Freeway Performance Initiative Program; to add a project for $4 million for SFMTA for priority identified TPI funding; to provide an additional $500,000 to the Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI); and to amend programming for two projects in Santa Clara County: San Jose's The Alameda "Beautiful Way" Phase 2 project, and Palo Alto's US-101/Adobe Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge project.

On December 17, 2014, Attachments A, B-1, and B-2 and Appendices A-1 and A-2 to Attachment A were revised to add a fifth year – FY 2016-17 - to the Cycle 2/OBAG 1 program to address the overall funding shortfall and provide additional programming in FY 2016-17 to maintain on-going commitments in FY 2016-17; make adjustments within the Freeway Performance Initiatives Program; rescind the Brentwood Wallace Ranch Easement Acquisition from the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program reducing the PCA program from $5 million to $4.5 million and use this funding to help with the FY 17 shortfall; identify two Santa Clara Local Priority Development Area Planning Program projects totaling $740,305 to be included within MTC's Regional Priority Development Area Program grants; make revisions to local OBAG compliance policies for complete streets and housing as they pertain to jurisdictions' general plans update deadlines; add five car sharing projects totaling $2,000,000 under the climate initiatives program; and add the Clipper Fare Collection Back Office Equipment Replacement Project to the Transit Capital Priority Program for $2,684,772.

On March 25, 2015, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to: add FY 2016-17 regional planning funds to Attachment B-1 per Commission action in December 2014; Redirect $1.0 million from the ALA-I-680 Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) project to Preliminary Engineering (PE) for various FPI corridors and redirect $270,000 in FPI Right of Way (ROW) savings to the SCL I-680 FPI project to cover an increase in Caltrans support costs; direct funding to the statewide local streets and roads needs assessment; identify specific Priority Development Area (PDA) planning grants in San Mateo County; delete the $10.2 million Masonic Avenue Complete Streets project and add the SF Light Rail Vehicle Procurement project in San Francisco County; and redirect $0.5 million from the Capitol Expressway Traffic ITS and Bike/Pedestrian Improvement project to the San Tomas Expressway Box Culvert Rehabilitation project in Santa Clara County.

On May 27, 2015, Attachment B-1 was revised to add Round 3 ($9,529,829) of the Transit Performance Incentive Program which involves 7 new projects and augmentations to 7 existing projects; and to add the Grand Avenue Bicycle / Pedestrian Improvements Project ($717,000) in San Rafael to the Safe Routes to School Program, and delete the Bicycle sharing project ($6,000,000).

On June 24, 2015, Attachment B-1 was revised to identify a $265,000 Local Priority Development Area Planning Grant for the City of Palo Alto.

On July 22, 2015, Attachments B-1 and Attachment B-2 were revised to redirect $3,000,000 from the SFMTA N-Judah Mobility Maximization project to the SFMTA Colored Lanes on MTC Rapid Network project within the Transit Performance Initiative program, identify a $252,000 Safe Routes to Schools grant for San Mateo County, redirect $2,100,000 in Freeway Performance Initiative funding from the Alameda County I-680 project to the Various Corridors – Caltrans Preliminary Engineering project, delete $500,000 from the SMART Vehicle Purchase project in Sonoma County (revised from $6,600,000 to $6,100,000), and add the SMART Clipper Card Service project in Sonoma County for $500,000.

On September 23, 2015, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect $6,100,000 from the SMART Vehicle Purchase project to the SMART San Rafael to Larkspur Extension project.

On October 28, 2015, Attachment B-1 and B-2 were revised to redirect $350,000 from Vacaville's Ulatis Creek Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway and Streetscape project to Vallejo's Downtown Streetscape – Phases 3 and 4 project, and to redirect $122,249 from Marin Transit's Preventive Maintenance program to the preliminary engineering phase of Marin Transit's Relocate Transit Maintenance Facility project.

On November 18, 2015, Attachment B-1 and Appendix A-3 to Attachment A were revised to increase the program amount for the Safe Routes to School Program by $2.35 million increasing the FY 2016-17 program amount to $5.0 million.

On December 16, 2015, Attachment B-1 was revised to add six parking management and transportation demand management projects totaling $6,000,000 under the Climate Initiatives Program.

Further discussion of the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policies is contained in the memorandum to the Joint Planning Committee dated May 11, 2012; to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated October 10, 2012; to the Commission dated November 28, 2012; to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated December 12, 2012 and January 9, 2013; to the Joint Planning Committee dated February 8, 2013; to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated February 13, 2013, May 8, 2013, September 11, 2013, November 13, 2013, December 11, 2013, January 8, 2014, February 12, 2014, March 5, 2014, April 9, 2014; and to the Planning Committee dated May 9, 2014; and to the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee Summary Sheet dated May 14, 2014, June 11, 2014, July 9, 2014, September 10, 2014, December 10, 2014, March 11, 2015, May 13, 2015, and to the Administration Committee on May 13, 2015, and to the Programming and Allocations Committee on June 10, 2015, July 8, 2015, September 9, 2015, October 14, 2015, November 4, 2015, and December 9, 2015.

Date: May 17, 2012
W.I.: 1512
Referred By: Planning

RE: Federal Cycle 2 Program covering FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14, FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16: Project Selection Policies and Programming

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4035

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region and is required to prepare and endorse a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which includes federal funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated recipient for federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) assigned to the MPO/RTPA of the San Francisco Bay Area for the programming of projects (regional federal funds); and

WHEREAS, the federal funds assigned to the MPOs/RTPAs for their discretion are subject to availability and must be used within prescribed funding deadlines regardless of project readiness; and

WHEREAS, MTC, in cooperation with the Association of Bay Area Governments, (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), transit operators, counties, cities, and interested stakeholders, has developed criteria, policies and procedures to be used in the selection of projects to be funded with various funding including regional federal funds as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution, incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS, using the policies set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution, MTC, in cooperation with the Bay Area Partnership and interested stakeholders, has or will develop a program of projects to be funded with these funds for inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as set forth in Attachments B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution, incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS the federal TIP and subsequent TIP amendments and updates are subject to public review and comment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED that MTC approves the "Project Selection Policies and Programming" for projects to be funded with Cycle 2 Program funds as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that the federal funding shall be pooled and redistributed on a regional basis for implementation of Project Selection Criteria, Policies, Procedures and Programming, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and be it further

RESOLVED that the projects will be included in the federal TIP subject to final federal approval; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or his designee can make technical adjustments and other non-substantial revisions, including updates to fund distributions to reflect final 2014-2022 FHWA figures; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee is authorized to revise Attachments B-1 and B-2 as necessary to reflect the programming of projects as the projects are selected and included in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director shall make available a copy of this resolution, and such other information as may be required, to the Governor, Caltrans, and to other such agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at the regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on May 17, 2012

Date: May 17, 2012
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: Planning
Revised: 10/24/12-C 11/28/12-C
12/19/12-C 02/27/13-C
11/20/13-C 05/28/14-C
12/17/14-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4035

# Cycle 2 / OBAG 1 Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

# For FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14, FY 2014-15, FY 2015-16, and FY 2016-17

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Cycle 2 Program
# Policy and Programming

## Table of Contents

BACKGROUND....1
CYCLE 2 REVENUE ESTIMATES AND FEDERAL PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE....1
NEW FUNDING APPROACH FOR CYCLE 2—THE ONE BAY AREA GRANT....2
CYCLE 2 GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES....3
REGIONAL PROGRAMS....8
ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAMMING POLICIES....11
CYCLE 2 COUNTY ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROJECT GUIDANCE....14
PROGRAM SCHEDULE....18

**Appendices**

**Appendix A-1** Cycle 2 Regional and County Programs
**Appendix A-2** Cycle 2 Planning Activities
**Appendix A-3** Safe Routes to School County Fund Distribution
**Appendix A-4** OBAG County Fund Distribution
**Appendix A-5** OBAG Call for Projects Guidance
**Appendix A-6** PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
**Appendix A-7** County PDA Implementation

## BACKGROUND

Anticipating the end of the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA) on September 30, 2009, MTC approved Cycle 1 commitments (Resolution 3925) along with an overall framework to guide upcoming programming decisions for Cycle 2 to address the new six-year surface transportation authorization act funding. However, the successor to SAFETEA has not yet been enacted, and SAFETEA has been extended through continuing resolutions. Without the new federal surface transportation act, MTC may program funds forward based on reasonable estimates of revenues. It is estimated that roughly $795 million is available for programming over the upcoming four-year Cycle 2 period.

Cycle 2 covers the four years from FY 2012-13 to FY 2016-17 pending the enactment of the new authorization and/or continuation of SAFETEA.

This attachment outlines how the region will use Cycle 2 funds for transportation needs in the MTC region. Funding decisions continue to implement the strategies and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Transportation 2035, which is the Bay Area's comprehensive roadmap to guide transportation investments in surface transportation including mass transit, highway, local road, bicycle and pedestrian projects over the long term. The program investments recommended for funding in Cycle 2 are an outgrowth of the transportation needs identified by the RTP and also take into consideration the preferred transportation investment strategy of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS).

Appendix A-1 provides an overview of the Cycle 2 Program commitments which contain a regional program component managed by MTC and a county program component to be managed by the counties.

## CYCLE 2 REVENUE ESTIMATES AND FEDERAL PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE

MTC receives federal funding for local programming from the State for local programming in the MTC region. Among the various transportation programs established by SAFETEA, this includes regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program and to a lesser extent, Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) and Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds. The STP/CMAQ/RTIP/TE programming capacity in Cycle 2 amounts to $795 million. The Commission programs the STP/CMAQ funds while the California Transportation Commission programs the RTIP and TE Funds. Furthermore, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) is contributing Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funding to Cycle 2. Below are issues to be addressed as the region implements Cycle 2 programming, particularly in light that approval of Cycle 2 will precede approval of the new federal transportation act.

**Revenues:** A revenue growth rate of 3% over prior federal apportionments is assumed for the first year – FY 2012-13. Due to continued uncertainties with federal funding, the estimated revenues for the later years of the program, FY 2013-14 through FY 2016-17, have not been escalated, but held steady at the estimated FY 2012-13 apportionment amount. If there are significant reductions in federal apportionments over the Cycle 2 time period, as in the past, MTC will reconcile the revenue levels following enactment of the New Act by making adjustments later if needed, by postponement of projects or adjustments to subsequent programming cycles.

**Fund Sources:** Development of the new federal surface transportation authorization will need to be closely monitored. New federal programs, their eligibility rules, and how funding is distributed to the states and regions could potentially impact the implementation of the Cycle 2 Regional and One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Programs. It is anticipated that any changes to the federal programs would likely overlap to a large extent with projects that are currently eligible for funding under Title 23 of the United States Code, though the actual fund sources will likely no longer be referred as STP/CMAQ/TE in the manner we have grown accustomed. Therefore, reference to specific fund sources in the Cycle 2 programming is a proxy for replacement fund sources for which MTC has programming authority.

## NEW FUNDING APPROACH FOR CYCLE 2—THE ONEBAYAREA GRANT

For Cycle 2, the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) is a new funding approach that better integrates the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy. Funding distribution to the counties will encourage land-use and housing policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments. This is accomplished through the following policies:

- Using transportation dollars to reward jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing.
- Supporting the Sustainable Communities Strategy for the Bay Area by promoting transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and by initiating a pilot program in the North Bay counties that will support open space preservation in Priority Conservation Areas (PCA).
- Providing a higher proportion of funding to local agencies and additional investment flexibility by eliminating required program targets. A significant amount of funding that was used for regional programs in Cycle 1 is shifted to local programs (the OneBayArea Grant). The OBAG program allows investments in transportation categories such as Transportation for Livable Communities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning and outreach activities, while also providing targeted funding opportunities for Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Priority Conservation Areas.

### Project List

Attachment B of Resolution 4035 contains the list of projects to be programmed under the Cycle 2 Program. Attachments B-1 and B-2 are listings of projects receiving Cycle 2 funding, and reflects the programs and projects included in the regional and OBAG programs respectively. The listing is subject to project selection actions (conducted by MTC for most of the regional programs and by the CMAs for funds distributed to them). MTC staff will update Attachments B-1 and B-2 as projects are selected by the Commission and CMAs and are included in the federal TIP.

### OneBayArea Grant Fund Distribution Formula

The formula used to distribute OneBayArea Grant funding to the counties takes into consideration the following factors: population, past housing production, future housing commitments as determined by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Regional Housing Needs

Assessment (RHNA) and added weighting to acknowledge very low and low income housing. The formula breakdown is as follows with distributions derived from each jurisdiction's proportionate share of the regional total for each factor:

### OBAG Fund Distribution Factors

| Factor Weighting | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Population | 50% |
| RHNA* (total housing units) | 12.5% |
| RHNA (low/very low income housing units) | 12.5% |
| Housing Production** (total housing units) | 12.5% |
| Housing Production (low/very low income housing units) | 12.5% |

* RHNA 2014-2022
**Housing Production Report 1999-2006

The objective of this formula is to provide housing incentives to complement the region's Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS) which together with a Priority Development Area (PDA) focused investment strategy will lead to transportation investments that support focused development. The proposed One Bay Area Grant formula also uses actual housing production data from 1999-2006, which has been capped such that each jurisdiction receives credit for housing up to its RHNA allocation. Subsequent funding cycles will be based on housing production from ABAG's next housing report to be published in 2013. The formula also recognizes jurisdictions' RHNA and past housing production (uncapped) contributions to very low and low income housing units. The resulting OBAG fund distribution for each county is presented in Appendix A-4. Funding guarantees are also incorporated in the fund distribution to ensure that all counties receive as much funding under the new funding model as compared to what they would have received under the Cycle 1 framework.

The Commission, working with ABAG, will revisit the funding distribution formula for the next cycle (post FY 2016-17) to further evaluate how to best incentivize housing production across all income levels and other Plan Bay Area performance objectives.

## CYCLE 2 GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

The following programming policies apply to all projects funded in Cycle 2:

1. **Public Involvement.** MTC is committed to a public involvement process that is proactive and provides comprehensive information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for continuing involvement. MTC provides many methods to fulfill this commitment, as outlined in the *MTC Public Participation Plan*, Resolution No. 3821. The Commission's adoption of the Cycle 2 program, including policy and procedures meet the provisions of the MTC *Public Participation Plan*. MTC's advisory committees and the Bay

Area Partnership have been consulted in the development of funding commitments and policies for this program; and opportunities to comment have been provided to other stakeholders and members of the public.

Furthermore, investments made in the Cycle 2 program must be consistent with federal Title VI requirements. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, income, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Public outreach to and involvement of individuals in low income and minority communities covered under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the Executive Order pertaining to Environmental Justice is critical to both local and regional decisions. Additionally, when CMAs select projects for funding at the county level, they must consider equitable solicitation and selection of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements (as set forth in Appendix A-5).

2. **Commission Approval of Programs and Projects and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).** Projects approved as part of the Cycle 2 Program must be amended into the federal TIP. The federally required TIP is a comprehensive listing of all San Francisco Bay Area surface transportation projects that receive federal funds, and/or are subject to a federally required action, such as federal environmental clearance, and/or are regionally significant for air quality conformity or modeling purposes. It is the project sponsor's responsibility to ensure their project is properly programmed in the TIP in a timely manner. Where CMAs are responsible for project selection the Commission will revise the TIP to include the resulting projects and Attachment B to this Resolution may be amended by MTC staff to reflect these revisions. Where responsibility for project selection in the framework of a Cycle 2 funding program is assigned to MTC, TIP amendments and a revision to Attachment B will be reviewed and approved by the Commission.

3. **Minimum Grant Size.** The objective of a grant minimum requirement is to maximize the efficient use of federal funds and minimize the number of federal-aid projects which place administrative burdens on project sponsors, CMAs, MTC, Caltrans, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff. Funding grants per project must therefore be a minimum of $500,000 for counties with a population over 1 million (Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties) and $250,000 for counties with a population under one million (Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma counties).

   To provide flexibility, alternatively an averaging approach may be used. A CMA may program grant amounts no less than $100,000 for any project, provided that the overall average of all grant amounts within their OBAG program meets the county minimum grant amount threshold.

   Given the typical smaller scale of projects for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program, a lower threshold applies to the regional Safe Routes to School Program projects which have a minimum grant size of $100,000.

4. **Air Quality Conformity.** In the Bay Area, it is the responsibility of MTC to make an air quality conformity determination for the TIP in accordance with federal Clean Air Act requirements and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity regulations. MTC evaluates the impact of the TIP on regional air quality during the biennial update of the TIP. Since the 2011 air quality conformity finding has been completed for the 2011 TIP, no non-exempt projects that were not incorporated in the finding will be considered for funding in the Cycle 2 Program until

the development of the 2013 TIP during spring 2013. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for PM 2.5. Therefore, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed "Projects of Air Quality Concern" must complete a hot-spot analysis required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) are those projects that result in significant increases in the number of or emissions from diesel vehicles.

5. **Environmental Clearance.** Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 2l000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (l4 California Code of Regulations Section l5000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.

6. **Application, Resolution of Local Support**. Project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding through MTC's Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) an application submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff, and 2) Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor's governing board or council. A template for the resolution of local support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP_CMAQ_LocalSupportReso.doc

7. **Project Screening and Compliance with Regional and Federal Requirements.** MTC staff will perform a review of projects proposed for the Cycle 2 Program to ensure 1) eligibility; 2) consistency with the RTP; and 3) project readiness. In addition, project sponsors must adhere to directives such as "Complete Streets" (MTC Routine Accommodations for Bicyclists and Pedestrians); and the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy as outlined below; and provide the required matching funds. Project sponsors should note that fund source programs, eligibility criteria, and regulations may change as a result of the passage of new surface transportation authorization legislation. In this situation, MTC staff will work to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission.

   - Federal Project Eligibility: STP has a wide range of projects that are eligible for consideration in the TIP. Eligible projects include, federal-aid highway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational), mitigation related to an STP project, public transit capital improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, and transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

     CMAQ funding applies to new or expanded transportation projects, programs, and operations that help reduce emissions. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit expansion projects, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, Inspection and maintenance

programs, magnetic levitation transportation technology deployment program, and experimental pilot projects. For more detailed guidance see the *CMAQ Program Guidance* (FHWA, November 2008).

In the event that the next surface transportation authorization materially alters these programs, MTC staff will work with project sponsors to match projects with appropriate federal fund programs. MTC reserves the right to assign specific fund sources based on availability and eligibility requirements.

- RTP Consistency: Projects included in the Cycle 2 Program must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), according to federal planning regulations. Each project included in the Cycle 2 Program must identify its relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, and where applicable, the RTP ID number or reference.

- Complete Streets (MTC Routine Accommodations of Pedestrians and Bicyclists) Policy): Federal, state and regional policies and directives emphasize the accommodation of bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. MTC's Complete Streets policy (Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure that the accommodation of non-motorized travelers are considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are considered by the county for funds and submitted to MTC. CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review prior to CMAs' project selection actions for Cycle 2.

  Other state policies include, Caltrans Complete Streets Policy Deputy Directive 64 R1 which stipulates: pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities must be considered in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products and SB 1358 California Complete Streets Act, which requires local agency general plan circulation elements to address all travel modes.

- Project Delivery and Monitoring. Cycle 2 funding is available in the following five federal fiscal years: FY 2012-13, 2013-14, 2014-15, FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17. Funds may be programmed in any one of these years, conditioned upon the availability of federal apportionment and obligation authority (OA). This will be determined through the development of an annual obligation plan, which is developed in coordination with the Partnership and project sponsors. However, funds MUST be obligated in the fiscal year programmed in the TIP, with all Cycle 2 funds to be obligated no later than January 31, 2017. Specifically, the funds must be obligated by FHWA or transferred to Federal Transit Administration (FTA) within the federal fiscal year that the funds are programmed in the TIP.

  All Cycle 2 funding is subject to the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and any subsequent revisions (MTC Resolution No. 3606 at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf . Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by

the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy. All funds are subject to obligation, award, invoicing, reimbursement and project close out requirements. The failure to meet these deadlines may result in the de-programming and redirection to other projects.

To further facilitate project delivery and ensure all federal funds in the region are meeting federal and state regulations and deadlines, every recipient of Cycle 2 funding will need to identify a staff position that serves as the single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA-administered funds within that agency. The person in this position must have sufficient knowledge and expertise in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out. The agency is required to identify the contact information for this position at the time of programming of funds in the federal TIP. This person will be expected to work closely with FHWA, Caltrans, MTC and the respective CMA on all issues related to federal funding for all FHWA-funded projects implemented by the recipient.

Project sponsors that continue to miss delivery milestones and funding deadlines for any federal funds are required to prepare and update a delivery status report on all projects with FHWA-administered funds they manage, and participate if requested in a consultation meeting with the county CMA, MTC and Caltrans prior to MTC approving future Cycle programming or including any funding revisions for the agency in the federal TIP. The purpose of the status report and consultation is to ensure the local public agency has the resources and technical capacity to deliver FHWA federal-aid projects, is fully aware of the required delivery deadlines, and has developed a delivery timeline that takes into consideration the requirements and lead-time of the federal-aid process within available resources.

By applying for and accepting Cycle 2 funding, the project sponsor is acknowledging that it has and will maintain the expertise and staff resources necessary to deliver the federal-aid project within the funding timeframe.

- Local Match. Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funding requires a non-federal local match. Based on California's share of the nation's federal lands, the local match for STP and CMAQ is currently 11.47% of the total project cost. The FHWA will reimburse up to 88.53% of the total project cost. Project sponsors are required to provide the required match, which is subject to change.

- Fixed Program and Specific Project Selection. Projects are chosen for the program based on eligibility, project merit, and deliverability within established deadlines. The Cycle 2 program is project specific and the funds programmed to projects are for those projects alone. The Cycle 2 Program funding is fixed at the programmed amount; therefore, any cost increase may not be covered by additional Cycle 2 funds. Project sponsors are responsible for securing the necessary match, and for cost increases or additional funding needed to complete the project including contingencies.

# REGIONAL PROGRAMS

The programs below comprise the Regional Program of Cycle 2, administered by the Commission. Funding amounts for each program are included in Attachment A-1. Individual projects will be added to Attachment B as they are selected and included in the federal TIP.

### *1. Regional Planning Activities*

This program provides funding to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the San Francisco Bay Area Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), and MTC to support regional planning activities. (Note that in the past this funding category included planning funding for the CMAs. Starting with Cycle 2, CMAs will access their OneBayArea Grant to fund their planning activities rather than from this regional program category). Appendix A-2 details the fund distribution.

### *2. Regional Operations*

This program includes projects which are administered at the regional level by MTC, and includes funding to continue regional operations programs for Clipper®, 511 Traveler information (including 511 Rideshare, 511 Bicycle, 511 Traffic, 511 Real-Time Transit and 511 transit), Freeway Service Patrol / SAFE and Incident Management. Information on these programs is available at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/.

### *3. Freeway Performance Initiative*

This program builds on the proven success of recent ramp metering projects that have achieved significant delay reduction on Bay Area freeways and arterials at a fraction of the cost of traditional highway widening projects. Several corridors are proposed for metering projects, targeting high congestion corridors. These projects also include Traffic Operations System elements to better manage the system as well as implementing the express lane network. This category also includes funding for performance monitoring activities, regional performance initiatives implementation, Regional Signal Timing Program, Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS), freeway and arterial performance initiative projects and express lanes.

### *4. Pavement Management Program*

This continues the region's Pavement Management Program (PMP) and related activities including the Pavement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP). MTC provides grants to local jurisdictions to perform regular inspections of their local streets and roads networks and to update their pavement management systems which is a requirement to receive certain funding. MTC also assists local jurisdictions in conducting associated data collection and analysis efforts including local roads needs assessments and inventory surveys and asset management analysis that feed into regional planning efforts. MTC provides, training, research and development of pavement and non-pavement preservation management techniques, and participates in the state-wide local streets and roads needs assessment effort.

### *5. Priority Development Area (PDA) Implementation*

Funding in this program implements the following:

***Regional PDA Implementation:***

***ABAG Funding:*** Funds directed to ABAG for implementation of PDAs.

***Affordable TOD fund:*** This is a continuation of MTC's successful Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund into Cycle 2 which successfully has leveraged a significant amount of outside funding. The TOD fund provides financing for the development of affordable housing and other vital community services near transit lines throughout the Bay Area. Through the Fund, developers can access flexible, affordable capital to purchase or improve available property near transit lines for the development of affordable housing, retail space and other critical services, such as child care centers, fresh food outlets and health clinics. Similar to the initial investment in the TOAH Fund, the following are program conditions: 1) MTC is able to exchange the $10 million in federal transportation funds for local funds because they cannot be used directly for housing investment; 2) Foundation or other sources of funding would be matched by MTC funds on a minimum 3:1 basis to reach a minimum fund of $40 million, and 3) the TOAH fund would be spent only in PDAs on projects that have the greatest potential to deliver affordable housing units with direct access to transit.

***PDA Planning Grants:*** MTC and ABAG's PDA Planning Grant Program will place an emphasis on affordable housing production and preservation in funding agreements with grantees. Grants will be made to jurisdictions to provide support in planning for PDAs in areas such as providing housing, jobs, intensified land use, promoting alternative modes of travel to the single occupancy vehicle, and parking management. These studies will place a special focus on selected PDAs with a greater potential for residential displacement and develop and implement community risk reduction plans. Grants will be made to local jurisdictions to provide planning support as needed to meet regional housing goals. Also program funds will establish a new local planning assistance program to provide staff resources directly to jurisdictions to support local land-use planning for PDAs. The Regional PDA Planning/Implementation component will complement county PDA Planning efforts, but will target investments in jurisdictions taking on the majority of Plan Bay Area housing and job growth. Funds would be used to support planning grants and technical assistance.

MTC will commence work with state and federal government to create private sector economic incentives to increase housing production.

***Local Planning & Implementation:*** Funds are made available to support local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs in each of the nine counties, developed through the county PDA Investment & Growth Strategy in consultation with ABAG and MTC. Funding is distributed to the county CMAs (with funds for San Francisco distributed to the City/County of San Francisco planning department) using the OBAG distribution formula with no county receiving less than $750,000 as shown in Appendix 5. Local jurisdictions will either directly access these funds through Caltrans Local Assistance similar to other OBAG grants provided to them by the CMAs, the CMAs may choose to provide individual grants to local jurisdictions through a single program administered by the CMA, or the CMA may request that ABAG administer the grants in cooperation with the local jurisdictions. CMA grants to local jurisdictions and the expenditure of funds by the San Francisco Planning Department are to be aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in their adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy; as well as to the PDA Planning Program guidelines as they apply only to those activities relevant to those guidelines. The CMAs are limited to using no more than 5% of the funds for program administration.

***6. Climate Change Initiatives***

The proposed funding for the Cycle 2 Climate Initiative Program is to support the implementation of strategies identified in Plan Bay Area to achieve the required CO2 emissions reductions per SB375 and federal criteria pollutant reductions. Staff will work with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to implement this program.

***7. Safe Routes to Schools***

Within the Safe Routes to School Program (SR2S program) funding is distributed among the nine Bay Area counties based on K-12 total enrollment for private and public schools as reported by the California Department of Education for FY 2010-11. Appendix A-3 details the county fund distribution. Before programming projects into the TIP the CMAs shall provide the SR2S recommended county program scope, budget, schedule, agency roles, and federal funding recipient. CMAs may choose to augment this program with their own Cycle 2 OBAG funding.

***8. Transit Capital Rehabilitation***

The program objective is to assist transit operators to fund major fleet replacements, fixed guideway rehabilitation and other high-scoring capital needs, and implement elements of the Transit Sustainability Project, consistent with the FTA Transit Capital Priorities program (MTC Resolution 4072 or successor resolution). This includes a set-aside of $1 million to support the consolidation and transition of Vallejo and Benicia bus services to SolTrans.

***9. Transit Performance Initiative:*** This new pilot program implements transit supportive investments in major transit corridors that can be carried out within two years. The focus is on making cost-effective operational improvements on significant trunk lines which carry the largest number of passengers in the Bay Area including transit signal prioritization, passenger circulation improvements at major hubs, and boarding/stop improvements. Specific projects are included in Attachment B.

***10. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program***: This is a new pilot program for the development of Priority Conservation Area (PCA) plans and projects to assist counties to ameliorate outward development expansion and maintain their rural character. The PCA funding program includes one approach for the North Bay program (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second for the remaining five counties. In the North Bay, each CMA will take the lead to develop its own program building on PCA planning conducted to date and select projects for funding. For the remaining counties, MTC and ABAG will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. MTC will provide $5 million to the Coastal Conservancy to manage the call for projects in coordination with the Coastal Conservancy's own program funds in order to support a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) than can be accommodated with federal transportation dollars alone and achieve the 3:1 minimum match as required by OBAG. MTC and ABAG staff will support the administration of the program. Appendix A-8 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.

# ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAMMING POLICIES

The policies below apply to the OneBayArea Grant Program, administered by the county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) or substitute agency:

- Program Eligibility: The congestion management agency may program funds from its One Bay Area Grant fund distribution to projects that meet the eligibility requirements for any of the following transportation improvement types:
  - Local Streets and Roads Preservation
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
  - Transportation for Livable Communities
  - Safe Routes To School/Transit
  - Priority Conservation Area
  - Planning and Outreach Activities

- Fund Source Distribution: OBAG is funded primarily from three federal fund sources: STP, CMAQ and TE. Although the new federal surface transportation authorization act now under consideration may alter the actual fund sources available for MTC's programming discretion it is anticipated that any new federal programs would overlap to a large extent with existing programs. The CMAs will be provided a breakdown of specific OBAG fund sources, with the understanding that actual fund sources may change as a result of the new federal surface transportation act. In this situation, MTC staff will work with the CMAs to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission. Furthermore, due to strict funding availability and eligibility requirements, the CMAs must adhere to the fund source limitations provided. Exceptions may be granted by MTC staff based on actual fund sources available and final apportionment levels.

  In determining the fund source distribution to the counties, each county was first guaranteed at least what they would otherwise received in Cycle 2 under the original Cycles 1 & 2 framework as compared to the original July 8, 2011 OBAG proposal. This resulted in the county of Marin receiving an additional $1.1 million, county of Napa receiving $1.3 million each, and the county of Solano receiving $1.4 million, for a total of $3.8 million (in CMAQ funds) off the top to hold these counties harmless. The Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds were then distributed based on the county TE shares available for OBAG as approved in the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). STP funds were then assigned to the CMA planning and outreach activities. The remaining STP funds assigned to OBAG were then distributed to each county based on the OBAG distribution formula. The remaining funds were distributed as CMAQ per the OBAG distribution formula. The hold harmless clause resulted in a slight deviation in the OBAG formula distribution for the overall funding amounts for each county.

- Priority Development Area (PDA) Policies
  - PDA minimum: CMAs in larger counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) shall direct at least 70% of their OBAG

investments to the PDAs. For North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) this minimum target is 50% to reflect the more rural nature of these counties. A project lying outside the limits of a PDA may count towards the minimum provided that it directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA. Depending on the county, CMA planning costs would partially count towards PDA targets (70% or 50%) in line with its PDA funding target. At MTC staff discretion, consideration may be given to counties that provided higher investments in PDAs in Cycle 1 as part of an overall Cycle 1 and 2 investment package. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) investments do not count towards PDA targets and must use "anywhere" funds. The PDA/'anywhere' funding split is shown in Appendix A-4.

- PDA Boundary Delineation: Refer to http://geocommons.com/maps/141979 which provides a GIS overlay of the PDAs in the Bay Area to exact map boundaries including transportation facilities. As ABAG considers and approves new PDA designations this map will be updated.
- Defining "proximate access to PDAs": The CMAs make the determination for projects to count toward the PDA minimum that are not otherwise geographically located within a PDA. For projects not geographically within a PDA, CMAs are required to map projects and designate which projects are considered to support a PDA along with policy justifications. This analysis would be subject to public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions. This should allow decision makers, stakeholders, and the public to understand how an investment outside of a PDA is to be considered to support a PDA and to be credited towards the PDA investment minimum target. MTC staff will evaluate and report to the Commission on how well this approach achieves the OBAG objectives prior to the next programming cycle.
- PDA Investment & Growth Strategy: By May 1, 2013, CMAs shall prepare and adopt a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to guide transportation investments that are supportive of PDAs. An existing Investment and Growth Strategy adopted by the County will be considered as meeting this requirement if it satisfies the general terms in Appendix A-6. See Appendix A-6 for details.

▶ Performance and Accountability Policies: Jurisdictions need to comply with the following policies in order to be eligible recipients of OBAG funds.

- To be eligible for OBAG funds, a jurisdiction will need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. Staff will provide minimum requirements based on best practices for the resolution. A county can provide its jurisdictions an extension of the deadline to June 30, 2013 as long as no programming for projects is requested of MTC until jurisdictions are in compliance. As discussed below, jurisdictions will be expected to have a general plan that complies within the Complete Streets Act of 2008 to be eligible for the next round of funding.

- A jurisdiction is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-14 RHNA prior to January 31, 2013. If a jurisdiction submits its housing element to the state on a timely basis for review, but the State's comment letter identifies deficiencies that the local jurisdictions must address in order to receive HCD certification, then the local jurisdiction may submit a request to the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee for a time extension to address the deficiencies and resubmit its revised draft housing element to HCD for re-consideration and certification.
- For the OBAG cycle subsequent to FY 2016-17, a jurisdiction is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-22 RHNA prior to May 31, 2015. Additionally, a jurisdiction is required to have its general plan circulation element comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 prior to January 31, 2016. These deadlines must be met in order to be eligible for funding for the subsequent OBAG cycle.
- OBAG funds may not be programmed to any jurisdiction out of compliance with OBAG policies and other requirements specified in this attachment. The CMA will be responsible for tracking progress towards these requirements and affirming to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance prior to MTC programming OBAG funds to its projects in the TIP.
- For a transit agency project sponsor under a JPA or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction), the jurisdiction where the project (such as station/stop improvements) is located will need to comply with these policies before funds may be programmed to the transit agency project sponsor. However, this is not required if the project is transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or transit maintenance facility.
- CMAs will provide documentation for the following prior to programming projects in the TIP:
    - The approach used to select OBAG projects including outreach and a board adopted list of projects
    - Compliance with MTC's complete streets policy
    - A map delineating projects selected outside of PDAs indicating those that are considered to provide proximate access to a PDA including their justifications as outlined on the previous page. CMA staff is expected to use this exhibit when it presents its program of projects to explain the how "proximate access" is defined to their board and the public.
    - Self-certification that the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy, Performance and Accountability Measures, and Outreach have been met using the checklist developed by MTC and the CMAs.
- MTC staff will report on the outcome of the CMA project selection process in late 2013. This information will include, but not be limited to, the following:
    - Mix of project types selected;

- Projects funded within PDAs and outside of PDAs and how proximity and direct connections were used and justified through the county process;
- Complete streets elements that were funded;
- Adherence to the performance and accountability requirements;
- Amount of funding to various jurisdictions and how this related to the distribution formula that includes population, RHNA housing allocations and housing production, as well as low-income housing factors.
- Public participation process.

- The CMAs will also be required to present their PDA Growth Strategy to the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee.

▶ Project Selection: County congestion management agencies or substitute agencies are given the responsibility to develop a project selection process along with evaluation criteria, issue a call for projects, conduct outreach, and select projects

- Public Involvement: The decision making authority to select projects for federal funding accompanies responsibilities to ensure that the process complies with federal statutes and regulations. In order to ensure that the CMA process for administering OBAG is in compliance, CMAs are required to lead a public outreach process as directed by Appendix A-5.
- Unified Call for Projects: CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects for their One Bay Area grant, with a final project list due to MTC by June 30, 2013. CMA staff need to ensure that all projects are submitted using the Fund Management System (FMS) no later than July 30, 2013. The goal of this process is to reduce staff time, coordinate all programs to respond to larger multi-modal projects, and provide project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects.
- Project Programming Targets and Delivery Deadlines: CMAs must program their block grant funds over the four-year period of Cycle 2 (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16). The expectation is that the CMA planning activities \ project would use capacity of the first year to provide more time for delivery as contrasted to other programs which tend to have more complex environmental and design challenges, but this is not a requirement. The funding is subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606 or its successor) including the Request for Authorization (RFA) submittal deadline and federal authorization/obligation deadline. Furthermore the following funding deadlines apply for each county, with earlier delivery strongly encouraged:
    - Half of the OBAG funds, including all funds programmed for the PE phase, must be obligated (federal authorization/E-76) by March 31, 2015.
    - All remaining OBAG funds must be obligated by January 31, 2017.

## CYCLE 2 COUNTY ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROJECT GUIDANCE

The categories below comprise the Cycle 2 County One Bay Area Grant Program, administered by the county congestion management agencies. Project selection should ensure that all of the

eligibility requirements below are met. MTC staff will work with CMAs and project sponsors to resolve any eligibility issues which may arise, including air quality conformity exceptions and requirements.

***1. CMA Planning and Outreach***

This category provides funding to the nine county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to support regional planning, programming and outreach activities. Such efforts include: county-based planning efforts for development of the RTP/SCS; development of PDA growth strategies; development and implementation of a complete streets compliance protocol; establishing land use and travel forecasting process and procedures consistent with ABAG/MTC; ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of federal-aid local projects; and undertaking the programming of assigned funding and solicitation of projects. The base funding level reflects continuing the Transportation 2035 commitment level by escalating at 3% per year from the base amount in FY 2011-12. In addition, the CMAs may request additional funding from their share of OBAG to enhance or augment additional activities at their discretion. All funding and activities will be administered through an interagency agreement between MTC and the respective CMA. Actual amounts for each CMA as augmented, are shown in Appendix A-2

***2. Local Streets and Roads Preservation***

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federally-eligible system. To be eligible for funding of any Local Streets and Roads (LSR) preservation project, the jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). The needs analysis ensures that streets recommended for treatment are cost effective. Pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status. The certification status can be found at www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html. Specific eligibility requirements are included below:

Pavement Rehabilitation:
Pavement rehabilitation projects including pavement segments with a PCI below 70 should be consistent with segments recommended for treatment within the programming cycle by the jurisdiction's PMP.

Preventive Maintenance: Only projects where pavement segments have a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 70 or above are eligible for preventive maintenance. Furthermore, the local agency's Pavement Management Program (PMP) must demonstrate that the preventive maintenance strategy is a cost effective method of extending the service life of the pavement.

Non-Pavement:
Eligible non-pavement activities and projects include rehabilitation or replacement of existing features on the roadway facility, such as storm drains, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), curbs, gutters, culverts, medians, guardrails, safety features, signals, signage, sidewalks, ramps and features that bring the facility to current standards. The jurisdiction must still have a certified PMP to be eligible for improvements to non-pavement features.

Activities that are not eligible for funding include: Air quality non-exempt projects (unless granted an exception by MTC staff), capacity expansion, new roadways, roadway extensions, right of way acquisition (for future expansion), operations, routine maintenance, spot application, enhancements that are above and beyond repair or replacement of existing assets (other than bringing roadway to current standards), and any pavement application not recommended by the Pavement Management Program unless otherwise allowed above.

Federal-Aid Eligible Facilities: Federal-aid highways as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(5) are eligible for local streets and roads preservation funding. A federal-aid highway is a public road that is not classified as a rural minor collector or local road or lower. Project sponsors must confirm the eligibility of their roadway through the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) prior to the application for funding.

Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Program Set-Aside: While passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991 dissolved the Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program, California statutes provide the continuation of minimum funding to counties, guaranteeing their prior FAS shares. The first three years of Cycle 2 were covered up-front under the Cycle 1 FAS program (covering a total 6-year period). The fourth and fifth years of Cycle 2 will be covered under the OBAG. Funding provided to the counties by the CMAs under OBAG will count toward the continuation of the FAS program requirement.

***3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements***

The Bicycle and Pedestrian program may fund a wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements including Class I, II and III bicycle facilities, bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking, sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges, user safety and supporting facilities, and traffic signal actuation.

According to CMAQ eligibility requirements, bicycle and pedestrian facilities must not be exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips resulting in air pollution reductions. Also to meet the needs of users, hours of operation need to be reasonable and support bicycle / pedestrian needs particularly during commute periods. For example the policy that a trail be closed to users before sunrise or after sunset limits users from using the facility during the peak commute hours, particularly during times of the year with shorter days. These user restrictions indicate that the facility is recreational rather than commute oriented. Also, as contrasted with roadway projects, bicycle and pedestrian projects may be located on or off the federal-aid highway system.

***4. Transportation for Livable Communities***

The purpose of Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) projects is to support community-based transportation projects that bring new vibrancy to downtown areas, commercial cores, high-density neighborhoods, and transit corridors, enhancing their amenities and ambiance and making them places where people want to live, work and visit. The TLC program supports the RTP/SCS by investing in improvements and facilities that promote alternative transportation modes rather than the single-occupant automobile.

General project categories include the following:

- Station Improvements such as plazas, station access pocket parks, bicycle parking

- Complete streets improvements that encourage bicycle and pedestrian access
- Transportation Demand Management projects including carsharing, vanpooling traveler coordination and information or Clipper®-related projects
- Connectivity projects connecting high density housing/jobs/mixed use to transit, such as bicycle/pedestrian paths and bridges and safe routes to transit.
- Density Incentives projects and non-transportation infrastructure improvements that include density bonuses, sewer upgrade, land banking or site assembly (these projects require funding exchanges to address federal funding eligibility limitations)
- Streetscape projects focusing on high-impact, multi-modal improvements or associated with high density housing/mixed use and transit (bulb outs, sidewalk widening , cross walk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid block crossing and signal, new stripping for bicycle lanes and road diets, pedestrian street lighting, medians, pedestrian refugees, way finding signage, pedestrian scaled street furniture including bus shelters, tree grates, benches, bollards, magazine racks, garbage and recycling bins, permanent bicycle racks, signal modification for bicycle detection, street trees, raised planters, planters, costs associated with on- site storm water management, permeable paving)
- Funding for TLC projects that incentivize local PDA Transit Oriented Development Housing

***5. Safe Routes to School***

The county Safe Routes to School Program continues to be a regional program. The funding is distributed directly to the CMAs by formula through the Cycle 2 regional program (see Appendix A-3). However, a CMA may use OBAG funding to augment this amount. Eligible projects include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. It is important to note that CMAQ is used to fund this program which is targeted towards air quality improvement rather than children's health or safety. Nevertheless CMAQ eligibility overlaps with Safe Routes to School Program projects that are eligible under the federal and state programs with few exceptions which are noted below. Refer to the following link for detailed examples of eligible projects which is followed by CMAQ funding eligibility parameters: http://mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/7_SR2S_Eligibility_Matrix.pdf

Non-Infrastructure Projects

Public Education and Outreach Activities

- Public education and outreach can help communities reduce emissions and congestion by inducing drivers to change their transportation choices.
- Activities that promote new or existing transportation services, developing messages and advertising materials (including market research, focus groups, and creative), placing messages and materials, evaluating message and material dissemination and public awareness, technical assistance, programs that promote the Tax Code provision related to commute benefits, and any other activities that help forward less-polluting transportation options.
- Air quality public education messages: Long-term public education and outreach can be effective in raising awareness that can lead to changes in travel behavior and ongoing emissions reductions; therefore, these activities may be funded indefinitely.
- Non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use
- Travel Demand Management Activities including traveler information services, shuttle services, carpools, vanpools, parking pricing, etc.

Infrastructure Projects

Bicycle/Pedestrian Use:

- Constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc.) that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips
- Programs for secure bicycle storage facilities and other facilities, including bicycle lanes, for the convenience and protection of bicyclists, in both public and private areas new construction and major reconstructions of paths, tracks, or areas solely for the use by pedestrian or other non-motorized means of transportation when economically feasible and in the public interest
- Traffic calming measures

Exclusions found to be ineligible uses of CMAQ funds:

- Walking audits and other planning activities (STP based on availability will be provided for these purposes upon CMA's request)
- Crossing guards and vehicle speed feedback devices, traffic control that is primarily oriented to vehicular traffic rather than bicyclists and pedestrians
- Material incentives that lack an educational message or exceeding a nominal cost.

***6. Priority Conservation Areas***

This is an outgrowth of the new regional program pilot for the development of Priority Conservation Area (PCA) plans and projects to assist counties to ameliorate outward development expansion and maintain their rural character. A CMA may use OBAG funding to augment grants received from the regionally competitive program or develop its own county PCA program Generally, eligible projects will include planning, land / easement acquisition, open space access projects, and farm-to-market capital projects.

## PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Cycle 2 spans apportionments over five fiscal years: FY 20012-13, FY 2013-14, FY 2014-15 FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17. Programming in the first year will generally be for the on-going regional operations and regional planning activities which can be delivered immediately, allowing the region to meet the obligation deadlines for use of FY 2012-13 funds. This strategy, at the same time, provides several months during FY 2012-13 for program managers to select projects and for MTC to program projects into the TIP to be obligated during the remaining second, third, fourth and fifth years of the Cycle 2 period. If CMAs wish to program any OBAG funds in the first year, MTC will try to accommodate requests depending on available federal apportionments and obligation limitations, as long as the recipient has meet the OBAG requirements.

# Appendix A-1

## Cycle 2 / OBAG 1
## Regional and County Programs
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2014

## Cycle 2/OBAG 1 Funding Commitments

| Regional Program (millions $ - rounded) | | 4-Year Total | FY 2016-17 * | 5-Year Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Regional Categories** | | | | |
| 1 | Regional Planning Activities | $7 | $1.8 | $8 |
| 2 | Regional Operations | $96 | $9.9 | $106 |
| 3 | Freeway Performance Initiative | $96 | $3.2 | $99 |
| 4 | Pavement Management Program | $7 | $1.9 | $9 |
| 5 | Priority Development Activities | $40 | | $40 |
| 6 | Climate Initiatives | $20 | $0.3 | $20 |
| 7 | Safe Routes To School ** | $20 | $2.7 | $23 |
| 8 | Transit Capital Rehabilitation | $150 | | $150 |
| 9 | Transit Performance Initiative | $30 | | $30 |
| 10 | Priority Conservation Area | $10 | | $10 |
| | **Regional Program Total:** | **$475** | **$20** | **$495** |
| | | | | **60%** |

*** FY 17 funding does not include $1.488 M redirected from deleted projects in Cycles 1 & 2**

**** Safe Routes To School assigned to County CMAs**

| One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 1) (millions $ - rounded) | | 4-Year Total *** | FY 2016-17 | 5-Year Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Counties** | | | | |
| 1 | Alameda | $63 | $1.0 | $64 |
| 2 | Contra Costa | $45 | $0.8 | $46 |
| 3 | Marin | $10 | $0.7 | $11 |
| 4 | Napa | $6 | $0.7 | $7 |
| 5 | San Francisco | $38 | $0.8 | $39 |
| 6 | San Mateo | $26 | $0.7 | $27 |
| 7 | Santa Clara | $88 | $1.1 | $89 |
| 8 | Solano | $18 | $0.7 | $19 |
| 9 | Sonoma | $23 | $0.7 | $24 |
| | **OBAG Total:**** | **$320** | **$7** | **$327** |
| | | | | **40%** |

*** 4-Year OBAG amounts revised October 2012 to reflect revised RHNA, released July 2012.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Cycle 2/OBAG 1 Total Total:*** | **$795** | **$27** | **$822** |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\tmp-4035_OBAG\[tmp-4035_Appendices to Att-A.xlsx]A-1 Cycle 2 Funding

NOTE: Amounts may not total due to rounding

# Appendix A-2

## Cycle 2 / OBAG 1
## Planning & Outreach
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2014

**OBAG 1 - County CMA Planning**

| County | Agency | Cycle 2 / OBAG 1 County CMA Planning - Base 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | SubTotal | CMA-OBAG Augmentation | SubTotal | 2016-17 * Supplemental | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alameda | ACTC | $916,000 | $944,000 | $973,000 | $1,003,000 | $3,836,000 | $3,270,000 | **$7,106,000** | **$1,034,000** | **$8,140,000** |
| Contra Costa | CCTA | $725,000 | $747,000 | $770,000 | $794,000 | $3,036,000 | $1,214,000 | **$4,250,000** | **$818,000** | **$5,068,000** |
| Marin | TAM | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $418,000 | **$3,091,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,811,000** |
| Napa | NCTPA | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $0 | **$2,673,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,393,000** |
| San Francisco | SFCTA | $667,000 | $688,000 | $709,000 | $731,000 | $2,795,000 | $773,000 | **$3,568,000** | **$753,000** | **$4,321,000** |
| San Mateo | SMCCAG | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $752,000 | **$3,425,000** | **$720,000** | **$4,145,000** |
| Santa Clara | VTA | $1,014,000 | $1,045,000 | $1,077,000 | $1,110,000 | $4,246,000 | $1,754,000 | **$6,000,000** | **$1,145,000** | **$7,145,000** |
| Solano | STA | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $333,000 | **$3,006,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,726,000** |
| Sonoma | SCTA | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $0 | **$2,673,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,393,000** |
| **County CMAs Total:** | | **$6,512,000** | **$6,714,000** | **$6,919,000** | **$7,133,000** | **$27,278,000** | **$8,514,000** | **$35,792,000** | **$7,350,000** | **$43,142,000** |

**Regional Agency Planning**

| Regional Agency | Cycle 2 Regional Agency Planning - Base 2012-13 | 2013-14 | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | SubTotal | Augmentation | SubTotal | 2016-17 * Supplemental | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ABAG | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $0 | **$2,673,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,393,000** |
| BCDC | $320,000 | $330,000 | $340,000 | $351,000 | $1,341,000 | $0 | **$1,341,000** | **$360,000** | **$1,701,000** |
| MTC | $638,000 | $658,000 | $678,000 | $699,000 | $2,673,000 | $0 | **$2,673,000** | **$720,000** | **$3,393,000** |
| **Regional Agencies Total:** | **$1,596,000** | **$1,646,000** | **$1,696,000** | **$1,749,000** | **$6,687,000** | **$0** | **$6,687,000** | **$1,800,000** | **$8,487,000** |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\tmp-4035_OBAG\[tmp-4035_Appendices to Att-A.xlsx]A-2 Cycle 2 Planning

* 3% escalation from FY 2015-16 Planning Base

**$42,479,000** **$51,629,000**

# Appendix A-3

## OBAG 1
## Safe Routes to School County Distribution
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## November 2015

**Safe Routes To School County Distribution**

| County | Public School Enrollment (K-12) * | Private School Enrollment (K-12) * | Total School Enrollment (K-12) * | Percentage | SubTotal | Supplemental | FY 13 - FY 17 Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |
| **Alameda** | 214,626 | 24,537 | 239,163 | 21.5% | **$4,862,000** | **$504,000** | **$5,366,000** |
| **Contra Costa** | 166,956 | 16,274 | 183,230 | 16.4% | **$3,725,000** | **$386,000** | **$4,111,000** |
| **Marin** | 29,615 | 5,645 | 35,260 | 3.2% | **$717,000** | **$74,000** | **$791,000** |
| **Napa** | 20,370 | 3,036 | 23,406 | 2.1% | **$476,000** | **$49,000** | **$525,000** |
| **San Francisco** | 56,454 | 23,723 | 80,177 | 7.2% | **$1,630,000** | **$169,000** | **$1,799,000** |
| **San Mateo** | 89,971 | 16,189 | 106,160 | 9.5% | **$2,157,000** | **$225,000** | **$2,382,000** |
| **Santa Clara** | 261,945 | 38,119 | 300,064 | 26.9% | **$6,099,000** | **$633,000** | **$6,732,000** |
| **Solano** | 67,117 | 2,855 | 69,972 | 6.3% | **$1,422,000** | **$148,000** | **$1,570,000** |
| **Sonoma** | 71,049 | 5,787 | 76,836 | 6.9% | **$1,562,000** | **$162,000** | **$1,724,000** |
| **Total:** | **978,103** | **136,165** | **1,114,268** | **100%** | **$22,650,000** | **$2,350,000** | **$25,000,000** |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\tmp-4035_OBAG\[tmp-4035_Appendices to Att-A.xlsx]A-3 REG SR2S

* From California Department of Education for FY 2010-11

# Appendix A-4

## Cycle 2
## OBAG County Fund Distribution
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
## October 24, 2012

**OBAG Geographic Funding Distribution**

| County | OBAG Funds | PDA / Anywhere Split | PDA | Anywhere |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| Alameda | $63,065,000 | 70/30 | $44,146,000 | $18,919,000 |
| Contra Costa | $45,204,000 | 70/30 | $31,643,000 | $13,561,000 |
| Marin | $10,028,000 | 50/50 | $5,014,000 | $5,014,000 |
| Napa | $6,661,000 | 50/50 | $3,331,000 | $3,330,000 |
| San Francisco | $38,584,000 | 70/30 | $27,009,000 | $11,575,000 |
| San Mateo | $26,524,000 | 70/30 | $18,567,000 | $7,957,000 |
| Santa Clara | $88,126,000 | 70/30 | $61,688,000 | $26,438,000 |
| Solano | $18,769,000 | 50/50 | $9,385,000 | $9,384,000 |
| Sonoma | $23,039,000 | 50/50 | $11,520,000 | $11,519,000 |
| Total: | $320,000,000 | | $212,303,000 | $107,697,000 |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\tmp-4035_OBAG\[tmp-4035_Appendices to Att-A.xlsx]A-4 OBAG PDA

OBAG amounts revised October 2012 to reflect revised RHNA, released July 2012.

# Appendix A-5: One Bay Area Grant Call for Projects Guidance

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has delegated OBAG project selection to the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as they are best suited for this role because of their existing relationships with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their respective counties. In order to meet federal requirements that accompany the decision-making process regarding federal transportation funding, MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process to solicit candidate projects to be submitted to MTC for consideration for inclusion in the Cycle 2 One Bay Area Grant Program. CMAs will also serve as the main point of contact for local sponsoring agencies and members of the public submitting projects for consideration for inclusion in the 2013 Transportation Improvement Program.

CMAs will conduct a transparent process for the Call for Projects while complying with federal regulations by carrying out the following activities:

1. **Public Involvement and Outreach**
   - ***Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.*** CMAs will be expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 3821), which can be found at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm. CMAs are expected at a minimum to:
     - Execute effective and meaningful local engagement efforts during the call for projects by working closely with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and the public through the project solicitation process.
     - Explain the local Call for Projects process, informing stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comments on project ideas and when decisions are to be made on the list of projects to be submitted to MTC;
     - Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times which are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;
     - Post notices of public meetings and hearing(s) on their agency website; include information on how to request language translation for individuals with limited English proficiency. If agency protocol has not been established, please refer to MTC's Plan for Assisting Limited English Proficient Populations at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/lep.htm
     - Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with disabilities and by public transit;
     - Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting.

   - ***Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.*** CMAs are to provide MTC with:
     - A description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects selected for OBAG funding. Specify whether public input was

gathered at forums held specifically for the OBAG project solicitation or as part of a separate planning or programming outreach effort;
- A description of how the public engagement process met the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan, including how the CMA ensured full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project submittal process.
- A summary of comments received from the public and a description of how public comments informed the recommended list of projects submitted by the CMA.

**2. Agency Coordination**

- ***Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, federally recognized tribal governments, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the* OBAG *Program.*** CMAs will assist with agency coordination by:
  - Communicating this Call for Projects guidance to local jurisdictions, transit agencies, federally recognized tribal governments, and other stakeholders

**3. Title VI Responsibilities**

- ***Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process as in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.***
  - Assist community-based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in having projects submitted for funding;
  - Remove barriers for persons with limited-English proficiency to have access to the project submittal process;
  - For Title IV outreach strategies, please refer to MTC's Public Participation Plan found at: http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm
  - Additional resources are available at
    i. http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/civilrights/programs/tvi.htm
    ii. http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DBE_CRLC.html#TitleVI
    iii. http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/rights/index.htm

# Appendix A-6: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG funding that supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. From time to time, MTC shall consult with the CMAs to evaluate progress on the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting among MTC, ABAG and the CMAs. Significant modifications to the scope of activities may be formalized through future revisions to this resolution. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

**(1) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies**

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Encourage community participation throughout the planning process and in determining project priorities
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans.

**(2) Planning Objectives –** to Inform Project Priorities

- Keep apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county
- Encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes
- Encourage and support local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA.
    - *Short-term*: By May 1, 2013, receive and review information submitted to the CMA by ABAG on the progress of local jurisdictions in implementing their housing element objectives and identify current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization.
    - *Long-term*: Starting in May 2014 and in all subsequent updates, PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals[1]. The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently does not provide for a mix of income-levels, any recommend policy changes should be aimed at promoting affordable housing. If the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization. This analysis will be coordinated with related work conducted through the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) grant awarded to the region in fall 2011.

**(3) Establishing Local Funding Priorities -** Develop funding guidelines for evaluating OBAG projects that support multi-modal transportation priorities based on connections to housing, jobs and commercial activity. Emphasis should be placed on the following factors when developing project evaluation criteria:

- **Projects located in high impact project areas**. Key factors defining high impact areas include:
    a. Housing – PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units and percentage change), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production

[1] Such as inclusionary housing requirements, city-sponsored land-banking for affordable housing production, "just cause eviction" policies, policies or investments that preserve existing deed-restricted or "naturally" affordable housing, condo conversion ordinances that support stability and preserve affordable housing, etc.

b. Jobs in proximity to housing and transit (both current levels and those included in the SCS),
c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
d. Consistency with regional TLC design guidelines or design that encourages multi-modal access: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc/2009_TLC_Design_Guidelines.pdf
e. Project areas with parking management and pricing policies

- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC (see: http://geocommons.com/maps/110983 ) or as defined by CMAs according to local priorities
- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies or policies
- **PDAs that overlap or are colocated with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaulation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure –**Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

**Process/Timeline**

| | |
|---|---|
| CMAs develop PDA Investment & Growth Strategy | June 2012 – May 2013 |
| PDA Investment & Growth Strategy Presentations by CMAs to Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee | Summer/Fall 2013 |
| CMAs amend PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local housing production and policies | May 2014 |
| CMAs submit annual progress reports related to PDA Growth Strategies, including status of jurisdiction progress on development/adoption of housing elements and complete streets ordinances. | May 2014, Ongoing |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-4035_Attach-A.doc

# Appendix A-7

## Cycle 2
## County PDA Implementation
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
## November 2012

### County PDA Implementation

| County | Administering Agency | OBAG Formula | PDA Planning Share * | County PDA Implementation Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Alameda** | **ACTC** | 20.2% | 19.5% | **$3,905,000** |
| **Contra Costa** | **CCTA** | 14.2% | 13.7% | **$2,745,000** |
| **Marin** | **TAM** | 2.8% | 3.8% | **$750,000** |
| **Napa** | **NCTPA** | 1.7% | 3.8% | **$750,000** |
| **San Francisco **** | **City/County of SF** | 12.3% | 11.9% | **$2,380,000** |
| **San Mateo** | **SMCCAG** | 8.3% | 8.0% | **$1,608,000** |
| **Santa Clara** | **VTA** | 27.6% | 26.7% | **$5,349,000** |
| **Solano** | **STA** | 5.5% | 5.3% | **$1,066,000** |
| **Sonoma** | **SCTA** | 7.5% | 7.2% | **$1,447,000** |
| **County PDA Implementation Total:** | | 100.0% | 100.0% | **$20,000,000** |

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4 - New Act\T4 - STP-CMAQ\T4 Cycle Programming\T4 Second Cycle\Cycle 2 Policy Dev\One Bay Area Grant\[Cycle 2 STP-CMAQ-TE Fund Source Distribution.xls]CMA Planning

* County minimum of $750,000 for Marin and Napa results in actual PDA Implementation share different than OBAG formula share

** Funding for San Francisco to be provided to San Francisco City/County planning department

# APPENDIX A-8: Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program

**Program Goals and Eligible Projects**

The goal of the Priority Conservation Area Program is to support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands in the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. These values include globally unique ecosystems, productive agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, healthy fisheries, and climate protection (mitigation and adaptation), among others. The PCA Program should also be linked to SB 375 goals which direct MPOs to prepare sustainable community strategies which consider resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Section 65080.01 (attached). ABAG's FOCUS program delineates both the Priority Development Areas and the Priority Conservation Areas.

Per MTC Resolution No. 4035, the PCA program is split into two elements:

1. North Bay Program ($5 million)
2. Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program ($5 million)

The North Bay program framework is to be developed by the four North Bay county congestion management agencies, building on their PCA planning and priorities carried out to date. Project eligibility is limited by the eligibility of federal surface transportation funding; unless the CMA can exchange these funds or leverage new fund sources for their programs.

The Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program will be administered by the Coastal Conservancy in partnership with MTC and ABAG based on the proposal provided below. The table below outlines screening criteria, eligible applicants, and the proposed project selection and programming process for the Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Funding Amount** | • $5 million |
| **Screening Criteria** | • **PCA Designation**: If a project currently isn't in or doesn't connect to a PCA, the applicant must file an application with ABAG requesting a PCA designation.<br>• **Regionally Significant**: Indicators of regional significance include a project's contribution to goals stated in regional habitat, agricultural or open space plans (i.e. *San Francisco Bay Area Upland Habitat Goals Project Report* at http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/), countywide Plans or ABAG's PCA designations. Applicants should describe who will benefit from the project and regional (greater-than-local need) it serves.<br>• **Open Space Protection In Place**: Linkages to or location in a Greenbelt area that is policy protected from development. Land acquisition or easement projects would be permitted in an area without open space policy protections in place.<br>• **Non-Federal Local Match**: 3:1 minimum match<br>• **Meets Program Goals:** Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see next page):<br>  o Protects or enhances "resource areas" or habitats as defined in California Government Code Section 65080.01.<br>  o Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems.<br>  o Supports the agricultural economy of the region. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Eligible Applicants** | • Local governments (cities, counties, towns), county congestion management agencies, tribes, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area are invited to nominate projects. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate and partner with other entities on the nomination of projects, and partnerships that leverage additional funding will be given higher priority in the grant award process. **Partnerships are necessary with cities, counties, or CMAs in order to access federal funds. Project must have an implementing agency that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (master agreement with Caltrans)** |
| **Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects** | **Eligible Projects**<br>1. **Planning Activities**<br>2. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities/ Infrastructure:** On-road and off-road trail facilities, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming, lighting and other safety related infrastructure, and ADA compliance, conversion and use of abandoned rail corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists.<br>3. **Visual Enhancements**: Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas.<br>4. **Habitat / Environmental Enhancements**: Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way, reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats, mitigation of transportation project environmental impacts funded through the federal-aid surface transportation program.<br>5. **Protection (Land Acquisition or Easement) or Enhancement of Natural Resources, Open Space or Agricultural Lands**: Parks and open space, staging areas or environmental facilities; or natural resources, such as listed species, identified priority habitat, wildlife corridors, wildlife corridors watersheds, or agricultural soils of importance. |
| **Project Selection** | **Coastal Conservancy* Partnership Program:**<br>MTC will provide $5 million of federal transportation funds to the Conservancy which will be combined with the Conservancy's program funding, and further leveraged by private foundation funding, as the basis for a regional call for projects. In addition a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) can be accommodated, which is not the case with federal transportation funds alone. The Conservancy will manage the program in collaboration with MTC and ABAG staff. This approach would harness the expertise of the coastal conservancy, expand the pool of eligible projects, and leverage up to $10 million in additional resources through Coastal Conservancy, and the Moore Foundation**. |

*The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency and the primary public land conservation funding source in the Bay Area, providing funding for many different types of land conservation projects. For more information see http://scc.ca.gov/
**The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation seeks to advance environmental conservation, scientific research, and patient care--around the world and in the San Francisco Bay Area. For more information see http://www.moore.org/

# Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C
05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 12/18/13-C
02/26/14-C 03/26/14-C 04/23/14-C 05/28/14-C
06/25/14-C 07/23/14-C 09/24/14-C 11/19/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 05/27/15-C 06/24/15-C
07/22/15-C 10/28/15-C 11/18/15-C 12/16/15-C

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2015

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other RTIP/TAP/TFCA | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OBAG 1 REGIONAL PROGRAMS** | | **$457,329,000** | **$40,000,000** | **$497,329,000** |
| **1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (STP Planning)** | | | | |
| ABAG Planning | ABAG | $3,393,000 | $0 | $3,393,000 |
| BCDC Planning | BCDC | $1,701,000 | $0 | $1,701,000 |
| MTC Planning | MTC | $3,393,000 | $0 | $3,393,000 |
| **1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (STP Planning)** | **TOTAL:** | **$8,487,000** | **$0** | **$8,487,000** |
| **2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)** | | | | |
| 511 - Traveler Information | MTC | $57,800,000 | $0 | $57,800,000 |
| Clipper® Fare Media Collection | MTC | $21,400,000 | $0 | $21,400,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $79,200,000 | $0 | $79,200,000 |
| Incident Management Program | MTC/SAFE | $12,240,000 | $0 | $12,240,000 |
| FSP/Call Box Program | MTC/SAFE | $14,462,000 | $0 | $14,462,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $26,702,000 | $0 | $26,702,000 |
| **2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)** | **TOTAL:** | **$105,902,000** | **$0** | **$105,902,000** |
| **3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)** | | | | |
| Regional Performance Initiatives Implementation | MTC | $5,750,000 | $0 | $5,750,000 |
| Regional Performance Initiatives Corridor Implementation | MTC/SAFE | $9,200,000 | $0 | $9,200,000 |
| Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS) | MTC | $9,000,000 | $0 | $9,000,000 |
| PASS - LAVTA Dublin Blvd Transit Performance Initiative | MTC | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| PASS - AC Transit South Alameda County Corridors Travel Time Imps | MTC | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $24,950,000 | | $24,950,000 |
| **Ramp Metering and TOS Elements** | | | | |
| FPI - ALA I-580: SJ Co. Line to Vasco & Foothill to Crow Canyon | Caltrans | $5,150,000 | $0 | $5,150,000 |
| FPI - ALA I-680: SCL Co. Line to CC Co. Line | Caltrans | $3,192,000 | $14,430,000 | $17,622,000 |
| FPI - ALA SR92 & I-880: Clawiter to Hesperian & Decoto Road | Caltrans | $656,000 | $0 | $656,000 |
| FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 1 | MTC/SAFE | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 2 | Caltrans | $8,118,000 | $0 | $8,118,000 |
| FPI - Various Corridors Caltrans Right of Way (ROW) | Caltrans | $975,000 | $0 | $975,000 |
| FPI - Various Corridors - Caltrans Preliminary Engineering (PE) | Caltrans | $7,200,000 | $19,570,000 | $26,770,000 |
| FPI - SCL US 101: San Benito County Line to SR 85 | Caltrans | $3,417,000 | $0 | $3,417,000 |
| FPI - MRN 101 - SF Co Line - Son Co Line | Caltrans | $10,000,000 | $0 | $10,000,000 |
| FPI - SON 101 - MRN Co Line - Men Co Line | MTC | $350,000 | $0 | $350,000 |
| FPI - SCL I-680: US 101 to ALA Co. Line | Caltrans | $270,000 | $0 | $270,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $40,078,000 | $34,000,000 | $74,078,000 |
| **3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)** | **TOTAL:** | **$65,028,000** | **$34,000,000** | **$99,028,000** |
| **4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)** | | | | |
| Pavement Management Program (PMP) | MTC | $1,547,000 | $0 | $1,547,000 |
| Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP) | MTC | $7,500,000 | $0 | $7,500,000 |
| Statewide Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Needs Assessment | MTC/Caltrans | $53,000 | $0 | $53,000 |
| **4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)** | **TOTAL:** | **$9,100,000** | **$0** | **$9,100,000** |
| **5. PRIORTY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION** | | | | |
| **Regional PDA Implementation** | | | | |
| PDA Planning - ABAG | ABAG | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| **Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)** | | | | |
| SF Park Parking Pricing (Transit Oriented Affordable Housing Exchange) | SFMTA | $10,000,000 | $0 | $10,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $10,000,000 | $0 | $10,000,000 |
| **Local PDA Planning** | | | | |
| Local PDA Planning - Alameda | ACTC | $3,905,000 | $0 | $3,905,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - Contra Costa | CCTA | $2,745,000 | $0 | $2,745,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - Marin | TAM | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - City of Napa | Napa | $275,000 | $0 | $275,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - American Canyon | American Canyon | $475,000 | $0 | $475,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - San Francisco | SF City/County | $2,380,000 | $0 | $2,380,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - San Mateo | SMCCAG | $218,000 | $0 | $218,000 |
| Belmont Village Specific/Implementation Plan | Belmont | $440,000 | $0 | $440,000 |
| Millbrae PDA Specific Plan | Millbrae | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Redwood City Downtown Sequoia Station and Streetcar Planning Study | Redwood City | $450,000 | $0 | $450,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - Santa Clara | VTA | $4,343,695 | $0 | $4,343,695 |
| San Jose Stevens Creek/Santana Row/Winchester Specific Plan | MTC/San Jose | $640,305 | $0 | $640,305 |
| Santa Clara El Camino Corridor Precise Plan | MTC/Santa Clara | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - Palo Alto | Palo Alto | $265,000 | | $265,000 |
| Local PDA Planning - Solano | STA | $1,066,000 | $0 | $1,066,000 |
| Santa Rosa - Roseland/Sebastopol Road PDA Planning | Santa Rosa | $647,000 | $0 | $647,000 |
| Sonoma County - Sonoma Springs Area Plan | Sonoma County | $450,000 | $0 | $450,000 |

# Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C
05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 12/18/13-C
02/26/14-C 03/26/14-C 04/23/14-C 05/28/14-C
06/25/14-C 07/23/14-C 09/24/14-C 11/19/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 05/27/15-C 06/24/15-C
07/22/15-C 10/28/15-C 11/18/15-C 12/16/15-C

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2015

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other RTIP/TAP/TFCA | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OBAG 1 REGIONAL PROGRAMS** | | **$457,329,000** | **$40,000,000** | **$497,329,000** |
| Sonoma County - Airport Employment Center Planning | Sonoma County | $350,000 | $0 | $350,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $20,000,000 | $0 | $20,000,000 |
| **Regional PDA Planning** | | | | |
| *Regional PDA Implementation Priorities* | | | | |
| Bay Area Transit Core Capacity Study | MTC | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Public Lands Near Rail Corridors Assessment | MTC | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| PDA Implementation Studies/Forums | MTC | $156,500 | $0 | $156,500 |
| State Route 82 Relinquishment Exploration Study | MTC/VTA | $275,000 | $0 | $275,000 |
| *PDA Planning* | | | | |
| Oakland Downtown Specific Plan | Oakland | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| South Berkeley/ Adeline/Ashby BART Specific Plan | Berkeley | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| Bay Fair BART Transit Village Specific Plan | San Leandro | $440,000 | $0 | $440,000 |
| Alameda Naval Air Station Specific Plan | Alameda | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Del Norte BART Station Precise Plan | El Cerrito | $302,500 | $0 | $302,500 |
| Mission Bay Railyard and I-280 Alternatives | San Francisco | $700,000 | $0 | $700,000 |
| Santa Clara El Camino Corridor Precise Plan | Santa Clara | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| Sunnyvale El Camino Corridor Precise Plan | Sunnyvale | $587,000 | $0 | $587,000 |
| San Jose Stevens Creek/Santana Row/Winchester Specific Plan | San Jose | $750,000 | $0 | $750,000 |
| *Staff Assistance* | | | | |
| Alameda PDA TDM Plan | Alameda | $150,000 | $0 | $150,000 |
| Downtown Livermore Parking Implementation Plan | Livermore | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Oakland Transporation Impact Review Streamlining | Oakland | $300,000 | $0 | $300,000 |
| Oakland Complete Streets, Design Guidance, Circulation Element Update | Oakland | $235,000 | $0 | $235,000 |
| Downtown Oakland Parking Management Strategy | Oakland | $200,000 | $0 | $200,000 |
| *Technical Assistance* | | | | |
| Concord Salvio Streetscape | Concord | $50,000 | $0 | $50,000 |
| South Richmond Affordable Housing and Commercial Linkage | Richmond | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| San Mateo Planning/Growth Forum Series | San Mateo | $25,000 | $0 | $25,000 |
| South San Francisco El Camino/Chestnut Ave Infrastructure Financing Analysis | SSF | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| Milpitas Transit Area Parking Analysis | Milpitas | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| Morgan Hill Housing/Employment Market Demand/Circulation Analysis | Morgan Hill | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| Sab Jose West San Carlos Master Streetscape Plan | San Jose | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| Sunnyvale Mathilda Ave Downtown Plan Line | Sunnyvale | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| Downtown Sunnyvale Block 15 Sale/Land Exchange | Sunnyvale | $59,000 | $0 | $59,000 |
| Sunnyvale El Camino Street Space Allocation Study | Sunnyvale | $60,000 | $0 | $60,000 |
| **SUBTOTAL** | | $8,000,000 | $0 | $8,000,000 |
| **5. PRIORTY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION** | **TOTAL:** | **$40,000,000** | **$0** | **$40,000,000** |
| **6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)** | | | | |
| *Car Sharing* | | | | |
| Hayward RFP for Car Sharing Services | Hayward | $200,480 | $0 | $200,480 |
| Oakland Car Share and Outreach Program | Oakland | $320,526 | $0 | $320,526 |
| CCTA Car Share4All | CCTA | $973,864 | $0 | $973,864 |
| TAM Car Share CANAL | TAM | $125,000 | $0 | $125,000 |
| City of San Mateo Car Sharing - A Catalyst for Change | San Mateo | $210,000 | $0 | $210,000 |
| Santa Rosa Car Share | SCTA | $170,130 | $0 | $170,130 |
| Public Education Outreach | MTC | $312,000 | $0 | $312,000 |
| *Transportation Demand Management* | | | | |
| **goBerkeley Residential Shared Parking Pilot** | **Berkeley** | **$950,000** | **$0** | **$950,000** |
| **Hayward Comprehensive Parking Mgmt Plan Implementation** | **Hayward** | **$338,000** | **$0** | **$338,000** |
| **Oakland Demand-Responsive Parking and Mobility Mgmt Initiative** | **Oakland** | **$1,300,000** | **$0** | **$1,300,000** |
| **Downtown San Mateo Parking Technology Implementation** | **San Mateo** | **$1,500,000** | **$0** | **$1,500,000** |
| **Walnut Creek Parking Guidance System Pilot** | **Walnut Creek** | **$783,000** | **$0** | **$783,000** |
| **Peery Park Rides** | **VTA/Sunnyvale** | **$1,129,000** | **$0** | **$1,129,000** |
| To Be Determined | TBD | $6,000,000 | $0 | $6,000,000 |
| EV Charging Infastructure and Vehicles (Programmed by BAAQMD)* | BAAQMD | $0 | $6,000,000 | $6,000,000 |
| **6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)** | **TOTAL:** | **$14,312,000** | **$6,000,000** | **$20,312,000** |

* Selected and funded by the BAAQMD. Listed here for informational purposes only

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **7. REGIONAL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (RSRTS)** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by CMAs* | | | | |
| Alameda County SRTS Program - Supplemental | ACTC | $1,073,000 | $0 | $1,073,000 |
| Contra Costa County SRTS Program - Supplemental | CCTA | $822,000 | $0 | $822,000 |
| Marin County SRTS Program - Supplemental | TAM | $74,000 | $0 | $74,000 |
| Napa County SRTS Program - Supplemental | NCTPA | $105,000 | $0 | $105,000 |
| San Francisco County SRTS Program - Supplemental | SFCTA | $360,000 | $0 | $360,000 |

# Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C
05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 12/18/13-C
02/26/14-C 03/26/14-C 04/23/14-C 05/28/14-C
06/25/14-C 07/23/14-C 09/24/14-C 11/19/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 05/27/15-C 06/24/15-C
07/22/15-C 10/28/15-C 11/18/15-C 12/16/15-C

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2015

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other RTIP/TAP/TFCA | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OBAG 1 REGIONAL PROGRAMS** | | **$457,329,000** | **$40,000,000** | **$497,329,000** |
| San Mateo County SRTS Program - Supplemental | SMCCAG | $225,000 | $0 | $225,000 |
| Santa Clara County SRTS Program - Supplemental | Santa Clara | $1,346,000 | $0 | $1,346,000 |
| Solano County SRTS Program - Supplemental | STA | $314,000 | $0 | $314,000 |
| Sonoma County SRTS Program - Supplemental | SCTA | $345,000 | $0 | $345,000 |
| Alameda County SRTS Program | ACTC | $4,293,000 | $0 | $4,293,000 |
| Cavallo Rd, Drake St, and 'G' Street Safe Routes to School Imps | Antioch | $330,000 | $0 | $330,000 |
| Actuated Ped /Bicycle Traffic Signal on Oak Grove Rd at Sierra Rd | Concord | $504,900 | $0 | $504,900 |
| Port Chicago Hwy/Willow Pass Rd Pedestrian & Bicycle Imps | Contra Costa County | $441,700 | $0 | $441,700 |
| West Contra Costa SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | Contra Costa County | $709,800 | $0 | $709,800 |
| Vista Grande Street Pedestrian Safe Routes to School Imps | Danville | $157,000 | $0 | $157,000 |
| Happy Valley Road Walkway Safe Routes to School Imps | Lafayette | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Moraga Road Safe Routes to School Bicycle/Pedestrian Imps | Moraga | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Orinda Sidewalk Imps | Orinda | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Pittsburg School Area Safety Imps | Pittsburg | $203,000 | $0 | $203,000 |
| Pleasant Hill - Boyd Road and Elinora Drive Sidewalks | Pleasant Hill | $395,000 | $0 | $395,000 |
| San Ramon School Crossings Enhancements | San Ramon | $247,600 | $0 | $247,600 |
| San Rafael Grand Ave Bike/Ped Imps | San Rafael | $717,000 | $0 | $717,000 |
| Napa County SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | NCTPA | $420,000 | $0 | $420,000 |
| San Francisco SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | SFDPH | $1,439,000 | $0 | $1,439,000 |
| San Mateo County SRTS Program | SMCCAG | $2,157,000 | $0 | $2,157,000 |
| Campbell - Virginia Avenue Sidewalks | Campbell | $708,000 | $0 | $708,000 |
| Mountain View - El Camino to Miramonte Complete Streets | Mountain View | $840,000 | $0 | $840,000 |
| Mountain View SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | Mountain View | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Palo Alto - Arastradero Road Schoolscape/Multi-use Trail | Palo Alto | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| San Jose - Walk N' Roll Phase 2 | San Jose | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| City of Santa Clara SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program Phase 2 | Santa Clara | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Santa Clara County SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | Santa Clara County | $838,000 | $0 | $838,000 |
| Solano County SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program | STA | $1,256,000 | $0 | $1,256,000 |
| Sonoma County SRTS Program | Sonoma County TPW | $1,379,000 | $0 | $1,379,000 |
| **7. REGIONAL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (RSRTS)** | **TOTAL:** | **$25,000,000** | **$0** | **$25,000,000** |
| **8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM** | | | | |
| SolTrans - Preventive Maintenance | SolTrans | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| **Transit Capital Rehabilitation** | | | | |
| *Specific Projects TBD by Commission* | | | | |
| ECCTA Replace Eleven 2001 40' Buses | ECCTA | $636,763 | $0 | $636,763 |
| BART Car Exchange Preventative Maintenance | BART | $2,831,849 | $0 | $2,831,849 |
| Clipper Fare Collection Equipment Replacement | MTC | $9,994,633 | $0 | $9,994,633 |
| SFMTA - New 60' Flyer Trolly Bus Replacement | SFMTA | $15,502,261 | $0 | $15,502,261 |
| VTA Preventive Maintenance (for vehicle replacement) | VTA | $3,349,722 | $0 | $3,349,722 |
| Clipper Back Office Fare Collection Equipment Replacement | MTC | $2,684,772 | $0 | $2,684,772 |
| Unanticipated Cost Reserve | TBD | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $37,000,000 | $0 | $37,000,000 |
| **Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Incentive Program** | | | | |
| *Specific Projects TBD by Commission* | | | | |
| TPI - AC Transit Spectrum Ridership Growth | AC Transit | $1,802,676 | $0 | $1,802,676 |
| TPI - ACE Positive Train Control | SJRRC/ACE | $129,156 | $0 | $129,156 |
| TPI - Marin Transit Preventive Maintenance (for low income youth pass) | Marin Transit | $99,289 | $0 | $99,289 |
| TPI - BART Train Car Accident Repair | BART | $1,493,189 | $0 | $1,493,189 |
| TPI - BART 24th Street Train Control Upgrade | BART | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| TPI - SFMTA Preventive Maintenance (for low income youth pass) | SFMTA | $1,600,000 | $0 | $1,600,000 |
| TPI - SFMTA Light Rail Vehicle Rehabilitation | SFMTA | $5,120,704 | $0 | $5,120,704 |
| TPI - VTA Preventive Maintenance (for low income fare pilot) | VTA | $1,302,018 | $0 | $1,302,018 |
| TPI - AC Transit - East Bay Bus Rapid Transit | AC Transit | $3,340,781 | $0 | $3,340,781 |
| TPI - BART - Metro Priority Track Elements | BART | $3,459,057 | $0 | $3,459,057 |
| TPI - Caltrain - Off-peak Marketing Campaign | Caltrain | $44,200 | $0 | $44,200 |
| TPI - Caltrain - Control Point Installation | Caltrain | $2,840,952 | $0 | $2,840,952 |
| TPI - CCCTA - 511 Real-Time Interface | CCCTA | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| TPI - CCCTA - Implementation of Access Improvement | CCCTA | $465,899 | $0 | $465,899 |
| TPI - Petaluma - Transit Signal Priority, Phase I & II | Petaluma | $287,902 | $0 | $287,902 |
| TPI - Santa Rosa - CityBus COA and Service Plan | Santa Rosa | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| TPI - Vacaville - City Coach Public Transit Marketing / Public Outreach | Vacaville | $171,388 | $0 | $171,388 |
| TPI - MCTD Preventative Maintenance (Youth Pass Program) | Marin Transit | $116,728 | $0 | $116,728 |

# Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
11/28/12-C 12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 02/27/13-C
05/22/13-C 09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 12/18/13-C
02/26/14-C 03/26/14-C 04/23/14-C 05/28/14-C
06/25/14-C 07/23/14-C 09/24/14-C 11/19/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 05/27/15-C 06/24/15-C
07/22/15-C 10/28/15-C 11/18/15-C 12/16/15-C

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## December 2015

## OBAG 1 Regional Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other RTIP/TAP/TFCA | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **OBAG 1 REGIONAL PROGRAMS** | | **$457,329,000** | **$40,000,000** | **$497,329,000** |
| TPI - Relocate Transit Maintenance Facility (PE only) (Youth Pass Program) | Marin Transit | $122,249 | $0 | $122,249 |
| TPI - NCTPA - Bus Mobility Device Retrofits | NCTPA | $120,988 | $0 | $120,988 |
| TPI - SamTrans - Preventative Maintenance (Service Plan Implementation) | SMCTD | $992,535 | $0 | $992,535 |
| TPI - SFMTA - Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Propulsion System | SFMTA | $9,285,937 | $0 | $9,285,937 |
| TPI - Sonoma County Transit - 30-foot CNG Bus Replacements | Sonoma County | $173,052 | $0 | $173,052 |
| TPI - Caltrain - Map-Based Real-Time Train Display | Caltrain | $44,000 | $0 | $44,000 |
| TPI - GGBHTD - Regional Customer Study: On-Board Bus and Ferry Surveys | GGBHTD | $402,572 | $0 | $402,572 |
| TPI - GGBHTD - Building Ridership to Meet Capacity Campaign | GGBHTD | $177,060 | $0 | $177,060 |
| TPI - CCCTA - TRANSITMIX Software Implementation Project | CCCTA | $17,851 | $0 | $17,851 |
| TPI - NCTPA - Am. Canyon Priority Signal Interconnection on SR 29 | NCTPA | $91,757 | $0 | $91,757 |
| TPI - Santa Rosa CityBus - Clean Diesel Bus Purchase | Santa Rosa | $525,787 | $0 | $525,787 |
| TPI - Sonoma County Transit - 40-foot CNG Bus Replacements | Sonoma County | $114,656 | $0 | $114,656 |
| Specific Transit Performance Initiative Incentive Program projects - TBD | TBD | $23,457,617 | $0 | $23,457,617 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $60,000,000 | $0 | $60,000,000 |
| **8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM** | **TOTAL:** | **$98,000,000** | **$0** | **$98,000,000** |
| **9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)** | | | | |
| **TPI - Capital Investment Program** | | | | |
| TPI-1 - AC Transit Line 51 Corridor Speed Protection and Restoration | AC Transit | $10,515,624 | $0 | $10,515,624 |
| TPI-1 - SFMTA Mission Mobility Maximization | SFMTA | $5,383,109 | $0 | $5,383,109 |
| TPI-1 - SFMTA N-Judah Mobility Maximization | SFMTA | $2,383,860 | $0 | $2,383,860 |
| TPI-1 - SFMTA Potrero Ave Fast Track Transit and Streetscape Imps | SFMTA | $4,133,031 | $0 | $4,133,031 |
| TPI-1 - VTA Light Rail Transit Signal Priority | VTA | $1,587,176 | $0 | $1,587,176 |
| TPI-1 - VTA Stevens Creek - Limited 323 Transit Signal Priority | VTA | $712,888 | $0 | $712,888 |
| TPI-1 - MTC Clipper Phase III Implementation | MTC | $8,000,000 | $0 | $8,000,000 |
| TPI-2 - AC Transit South Alameda County Corridors Travel Time Imps | AC Transit | $5,000,000 | $0 | $5,000,000 |
| TPI-2 - LAVTA Dublin Blvd Transit Performance Initiative | LAVTA | $1,009,440 | $0 | $1,009,440 |
| TPI-2 - SFMTA Colored Lanes on MTA Rapid Network | SFMTA | $4,784,880 | $0 | $4,784,880 |
| TPI-2 - SFMTA Muni Forward Capital Transit Enhancements | SFMTA | $3,205,680 | $0 | $3,205,680 |
| TPI-2 - VTA Prev. Maint. (Mountain View Double Track Phase 1) | VTA | $8,000,000 | $0 | $8,000,000 |
| Unprogrammed Transit Performance Initiative Reserve | TBD | $27,284,312 | $0 | $27,284,312 |
| **9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)** | **TOTAL:** | **$82,000,000** | **$0** | **$82,000,000** |
| **10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)** | | | | |
| **North Bay PCA Program** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by North Bay CMAs* | | | | |
| Marin PCA - Bayfront Park Recreational Bay Access | Mill Valley | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Marin PCA - Mill Valley - Sausalito Pathway Preservation | Marin County | $320,000 | $0 | $320,000 |
| Marin PCA - Sunny Hill Ridge and Red Hill Trails | San Anselmo | $80,000 | $0 | $80,000 |
| Marin PCA - Thatcher Ranch Easement Acq. (pending exchange) | Novato | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Marin PCA - Pacheco Hill Parkland Acq. (pending exchange) | Novato | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Napa PCA - Silverado Trail Yountville-Napa Safety Imps | Napa County | $143,000 | $0 | $143,000 |
| Napa PCA: Napa Soscol Headwaters Preserve Acq. (SilveradoTrail Phase G Overlay) | Napa County | $1,107,000 | $0 | $1,107,000 |
| Solano PCA - Suisun Valley Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps | Solano County | $1,175,000 | $0 | $1,175,000 |
| Solano PCA - Solano PCA Assessment Plan | STA | $75,000 | $0 | $75,000 |
| Sonoma PCA - Bodega Hwy Roadway Preservation | Sonoma County | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| Sonoma PCA - Sonoma County Urban Footprint Planning | Sonoma County | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $5,000,000 | $0 | $5,000,000 |
| **Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties PCA Program** | | | | |
| Bay Trail Shoreline Access Staging Area | Berkeley | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Breuner Marsh Restoration and Public Access | EBRPD | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| SF Bay Trail, Pinole Shores to Bay Front Park | EBRPD | $119,711 | $0 | $119,711 |
| Coyote Creek Trail: Brokaw Road to Union Pacific Railroad | San Jose | $712,700 | $0 | $712,700 |
| Pier 70 - Crane Cove Park | Port of SF | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| Twin Peaks Connectivity Conceptual Plan | SF Rec. and Parks | $167,589 | $0 | $167,589 |
| Southern Skyline Blvd. Ridge Trail Extension | SF PUC | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| SUBTOTAL | | $4,500,000 | $0 | $4,500,000 |
| **10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)** | **TOTAL:** | **$9,500,000** | **$0** | **$9,500,000** |
| **OBAG 1 REGIONAL PROGRAMS TOTAL** | **TOTAL:** | **$457,329,000** | **$40,000,000** | **$497,329,000** |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4035_ongoing\[tmp-4035_Attach_B-1_12-16-15.xlsx]Attach B-1 12-16-15 Revised

# Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 05/22/13-C
09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 01/22/14-C
02/26/14-C 05/28/14-C 09/24/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 07/22/15-C
09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C

## OBAG 1 County Program
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## September 2015

## OBAG 1 County Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other (RTIP, etc.) | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COUNTY OBAG 1 PROGRAMMING** | | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |
| **ALAMEDA COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Alameda CMA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Alameda | ACTC | $3,836,000 | $0 | $3,836,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Alameda | ACTC | $3,270,000 | $0 | $3,270,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Alameda | ACTC | $1,034,000 | $0 | $1,034,000 |
| Alameda County Safe Routes to School Program | ACTC | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| Alameda City Complete Streets | Alameda (City) | $635,000 | $0 | $635,000 |
| Alameda County Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Alameda County | $1,665,000 | $0 | $1,665,000 |
| Berkeley Downtown BART Plaza Streetscape | BART | $340,000 | $3,726,000 | $4,066,000 |
| Shattuck Ave Complete Streets and De-Couplet | Berkeley | $2,777,000 | $0 | $2,777,000 |
| Berkeley - Hearst Avenue Complete Streets | Berkeley | $2,156,000 | $0 | $2,156,000 |
| Dublin Boulevard Preservation | Dublin | $470,000 | $0 | $470,000 |
| Emeryville - Hollis Street Preservation | Emeryville | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Fremont Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Fremont | $2,105,000 | $0 | $2,105,000 |
| Fremont City Center Multi-Modal Imps | Fremont | $5,855,000 | $0 | $5,855,000 |
| Hayward - Industrial Boulevard Preservation | Hayward | $1,335,000 | $0 | $1,335,000 |
| Livermore Various Streets Preservation | Livermore | $1,053,000 | $0 | $1,053,000 |
| Enterprise Drive Complete Streets and Road Diet | Newark | $454,000 | $0 | $454,000 |
| Oakland Complete Streets | Oakland | $3,851,000 | $0 | $3,851,000 |
| 7th Street West Oakland Transit Village Phase 2 | Oakland | $3,288,000 | $0 | $3,288,000 |
| Lakeside Complete Streets and Road Diet | Oakland | $7,000,000 | $0 | $7,000,000 |
| Oakland - Peralta and MLK Jr. Way Streetscape- Phase I | Oakland | $5,452,000 | $0 | $5,452,000 |
| Lake Merritt BART Bikeways | Oakland | $571,000 | $0 | $571,000 |
| Piedmont Complete Streets | Piedmont | $129,000 | $0 | $129,000 |
| Pleasanton Complete Streets | Pleasanton | $832,000 | $0 | $832,000 |
| San Leandro Boulevard Preservation | San Leandro | $804,000 | $0 | $804,000 |
| Whipple Road Complete Streets | Union City | $669,000 | $0 | $669,000 |
| Union City BART TLC Phase 2 | Union City | $8,692,000 | $0 | $8,692,000 |
| **ALAMEDA COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$60,373,000** | **$3,726,000** | **$64,099,000** |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CONTRA COSTA COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Contra Costa CMA* | TBD | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Contra Costa | CCTA | $3,036,000 | $0 | $3,036,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Contra Costa | CCTA | $1,214,000 | $0 | $1,214,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Contra Costa | CCTA | $818,000 | $0 | $818,000 |
| Antioch 9th Street Preservation | Antioch | $673,000 | $0 | $673,000 |
| Richmond BART Station Intermodal Imps. | BART | $2,900,000 | $0 | $2,900,000 |
| Balfour Road Preservation | Brentwood | $290,000 | $0 | $290,000 |
| Clayton Various Streets Preservation | Clayton | $386,000 | $0 | $386,000 |
| Concord BART Station Bicycle and Ped. Access Imps. | Concord | $0 | $1,195,000 | $1,195,000 |
| Detroit Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps. | Concord | $965,000 | $1,189,000 | $2,154,000 |
| Concord Various Streets Preservation | Concord | $757,000 | $0 | $757,000 |
| Contra Costa County Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Contra Costa County | $1,941,000 | $0 | $1,941,000 |
| Danville Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Danville | $933,000 | $0 | $933,000 |
| El Cerrito Various Streets and Roads Preservation | El Cerrito | $630,000 | $0 | $630,000 |
| El Cerritto Ohlone Greenway Bike and Ped. Imps. | El Cerrito | $3,468,000 | $0 | $3,468,000 |
| Hercules Intermodal Transit Center | Hercules | $2,584,000 | $0 | $2,584,000 |
| Hercules - Refugio Valley Road Preservation | Hercules | $702,000 | $0 | $702,000 |
| Lafayette - Mt. Diablo Blvd West Preservation | Lafayette | $584,000 | $0 | $584,000 |
| Martinez Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Martinez | $1,023,000 | $0 | $1,023,000 |
| Moraga Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Moraga | $709,000 | $0 | $709,000 |
| Oakley Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Oakley | $1,031,000 | $0 | $1,031,000 |
| Ivy Street Preservation | Orinda | $552,000 | $0 | $552,000 |
| Pinole - San Pablo Avenue Preservation | Pinole | $453,000 | $0 | $453,000 |
| Pittsburg - Railroad Avenue Preservation | Pittsburg | $299,000 | $0 | $299,000 |
| Pittsburg Multimodal Station Bike/Ped Access Imps. | Pittsburg | $1,300,000 | $0 | $1,300,000 |
| Golf Club Road Roundabout and Bike/Ped Imps. | Pleasant Hill | $4,770,000 | $0 | $4,770,000 |
| Pleasant Hill - Contra Costa Boulevard Preservation | Pleasant Hill | $799,000 | $0 | $799,000 |
| Dornan Drive/Garrard Blvd Tunnel Rehabilitation | Richmond | $413,000 | $0 | $413,000 |
| Richmond Local Streets and Roads Preservation | Richmond | $3,030,000 | $0 | $3,030,000 |
| San Pablo Various Streets and Roads Preservation | San Pablo | $454,000 | $0 | $454,000 |
| San Pablo Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps. | San Pablo | $5,978,000 | $0 | $5,978,000 |
| San Ramon Valley Blvd Preservation | San Ramon | $291,000 | $0 | $291,000 |
| Walnut Creek North Main Street Preservation | Walnut Creek | $655,000 | $0 | $655,000 |

# Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 05/22/13-C
09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 01/22/14-C
02/26/14-C 05/28/14-C 09/24/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 07/22/15-C
09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C

## OBAG 1 County Program
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## September 2015

## OBAG 1 County Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other (RTIP, etc.) | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COUNTY OBAG 1 PROGRAMMING** | | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |
| **CONTRA COSTA COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$43,638,000** | **$2,384,000** | **$46,022,000** |
| **MARIN COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Marin CMA* | TBD | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Marin | TAM | $2,673,000 | $0 | $2,673,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Marin | TAM | $418,000 | $0 | $418,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Marin | TAM | $720,000 | $0 | $720,000 |
| Central Marin Ferry Bike/Ped Connection | TAM | $1,500,000 | $0 | $1,500,000 |
| Bolinas Avenue and Sir Francis Drake Intersection Imps. | Ross | $274,000 | $0 | $274,000 |
| San Rafael Various Streets and Roads Preservation | San Rafael | $457,000 | $0 | $457,000 |
| San Rafael Transit Center Pedestrian Access Imps. | San Rafael | $1,900,000 | $0 | $1,900,000 |
| Fairfax Parkade Circulation and Safety Imps. | Fairfax | $0 | $300,000 | $300,000 |
| North Civic Center Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps | Marin County | $243,000 | $407,000 | $650,000 |
| Donahue Street Preservation | Marin County | $1,077,000 | $0 | $1,077,000 |
| DeLong Ave. and Ignacio Blvd Preservation | Novato | $779,000 | $0 | $779,000 |
| **MARIN COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$10,041,000** | **$707,000** | **$10,748,000** |
| **NAPA COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Napa - NCTPA* | TBD | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Napa | NCTPA | $2,673,000 | $0 | $2,673,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Napa | NCTPA | $720,000 | $0 | $720,000 |
| Napa City North/South Bike Connection | Napa (City) | $300,000 | $0 | $300,000 |
| California Boulevard Roundabouts | Napa (City) | $2,463,000 | $431,000 | $2,894,000 |
| Silverado Trail Phase "H" Preservation | Napa County | $794,000 | $0 | $794,000 |
| **NAPA COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$6,950,000** | **$431,000** | **$7,381,000** |
| **SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY** | | $3,393,000 | | $0.46 |
| *Specific projects TBD by San Francisco CMA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - San Francisco | SFCTA | $2,795,000 | $0 | $2,795,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - San Francisco | SFCTA | $773,000 | $0 | $773,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement- San Francisco | SFCTA | $753,000 | $0 | $753,000 |
| Longfellow Safe Routes to School | SF DPW | $670,307 | $0 | $670,307 |
| ER Taylor Safe Routes to School | SF DPW | $519,631 | $0 | $519,631 |
| Chinatown Broadway Complete Streets Phase IV | SF DPW | $3,410,536 | $1,910,000 | $5,320,536 |
| Mansell Corridor Complete Streets | SFCTA | $1,762,239 | $0 | $1,762,239 |
| Additional Light Rail Vehicles to Expand Muni Rail | SFMTA | $10,227,539 | $0 | $10,227,539 |
| Second Street Complete Streets | SFMTA | $10,515,748 | $0 | $10,515,748 |
| Transbay Center Bicyle and Pedestrian Imps. | TJPA | $6,000,000 | $0 | $6,000,000 |
| **SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$37,427,000** | **$1,910,000** | **$39,337,000** |
| **SAN MATEO COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by San Mateo CMA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - San Mateo | SMCCAG | $2,673,000 | $0 | $2,673,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - San Mateo | SMCCAG | $752,000 | $0 | $752,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - San Mateo | SMCCAG | $720,000 | $0 | $720,000 |
| PDA Planning Augmentation - San Mateo | SMCCAG | $84,000 | $0 | $84,000 |
| Atherton Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Atherton | $285,000 | $0 | $285,000 |
| Belmont Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Belmont | $534,000 | $0 | $534,000 |
| Ralston Road Pedestrian Improvements | Belmont | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Old County Road Bike and Pedestrian Imps | Belmont | $270,000 | $0 | $270,000 |
| Carolan Avenue Complete Streets and Road Diet | Burlingame | $986,000 | $0 | $986,000 |
| US 101 / Broadway Interchange Bike/Ped Imps | Caltrans | $3,613,000 | $0 | $3,613,000 |
| Daly City Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Daly City | $562,000 | $0 | $562,000 |
| John Daly Boulevard Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps. | Daly City | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| Bay Road Bike and Ped Imps. Phase II and III | East Palo Alto | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| Menlo Park Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Menlo Park | $427,000 | $0 | $427,000 |
| Menlo Park Various Streets Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps | Menlo Park | $797,000 | $0 | $797,000 |
| Millbrae Various Streets and Roads Prerservation | Millbrae | $445,000 | $0 | $445,000 |

# Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 05/22/13-C
09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 01/22/14-C
02/26/14-C 05/28/14-C 09/24/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 07/22/15-C
09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C

## OBAG 1 County Program
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## September 2015

## OBAG 1 County Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other (RTIP, etc.) | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COUNTY OBAG 1 PROGRAMMING** | | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |
| San Pedro Creek Bridge Replacement Bike/Ped Imps | Pacifica | $1,141,000 | $0 | $1,141,000 |
| Pacifica Linda Mar Blvd Preservation | Pacifica | $431,000 | $0 | $431,000 |
| Palmetto Avenue Streetscape | Pacifica | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| Portola Valley Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Portola Valley | $224,000 | $0 | $224,000 |
| Redwood City Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Redwood City | $548,000 | $0 | $548,000 |
| Middlefield Road Bicyle and Pedestrian Imps | Redwood City | $1,752,000 | $0 | $1,752,000 |
| San Bruno Avenue Pedestrian Improvements | San Bruno | $265,000 | $0 | $265,000 |
| San Bruno Avenue Street Median Imps | San Bruno | $735,000 | $0 | $735,000 |
| Crestview Drive Pavement Rehabilitation | San Carlos | $412,000 | $0 | $412,000 |
| San Carlos Streetscape and Pedestrian Imps | San Carlos | $850,000 | $0 | $850,000 |
| El Camino Real Ped Upgrades (Grand Boulevard Inititive) | San Carlos | $182,000 | $0 | $182,000 |
| Mount Diablo Ave. Rehabilitation | San Mateo (City) | $270,000 | $0 | $270,000 |
| North Central Pedestrian Imps | San Mateo (City) | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| San Mateo Citywide Crosswalk Improvements | San Mateo (City) | $368,000 | $0 | $368,000 |
| Semicircular Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Imps | San Mateo County | $320,000 | $0 | $320,000 |
| South San Francisco Citywide Sidewalk Gap Closures | South San Francisco | $357,000 | $0 | $357,000 |
| South San Francisco Grand Blvd Pedestrain Imps | South San Francisco | $1,000,000 | $0 | $1,000,000 |
| South San Francisco Grand Blvd Complete Streets | South San Francisco | $0 | $1,991,000 | $1,991,000 |
| **SAN MATEO COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$25,253,000** | **$1,991,000** | **$27,244,000** |
| **SANTA CLARA COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Santa Clara CMA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Santa Clara | VTA | $4,246,000 | $0 | $4,246,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Santa Clara | VTA | $1,754,000 | $0 | $1,754,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Santa Clara | VTA | $1,145,000 | $0 | $1,145,000 |
| Hamilton Avenue Preservation | Campbell | $279,000 | $0 | $279,000 |
| Campbell Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrain Imps. | Campbell | $3,718,000 | $0 | $3,718,000 |
| Stevens Creek Boulevard Preservation | Cupertino | $735,000 | $0 | $735,000 |
| Ronan Channel / Lions Creek Multi-Use Trail | Gilroy | $1,034,000 | $0 | $1,034,000 |
| Eigleberry Street Preservation | Gilroy | $808,000 | $0 | $808,000 |
| Los Altos Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Los Altos | $312,000 | $0 | $312,000 |
| El Monte Road Preservation | Los Altos Hills | $186,000 | $0 | $186,000 |
| Hillside Road Preservation | Los Gatos | $139,000 | $0 | $139,000 |
| Milpitas Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Milpitas | $1,652,000 | $0 | $1,652,000 |
| Monte Sereno Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Monte Sereno | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Monterey Road Preservation | Morgan Hill | $1,379,000 | $0 | $1,379,000 |
| Mountain View Various Streets Preservation and Bike Lanes | Mountain View | $1,166,000 | $0 | $1,166,000 |
| Palo Alto Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Palo Alto | $956,000 | $0 | $956,000 |
| US 101/Adobe Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge | Palo Alto | $0 | $4,350,000 | $4,350,000 |
| San Jose Citywide Bikeway Program | San Jose | $1,150,000 | $0 | $1,150,000 |
| San Jose Citywide Pavement Management Program | San Jose | $11,531,000 | $0 | $11,531,000 |
| San Jose Citywide SRTS Infrastructure Program | San Jose | $1,150,000 | $0 | $1,150,000 |
| San Jose Citywide Smart Intersections Program | San Jose | $1,150,000 | $0 | $1,150,000 |
| Downtown San Jose Bike Lanes and De-Couplet | San Jose | $1,500,000 | $0 | $1,500,000 |
| East San Jose Bicycle/Pedestrian Transit Connection | San Jose | $2,000,000 | $0 | $2,000,000 |
| Jackson Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Imps. | San Jose | $1,500,000 | $0 | $1,500,000 |
| San Jose Pedestrian-Oriented Traffic Safety Signals | San Jose | $3,000,000 | $0 | $3,000,000 |
| St. Johns Bikeway and Pedestiran Improvements | San Jose | $1,185,000 | $0 | $1,185,000 |
| The Alameda "Beautiful Way" Grand Boulevard Phase 2 | San Jose | $3,150,000 | $0 | $3,150,000 |
| Santa Clara Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Santa Clara (City) | $1,891,000 | $0 | $1,891,000 |
| San Tomas Expressway Box Culvert Rehabilitation | Santa Clara County | $8,350,000 | $0 | $8,350,000 |
| Capitol Expressway Traffic ITS and Bike/Ped Imps. | Santa Clara County | $7,735,000 | $0 | $7,735,000 |
| San Tomas Aquino Spur Multi-Use Trail Phase 2 | Santa Clara County | $3,234,000 | $0 | $3,234,000 |
| Saratoga Village Sidewalk Preservation | Saratoga | $162,000 | $0 | $162,000 |
| Saratoga Ave-Prospect Rd Complete Streets | Saratoga | $4,205,000 | $0 | $4,205,000 |
| Duane Avenue Preservation | Sunnyvale | $1,576,000 | $0 | $1,576,000 |
| East & West Channel Multi-Use Trails | Sunnyvale | $3,440,000 | $0 | $3,440,000 |
| Fair Oaks Avenue Bikeway and Streetscape | Sunnyvale | $956,000 | $0 | $956,000 |
| Maude Avenue Bikeway and Streetscape | Sunnyvale | $695,000 | $0 | $695,000 |
| Sunnyvale Safe Routes to School Ped Infrastructure Imps | Sunnyvale | $1,569,000 | $0 | $1,569,000 |

# Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 05/22/13-C
09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 01/22/14-C
02/26/14-C 05/28/14-C 09/24/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 07/22/15-C
09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C

## OBAG 1 County Program
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## September 2015

## OBAG 1 County Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other (RTIP, etc.) | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COUNTY OBAG 1 PROGRAMMING** | | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |
| Sunnyvale-Saratoga Road Bike/Ped Safety Enhancements | Sunnyvale | $524,000 | $0 | $524,000 |
| Milpitas BART Station Montague Expwy Ped Overcrossing | VTA | $744,000 | $0 | $744,000 |
| VTA/San Jose: Upper Penitencia Creek Multi-Use Trail | VTA | $1,514,000 | $0 | $1,514,000 |
| Santa Clara Caltrain Station Bike/Ped Undercrossing | VTA | $1,251,000 | $0 | $1,251,000 |
| **SANTA CLARA COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$84,921,000** | **$4,350,000** | **$89,271,000** |
| **SOLANO COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Solano CMA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Solano | STA | $2,673,000 | $0 | $2,673,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Solano | STA | $333,000 | $0 | $333,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Solano | STA | $720,000 | $0 | $720,000 |
| Local PDA Planning Augmentation | STA | $511,000 | $0 | $511,000 |
| East 2nd Street Preservation | Benicia | $495,000 | $0 | $495,000 |
| Benicia Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure Imps | Benicia | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| West A Street Preservation | Dixon | $584,000 | $0 | $584,000 |
| Dixon SRTS Infrastructure Imps | Dixon | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Beck Avenue Preservation | Fairfield | $1,424,000 | $0 | $1,424,000 |
| SR 12 Pedestrian Crossing Improvements | Rio Vista | $100,000 | $0 | $100,000 |
| Solano County - Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Solano County | $1,389,000 | $0 | $1,389,000 |
| Vaca-Dixon Bike Route Phase 5 | Solano County | $1,800,000 | $0 | $1,800,000 |
| West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian RxR Undercrossing | STA | $1,394,000 | $1,141,000 | $2,535,000 |
| Eastern Solano / SNCI Rideshare Program | STA | $533,000 | $0 | $533,000 |
| Solano Transit Ambassador Program | STA | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Driftwood Drive Path | Suisun City | $349,065 | $0 | $349,065 |
| Walters Road/Pintail Drive Preservation | Suisun City | $356,000 | $0 | $356,000 |
| Suisun/Fairfield Intercity Rail Station Access Imps | Suisun City | $415,000 | $0 | $415,000 |
| Vacaville SRTS Infrastructure Imps | Vacaville | $303,207 | $0 | $303,207 |
| Vacaville - Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Vacaville | $1,231,000 | $0 | $1,231,000 |
| Allison Bicycle/Pedestrian Imps. | Vacaville | $450,000 | $0 | $450,000 |
| Ulatis Creek Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway and Streetscape | Vacaville | **$150,000** | $0 | **$150,000** |
| Vallejo SRTS Infrastructure Imps | Vallejo | $247,728 | $0 | $247,728 |
| Vallejo Downtown Streetscape - **Phases 3 and 4** | Vallejo | **$2,440,000** | $0 | **$2,440,000** |
| **SOLANO COUNTY** | **TOTAL:** | **$18,348,000** | **$1,141,000** | **$19,489,000** |
| **SONOMA COUNTY** | | | | |
| *Specific projects TBD by Sonoma - SCTA* | | $0 | $0 | $0 |
| CMA Base Planning Activities - Sonoma | SCTA | $2,673,000 | $0 | $2,673,000 |
| CMA Planning Activities FY 2016-17 Supplement - Sonoma | SCTA | $720,000 | $0 | $720,000 |
| Cloverdale Safe Routes to Schools Phase 2 | Cloverdale | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Cotati Old Redwood Highway South Preservation (CS) | Cotati | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Healdsburg Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Healdsburg | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Petaluma Complete Streets | Petaluma | $1,848,000 | $0 | $1,848,000 |
| Rohnert Park Various Streets Preservation | Rohnert Park | $1,103,000 | $0 | $1,103,000 |
| Rohnert Park Bicyle and Pedestrian Improvements | Rohnert Park | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| Downtown Santa Rosa Streetscape | Santa Rosa | $360,000 | $353,000 | $713,000 |
| Santa Rosa Complete Streets Road Diet on Transit Corridors | Santa Rosa | $2,460,000 | $0 | $2,460,000 |
| Sebastopol Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Sebastopol | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| SMART Larkspur Extension (Regional Project) | SMART | $6,100,000 | $0 | $6,100,000 |
| SMART Clipper Card Service | MTC | $500,000 | $0 | $500,000 |
| SMART Bicycle/Pedestrian Pathway | SMART | $0 | $1,043,000 | $1,043,000 |
| Sonoma Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Sonoma (City) | $250,000 | $0 | $250,000 |
| Sonoma County Various Streets and Roads Preservation | Sonoma County | $3,377,000 | $0 | $3,377,000 |
| Windsor Road/Jaquar Lane Bicycle/Pedestrian Imps. | Windsor | $630,000 | $0 | $630,000 |
| Conde Lane/Johnson Street Pedestrian Imps. | Windsor | $432,000 | $0 | $432,000 |
| Windsor Rd/Bell Rd/Market St Pedestrian Imps. | Windsor | $410,000 | $0 | $410,000 |
| | **TOTAL:** | **$22,363,000** | **$1,396,000** | **$23,759,000** |

# Attachment B-2

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Attachment B-2
Adopted: 05/17/12-C
Revised: 10/24/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C 05/22/13-C
09/25/13-C 11/20/13-C 01/22/14-C
02/26/14-C 05/28/14-C 09/24/14-C
12/17/14-C 03/25/15-C 07/22/15-C
09/23/15-C 10/28/15-C

## OBAG 1 County Program
## FY 2012-13 through FY 2016-17
## September 2015

## OBAG 1 County Programs Project List

| Project Category and Title | Implementing Agency | Total STP/CMAQ | Total Other (RTIP, etc.) | Total Cycle 2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **COUNTY OBAG 1 PROGRAMMING** | | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |
| **Cycle 2 Total** | **TOTAL:** | **$309,314,000** | **$18,036,000** | **$327,350,000** |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-4035_OBAG\[RES-4035_Attach_B-2.xlsx]Attach B-2 10-28-15