Date: November 18, 2015
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: Programming & Allocations
Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4202

Adoption of the project selection policies and project programming for the second round of the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG 2). The project selection criteria and programming policy 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) for the OBAG 2 funding period.

The resolution includes the following attachments:

Attachment A – Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy
Attachment B-1 – Regional Program Project List
Attachment B-2 – County Program Project List

On July 27, 2016, Attachment A, and Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to add additional funding and projects to the OBAG 2 framework, including $72 million in additional Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act (FAST) funding, and to incorporate housing-related policies.

On October 26, 2016, Attachment A, and Attachment B-1 were revised to clarify language related to the North Bay Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program in Attachment A and to deprogram $2,500,000 from the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) Ferry Service Enhancement Pilot within the Regional Active Operational Management Program.

Further discussion of the project selection criteria and programming policy is contained in the memorandum to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated November 4, 2015, July 13, 2016, and October 12, 2016.

Date: November 18, 2015
W.I.: 1512
Referred By: Programming & Allocations

RE: One Bay Area Grant Program Second Round (OBAG 2) Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4202

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 state and federal funding assigned to the RTPA/MPO of the San Francisco Bay Area for the programming of projects; and

WHEREAS, state and federal funds assigned for RTPA/MPO programming 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), county Transportation Authorities (TAs), 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, will develop a program of projects to be funded with these funds for inclusion in the federal 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 Criteria and Programming Policy" for projects to be funded in the OBAG 2 Program as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that the regional discretionary funding shall be pooled and distributed 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 requirements; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee may make technical adjustments and other non-substantial revisions, including updates to fund sources and distributions to reflect final funding criteria and availability; 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, revised and included in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee shall make available a copy of this resolution, and attachements as may be required and appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Dave Cortese, Chair

The above resolution was entered into
by the Metropolitan Transportation
Commission at the regular meeting
of the Commission held in Oakland,
California, on November 18, 2015

Date: November 18, 2015
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: P&A
Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4202

OBAG 2
One Bay Area Grant Program
Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

This page intentionally left blank

OBAG 2 – One Bay Area Grant Program
Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background 1
Revenue Estimates and Program Architecture 1
Program Categories and Project List 6
General Programming Policies 6
Regional Programs 11
County Programming Policies 15
County Programs 21

Appendices

Appendix A-1 Regional and County Program Categories
Appendix A-2 County Program Fund Distribution
Appendix A-3 Regional and County Planning Activities
Appendix A-4 County Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS)
Appendix A-5 County Safe Routes to School (SRTS)
Appendix A-6 Priority Conservation Area (PCA)
Appendix A-7 CMA Call for Projects Guidance
Appendix A-8 County PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
Appendix A-9 Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Implementation
Appendix A-10 Checklist for CMA and Local Jurisdiction Compliance with MTC Resolution 4202

The One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2) is the second round of the federal funding program designed to support the implementation of *Plan Bay Area,* the region's first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). OBAG 2 covers the five-year period from FY 2017-18 to FY 2021-22. The proposed revenue estimates, funding approach, programming policies, project guidance, and timeline for OBAG 2 are outlined in this attachment.

BACKGROUND

The inaugural One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 1) was approved by the Commission in May 2012 (MTC Resolution 4035). The OBAG 1 program incorporated the following program features:

- Targeting project investments to the region's Priority Development Areas (PDAs);
- Rewarding jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing;
- Supporting open space preservation in Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs); and
- Providing a larger and more flexible funding pot to deliver transportation projects in categories such as Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning activities, while also providing dedicated funding opportunities for Safe Routes to School activities and PCAs.

The early outcomes of the OBAG 1 program are documented in the One Bay Area Grant Report Card located at: (http://files.mtc.ca.gov/pdf/OBAG_Report_Card.pdf). The key findings of the report highlight a variety of improvements as compared to previous federal highway funding programs, including: increased grant and project size, complexity, and multi-modality; significant investments in active transportation and TLC projects; region wide achievement of PDA investment targets; and compliance with local performance and accountability requirements. Considering the positive results achieved in OBAG 1, and in order to further extend the timeframe for OBAG to meet its policy goals, OBAG 2 maintains largely the same framework and policies.

REVENUE ESTIMATES AND PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE

OBAG 2 funding is based on anticipated future federal transportation program apportionments from the regional Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Programs. Originally, the programming capacity estimated for OBAG 2 amounted to $790 million (down from $827 million programmed with OBAG 1). The estimated decrease in revenues between program cycles reflects annual apportionment amounts in the federal surface transportation act (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21) authorized after approval of OBAG 1 not keeping pace with estimated growth rates, as well as changes in state and federal programs that impacted estimated regional funding levels (such as the elimination of the Transportation Enhancements (TE) program). Subsequent to the Commission's original adoption of OBAG 2, Congress approved the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, providing an additional

estimated $72 million during the OBAG 2 period. The revised total STP/CMAQ funding for OBAG 2 is $862 million.

The OBAG 2 program continues to integrate the region's federal transportation program with California's climate statutes and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and contributes to the implementation of the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan. Funding distribution formulas to the counties will continue to encourage land-use, housing and complete streets policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments. This is accomplished through the following principles:

1. **Realistic Revenue Assumptions:**

   OBAG 2 funding is based on anticipated future federal transportation program apportionments. In past years, the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement programs (STP/CMAQ) have not grown, and changes in the federal and state programs (such as elimination of the Transportation Enhancement (TE) program) resulted in decreases that were not anticipated when OBAG 1 was developed. For the initial OBAG 2 estimates, a 2% annual escalation rate above current federal revenues was assumed, consistent with the mark-up of the Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy (DRIVE) Act by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Even with the 2% escalation, revenues for OBAG 2 were expected to be 4% less than OBAG 1 revenues. Following the Commission's original adoption of OBAG 2, an additional $72 million in FAST Act revenue was made available, for a total of $862 million for OBAG 2 - an increase of 4% over the OBAG 1 funding level.

   If there are significant changes in federal apportionments over the OBAG 2 time period, MTC will return to the Commission to recommend adjustments to the program. These adjustments could include increasing or decreasing funding amounts for one or more programs, postponement of projects, expansion of existing programs, development of new programs, or adjustments to subsequent programming cycles.

   Upon enactment and extension of the federal surface transportation authorizations expected during the OBAG funding period, MTC will need to closely monitor any new federal programs, their eligibility rules, and how funding is distributed to the states and regions. It is anticipated that any changes to the current federal programs would likely overlap to a large extent with projects that are currently eligible for funding under 23 U.S.C., although the actual fund sources may no longer mirror the current STP and CMAQ programs. Therefore, any reference to a specific fund source in the OBAG 2 programming serves as a proxy for replacement fund sources for which MTC has discretionary project selection and programming authority.

   OBAG 2 programming capacity is based on apportionment rather than obligation authority. Because obligation authority (the amount actually received) is less than the apportionment level, there is typically a carryover balance from year to year of unfunded

commitments. MTC's current negative obligation authority imbalance is $51 million, and has held steady the past few years as a result of the region's excellent delivery record. Successful project delivery has allowed MTC to capture additional, unused obligation authority (OA) from other states, enabling the region to deliver additional projects each year. Because this negative balance has held steady, there does not appear to be a need to true-up the difference at this time. MTC staff will continue to monitor this OA shortfall throughout the OBAG 2 period and make adjustments as necessary in the next round of programming.

2. **Support Existing Programs:**

   Originally, the OBAG program was expected to face declining revenues from $827 million in OBAG 1 to $790 million in OBAG 2. Therefore, no new programs were introduced with OBAG 2 and the anticipated funding reduction was spread among the various transportation needs supported in OBAG 1. With the $72 million in additional revenues from the FAST Act, funding for OBAG 2 increased to $862 million.

   The OBAG 2 program categories and commitments for the regional and county programs are outlined in Appendix A-1.

3. **Support Plan Bay Area's Sustainable Communities Strategy by Linking OBAG Funding to Housing:**

   County Program Distribution Formula

   OBAG 1's county distribution formula leveraged transportation dollars to reward jurisdictions that produce housing and accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process. The formula also considered the share of affordable housing within housing production and RHNA allocations.

   In OBAG 2, the county distribution formula is updated to use the latest housing data from the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG). The formula is also based on housing over a longer time frame, considering housing production between 1999 and 2006 (weighted 30%) and between 2007 and 2014 (weighted 70%) in order to mitigate the effect of the recent recession and major swings in housing permit approvals.

   The OBAG 2 formula places additional emphasis on housing production and the share of affordable housing within both production and RHNA. The formula also expands the definition of affordable housing to include housing for moderate-income households in addition to low- and very low-income households. Furthermore, housing production is capped at the total RHNA allocation.

   The distribution formula factors for OBAG 2 are detailed in the table below.

OBAG 2 County Distribution Formula Factors

	Population	Housing RHNA	Housing Production	Housing Affordability *
OBAG 2	**50%**	**20%**	**30%**	**60%**

*OBAG 2 housing affordability factor includes housing at the very low, low and moderate income levels which are weighted within both housing production and RHNA allocation.

The distribution formula is further adjusted to ensure that CMA base planning funds are no more than 50% of the total distribution for that county. The resulting proposed county program formula distributions are presented in Appendix A-2.

Priority Development Areas (PDAs)

OBAG 2 continues to support the SCS for the Bay Area by promoting transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

- PDA Investment targets remain at OBAG 1 levels: 50% for the four North Bay counties and 70% for the remaining counties.
- PDA Investment and Growth Strategies should play a strong role in guiding the County CMA project selection and be aligned with the Plan Bay Area update cycle.

Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)

OBAG 2 maintains the two separate Priority Conservation Area (PCA) programs as introduced in OBAG 1, with one program dedicating funding to the four North Bay counties and one competitive program for the remaining counties.

4. **Continue Flexibility and Local Transportation Investment Decision Making:**

OBAG 2 continues to provide the same base share of the funding pot (40%) to the county CMAs for local decision-making. The program allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning and outreach activities.

In addition to the base county program, two previously regional programs, Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads), have been consolidated into the county program with guaranteed minimum funding amounts to ensure the programs continue to be funded at specified levels.

5. **Cultivate Linkages with Local Land-Use Planning:**

As a condition to access funds, local jurisdictions need to continue to align their general plans' housing and complete streets policies as a part of OBAG 2 and as separately required by state law.

Complete Streets Requirement

Jurisdictions must adopt a complete streets resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC, incorporating MTC's required complete streets elements as outlined in MTC's Complete Streets Guidance.

Alternatively, to recognize local jurisdictions' efforts to update their general plan circulation element to incorporate the provisions of the 2008 Complete Streets Act in response to the provisions stated in OBAG 1, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010 and before the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC.

The approach above focuses on the adoption of local complete streets resolutions, while acknowledging the jurisdictions that took efforts to update their circulation element in anticipation of future OBAG requirements.

Housing Element Requirement

Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015. Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding.

Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this requirement during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or risk deprogramming of OBAG 2 funding.

The complete streets and housing requirements are not required for jurisdictions with no general plan or land use authority such as Caltrans, CMAs or transit agencies under a JPA or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction). However, in such instances the jurisdiction in which the project is physically located must meet these requirements, except for transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a maintenance facility.

Surplus Land Requirement

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

This requirement shall not apply to charter cities unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the Act. In addition, the resolution is not required for public agencies with no general plan or land use authority.

6. **Continue Transparency and Outreach to the Public Throughout the Process:**

   CMAs will continue to report on their outreach process as part of their solicitation and selection of projects for OBAG. Each CMA will develop a memorandum addressing outreach efforts, agency coordination, distribution methodology and Title VI compliance. CMA reporting requirements are provided in Appendix A-10, the Checklist for CMA and Local Jurisdiction Compliance with MTC Resolution 4202.

PROGRAM CATEGORIES AND PROJECT LIST

Appendix A-1 outlines the OBAG 2 program categories and commitments.

Attachment B of Resolution 4202 contains the list of projects to be programmed under the OBAG 2 program. Attachments B-1 and B-2 list the projects receiving OBAG 2 funding through the regional programs and county programs respectively. The project lists are subject to project selection actions (conducted by MTC for most of the regional programs and by the CMAs for the county programs and other funds distributed to them). MTC staff will update Attachments B-1 and B-2 as projects are selected or revised by the Commission and CMAs and are included in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

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

1. **Public Involvement.** MTC is committed to a public involvement process that is proactive and provides comprehensive information, timely public notice, 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. 4174. The Commission's adoption of the OBAG 2 program, including policy and procedures, meets 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 OBAG 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-7).

2. **Commission Approval of Programs and Projects and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).** Projects approved as part of the OBAG 2 program must be amended into the 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 updated by MTC staff to reflect these revisions. Where responsibility for project selection is assigned to MTC, TIP amendments and a revision to Attachment B to add or delete a project will be reviewed and approved by the Commission. Changes to existing projects in Attachment B may be made by MTC staff following approval of a related TIP revision.

3. **Minimum Grant Size.** Funding grants per project must 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). 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.

   To provide flexibility, an alternative averaging approach may be used. For this approach, 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 County CMA Program meets the county minimum grant amount threshold. This lower threshold of $100,000 also applies to Safe Routes to School projects, which are typically of smaller scale.

   Furthermore, all OBAG 2 programming amounts must be rounded to thousands.

4. **Air Quality Conformity.** In the Bay Area, it is the responsibility of MTC to make a regional 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 update of the TIP. Non-exempt projects that are not incorporated in the current finding for the TIP will not be considered for funding in the OBAG 2 program until the development of a subsequent air quality finding for the TIP. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for fine particulate matter ($PM_{2.5}$). Therefore, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) must complete a hot-spot analysis as required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally, POAQC are those projects that result in significant increases in, or concentrations of, 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 § 21000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section § 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.

6. **Application and Resolution of Local Support.** Once a project has been selected for funding, project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project through MTC's Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) a project submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff through FMS, and 2) a Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor's governing board or council and submitted in FMS. A template for the Resolution of Local Support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link: http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2.

7. **Project Screening and Compliance with Regional and Federal Requirements.** MTC staff will perform a review of projects proposed for OBAG 2 to ensure 1) eligibility; 2) consistency with the region's long-range plan; and 3) project readiness. In addition, project sponsors must adhere to directives such as the Complete Streets Requirements, Housing Element Requirements, and the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606), 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 is the most flexible source of federal funding, with a wide range of projects that may be considered eligible. Eligible projects include roadway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration), public transit capital improvements, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, mitigation related to an STP project, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in 23 U.S.C § 133 and at: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/ factsheets/stp.cfm.

     CMAQ is a more targeted funding source. In general, CMAQ funds may be used for new or expanded transportation projects, programs, and operations that help reduce emissions. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in an approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit expansion projects, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, and experimental

pilot projects. For more detailed information, refer to FHWA's revised guidance provided at: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/.

MTC reserves the right to assign specific fund sources to projects based on availability and eligibility requirements. In the event that a new surface transportation authorization is enacted during implementation of OBAG 2 that materially alters these programs, MTC staff will work with the CMAs and project sponsors to match projects with appropriate federal fund programs.

- RTP Consistency: Projects funded through OBAG 2 must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (currently *Plan Bay Area*). Project sponsors must identify each project's relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, including the specific RTP ID number or reference. RTP consistency will be verified by MTC staff for all OBAG 2 projects. Projects in the County program will also be reviewed by CMA staff prior to submitting selected projects to MTC.

- Complete Streets 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 (MTC Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure the accommodation of non-motorized travelers is considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county CMAs ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are considered by the county for OBAG 2 funding and submitted to MTC. The CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review prior to CMAs' project selection actions.

  Related 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 the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, which requires local agency general plan circulation elements to address all travel modes.

- Project Delivery and Monitoring: OBAG 2 funding is available in the following five federal fiscal years: 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. Funds may be programmed in any of these years, conditioned upon the availability of federal apportionment and obligation authority (OA), and subject to TIP financial constraint requirements. In addition, in order to provide uninterrupted funding to ongoing efforts and to provide more time to prepare for the effective delivery of capital projects, priority of funding for the first year of programming apportionment (FY 2017-18) will be provided to ongoing programs, such as regional and CMA planning, non-infrastructure projects, and the preliminary engineering phase of capital projects.

Specific programming timelines will be determined through the development of the Annual Obligation Plan, which is developed by MTC staff in collaboration with the Bay Area Partnership technical working groups and project sponsors. Once programmed in the TIP, the funds must be obligated by FHWA or transferred to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) within the federal fiscal year the funds are programmed in the TIP. Additionally, all OBAG 2 funds must be obligated no later than January 31, 2023.

Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606 and any subsequent revisions). 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 of funds 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 OBAG 2 funding is required to identify and maintain a staff position that serves as the single point of contact (SPOC) 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 TIP, and to notify MTC immediately when the position contact has changed. 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 programming or including any funding revisions for the agency in the 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 OBAG 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 project-funding timeframe.

- Funding Exchange: Sometimes federal funds may not be the best fit for projects being implemented to meet plan and program goals and objectives. In such cases, federal OBAG funding may be exchanged with non-federal funds. MTC staff will work with the

CMAs when such opportunities arise. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC's fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331) and the locally-funded project must be included in the federal TIP.

- Local Match: Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funding require a non-federal local match. Although local match requirements are subject to change, the current local match requirement for STP and CMAQ funded projects in California is 11.47% of the total project cost, with FHWA providing up to 88.53% of the total project cost through reimbursements. For capital projects, sponsors that fully fund the project development or Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase with non-federal funds may use toll credits in lieu of a match for the construction phase. For these projects, sponsors must still meet all federal requirements for the PE phase.
- Fixed Program and Specific Project Selection: Projects are chosen for the program based on eligibility, project merit, and deliverability within established deadlines. The OBAG 2 program is project-specific and the funds programmed to projects are for those projects alone.

  The OBAG 2 program funding is fixed at the programmed amount; therefore, any project cost increases may not be covered by additional OBAG 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 OBAG 2 Regional Programs, managed by MTC. Funding amounts for each program are included in Appendix A-1. Individual projects will be added to Attachment B-1 and B-2 as they are selected and included in the federal TIP.

1. Regional Planning Activities

This program provides funding to support regional planning and outreach activities.

Appendix A-3 details the funding amounts and distribution for planning and outreach activities.

2. Pavement Management Program

This continues the region's acclaimed Pavement Management Program (PMP) and related activities including the Pavement Technical Assistance Program (PTAP), training, and regional and statewide local streets and roads needs assessment. 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 statewide local streets and roads needs assessment effort.

To support the collection and analysis of local roads asset conditions for regional planning efforts and statewide funding advocacy, and to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding for local streets and roads, a jurisdiction must:

- Have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent) updated at least once every three years (with a one-year extension allowed); and
- Fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey (including any assigned funding contribution); and
- Provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years (with a one-year grace period allowed).

3. Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning & Implementation

Funding in this program implements the following:

Regional PDA Planning and Implementation: The PDA Planning Program places an emphasis on intensifying land uses at and near transit stations and along transit corridors in PDAs. The key goals of the program are to: increase supply of affordable and market rate housing, jobs and services within the PDA planning area; boost transit ridership and thereby reduce vehicle miles traveled by PDA residents, employees and visitors; increase walking and bicycling by improving multi-modal access and effectively managing parking; and locate key services and retail within the PDA planning area. Funding is available for regional planning and implementation efforts and grants to jurisdictions to provide PDA planning support, and typically fund specific plans and programmatic Environmental Impact Reports. PDA plans funded through the program focus on a range of transit-supportive elements including market demand analysis, affordable housing strategies, multi-modal connectivity including pedestrian-friendly design standards, parking demand analysis, infrastructure development, implementation planning and financing strategies and implementation of the best practices identified in the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines.

The PDA Planning Program will give priority to cities with high risk of displacement in order to support the development of local policies and programs to meaningfully address identified housing issues.

Community-Based Transportation Planning: A portion of this program will be dedicated to the Community-Based Transportation Planning (CBTP) grant program. These locally-led plans address the mobility needs of low-income households in the region's 35 Communities of Concern. Grant funds will be used to update CBTPs that are in many cases more than 10 years old.

Naturally Occurring Affordable Housing (NOAH): Consistent with the OBAG 2 framework and PDA Planning Program, a NOAH revolving loan fund will be established as a complement to the existing TOAH loan products for new construction. NOAH loans would be used to buy apartment buildings to create long-term affordability where displacement risk is high and to secure long-term affordability in currently subsidized units that are set to expire. NOAH investments will be made in PDAs or Transit Priority Areas.

4. Climate Initiatives Program

The purpose of the OBAG 2 Climate Initiatives Program is to support the implementation of strategies identified in Plan Bay Area to achieve the required CO_2 emissions reductions per SB375 and federal criteria pollutant reductions. Investments focus on projects and programs with effective greenhouse gas emission reduction results.

Spare the Air Youth: A portion of the Climate Initiatives program would be directed to the implementation of Spare the Air Youth program.

5. Regional Active Operational Management

This program is administered at the regional level by MTC to actively manage congestion through cost-effective operational strategies that improve mobility and system efficiency across freeways, arterials and transit modes. Funding continues to be directed to evolving MTC operational programs such as next generation 511, Freeway Service Patrol (FSP), incident management program, managed lanes and regional rideshare program. Funding will also be directed to new initiatives such as the Columbus Day Initiative that deploys advanced technologies and Transportation Management Systems that ensures the existing and new technology infrastructure is operational and well-maintained.

Columbus Day Initiative

The Columbus Day Initiative (CDI) builds on the proven success of its predecessor program (the Freeway Performance Initiative), which implemented traditional fixed time-of-day freeway ramp metering and arterial signal timing projects that achieved significant delay reduction and safety on Bay Area freeways and arterials at a fraction of the cost of traditional highway widening projects. The CDI aims to deliver cost-effective, technology-driven operational improvement projects such as, adaptive ramp metering, hard shoulder running lanes, queue warning signs, connected vehicle technologies, shared mobility technologies, and regional arterial operations strategies. Projects would target priority freeway and arterial corridors with significant congestion. Funding for performance monitoring activities and corridor studies is included to monitor the state of the system and to identify and assess the feasibility of operational strategies to be deployed.

Transportation Management Systems

This program includes the operations and management of highway operations field equipment; critical freeway and incident management functions; and Transportation Management Center (TMC) staff resources needed to actively operate and maintain the highway system.

Bay Bridge Forward Project

As part of the overall OBAG 2 framework, this project encompasses the implementation of several near-term, cost-effective operational improvements that offer travel time savings, reliability and lower costs for carpooling and bus/ferry transit use to increase person throughput and reduce congestion, incidents, and emissions in the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge corridor.

6. Transit Priorities Program

The objective of the Transit Priorities Program is to assist transit operators to fund major fleet replacements, including the BART Car Replacement Phase 1 project, fixed guideway rehabilitation and other high-scoring capital needs, including replacement of Clipper equipment and development of Clipper 2.0, that are consistent with MTC's Transit Capital Priorities policy for programming federal transit funds (MTC Resolution 4140 or successor resolution).

The program also implements elements of the Transit Sustainability Project by making transit-supportive investments in major transit corridors that can be carried out within two years through the Transit Performance Initiative (TPI). The focus of TPI 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, boarding/stop improvements and other improvements to improve the passenger experience.

7. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program

The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands and open space amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. The PCA program includes one approach for the North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second approach for the remaining five counties.

In the North Bay, each of the four CMAs will take the lead to develop a county-wide program, building on PCA planning conducted to date to select projects for funding.

For the remaining counties, MTC will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. MTC will provide federal funding which will be combined 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. The Coastal Conservancy, MTC, and ABAG staff will cooperatively manage the call for proposals.

The minimum non-federal match required for PCA-program funding is 2:1.

As a part of the update to *Plan Bay Area*, MTC is exploring implementing a Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) Program. RAMP would mitigate certain environmental impacts from multiple planned transportation projects, rather than mitigating on a less-efficient per-project level. Partnering arrangements can be established to leverage multiple fund sources in order to maximize benefits of the RAMP and PCA programs. As such, PCA funds may be used to deliver net environmental benefits to a RAMP program project.

In instances where federal funds may not be used for this purpose, sponsors may exchange OBAG 2 funds with eligible non-federal funds. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC's fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).

Appendix A-9 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening, eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.

8. Housing Production Incentive

As part of the OBAG 2 framework, MTC will develop a challenge grant program for the production of affordable housing. The purpose of the program is to reward local jurisdictions that produce the most housing units at the very low, low, and moderate income levels.

The proposed concept for this program is to set a six year target for production of low and moderate income housing units (2015 through 2020), based on the housing unit needs identified through the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) for 2014-22. The target for the proposed challenge grant period is approximately 80,000 low and moderate income units (35,000 very low, 22,000 low and 25,000 moderate units, for a total of 82,000 units, derived from the years of the current RHNA cycle). The units would need to be located in PDA's or in Transit Priority Areas (TPA's). Additionally, to be credited towards reaching the production targets, very low and low income units need to be deed restricted; moderate income units do not require deed restriction to be credited in the program.

At the end of the production challenge cycle, MTC will distribute grant funds to the jurisdictions that contribute the most toward reaching the regional production target. To keep the grant size large enough to serve as an incentive for housing production, the grant program would be limited to no more than the top ten producers of affordable housing units, or fewer, if the 80,000 unit target is reached by less than ten cities. Staff will provide annual progress reports on production of affordable housing units.

The funds provided would be STP/CMAQ, and would need to be used only for federally eligible transportation purposes.

COUNTY PROGRAMMING POLICIES

The policies below apply to the programs managed by the county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) or substitute agency:

- Program Eligibility: The CMA, or substitute agency, may program funds from its OBAG 2 county fund distribution to projects that meet the eligibility requirements for any of the following transportation improvement types:
    - Planning and Outreach Activities
    - Local Streets and Roads Preservation
    - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
    - Transportation for Livable Communities
    - Safe Routes To School
    - Priority Conservation Areas
    - Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Improvements

- Fund Sources & Formula Distribution: OBAG 2 is funded primarily from two federal fund sources: STP and CMAQ. The CMAs will be provided a breakdown of specific OBAG 2 fund sources, with the understanding that actual fund sources are subject to change. Should there be significant changes to federal fund sources, MTC staff will work with the CMAs to identify and 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 source availability and final federal apportionment levels.

  Consistent with OBAG 1, 60% of available OBAG 2 funding is assigned to Regional Programs and 40% assigned to the base County CMA Programs. The Safe Routes to School (SRTS) and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) programs augment the county base funding, bringing the final proportionate share to 55% regional and 45% county. The Base county funds (SRTS & FAS have their own formula distribution) are distributed to each county based on the OBAG 2 county distribution formula (see page 3). Counties are further guaranteed that the funding amount for planning purposes will not exceed 50% of their total distribution. This results in the county of Napa receiving additional funding. This planning guarantee clause results in a slight deviation in the final OBAG 2 fund distribution for each county. The base County CMA Program fund distribution after the planning guarantee adjustment is shown in Appendix A-2.

- Priority Development Area (PDA) Policies
  - PDA minimum investment: CMAs in larger counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) shall direct at least 70% of their OBAG 2 investments to PDAs. For North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) this minimum target is 50% to reflect the more rural nature of these counties. CMA planning and outreach costs partially count towards PDA minimum investment targets (70% or 50%, in line with each county's PDA minimum investment target). The guaranteed minimum for Priority Conservation Area (PCA), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) do not count towards PDA targets. The PDA/non-PDA funding split is shown in Appendix A-2.
  - PDA boundary delineation: Refer to http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive_maps/ which provides a GIS overlay of the PDAs in the Bay Area to exact map boundaries including transportation facilities. This map is updated as ABAG approves new PDA designations.
  - Defining proximate access to PDAs: The CMAs may determine that a project located outside of a PDA provides proximate access to the PDA, and thus counts towards the county's minimum PDA investment target. The CMA is required to map these projects along with the associated PDA(s) and provide a policy justification for designating the project as supporting a PDA through

proximate access. This information should assist decision makers, stakeholders, and the public in evaluating the impact of the investment on a nearby PDA, to determine whether or not the investment should be credited towards the county's PDA minimum investment target. This information must be presented for public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions.

- PDA Investment & Growth Strategy: Updates to each county's PDA Investment & Growth Strategy are required every four years and must be adopted by the CMA Board. The updates should be coordinated with the countywide plan and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) updates to inform RTP development decisions. Interim status reports are required two years after each update to address needed revisions and provide an activity and progress status. See Appendix A-8 for details.

▶ Project Selection: County CMAs or substitute agencies are given the responsibility to develop a project selection process. The process should include solicitation of projects, identifying evaluation criteria, conducting outreach, evaluating project applications, and selecting projects.

- Public Involvement: In selecting projects for federal funding, the decision making authority is responsible for ensuring that the process complies with federal statutes and regulations. In order to ensure that the CMA process for administering OBAG 2 is in compliance with federal regulations, CMAs are required to lead a public outreach process as directed by Appendix A-7.
- CMAs must adopt a specific scoring methodology for funding allocation to projects within PDAs or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs) that rewards jurisdictions with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies.
- MTC and the CMAs will conduct an analysis of the impact of this incentive-based scoring methodology on project selection and local anti-displacement and affordable housing production policy development. The findings will be used to inform future planning and funding priorities.
- Unified Call for Projects: CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects for their OBAG 2 program. Final project lists are due to MTC by July 31, 2017, with all associated project information submitted to MTC using the Fund Management System (FMS) by August 31, 2017. On a case-by-case basis and as approved in advance by MTC staff, these deadlines may be waived to allow coordination with other county-wide call for projects or programming needs. The goal is to coordinate the OBAG2 call for 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 OBAG 2 period (FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-

22). In general, the expectation is that on-going activities such as CMA planning, non-infrastructure projects and the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of projects would use capacity in the first year, followed by the capital phases of project in later years.

- OBAG 2 funding is subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606, or its successor) including the deadlines for Request for Authorization (RFA) submittal and federal authorization/ obligation. Additionally, the following funding deadlines apply for each county, with earlier delivery strongly encouraged:
    - At least half of the OBAG 2 funds, must be obligated (federal authorization/FTA Transfer) by January 31, 2020.
    - All remaining OBAG 2 funds must be obligated by January 31, 2023.

▶ Performance and Accountability Policies: Jurisdictions need to comply with the following policies, as well as other requirements noted in the document, in order to be eligible recipients of OBAG 2 funds.

- Adopt a complete streets resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC, incorporating MTC's required complete streets elements as outlined in MTC's Complete Streets Guidance.

  Alternatively, to recognize local jurisdiction's efforts to update their general plan circulation element to incorporate the provisions of the 2008 Complete Streets Act in response to the provisions stated in OBAG 1, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010.

  For compliance, a substantial revision of the circulation element, passed after January 1, 2010, shall "…plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan," while complying with the other provisions of CA Government Code Section 65302 and Complete Streets Act of 2008.

  The approach above focuses on the adoption of local complete streets resolutions, while acknowledging the jurisdictions that took efforts to update their circulation element in anticipation of future OBAG requirements.

- Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015. Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding.

- Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this statute during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or risk deprogramming of OBAG 2 funding.
- General law cities and counties must adopt a surplus land resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC. The resolution must verify that any disposition of surplus land undertaken by the jurisdiction complies with the State Surplus Land Act, as amended by AB 2135, 2014. MTC will issue guidance to assist cities and counties in drafting a resolution to meet this requirement. This guidance will be posted on the OBAG 2 website: http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/federal-funding/obag-2.

  Charter cities do not have to adopt a surplus land resolution unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the Act.
- For jurisdictions with local public streets and roads, to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding, the jurisdiction must:
  - Have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent) updated at least once every three years (with a one-year extension allowed);
  - Fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey; and
  - Provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years (with a one-year grace period allowed).
- For a transit agency project sponsor under a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction), or an agency where housing and complete streets policies do not apply, the jurisdiction where the project is located (such as station/stop improvements) will need to comply with the policies and other requirements specified in this attachment before funds may be programmed to the project sponsor. However, this is not required if the project is transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a transit maintenance facility.
- OBAG 2 funds may not be programmed to any jurisdiction out of compliance with the policies and other requirements specified in this attachment.
- The CMA will be responsible for tracking progress towards all OBAG 2 requirements and affirming to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance prior to MTC programming OBAG 2 funds to its projects in the TIP.

CMAs will provide the following prior to programming projects in the TIP (see Appendix A-10):

- Documentation of the approach used to select OBAG 2 projects including outreach efforts, agency coordination, Title VI compliance, the methodology used for distributing funds within the county, and the specific scoring methodology used for allocating funds to projects within PDAs or TPAs that rewards local jurisdictions with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies;
- The board adopted list of projects recommended for OBAG 2 funding;
- Self-certification that all projects recommended for funding are consistent with the current RTP (including documentation) and have completed project-specific Complete Streets Checklists (including documentation);
- Identification of the Single-Point of Contact assigned by the jurisdiction for all FHWA-funded projects, including OBAG 2 projects;
- Documentation of local jurisdiction compliance with MTC's Complete Streets Policy, including a list of the status of each jurisdiction, a letter from the CMA for each jurisdiction describing how the jurisdiction meets the policy requirements, and supporting documentation for each local jurisdiction (resolutions and/or circulation elements)
- Documentation of local jurisdiction compliance with MTC's Housing Element requirements, including a list of the status of each jurisdiction's Annual Housing Element Progress Report as well as any supporting documentation for each jurisdiction (progress reports and copies of submittal letter to HCD). This documentation will be required annually from CMAs (April 30 each year) throughout the OBAG 2 programming period;
- Documentation of compliance with the State's Surplus Land Act requirements, for each applicable jurisdiction (copy of adopted resolution).
- Documentation for any projects recommended for funding that apply toward the county's minimum PDA investment target. This includes mapping of all mappable projects (projects with a physical location). For projects that are not physically located within a PDA, the CMA is required to map each project along with the associated PDA(s) and provide a policy justification for designating each project as supporting a PDA through proximate access. CMAs must also document that this information was used when presenting its program of projects to their board and the public; and
- Self-certification that the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy has been completed and adopted by the CMA Board, or will be adopted in coordination with the RTP update. Documentation of required updates

and interim progress reports must also be submitted by the CMAs throughout the OBAG 2 period.

COUNTY PROGRAMS

The categories below comprise the eligible OBAG 2 County Programs, administered by the nine county CMAs. The CMAs should ensure that the project selection process and selected projects meet all eligibility requirements throughout this document as well as in federal statutes and regulations. MTC staff will work with CMAs and project sponsors to resolve any eligibility issues which may arise, including air quality conformity exceptions and requirements.

County CMA Program

The base OBAG 2 County program accounts for 40% of the total funding available through OBAG 2 and is distributed to each county according to the OBAG 2 county formula after accounting for the CMA Planning minimum guarantee (see Appendices A-2 and A-3). This program includes CMA planning and outreach as well as the various projects selected through each county's competitive call for projects. Projects selected through the base county program are subject to the PDA investment minimum requirements.

1. CMA Planning and Outreach

This category provides funding to the county Congestion Management Agency (CMA) or substitute agency to support programming, monitoring and outreach activities. Such efforts include, but are not limited to: county-based planning efforts for development of the RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (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 minimum funding level for the CMA planning and outreach program continues OBAG 1 commitments by escalating FY 2016-17 amounts at 2% per year. In addition, counties are guaranteed that the base funding level for the CMA's planning and outreach program will not exceed 50% of the county's total OBAG 2 County Program distribution. Actual CMA planning and outreach amounts for each county, are shown in Appendix A-3.

At their discretion, the CMAs may choose to designate additional funding from their County Program to augment their planning and outreach efforts.

All funding and activities will be administered through an interagency agreement between MTC and the respective CMA.

2. Local Streets and Roads Preservation

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid 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). In addition, selected pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. This requirement ensures that streets selected for investment are cost effective. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status of jurisdictions. The current certification status of area jurisdictions can be found at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/.

Furthermore, to support the collection and analysis of local roads asset conditions for comprehensive regional planning efforts and statewide funding advocacy, a jurisdiction must fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding for pavement rehabilitation.

Eligibility requirements for specific project types are included below:

- Pavement Rehabilitation:

  All pavement rehabilitation projects, including projects with pavement segments with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) below 70, must 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 PCI of 70 or above are eligible for preventive maintenance. Furthermore, the local agency's 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 bridge structures, storm drains, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), curbs, gutters, culverts, medians, guardrails, safety features, signals, signage, sidewalks, ramps, complete streets elements and features that bring the facility to current standards. Jurisdictions must have a certified PMP to be eligible to receive funding 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), 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 or implementing compete streets elements) and any pavement application not recommended by the PMP unless otherwise allowed above.

Federal-Aid Eligible Facilities: Federal-aid highways as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(6) 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 (residential) or lower. Project sponsors must

confirm the eligibility of their roadway through the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) prior to the application for funding.

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

This category funds a wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements including Class I, II and III bicycle facilities; cycle tracks; bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking; sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges; user safety and supporting facilities; and traffic signal actuation. Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be located on or off the federal-aid highway system.

Additional eligibility requirements will apply to bicycle and pedestrian projects that are funded with CMAQ funds rather than STP funds, given the more limited scope of the CMAQ funding program. According to CMAQ eligibility requirements, bicycle and pedestrian facilities must not be exclusively recreational and should reduce vehicle trips resulting in air pollution reductions. Also, the 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 may limit users from using the facility during the portions of peak commute hours, particularly during times of the year with shorter days.

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:

- Transit station improvements such as plazas, station access, pocket parks, and bicycle parking.
- Transit expansions serving PDAs.
- Complete Streets improvements that improve bicycle and pedestrian access and encourage use of alternative modes.
- Cost-effective, technology-driven active operational management strategies for local arterials and for highways when used to augment other fund sources or match challenge grants.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects including car sharing, vanpooling traveler coordination and information, and Clipper®-related projects.
- Transit access projects connecting high density housing/jobs/mixed land use to transit, such as bicycle/pedestrian paths and bridges and safe routes to transit.
- Streetscape projects focusing on high-impact, multi-modal improvements or associated with high density housing/mixed use and transit, such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, crosswalk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossing and signals, new striping for bicycle lanes and road diets, pedestrian street

lighting, medians, pedestrian refuges, wayfinding signage, tree grates, bollards, permanent bicycle racks, signal modification for bicycle detection, street trees, raised planters, planters, costs associated with on-site storm water management, permeable paving, and pedestrian-scaled street furniture including bus shelters, benches, magazine racks, garbage and recycling bins.

- Mobility management and coordination projects that meet the specific needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities and enhance transportation access for populations beyond those served by one agency or organization within a community. Examples include the integration and coordination of services for individuals with disabilities, seniors, and low-income individuals; individualized travel training and trip planning activities for customers; the development and operation of one-stop transportation traveler call centers to coordinate transportation information on all travel modes and to manage eligibility requirements and arrangements for customers among supporting programs; and the operation of transportation brokerages to coordinate providers, funding agencies and passengers. Selected project sponsors may need to transfer the STP/CMAQ funds received to FTA.
- PDA planning and implementation, including projects that incentivize local PDA transit oriented development housing (within funding eligibility limitations unless exchanged).
- 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).

Activities that are not eligible for funding include: air quality non-exempt projects (unless granted an exception by MTC staff), new roadways, roadway extensions, right of way acquisition for future expansion, operations, and routine maintenance.

Additional County Programs

In addition to the base County CMA Program, OBAG 2 directs additional funds to the CMAs to distribute to eligible project types. These programs are the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program, the Federal Aid Secondary Shares Continuation (FAS) program, and for the North Bay Counties, the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) program.

1. Safe Routes to School

Eligible projects for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. It is important to note that this program is funded exclusively by the CMAQ funding program. Given the intent of the CMAQ program to reduce vehicular emissions, the OBAG 2 SRTS program is targeted towards air quality improvement rather than the health or safety of school-aged children. Despite this limitation, project eligibility under CMAQ largely overlaps with typical eligibility requirements for Safe Routes to School programs. Detailed examples of eligible projects are provided below:

Eligible 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 (TDM) activities including traveler information services, shuttle services, carpools, vanpools, parking pricing, etc.

Eligible Infrastructure Projects

- Constructing bicycle and pedestrian facilities (paths, sidewalks, 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 (Upon the CMA's request and availability of funds, STP funds will be provided for these purposes)
- Crossing guards, vehicle speed feedback devices, and traffic control that is primarily oriented to vehicular traffic rather than bicyclists and pedestrians
- Material incentives that lack an educational message or exceed a nominal cost

Within the SRTS 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 2013-14 (see Appendix A-5). SRTS funding distributed to CMAs based on enrollment is not subject to the PDA minimum investment requirements. However, if a CMA chooses to augment the SRTS program with additional funding from their base OBAG 2 County CMA program, this additional funding is subject to the PDA minimum investment requirements.

Before programming projects into the TIP, the CMAs shall provide the SRTS projects, recommended county program scope, budget, schedule, agency roles, and federal funding recipient(s).

In programming the funds in the TIP, project sponsors may consider using non-federal funds to fund SRTS activities ineligible for federal funding. In such instances, the sponsor is allowed to use toll credits for the federal project, conditioned upon a minimum of 11.47% in non-federal funds being dedicated for SRTS activities. Separate accounting of a federalized project and a non-federalized project to fund a single program can be challenging, so care should be taken when using this option.

CMAs with an established SRTS program may choose to program local funds for SRTS projects in lieu of OBAG 2 funds and use the OBAG 2 funding for other eligible OBAG 2 projects. In such instances the local SRTS project(s) must be identified at the time the CMA submits the county OBAG 2 program to MTC and subsequently programmed in the federal TIP.

2. Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Shares

The Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program, which directed funding to rural roads, was eliminated in 1991 with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). However, California statutes provide for the continuation of minimum funding levels to counties, guaranteeing their prior FAS shares for rural county roads.

The county CMAs are required to ensure the counties receive their guaranteed annual funding through the CMA-managed OBAG county program. The county of San Francisco has no rural roads, and therefore does not receive FAS funding. In addition, the counties of Marin, Napa, and San Mateo may exchange their annual guaranteed FAS funding with state funding from Caltrans, as permitted by state statute. Caltrans takes these federal funds "off the top" before distributing regional STP funds to MTC. The CMAs for these three counties are not required to provide FAS guaranteed funding to these three counties for years in which these counties request such an exchange, as the statutory requirement is met through this exchange with Caltrans.

Counties may access their FAS funding at any time within the OBAG 2 period for any project eligible for STP funding. Guaranteed minimum FAS funding amounts are determined by California's Federal-Aid Secondary Highways Act (California Code § 2200-2214) and are listed in Appendix A-4. This FAS funding is not subject to the minimum PDA investment requirement. Any additional funding provided by the CMAs to the counties from the OBAG 2 county base formula distribution is subject to the minimum PDA investment requirements.

3. Priority Conservation Area (PCA)

The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands and open space. Generally, eligible projects include PCA planning activities, bicycle and pedestrian access to open space and parklands, visual enhancements and habitat/environmental enhancements. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses.

Land acquisition for preservation purposes is not federally eligible, but may be facilitated through CMA-initiated funding exchanges.

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 receive dedicated funding, lead a county-wide program building on PCA planning conducted to date, and select projects for funding. For the remaining counties, MTC will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. Appendix A-9 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.

Any CMA may use additional funding from its base OBAG 2 County Program to expand its dedicated PCA program (North Bay counties), augment grants received from the regionally competitive PCA program (remaining counties), or develop its own county PCA program (all counties).

The North Bay program framework is to be developed by the four North Bay CMAs, building upon 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.

As a part of the update to *Plan Bay Area*, MTC is exploring implementing a Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) Program. RAMP would mitigate certain environmental impacts from multiple planned transportation projects, rather than mitigating on a less-efficient per-project level. Partnering arrangements can be established to leverage multiple fund sources in order to maximize benefits of the RAMP and PCA programs. As such, PCA funds may be used to deliver net environmental benefits to a RAMP program project.

In instances where federal funds may not be used for this purpose, sponsors may exchange OBAG 2 funds with eligible non-federal funds. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC's fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).

Appendix A-1

OBAG 2
Program Categories
FY 2017-18 through FY 2019-22
July 27, 2016

Program Categories

Regional Program		OBAG 1		OBAG 2		
		Regional Distribution			% Share	Amount
Regional Categories			**$499.3**			**476.5**
1	Regional Planning Activities	2%	$8.5		2%	9.6
2	Pavement Management Program	2%	$9.1		2%	9.3
3	Regional PDA Planning & Implementation	4%	$20.0		5%	20.0
4	Climate Initiatives	4%	$22.3		5%	23.0
5	Priority Conservation Area	2%	$9.5		4%	16.4
6	Regional Active Operational Management	37%	$183.5		39%	179.0
7	Transit Capital Priorities	40%	$201.4		43%	189.3
			$454.3	**Regional Program Total:**	**52%**	**446.5**
Local Categories						
	Local PDA Planning *(within county program for OBAG 2)*	4%	$20.0			
	Safe Routes To School *(Moved to county program for OBAG 2)*	5%	$25.0			
	Federal-Aid Secondary - FAS *(within county program for OBAG 2)*	-	-			
8	Local Housing Production Incentive	-	-			30.0
		9%	**$45.0**	**Local Program Total:**	**3%**	**30.0**

County Program			OBAG 1				OBAG 2					
		Population	Base Formula STP/CMAQ/TE *		Final Distribution Including SRTS & PDA		Base Formula **		SRTS ***	FAS ***	Final Adjusted Distribution Including SRTS & FAS ****	
Counties												
1	Alameda	21.2%	19.6%	$64.1	19.7%	$73.4	20.0%	$69.7	$5.3	$1.8	19.9%	$76.7
2	Contra Costa	14.6%	14.1%	$46.0	14.2%	$52.9	14.6%	$50.8	$4.1	$1.3	14.6%	$56.1
3	Marin	3.4%	3.3%	$10.7	3.3%	$12.3	2.6%	$9.2	$0.9	$0.8	2.8%	$10.9
4	Napa	1.9%	2.3%	$7.4	2.3%	$8.7	1.6%	$5.5	$0.5	$1.2	2.2%	$8.2
5	San Francisco	11.3%	12.0%	$39.3	11.7%	$43.5	13.4%	$46.5	$1.8	$0.0	12.4%	$48.2
6	San Mateo	10.0%	8.3%	$27.2	8.4%	$31.2	8.4%	$29.3	$2.4	$0.9	8.4%	$32.5
7	Santa Clara	25.2%	27.3%	$89.3	27.2%	$101.4	27.5%	$95.8	$6.9	$1.7	26.9%	$104.1
8	Solano	5.7%	6.0%	$19.5	5.9%	$22.1	5.2%	$18.3	$1.5	$1.5	5.5%	$21.2
9	Sonoma	6.6%	7.3%	$23.8	7.2%	$26.9	6.6%	$22.9	$1.7	$3.3	7.2%	$27.7
		Total:		**$327.4**		**$372.4**		**$348.0**	**$25.0**	**$12.5**	**45%**	**$385.5**

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\Final_ver3\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-3 Planning

OBAG Total: OBAG 1: **$827** OBAG 2: **$862**

*** OBAG 1:** In OBAG 1, the county CMAs received $327 M with $18 M in RTIP-TE and $309 M in STP/CMAQ. RTIP-TE funding is no longer part of OBAG 2
**** Base:** Unadjusted raw county base formula amount
***** SRTS:** SRTS moved to County Program and distributed based on FY 2013-14 K-12 school enrollment
***** FAS:** Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) distributed based by statutory requirements. San Francisco has no rural roads and therefore is not subject to State Statute requirements
****** OBAG2:** Final county distribution rounded to nearest $1,000 and includes SRTS & FAS and adjusted so a county CMA's base planning is no more than 50% of total

Appendix A-2

OBAG 2
County Fund Distribution
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
July 27, 2016

OBAG 2 - County Funding Formula Distribution

County	Total County Distribution *	OBAG 2 Adjusted Base **	PDA Percentage	PDA/Anywhere Split	PDA	Anywhere
Alameda	$76,655,000	$69,728,000	70%	70/30	$48,810,000	$27,845,000
Contra Costa	$56,136,000	$50,846,000	70%	70/30	$35,592,000	$20,544,000
Marin	$10,870,000	$9,194,000	50%	50/50	$4,597,000	$6,273,000
Napa	$8,150,000	$5,501,000	50%	50/50	$2,751,000	$5,399,000
San Francisco	$48,183,000	$46,514,000	70%	70/30	$32,560,000	$15,623,000
San Mateo	$32,545,000	$29,339,000	70%	70/30	$20,537,000	$12,008,000
Santa Clara	$104,073,000	$95,758,000	70%	70/30	$67,031,000	$37,042,000
Solano	$21,177,000	$18,253,000	50%	50/50	$9,127,000	$12,050,000
Sonoma	$27,723,000	$22,867,000	50%	50/50	$11,434,000	$16,289,000
Total:	**$385,512,000**	**$348,000,000**			**$232,439,000**	**$153,073,000**

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\Final_ver3\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-3 Planning

* Total county distribution including SRTS, FAS and planning adjustment
** OBAG 2 adjusted base county amount subject to PDA investment - does not include SRTS, FAS or PCA. Rounded to thousands and adjusted to ensure a county's base planning activity is no more than 50% of the total distribution

Appendix A-3

OBAG 2
Planning & Outreach
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

OBAG 2 - County CMA Planning

County	Agency	2.0% 2016-17	OBAG 2 County CMA Planning - Base * 2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
Alameda	ACTC	$1,034,000	$1,055,000	$1,076,000	$1,097,000	$1,119,000	$1,142,000	**$5,489,000**
Contra Costa	CCTA	$818,000	$834,000	$851,000	$868,000	$885,000	$904,000	**$4,342,000**
Marin	TAM	$720,000	$734,000	$749,000	$764,000	$779,000	$796,000	**$3,822,000**
Napa	NCTPA	$720,000	$734,000	$749,000	$764,000	$779,000	$796,000	**$3,822,000**
San Francisco	SFCTA	$753,000	$768,000	$783,000	$799,000	$815,000	$832,000	**$3,997,000**
San Mateo	SMCCAG	$720,000	$734,000	$749,000	$764,000	$779,000	$796,000	**$3,822,000**
Santa Clara	VTA	$1,145,000	$1,168,000	$1,191,000	$1,215,000	$1,239,000	$1,265,000	**$6,078,000**
Solano	STA	$720,000	$734,000	$749,000	$764,000	$779,000	$796,000	**$3,822,000**
Sonoma	SCTA	$720,000	$734,000	$749,000	$764,000	$779,000	$796,000	**$3,822,000**
County CMAs Total:		**$7,350,000**	**$7,495,000**	**$7,646,000**	**$7,799,000**	**$7,953,000**	**$8,123,000**	**$39,016,000**

OBAG 2 - Regional Planning

	2.0% 2016-17	OBAG 2 Regional Agency Planning - Base * 2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	Total
Regional Planning Total:	**$1,800,000**	**$1,835,000**	**$1,873,000**	**$1,910,000**	**$1,948,000**	**$1,989,000**	**$9,555,000**

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\Final_ver3\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-3 Planning

* 2% escalation from FY 2016-17 Planning Base

$48,571,000

Appendix A-4

OBAG 2
Federal-Aid Secondary
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

OBAG 2 - Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS)

County	FAS Regional Percentage	Annual FAS Funding *	5-Year FAS Funding	Total OBAG 2 Rounded
Alameda	14.2%	$355,761	$1,778,805	**$1,779,000**
Contra Costa	10.7%	$268,441	$1,342,205	**$1,343,000**
Marin	6.7%	$167,509	$837,545	**$838,000**
Napa	9.5%	$237,648	$1,188,240	**$1,189,000**
San Francisco **	0.0%	$0	$0	**$0**
San Mateo	7.1%	$178,268	$891,340	**$892,000**
Santa Clara	13.6%	$340,149	$1,700,745	**$1,701,000**
Solano	12.0%	$301,159	$1,505,795	**$1,506,000**
Sonoma	26.1%	$652,790	$3,263,950	**$3,264,000**
Total:	**100.0%**	**$2,501,725**	**$12,508,625**	**$12,512,000**

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\Final_ver3\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-3 Planning

* As provided by Caltrans per State Statute

** San Francisco has no rural roads

Appendix A-5

OBAG 2
Safe Routes to School County
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

OBAG 2 - Safe Routes To School County Distribution

County	Public School Enrollment (K-12) *	Private School Enrollment (K-12) *	Total School Enrollment (K-12) *	FY 2013-14 Percentage	Total OBAG 2 Rounded
Alameda	222,681	24,036	246,717	21.4%	**$5,340,000**
Contra Costa	173,020	15,825	188,845	16.4%	**$4,088,000**
Marin	32,793	7,104	39,897	3.5%	**$864,000**
Napa	20,868	2,913	23,781	2.1%	**$515,000**
San Francisco	58,394	24,657	83,051	7.2%	**$1,797,000**
San Mateo	94,667	15,927	110,594	9.6%	**$2,394,000**
Santa Clara	276,175	41,577	317,752	27.5%	**$6,878,000**
Solano	63,825	4,051	67,876	5.9%	**$1,469,000**
Sonoma	70,932	5,504	76,436	6.6%	**$1,655,000**
Total:	**1,013,355**	**141,594**	**1,154,949**	**100%**	**$25,000,000**

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\Final_ver3\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-3 Planning

* From California Department of Education for FY 2013-14

Appendix A-6

OBAG 2
Priority Conservation Area
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

OBAG 2 - Priority Conservation Area (PCA)

PCA Program	Total OBAG 2
Northbay Program	
Marin	$2,050,000
Napa	$2,050,000
Solano	$2,050,000
Sonoma	$2,050,000
Subtotal:	$8,200,000
Remaining Counties Competitive Program	
Subtotal:	$8,200,000
Total	
Total:	$16,400,000

Appendix A-7: OBAG 2 – CMA One Bay Area Grant County Program Outreach

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) delegates authority for the county program project selection to the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs). The existing relationships the CMAs have with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their respective counties make them best suited for this role. As one of the requirements for distributing federal transportation funding, MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process during development of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and the solicitation and project selection for the OBAG 2 program. CMAs 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 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

To comply with federal regulations, the CMAs must conduct a transparent process for the Call for Projects, and include the following activities:

1. **Public Involvement and Outreach**

   Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas. CMAs are expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 4174), which can be found at http://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/public-participation/public-participation-plan . 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 that 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://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/public-participation/get-language-assistance;
   - Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting; and
   - Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with disabilities and by public transit.

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 2 funding.

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 2 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.
  - Documenting the steps taken to engage the above-listed organizations.

3. Title VI Responsibilities

- ***Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process 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.
  - Document the steps taken to engage underserved communities.
  - For Title VI outreach strategies, please refer to MTC's Public Participation Plan found at: http://mtc.ca.gov/about-mtc/public-participation/public-participation-plan.
  - 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-8: 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 2 funding that supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require a range of 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) <u>Engaging Regional/Local Agencies</u>

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Understand the needs of both groups and share information with MTC and ABAG.
- Encourage community participation throughout the development of the Investment and Growth Strategy, consistent with the OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidance (Appendix A-7).
- The CMA governing boards must adopt the final Investment & Growth Strategy.
- 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. Look for opportunities to support planning processes with technical or financial assistance.

(2) <u>Planning Objectives</u> – 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.

  The second round of PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess local jurisdiction success approving sufficient housing at all income levels. They will also, 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 has few moderate- or low-income households, 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.

[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.

MTC and ABAG staff will distribute a technical memo to guide this task by October 1, 2016, including data to identify jurisdictions' challenges (e.g. RHNA performance and current affordability) and a listing of the Bay Area's best housing policies that are intended to address a range of housing challenges. This section should identify planning costs needed to address policy changes and other barriers to creating or maintaining affordability.

(3) <u>Establishing Local Funding Priorities</u>

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

- **Projects located in high impact project areas**. Favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
  a. PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units,
  b. Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and TDM programs,
  c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC or as defined by CMAs or Community Based Transportation Plans.
- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies** and community stabilization policies – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.
- **Projects that protect public health during construction and operation** – Favorably consider projects that implement the Best Practices in the Air District's Planning Healthy Places, or projects located in jurisdictions that have demonstrated a commitment to adopt, as policies and/or enforceable ordinances, best practices to reduce emissions of and exposure to local air pollution.[2]
- **PDAs that overlap or are co-located with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (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.

[2] Guidance and maps have been developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff, please see: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/planning-healthy-places.

Process/Timeline

CMAs will develop a new PDA Investment & Growth Strategy every four years, consistent with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Investment & Growth Strategy must be adopted by the CMA Board (new for OBAG 2). CMAs will provide a status report update every two years.

APPENDIX A-9: Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program

Program Goals and Eligible Projects

The goal of the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program is to support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands and open space in the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. These values include globally unique ecosystems, productive agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, urban greening, 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. One purpose of the PCA program is to reinforce efforts to target growth in existing neighborhoods (PDAs), rather than allowing growth to occur in an unplanned "project-by-project" approach.

The PCA program is split into two elements:

1. North Bay Program ($8 million)
2. Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program ($8 million)

The North Bay program framework is to be developed by the four North Bay county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), 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 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	• $8 million
Screening Criteria	• **PCA Designation**: Eligible projects must be within a designated PCA. The list of adopted PCAs can be found at: http://abag.ca.gov/priority/conservation/. • **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 the regional (greater-than-local) need it serves. • **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. • **Non-Federal Local Match**: 2:1 minimum match

	• **Meets Program Goals:** Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see below): o Protects or enhances "resource areas" or habitats as defined in California Government Code § 65080.01(a). o Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems. o Supports the agricultural economy of the region. o Includes existing and potential urban green spaces that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater.
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. Federally-funded projects must have an implementing agency that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (master agreement with Caltrans).**
Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects	**Eligible Projects** 1. **Planning Activities** 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. 3. **Visual Enhancements**: Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas. 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. 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. 6. **Urban Greening**: Existing and potential green spaces in cities that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater. **Note:** MTC encourages PCA project applicants to partner with other agencies and programs to leverage other funds in order to maximize benefits. As such, PCA funded projects may become eligible to deliver net environmental benefits to a future Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) program project, above any required mitigation requirements. Note that such projects may need to rely on funding exchanges with eligible non-federal funds because most land acquisition and habitat restoration projects that are not mitigation for transportation projects are not eligible for federal transportation funds. Any such funding exchange must be consistent with MTC's fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).
Project Selection	**Coastal Conservancy Partnership Program:** MTC will provide $8 million of federal transportation funds which will be combined 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. The Coastal Conservancy, MTC, and ABAG staff will cooperatively manage the call for projects. This approach would harness the expertise of the Coastal Conservancy, expand the pool of eligible projects, and leverage additional resources through the Coastal Conservancy.

*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/.

APPENDIX A-10: Checklist for CMA and Local Jurisdiction Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) Checklist for CMA Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202

Federal Program Covering FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

The intent of this checklist is to delineate the requirements included in the OBAG 2 Grant Program (Resolution No. 4202), as adopted by MTC on November 18, 2015. This checklist must be completed by Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) and submitted to MTC to certify compliance with the OBAG 2 requirements. MTC will not take action to program projects recommended by a CMA until a checklist demonstrating compliance has been submitted to MTC.

CMA Call for Projects Guidance: Appendix A-7

1. Public Involvement and Outreach, Agency Coordination, and Title VI	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the CMA conducted countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas consistent with Appendix A-7?	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the CMA performed agency coordination consistent with Appendix A-7?	☐	☐	☐
c. Has the CMA fulfilled its Title VI responsibilities consistent with Appendix A-7?	☐	☐	☐
d. Has the CMA documented the efforts undertaken for Items 1a-1c, above, and submitted these materials to MTC as an attachment to this Checklist?	☐	☐	☐

PDA Investment and Growth Strategy: Appendix A-8

2. Engage with Regional and Local Jurisdictions	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the CMA developed a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff in developing a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy that supports and encourages development in the county's PDAs?	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the CMA encouraged community participation throughout the development of the Investment and Growth Strategy, consistent with the OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidance (Appendix A-7)?	☐	☐	☐

c.	Has the CMA governing board adopted the final Investment and Growth Strategy?	☐	☐	☐
d.	Has the CMA's staff or consultant designee participated in TAC meetings established through the local jurisdiction's planning processes funded through the regional PDA planning program?	☐	☐	☐
e.	Has the CMA worked with MTC and ABAG staff to confirm that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans?	☐	☐	☐
3.	**Planning Objectives to Inform Project Priorities**	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**
a.	Has the CMA kept itself apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county?	☐	☐	☐
b.	Has the CMA encouraged local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes?	☐	☐	☐
c.	Has the CMA encouraged and supported local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA?			
	1. Has the CMA received and reviewed information submitted to the CMA by ABAG on the progress that local jurisdictions have made in implementing their housing element objectives and identifying current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization?	☐	☐	☐
	2. In all updates of its PDA Investment & Growth Strategy, has the CMA assessed local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assisted local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals?	☐	☐	☐
	3. Using guidance issued by MTC, has the Investment & Growth Strategy fully addressed items in C1 and C2, above?	☐	☐	☐

4. Establishing Local Funding Priorities	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the CMA developed funding guidelines for evaluating OBAG 2 projects that support multi-modal transportation priorities based on connections to housing, jobs and commercial activity and that emphasize the following factors?	☐	☐	☐

1. Projects located in high impact project areas – favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
   a) PDAs taking on significant housing growth (total number of units) in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units;
   b) Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs;
   c) Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.).
2. Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC:
   a) CMAs may also include additional COCs beyond those defined by MTC, such as those defined by the CMAs according to local priorities or Community Based Transportation Plans.

3. PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.
4. Specific scoring methodology for funding allocations to projects in PDAs or TPAs that rewards jurisdictions with the most effective housing anti-displacement policies.
5. Projects that implement the Best Practices identified in the Air District's Planning Healthy Places guidelines, or projects located in jurisdictions that have demonstrated a commitment to adopt, as policies and/or enforceable ordinances, best practices to reduce emissions of and exposure to local air pollution. [1]
6. PDAs that overlap or are co-located with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants, as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure.

b. Has the CMA submitted the documentation for item 4a to MTC as part of this Checklist?			
c. Has the CMA provided a status report on their PDA Investment & Growth Strategy (required two years after the adoption of a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy)?	☐	☐	☐
d. Has the CMA committed to developing a new PDA Investment & Growth Strategy by May 1, 2017 (new PDA required every four years), consistent with the update of the RTP/SCS?	☐	☐	☐

[1] Guidance and maps have been developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff, please see: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/planning-healthy-places.

PDA Policies

5. PDA Minimum Investment Targets	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the CMA met its minimum PDA investment target (70% for Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and 50% for Marin, Napa, Sonoma, and Solano)?	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the CMA defined the term "proximate access," for projects located outside of a PDA that should be counted towards the county's minimum PDA investment target?	☐	☐	☐
c. Has the CMA designated and mapped projects recommended for funding that are not geographically within a PDA but provide "proximate access" to a PDA, along with policy justifications for those determinations, and presented this information for public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG 2 programming decisions?	☐	☐	☐
d. Has the CMA submitted the documentation from items 5a-c, above, to MTC as part of this Checklist?	☐	☐	☐

Project Selection Policies

6. Project Selection	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the CMA documented and submitted the approach used to select OBAG 2 projects including outreach, coordination, and Title VI compliance?	(See 1 & 2)		
b. Has the CMA issued a unified call for projects?	☐	☐	☐
c. Has the CMA submitted a board adopted list of projects to MTC by July 31, 2017?	☐	☐	☐
d. Does the CMA acknowledge that all selected projects must be submitted into MTC's Fund Management System (FMS) along with a Resolution of Local Support no later than August 31, 2017?	☐	☐	☐

e. Does the CMA affirm that the projects recommended for funding meet the following requirements? 1. Are consistent with the current Regional Transportation Plan (Plan Bay Area); 2. Have completed project-specific Complete Streets Checklists;	☐	☐	☐
f. Does the CMA acknowledge the that OBAG 2 funding is subject to MTC's Regional Project Delivery Policy (Resolution No. 3606, or successor resolution) in addition to the following OBAG 2 deadlines? 1. Half of the CMA's OBAG 2 funds, must be obligated by January 31, 2020; and 2. All remaining OBAG 2 funds must be obligated by January 31, 2023.	☐	☐	☐

Performance and Accountability Policies

7. Ensuring Local Compliance	**YES**	**NO**	**N/A**
a. Has the CMA received confirmation that local jurisdictions have met the Performance and Accountability Policies requirements related to Complete Streets, local Housing Elements, surplus lands (general law cities and counties only unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities are subject to the provisions of the State Surplus Land Act), local streets and roads, and transit agency project locations as set forth in pages 18-21 of MTC Resolution 4202? *Note: CMAs can use the Local Jurisdiction OBAG 2 Requirement Checklist to help fulfill this requirement.*	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the CMA affirmed to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance with the requirements of MTC Resolution 4202 prior to programming OBAG 2 funds to its projects in the TIP?	☐	☐	☐

8. Completion of Checklist	YES	NO	N/A
Has the CMA completed all section of this checklist?	☐	☐	☐

If the CMA has checked "NO" or "N/A" to any checklist items, please include which item and a description below as to why the requirement was not met or is considered Not Applicable:

Attachments

- ☐ Documentation of CMA efforts for public outreach, agency coordination, and Title VI compliance (Checklist Items 1, 2).
- ☐ Documentation of CMA compliance with PDA minimum investment targets, including documentation that the information was presented to the public during the decision-making process (Checklist Item 6).

Review and Approval of Checklist

This checklist was prepared by:

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____
Name & Title (print)

_____ _____
Phone Email

This checklist was approved for submission to MTC by:

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____
CMA Executive Director

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) Checklist for Local Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202

Federal Program Covering FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

The intent of this checklist is to delineate the requirements for local jurisdictions included in the OBAG Grant Program (Resolution No. 4202), as adopted by MTC on November 18, 2015. This checklist must be completed by local jurisdictions and submitted to the CMA to certify compliance with the OBAG 2 requirements listed in MTC Resolution No. 4202. MTC will not take action to program projects for a local jurisdiction until the CMA affirms that the jurisdiction has met all requirements included in OBAG 2.

1. Compliance with the Complete Streets Act of 2008	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the jurisdiction met MTC's Complete Street Requirements for OBAG 2 prior to the CMA submitting its program to MTC through either of the following methods? 1. Adopting a Complete Streets resolution incorporating MTC's nine required complete streets elements; or 2. Adopting a significant revision to the General Plan Circulation Element after January 1, 2010 that complies with the California Complete Streets Act of 2008.	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the jurisdiction submitted documentation of compliance with Item a. (copy of adopted resolution or circulation element) to the CMA as part of this Checklist?	☐	☐	☐
c. Has the jurisdiction submitted a Complete Streets Checklist for any project for which the jurisdiction has applied for OBAG 2 funding?	☐	☐	☐

2. Housing Element Certification	YES	NO	N/A
a. Has the jurisdiction's General Plan Housing Element been certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA prior to May 31, 2015? If not, has the jurisdiction's Housing Element been fully certified by HCD by June 30, 2016?	☐	☐	☐
b. Has the jurisdiction submitted the latest Annual Housing Element Report to HCD by April 1, 2016?	☐	☐	☐

c. Does the jurisdiction acknowledge that the Annual Housing Element Report must be submitted to HCD each year through the end of the OBAG 2 program (FY22) in order to be eligible to receive funding?	☐	☐	☐
d. Has the jurisdiction submitted documentation of compliance with Item 2 (copy of certified housing element or annual report, or letter of compliance from HCD) to the CMA as part of this Checklist?	☐	☐	☐

3. Surplus Land Act

a. Has the jurisdiction met MTC's Surplus Land Requirements for OBAG 2 prior to the CMA submitting its program, through adoption of a resolution demonstrating compliance with the State's Surplus Land Act (AB 2135 amended)? Resolution requirement applies only to general law cities and counties unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities must comply with the provisions of this Act.	☐	☐	☐

4. Local Streets and Roads

	YES	NO	N/A
a. Does the jurisdiction have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent) updated at least once every three years (with a one-year extension allowed)?	☐	☐	☐
b. Does the jurisdiction fully participate in the statewide local streets and roads needs assessment survey?	☐	☐	☐
c. Does the jurisdiction provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years (with a one-year grace period allowed)?	☐	☐	☐

5. Projects Sponsored by Other Agencies

	YES	NO	N/A
a. Does the jurisdiction acknowledge that the jurisdiction in which a project is located must comply with OBAG 2 requirements (MTC Resolution No. 4202) in order for any project funded with OBAG 2 funds to be located within the jurisdiction, even if the project is sponsored by an outside agency (such as a transit agency)?	☐	☐	☐

6. Regional Project Delivery Requirements	YES	NO	N/A
a. Does the jurisdiction acknowledge that it must comply with the regional Project Delivery Policy and Guidance requirements (MTC Resolution No. 3606) in the implementation of the project, and that the jurisdiction must identify and maintain a Single Point of Contact for all projects with FHWA-administered funding?	☐	☐	☐

7. Completion of Checklist	YES	NO	N/A
Has the jurisdiction completed all sections of this checklist?	☐	☐	☐

If the jurisdiction has checked "NO" or "N/A" to any of the above questions, please provide an explanation below as to why the requirement was not met or is considered not applicable:

Attachments

- ☐ Documentation of local jurisdiction's compliance with MTC's Complete Streets Requirements, including copy of adopted resolution or circulation element (Checklist Item 1).
- ☐ Documentation of compliance with MTC's Housing Element Requirements, such as a copy of certified housing element or annual report, or a letter of compliance from HCD (Checklist Item 2).
- ☐ Documentation of compliance with the State's Surplus Land Act, such as a copy of the adopted resolution (Checklist Item 3). This requirement applies only to general law cities and counties unless and until a final court decision is rendered that charter cities must comply with the provisions of this Act.

Review and Approval of Checklist

This checklist was prepared by:

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____
Name & Title (print)

_____ _____
Phone Email

This checklist was approved for submission to <INSERT NAME>City/County by:

_____ _____
Signature Date

_____
City Manager/Administrator or designee

Attachment B-1
MTC Resolution No. 4202
OBAG 2 Regional Programs
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
October 2016

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1
Adopted: 11/18/15-C
Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C

OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List

PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE	COUNTY	SPONSOR	TOTAL OBAG 2 STP/CMAQ
OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS			
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES			
Regional Planning	Regionwide	MTC	$9,555,000
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES		**TOTAL:**	**$9,555,000**
2. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM			
Pavement Management Program	Regionwide	MTC	$1,500,000
Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP)	Regionwide	MTC	$7,500,000
Statewide Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Needs Assessment	Regionwide	MTC/Caltrans	$250,000
2. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM		**TOTAL:**	**$9,250,000**
3. PDA PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION			
PDA Planning and Implementation	Regionwide	MTC	$18,500,000
Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Updates	Regionwide	MTC	$1,500,000
3. PDA PLANNING & IMPLEMENTATION		**TOTAL:**	**$20,000,000**
4. CLIMATE INITIATIVES			
Climate Inititiaves Program of Projects	TBD	TBD	$22,000,000
Spare the Air Youth Program	Regionwide	MTC	$1,000,000
4. CLIMATE INITIATIVES		**TOTAL:**	**$23,000,000**
5. REGIONAL ACTIVE OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT			
AOM Implementation	Regionwide	MTC	$22,500,000
511 Next Gen	Regionwide	MTC	$39,000,000
Rideshare	Regionwide	MTC	$10,000,000
Bay Bridge Forward	Regionwide	MTC	
Transbay Higher Capacity Bus Fleet/Increased Service Frequencies	Alameda	AC Transit	$1,200,000
Pilot Transbay Express Bus Routes	Alameda	AC Transit	$800,000
Eastbay Commuter Parking	Alameda	MTC	$1,500,000
Casual Carpool in San Francisco and along I-80	SF/Alameda	MTC	$1,000,000
Transbay Higher Capacity Bus Fleet/Increased Service Frequencies	Contra Costa	WestCat	$2,000,000
~~**Ferry Service Enhancement Pilot (pending exchange)**~~	~~**Various**~~	~~**WETA**~~	~~**$2,500,000**~~
Unprogrammed Balance	***TBD***	***TBD***	**$2,500,000**
Columbus Day Initiative (CDI)	Regionwide	MTC	
Freeway Performance	Regionwide	MTC	$43,500,000
Arterial/Transit Performance	Regionwide	MTC	$18,000,000
Connected Vehicles/Shared Mobility	Regionwide	MTC	$5,000,000
Transportation Management System	Regionwide	MTC	
Field Equipment Devices O&M	Regionwide	MTC	$19,000,000
Incident Management	Regionwide	MTC	$13,000,000
5. REGIONAL ACTIVE OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT		**TOTAL:**	**$179,000,000**
6. TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES			
BART Car Replacement/Expansion	Various	BART	$150,000,000
Clipper	Regionwide	MTC	$20,000,000
Unprogrammed Balance			$19,283,000
6. TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES		**TOTAL:**	**$189,283,000**
7. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)			
Regional Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties PCA Program			
Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties PCA Program	TBD	MTC/CCC	$8,200,000
Local Northbay PCA Program			
Marin PCA Program	Marin	TAM	$2,050,000
Napa PCA Program	Napa	NCTPA	$2,050,000
Solano PCA Program	Solano	STA	$2,050,000

Attachment B-1
MTC Resolution No. 4202
OBAG 2 Regional Programs
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
October 2016

OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List

PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE	COUNTY	SPONSOR	TOTAL OBAG 2 STP/CMAQ
OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS			
Sonoma PCA Program	Sonoma	SCTA	$2,050,000
7. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)		**TOTAL:**	**$16,400,000**
8. LOCAL HOUSING PRODUCTION INCENTIVE			
Local Housing Production Incentive	TBD	TBD	$30,000,000
8. LOCAL HOUSING PRODUCTION INCENTIVE		**TOTAL:**	**$30,000,000**
OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS		**TOTAL:**	**$476,488,000**

Attachment B-2
MTC Resolution No. 4202
OBAG 2 County Programs
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
July 27, 2016

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-2
Adopted: 11/18/15-C
Revised: 07/27/16-C

OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE	COUNTY	SPONSOR	OBAG 2 STP/CMAQ
OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS			
ALAMEDA COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Alameda	ACTC	$5,489,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Alameda	Alameda County	$1,779,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Alameda	ACTC/Various	$5,340,000
TBD	Alameda	TBD	$64,047,000
ALAMEDA COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$76,655,000**
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Contra Costa	CCTA	$4,343,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Contra Costa	Contra Costa County	$1,343,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Contra Costa	CCTA/Various	$4,088,000
TBD	Contra Costa	TBD	$46,362,000
CONTRA COSTA COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$56,136,000**
MARIN COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Marin	TAM	$3,822,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Marin	Marin County	$838,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Marin	TAM/Various	$864,000
TBD	Marin	TBD	$5,346,000
MARIN COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$10,870,000**
NAPA COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Napa	NCTPA	$3,822,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Napa	Napa County	$1,189,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Napa	NCTPA/Various	$515,000
TBD	Napa	TBD	$2,624,000
NAPA COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$8,150,000**
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	San Francisco	SFCTA	$3,998,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	San Francisco	SFCTA/Various	$1,797,000
TBD	San Francisco	TBD	$42,388,000
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$48,183,000**
SAN MATEO COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	San Mateo	CCAG	$3,822,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	San Mateo	San Mateo County	$892,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	San Mateo	CCAG/Various	$2,394,000
TBD	San Mateo	TBD	$25,437,000
SAN MATEO COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$32,545,000**
SANTA CLARA COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Santa Clara	VTA	$6,078,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Santa Clara	Santa Clara County	$1,701,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Santa Clara	VTA/Various	$6,878,000
TBD	Santa Clara	TBD	$89,416,000
SANTA CLARA COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$104,073,000**
SOLANO COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Solano	STA	$3,822,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Solano	Solano County	$1,506,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Solano	STA/Various	$1,469,000
TBD	Solano	TBD	$14,380,000
SOLANO COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$21,177,000**
SONOMA COUNTY			
Specific projects TBD			
Planning Activities Base	Sonoma	SCTA	$3,822,000
Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)	Sonoma	Sonoma County	$3,264,000
Safe Routes To School (SRTS)	Sonoma	SCTA/Various	$1,655,000
TBD	Sonoma	TBD	$18,982,000
SONOMA COUNTY		**TOTAL:**	**$27,723,000**
OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS		**TOTAL:**	**$385,512,000**