

CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM GUIDANCE NEW ACT CYCLE 1 STP/CMAQ

INTRODUCTION

On December 16, 2009 the Commission approved the Cycle 1 Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy (MTC Resolution 3925) which guides the programming of the first three year increment (FY 2009-10, FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12) of federal funding in the Surface Transportation Authorization Act (pending further congressional development and action) and establishes as well an overall framework and funding estimate for the final three years (FY2012-13 through FY2014-2015).

Programming policies also established the CMA Block Grant approach, which delegates program management and project selection to the county congestion management agencies for three programs: the County Transportation for Livable Communities Program, the Regional Bicycle Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. The objective of the block grant is to provide additional flexibility to the CMAs.

The use of this guidance targets congestion management agency staff in order to facilitate the selection of projects, programming of STP/CMAQ funding in the Transportation Improvement Program, and timely use of these funds.

The guidance is structured as follows:

1. General Programming Policies, which apply to all federally funded projects
2. CMA Block Grant Approach
3. CMA Strategic Plan
4. Program Schedule
5. Project Selection Criteria for Each Program
6. MTC Staff Contacts

1. GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

The following programming policies apply to all projects, irrespective of their MTC program origin. The CMAs need to make potential applicants for STP/CMAQ funding aware of these obligations that apply to federal grants:

Project Amendments: The implementing agency or MTC may determine that circumstances may justify changes to the STP/CMAQ programming. These changes, or amendments to these regional programs, are not routine. All proposed changes will be reviewed by MTC staff before the Commission considers any formal actions on program amendments. All changes must follow MTC policies on the Public Involvement Process and Federal Air Quality Procedures and

Conformity Protocol. Changes must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), must not adversely affect the expeditious implementation of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), must not negatively impact the deliverability of other projects in the regional programs, and must not affect the conformity finding in the TIP.

Public Involvement. MTC is committed to a public involvement process that is proactive and provides comprehensive information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for continuing involvement. MTC provides many methods to fulfill this commitment, as outlined in the *MTC Public Participation Plan*, Resolution No. 3821. The Commission's adoption of the STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 program, including policy and procedures meet the provisions of the *MTC Public Participation Plan*. MTC's advisory committees and the Bay Area Partnership have been consulted in the development of funding commitments and policies for this program; and opportunities have been provided to other stakeholders and members to comment.

Furthermore, investments made in the STP/CMAQ 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 asked to select projects for funding at the county level, CMAs must consider equitable solicitation and selection of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements.

Inclusion into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Projects approved as part of the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ program must be amended into the 2009 TIP, or the subsequent 2011 TIP. The federally required TIP is a comprehensive listing of all San Francisco Bay Area 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.

Air Quality Conformity. In the Bay Area, it is the responsibility of MTC to make an air quality conformity determination for the TIP in accordance with federal Clean Air Act requirements and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity regulations. MTC evaluates the impact of the TIP on regional air quality during the biennial update of the TIP. Since the 2009 air quality conformity finding has been completed for the 2009 TIP, no non-exempt projects that were not incorporated in the finding will be considered for funding in the Cycle 1 Program until the development of the 2011 TIP during spring 2010. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for PM 2.5 starting December 14, 2009. Within 12 months of effective date of this classification, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed "Projects of Air Quality Concern" must complete a hot-spot analysis required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally Projects of Air Quality Concern are those projects result in significant increases in the number of or emissions from diesel vehicles. Owing to the nature of the programs funded through the CMA Block Grant, anticipated projects are expected to be exempt from air quality conformity.

Environmental Clearance. Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 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 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with Federal funds.

Application, Resolution of Local Support. Project sponsors/ implementing agencies must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding through MTC's Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) an application submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff and 2) Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor/ implementing agency's governing board or council. A template for the resolution of local support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP_CMAQ_LocalSupportReso.doc A project sponsor will submit the resolution of local support at the same time it requests a revision to the TIP adding its project and/or federal funding. This is done by attaching a pdf version of the adopted resolution to the project record in MTC's Fund Management System (FMS). Sponsors of projects that have previously received STP/CMAQ or State Improvement Program (STIP) funds may rely on the prior Resolution of local support prepared for the same project, provided that the project scope remains unchanged.

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

- ▶ **Federal Project Eligibility:** STP has a wide range of projects that are eligible for consideration in the TIP. Eligible projects include, federal-aid highway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational), mitigation related to an STP project, public transit capital improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, and transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.
- ▶ **CMAQ funding** applies to new or expanded transportation projects, programs, and operations that help reduce emissions. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), public-private partnerships, alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit projects (facilities, vehicles, operating assistance up to three years), bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, Inspection and maintenance programs, magnetic

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

► **MTC Program Eligibility:** MTC staff will review all projects nominated by the CMA for block grants, to ensure that they meet the eligibility requirements of the MTC established programs: Regional Bicycle Program, County TLC Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. Eligibility requirements for these programs are explained later in this guidance.

► **RTP Consistency:** Projects included in the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Program must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), according to federal planning regulations. Each project included in the Cycle 1 Program must identify its relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, and where applicable, the RTP ID number or reference.

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

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine_accommodations.htm

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

► **Regional Project Delivery Policy:** Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ funding is available in the following three fiscal years: FY 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12. Block grant funds are available in the last two years of the program: 2010-11, and 2011-12. CMAs need to program 50% of their block grant funding in each of these years. Some flexibility may be granted conditioned upon the availability of obligation authority (OA). This will be determined through the development of an annual obligation plan, which is developed in concert with the Partnership and project sponsors. Funds designated for each project component will be available for obligation in the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It is therefore very important that projects be ready to proceed in the year programmed. For example, a project that is assigned funds in FY 2010-11 is required to obligate by April 30, 2011. Obligation is defined FHWA's authorization of the funds or FHWA's transfer of funds to Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

All Cycle 1 funding is subject to the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and any subsequent revisions (MTC Resolution No. 3606). Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy, which enforces fund obligation deadlines, and project substitution for STP and CMAQ funds. All funds are subject to award, invoicing and project close out requirements. Project sponsors must sign project supplementary agreements and award construction contracts within six months of obligation; and subsequently request reimbursements every six-twelve months to keep grants active. The failure to meet these deadlines will result in the deobligation of any unexpended fund balances for the project. Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings also will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Delivery Policy which enforces fund obligation deadlines and project substitution for STP and CMAQ funds (MTC Resolution No. 3606).

For specific details on the regional project delivery policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606), its deadlines, and other requirements refer to http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf. It is the responsibility of the implementing agency at the time of programming, to ensure the regional, state and federal deadlines and provisions of the regional project delivery policy can be met.

MTC staff will actively monitor and report the obligation status of projects to the Programming Deliver Working Group (PDWG) of the Bay Area Partnership. The project sponsor is responsible for meeting all funding and delivery requirements and ensuring funds are not de-obligated from the project. Acceptance of funds from the CMA Block Grant Program indicates a project sponsor's acceptance of the federal regulations, state statutes, and regional polices as they pertain to the funding of the project and of the policies set forth in the Cycle 1 Program. The PDWG will monitor project delivery issues as they arise and make recommendations to the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) as necessary.

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

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

► Priority Development Areas (PDA) Based Funding Decisions: In Transportation 2035, the Commission's transportation/land use and climate change policies seek to align

“focused growth” land use principles and transportation investments. As part of the ARRA program adoption in February 2009, the Commission directed staff to begin developing a PDA investment strategy in advance of the new federal authorization. As it relates to the New Act programming under the CMA block grant, the following policies support PDA based funding strategies:

- *Transportation for Livable Communities:* All TLC projects must be located in priority development areas with additional weight given in project evaluation depending on whether the projects are in planned or proposed PDAs and based on proposed development intensity.
- *Rehabilitation – Streets and Roads and Transit:* The current distribution formula prioritizes funding for local jurisdictions that are considered high-intensity PDAs. The allocation formula for streets and roads rehabilitation contains four factors, weighted 25% each, including population, lane mileage, arterial and collector shortfall, and preventive maintenance performance. The population and lane mileage factors result in the support of PDAs. To ensure this PDA emphasis, CMAs should, in general, use the same allocation formula for streets and roads distribution within the counties. The CMAs, through a required Strategic Plan, may propose some modifications, including deferring some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or using local funds, to address the competing objective of adhering to federal grant minimums.

2. CMA BLOCK GRANT APPROACH

Program management responsibilities will generally be split between MTC and the congestion management agencies (CMAs) as outlined in Table 1. MTC management role is limited to program areas of regional scope or with a network impact. Congestion management agencies would manage programs with a local/community focus.

Table 1: Program Administration

Transportation 2035 Core Programs	Manager	Block Grant
Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) and the Regional Signal Timing Program.	MTC, Caltrans and CMAs	
Climate Initiatives (Public Outreach/ Innovative Grants/ Evaluation)	MTC and Bay Area Air Quality Management District	
Climate Initiatives – Safe Routes to School	County – TBD and MTC regional coordination and assistance	
Regional Bicycle Program	CMAs	Yes
Climate Initiatives—Eastern Solano CMAQ	Solano Transportation Authority	
TLC – Regional	MTC	
TLC – County	CMAs	Yes
Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program	CMAs	Yes
Transit Capital Rehabilitation	MTC	

For core programs managed by the CMAs, MTC will be making funding available to the CMAs by means of a CMA block grant” to allow more flexibility and more strategic project selection. The block grant will encompass the Regional Bicycle Program, County TLC Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. Table 2 presents an overview of the funding made available to the CMAs under their block grants. The block grant program will function as follows:

- **Planning Activities:** Up to 4% may be used by CMAs for planning activities to be deducted proportionately from all Block Grant programs within the county. Contract amendments to the Regional Planning agreements in March/April are to capture any augmentations.
- **Flex provision:** Up to 20% of each program’s funds may be flexed from one Block Grant program to fund another in order to recognize practical project delivery considerations and unique county priorities. CMAs can request flexibility beyond the 20% through their Strategic Plan for consideration by the Commission. Before programming Cycle 2 MTC staff will provide a report on how the flex provision was applied for Cycle 1 funds for consideration by the Commission.
- **Minimum Grant Size:** STP/CMAQ grants per project cannot be programmed for less than \$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 1 million (Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma counties). CMAs may request exceptions through the strategic plan process, especially when balancing the objective of using the Local Streets and Road distribution formula. The objective of this requirement is to minimize the number of federal-aid projects, which place administrative burdens on project sponsor, MTC, Caltrans Local Assistance, and Federal Highway Administration

staff. Also for programming purposes, grants need to be rounded to the nearest thousand dollar place value.

- **Unified Call for Projects:** CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects addressing all of their respective Block Grant programs in early 2010. A strategic plan (discussed subsequently) will explain the CMA programming approach in general terms due by April 1, 2010; a final project list is due to MTC by July 30, 2010. The goal is to reduce staff resources, coordinate all programs to respond to larger multi-modal projects, and give project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects. In the case of the County TLC program, final recommendations for the Regional TLC program will be going to the Commission in July 2010; so CMAs may request an additional month to submit County TLC projects to MTC if needed to coordinate their project selection for the County TLC program with the MTC adopted Regional TLC Program.

Table 2: CMA Block Grant Program
(thousands \$)

Counties	Regional Bicycle	County TLC	LS&R Rehab.	County Total	CMA Planning (max. 4%)
Alameda	\$3,836	\$5,962	\$16,550	\$26,348	TBD
Contra Costa	\$2,367	\$4,152	\$10,742	\$17,261	TBD
Marin	\$1,649	\$1,010	\$2,435	\$5,094	TBD
Napa	\$605	\$540	\$1,880	\$3,025	TBD
San Francisco	\$1,368	\$3,115	\$7,745	\$12,228	TBD
San Mateo	\$1,739	\$2,878	\$6,790	\$11,407	TBD
Santa Clara	\$4,638	\$7,121	\$17,233	\$28,992	TBD
Solano	\$1,349	\$1,664	\$6,465	\$9,478	TBD
Sonoma	\$1,949	\$1,891	\$9,160	\$13,000	TBD
Totals	\$19,500	\$28,333	\$79,000	\$126,833	TBD

3. CMA BLOCK GRANT STRATEGIC PLAN

By April 1, 2010, CMAs are asked to submit a Strategic Plan to MTC outlining their approach for programming their block grants as a preliminary step to final project selection by July 30, 2010. This plan is anticipated to summarize a county's overall thinking in a brief and concise way, communicating to MTC a given county's programming goals underlying the use of block grant funds, how the program requirements are being met, and needed flexibility. Specifically the plan is to address the following policies, not exceeding several pages in length:

- Amount of funds for CMA planning purposes and rationale behind any flexing of program amounts within the Block Grant Programs up to the 20% allowed. Examples might include flexibility to deliver on a complete streets approach or deliver investments that better support PDAs. Any request beyond 20% would need to be submitted to the Commission for approval.

- The approach used to select Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program projects, if it differs from the MTC distribution formula. A CMA needs to explain demonstrate that the alternate approach would not divert funds from PDAs within its jurisdiction. For added flexibility CMAs may elect to fund a few large projects, while making sales tax or other funding available to other jurisdictions. CMAs may also use Cycle 2 to defer grants to jurisdictions not receiving funding in Cycle 1.
- Federal Funding Minimums: Unique circumstances or hardships may allow for modifications to this policy, which need to be discussed with MTC staff beforehand and included in the plan. Also for the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program, in order to balance the objectives of streamlining federal fund expenditures through project minimums and the requirement that CMAs should adhere to the distribution formula down to the jurisdiction level, CMAs may propose to defer some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or to use local funds.
- Safe Routes to Schools Program (SR2S) recommended county approach, including lead agency for project selection and federal funding recipient, and any request for additional funding to expand implementation of creative school-related emission reduction strategies. MTC will coordinate the SR2S program, including review and approval of county programs by the Commission. The CMAs are requested to provide assistance in the development of objectives and the definition of agency roles for this program within their respective jurisdictions. These will vary throughout the region and even within a county. There are various lead agencies for current Safe Routes to School programs including bicycle and regional coalitions, departments of health, congestion management agencies, offices of education, and cities. As part of the CMA Block Grant Strategic Plan, the CMA would identify the lead agency for plan implementation, the allocation of funds to specific implementation actions, performance targets, and plan for sustaining the SR2S program beyond the allocation of CMAQ funds. CMAs should also include briefly a description of potential project submittals for the innovative component of the SR2S program (\$2 million), which is regionally competitive. A project solicitation will follow. Please note that this program does not fall under the CMA Grant Program.
- Complete Streets: A CMA should explore giving priority to funding projects that demonstrate a “complete streets” design approach by including pedestrian and/or bicycle projects in the project scope.
- Priority Development Area: The CMA should discuss its consideration of priority development areas and policies in its project selection approach. Information on PDA designations is available at <http://www.bayareavision.org/pda/>

4. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Cycle 1 spans apportionments over three federal fiscal years: FY 2009-10, FY 2010-11, and FY 2011-12. Programming in the first year will generally be for the on-going regional operations and regional planning activities which can be delivered immediately, allowing the region to meet the obligation deadlines for use of FY 2009-10 funds. This strategy, at the same time, provides several months during FY 2009-10 for program managers to select projects and for MTC to program projects into the TIP to be obligated during the remaining second and third years of the Cycle 1 period.

As a starting point, core programs' STP/CMAQ funds will need to be programmed in the TIP and delivered (obligated), 50% of their funds in each of the FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 years. However; a program may potentially deviate from this 50-50 percent split, depending on whether other program funding needs can be offset accordingly, based on other Cycle 1 program requests. Within their block grant programs, CMAs have the flexibility to make this split in a combined fashion for the County TLC and Regional Bicycle programs, which both use CMAQ. In the summer, MTC staff will work all program managers and CMAs to develop a cash flow plan based on these needs prior to the start of Federal Fiscal year 2010-11 (July 30, 2010). Ultimately, all Cycle 1 projects must be delivered (funds obligated) by April 30, 2012.

5. PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EACH PROGRAM

Local Streets and Roads Shortfall (LSRS) Program

General Program Information

MTC is committed to maintaining the regionally important system of state highways and local roads, identified as the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS). To assist jurisdictions with the local streets and roads maintenance, MTC has set aside Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for local streets and roads pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects. State highway rehabilitation and maintenance is to be funded by Caltrans under the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

Local Streets and Project Eligibility

Purpose of Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance Projects. The purpose of pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects is to preserve and extend the service life of an existing facility. This includes work on non-pavement items listed in Table 3, placement of additional pavement surfacing and/or other work necessary to return an existing structure or roadway, including shoulders, to a serviceable condition. Pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance strategies should extend the service life of a facility for a minimum of 5 years. This program does not fund routine maintenance projects.

Pavement Management System. MTC recognizes the importance of having effective pavement management tools available to jurisdictions. MTC's pavement management system, StreetSaver[®], is used by all 109 cities and counties in the Bay Area and the software has been instrumental in accurately establishing the rehabilitation needs of local streets and roads in the region. In addition to providing meaningful estimates on the future financial rehabilitation needs of the local streets and roads, the system also uses decision rules to help jurisdictions determine the most cost effective treatments for rehabilitating a facility.

The proposed projects must be based on the analysis results from an established PMS for a jurisdiction. Local jurisdictions can access their pavement management database at www.streetsaveronline.com. The sponsoring agency must have a certified Pavement Management System (PMS), MTC's or equivalent, for submitting rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status. A list of jurisdiction certification status can be found at www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html.

Project Eligibility. The LSRS Shortfall Program funding is reserved for pavement rehabilitation and preventative maintenance projects located on the Federal-Aid System. Capacity-expansion projects, right of way purchases, channelization, routine maintenance, spot application, seismic retrofit, and structural repair on bridges are not eligible activities. Non-pavement enhancements, such as streetscape projects and new traffic calming features, are also not eligible for this program. Generally, the non-pavement activities and projects are replacement of features that currently exist on the roadway facility. Refer to Table 3 for a list of eligible non-pavement project types.

Federal-Aid Eligible Facilities. All public roads functionally classified above rural minor collector are eligible for STP funding. The functional classification system for roadway facilities is further separated between urban and rural classification systems to reflect the fundamentally different travel characteristics of these two classes.

The urban functional classification system is hierarchically represented by four functional categories: 1) principal arterials, 2) minor arterials, 3) collector streets, and 4) local streets. Projects located on facilities classified as collector streets and above are eligible for funding in the urban system. Projects located on a facility classified as a local street in the urban functional classification is not eligible for funding.

The rural functional classification system is separated into five categories: 1) principal arterials, 2) minor arterials, 3) major collectors, 4) minor collectors, and 5) local streets. For facilities in the rural classification system, projects located on major collectors and above are eligible for funding. Projects located on facilities classified as minor collectors and local streets are not eligible for funding.

Caltrans maintains a database of the functional classifications for a majority of the roadways in California. For a general description of the functional classification system, please see http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/func_clas.html. The California Road System (CRS) maps are accessible online at http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/crs_maps/index.php. For more information, please contact Malcolm Gilmour, District 4 Caltrans, at (510) 286-5553 for a functional classification change or verification of a particular roadway.

County Funding Targets

LSRS Program Fund Distribution: Under the Cycle 1 Program, \$79 million is available for the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall (LSRS) Program. Table 4 establishes funding targets for each jurisdiction to program local streets and roads projects. The Cycle 1 round of the local streets and roads rehabilitation program distributes funding to counties based on a performance-based formula that was developed and approved by the LS&R Working Group and the Partnership Board. The allocation formula contains four factors:

Weight	Factor
25%	Population
25%	Arterial and Collector Lane Mileage
25%	Arterial and Collector Shortfall

25%	Preventive Maintenance Performance
-----	------------------------------------

A distribution share is calculated for each jurisdiction using the four factors described above and the funding shares for all jurisdictions are summed at the county level for final distribution by the county congestion management agencies (CMA).

The distribution formula prioritizes funding for local jurisdictions that are considered high-intensity PDAs. The allocation formula for streets and roads rehabilitation contains four factors, weighted 25% each, including population, lane mileage, arterial and collector shortfall, and preventive maintenance performance. The population and lane mileage factors result in the support of PDAs. To ensure this PDA emphasis, CMAs should generally use the same allocation formula for streets and roads distribution within the counties. The CMAs, through a required Strategic Plan, may propose some modifications, including deferring some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or using local funds, to address the competing objective of adhering to federal grant minimums.

Table 3
Pavement Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance Projects
Eligible Project Costs

Category: Pavement Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance

- | |
|--|
| <p>A. Material cost</p> <p>B. Labor cost</p> <p>C. Rental equipment costs related to the project</p> <p>D. Pavement striping costs</p> <p>E. Replacement of loop detectors</p> <p>F. Necessary incidental repairs required by the roadway improvement (such as repairs/replacement of storm drains, culverts, drainage channels, curb & gutter, driveway conforms)</p> <p>G. Staff costs</p> <p>H. Project design costs</p> <p>I. Construction engineering/management costs (up to 15% of construction cost)</p> <p>J. Contract procurement and advertising costs</p> <p>K. Adjustment of storm drain manholes/survey monuments/storm water inlets/utility covers and boxes</p> <p>L. Traffic control at project site</p> <p>M. Dust control measures</p> <p>N. Erosion control measures</p> <p>O. Repairs to shoulders</p> <p>P. Mobilization costs</p> |
|--|

Non-Pavement Rehabilitation Project Types

- | |
|--|
| <p>1. Minor Structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drainage –headwalls, CMP, etc • Retaining walls • Storm damage (slope protection, slide repair) <p>2. ADA compliance – (ramps)</p> <p>3. NPDES / Permits</p> <p>4. Traffic Safety – Signs, signals, striping, etc</p> <p>5. Bike path – Class II / III only</p> <p>6. Pedestrian – Sidewalks</p> |
|--|

Table 4
Cycle 1 Local Streets & Roads (LS&R) Shortfall Program Fund Distribution

(For programming purposes, CMAs need to refer to Table 2 for rounded target amounts)

ALAMEDA COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Alameda	\$ 1,167,832
Alameda	\$ 872,194
Albany	\$ 122,023
Berkeley	\$ 994,629
Dublin	\$ 570,036
Emeryville	\$ 135,621
Fremont	\$ 3,028,368
Hayward	\$ 1,391,442
Livermore	\$ 1,070,502
Newark	\$ 710,725
Oakland	\$ 3,768,142
Piedmont	\$ 69,746
Pleasanton	\$ 912,261
San Leandro	\$ 840,217
Union City	\$ 896,412
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 16,550,149

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Contra Costa	\$ 1,608,148
Antioch	\$ 1,021,185
Brentwood	\$ 440,501
Clayton	\$ 152,858
Concord	\$ 1,149,694
Danville	\$ 369,404
El Cerrito	\$ 249,814
Hercules	\$ 278,080
Lafayette	\$ 231,129
Martinez	\$ 404,618
Moraga	\$ 280,677
Oakley	\$ 408,325
Orinda	\$ 218,486
Pinole	\$ 179,376
Pittsburg	\$ 454,372
Pleasant Hill	\$ 316,734
Richmond	\$ 1,362,912
San Pablo	\$ 180,159
San Ramon	\$ 441,969
Walnut Creek	\$ 993,717
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 10,742,158

MARIN COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Marin	\$ 873,788
Belvedere	\$ 23,556
Corte Madera	\$ 74,214
Fairfax	\$ 63,840
Larkspur	\$ 76,244
Mill Valley	\$ 128,163
Novato	\$ 371,718
Ross	\$ 19,390
San Anselmo	\$ 108,142
San Rafael	\$ 540,115
Sausalito	\$ 81,513
Tiburon	\$ 74,219
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 2,434,904

NAPA COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Napa	\$ 548,047
American Canyon	\$ 202,930
Calistoga	\$ 46,553
Napa	\$ 970,989
St. Helena	\$ 94,985
Yountville	\$ 16,489
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 1,879,992

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
San Francisco	\$ 7,745,198
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 7,745,198

SAN MATEO COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of San Mateo	\$ 650,090
Atherton	\$ 98,193
Belmont	\$ 276,426
Brisbane	\$ 76,353
Burlingame	\$ 310,836
Colma	\$ 31,863
Daly City	\$ 835,767
East Palo Alto	\$ 266,321
Foster City	\$ 200,296
Half Moon Bay	\$ 78,404
Hillsborough	\$ 176,757
Menlo Park	\$ 250,119
Millbrae	\$ 242,031
Pacifica	\$ 400,648
Portola Valley	\$ 103,135
Redwood City	\$ 668,428
San Bruno	\$ 390,507
San Carlos	\$ 199,706
San Mateo	\$ 748,813
So. San Francisco	\$ 688,301
Woodside	\$ 97,202
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 6,790,197

SANTA CLARA COUNTY*

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Santa Clara	\$ 1,756,931
Campbell	\$ 334,650
Cupertino	\$ 450,383
Gilroy	\$ 640,094
Los Altos	\$ 269,959
Los Altos Hills	\$ 98,166
Los Gatos	\$ 298,800
Milpitas	\$ 692,347
Monte Sereno	\$ 31,120
Morgan Hill	\$ 477,228
Mountain View	\$ 552,215
Palo Alto	\$ 572,327
San Jose	\$ 8,319,770
Santa Clara	\$ 1,211,962
Saratoga	\$ 336,183
Sunnyvale	\$ 1,191,206
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 17,233,340

SOLANO COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Solano	\$ 1,067,867
Benicia	\$ 301,570
Dixon	\$ 229,739
Fairfield	\$ 1,433,558
Rio Vista	\$ 89,091
Suisun City	\$ 457,586
Vacaville	\$ 1,216,032
Vallejo	\$ 1,669,077
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 6,464,521

SONOMA COUNTY

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Sonoma	\$ 4,769,815
Cloverdale	\$ 56,626
Cotati	\$ 89,045
Healdsburg	\$ 177,125
Petaluma	\$ 1,015,233
Rohnert Park	\$ 534,215
Santa Rosa	\$ 2,032,465
Sebastopol	\$ 76,593
Sonoma	\$ 69,189
Windsor	\$ 339,235
COUNTY TOTAL	\$ 9,159,541

BAY AREA SHARES

Jurisdiction	Total Share	% Share
Alameda	16,550,149	20.9%
Contra Costa	10,742,158	13.6%
Marin	2,434,904	3.1%
Napa	1,879,992	2.4%
San Francisco	7,745,198	9.8%
San Mateo	6,790,197	8.6%
Santa Clara	17,233,340	21.8%
Solano	6,464,521	8.2%
Sonoma	9,159,541	11.6%
Total	79,000,000	100.0%

*In the case of Santa Clara County additional flexibility shall be given with respect to the distribution formula. Specifically, the CMA needs to work with the County of Santa Clara in distributing the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program funds to account for the Santa Clara County expressway system.

REGIONAL BICYCLE PROGRAM

General Program Information

The Regional Bikeway Network (RBN) was developed in 2001 to define bicycling corridors of regional significance. The network includes high priority projects in county or local bicycle plans that fulfilled the criteria to provide connectivity to transit as well as major activity centers.

Transportation 2035 identifies an investment of \$1 billion over 25-years to complete the 2,100 mile long network. This funding will complete all bikeway facilities in every county with the exception of bicycle access over the three bridges (Richmond/San Rafael, San Francisco/Oakland Bay west span and San Mateo/Hayward) where no bicycle access currently exists.

Under the New Act STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 Program, \$19,500,000 has been made available to CMAs under the Block Grant Program to fund bicycle improvements.

Project Eligibility Criteria

Projects selection to be funded with Regional Bicycle Program funds must meet the following eligibility criteria

1. Projects eligible for funding must be part of the Regional Bikeway Network as outlined in the Regional Bicycle Plan (2009 Update) or as incorporated into the network through the update process described below. Eligible projects are capital in nature, resulting in additional bicycle route mileage.
2. Note that Federal guidelines prohibit the use of CMAQ funds for projects purely intended for safety, recreational bicycle trails, as well as for basic repair and rehabilitation of bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition projects funded with CMAQ may not limit public access to the facility. The facility is to allow bicycle and pedestrian access 24 hours per day 7 days a week to maximize air quality improvements and the reduction of emissions.
3. As a general guideline, auxiliary elements (e.g. ADA access improvements, utility trenching, drainage work, fire hydrants, landscaping, cosmetic resurfacing, surface improvements, etc.) that are incidental to the overall project should not exceed 20% of the total project cost. Signage designating a bicycle or pedestrian facility is not considered auxiliary elements for this program. Exceptions may be allowed at the discretion of the CMA.

Flexibility to Accommodate Funding Requests Not Currently on the Network

In the event that a MTC is interested providing a Regional Bicycle Program grant to a project supported by local planning, which has not been previously incorporated into the Regional Bicycle Network, flexibility will be provided. MTC will consider CMA requests to add projects that projects to the Regional Bikeway Network to make projects eligible for program funding through the following process:

- a) Submitted projects must meet at least one of the three network criteria (Table 5) as part of a regional destination, regional connection or regional route.

- b) A countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee (BPACs) (and if desired other committees with bicycle and pedestrian interests) must review the projects submitted to MTC for consideration for inclusion on the network.
- c) The Regional Bicycle Working Group must evaluate and recommend to staff which projects are included on the network. Staff will approve projects to be amended on the network.
- d) Any new projects submitted to the network will be indentified for inclusion in the next update to the Regional Bikeway Network prior to the next Regional Transportation Plan update. It is expected that Cycle 2 will be programmed after the RTP update and at that time we will decide whether to require a substitution process to constrain the network to the current cost estimates or to allow the network to grow in both mileage and costs

Table 5: Regional Bikeways Criteria

<p>1. Regional Destinations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create connections to the regional transit system – including transit centers and ferry terminals (including BART stations, light rail stations, significant bus stops, airports and commuter rail) – from the four directions surrounding each station. • Provide access to and through the major central business districts of the region or sub region. • Establish connections to regionally significant activity centers, including selected commercial districts, universities and community colleges, hospitals, regional parks, and recreational venues. <p>2. Regional Connections</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selected connections across county lines. • Selected connections across barriers created by the regional transportation system (e.g., freeways, interchanges, railroads) and natural barriers (e.g., rivers, creeks and bays.) • Within current or planned Priority Development Areas (PDAs) <p>3. Regional Routes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Francisco Bay Trail. • Other regional bicycle routes that serve multiple jurisdictions or connect to adjoining regions (e.g., Iron Horse Trail, Pacific Coast Bikeway, SMART corridor).
--

County Funding Targets

Under New Act Cycle 1, \$19.5 million is available for the projects on the Regional Bikeway Network. Table 6 shows the distribution per county to program bicycle projects, based on a formula and adjusted to reflect funds owed to counties from the previous cycle of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. Details follow below:

Table 6
Regional Bicycle Program (RBP) Cycle 1 Fund Distribution
(thousands \$)

County	CMAQ Funds
Alameda	\$3,836
Contra Costa	\$2,367
Marin	\$1,649
Napa	\$605
San Francisco	\$1,368
San Mateo	\$1,739
Santa Clara	\$4,638
Solano	\$1,349
Sonoma	\$1,949
Totals	\$19,500

The performance based formula in Table 7 was developed in conjunction with the Regional Bicycle Working Group, P&D Working Group and the CMAs. The formula is comprised of the following factors:

Table 7 Formula for Regional Bicycle Program

Weight	Factor
25%	Costs of bikeway network
25%	Miles of bikeways
50%	Population share

Adjustment to Reconcile Population Share Guarantees from MTC Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program under SAFETEA-LU

The Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Program, guided by the *Transportation 2030 Plan* and funded under SAFETEA-LU, included \$32 million over six years divided up into two portions: 25% of the total funds towards a regionally competitive program (\$8 million) and the remaining 75% of the funds designated to the counties (\$24 million) based on their population share. All of these funds have been programmed. MTC Resolutions 3615, 3644 and 3625 call for all counties to receive their population share of the regional share (\$8 million) over twelve years. Due to the program's competitive nature, the mix of projects selected under the regional program resulted in over-programming to three counties by a total of \$1.8 million more than their population shares and under-programming to the remaining counties relative to their population shares.

Counties will be credited and debited their share from the previous program in the New Act bicycle program. \$1.8 million will be split between Cycle 1 and 2 off the top and be used to repay each of the six counties the amount it was under funded in the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program. A total of \$919 thousand will be deducted from Cycle 1; the remaining \$18.5 million would be allocated to each county by the formula adopted for the new Regional Bicycle Program.

County Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)

General Program Information

For the past ten years, the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program has served as one of the Bay Area's primary tools for fostering smart growth. By promoting compact, mixed-use development in existing communities, smart growth aims to accommodate a growing population by providing housing options, and reduced automobile dependency, while protecting open space and agricultural resources.

In September 2009, staff presented several recommendations to MTC's Planning Committee for the next TLC funding cycle. These recommendations were based on (1) the results of a program evaluation beginning in summer 2007, which included a review of completed TLC Planning, Housing Incentive Program (HIP), and the TLC Capital grants, and (2) a white paper completed by Reconnecting America's Center for Transit Oriented Development (CTOD). The white paper detailed various options and strategies for financing transit-oriented development in the Bay Area, and made several recommendations for revising the TLC program, including creating a flexible financing program that responds to different market conditions within the region.

The four elements for the regional TLC program framework approved by the Planning Committee include:

1. Incentivize development in Priority Development Areas (PDA)
2. Increase maximum grant size to \$6 million, no grant minimum.
3. Expand eligible program categories
4. Establish Regional/County shares – 2/3 regional, 1/3 local

County Funding Targets

As mentioned above, MTC's Planning Committee approved 2/3 of the funds to be administered through the regional TLC Program, and 1/3 to be administered through the county programs. For Cycle 1, in December 2009, the Commission approved a total of \$85 million for the TLC program. \$56.7 million will be allocated to the region (2/3), while \$28.3 million will be allocated to the counties (1/3) based on population. The County TLC fund distribution to the county congestion management is shown in Table 8.

Table 8: County TLC Fund Distribution

(\$ in thousands)

Estimated Cost of Program	2007 Population	Percentage	Fund Distribution
Regional TLC Program			
Competitive	6,958,473		\$56,667
Regional TLC Program Subtotal			\$56,667
County TLC Program			
Alameda	1,464,202	21.0%	\$5,962
Contra Costa	1,019,640	14.7%	\$4,152
Marin	248,096	3.6%	\$1,010
Napa	132,565	1.9%	\$540
San Francisco	764,976	11.0%	\$3,115
San Mateo	706,984	10.2%	\$2,878
Santa Clara	1,748,976	25.1%	\$7,121
Solano	408,599	5.9%	\$1,664
Sonoma	464,435	6.7%	\$1,891
County TLC Program Subtotal	6,958,473	100.0%	\$28,333
Grand Total			
			\$85,000

Project Eligibility Criteria

Consistent with the Planning Committee action in September, county TLC funds must be invested in FOCUS PDAs. MTC staff is encouraging CMAs to use the Commission-approved scoring criteria or similar to it. CMAs have the flexibility to set their own grant limits consistent with the PDA block grant approach adopted by the Commission in December 2009.

In September 2009, the Commission approved a 20% match for both the regional and county TLC programs. Local match, in conjunction with the scoring criteria, was revisited at the January 2010 Planning Committee. The Commission is scheduled to act on both the final scoring criteria and match requirement at their January 27 meeting. A copy of the proposed criteria and accompanying memo will be available at your January 22 meeting.

MTC PROGRAM CONTACTS

For further assistance, please contact the following MTC Staff:

General Cycle 1 Programming Requirements and CMA Block Grant Administration
Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program:

Craig Goldblatt **cgoldblatt@mtc.ca.gov** **(510) 817-5837**

Pavement Management System and Federal-Aid Classification System Requirements:

Sui Tan **stan@mtc.ca.gov** **(510) 817-5844**

Regional Bicycle Program:

Sean Co **sco@mtc.ca.gov** **(510) 817-5748**

County Transportation for Livable Communities Program
Priority Development Areas:

Doug Johnson **djohnson@mtc.ca.gov** **(510) 817-5846**

TIP Revisions and the Online FMS Application Process:

Sri Srinivasan **ssrinivasan@mtc.ca.gov** **(510) 817-5793**

CMA BLOCK GRANT PROJECT SELECTION AND TIP REVISION SCHEDULE

Deadlines	Actions
March 31, 2010	Last day to submit new exempt projects for the current TIP for the last 2009 formal TIP amendment.
April 1, 2010	Submit CMA Block Grant Strategic Plan to MTC
May 28, 2010	Last day to submit changes to current TIP for final 2009 TIP Administrative Action. (new projects not permitted)
July 30, 2010 ^a	Submit final project lists to MTC using provided template to MTC. Projects subsequently added to Draft 2011 TIP Update allowing Caltrans to begin field reviews and other non-reimbursable activities.
August 30, 2010	Submit projects through FMS to MTC
October 27, 2010	Final 2011 TIP Approved by Commission
December 14, 2010	Anticipated FHWA/FTA approval of the 2011 TIP. Projects programmed in FY 2011 may be granted E-76s
February 1, 2011 ^b	Obligation/ FTA transfer request submittal to Caltrans for projects programmed in FY 2011
April 30, 2011 ^b	Obligation/ Transfer to FTA for projects programmed in FY 2011
May 1, 2011 ^b	Unobligated funds are available to other regions/projects on first-come first-serve basis until obligation authority runs out. Projects programmed in FY 2012 may be advanced at sponsor's discretion
August 30, 2011 ^b	End of federal fiscal year—OA no longer available. Unobligated funds lost to projects programmed in FY 2011

Notes:

^a To coordinate CMA selections with the Regional TLC Program project selection, the CMA may submit an updated County TLC program project list through August 30, 2010, only after submitting an initial draft project list no later than July 30, 2010. The next opportunity to submit a revision to the TIP to add CMA block grant projects is no later than December 31, 2010 with final approval anticipated by January 31, 2011.

^b Obligation information pertains to projects funded in FY 2011. For projects funded in FY 2012, delay deadlines by one year. Refer to Resolution 3606 for a complete list of project delivery deadlines and requirements.



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Commission

DATE: January 20, 2010

FR: Executive Director

W. I.: 1611

RE: Revised Transportation for Livable Communities Scoring Criteria

The Planning Committee has referred to the Commission for approval the scoring criteria for the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program with certain revisions and clarifications that are identified in underlined text in Attachment A.

The Committee also discussed a suggestion from Commissioner Bates that, given current economic difficulties, local jurisdictions will have difficulty meeting the 20% local match requirement approved by the Committee in September. The Planning Committee did not support this change, but requested additional information about fund sources that could be used as local match.

Potential Sources of Funds for Local Match

In April 2008 staff completed an evaluation of the TLC program results since 1998. This evaluation determined that jurisdictions have used a variety of sources to meet the local match requirements and that the average local match contribution was over 70%. As part of the study, local jurisdictions were asked about the source of local matching funds. The following is a breakdown of funding sources as a percent of all projects funded, all of which can be used to meet the 20% requirement:

- 46% used **state or other local funds** (i.e. State Transportation Improvement Program, local bond measures, State Surplus Property Authority Disposition funds, city Capital Improvement Programs)
- 45% used **redevelopment funds**
- 36% used **private equity** (i.e. developer funds/fees)
- 32% used **city general funds**
- 21% used **other MTC grant programs**
- 11% used **Congestion Management Agency grant funding**
- 9% used **Business Improvement District funds**

In-Kind Funds for Local Match

Staff researched whether in-kind costs, particularly staffing costs, are eligible as the local match to federal funds. Based on information from both Caltrans and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), this source of in-kind match is possible under very limited circumstances and would

require pre-approval by Caltrans and FHWA. Therefore, if a local jurisdiction is interested in pursuing this option, the jurisdiction would need to work with MTC staff to preview the proposal with Caltrans and FHWA. This will be clearly spelled out in the program application.

Other Federal Funds as Match

Staff also researched whether other federal funds can be used as local match, as this is typically not allowable under Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA) funding. Staff found only a handful of funding sources that are eligible - the most applicable to the TLC program being HUD's Community Development Block Grant funds.

The project application and guidance to local jurisdictions will include the information summarized above.

Recommendation

Staff requests that the Commission approve the TLC scoring criteria (Attachment A) as referred by the Planning Committee.

Steve Heminger

Attachment A: Proposed Regional TLC Scoring Criteria

TLC Scoring Criteria	Points Available	% of Total Points Available
<p>(A) Location of project in <i>planned</i> PDA</p> <p>High-impact <i>potential</i> PDAs with a specific or precise plan underway will be awarded 10 points.</p>	20	13%
<p>(B) Project Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing in proximity to essential services (shopping, medical, schools, etc.). Demonstrated ability of the project area to help meet current RHNA allocation (as percentage and total number of units). Extent to which project area exceeds standards for affordable housing. • <u>Jobs in proximity to housing and transit</u> • Evidence of California Department of Housing and Community Development-certified housing element by close of application period. • Extent to which project area improves transportation choices for all income levels – i.e. produces fewer vehicle trips/VMT, increases current/future transit ridership and reduces walking distance to transit, shops and services (mixed-use development) • Consistency with TLC design guidelines 	<p>20</p> <p><u>10</u></p> <p>5</p> <p>20</p> <p>15</p>	45%
<p>(C) Community Engagement: Extent to which local community has been engaged in planning processes and <u>project development and extent to which any community opposition has been addressed or negotiated.</u></p>	<u>5</u>	3%
<p>(D) <u>Neighborhood</u> Parking Policies: Extent to which project area incorporates innovative parking management strategies, such as pricing, unbundling/cash-out, shared parking, shuttles, car-sharing, TransLink® for TOD/EcoPass.</p> <p>If requesting funds for parking structures, project sponsors must have completed an analysis of the costs and benefits of the parking structure using parking management strategies, noted above, or other locally appropriate TDM <u>strategies</u>. Funding of parking structures requires implementation of best practices parking strategies/TDM <u>strategies</u>, to be developed in concert with MTC.</p>	10	6%
<p>(E) Accessibility: Extent to which project area exhibits design guidelines that <u>address the needs of the growing elderly and disabled population</u> that go beyond ADA access standards <u>and comply with federal Fair Housing standards</u>, including both habitability of housing units, <u>including townhomes</u> (universal design) in the project area and path of access to/from transit and TOD housing and local essential services</p>	10	6%
<p>(F) Supplemental Greenhouse Gas Reduction: Extent to which project area minimizes the environmental footprint and incorporates green building practices, <u>such as LEED and GreenPoint standards.</u></p>	10	6%
<p>(G) Amount of local matching funds committed to the project.</p>	10	6%
<p>(H) Project Readiness (<u>based on project type</u>): 35% construction drawings, completed feasibility studies, <u>secured entitlements and permits (where applicable)</u>, and project delivery capacity. <u>MTC will assist in identifying and overcoming interagency coordination challenges.</u></p>	20	13%
TOTAL	155	100%

Regional TLC Design Guidance for Streetscapes:

The Regional TLC Capital Program design guidelines aim to address all transit modes of transportation, giving non-motorized users of the street an alternative to automobile travel and access to transit. In June 2006, the MTC Commission adopted regional policies for the accommodation of non-motorized travelers. MTC Resolution No. 3765 (Routine Accommodations aka Complete Streets) called for creation and implementation of a checklist that promotes the routine accommodation of non-motorized travelers in project planning and design. Partner agencies will complete this checklist prior to submitting projects to MTC. The following is a link to the checklist:

http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine_accommodations.htm

Additionally, in September 2008, AB 1358 a Complete Streets Policy was adopted by the state. The design of the street should accommodate all modes of travel and improve access to transit, particularly for pedestrians, elderly and disabled persons, bicyclists as well as motorists.

The following section utilizes Context Sensitive Design Solutions and sets design recommendations for the Regional TLC Program. This guidance suggests ranges (minimum and maximums) and the best practices to strive for. Projects will be evaluated for how well the project addresses these elements. Project design must comply as well with the following State and Federal Statues: Title 24, CEQA, NEPA and ADA.

Street Design Guideline	Min	Max	Best Practice	Comments	Source
Travel Lane Width	9.5ft	12ft	10ft or 11ft curb lane with transit, or shared curb lane for bicyclist with on street parallel parking.	Avoid conflicts with pedestrians, provide access for bicyclist. Check with transit provider to make sure lane width is adequate.	ITE
Bicycle Lane Width (Class II)	5ft	7ft	6ft including 4ft clear width from gutter pan seam. 7ft if ample ROW	Utilize sharrows if ROW constrained.	ITE
Sharrows (Class III)	11ft	14ft	14ft shared curb lane	Use only on streets with on street parallel parking. Use only if ROW cannot accommodate Class II bike lanes.	AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities p. 17
Medians	2-3ft	22ft	16ft min. at intersection with turn lane pocket and Pedestrian Refuge or 2ft without (3ft. with plantings).	Most appropriate if ROW accommodates all modes of travel and utilizes a Ped. Refuge, if crossing distance exceeds 60ft.	ITE

On Street Parking	7ft	8ft	8ft wide, 9ft wide if ROW permits.	Prefer wider to avoid bike lane conflict (door zone)	ITE
Mid Block Crossings	-	-	-	Use in areas with high pedestrian volume where space between intersection pedestrian crossings exceed 400ft.	ITE
Pedestrian Refuge Island	6ft	22ft	8ft wide	Most appropriate when used with medians where crossing distance exceeds 60ft.	ITE
Mid Block Bus Stops	-	-	Used in conjunction with mid block crosswalks.	Check with local transit provider. Use at major activity generators and signalized mid block crossings. Consolidate stops when possible.	ITE
Pedestrian Scaled Lighting (Height)	8ft	14ft	10-12ft tall	.5 to 2.0 foot candle coverage desired. Space between street trees 25-30ft o.c.	VTA CDT Best Practices
Sidewalk Width	5ft	-	12ft. or wider	Must comply with Title 24, ADA guidelines.	MTC
Street Trees	15ft. o.c.	35ft o.c.	25-30ft on center spacing	Use species with non invasive roots. Use tree grates where appropriate. 5x5 or 4x6 ft tree well or larger preferred.	Creating Livable Streets Metro
Sidewalk Planters	-	-	Maximize where feasible while preserving space for street furniture and bike racks.	Storm Water Mitigation. See below.	Creating Livable Streets Metro
Street Planters	-	-	Maximize where feasible	Between parking and at intersections as part of bulb out.	Creating Livable Streets Metro
Street Furniture and Fixtures	-	-	-	Provide benches, newspaper racks, bus shelters, trash and recycling bins as needed or required. Apply CSS Design Principles.	VTA CDT Best Practices
Bike Racks/Storage	300ft	50ft	100ft.	Install in Furniture Zone of sidewalk, clear of curb and any on-street parking. Avoid conflicts with bus stops.	John Brazil, Bike Planner, San Jose
Vehicle Speed	15mph	30mph	25 mph	Within project boundaries.	

Intersection Guidelines	Min	Max	Best Practice	Comments	Source
Curb Return Radii	5ft	10ft to 15ft	5' radius in urban areas with no turns,10-15ft radius in areas with high pedestrian traffic and predominately passenger vehicles	Minimize curb return radii to slow speed of turning vehicles and to shorten pedestrian crossing distance. May need to be wider to accommodate buses.	ITE
Audible Signals	-	-	Install at busy intersections	At all crosswalks.	SFMTA
Pedestrian Treatments at Intersections	-	-	Crosswalks at all intersection legs.	Provide high visibility crosswalks at all legs of an intersection, within project area.	
Curb Extensions (Bulb Outs)	6ft	8ft	7ft	Utilize to minimize crossing distances and calm traffic.	ITE
Bike Lane Treatment at Intersections	-	-	-	Bike lane should stop at cross walk or stop bar, in large intersections left turn lane treatment may be applied within intersection.	CA MUCTD P 9C-1
Bus Stops at Intersections	-	-	Far Side Stops	Near or Far Side Stops, connect with other major routes. Provide bus shelters if ROW allows. Check with transit provider.	ITE
Bus Bulb out	40ft.	60ft.	55ft.	At bus stop locations use in place of curb extensions. Check with transit provider.	AC Transit
Storm Water Management	Min	Max	Best Practice	Comments	Source
Minimize run-off	-	-	-	Contain storm water on site	“
Street Trees	15ft	30ft	Less than 30ft on center spacing.		“
Rain Gardens/ Street Planters	-	-	-	Maximize planting areas on street and sidewalks.	“
Permeable Paving Materials	-	-	-	Use on sidewalks were planters are not feasible and in parking areas.	“

Median Bio Filtration Swale	12ft wide			Should be at least 250ft long.	“
Urban Paths	Min	Max	Best Practice	Comments	Source
Class 1 Bike/Ped. Multi-Use Path	10ft	14ft	12ft wide paved path, 6ft ea. direction, 2ft shoulder for walkers	Must comply with ADA and should be lighted during winter months. 5% max. slope.	SF Bay Trail Design Guidelines

***Sources**

ITE- Institute of Transportation Engineers and the Congress for New Urbanism’s (CNU) “Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities-ITE Recommended Practices” <http://ite.org/bookstore/RP036.pdf>

AASHTO- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 1999 Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, p. 17 http://www.sccrtc.org/bikes/AASHTO_1999_BikeBook.pdf

CA MUCTD- Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices, 2003 California Supplement, Part 9, Traffic Controls for Bicycle Facilities, P 9C-1

Creating Livable Streets- June 2002, Street Design Guidelines, Metro (Portland, OR)

San Mateo County Sustainable Green Streets and Parking Lots Design Guidebook, First Edition: January 2009 http://www.flowstobay.org/ms_sustainable_streets.php

Green Streets- June 2002, Innovative Solutions for Stormwater and Stream Crossings, Metro (Portland, OR)

John Brazil, Bike Planner, City of San Jose, Contact: John.Brazil@sanjoseca.gov

VTA CDT Best Practices- 2003 Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority-Community Design and Transportation, A Manual for the Best Practices for Integrating Transportation and Land Use

MEMO

To: County Congestion Management Agencies

From: MTC and ABAG Planning Staff

Date: January 22, 2010

RE: Priority Development Areas and CMA Block Grants

This memo answers questions about Priority Development Areas relative to the CMA Block Grant program.

What are Priority Development Areas?

Priority Development Areas (PDAs) are locally-identified, infill development opportunity areas. They are generally areas of at least 100 acres where there is local commitment to developing more housing along with amenities and services to meet the day-to-day needs of residents in a pedestrian-friendly environment served by transit. Cities, Counties, and CMAs nominate PDAs and they are adopted by ABAG's Executive Board. To be eligible to become a PDA, an area must be within an existing community, near existing or planned fixed transit or served by comparable bus service, and planned for more housing. The process is incentive-based and is a way to integrate land use and transportation planning.

Where are the PDAs?

Over 100 PDAs have been adopted in nearly 60 jurisdictions. The areas include most of the places in the Bay Area served by fixed transit, major bus corridors, or planned transit under MTC's Resolution 3434. Together, these areas comprise about 115,000 acres of urban and suburban land, less than 5 percent of the Bay Area's total land area. However, the proposed PDAs could accommodate over half of the Bay Area's projected housing growth to the year 2035, mostly at relatively moderate densities.

What is a Potential PDA?

Potential PDAs are areas that have applied for PDA status, but that have not yet adopted a detailed land use plan for future housing development. Planned PDA status is a scoring criteria for receipt of regional TLC funds.

What are some examples of transportation investments that support PDAs?

Investing in PDAs is a core strategy for the reduction of VMT region-wide. It is the first building block of the regional Sustainable Communities Strategy, the SB 375-mandated process to define a regional land use and transportation plan that reduces emissions and achieves state housing goals. Only TLC funds are required to be spent in PDAs; however, additional Block Grant flexibility is possible for projects that support PDAs. Below are some examples of PDA-supportive projects.

1. PDAs justify the concentration of funds in targeted areas where they can be combined with land use development to have a high impact. CMA block grants make it easier to pool funding for larger infrastructure projects, such as challenging highway-pedestrian interfaces and new street designs, that can increase transit ridership, walking, and bicycling within PDAs.
2. On a smaller scale, block grants can also include projects that improve the liveability of PDAs, such as providing more or improved green space, improved streetscapes and sense of community identity, and improved pedestrian and bicycle connections to town/city centers for services, jobs, and transit.
3. PDAs are very vocal on their desire for increased transit service, including shuttles. Capital projects to facilitate BRT or other new transit development or facility improvements to reduce bicycle/bus conflict are PDA-supportive.
4. Parking management, including smart meters and bike parking, is essential for sustainable land use development in PDAs.
5. Regional TLC funds can be used to directly support land use development by purchasing land or paying for non-transportation infrastructure like water and energy. County TLC programs use CMAQ funds; since these are not eligible uses for CMAQ, counties are encouraged to refer those projects to the Regional TLC program.
6. Block grants can strategically program Regional Bicycle Network funds to support segments within PDAs, or between residential PDAs and job centers.
7. Prioritizing new pavement and street maintenance within PDA boundaries in areas of high intensity development increases PDA livability.
8. Over 20 cities have MTC-funded Station Area Plans underway which will be adopted in 2010-2011. These plans will identify priority projects for PDAs.
9. As some have already done, CMAs can encourage jurisdictions to adopt new Priority Development Areas in locations where peak hour transit has headways of 20 minutes or less.

View maps, plans, and contact information
for Priority Development Areas at
<http://www.bayareavision.org/pda/>

Alameda County

Alameda County: *Urban Unincorporated Area*
City of Alameda: Naval Air Station
 City of Berkeley: *Adeline Street*
City of Berkeley: Downtown
City of Berkeley: San Pablo Avenue
City of Berkeley: South Shattuck
 City of Berkeley: *Telegraph Avenue*
City of Berkeley: University Avenue
City of Dublin: Town Center
City of Dublin: Transit Center
City of Dublin: West Dublin BART Station
City of Emeryville: Mixed Use Core
City of Fremont: Centerville
City of Fremont: Central Business District
City of Fremont: Irvington District
City of Hayward: Downtown
City of Hayward: South Hayward BART Station
City of Hayward: The Cannery
City of Livermore: Downtown
 City of Newark: *Dumbarton Transit Area*
 City of Newark: *Old Town*
 City of Oakland: *Corridors & Station Areas*
 City of Pleasanton: *Hacienda*
 City of San Leandro: *Bay Fair BART Transit Village*
City of San Leandro: Downtown
City of San Leandro: East 14th Street
City of Union City: Intermodal Station District

Contra Costa County

City of Antioch: *Hillcrest eBART Station*
 City of Antioch: *Rivertown Waterfront*
 City of Concord: *Community Reuse Area*
City of El Cerrito: San Pablo Avenue
City of Hercules: Central Hercules
City of Hercules: Waterfront District
City of Lafayette: Downtown
City of Martinez: Downtown
 City of Oakley: *Downtown*
 City of Oakley: *Employment Area*
 City of Oakley: *Southeast Oakley*
 City of Orinda: *Downtown*
 City of Pinole: *Old Town Pinole*
 City of Pinole: *Appian Way Corridor*
City of Pittsburg: Downtown
 City of Pittsburg: *Railroad Avenue eBART Station*
 City of Pleasant Hill: *Buskirk Avenue Corridor*

*Planned PDAs listed in Bold

City of Pleasant Hill: *Diablo Valley College Area*
 City of Richmond (with Contra Costa County):
North Richmond
 City of Richmond: *Central Richmond*
 City of Richmond: *South Richmond*
City of San Ramon: City Center
 City of San Ramon: *North Camino Ramon Plan Area*
City of Walnut Creek: West Downtown
Contra Costa County: Contra Costa Centre
 Contra Costa County: *Downtown El Sobrante*
 Contra Costa County: *Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station*
 Town of Moraga: *Moraga Center*
 West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee:
San Pablo Avenue Corridor

Marin County

City of San Rafael: Downtown
City of San Rafael: Civic Center/North San Rafael Town Center
 Marin County: *Urbanized 101 Corridor*

San Francisco City and County

19th Avenue Corridor: County Line to Eucalyptus Drive
Bayview/Hunters Point/Candlestick Point
Better Neighborhoods: Balboa Park/Market & Octavia
Downtown Neighborhoods & Transit Rich Corridors
Eastern Neighborhoods
Mission Bay
Port of San Francisco
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with City of Brisbane)
Transbay Terminal
Treasure Island

San Mateo County

City/County Association of Governments: El Camino Real
 City of Brisbane (with City & County of San Francisco):
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area
 City of Daly City: *Bayshore Neighborhood*
 City of Daly City: *Mission BART Corridor*
 City of East Palo Alto: *Ravenswood Business District and 4 Corners*
 City of Menlo Park: *El Camino Real Corridor & Downtown*
City of Millbrae: Transit Station Area
City of Redwood City: Downtown
 City of San Bruno: *Transit Corridors*
City of San Carlos: Railroad Corridor
City of San Mateo: Downtown
City of San Mateo: El Camino Real
City of San Mateo: Rail Corridor
 City of South San Francisco: *Downtown*

Santa Clara County

City of Campbell: *Central Redevelopment Area*

City of Gilroy: *Downtown*

City of Milpitas: *Transit Area*

City of Morgan Hill: *Downtown*

City of Mountain View: *Whisman Station*

City of Palo Alto: *California Avenue*

City of San Jose: *Consolidated Area*

City of San Jose: *Cottle Transit Village and Shopping Center*

City of Sunnyvale: *Downtown & Caltrain Station*

City of Sunnyvale: *El Camino Real Corridor*

City of Sunnyvale: *Lawrence Station Transit Village*

Valley Transportation Authority: *City Cores, Corridors & Station Areas*

Solano County

City of Benicia: *Downtown*

City of Fairfield: *Downtown South*

City of Fairfield: *Fairfield/Vacaville Train Station*

City of Fairfield: *North Texas Street Core*

City of Fairfield: *West Texas Street Gateway*

City of Suisun City: *Downtown & Waterfront District*

City of Vacaville: *Allison/Ulatis Area*

City of Vacaville: *Downtown*

City of Vallejo: *Waterfront & Downtown*

Sonoma County

City of Cloverdale: *Downtown & SMART Transit Station*

City of Cotati: *Downtown & Cotati Depot*

City of Petaluma: *Central Petaluma*

City of Rohnert Park: *Sonoma Mountain Village*

City of Santa Rosa: *Downtown Station Area*

City of Santa Rosa: *Mendocino/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor*

City of Santa Rosa: *Sebastopol Road Corridor*

City of Sebastopol: *Nexus Area*

Town of Windsor: *Redevelopment Area*

**New Act Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ
Safe Routes To School
December 16, 2009**

(thousands \$)

Estimated Cost of Program	Total School Enrollment (K-12) ¹		Total Annual Funding	Cycle 1 Total Funding
	Attendance	%		
Innovative Approaches				
	TBD	TBD	\$667	\$2,000
Innovative Approaches SubTotal	TBD	TBD	\$667	\$2,000
Supplemental School Roll-out			\$5,000	\$15,000
Alameda	239,163	21%	\$1,073	\$3,220
Contra Costa	183,230	16%	\$822	\$2,467
Marin	35,260	3%	\$158	\$475
Napa	23,406	2%	\$105	\$315
San Francisco	80,177	7%	\$360	\$1,079
San Mateo	106,160	10%	\$476	\$1,429
Santa Clara	300,064	27%	\$1,346	\$4,039
Solano	69,972	6%	\$314	\$942
Sonoma	76,836	7%	\$345	\$1,034
Supplemental School Roll-out SubTotal	1,114,268	100%	\$5,000	\$15,000
Safe Routes To School Grand Total			\$5,667	\$17,000

Notes:

1) Figures from the California Department of Education's website for FY 2008-09 and include both public and private schools

Scenarios - Section Remaining Life

Scenario: Annual Budget \$15 Million

Printed: 10/30/2008

Year	Street ID	Section ID	Street Name	Functional Class	Surface	Treatment	PCI before	PCI after	Life Ext.	Remaining Life
2010	CHILTE	03	CHILTERN DR - CHILTE	C - Collector	O - AC/AC	2IN RAC OVERLAY	69.58	100.00	13.41	30.05
	CHRIST	03	CHRISTY ST - CHRIST	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	MILL & REPLACE	42.03	100.00	24.98	29.37
	COBBLE	01	COBBLESTONE DR - COBBLE	C - Collector	O - AC/AC	2IN RAC OVERLAY	68.55	100.00	18.80	30.05
	CORALL	01	CORALLINE CT - CORALL	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	89.53	94.89	7.64	51.43
	CORPOR	01	CORPORATE WAY - CORPOR	C - Collector	O - AC/AC	2IN RAC OVERLAY	69.64	100.00	19.14	30.05
	COTTON	01	COTTONWOOD ST - COTTON	R - Residential/Local	O - AC/AC	2IN AC OVERLAY	69.07	100.00	16.95	38.51
	COUGAR	02	COUGAR CIR - COUGAR	C - Collector	O - AC/AC	2IN RAC OVERLAY	69.68	100.00	19.71	30.05
	DECOTO	01E	DECOTO RD E/B - DECOTO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.53	92.06	3.05	28.77
	DECOTO	01W	DECOTO RD W/B - DECOTO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	84.92	91.60	3.27	28.63
	DECOTO	02E	DECOTO RD E/B - DECOTO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.53	92.06	3.05	28.77
	DEEPCR	03	DEEP CREEK RD - DEEPCR	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.65	92.15	3.01	28.80
	DELAWA	02	DELAWARE DR - DELAWA	C - Collector	A - AC	SURFACE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	76.42	84.63	5.30	21.19
	DELEGA	01	DELEGADO CT - DELEGA	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	69.79	78.88	7.70	29.74
	DENNIS	01	DENNIS CT - DENNIS	R - Residential/Local	O - AC/AC	2IN AC OVERLAY	48.59	100.00	29.29	38.51
	DEVALL	01	DEVALLE CT - DEVALL	R - Residential/Local	O - AC/AC	2IN AC OVERLAY	47.90	100.00	30.13	38.51
	DOBSON	02	DOBSON CT - DOBSON	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	86.19	92.55	7.76	45.84
	DOMINI	01	DOMINICI DR - DOMINI	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	68.21	77.53	3.37	17.96
	DRIFTW	01	DRIFTWOOD DR - DRIFTW	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	68.90	78.12	4.62	22.18
	DRISCO	02E	DRISCOLL RD E/B - DRISCO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.65	92.15	3.01	28.80
	DRISCO	03E	DRISCOLL RD E/B - DRISCO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.65	92.15	3.01	28.80
	DRISCO	03W	DRISCOLL RD W/B - DRISCO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	SLURRY SEAL & CRACK SEAL	85.65	92.15	3.01	28.80
	DRISCO	04E	DRISCOLL RD E/B - DRISCO	A - Arterial	O - AC/AC	2IN RAC OVERLAY	69.80	100.00	14.32	29.37
	DUNBAR	01	DUNBAR PL & CT - DUNBAR	R - Residential/Local	A - AC	CAPE SEAL & CRACK SEAL	69.96	79.03	5.86	26.12