

Date: November 18, 2015  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: PAC  
Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C  
03/22/17-C 04/26/17-C 05/24/17-C  
06/28/17-C 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C  
10/25/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C  
07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C  
12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 02/27/19-C  
03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 07/24/19-C  
09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C  
02/26/20-C 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C  
09/23/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C  
02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C  
11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C 01/26/22-C  
02/23/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C  
05/25/22-C 06/22/22-C 09/28/22-C  
10/26/22-C 11/16/22-C 03/22/23-C  
04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C  
02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C  
05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C  
04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C  
10/22/25-C 06/24/26-C

### ABSTRACT

#### Resolution No. 4202, Revised

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 – OBAG 2 Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

Attachment B-1 – OBAG 2 Regional Program Project List

Attachment B-2 – OBAG 2 County Program Project List

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 2 of 19

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.

On December 21, 2016, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to redirect \$417,000 in un-programmed balances from the Regional Active Operational Management program to MTC's Spare the Air Youth within the Climate Initiatives Program; divide MTC's Rideshare Program into three subcomponents totaling \$10,000,000: \$720,000 for Rideshare Implementation, \$7,280,000 for the Carpool Program, and \$2,000,000 for the Vanpool Program; direct \$1,785,000 from 511 Next Gen to the Commuter Benefits program; direct \$1,000,000 in un-programmed balances to SMART's Multi-Use Pathway; transfer \$1,000,000 from MTC's Casual Carpool project to MTC's Eastbay Commuter Parking project within the Bay Bridge Forward program, as the former will be funded with non-federal funds; transfer \$500,000 from the Freeway Performance Initiative program and \$500,000 in un-programmed balances to US 101/Marin Sonoma Narrow's B2 Phase 2 project in the Regional Active Operational Management Program; shift \$40,000,000 from the BART Car Replacement/Expansion project to the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent project and \$13 million from MTC's Clipper project to un-programmed balances within the Transit Priorities program as part of a RM2 funding action to address a cost increase on the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent project; and program \$5,990,000 to Alameda County's Safe Routes to School Program in the County Program.

On March 22, 2017, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$17,000,000 in un-programmed balances within the Regional Transit Priorities Program to MTC's Clipper Program, as part of the FY17 Transit Capital Priorities program.

On April 26, 2017, Attachment B-2 was revised to program \$1,655,000 to the Sonoma Safe Routes to School program; and redirect \$1,000 from Contra Costa Transportation Authority's Planning Activities Base to its discretionary balance and \$1,000 from San Francisco County Transportation Authority's Planning Activities Base to its discretionary balance to address an inconsistency between

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 3 of 19

amounts programmed to planning activities in Appendix A-3 and reflect actual amounts obligated for planning.

On May 24, 2017, Attachment B-1 was revised to redirect \$1,237,000 from 511 Next Gen to AOM Implementation within the Regional Active Operational Management program to reflect re-organization of staff between program elements; direct \$18,000,000 in Arterial/Transit Performance to the Program for Arterial System Synchronization (\$5,000,000) and the Next Gen Arterial Operations Program (\$13,000,000) within the Regional Active Operational Management program; direct \$19,000,000 from the Transportation Management System (TMS) Field Equipment Devices Operations and Maintenance to TMS Implementation (\$2,910,000), Performance-Based Intelligent Transportation Systems Device Maintenance and Rehabilitation (\$5,940,000), Transportation Management Center Asset Upgrade and Replacement (\$4,000,000), I-880 Communication Upgrade and Infrastructure Gap Closures (\$4,000,000) and a Detection Technology Pilot (\$5,000,000) within the Regional Active Operational Management program; and remove \$290,556 in un-programmed balances from the Regional Active Operational Management program to address over-programming in a previous cycles of the STP/CMAQ regional programs.

On June 28, 2017, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to reprogram \$1,000,000 from the SMART Pathway – 2<sup>nd</sup> to Andersen to San Rafael's Grand Ave Bike/Pedestrian Improvements within the Regional Climate Initiatives program as part of a funding exchange within the City of San Rafael, conditioned on San Rafael committing \$1 million in non-federal funds to the construction of the pathway, and a resolution of local support for the use of federal funds on the Grand Ave project, and TAM approval of the redirection of local measure funds between the projects; split out \$8,729,000 from the 511 Next Gen program to 511 Implementation within the Regional Active Operational Management program; program \$1,250,000 to Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District for the Bettini Transit Center as part of the Marin County Program; and program \$2,617,000 within the San Mateo County Program to the San Mateo County Office of Education for the SRTS program, including \$223,000 in supplemental funds from San Mateo's discretionary balance.

On July 26, 2017, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$12,000,000 to the US 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows project as part of a fund exchange agreement with Sonoma County Transportation Authority; \$11,000,000 in exchange funds are added to the program for tracking purposes, with the final \$1 million in exchange funds to be identified through a future Commission action.

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 4 of 19

On September 27, 2017, Attachment B-1 was revised to change the name of the Next Gen Arterial Operations Program (NGAOP) to Innovative Deployment for Enhanced Arterials (IDEA) to reflect program rebranding and additional focus on advanced technologies; program \$4,160,000 to Incident Management Implementation and \$8,840,000 to I-880 Integrated Corridor Mobility project within the Regional Active Operational Management program; split out the Connected Vehicles/Shared Mobility program into the Connected Vehicles/Automated Vehicles program for \$2,500,000 and the Shared Use Mobility program for \$2,500,000; and program \$16,000,000 for three corridors within the Freeway Performance Program, with \$8,000,000 for I-680, \$3,000,000 for I-880, and \$5,000,000 for SR-84.

On October 25, 2017, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$10,000,000 to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for the Spare the Air program, in lieu of the Electric Vehicle Programs within the Regional Climate Initiatives Program, conditioned on the Air District contribution of an additional \$10 million to advance implementation of electric vehicles within the region.

On November 15, 2017, Attachment B-2 was revised to program \$200,000 in the Alameda County Program to the I-580 Corridor Study, to support a joint corridor study between Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) and MTC; \$122,000 within the Napa County Program to Napa Valley Transportation Authority (NVTa) for the Napa County Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Program; and \$300,000 within the Contra Costa County Program to San Ramon for the San Ramon Valley Street Smarts Program.

On December 20, 2017, Attachments A, Appendix A-3, B-1, and B-2 were revised to program \$334 million in the County Program to local and county projects recommended by the nine Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs); redirect \$10,248,000 from BART Car Replacement/Expansion to Clipper within the Regional Transit Priorities Program; revise the CMA Planning Activities funding amounts to reflect the supplementary funds requested by several CMAs through their County Programs; and clarify the program details for the Local Housing Production Incentive program (also known as the *80K by 2020 Challenge Grant*).

On January 24, 2018, Attachment B-1 was revised to redirect \$4,100,000 from Performance-Based ITS Device Maintenance and Rehabilitation to I-880 Communication Upgrade and Infrastructure Gap Closures, within the Transportation Management System program.

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 5 of 19

On February 28, 2018, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$13 million in Innovative Deployments to Enhance Arterials (IDEA) program grants within the Regional Active Operational Management Program; redirect \$822,000 within Contra Costa County's Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) for future SRTS projects; program \$2,813,000 to San Francisco SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program within the San Francisco County Program; and clarify MTC exchange fund projects.

On March 28, 2018, Attachment B-1 was revised to distribute the \$1.5 million Community-Based Transportation Planning Program among the nine county Congestion Management Areas (CMAs); clarify the limits of three Freeway Performance Program projects within the Regional Active Operational Management Program; and reflect the programming of \$30,000 in MTC exchange funds for Bay Area Greenprint Functionality Improvements, as part of the PCA program.

On April 25, 2018, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$8,200,000 in Priority Conservation Area (PCA) grants within the North Bay PCA Program; \$3,400,000 to Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) for the Marin Sonoma Narrows B2 Phase 2 project, as part of an exchange agreement in which an equal amount of SCTA's future Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds will be programmed at MTC's discretion; \$7,288,000 in PDA Planning and Implementation grants; and \$500,000 to MTC for PDA Implementation.

On May 23, 2018, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to change the project sponsor from MTC to VTA for the IDEA Program project at the Veteran's Administration Palo Alto Medical Center; redirect funds within the Santa Clara County OBAG 2 County Program to reduce San Jose's West San Carlos Urban Village Streetscape Improvements by \$2,050,000, redirecting \$1,000,000 from the project to Santa Clara's Saratoga Creek Trail Phase 1 and \$1,050,000 to Saratoga's Prospect Rd Complete Streets project; and direct an additional \$25,000 in unprogrammed balances within Santa Clara County OBAG 2 County Program to Saratoga's Prospect Rd Complete Streets project.

On June 27, 2018, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$800,000 to MTC's Carsharing Implementation and \$325,000 to Targeted Transportation Alternatives within the Climate Initiatives Program; redirect from MTC's 511 NextGen program \$8,271,000 to 511 Implementation, \$2,000,000 to Contra Costa Transportation Authority's (CCTA's) I-80 Central Ave Interchange Improvements project, and \$380,000 to an unprogrammed balance within the

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 6 of 19

Regional Active Operational Management program; clarify the scope of MTC's Freeway Performance Program I-880 to reflect the project limits of I-80 to I-280; and redirect \$1,394,000 from Vallejo's Local Streets Rehabilitation project to Fairfield's Heart of Fairfield project within the Solano County Program.

On July 25, 2018, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$1,600,000 to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) for the SR 85 Transit Guideway Study as part of a fund exchange agreement; remove Rohnert Park's \$65,000 Central Rohnert Park PDA/Creekside Neighborhood Subarea Connector Path Technical Assistance grant from the Regional PDA Planning Grant program as it will be funded through a prior cycle; reduce the funding for Windsor's PDA Planning and Implementation Staffing Assistance grant by \$85,000 as this project will receive an equivalent amount of funds through a prior cycle; a total of \$150,000 balance created by these two revisions was returned to the Regional PDA Planning Grant Program un-programmed balance.

On September 12, 2018, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$3,000,000 within the Freeway Performance Program to the US 101 corridor in San Mateo and Santa Clara counties; direct an additional \$6,000,000 within the Freeway Performance Program to the I-680 corridor within Contra Costa County, \$4,000,000 of which is part of an exchange agreement with Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA); redirect \$15,000 within the Innovative Deployment for Enhanced Arterials (IDEA) program from IDEA Technical Assistance to VTA's IDEA grant at the Veterans Affairs Palo Alto Medical Center; redirect \$48,000 from MTC's Clipper to the BART Car Replacement/Expansion project within the Transit Priorities program to reflect program amounts previously adopted through the Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) program; revise the amount programmed to VTA's SR 85 Transit Guideway Study within Regional Strategic Initiatives to \$1,200,000 to reflect amount previously approved; redirect \$1,214,000 from Berkeley's North Shattuck Avenue Rehabilitation project to its Southside Complete Streets and Transit Improvements project within the Alameda County Program; from Sunnyvale's East Sunnyvale Area Sense of Place Improvements, redirect \$1,000,000 to Los Altos' Miramonte Ave Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements and \$1,140,000 to the Safe Routes to School program balance within the Santa Clara County Program; and program \$4,500,000 available from a previous funding cycle to the following projects within Regional Strategic Initiatives: \$617,000 to Novato's Pavement Rehabilitation (for Downtown Novato SMART Station) as part of a local funding exchange, \$1,120,000 to the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) for the Old Redwood Highway Multi-Use Pathway project, \$763,000 for San

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 7 of 19

Rafael's Grand Ave Bridge project, and \$2,000,000 to TAM for the US 101 Marin Sonoma Narrows project.

On November 28, 2018, Attachment B-1 was revised to make adjustments related to the MTC/SCVTA Funding Exchange Agreement MTC Resolution No. 4356 and to the MTC/CCTA Funding Exchange Agreement MTC Resolution No. 4357, and to program \$4,000,000 in MTC exchange funds in accordance with MTC Resolution 3989, to the following projects: \$619,000 to CCTA for Innovative Deployment for Enhanced Arterials; \$621,000 to the city of Walnut Creek for innovative Deployment for Enhanced Arterials; \$500,000 to the city of Richmond for the Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Bikeway Access; \$1,160,000 to MTC for Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Forward; and \$1,100,000 to MTC for Napa Valley Transportation Demand.

On December 19, 2018, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to redirect \$5,200,000 from MTC's I-880 Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Central Segment to the I-880 ICM Northern Segment project within the Regional Active Operational Management Program; clarify the Diridon Integrated Station Area Concept Plan project within the Regional Priority Development Planning and Implementation Program to reference Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) as a project partner; within the Santa Clara County Program, redirect \$794,000 in unprogrammed balances to Sunnyvale's East Sunnyvale Sense of Place Improvements, clarify the remaining unprogrammed balance is discretionary, and clarify the division of funding for Santa Clara's Saratoga Creek Trail Phase 1 project between the county's Safe Routes to School program and its discretionary program.

On January 23, 2019, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect \$15,980,000 within the San Francisco County Program from the Better Market Street project to the Central Subway project.

On February 27, 2019, Attachment B-1 was revised to change the fund source of \$3,779,849 programmed to the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent in Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds to federal Highway Infrastructure Program (STP Bump) funds provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018. Of the \$3,779,849 freed up by this swap, \$1,000,000 is returned to the region's STP/CMAQ balance to help address the CMAQ shortfall as a result of the region becoming attainment for carbon monoxide (CO) and therefore receiving less CMAQ funds which are distributed based on air quality status. The remaining \$2,779,849 is held for future Commission action.

On March 27, 2019, Attachment A, Appendix A-8, Appendix A-10, and Attachment B-1 were revised to clarify provisions pertaining to the interim status report requirements for Priority

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 8 of 19

Development Area (PDA) Investment & Growth Strategies; change the recipient of the Concord IDEA project from CCTA to the City of Concord and reduce the MTC Exchange funding from \$619,000 to \$589,000; and redirect the \$30,000 in MTC Exchange funds to a new MTC-led Concord IDEA project.

On June 26, 2019, Attachment B-2 was revised to program \$822,000 in unprogrammed Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS) balances within the Contra Costa County Program to six existing projects; and to redirect \$251,000 within the San Mateo County Program from Atherton's Middlefield Road Class II Bike Lanes to its James Avenue Rehabilitation.

On July 24, 2019, Attachment A was revised to delegate authority to the Executive Director or designee to sign Letters of Understanding for the exchange of STP/CMAQ funds with other regions, within certain conditions and limitations, and to delegate to a Committee of the Commission the authority to approve exchanges beyond these conditions and limitations.

On September 25, 2019, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to clarify that the \$300,000 programmed to Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) within the Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Updates program will be directed to its Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Planning program as part of an internal fund exchange within ACTC; redirect \$9.6 million from 511 Implementation to 511 Next Gen within the Bay Area 511 Traveler Information Program; within the Freeway Performance Program redirect \$625,000 in from MTC's SR 84 (US 101 to I-880) to the environmental phase of MTC's I-580 WB HOV Lane Extension project and change the project sponsor of the I-80/Central Ave. Interchange Improvements project from the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) to City of Richmond; within the Innovative Deployment to Enhance Arterials (IDEA) program, clarify that LAVTA is a partner agency for the Dublin Category 2 IDEA project; within the Transportation Management Systems (TMS) program, change the name of the overall program to Connected Bay Area, redirect \$2 million from the Detection Technology Pilot project and \$1.8 million from the Performance-Based ITS Device Maintenance and Rehabilitation project to provide an additional \$3.8 million to the I-880 Communications Upgrade and Infrastructure Gap Closures project; within the Incident Management program, redirect \$1 million from MTC's I-880 Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Central Segment to the Northern Segment; within the San Francisco County program, redirect \$3,366,000 from John Yehall Chin Elementary Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Improvement; and within the Santa Clara County program, redirect \$1 million from Los Altos' Miramonte Ave Bicycle and Pedestrian Access Improvements project to



## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 9 of 19

Cupertino's McClellan Rd Separated Bike Lane project, and program \$1,346,000 in unprogrammed discretionary balances to Campbell's Harriet Ave Sidewalk project and Los Gatos Shannon Rd Complete Streets project.

On October 23, 2019, Attachment B-1 was revised to redirect \$3 million from MTC's Detection Technology Pilot project to establish the InterConnect Bay Area grant program within the Connected Bay Area program; direct \$5 million (\$4 million Solano County and \$1 million other North Bay counties) within the Housing Incentive Pool program to establish the Sub-HIP program, with specific projects to be recommended through future programming actions; and program \$1 million to BART for AB2923 Implementation from unprogrammed balances within the PDA Planning & Implementation program.

On November 20, 2019, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$6,023,000 in MTC exchange funds in accordance with MTC Resolution No. 3989 to 13 projects within the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grants program; and within the Contra Costa County program, redirect \$1,025,000 from Brentwood's Various Streets and Roads Preservation project to Pittsburg's Pavement Improvements project, redirect \$618,000 from San Pablo's Market Street Pavement Rehabilitation project to Giant Road Pavement Rehabilitation project; and revise the name of Walnut Creek's Ygnacio Valley Road Rehabilitation project to reflect the latest proposed scope of work.

On February 26, 2020, Attachments A, B-1, and B-2 were revised to program \$1 million to MTC for SR 37 corridor planning in Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma Counties and \$3 million to MTC for I-80 corridor planning from the Carquinez Bridge to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge (SFOBB) Toll Plaza within the Freeway Performance Program; revise the name of the Concord Willow Pass Road Rehabilitation and Safe Routes to School project within the Contra Costa County Program to reflect the project's current scope; and clarify language within the OBAG 2 Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy to reflect the Commission adoption of Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) program guidelines, MTC Resolution No. 4348.

On May 27, 2020, Attachment B-1 was revised to clarify the scope of MTC's Freeway Performance Program planning-only project on I-80 extends from Carquinez Bridge in Contra Costa to Fremont Street in San Francisco; change the sponsor for three projects within the Regional Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant program; and to redirect \$104,000 in the

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 10 of 19

North Bay Priority PCA Grant program from Novato's Carmel Open Space Acquisition project to Novato's Hill Area National Recreation Area, as the former project has been cancelled.

On July 22, 2020, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$5 million to five projects in Solano, Marin, Napa, and Sonoma Counties within the Housing Incentive Pool Pilot Program (Sub-HIP) and program \$1 million to the Napa Valley Forward Traffic Calming and Multimodal Improvements project within the Freeway Performance Program (FPP); and incorporate \$7,681,887 in federal Highway Infrastructure Program apportionment provided through the Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2020 to the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent.

On September 23, 2020, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect \$2,000,000 from Napa's Silverado Trail Five-way Intersection Improvement project to Napa Valley Transportation Authority's Vine Transit Bus Maintenance Facility within the Napa County Program, and \$1,394,000 from Fairfield's Heart of Fairfield Improvements to its Cadenasso Dr. repaving project within the Solano County Program.

On November 20, 2020, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$1,000,000 to SFCTA for the environmental phase of the Yerba Buena Island/Treasure Island Multi-Use Pathway project within the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grants program, with payback from BATA at a future date; \$647,000 in MTC exchange funds in accordance with MTC Resolution No. 3989 to four projects within the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grants program; and to clarify the project sponsor of the Old Redwood Highway Multi-Use Pathway project as Larkspur, rather than the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM).

On January 27, 2021, Attachments A and Attachment B-1 were revised, and Appendix A-11 was added, to incorporate additional funding into the OBAG 2 framework, including \$52.9 million in STP/CMAQ program balances made available through FY2018-FY2020 appropriations of Federal Highway Infrastructure Program (FHIP) funds, and a \$1.5 million balance redirected from the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Climate Initiatives program, as part of the Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program.

On February 24, 2021, Attachment B-1 was revised to program a total of \$7.91 million in Federal Highway Infrastructure Program (FHIP) funds provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, and project savings from previous STP/CMAQ cycles to the Golden Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) for shareable costs of an increase

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 11 of 19

to the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent System. Because the final FFY 2021 FHIP amount is not yet available at the time of the Commission meeting, the final split between the two fund sources will be adjusted by staff as a technical change, with the total amount not to exceed \$7.91 million.

On April 28, 2021, Attachment B-1 was revised to change the fund source of \$13,942,852 from Federal Highway Infrastructure Program (FHIP) funds to Surface Transportation Block Grant (STP) funds for the Gate Bridge Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) for the Golden Gate Bridge Suicide Deterrent System project; program \$61,708,245 in STP/CMAQ funds, and \$13,942,852 in FHIP funds redirected from the GGB suicide deterrent system, to the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) for the US-101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows Segment B7 project as part of the SB1/RMS alternative funding plan; and program \$99,840,510 in STP/CMAQ funds to the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) for the Solano I-80 Express Lanes project as part of the SB1/RMS alternative funding plan. The programmed funding to TAM and STA serves as a loan to the project sponsors to permit the projects to move to construction while Regional Measure 3 funds are unavailable. The loaned funds shall be repaid to MTC as non-federal funds and will be subject to future OBAG programming.

On May 26, 2021, Attachment B-1 and Appendix A-11 were revised to program \$34,593,076 in Federal Highway Infrastructure Program funds made available through federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA) to augment the Regional Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program framework; and to program \$7,775,000 in Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning and Implementation grants and \$87,000 in Regional PDA Supportive Studies within the Regional PDA Planning and Implementation program.

On June 23, 2021, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$83,118,000 to various local and regional projects within the Regional Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program; and program \$1,000,000 in project savings from previous fund cycles to VTA's Diridon Station Planning and Studies project as part of the Regional Strategic Initiatives program.

On July 28, 2021, Attachments A, B-1, and B-2 were revised to: temporarily increase the delegated authority amount the Executive Director may authorize for STP/CMAQ exchanges from \$2 million per region to \$100 million in total for federal fiscal year 2020-2021; to program \$4,667,000 to AC Transit for Bus Purchases and to reflect changes in program amounts and projects proposed for MTC regional exchange funds (in accordance with MTC Resolution No. 3989) as part of the funding arrangement for the Solano I-80 Express Lanes project; to program

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 12 of 19

\$1,750,000 within the Regional Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program; to transit integration planning efforts in Solano, Sonoma, and East Bay Counties; redirect \$130,000 in project savings from the County of Contra Costa Local Streets and Roads Preservation project to the City of Danville's San Ramon Valley Blvd. Improvements project (in lieu of the Diablo Road Trail project which will be provided an equivalent amount of non-federal funds from CCTA) and redirect \$350,000 in project savings from the County of Contra Costa Local Streets and Roads Preservation project to the City of Pinole's Safety Improvements at Appian Way and Marlesta Rd project within the Contra Costa County program; and to cancel the \$4,655,000 El Camino Real Pedestrian Safety & Streetscape Improvements project in Palo Alto, direct \$41,428 from the cancelled project to Campbell's Harriet Avenue Sidewalk project, and leave the remaining \$4,614,572 balance unprogrammed within the Santa Clara county program.

On September 22, 2021, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$4,191,538 to various projects within the Regional Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program; \$184,000 in prior cycle project savings to San Mateo County's Broadmoor SRTS Pedestrian Safety and Mobility Improvements project within the Regional Strategic Investments program; and to redirect \$800,000 from MTC's Carsharing Implementation project and \$1,848,099 from the Climate Initiatives unprogrammed balance to various projects within the Mobility Hubs Pilot Program.

On November 17, 2021, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect \$948,000 from the City of Redwood City's US-101/Woodside Rd. Class I Bikeway project to the following projects: Daly City's Southgate Avenue and School Street Safety Improvements (\$450,000) and Millbrae's Park Boulevard and Santa Teresa Way Improvements (\$347,000), leaving an unprogrammed balance of \$151,000 in the San Mateo County Program.

On December 15, 2021, Attachment B-2 was revised to program \$4,613,572 in unprogrammed balances from the Santa Clara County Program to the following projects: Campbell's PDA Enhancements (\$550,000), Mountain View's Shoreline Boulevard Pathway Improvements (\$1,996,000), and San Jose's Julian and St. James Livable Streets Couplet Conversion (\$2,067,572). In the San Mateo County Program, the project title for Millbrae's Park Blvd, San Anselmo Ave, and Santa Teresa Way Improvements was revised to clarify the project scope.

On January 26, 2022, Attachment B-1 was revised to direct \$12,000,000 in unprogrammed balances from the Freeway Performance Program to MTC's Bay Bridge Forward Preliminary Engineering project, and to revise SCTA/MTC's \$750,000 Sonoma Integration and Coordination

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 13 of 19

Implementation Planning project to reflect that these funds will be used to advance the Blue Ribbon Transit Transformational Action Plan as part of a fund swap with SCTA.

On February 23, 2022, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect \$120,000 in project savings within the Contra Costa County Program, from El Cerrito's Carson Boulevard and Central Avenue Pavement Rehabilitation project to the El Cerrito's El Cerrito del Norte TOD Complete Streets Improvements project.

On March 23, 2022, Attachment B-1 was revised to redirect \$251,000 within the Priority Conservation Area grant program from Albany's Albany Hill Access Improvements project and \$249,000 in regional program balances to Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority's (VTA's) Highway 17 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail and Wildlife Overcrossing Project as part of a fund exchange agreement with the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District; revise \$2,322,000 in Regional Active Operational Management program funds to reflect the amounts awarded to projects, technical advisory services, and project evaluations through the MTC's Connected Vehicles/Automated Vehicles program; and direct \$14,495 in unprogrammed balances within the Climate Initiatives program to the Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) MacArthur BART Station Mobility Hub project as part of a fund source change between fund cycles, with no net change in the total amount programmed to the project.

On April 27, 2022, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$2,240,000 within the Freeway Performance Program for MTC's I-880 Optimized Corridor Operations project; reprogram \$1,800,000 in Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike funds from Vallejo's Bay Trail/Vine Trail Gap Closure Segment to Vallejo's Springs Road Pavement Preservation project as part of a local funding exchange; revise MTC's \$1.4 million Blue Ribbon Centralized Program Eligibility project within the Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program to redirect \$900,000 to Clipper for Regional Transit Connection contract expenses in support of the project; rename MTC's Interconnect Bay Area Program project to Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade; reprogram \$2,206,000 within the Napa County Program to NVRTA's Vine Trail Calistoga to St. Helena project from St. Helena's \$1,206,000 Main Street Pedestrian Improvements project and American Canyon's \$1,000,000 Green Island Road Improvements; and rename the City of Alameda's City-Wide Pavement Rehabilitation project within the Alameda County Program to Grand Street Pavement Resurfacing and Safety Improvements.

On May 25, 2022, Attachment B-2 was revised to redirect funds within the Santa Clara County Program, including \$2,449,000 from Santa Clara's San Tomas Aquino Creek Trail Underpass

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 14 of 19

and \$790,000 Hetch Hetchy Trail Phase 1 projects, and \$919,000 from Palo Alto's Waverly Multi-Use Path, East Meadow Drive and Fabian Way Enhanced Bikeways project, and reprogram \$3,351,000 of these funds to Los Gatos' Creek Trail to Highway 9 Trailhead Connection and \$807,000 to Cupertino's new Stevens Creek Boulevard Class IV Bike Lanes project; redirect funds within the Alameda County Program, including \$1,662,000 from Hayward's Winton Avenue Complete Streets project and \$225,000 from Emeryville's Slurry Seal of Frontage Road, 65<sup>th</sup> Street, and Powell Street projects, and reprogram \$620,000 of these funds to ACTC's Alameda County Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program, leaving an unprogrammed balance of \$1,267,000 within the Alameda County Program.

On June 22, 2022, Attachment B-1 was revised to deprogram \$400,000 from Cupertino's VTA Cores and Corridors PDA Plan, leaving an unprogrammed balance of \$400,000 within the PDA Planning & Implementation program; program \$100,000 in regional program balances to the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority's (CCJPA's) State Route 84 Ardenwood Intermodal Bus Facility project within the Regional Strategic Investments program as part of a fund exchange agreement with CCJPA; and reprogram \$1,250,000 within the Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program to MTC's Bay Bridge Forward project's preliminary engineering phase, including \$500,000 from MTC's Blue Ribbon Centralized Program Eligibility project and \$750,000 in remaining program balance from the Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Action Plan.

On September 28, 2022, Attachments A, A-11, and B-1 were revised to extend project obligation deadlines, and program a \$380,000 balance within the Regional Active Operational Management program and \$145,000 in prior cycle savings to MTC's Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant Implementation.

On October 26, 2022, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$9,012,406 in unprogrammed balances within the Regional Climate Initiatives program to MTC's Parking Management Program and \$1,267,000 in unprogrammed balances within the Alameda County Program to Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC) for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Non-Infrastructure programs.

On November 16, 2022, Attachment B-2 was revised to reprogram \$1,657,000 within the Solano County Program from Vacaville's Vaca Valley/I-505 Roundabouts project to Solano Transportation Authority's Vacaville Jepson Parkway Phase 3 Bike Path project.

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 15 of 19

On March 22, 2023, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$15,283,000 in unprogrammed balances to various projects within the Transit Performance Initiatives (TPI) Program; deprogram \$340,760 for San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Temporary Transbay Terminal within the Mobility Hubs Pilot Program; revise MTC's I-880 Integrated Corridor Management (ICM) Central project to include San Leandro as a co-sponsor; and revise the project names of Marin County's Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant Program projects to Hicks Valley Road Rehabilitation.

On April 26, 2023, Attachment B-1 was revised to change the project names of Marin County's Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Grant Program projects to Wilson Hill Road Rehabilitation, program \$239,000 in unprogrammed balances within the Mobility Hubs Pilot Program to Burlingame's Caltrain Station – Burlingame Square Transit Hub project, and revise projects within the Connected Bay Area program, including deprogramming \$1,150,000 from MTC's TMC Asset Upgrade and Replacement project, deprogramming \$2,500,000 from MTC and Caltrans' I-880 Communication Upgrade and Infrastructure Gap Closures project, programming \$2,500,000 to Caltrans' Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade project, and programming \$1,150,000 to MTC's Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade project.

On May 24, 2023, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to reprogram \$150,000 within the Connected Vehicles/Automated Vehicles Regional Program from MTC's Project Evaluations to the Palo Alto Advanced Transit Passenger Management project, change the sponsor on the latter project from MTC to the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA), deprogram \$3,735,000 in Santa Clara County Program funds from Santa Clara's Saratoga Creek Trail Phase 1 project, and reprogram \$1,000,000 within the San Mateo County Program from San Carlos' US 101/Holly Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing project to Pacifica's Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Improvement project.

On June 28, 2023, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to program \$5,958,000 in Regional Climate Initiatives funds to various Parking Management Program projects; and program \$2,842,000 for Los Gatos' Los Gatos Creek Trail to Highway 9 Trailhead Connection and \$443,000 for Saratoga's Citywide Master Plan for Bicycle and Sidewalks within the Santa Clara County Program.

On July 26, 2023, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to reflect the fund source change of \$16,727,000 programmed to various projects within the Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 16 of 19

Program from federal Coronavirus Response and Relief Supplemental Appropriations Act (CRRSAA) funds to STP/CMAQ; deprogram \$700,000 in Safe & Seamless Mobility Quick Strike funds from San Pablo's Giant Road Cycletrack Quick Build project; and revise the project name for Solano Transportation Authority's Vacaville Jepson Parkway Phase 1B Bike Path to reflect project phasing.

On September 27, 2023, Attachment B-2 was revised to program \$450,000 in unprogrammed balances within the Santa Clara County Program to Santa Clara County's Circulation and Mobility Element.

On December 20, 2023, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to reflect an additional \$46 million in program capacity for the Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) program, consisting of \$27,730,000 in STP/CMAQ and \$18,270,000 in San Francisco County transportation sales tax funds, as part of fund source changes enacted with the adoption of the 2024 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Guidelines; program \$71 million in HIP preliminary award amounts to fifteen jurisdictions; reprogram \$2,731,000 in County Program funds from Benicia's Park Road Improvements project to Fairfield's East Tabor Tolenas Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Gap Closure; reprogram \$500,000 in Marin County Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program funds from the National Park Service's Fort Baker Vista Point Trail project to Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit's (SMART's) SMART Pathway, Great Redwood Trail to Novato segment; and reprogram \$250,000 in Solano County Program funds from Vacaville's Vaca Valley/ I-505 Roundabouts projects to the City's Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail Improvements at Fruitvale Road, Briarwood Drive, and Arlene Drive.

On February 28, 2024, Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to deprogram \$9,300,000 in OBAG 2 County funds from Alameda County's Meekland Avenue Corridor Improvement, Phase II and deprogram \$387,600 in OBAG 2 Mobility Hubs Pilot Program funds from San Ramon's Bishop Ranch Business Park project.

On March 27, 2024, Attachment B-1 was revised to reflect final Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) award amounts.

On April 24, 2024, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$157,000 in unprogrammed balances within the Mobility Hubs Pilot Program to the City of Burlingame's Caltrain Station Burlingame Square Transit Hub.



## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 17 of 19

On May 22, 2024, Attachment B-1 was revised to reprogram \$16,090,000 in various Regional Connected Bay Area projects to MTC and Caltrans' Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade project, program \$1,621,000 in Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning & Implementation funds from various projects to MTC for Priority Sites Technical Assistance in various jurisdictions, and program \$30,000 in Regional Parking Management Program balances to the City of Martinez's Parking Meter Program Update project.

On November 20, 2024, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$4,600,000 to MTC's Mapping and Wayfinding project, deprogram \$4,600,000 in Innovative Deployments for Enhanced Arterials (IDEA) projects and balances, reprogram \$941,000 among various Priority Sites Technical Assistance projects, and deprogram \$225,000 from MTC's Milpitas Midtown PDA Plan project.

On December 18, 2024, Attachment B-1 was revised to award \$22,855,000 in Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) funds to various San Francisco and Santa Rosa projects, including \$4,000,000 in San Francisco County transportation sales tax funds available to the HIP program through a prior funding exchange, and reprogram \$250,000 among various projects within the Priority Sites Technical Assistance program.

On January 22, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to award \$5,419,000 in Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) funds to various projects.

On February 26, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$4,987,000 in Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) funds to various projects.

On March 26, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$2,650,000 in Parking Management funds to various projects, reprogram \$1,645,000 in Regional Active Operational Management funds from MTC's Eastbay Commuter Parking project to MTC's Bay Bridge Forward Preliminary Engineering project, reprogram \$1,600,000 in Priority Development Area (PDA) planning funds among various projects, and program \$300,000 in Mobility Hubs funds to one project

On April 23, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$23,469,000 in Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) funds to various projects.

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 18 of 19

On June 25, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to program \$141,000 in Priority Sites Technical Assistance funds to MTC for San Rafael's Public Sites Portfolio.

On September 24, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to reprogram \$10,000,000 from MTC's Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade project to MTC's West Oakland Link project and reflect deprogramming of \$51,619 in non-federal MTC Exchange funds from MTC for Alameda County's Niles Canyon Road (Phase 1) project.

On October 22, 2025, Attachment B-1 was revised to select various San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) projects for the HIP program using \$14,270,000 in San Francisco County transportation sales tax funds available through a prior funding exchange, program \$10,161,000 in Regional funds to MTC for Planning and Program Implementation, change the fund source for \$8,302,000 for MTC's West Oakland Link project from STP/CMAQ to CRP, reprogram \$2,267,000 in federal HIP funds from the San Francisco County Transportation Authority's (SFCTA's) West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit project to SFCTA's Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path, and change the fund source for \$1,859,000 in San Leandro HIP funds from STP/CMAQ to CRP and change San Leandro's HIP project from the MacArthur Superior Roundabout project to the City's Lewelling Boulevard Class IV Bikeways project.

On June 24, 2026, Attachment B-1 was revised to reprogram \$3,400,000 in HIP funds from SFMTA's Lincoln Way Traffic Improvements project to SFMTA's 29 Sunset Muni Forward project.

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, October 12, 2016, December 14, 2016, February 8, 2017 (action deferred to March 2017), March 8, 2017, April 12, 2017, May 10, 2017, June 14, 2017, July 12, 2017, September 13, 2017, October 11, 2017, November 8, 2017, December 13, 2017, January 10, 2018, February 14, 2018, March 7, 2018, and April 11, 2018; the Planning Committee dated April 6, 2018; the Programming and Allocations Committee dated May 9, 2018, June 13, 2018, July 11, 2018, September 12, 2018, November 14, 2018, December 12, 2018, January 9, 2019, February 13, 2019, March 6, 2019, June 12, 2019, July 10, 2019, September 4, 2019, October 9, 2019, November 13, 2019, February 12, 2020, May 13, 2020, July 8, 2020, September 9, 2020, November 4, 2020, January 13, 2021, February 10, 2021, April 14, 2021, and May 12, 2021; the Planning Committee dated May 14, 2021; the Programming and Allocations Committee dated

## ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised

Page 19 of 19

June 9, 2021, July 14, 2021; and September 8, 2021; the Planning Committee dated September 10, 2021; and the Programming and Allocations Committee dated November 10, 2021, December 8, 2021, January 12, 2022, February 9, 2022; the Operations Committee dated February 11, 2022; the Programming and Allocations Committee dated March 9, 2022, April 13, 2022, May 11, 2022, June 8, 2022, September 14, 2022, October 12, 2022, November 9, 2022, March 8, 2023, April 12, 2023, and May 10, 2023; the Planning Committee dated June 9, 2023; and the Programming and Allocations Committee dated June 14, 2023, July 12, 2023, September 13, 2023, December 13, 2023, February 14, 2024, March 13, 2024, April 10, 2024, May 8, 2024, November 13, 2024, December 11, 2024, January 8, 2025, February 12, 2025, March 12, 2025, April 9, 2025, June 11, 2025, September 10, 2025, October 8, 2025, and June 10, 2026.

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 attachments 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  
12/20/17-C 03/27/19-C  
07/24/19-C 02/26/20-C  
01/27/21-C 07/28/21-C  
09/28/22

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**

|                                                        |           |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Background.....</b>                                 | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Revenue Estimates and Program Architecture.....</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Program Categories and Project List.....</b>        | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>General Programming Policies .....</b>              | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>Regional Programs.....</b>                          | <b>14</b> |
| <b>County Programming Policies .....</b>               | <b>18</b> |
| <b>County Programs.....</b>                            | <b>23</b> |

**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 |
| Appendix A-11 Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike                                      |



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](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 21<sup>st</sup> 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**

|               | <b>Population</b> | <b>Housing<br/>RHNA</b> | <b>Housing<br/>Production</b> | <b>Housing<br/>Affordability *</b> |
|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2</b> | <b>50%</b>        | <b>20%</b>              | <b>30%</b>                    | <b>60%</b>                         |

\*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<sub>2.5</sub>). 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/](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, 2024.

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.

- 8. Regional STP/CMAQ Exchanges.** It is often difficult for smaller regions to fully utilize their federal funds and deliver projects through the federal-aid process. This can place these more rural regions in conflict with state and federal timely use funds provisions, such as Sections 182.6 and 182.7 of the State Streets and Highways Code which require federal apportionment to be secured (obligated) within three years of federal eligibility, or when Congress enacts

rescissions of unobligated funds. The SF Bay Area region is often in the opposite situation – more projects are ready for delivery than funds available each year.

Regions also find themselves in situations where a project or activity is ineligible for a certain federal fund source such as CMAQ, and may require STP, while another region can easily use either fund source.

To avoid the lapsing of funds and address these funding issues, regions may enter into exchange agreements, where older unused STP/CMAQ funds subject to lapse or rescission from one region are “exchanged” with future funds from a region that can use the funds by the deadline. Or a simple fund source exchange is needed. Such exchanges benefit both regions by avoiding the loss of funds in one region, while another region can advance projects that may be stalled due to a lack of eligible funding.

To facilitate such exchanges, the MTC Executive Director or designee is hereby authorized to sign letters of understanding with Caltrans and other regions for the exchange of STP/CMAQ funds with the following conditions and limitations.

- The exchange does not negatively impact the delivery of regional STP/CMAQ projects.
- The amount exchanged does not exceed \$2 million per region per year, with the exception of federal fiscal year 2020-21 when the amount exchanged may not exceed \$100 million in total.
- The exchange is a dollar for dollar exchange.
- The exchange is allowed under Caltrans’ obligation authority management policy.
- The Letter of Understanding can be executed in time for the MTC to secure the funds prior to any lapse or rescission.
- If any timely use of funds deadlines or Caltrans processes are not met in time and therefore result in the loss of apportionment balance, MTC’s apportionment shall not be negatively affected and the Letter of Understanding is null and void.

Exchanges beyond these conditions and limitations may be approved by a standing Committee of the Commission.

## **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<sub>2</sub> 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 developed a challenge grant program for the production and preservation 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 funds provided for the HIP program through OBAG 2 would be STP/CMAQ, and would need to be used only for federally-eligible transportation purposes. Additional funds may be added outside of OBAG 2 to increase the size of the challenge grant program.

### **9. Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike**

The Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program is a regional, competitive grant program to fund projects that can be implemented quickly to benefit communities. The program emphasizes bicycle/pedestrian safety and mobility, transit and transit access improvements, connected mobility, advancing equitable mobility, or other near-term strategies to advance transit recovery and connected mobility.

Appendix A-11 outlines the framework for this program including program focus areas, project eligibility, evaluation criteria, and the project nomination and selection process.

### **10. Regional Strategic Initiatives**

The Regional Strategic Initiatives program reflects regional funding commitments to projects not captured in the original OBAG 2 framework as well as projects funded through unspent STP/CMAQ balances from prior cycles and various funding exchanges.

## **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/](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. The interim status report required for 2019 will be satisfied through a collaborative effort between the CMAs and MTC. 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, 2024.
- 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. The interim progress report requirement for 2019 will be satisfied through a collaborative effort between the CMAs and MTC. Documentation of subsequent 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 complete 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 |                                                                |           |        |                              |  |
|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|--------|------------------------------|--|
|                  |                                                                |           |        |                              |  |
| 8                | 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) | -         | -      |                              |  |
|                  | Local Housing Production Incentive                             | -         | -      |                              |  |
|                  |                                                                | 9% \$45.0 |        | Local Program Total: 3% 30.0 |  |

| County Program |               |       | OBAG 1                        |        |                                            |         | OBAG 2          |        |          |         |                                                          |         |
|----------------|---------------|-------|-------------------------------|--------|--------------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|--------|----------|---------|----------------------------------------------------------|---------|
|                |               |       | Base Formula<br>STP/CMAQ/TE * |        | Final Distribution<br>Including SRTS & PDA |         | Base Formula ** |        | SRTS *** | FAS *** | Final Adjusted Distribution<br>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 &amp; 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         |
| <b>Total:</b> | <b>\$385,512,000</b>        | <b>\$348,000,000</b>    |                |                    | <b>\$232,439,000</b> | <b>\$153,073,000</b> |

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 December 20, 2017

#### OBAG 2 - County CMA Planning

| County             | Agency     | 2.0%        | OBAG 2 County CMA Planning - Base * |             |             |             |             | SubTotal     | Supplemental | Total        |
|--------------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                    |            | 2016-17     | 2017-18                             | 2018-19     | 2019-20     | 2020-21     | 2021-22     |              |              |              |
| Alameda            | ACTC       | \$1,034,000 | \$1,055,000                         | \$1,076,000 | \$1,097,000 | \$1,119,000 | \$1,142,000 | \$5,489,000  | \$2,800,000  | \$8,289,000  |
| Contra Costa       | CCTA       | \$818,000   | \$834,000                           | \$851,000   | \$868,000   | \$885,000   | \$904,000   | \$4,342,000  | \$0          | \$4,342,000  |
| Marin              | TAM        | \$720,000   | \$734,000                           | \$749,000   | \$764,000   | \$779,000   | \$796,000   | \$3,822,000  | \$0          | \$3,822,000  |
| Napa               | NCTPA NVTA | \$720,000   | \$734,000                           | \$749,000   | \$764,000   | \$779,000   | \$796,000   | \$3,822,000  | \$0          | \$3,822,000  |
| San Francisco      | SFCTA      | \$753,000   | \$768,000                           | \$783,000   | \$799,000   | \$815,000   | \$832,000   | \$3,997,000  | \$1,900,000  | \$5,897,000  |
| San Mateo          | SMCCAG     | \$720,000   | \$734,000                           | \$749,000   | \$764,000   | \$779,000   | \$796,000   | \$3,822,000  | \$1,512,000  | \$5,334,000  |
| Santa Clara        | VTA        | \$1,145,000 | \$1,168,000                         | \$1,191,000 | \$1,215,000 | \$1,239,000 | \$1,265,000 | \$6,078,000  | \$4,822,000  | \$10,900,000 |
| Solano             | STA        | \$720,000   | \$734,000                           | \$749,000   | \$764,000   | \$779,000   | \$796,000   | \$3,822,000  | \$3,039,000  | \$6,861,000  |
| Sonoma             | SCTA       | \$720,000   | \$734,000                           | \$749,000   | \$764,000   | \$779,000   | \$796,000   | \$3,822,000  | \$1,178,000  | \$5,000,000  |
| County CMAs Total: |            | \$7,350,000 | \$7,495,000                         | \$7,646,000 | \$7,799,000 | \$7,953,000 | \$8,123,000 | \$39,016,000 | \$15,251,000 | \$54,267,000 |

#### OBAG 2 - Regional Planning

|                          | 2.0%        | OBAG 2 Regional Agency Planning - Base * |             |             |             |             | SubTotal    | Augmentation | Total       |
|--------------------------|-------------|------------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
|                          | 2016-17     | 2017-18                                  | 2018-19     | 2019-20     | 2020-21     | 2021-22     |             |              |             |
| Regional Planning Total: | \$1,800,000 | \$1,835,000                              | \$1,873,000 | \$1,910,000 | \$1,948,000 | \$1,989,000 | \$9,555,000 | \$0          | \$9,555,000 |

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202\_ongoing\_OBAG2\[tmp-4202\_Appendix-A1-A6 12-20-17.xlsx]A-3 Planning 12-20-17

\* 2% escalation from FY 2016-17 Planning Base

**\$63,822,000**

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

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<br>Enrollment<br>(K-12) * | Private School<br>Enrollment<br>(K-12) * | Total School<br>Enrollment<br>(K-12) * | FY 2013-14<br>Percentage | Total<br>OBAG 2<br>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                |
| <b>Total:</b> | <b>1,013,355</b>                        | <b>141,594</b>                           | <b>1,154,949</b>                       | <b>100%</b>              | <b>\$25,000,000</b>        |

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<br>OBAG 2 |
|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Northbay Program</b>                       |                 |
| Marin                                         | \$2,050,000     |
| Napa                                          | \$2,050,000     |
| Solano                                        | \$2,050,000     |
| Sonoma                                        | \$2,050,000     |
| Subtotal:                                     | \$8,200,000     |
| <b>Remaining Counties Competitive Program</b> |                 |
| Subtotal:                                     | \$8,200,000     |
| <b>Total</b>                                  |                 |
| 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:

- o 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;
- o 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;
- o Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times that are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;
- o 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>;
- o Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting; and
- o 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:

- o 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:
  - o Communicating this call for projects guidance to local jurisdictions, transit agencies, federally recognized tribal governments, and other stakeholders.
  - o 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.**
  - o Assist community-based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in having projects submitted for funding.
  - o Remove barriers for persons with limited-English proficiency to have access to the project submittal process.
  - o Document the steps taken to engage underserved communities.
  - o 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>.
  - o 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](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DBE_CRLC.html#TitleVI)
    - iii. [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get\\_involved/rights/index.htm](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) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies**

- 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) Planning Objectives – to Inform Project Priorities**

- Keep apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county
- Encourage local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes
- Encourage and support local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA.

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<sup>1</sup>. 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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) Establishing Local Funding Priorities**

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.<sup>2</sup>
- **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.

<sup>2</sup> 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**

CMAAs 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). The interim status report required for 2019 will be satisfied through a collaborative effort between the CMAAs and MTC.

## 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.

|                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Funding Amount</b>     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• \$8 million</li></ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| <b>Screening Criteria</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>PCA Designation:</b> Eligible projects must be within a designated PCA. The list of adopted PCAs can be found at: <a href="http://abag.ca.gov/priority/conservation/">http://abag.ca.gov/priority/conservation/</a>.</li><li>• <b>Regionally Significant:</b> Indicators of regional significance include a project's contribution to goals stated in regional habitat, agricultural or open space plans (i.e. <i>San Francisco Bay Area Upland Habitat Goals Project Report</i> at <a href="http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/">http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/</a>), 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.</li><li>• <b>Open Space Protection In Place:</b> 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.</li><li>• <b>Non-Federal Local Match:</b> 2:1 minimum match</li></ul> |

|                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Meets Program Goals:</b> Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Protects or enhances “resource areas” or habitats as defined in California Government Code § 65080.01(a).</li> <li>o Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems.</li> <li>o Supports the agricultural economy of the region.</li> <li>o Includes existing and potential urban green spaces that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| <b>Eligible Applicants</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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. <b>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).</b></li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| <b>Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects</b> | <p><b>Eligible Projects</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Planning Activities</b></li> <li>2. <b>Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities/ Infrastructure:</b> 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.</li> <li>3. <b>Visual Enhancements:</b> Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas.</li> <li>4. <b>Habitat / Environmental Enhancements:</b> 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.</li> <li>5. <b>Protection (Land Acquisition or Easement) or Enhancement of Natural Resources, Open Space or Agricultural Lands:</b> Parks and</li> </ol> |

|                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                          | <p>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.</p> <p>6. <b>Urban Greening:</b> Existing and potential green spaces in cities that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> 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).</p> |
| <b>Project Selection</b> | <p><b>Coastal Conservancy Partnership Program:</b></p> <p>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.</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |

\*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**

| <b>1. Public Involvement and Outreach, Agency Coordination, and Title VI</b>                                                                      | <b>YES</b>               | <b>NO</b>                | <b>N/A</b>               |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Has the CMA conducted countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas consistent with Appendix A-7?                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Has the CMA performed agency coordination consistent with Appendix A-7?                                                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Has the CMA fulfilled its Title VI responsibilities consistent with Appendix A-7?                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

**PDA Investment and Growth Strategy: Appendix A-8**

| <b>2. Engage with Regional and Local Jurisdictions</b>                                                                                                                                                         | <b>YES</b>               | <b>NO</b>                | <b>N/A</b>               |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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)?                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

If "NO" or "N/A –Not Applicable" is marked in any box on the checklist, please include a statement at the end of the checklist to indicate why the item was not met.

|           |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |                          |                          |                          |
|-----------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c.        | Has the CMA governing board adopted the final Investment and Growth Strategy?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                                                                                                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e.        | Has the CMA worked with MTC and ABAG staff to confirm that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans?                                                                                                                                                                                                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <b>3.</b> | <b>Planning Objectives to Inform Project Priorities</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               | <b>YES</b>               | <b>NO</b>                | <b>N/A</b>               |
| a.        | Has the CMA kept itself apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county?                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b.        | Has the CMA encouraged local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes?                                                                                                                                                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?            | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3.        | Using guidance issued by MTC, has the Investment & Growth Strategy fully addressed items in C1 and C2, above?                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 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?                                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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.<sup>1</sup>
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)? Note: The interim status report required for 2019 will be satisfied through a collaborative effort between the CMAs and MTC. ☐ ☐ ☐

---

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? ☐ ☐ ☐

---

---

<sup>1</sup> 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)?                                                                                                                                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                                                                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Has the CMA submitted the documentation from items 5a-c, above, to MTC as part of this Checklist?                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

## 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?                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Has the CMA submitted a board adopted list of projects to MTC by July 31, 2017?                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 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?<br><br>1. Adopting a Complete Streets resolution incorporating MTC's nine required complete streets elements; or<br><br>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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Has the jurisdiction submitted a Complete Streets Checklist for any project for which the jurisdiction has applied for OBAG 2 funding?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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?                                                                                                                                                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Has the jurisdiction submitted the latest Annual Housing Element Report to HCD by April 1, 2017?                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 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? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| 7. Completion of Checklist                                     | YES                      | NO                       | N/A                      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Has the jurisdiction completed all sections of this checklist? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

## **Appendix A-11: Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike Program**

The Safe and Seamless Mobility Quick-Strike program is a one-time, competitive grant program within the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG 2) framework. Federal funding is available to support local and regional projects that can be implemented quickly to benefit communities responding and adapting to the COVID-19 environment.

Available funding includes a mix of Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) and Federal Highway Infrastructure Program (FHIP) funds, with FHIP funds exchanged with STP/CMAQ funds to the extent possible to meet federal other funding deadlines and requirements. CMAQ funds will be used for eligible projects that demonstrate air quality benefits and implement Plan Bay Area's climate initiative goals and priorities.

### **Project Eligibility & Focus Areas**

The program emphasizes bicycle/pedestrian safety and mobility, connections to transit, and projects that advance equitable mobility. Eligible project types include:

- Quick-build bike, pedestrian, and transit improvements; including bike share enhancements.
- Local safe and seamless mobility projects, including projects that advance equitable mobility; invest in bicycle/pedestrian safety; improve connections to transit; or implement seamless strategies within a corridor.
- In addition to capital projects, programs that support safe and seamless mobility or advance equitable mobility are also eligible (ex. safe routes to school/transit programs); a limited amount of funding, (up to \$200,000 per county) may also be directed towards countywide implementation of safe and seamless mobility planning and programming efforts).
- Other near-term implementation of strategies emerging from the Blue-Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force and Partnership Board's Connected Mobility Subcommittee.

Fund commitments for specific focus areas include:

- One-quarter of the total program is targeted for bicycle/pedestrian safety (including local road safety).
- \$5 million is set aside to support early implementation efforts anticipated from the Blue-Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force.
- \$15.3 million directed to regional and corridor co-nominated projects and projects of interest to the Blue-Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force.
- \$1.9 million is set aside for ongoing CTA planning and programming activities
- \$1.9 million is set aside for regional planning and programming activities, including Priority Development Area (PDA) planning and implementation and the FasTrak START Pilot program evaluation

### **Evaluation Criteria**

MTC staff will evaluate nominated projects against the following program criteria.

Nominated projects should:

- Align with Connected Mobility Framework Values and Goals (see inset below)
- Be the direct result or outcome of a community engagement process
- Be within or directly connected to a Priority Development Area (PDA) or Transportation Priority Area (TPA) and/or serve a Community of Concern (CoC), Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) program area, or similar local designation. PDAs and TPAs may be existing or recently designated as part of the Plan Bay Area 2050 growth framework.
- Addresses transit connectivity gaps, especially in areas significantly impacted from the pandemic
- Demonstrate partnership among jurisdictions, transit agencies, and counties.
- Demonstrate ability to quickly deliver, and meet federal funding requirements, as funds must be obligated by **September 30, 2023**

To ensure consistency with the implementation of county and regional plans and priorities, as well as encourage discussion and coordination in developing investment proposals, projects co-nominated by MTC and a CTA will be given extra consideration if meeting regional goals and priorities. Previously submitted co-nominated projects are to be funded out of the regional and corridor program component. New co-nominated projects may be funded out of either program.

Below are the regional connected mobility values and goals guiding these investments:

| <b>CONNECTED MOBILITY VALUES AND GOALS</b> |                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>Values</b>                              | <b>Goals</b>                                                                               |
| <b>Think Regionally Act Locally</b>        | Be coordinated, interconnected, and contiguous                                             |
| <b>Provide Great Travel Choices</b>        | Provide choices that are better than driving alone, are viable and intuitive for all trips |
| <b>Put the Traveler First</b>              | Ensure a dignified traveler experience, focusing on customer care and needs                |
| <b>Be Equitable &amp; Inclusive</b>        | Address disparities and be transparent for all people and all trips                        |
| <b>Be Sustainable</b>                      | Strive for a healthy planet, people, and full-cost accounting                              |

### **Project Nominations**

To address local needs throughout the region, and encourage community-based project investments, each County Transportation Agency (CTA) will act on MTC's behalf and submit project nominations for their county area. County targets have been provided as a guide, for each county (see table on following page). However, final project selection by MTC will not necessarily adhere to these targets. Target amounts are based on the OBAG 2 county program distribution.

In addition to county submissions, MTC may consider projects that would be implemented regionwide or in more than one county. Where applicable, MTC staff will work with CTAs to

coordinate on co-nominations for regional projects. Previously co-nominated projects are to be funded out of the regional and corridor program component. New co-nominated projects may be funded out of either program.

As the final program of projects must reflect regional or multi-county priorities, in addition to local priorities within each county, the final programming per county will not correspond exactly to nomination targets.

To ensure each county is provided sufficient funding to have a meaningful community impact, each county's nomination target will be a minimum of \$1 million.

### Project Selection Process

The prioritization process is designed to quickly distribute funds to competitive and impactful investments throughout the region.

- **Letters of Interest:** County Transportation Agencies (CTAs) submit Letters of Interest to nominate projects within their counties. In addition to basic project information (project description, sponsor, total cost, funding request), submittals should also describe how the project meets the program eligibility requirements and evaluation criteria, and how well the proposed project sponsor meets state and federal funding requirements.
- **Evaluation:** MTC staff evaluate CTA nominations as well as regional program considerations to develop a recommended program of projects. Program recommendations presented to Bay Area Partnership Board for review and discussion.
- **Project Applications:** MTC and CTA staff work with project sponsors to submit project applications with a detailed scope, delivery schedule, and funding plan.
- **Program Approval:** MTC Commission consideration and approval of projects and fund programming.

### Programming Policies and Requirements

Unless otherwise noted within these guidelines, OBAG 2 General Programming Policies (see MTC Resolution No. 4202, Attachment A, pages 6-11), and Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606) apply.

- **Project sponsors:** Eligible sponsors are those approved by Caltrans to receive FHWA federal-aid funds (including cities, counties, transit agencies, CTAs, and MTC). Sponsors must also have a demonstrated ability to meet timely use of funds deadlines and requirements (see Project Delivery and Monitoring, below).

### County Nomination Targets

(\$ millions, rounded)

|               | %             |
|---------------|---------------|
| Alameda       | 19.9%         |
| Contra Costa  | 14.6%         |
| Marin         | 2.8%          |
| Napa          | 2.1%          |
| San Francisco | 12.5%         |
| San Mateo     | 8.4%          |
| Santa Clara   | 27.0%         |
| Solano        | 5.5%          |
| Sonoma        | 7.2%          |
|               | <b>100.0%</b> |

Note: Final project selection and fund programming will not correspond exactly to nomination targets.

- **Minimum Grant Size:** Project nominations should be consistent with OBAG 2 minimum grant size requirements per county (\$500,000 grant minimum for counties with population over 1 million, and \$250,000 minimum for all other counties). Final funding awards may deviate from grant minimums per county, should one or more grant awards span multiple counties or regionwide.

Additionally, deviations from the OBAG 2 minimum grant size requirements for project nominations may be considered on a project-by-project basis. However, grant awards must be at least \$100,000.

- **Local Match:** Toll credits may be requested in lieu of non-federal cash match.
- **Supplanting of Funds Prohibited:** Supplanting of existing funds on fully-funded projects is prohibited, as the program is intended to infuse transportation investment into communities responding and adapting to the COVID-19 environment. If funds are requested to address a funding shortfall on a project due to reduced local revenues, CTAs must demonstrate why the project should be a priority for regional funding, if it was not the highest priority for available local funding. In their nomination, CTAs should describe how the county and local jurisdictions determined which projects are prioritized for reduced local revenues.
- **Project Phases:** The Environmental (ENV), Plans, Specifications and Estimates (PS&E), Preliminary Engineering (PE) and Right Of Way (ROW) phases are eligible for capital projects as long as the construction (CON) phase of the project is delivered and funds obligated by **September 30, 2023**
- **Project Delivery and Monitoring:** Project sponsors must have a record of consistently meeting state and federal timely use of funds deadlines and requirements, or demonstrate/identify revised/new internal processes to ensure they will meet funding deadlines and requirements moving forward at the time of project nomination. In addition to the provisions of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606), the following specific funding deadlines/requirements apply:
  - Funds must be obligated (authorized in a federal E-76, or transferred to FTA) no later than **September 30, 2023**
  - Funds must be encumbered or awarded in a contract within 6 months of federal obligation.
  - Funds must be invoiced against within 3 months of encumbrance/award and invoiced against and receive a federal reimbursement quarterly thereafter.
  - If there could be complications with invoicing against the construction phase within 9 months of federal obligation, then the sponsor should consider including Construction Engineering (CE) in the federal obligation so that eligible costs may be invoiced in order to meet the invoicing deadline.



- Project sponsor must meet all other timely use of funds deadlines and requirements, for all other state and federal transportation funds received by the agency, during the duration of project implementation (such as, but not limited to, project award, federal invoicing, and project reporting).
  - To help ensure compliance with state and federal invoicing requirements, as part of the application submittal, the Finance/Accounting Manager/Director for the agency receiving the funds must provide written documentation on the agency's internal process and procedures for complying with FHWA federal-aid timely use of funds requirements, especially with regards to meeting federal invoicing requirements.
  - CTAs nominating successful projects must monitor the project sponsors within their respective county in meeting the timely use of funds deadline requirements in MTC Resolution No. 3606 and report quarterly to MTC on the agency's status in meeting regional, state, and federal timely use of funds deadlines and requirements.
- **Additional Requirements Apply:**
    - Project sponsor must comply with MTC's Complete Street Policy and submit a Complete Streets Checklist for the project.
    - Project sponsor must adopt a Resolution of Local Support prior to adding the project into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
    - Project sponsor must satisfy the OBAG 2 housing policy requirements – have a certified Housing Element, submit the Annual Progress Report for the Housing Element, and have adopted a resolution affirming compliance with the California Surplus Lands Act.
    - CTAs must make each project's Complete Streets Checklist available for review by the appropriate Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) prior to MTC Commission approval of projects and fund programming. Documentation this has occurred must be included with the project application.

**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                           | SPONSOR      | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                      |              | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| <b>1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES</b>                                               |              |                      |                      |
| Regional Planning                                                                    | MTC          | \$9,555,000          |                      |
| Planning and Program Implementation                                                  | MTC          | \$10,161,000         |                      |
| <b>1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES</b>                                               |              | <b>\$19,716,000</b>  |                      |
| <b>2. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</b>                                                |              |                      |                      |
| Pavement Management Program                                                          | MTC          | \$1,500,000          |                      |
| Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP)                                           | MTC          | \$7,500,000          |                      |
| Statewide Local Streets and Roads (LSR) Needs Assessment                             | MTC/Caltrans | \$250,000            |                      |
| <b>2. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</b>                                                |              | <b>\$9,250,000</b>   |                      |
| <b>3. PDA PLANNING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</b>                                          |              |                      |                      |
| PDA Planning and Implementation                                                      |              |                      |                      |
| PDA Implementation                                                                   | MTC          | \$1,755,000          |                      |
| PDA Planning                                                                         |              |                      |                      |
| Berkeley: San Pablo Avenue PDA Plan                                                  | MTC          | \$750,000            |                      |
| Oakland: MacArthur Transit Village PDA; North Oakland/Golden Gate PDA Plan           | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| Oakland: Eastmont Town Center/International Blvd; Fruitvale & Dimond; MacArthur Blvd | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| Union City: Decoto Industrial Parkway Study Area Specific Plan 2.0                   | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| El Cerrito: San Pablo Avenue Specific Plan and EIR Update/Amendments                 | MTC          | \$308,000            |                      |
| Moraga: Moraga Center Specific Plan Implementation Project                           | MTC          | \$140,000            |                      |
| Richmond: Hilltop PDA Plan                                                           | MTC          | \$750,000            |                      |
| San Pablo: Rumrill Blvd PDA Plan                                                     | MTC          | \$250,000            |                      |
| Marin County: Urbanized Corridor/Marin City PDA Plan                                 | MTC          | \$300,000            |                      |
| San Rafael: Downtown Precise Plan                                                    | MTC          | \$500,000            |                      |
| San Francisco: HUB Area EIR                                                          | MTC          | \$265,000            |                      |
| San Francisco: Transit Corridors Study                                               | MTC          | \$316,000            |                      |
| Burlingame: Broadway Planning Area PDA Plan                                          | MTC          | \$400,000            |                      |
| South San Francisco: Downtown Station Area PDA Plan                                  | MTC          | \$500,000            |                      |
| Campbell: Hamilton Avenue Precise Plan                                               | MTC          | \$400,000            |                      |
| Milpitas: Midtown PDA Plan                                                           | MTC          | \$275,000            |                      |
| Palo Alto: University Ave/Downtown PDA Plan                                          | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| San Jose/VTA: Diridon Integrated Station Area Concept Plan                           | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| San Jose: SW Expressway/Race Street Light Rail Urban Village Plans                   | MTC          | \$22,000             |                      |
| Santa Clara: Downtown PDA Plan                                                       | MTC          | \$400,000            |                      |
| Santa Clara: El Camino Precise Plan EIR                                              | MTC          | \$166,000            |                      |
| Vacaville: Downtown Specific Plan                                                    | MTC          | \$350,000            |                      |
| Vallejo: Waterfront Amendment                                                        | MTC          | \$1,200,000          |                      |
| Santa Rosa: Downtown Station Area Specific Plan Update/Amendment                     | MTC          | \$800,000            |                      |
| Staffing Assistance                                                                  |              |                      |                      |
| Emeryville: Mitigate Regulation-Induced Displacement, Streamlined Asset Mgmt         | MTC          | \$162,000            |                      |
| Fremont: SB743 Implementation                                                        | MTC          | \$56,000             |                      |
| Hayward: SB743 Implementation                                                        | MTC          | \$66,000             |                      |
| Concord: VMT-based Transportation Impact Standards                                   | MTC          | \$51,000             |                      |
| Concord: Galindo Street Corridor Plan                                                | MTC          | \$154,000            |                      |
| Lafayette: Updated Parking Ordinance and Strategies                                  | MTC          | \$124,000            |                      |
| San Jose: PDA/Citywide Design Guidelines                                             | MTC          | \$7,000              |                      |
| Windsor: Parking Management and Pricing                                              | MTC          | \$67,000             |                      |
| Technical Assistance                                                                 |              |                      |                      |
| Emeryville: Developing the Highest and Best Use of the Public Curb                   | MTC          | \$55,000             |                      |
| Hayward: Micro Mobility/Safety Program                                               | MTC          | \$75,000             |                      |
| Oakland: General Plan Framework - PDA Community Engagement Program                   | MTC          | \$41,000             |                      |
| San Leandro: BayFair TOD Infrastructure Design/Finance                               | MTC          | \$150,000            |                      |
| San Francisco: PDA Density Bonus Program                                             | MTC          | \$55,000             |                      |
| Belmont: Transportation Demand Management Program                                    | MTC          | \$57,000             |                      |
| San Mateo: TDM Ordinance                                                             | MTC          | \$150,000            |                      |

**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
 04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
 02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
 06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
 09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
 01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
 06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                   | SPONSOR    | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                              |            | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| San Jose: Urban Villages District Parking & Rezoning                         | MTC        | \$120,000            |                      |
| Sunnyvale: Downtown Sunnyvale Block 15 Sale/Land Exchange                    | MTC        | \$4,000              |                      |
| Santa Rosa/Sonoma County: Renewal Enterprise District                        | MTC        | \$150,000            |                      |
| BART AB2923 Implementation                                                   | BART       | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| Marin/Sonoma VMT Implementation Group                                        | MTC        | \$178,000            |                      |
| Napa/Solano VMT Implementation Group                                         | MTC        | \$178,000            |                      |
| Various Jurisdictions: VMT Implementation Group                              | MTC        | \$132,000            |                      |
| <b>Priority Sites Technical Assistance</b>                                   |            |                      |                      |
| Alameda County: District Finance                                             | MTC        | \$250,000            |                      |
| Alameda County: Bay Fair BART Parking Lot                                    | MTC        | \$250,000            |                      |
| American Canyon: Adobe Lumber                                                | MTC        | \$150,000            |                      |
| Berkeley: Ashby BART Station Area                                            | MTC        | \$250,000            |                      |
| VTa: Great Mall Station (Milpitas)                                           | MTC        | \$40,000             |                      |
| Orinda: St John the Evangelist Orthodox Church                               | MTC        | \$150,000            |                      |
| Pleasanton: Dublin/Pleasanton BART                                           | MTC        | \$250,000            |                      |
| Richmond: 12th and MacDonald                                                 | MTC        | \$100,000            |                      |
| San Rafael: Public Sites Portfolio                                           | MTC        | \$141,000            |                      |
| VTa: River Oaks Campus (San Jose)                                            | MTC        | \$40,000             |                      |
| <b>Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Updates</b>                    | MTC        |                      |                      |
| ACTC: CMA Planning (for Community-Based Transportation Plans)                | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| CCTA: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                   | MTC        | \$215,000            |                      |
| TAM: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                    | MTC        | \$75,000             |                      |
| NVTA: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                   | MTC        | \$75,000             |                      |
| SFCTA: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                  | MTC        | \$175,000            |                      |
| C/CAG: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                  | MTC        | \$120,000            |                      |
| VTa: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                    | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| STA: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                    | MTC        | \$95,000             |                      |
| SCTA: Community-Based Transportation Plans                                   | MTC        | \$110,000            |                      |
| CBTP Program Evaluation                                                      | MTC        | \$35,000             |                      |
| <b>3. PDA PLANNING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</b>                                  |            | <b>\$20,000,000</b>  |                      |
| <b>4. CLIMATE INITIATIVES</b>                                                |            |                      |                      |
| <b>Climate Initiatives</b>                                                   |            |                      |                      |
| Spare the Air & EV Program Outreach (for Electric Vehicle Programs)          | BAAQMD     | \$10,000,000         |                      |
| <b>Parking Management Program</b>                                            |            |                      |                      |
| BART Variable Parking Pricing Project                                        | BART       | \$1,147,000          |                      |
| Demand-Based Parking Pricing/Curb Mgmt in Business Districts/Ferry Terminals | Alameda    | \$742,000            |                      |
| OakPark+                                                                     | Oakland    | \$1,500,000          |                      |
| Parking Meter Program Update                                                 | Martinez   | \$1,269,000          |                      |
| Pay or Permit Parking Program Expansion                                      | SFMTA      | \$1,494,000          |                      |
| Port of San Francisco-SFMTA Parking Management Pilot                         | Port of SF | \$200,000            |                      |
| <b>Parking Management Planning - Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC)</b>      |            |                      |                      |
| Alameda County CDA: TOC Parking Management Planning                          | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| Hayward: TOC Parking Management Planning                                     | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| Oakland: TOC Parking Management Planning                                     | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| Pleasanton: TOC Parking Management Planning                                  | MTC        | \$150,000            |                      |
| Antioch: TOC Parking Management Planning                                     | MTC        | \$100,000            |                      |
| Concord: TOC Parking Management Planning                                     | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| Orinda: TOC Parking Management Planning                                      | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| Larkspur: TOC Parking Management Planning                                    | MTC        | \$175,000            |                      |
| Menlo Park: TOC Parking Management Planning                                  | MTC        | \$200,000            |                      |
| Millbrae: TOC Parking Management Planning                                    | MTC        | \$300,000            |                      |
| San Bruno: TOC Parking Management Planning                                   | MTC        | \$100,000            |                      |
| Morgan Hill: TOC Parking Management Planning                                 | MTC        | \$125,000            |                      |
| Parking Management Unprogrammed Balance                                      | TBD        | \$10,406             |                      |
| <b>Mobility Hubs Pilot Program</b>                                           |            |                      |                      |

**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                    | SPONSOR       | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                               |               | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| Mobility Hubs Technical Assistance                                            | MTC           | \$150,000            |                      |
| BART: MacArthur BART Station                                                  | BART          | \$539,084            |                      |
| Hayward: TOC Station Access and Circulation Planning                          | MTC           | \$300,000            |                      |
| Burlingame: Caltrain Station - Burlingame Square Transit Hub                  | Burlingame    | \$896,000            |                      |
| Millbrae: BART and Caltrain Station - Millbrae Transit Center                 | Millbrae      | \$345,150            |                      |
| Mountain View: Mountain View Mobility Hub Pilot                               | Mountain View | \$200,000            |                      |
| Vallejo: Vallejo Ferry Terminal                                               | Vallejo       | \$200,000            |                      |
| Mobility Hubs unprogrammed balance                                            | TBD           | \$32,360             |                      |
| Targeted Transportation Alternatives                                          | MTC           | \$325,000            |                      |
| Spare the Air Youth Program - 2                                               | MTC           | \$1,417,000          |                      |
| <b>4. CLIMATE INITIATIVES</b>                                                 |               | <b>\$23,417,000</b>  |                      |
| <b>5. REGIONAL ACTIVE OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT</b>                              |               |                      |                      |
| Active Operational Management                                                 |               |                      |                      |
| AOM Implementation                                                            | MTC           | \$23,737,000         |                      |
| Bay Area 511 Traveler Information                                             |               |                      |                      |
| 511 Next Gen                                                                  | MTC           | \$26,148,000         |                      |
| 511 Implementation                                                            | MTC           | \$7,450,000          |                      |
| Rideshare                                                                     |               |                      |                      |
| Rideshare Implementation                                                      | MTC           | \$720,000            |                      |
| Carpool Program                                                               | MTC           | \$7,280,000          |                      |
| Vanpool Program                                                               | MTC           | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| Commuter Benefits Implementation                                              | MTC           | \$674,000            |                      |
| Commuter Benefits Program                                                     | MTC           | \$1,111,000          |                      |
| Napa Valley Transportation Demand Strategies (Fund Exchange)                  | MTC/NVTA      |                      | \$1,100,000          |
| Bay Bridge Forward 2018                                                       |               |                      |                      |
| Transbay Higher Capacity Bus Fleet/Increased Service Frequencies              | AC Transit    | \$1,200,000          |                      |
| Pilot Transbay Express Bus Routes                                             | AC Transit    | \$800,000            |                      |
| Eastbay Commuter Parking                                                      | MTC           | \$855,000            |                      |
| Transbay Higher Capacity Bus Fleet/Increased Service Frequencies              | WestCat       | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| Bay Bridge Forward 2020                                                       |               |                      |                      |
| Preliminary Engineering                                                       | MTC           | \$13,645,000         |                      |
| Dumbarton Forward                                                             |               |                      |                      |
| SR 84 (US 101 to I-880) Dumbarton Forward                                     | MTC           | \$4,375,000          |                      |
| Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Forward                                            |               |                      |                      |
| Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Bikeway Access (Fund Exchange)                     | Richmond      |                      | \$500,000            |
| Richmond-San Rafael Bridge Forward (Fund Exchange)                            | MTC           |                      | \$1,160,000          |
| Freeway Performance Program                                                   |               |                      |                      |
| FPP: I-880 (I-80 to I-280)                                                    | MTC           | \$3,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: I-880 Optimized Corridor Operations                                      | MTC           | \$2,240,000          |                      |
| FPP: I-580 WB HOV Lane Extension (SR 24 to I-80/SFOBB approach) PL & ENV Only | MTC           | \$625,000            |                      |
| FPP: I-80 (Carquinez Bridge to Fremont St., SF) PL only                       | MTC           | \$3,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: CC I-680 NB HOV/Express Lanes (Ala Co. to Sol Co.)                       | MTC           | \$10,000,000         |                      |
| FPP: I-80 Central Ave Interchange Improvements                                | Richmond      | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: SR 37 (US 101 to I-80) PL only                                           | MTC           | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: Napa Valley Forward Traffic Calming & Multimodal Imps.                   | MTC           | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: US 101 (SR 85 to San Francisco Co. Line)                                 | MTC           | \$3,000,000          |                      |
| FPP: SCTA US 101/Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B2 Phase 2                        | SCTA          | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS)                            | MTC           | \$5,000,000          |                      |
| Innovative Deployments for Enhanced Arterials (IDEA) Category 1               |               |                      |                      |
| AC Transit: Dumbarton Express Route (SR84)                                    | MTC           | \$1,410,000          |                      |
| Hayward: Various Locations                                                    | MTC           | \$263,000            |                      |
| Pleasanton: Various Locations                                                 | MTC           | \$234,000            |                      |
| Union City: Union City Blvd & Decoto Rd                                       | MTC           | \$619,000            |                      |
| San Ramon: Bollinger Canyon Rd & Crow Canyon Rd                               | MTC           | \$517,000            |                      |
| San Rafael: Downtown San Rafael                                               | MTC           | \$776,000            |                      |
| South San Francisco: Various Locations                                        | MTC           | \$120,000            |                      |



**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                        | SPONSOR               | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                   |                       | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| San Jose: Citywide                                                                | MTC                   | \$910,000            |                      |
| Innovative Deployments for Enhanced Arterials (IDEA) Category 2                   |                       |                      |                      |
| LAVTA/Dublin: Citywide                                                            | MTC                   | \$161,000            |                      |
| Emeryville: Powell, Shellmound, Christie & 40th St                                | MTC                   | \$661,000            |                      |
| Concord: Concord Blvd, Clayton Rd & Willow Pass Rd (Fund Exchange)                | MTC                   |                      | \$589,000            |
| MTC Concord Blvd, Clayton Rd & Willow Pass Rd (Fund Exchange)                     | MTC                   |                      | \$30,000             |
| Walnut Creek: Various locations (Fund Exchange)                                   | MTC                   |                      | \$621,000            |
| Los Gatos: Los Gatos Blvd                                                         | MTC                   | \$644,000            |                      |
| VTA: Veterans Admin. Palo Alto Medical Center                                     | VTA                   | \$845,000            |                      |
| Connected Vehicles/Automated Vehicles (CAV)                                       | MTC                   | \$178,000            |                      |
| VTA: Palo Alto Advanced Transit Passenger Management                              | VTA                   | \$976,000            |                      |
| SFCTA/TIMMA: Treasure Island Automated Shuttle Pilot                              | MTC                   | \$828,000            |                      |
| Technical Advisory Services                                                       | MTC                   | \$268,000            |                      |
| Project Evaluations                                                               | MTC                   | \$250,000            |                      |
| Shared Use Mobility                                                               | MTC                   | \$2,500,000          |                      |
| Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade                                    |                       |                      |                      |
| TMS Implementation                                                                | MTC                   | \$2,910,000          |                      |
| Regional Communications Infrastructure Upgrade                                    | MTC/Caltrans          | \$6,090,000          |                      |
| Incident Management                                                               |                       |                      |                      |
| Incident Management Implementation                                                | MTC                   | \$4,160,000          |                      |
| I-880 ICM Northern                                                                | MTC                   | \$6,200,000          |                      |
| I-880 ICM Central                                                                 | MTC/San Leandro       | \$2,640,000          |                      |
| <b>5. REGIONAL ACTIVE OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT</b>                                  |                       | <b>\$158,020,000</b> | <b>\$4,000,000</b>   |
| <b>6. TRANSIT PRIORITIES</b>                                                      |                       |                      |                      |
| BART Car Replacement/Expansion                                                    | BART                  | \$99,800,000         |                      |
| GGB Suicide Deterrent (for BART Car Replacement/Expansion)                        | GGBH&TD               | \$9,760,668          | \$30,239,332         |
| Clipper                                                                           | MTC                   | \$34,200,000         |                      |
| Transit Performance Initiative                                                    |                       |                      |                      |
| Foothill Corridor Planning Study                                                  | AC Transit            | \$1,500,000          |                      |
| MacDonald Avenue Transit Signal Priority - Phase 1                                | AC Transit            | \$2,237,000          |                      |
| Transit Corridors Study                                                           | CCCTA                 | \$400,000            |                      |
| Marin County Hwy 101 Part-Time Transit Lane                                       | MCTD/TAM              | \$1,107,000          |                      |
| Napa Valley Transit Safety and Efficiency Improvements                            | NVTA                  | \$1,060,000          |                      |
| 29 Sunset Improvements - Phase 2                                                  | SFMTA                 | \$2,959,000          |                      |
| Muni Forward Five-Minute Network Corridor Planning Program                        | SFMTA                 | \$3,038,000          |                      |
| Third Street Dynamic Traffic Signal Optimization                                  | SFMTA                 | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| El Camino Real Mid-County Transit and Multimodal Corridor Plan                    | SMCTA                 | \$407,000            |                      |
| Monterey Road Transit Lane                                                        | VTA                   | \$575,000            |                      |
| <b>6. TRANSIT PRIORITIES</b>                                                      |                       | <b>\$159,043,668</b> | <b>\$30,239,332</b>  |
| <b>7. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)</b>                                        |                       |                      |                      |
| <b><i>Regional Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties PCA Grant Program</i></b> |                       |                      |                      |
| Bay Area GreenPrint: PCA Functionality Imps                                       | MTC/GreenInfo Network |                      | \$30,000             |
| PCA Grant Implementation                                                          | MTC/Coastal Conserv   | \$525,000            | \$500,000            |
| Alameda County: Niles Canyon Trail, Phase 1                                       | Alameda County        |                      | \$269,381            |
| Livermore: Arroyo Road Trail                                                      | Livermore             |                      | \$400,000            |
| WOEIP/Urban Biofilter: Adapt Oakland Urban Greening in West Oakland               | WOEIP/Urban Biofilter |                      | \$300,000            |
| EBRPD: Bay Trail at Point Molate (RSR Bridge to Point Molate Beach Park)          | EBRPD                 |                      | \$1,000,000          |
| JMLT: Pacheco Marsh/Lower Walnut Creek Restoration and Public Access              | John Muir Land Trust  |                      | \$950,000            |
| SFCTA: Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Pathway (PE/ENV)                              | SFCTA                 | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| San Francisco: McLaren Park and Neighborhood Connections Plan                     | SF Recreation and Pa  |                      | \$194,000            |
| San Francisco/Coastal Conservancy: Twin Peaks Trail Improvement                   | SF Rec and Park/Cons  |                      | \$74,000             |
| GGNPC/NPS: Rancho Corral de Tierra Unit Management Plan Engagement                | National Parks Servi  |                      | \$200,000            |
| SMCHD: Pillar Point Public Access Improvements                                    | San Mateo Co. Harbo   |                      | \$298,000            |
| Menlo Park: Bedwell Bayfront Park Access Improvements                             | Menlo Park            |                      | \$520,000            |

**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
 04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
 02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
 06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
 09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
 01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
 06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                          | SPONSOR               | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                     |                       | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| San Mateo Co.: Colma Creek Adaptation Study (Colma Creek Connector)                 | San Mateo Co.         |                      | \$110,000            |
| San Mateo Co.: San Bruno Mtn. Habitat Conservation Plan Grazing Pilot               | San Mateo Co.         |                      | \$137,900            |
| South San Francisco: Sign Hill Conservation and Trail Master Plan                   | South San Francisco   |                      | \$135,100            |
| Point Blue: Pajaro River Watershed: Habitat Restoration and Climate Resilient Imps. | Point Blue Conservati |                      | \$379,000            |
| SCVOSA: Coyote Ridge Open Space Preserve Public Access, Phase 1                     | Point Blue Conservati |                      | \$400,000            |
| SCVOSA: Tilton Ranch Acquisition                                                    | Santa Clara Valley Op |                      | \$1,000,000          |
| VTA: SR17 Bicycle/Ped Trail & Wildlife Overcrossing (Fund Exchange)                 | VTA                   | \$251,000            |                      |
| <b>North Bay PCA Grant Program</b>                                                  |                       |                      |                      |
| Marin Co: Wilson Hill Road Rehab. (for Corte Madera: Paradise Dr MUP)               | Marin County          | \$312,000            |                      |
| Marin Co: Wilson Hill Road Rehab                                                    | Marin County          | \$869,000            |                      |
| Novato: Nave Dr/Bell Marin Keys Rehabilitation (for Hill Recreation Area Imps.)     | Novato                | \$104,000            |                      |
| Novato: Vineyard Rd Improvements (for Hill Recreation Area Imps.)                   | Novato                | \$265,000            |                      |
| SMART Pathway: Great Redwood Trail – Novato                                         | SMART                 | \$500,000            |                      |
| NVTA: Vine Trail - St. Helena to Calistoga                                          | NVTA                  | \$711,000            |                      |
| Napa: Vine Trail - Soscol Ave Corridor                                              | Napa                  | \$650,000            |                      |
| Napa County: Silverado Trail Rehabilitation - Phase L                               | Napa County           | \$689,000            |                      |
| Solano County: Suisun Valley Farm-to-Market - Phase 3 Bike Imps                     | Solano County         | \$2,050,000          |                      |
| Sonoma County: Crocker Bridge Bike/Pedestrian Bridge                                | Sonoma County         | \$1,280,000          |                      |
| Sonoma County: Joe Rodota Trail Bridge Replacement                                  | Sonoma County         | \$770,000            |                      |
| <b>7. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)</b>                                          |                       | <b>\$9,976,000</b>   | <b>\$6,897,381</b>   |
| <b>8. BAY AREA HOUSING INITIATIVES</b>                                              |                       |                      |                      |
| Bay Area Preservation Pilot (BAPP)                                                  | MTC                   |                      | \$10,000,000         |
| <b>Housing Incentive Pool (HIP)</b>                                                 |                       |                      |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 1 - San Francisco</b>                                                   |                       |                      |                      |
| <b>29 Sunset Muni Forward (Revised)</b>                                             | <b>SFMTA</b>          | <b>\$3,400,000</b>   | <b>\$2,393,000</b>   |
| Folsom Streetscape                                                                  | SFMTA                 | \$4,000,000          |                      |
| Howard Streetscape                                                                  | SFMTA                 |                      | \$1,000,000          |
| <b>Lincoln Way Traffic Signals (Removed)</b>                                        | <b>SFMTA</b>          | <b>\$3,400,000</b>   |                      |
| N-Judah Transit Priority                                                            | SFMTA                 |                      | \$6,452,000          |
| New Flyer Bus Midlife Overhaul Phase I                                              | SFMTA                 | \$4,663,000          |                      |
| New Flyer Bus Midlife Overhaul Phase II                                             | SFMTA                 |                      | \$4,425,000          |
| Powell Street Improvement                                                           | SFMTA                 |                      | \$4,000,000          |
| Bay Skyway: Yerba Buena Island Multi-Use Path                                       | SFCTA                 | \$2,267,000          |                      |
| West Side Bridges Seismic Retrofit (for YBI MUP)                                    | SFCTA                 | \$3,233,000          |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 2 - Oakland</b>                                                         |                       |                      |                      |
| Laurel Access to Mills, Maxwell Park & Seminary (LAMMPS)                            | Oakland               | \$10,033,000         |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 3 - Fremont</b>                                                         |                       |                      |                      |
| Fremont Boulevard Multimodal Corridor                                               | Fremont               | \$4,098,000          |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 4 - San Jose</b>                                                        |                       |                      |                      |
| Better Bikeway San Jose - San Fernando St                                           | San Jose              | \$2,233,000          |                      |
| San Jose Downtown Bikeways - Quick Strike                                           | San Jose              | \$1,421,000          |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 5 - Richmond</b>                                                        |                       |                      |                      |
| Bayview to BART                                                                     | Richmond              | \$450,000            |                      |
| Downtown Point Richmond Bicycle Connectivity                                        | Richmond              | \$1,078,000          |                      |
| McBryde Ave Safe Routes to Parks                                                    | Richmond              | \$922,000            |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 6 - San Leandro</b>                                                     |                       |                      |                      |
| Lewelling Blvd Class IV Bikeways                                                    | San Leandro           |                      | \$1,859,000          |
| <b>HIP Rank 7 - Sunnyvale</b>                                                       |                       |                      |                      |
| Poplar Ave Sidewalk                                                                 | Sunnyvale             | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| Sunnyvale Ave/California Ave Traffic Signal Upgrades                                | Sunnyvale             | \$836,000            |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 8 - Mountain View</b>                                                   |                       |                      |                      |
| Middlefield Rd Complete Streets                                                     | Mountain View         | \$1,766,000          |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 9 - Santa Clara</b>                                                     |                       |                      |                      |
| Santa Clara Uncontrolled Crosswalks Phase 2                                         | Santa Clara           | \$1,754,000          |                      |
| <b>HIP Rank 10 - Berkeley</b>                                                       |                       |                      |                      |

**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
 04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
 02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
 06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
 09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
 01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
 06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                                | SPONSOR          | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                           |                  | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| San Pablo Ave and Ashby Ave Intersection Improvements                                     | Berkeley         | \$1,508,000          |                      |
| HIP Rank 11 - American Canyon                                                             |                  |                      |                      |
| Pavement Rehab (Poco Wy, Melvin Rd, James Rd)                                             | American Canyon  | \$1,333,000          |                      |
| HIP Rank 12 - Redwood City                                                                |                  |                      |                      |
| Jefferson Avenue Safety Improvements                                                      | Redwood City     | \$1,011,000          |                      |
| Page Street Bike Boulevard                                                                | Redwood City     | \$310,000            |                      |
| HIP Rank 13 - Daly City                                                                   |                  |                      |                      |
| John Daly Blvd Pedestrian and Bicycle Facility Improvements                               | Daly City        | \$1,304,000          |                      |
| HIP Rank 14 - Santa Rosa                                                                  |                  |                      |                      |
| Santa Rosa US 101 Bicycle and Pedestrian Overcrossing                                     | Santa Rosa       | \$1,292,000          |                      |
| HIP Rank 15 - San Mateo                                                                   |                  |                      |                      |
| El Camino Real/Humbolt St/Hillsdale Blvd Intersection Safety                              | San Mateo        | \$959,000            |                      |
| Sub-HIP Pilot Program                                                                     |                  |                      |                      |
| Fairfield: Pavement Preservation/Rehabilitation (for One Lake Apts. Linear Park Trail)    | Fairfield        | \$2,100,000          |                      |
| Vacaville: Pavement Preservation/Rehabilitation (for Allison PDA Affordable Housing)      | Vacaville        | \$1,900,000          |                      |
| Marin County: Marin City Pedestrian Crossing Imps.                                        | Marin County     | \$300,000            |                      |
| NVTA: Imola Park and Ride                                                                 | NVTA             | \$300,000            |                      |
| Santa Rosa: Downtown Multi-modal and Fiber Improvements                                   | Santa Rosa       | \$400,000            |                      |
| <b>8. BAY AREA HOUSING INITIATIVES</b>                                                    |                  | <b>\$55,871,000</b>  | <b>\$30,129,000</b>  |
| <b>9. SAFE &amp; SEAMLESS MOBILITY QUICK-STRIKE</b>                                       |                  |                      |                      |
| County & Local                                                                            |                  |                      |                      |
| Alameda                                                                                   |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming (for Youth and Adult Bicycle Promotion & Education)            | ACTC             | \$160,000            |                      |
| Alameda County Safe Routes to Schools                                                     | ACTC             | \$1,500,000          |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | ACTC             | \$354,000            |                      |
| AC Transit Tempo Quick Build Transit Lane Delineation                                     | AC Transit       | \$300,000            |                      |
| AC Transit Quick Builds Transit Lanes                                                     | AC Transit       | \$954,000            |                      |
| Anita Avenue Safe and Accessible Route to School and Transit                              | Alameda County   | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| BART Fare Collection Equipment (for Oakland East Bay Greenway Segment II)                 | BART/Oakland     |                      | \$1,000,000          |
| Fremont Boulevard/Walnut Avenue Protected Intersection                                    | Fremont          | \$1,271,000          |                      |
| Fremont Boulevard/Grimmer Boulevard Protected Intersection                                | Fremont          | \$1,415,000          |                      |
| LAVTA Passenger Facilities Enhancements                                                   | LAVTA            |                      | \$2,000,000          |
| Oakland 14th Street Complete Streets                                                      | Oakland          |                      | \$1,000,000          |
| Contra Costa                                                                              |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | CCTA             | \$242,000            |                      |
| BART Fare Collection Equipment (for Lafayette Town Center Pathway and BART Bike Statio    | BART / Lafayette |                      | \$1,825,000          |
| BART Fare Collection Equipment (for Bicycle, Pedestrian, and ADA Imps. at Pittsburg/Bay P | BART             |                      | \$1,510,000          |
| East Downtown Concord PDA Access & Safe Routes to Transit                                 | Concord          | \$2,164,000          |                      |
| Richmond 13th Street Complete Streets                                                     | Richmond         | \$2,821,000          |                      |
| Marin                                                                                     |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | TAM              | \$141,000            |                      |
| Marin County Bus Stop Improvements                                                        | Marin Transit    | \$1,200,000          |                      |
| SMART Pathway - San Rafael McInnis Pkwy to Smith Ranch Road                               | SMART            | \$1,858,000          |                      |
| Napa                                                                                      |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | NVTA             | \$162,000            |                      |
| Napa Valley Safe Routes to School                                                         | NVTA             | \$100,000            |                      |
| Napa Valley Forward: SR 29/Rutherford & Oakville Roundabouts                              | MTC              | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| San Francisco                                                                             |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | SFCTA            | \$180,000            |                      |
| Downtown San Francisco Congestion Pricing Study                                           | SFCTA            | \$200,000            |                      |
| Embarcadero Station Platform Elevator Capacity & Redundancy                               | BART             | \$3,144,302          |                      |
| San Francisco Folsom Streetscape                                                          | SFMTA            |                      | \$5,000,000          |
| Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program                                          | SFMTA            | \$2,100,000          |                      |
| San Mateo                                                                                 |                  |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                                | C/CAG            | \$183,000            |                      |



**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
 04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
 02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
 06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
 09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
 01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
 06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                   | SPONSOR            | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                              |                    | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| Planning and Programming of safe and seamless mobility                       | C/CAG              | \$200,000            |                      |
| Burlingame City-Wide Pedestrian Safe Routes and Mobility Imps                | Burlingame         | \$200,000            |                      |
| San Bruno Transit Corridor Pedestrian Connection Phase 4                     | San Bruno          | \$385,000            |                      |
| Broadmoor SRTS Pedestrian Safety & Mobility Imps                             | San Mateo County   | \$1,419,000          |                      |
| El Camino Real Grand Boulevard Initiative Phase III                          | South San Francisc | \$2,120,000          |                      |
| East of 101 Transit Expansion Project                                        | South San Francisc | \$49,924             | \$430,076            |
| <b>Santa Clara</b>                                                           |                    |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                   | VTA                | \$419,000            |                      |
| Evaluating on-demand shuttle strategies for improved transit access          | VTA                | \$200,000            |                      |
| VTA Electronic Locker Upgrade and Replacement                                | VTA                | \$1,987,000          |                      |
| Mountain View Stierlin Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements              | Mountain View      | \$4,007,000          |                      |
| San Jose Julian Street & McKee Road Vision Zero Complete Streets             | San Jose           | \$705,000            |                      |
| San Jose Bascom Avenue Protected Bike Lanes & Complete Street                | San Jose           | \$690,000            |                      |
| En Movimiento Quick Build Network for East San Jose                          | San Jose           |                      | \$1,325,000          |
| San Jose - Downtown Bikeways                                                 | San Jose           | \$4,025,000          |                      |
| Saratoga Blue Hills Elementary Pedestrian Crossing at UPRR                   | Saratoga           | \$1,800,000          |                      |
| Sunnyvale Bicycle, Pedestrian and SRTS Safety Improvements                   | Sunnyvale          |                      | \$1,900,000          |
| <b>Solano</b>                                                                |                    |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                   | STA                | \$110,000            |                      |
| STA Mobility Planning                                                        | STA                | \$200,000            |                      |
| Solano Safe Routes to School Non-Infrastructure Program                      | STA                | \$600,000            |                      |
| Fairfield/Vacaville Hannigan Station Capacity Improvements                   | Fairfield          | \$1,900,000          |                      |
| Vallejo Springs Rd Pavement Preservation                                     | Vallejo            | \$1,800,000          |                      |
| <b>Sonoma</b>                                                                |                    |                      |                      |
| CTA planning & programming                                                   | SCTA               | \$135,000            |                      |
| Countywide Active Transportation Plan                                        | SCTA               | \$200,000            |                      |
| Cotati Downtown- Civic Center Connectivity and Safety Improvements           | Cotati             | \$242,000            | \$1,008,000          |
| Healdsburg Bike Share                                                        | Healdsburg         | \$250,000            |                      |
| Rohnert Park Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvements                      | Rohnert Park       | \$522,000            |                      |
| Santa Rosa Transit Mall Roadbed Rehabilitation                               | Santa Rosa         |                      | \$868,000            |
| Sebastopol SR 116 and Bodega Ave Pedestrian Access and Mobility Enhancements | Sebastopol         | \$476,000            |                      |
| SMART Pathway - Petaluma Payran to Lakeville                                 | SMART              | \$806,000            |                      |
| <b>Regional &amp; Corridor</b>                                               |                    |                      |                      |
| <b>Regional Planning</b>                                                     |                    |                      |                      |
| FasTrak START Pilot Evaluation Study                                         | MTC                | \$900,000            |                      |
| Diridon Station Planning & Studies                                           | MTC                | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| <b>Regional and Corridor</b>                                                 |                    |                      |                      |
| Bay Bridge Forward: I-580 WB HOV Lane Extension                              | MTC/ACTC           | \$7,000,000          |                      |
| Napa Valley Forward: SR 29/Rutherford & Oakville Roundabouts                 | MTC                | \$6,000,000          |                      |
| Redwood City Roosevelt Avenue Quick-Build                                    | Redwood City       | \$755,000            |                      |
| <b>Transit Recovery Blue Ribbon Task Force</b>                               |                    |                      |                      |
| East Bay Integration and Coordination Implementation Planning                | CCTA               | \$500,000            |                      |
| Solano Integration and Coordination Implementation Planning                  | STA                | \$500,000            |                      |
| Accessibility: Clipper for Centralized Program Eligibility Verification      | MTC                | \$900,000            |                      |
| Bay Bridge Forward: Preliminary Engineering                                  | MTC                | \$1,250,000          |                      |
| Customer Information: Mapping & Wayfinding                                   | MTC                | \$7,391,538          |                      |
| Unprogrammed Balance                                                         | TBD                | \$700,000            |                      |
| <b>9. SAFE &amp; SEAMLESS MOBILITY QUICK-STRIKE</b>                          |                    | <b>\$75,793,764</b>  | <b>\$17,866,076</b>  |
| <b>10. REGIONAL STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS (RSI)</b>                              |                    |                      |                      |
| AC Transit Bus Purchase (for Solano I-80 Express Lanes)                      | AC Transit         | \$4,667,000          |                      |
| SR 84 Ardenwood Intermodal Bus Facility PA&ED (Fund Exchange)                | CCJPA              | \$100,000            |                      |
| Bay Skyway: West Oakland Link                                                | MTC                | \$1,698,000          | \$8,302,000          |
| CC I-680 NB HOV/Express Lanes Ala Co to Sol Co (Fund Exchange)               | CCTA/MTC           | \$4,000,000          |                      |
| GGB Suicide Deterrent System                                                 | GGBHTD             | \$7,910,000          |                      |
| Pavement Rehab (for Downtown Novato SMART Station)                           | Novato             | \$617,000            |                      |



**Attachment B-1**  
**MTC Resolution No. 4202**  
**OBAG 2 Regional Programs**  
**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**  
**June 2026**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 11/18/15-C

Revised: 07/27/16-C 10/26/16-C 12/21/16-C 03/22/17-C 05/24/17-C 06/28/17-C  
 07/26/17-C 09/27/17-C 10/25/17-C 12/20/17-C 01/24/18-C 02/28/18-C 03/28/18-C  
 04/25/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 07/25/18-C 09/26/18-C 11/28/18-C 12/19/18-C  
 02/27/19-C 03/27/19-C 06/26/19-C 09/25/19-C 10/23/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C  
 05/27/20-C 07/22/20-C 11/20/20-C 01/27/21-C 02/24/21-C 04/28/21-C 05/26/21-C  
 06/23/21-C 07/28/21-C 09/22/21-C 01/26/22-C 03/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 06/22/22-C  
 09/28/22-C 10/26/22-C 03/22/23-C 04/26/23-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C 07/26/23-C  
 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C 03/27/24-C 04/24/24-C 05/22/24-C 11/20/24-C 12/18/24-C  
 01/22/25-C 02/26/25-C 03/26/25-C 04/23/25-C 06/25/25-C 09/24/25-C 10/22/25-C  
 06/24/26-C

**OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                      | SPONSOR          | Total STP/CMAQ       | Other                |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                 |                  | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |
| Old Redwood Highway Multi-Use Pathway                                           | Larkspur         | \$1,120,000          |                      |
| Grand Ave Bridge                                                                | San Rafael       | \$763,000            |                      |
| Grand Ave Bike/Ped Imps (for SMART 2nd to Andersen Pathway)                     | San Rafael       | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| US 101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows                                                     | TAM              | \$2,000,000          |                      |
| US 101 Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B7 (Loan for RM3)                             | TAM              | \$61,708,245         | \$13,942,852         |
| Diridon Station Planning & Studies                                              | MTC              | \$1,000,000          |                      |
| VTA: Highway 17 Bicycle/Pedestrian Trail and Wildlife Overcrossing (Fund Exch.) | VTA              | \$249,000            |                      |
| Broadmoor SRTS Pedestrian Safety & Mobility Imps                                | San Mateo County | \$184,000            |                      |
| I-80 Express Lanes in Solano County (Loan for RM3)                              | STA              | \$63,464,510         | \$3,255,000          |
| I-80 Express Lanes in Solano County (Toll System)                               | BAIFA            |                      | \$28,454,000         |
| US 101/Marin Sonoma Narrows (MSN) B2 Phase 2 (Fund Exchange)                    | SCTA             | \$15,400,000         |                      |
| <b>10. REGIONAL STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS (RSI)</b>                                 |                  | <b>\$165,880,755</b> | <b>\$53,953,852</b>  |
| <b>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</b>                                                 | <b>TOTAL:</b>    | <b>\$696,968,187</b> | <b>\$143,085,641</b> |

## MTC Resolution No. 4202

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs

FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

February 2024

Revised: 07/27/16-C 12/21/16-C 04/26/17-C 06/28/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
 02/28/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 09/26/18-C 12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 06/26/19-C  
 09/25/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C 09/23/20-C 07/28/21-C 11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C  
 02/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 05/25/22-C 10/28/22-C 11/16/22-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
 07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                   | SPONSOR               | STP/CMAQ             | Other              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                                |                       | <b>\$376,562,000</b> |                    |
| <b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>                                                        |                       |                      |                    |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                      |                       |                      |                    |
| Planning Activities Base                                                     | ACTC                  | \$5,489,000          |                    |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                           | ACTC                  | \$2,800,000          |                    |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                  |                       |                      |                    |
| Alameda County: Various Streets & Roads Preservation                         | Alameda County        | \$1,779,000          |                    |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                 |                       |                      |                    |
| ACTC: Alameda County SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program                         | ACTC                  | \$5,340,000          |                    |
| County Program                                                               |                       |                      |                    |
| ACTC: SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program - Supplemental                         | ACTC                  | \$2,579,000          |                    |
| ACTC: SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program - OBAG 3                               | ACTC                  | \$1,267,000          |                    |
| Alameda: Central Ave Complete Street                                         | Alameda               | \$3,487,000          |                    |
| Alameda: Grand St Pavement Resurfacing & Safety Improvements                 | Alameda               | \$827,000            |                    |
| Alameda: Clement Ave Complete Street                                         | Alameda               | \$5,018,000          |                    |
| <b>Alameda County: Meekland Ave Corridor Improvement, Phase II (Revised)</b> | <b>Alameda County</b> |                      | <b>\$9,300,000</b> |
| Alameda County: Various Streets and Roads Preservation                       | Alameda County        | \$2,171,000          |                    |
| Albany: San Pablo Ave and Buchanan St Pedestrian Improvements                | Albany                | \$340,000            |                    |
| Berkeley: Southside Complete Streets & Transit Improvements                  | Berkeley              | \$8,335,000          |                    |
| Dublin: Dublin Blvd Rehabilitation                                           | Dublin                | \$661,000            |                    |
| Fremont: Complete Streets Upgrade of Relinquished SR 84 in Centerville PDA   | Fremont               | \$7,695,000          |                    |
| Fremont: Various Streets and Roads Rehabilitation                            | Fremont               | \$2,760,000          |                    |
| Hayward: Main St Complete Street                                             | Hayward               | \$1,675,000          |                    |
| Hayward: Winton Ave Complete Street                                          | Hayward               | \$88,000             |                    |
| Livermore: Annual Pavement Preservation                                      | Livermore             | \$1,382,000          |                    |
| MTC: I-580 Corridor Study                                                    | MTC                   | \$200,000            |                    |
| Newark: Thornton Ave Pavement Rehabilitation                                 | Newark                | \$592,000            |                    |
| Oakland: Lakeside Family Streets                                             | Oakland               | \$4,792,000          |                    |
| Oakland: Citywide Various Streets and Roads Rehabilitation                   | Oakland               | \$4,895,000          |                    |
| Piedmont: Oakland Ave Improvements                                           | Piedmont              | \$168,000            |                    |
| Pleasanton: Hacienda Business Park Pavement Rehabilitation                   | Pleasanton            | \$1,095,000          |                    |
| San Leandro: Washington Ave Rehabilitation                                   | San Leandro           | \$1,048,000          |                    |
| Union City: Dyer Rd Pavement Rehabilitation                                  | Union City            | \$872,000            |                    |
| <b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>                                                        | <b>TOTAL:</b>         | <b>\$67,355,000</b>  | <b>\$9,300,000</b> |
| <b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>                                                   |                       |                      |                    |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                      |                       |                      |                    |
| Planning Activities Base                                                     | CCTA                  | \$4,342,000          |                    |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                  |                       |                      |                    |
| Contra Costa County: Kirker Pass Rd Overlay                                  | Contra Costa County   | \$1,343,000          |                    |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                 |                       |                      |                    |
| Antioch: L Street Pathway to Transit                                         | Antioch               | \$1,469,000          |                    |
| Concord: Willow Pass Road Rehab and SRTS                                     | Concord               | \$1,012,000          |                    |
| Contra Costa County: West County Walk & Bike Non-Infrastructure Prog.        | Contra Costa County   | \$561,000            |                    |
| Moraga: Moraga Way and Canyon Rd/Camino Pablo Improvements                   | Moraga                | \$91,000             |                    |
| Pleasant Hill: Pleasant Hill Rd Improvements                                 | Pleasant Hill         | \$67,000             |                    |
| Richmond: Lincoln Elementary Pedestrian Enhancements                         | Richmond              | \$497,000            |                    |
| San Ramon: San Ramon Valley Street Smarts Non-Infrastructure Program         | San Ramon             | \$391,000            |                    |
| County Program                                                               |                       |                      |                    |
| Antioch: Pavement Rehabilitation                                             | Antioch               | \$2,474,000          |                    |
| Brentwood: Various Streets and Roads Preservation                            | Brentwood             | \$628,000            |                    |
| Clayton: Neighborhood Streets Rehabilitation                                 | Clayton               | \$308,000            |                    |

## MTC Resolution No. 4202

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs

## FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

## February 2024

Revised: 07/27/16-C 12/21/16-C 04/26/17-C 06/28/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
 02/28/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 09/26/18-C 12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 06/26/19-C  
 09/25/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C 09/23/20-C 07/28/21-C 11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C  
 02/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 05/25/22-C 10/28/22-C 11/16/22-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
 07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                    | SPONSOR             | STP/CMAQ                   | Other |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                                 |                     | <b>\$376,562,000</b>       |       |
| Concord: Monument Blvd Class I Path                                           | Concord             | \$4,368,000                |       |
| Concord: Willow Pass Road Rehab and SRTS                                      | Concord             | \$4,183,000                |       |
| Contra Costa County: Local Streets and Roads Preservation                     | Contra Costa County | \$3,847,000                |       |
| Danville: Camino Ramon Improvements                                           | Danville            | \$1,357,000                |       |
| Danville: San Ramon Valley Blvd. Imps. (for: Diablo Road Trail)               | San Ramon           | \$130,000                  |       |
| El Cerrito: Carlson Blvd and Central Ave Pavement Rehabilitation              | El Cerrito          | \$424,000                  |       |
| El Cerrito: El Cerrito del Norte TOD Complete Streets Imps                    | El Cerrito          | \$4,960,000                |       |
| Hercules: Sycamore/Willow Pavement Rehabilitation                             | Hercules            | \$492,000                  |       |
| Lafayette: Pleasant Hill Rd Pavement Rehabilitation                           | Lafayette           | \$579,000                  |       |
| Martinez: Downtown Streets Rehabilitation                                     | Martinez            | \$846,000                  |       |
| Moraga: Moraga Way and Canyon Rd/Camino Pablo Improvements                    | Moraga              | \$596,000                  |       |
| Oakley: Street Repair and Resurfacing                                         | Oakley              | \$969,000                  |       |
| Orinda: Orinda Way Pavement Rehabilitation                                    | Orinda              | \$620,000                  |       |
| Pinole: San Pablo Ave Rehabilitation                                          | Pinole              | \$586,000                  |       |
| Pinole: Safety Improvements at Appian Way and Marlesta Rd                     | Pinole              | \$350,000                  |       |
| Pinole: Safety Improvements at Appian Way and Marlesta Rd                     | Pinole              | \$350,000                  |       |
| Pittsburg: BART Pedestrian and Bicycle Connectivity Improvements              | Pittsburg           | \$3,870,000                |       |
| Pittsburg: Pavement Improvements                                              | Pittsburg           | \$2,410,000                |       |
| Pleasant Hill: Pleasant Hill Rd Improvements                                  | Pleasant Hill       | \$920,000                  |       |
| Richmond: ADA Improvements on 7th, Central, Cutting, Giant Hwy                | Richmond            | \$2,205,000                |       |
| San Pablo: Giant Rd Pavement Rehabilitation                                   | San Pablo           | \$618,000                  |       |
| San Ramon: Alcosta Blvd Pavement Rehabilitation                               | San Ramon           | \$1,175,000                |       |
| San Ramon: Iron Horse Bike and Pedestrian Overcrossings                       | San Ramon           | \$4,840,000                |       |
| Walnut Creek: Ygnacio Valley Rd Rehabilitation                                | Walnut Creek        | \$2,608,000                |       |
| <b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>                                                    |                     | <b>TOTAL: \$56,486,000</b> |       |
| <b>MARIN COUNTY</b>                                                           |                     |                            |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                       |                     |                            |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                      | TAM                 | \$3,822,000                |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                   |                     |                            |       |
| County of Marin receives FAS funding directly from Caltrans                   |                     |                            |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                  |                     |                            |       |
| Corte Madera: Paradise Dr Multi-Use Path (San Clement Dr to Seawolf Passage)  | Corte Madera        | \$595,000                  |       |
| San Anselmo: San Anselmo Bike Spine                                           | San Anselmo         | \$269,000                  |       |
| County Program                                                                |                     |                            |       |
| GGBHTD: San Rafael Bettini Transit Center                                     | GGBHTD              | \$1,250,000                |       |
| Novato: Nave Dr and Bel Marin Keys Blvd Preservation (for Novato Downtown SM) | Novato              | \$1,450,000                |       |
| San Anselmo: Sir Francis Drake Blvd Pavement Rehab and Crossing Imps          | San Anselmo         | \$1,134,000                |       |
| San Rafael: Francisco Blvd East Sidewalk Improvements                         | San Rafael          | \$2,100,000                |       |
| Sausalito: US 101/Bridgeway/Gate 6 Bicycle Improvements                       | Sausalito           | \$250,000                  |       |
| <b>MARIN COUNTY</b>                                                           |                     | <b>TOTAL: \$10,870,000</b> |       |
| <b>NAPA COUNTY</b>                                                            |                     |                            |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                       |                     |                            |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                      | NVTA                | \$3,822,000                |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                   |                     |                            |       |
| County of Napa receives FAS funding directly from Caltrans                    |                     |                            |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                  |                     |                            |       |
| NVTA: Napa County SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program                             | NVTA                | \$122,000                  |       |
| NVTA: Vine Trail Calistoga to St. Helena                                      | NVTA                | \$393,000                  |       |
| County Program                                                                |                     |                            |       |
| NVTA: Vine Transit Bus Maintenance Facility                                   | NVTA                | \$2,000,000                |       |
| NVTA: Vine Trail Calistoga to St. Helena                                      | NVTA                | \$1,813,000                |       |

## MTC Resolution No. 4202

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs

## FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

## February 2024

Revised: 07/27/16-C 12/21/16-C 04/26/17-C 06/28/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
 02/28/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 09/26/18-C 12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 06/26/19-C  
 09/25/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C 09/23/20-C 07/28/21-C 11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C  
 02/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 05/25/22-C 10/28/22-C 11/16/22-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
 07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                                           | SPONSOR        | STP/CMAQ             | Other |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                                        |                | <b>\$376,562,000</b> |       |
| <b>NAPA COUNTY</b>                                                                   | <b>TOTAL:</b>  | <b>\$8,150,000</b>   |       |
| <b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>                                                          |                |                      |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                              |                |                      |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                             | SFCTA          | \$3,997,000          |       |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                                   | SFCTA          | \$1,900,000          |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                          |                |                      |       |
| County of San Francisco is entirely urban and therefore does not receive FAS funding |                |                      |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                         |                |                      |       |
| SFMTA: San Francisco SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program                                 | SFMTA          | \$1,797,000          |       |
| County Program                                                                       |                |                      |       |
| BART: Embarcadero Station New Northside Platform Elevator and Faregates              | BART           | \$2,000,000          |       |
| Caltrain: Peninsula Corridor Electrification                                         | Caltrain       | \$11,188,000         |       |
| SFMTA: Geary Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1                                               | SFMTA          | \$6,939,000          |       |
| SFMTA: San Francisco SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program - Supplemental                  | SFMTA          | \$1,016,000          |       |
| SFMTA: Central Subway                                                                | SFMTA          | \$15,980,000         |       |
| SFDPW: Better Market Street                                                          | SFDPW          | \$3,366,000          |       |
| <b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>                                                          | <b>TOTAL:</b>  | <b>\$48,183,000</b>  |       |
| <b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>                                                              |                |                      |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                              |                |                      |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                             | C/CAG          | \$3,822,000          |       |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                                   | C/CAG          | \$1,512,000          |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                                          |                |                      |       |
| County of San Mateo receives FAS funding directly from Caltrans                      |                |                      |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                                         |                |                      |       |
| C/CAG: San Mateo SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program                                     | CCAG/COE       | \$2,394,000          |       |
| County Program                                                                       |                |                      |       |
| Atherton: James Ave Rehabilitation                                                   | Atherton       | \$251,000            |       |
| Belmont: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                     | Belmont        | \$467,000            |       |
| Belmont: Ralston Ave Corridor Bike/Ped Improvements                                  | Belmont        | \$1,000,000          |       |
| Brisbane: Crocker Trail Commuter Connectivity Upgrades                               | Brisbane       | \$885,000            |       |
| Brisbane: Tunnel Ave Rehabilitation                                                  | Brisbane       | \$137,000            |       |
| Burlingame: Various Streets Resurfacing                                              | Burlingame     | \$571,000            |       |
| Burlingame: Broadway PDA Lighting Improvements                                       | Burlingame     | \$720,000            |       |
| Burlingame: Hoover School Area Sidewalk Improvements                                 | Burlingame     | \$700,000            |       |
| C/CAG: San Mateo SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program - Supplemental                      | CCAG/COE       | \$223,000            |       |
| Colma: Mission Rd Bike/Ped Improvements                                              | Colma          | \$625,000            |       |
| Daly City: Various Streets Pavement Resurfacing and Slurry Seal                      | Daly City      | \$1,310,000          |       |
| Daly City: Southgate Ave and School Street Safety Imps.                              | Daly City      | \$450,000            |       |
| East Palo Alto: Various Streets Resurfacing                                          | East Palo Alto | \$416,000            |       |
| Foster City: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                 | Foster City    | \$441,000            |       |
| Half Moon Bay: Poplar Street Complete Streets                                        | Half Moon Bay  | \$1,202,000          |       |
| Hillsborough: Various Streets Resurfacing                                            | Hillsborough   | \$408,000            |       |
| Menlo Park: Santa Cruz and Middle Avenues Rehabilitation                             | Menlo Park     | \$647,000            |       |
| Millbrae: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                    | Millbrae       | \$387,000            |       |
| Millbrae: Park Blvd, San Anselmo Ave, & Santa Teresa Way Imps.                       | Millbrae       | \$347,000            |       |
| Pacifica: Citywide Curb Ramp Replacements                                            | Pacifica       | \$400,000            |       |
| Pacifica: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                    | Pacifica       | \$671,000            |       |
| Pacifica: Palmetto Sidewalk Improvements                                             | Pacifica       | \$330,000            |       |
| Pacifica: Sharp Park Priority Development Area Pedestrian Imps                       | Pacifica       | \$1,000,000          |       |
| Portola Valley: Various Streets Resurfacing                                          | Portola Valley | \$201,000            |       |
| Redwood City: Twin Dolphin Parkway Overlay                                           | Redwood City   | \$1,266,000          |       |
| San Bruno: Huntington Transit Corridor Bicycle/Pedestrian and Related Imps           | San Bruno      | \$914,000            |       |
| San Bruno: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                   | San Bruno      | \$673,000            |       |
| San Carlos: Cedar and Brittan Ave Pavement Rehabilitation                            | San Carlos     | \$575,000            |       |
| San Carlos: Ped Enhancements Arroyo/Cedar and Hemlock/Orange                         | San Carlos     | \$500,000            |       |
| San Mateo: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                                   | San Mateo      | \$1,593,000          |       |
| San Mateo: Laurie Meadows Ped/Bike Safety Improvements                               | San Mateo      | \$987,000            |       |

## MTC Resolution No. 4202

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs

## FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

## February 2024

Revised: 07/27/16-C 12/21/16-C 04/26/17-C 06/28/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
 02/28/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 09/26/18-C 12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 06/26/19-C  
 09/25/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C 09/23/20-C 07/28/21-C 11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C  
 02/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 05/25/22-C 10/28/22-C 11/16/22-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
 07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C

## OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                              | SPONSOR             | STP/CMAQ             | Other               |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                           |                     | <b>\$376,562,000</b> |                     |
| San Mateo County: Canada Rd and Edgewood Rd Resurfacing                 | San Mateo County    | \$892,000            |                     |
| San Mateo County: Countywide Pavement Maintenance                       | San Mateo County    | \$1,072,000          |                     |
| South San Francisco: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation            | South San Francisco | \$1,027,000          |                     |
| South San Francisco: Grand Boulevard Initiative Complete Street Imps    | South San Francisco | \$1,000,000          |                     |
| Woodside: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                       | Woodside            | \$242,000            |                     |
| Woodside: Woodside Pathway Phase 3                                      | Woodside            | \$136,000            |                     |
| Unprogrammed balance                                                    | TBD                 | \$151,000            |                     |
| <b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>                                                 |                     | <b>TOTAL:</b>        | <b>\$32,545,000</b> |
| <b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>                                               |                     |                      |                     |
| <b>CMA Planning Activities</b>                                          |                     |                      |                     |
| Planning Activities Base                                                | VTA                 | \$6,078,000          |                     |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                      | VTA                 | \$4,822,000          |                     |
| <b>Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)</b>                                      |                     |                      |                     |
| Santa Clara County: Uvas Rd Rehabilitation                              | Santa Clara County  | \$1,701,000          |                     |
| <b>Safe Routes To School (SRTS)</b>                                     |                     |                      |                     |
| Campbell: Eden Ave Sidewalk Improvements                                | Campbell            | \$555,000            |                     |
| Cupertino: McClellan Rd Separated Bike Lane                             | Cupertino           | \$1,000,000          |                     |
| Los Gatos: Los Gatos Creek Trail to Highway 9 Trailhead Connection      | Los Gatos           | \$1,258,000          |                     |
| San Jose: Mount Pleasant Schools Area Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Imps. | San Jose            | \$1,000,000          |                     |
| Santa Clara: Santa Clara Schools Access Improvements                    | Santa Clara         | \$1,146,000          |                     |
| Sunnyvale: Homestead Rd at Homestead High School Ped & Bike Imps.       | Sunnyvale           | \$1,000,000          |                     |
| Sunnyvale: Pedestrian and Bicyclist Infrastructure Improvements         | Sunnyvale           | \$919,000            |                     |
| <b>County Program</b>                                                   |                     |                      |                     |
| Campbell: Campbell PDA Enhancements                                     | Campbell            | \$550,000            |                     |
| Campbell: Winchester Boulevard Overlay                                  | Campbell            | \$554,000            |                     |
| Campbell: Harriet Ave Sidewalk Project                                  | Campbell            | \$447,328            |                     |
| Cupertino: Pavement Management Program                                  | Cupertino           | \$769,000            |                     |
| Cupertino: Stevens Creek Boulevard Class IV Bike Lanes                  | Cupertino           | \$807,000            |                     |
| Gilroy: Downtown Monterey St Rehabilitation                             | Gilroy              | \$1,028,000          |                     |
| Los Altos: Fremont Ave Asphalt Concrete Overlay                         | Los Altos           | \$336,000            |                     |
| Los Gatos: Los Gatos Creek Trail to Highway 9 Trailhead Connection      | Los Gatos           | \$5,278,000          |                     |
| Los Gatos: Shannon Rd Complete Streets                                  | Los Gatos           | \$940,100            |                     |
| Milpitas: Various Streets Resurfacing                                   | Milpitas            | \$1,609,000          |                     |
| Morgan Hill: East Dunne Ave Pavement Rehabilitation                     | Morgan Hill         | \$857,000            |                     |
| Mountain View: Shoreline Boulevard Pathway Improvements                 | Mountain View       | \$1,996,000          |                     |
| Mountain View: West Middlefield Road Improvements                       | Mountain View       | \$1,136,000          |                     |
| Palo Alto: Adobe Creek/Highway 101 Bicycle Pedestrian Bridge            | Palo Alto           | \$4,350,000          |                     |
| Palo Alto: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan                          | Palo Alto           | \$638,000            |                     |
| Palo Alto: Various Streets Resurfacing                                  | Palo Alto           | \$1,009,000          |                     |
| San Jose: Downtown San Jose Mobility, Streetscape, and Public Life Plan | San Jose            | \$813,000            |                     |
| San Jose: East Side Alum Rock (east of 680) Urban Village Plan          | San Jose            | \$400,000            |                     |
| San Jose: Julian & St. James Livable Streets Couplet Conversion         | San Jose            | \$2,067,572          |                     |
| San Jose: McKee Road Vision Zero Priority Safety Corridor Improvements  | San Jose            | \$8,623,000          |                     |

## OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                              | SPONSOR            | STP/CMAQ                    | Other |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                           |                    | <b>\$376,562,000</b>        |       |
| San Jose: Various Streets Pavement Rehabilitation                       | San Jose           | \$14,597,000                |       |
| San Jose: Tully Road Vision Zero Priority Safety Corridor Improvements  | San Jose           | \$8,599,000                 |       |
| San Jose: West San Carlos Urban Village Streetscape Improvements        | San Jose           | \$3,582,000                 |       |
| Santa Clara: Streets & Roads Preservation                               | Santa Clara        | \$2,356,000                 |       |
| Santa Clara County: Capitol Expressway Rehabilitation                   | Santa Clara County | \$5,000,000                 |       |
| Santa Clara County: Circulation and Mobility Element                    | Santa Clara County | \$450,000                   |       |
| Santa Clara County: McKean Rd Pavement Rehabilitation                   | Santa Clara County | \$1,151,000                 |       |
| Saratoga: Citywide Master Plan for Bicycle and Sidewalks                | Saratoga           | \$443,000                   |       |
| Saratoga: Prospect Rd Complete Streets                                  | Saratoga           | \$1,075,000                 |       |
| Saratoga: Saratoga Village Crosswalks & Sidewalks Rehabilitation        | Saratoga           | \$338,000                   |       |
| Sunnyvale: Bernardo Avenue Bicycle Underpass - EIR                      | Sunnyvale          | \$500,000                   |       |
| Sunnyvale: East Sunnyvale Area Sense of Place Improvements              | Sunnyvale          | \$1,701,000                 |       |
| Sunnyvale: Fair Oaks Avenue Bikeway - Phase 2                           | Sunnyvale          | \$782,000                   |       |
| Sunnyvale: Java Drive Road Diet & Bike Lanes                            | Sunnyvale          | \$500,000                   |       |
| Sunnyvale: Lawrence Station Area Sidewalks & Bike Facilities            | Sunnyvale          | \$500,000                   |       |
| Sunnyvale: Peery Park Sense of Place Improvements                       | Sunnyvale          | \$2,686,000                 |       |
| Sunnyvale: Traffic Signal Upgrades                                      | Sunnyvale          | \$2,566,000                 |       |
| VTA/Milpitas: Montague Exwy Pedestrian Overcrossing at Milpitas BART    | VTA/Milpitas       | \$3,560,000                 |       |
| <b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>                                               |                    | <b>TOTAL: \$104,073,000</b> |       |
| <b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>                                                    |                    |                             |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                 |                    |                             |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                | STA                | \$3,822,000                 |       |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                      | STA                | \$3,039,000                 |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                             |                    |                             |       |
| Solano County: County Roads Paving                                      | Solano County      | \$506,000                   |       |
| Solano County: Farm to Market Phase 2 Imps                              | Solano County      | \$1,000,000                 |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                            |                    |                             |       |
| Fairfield: Grange Middle School SRTS Imps                               | Fairfield          | \$260,000                   |       |
| STA: Countywide SRTS Non-Infrastructure Program                         | STA                | \$1,209,000                 |       |
| County Program                                                          |                    |                             |       |
| Fairfield: East Tabor Tolenas SR2S Sidewalk Gap Closure                 | Fairfield          | \$2,731,000                 |       |
| Fairfield: Cadenasso Dr Repaving                                        | Fairfield          | \$1,394,000                 |       |
| Suisun City: Railroad Ave Repaving                                      | Suisun City        | \$491,000                   |       |
| STA: Vacaville Jepson Parkway Phase 1B Bike Path                        | STA                | \$3,064,000                 |       |
| STA: Solano Mobility Call Center                                        | STA                | \$1,537,000                 |       |
| Vacaville: Local Streets Overlay                                        | Vacaville          | \$1,193,000                 |       |
| Vacaville: Bike/Ped Trail Imps at Fruitvale Rd, Briarwood Dr, Arlene Dr | Vacaville          | \$250,000                   |       |
| Vallejo: Sacramento St Rehabilitation                                   | Vallejo            | \$681,000                   |       |
| <b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>                                                    |                    | <b>TOTAL: \$21,177,000</b>  |       |
| <b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>                                                    |                    |                             |       |
| CMA Planning Activities                                                 |                    |                             |       |
| Planning Activities Base                                                | SCTA               | \$3,822,000                 |       |
| Planning Activities - Supplemental                                      | SCTA               | \$1,178,000                 |       |
| Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)                                             |                    |                             |       |
| Sonoma County: River Road Pavement Rehabilitation                       | Sonoma County      | \$3,264,000                 |       |
| Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                                            |                    |                             |       |
| SCTA: Sonoma County Safe Routes To School (SRTS)                        | SCTA               | \$1,655,000                 |       |
| County Program                                                          |                    |                             |       |
| Cotati: E. Cotati Avenue Street Rehabilitation                          | Cotati             | \$675,000                   |       |



**Attachment B-2**

MTC Res. No. 4202 Attachment B-2

**MTC Resolution No. 4202**

Adopted: 11/18/15-C

**OBAG 2 County Programs****FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22****February 2024**

Revised: 07/27/16-C 12/21/16-C 04/26/17-C 06/28/17-C 11/15/17-C 12/20/17-C  
 02/28/18-C 05/23/18-C 06/27/18-C 09/26/18-C 12/19/18-C 01/23/19-C 06/26/19-C  
 09/25/19-C 11/20/19-C 02/26/20-C 09/23/20-C 07/28/21-C 11/17/21-C 12/15/21-C  
 02/23/22-C 04/27/22-C 05/25/22-C 10/28/22-C 11/16/22-C 05/24/23-C 06/28/23-C  
 07/26/23-C 09/27/23-C 12/20/23-C 02/28/24-C

**OBAG 2 County Programs Project List**

| PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE                                       | SPONSOR       | STP/CMAQ             | Other              |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                    |               | <b>\$376,562,000</b> |                    |
| Healdsburg: Healdsburg Avenue Road Diet                          | Healdsburg    | \$600,000            |                    |
| Petaluma: Petaluma Boulevard South Road Diet                     | Petaluma      | \$2,916,000          |                    |
| SMART: Petaluma SMART Pathway                                    | SMART         | \$400,000            |                    |
| Rohnert Park: Various Streets Rehabilitation                     | Rohnert Park  | \$1,035,000          |                    |
| Santa Rosa: US 101 Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge Overcrossing    | Santa Rosa    | \$1,418,000          |                    |
| Santa Rosa: Various Streets Rehabilitation                       | Santa Rosa    | \$1,655,000          |                    |
| Sebastopol: Bodega Avenue Bike Lanes and Pavement Rehabilitation | Sebastopol    | \$1,195,000          |                    |
| Sonoma (City) : New Fryer Creek Bicycle and Pedestrian Bridge    | Sonoma (City) | \$501,000            |                    |
| Sonoma County: Various County Roads Rehabilitation               | Sonoma County | \$2,600,000          |                    |
| Sonoma County: New Crocker Bridge Bike and Pedestrian Passage    | Sonoma County | \$1,809,000          |                    |
| Windsor: Windsor River Road at Windsor Road Intersection Imps    | Windsor       | \$3,000,000          |                    |
| <b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>                                             | <b>TOTAL:</b> | <b>\$27,723,000</b>  |                    |
| <b>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</b>                                    | <b>TOTAL:</b> | <b>\$376,562,000</b> | <b>\$9,300,000</b> |