707 Randolph Street, Suite 100 • Napa, CA 94559-2912
Tel: (707) 259-8631
Fax: (707) 259-8638

Technical Advisory Committee

AGENDA

Thursday, June 7, 2012
2:00 p.m.

NCTPA Conference Room
707 Randolph Street, Suite 100
Napa CA 94559

General Information

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the TAC which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the TAC by TAC members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Secretary of the TAC, 707 Randolph Street, Suite 100, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for NCTPA holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the TAC at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the TAC or staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.

Members of the public may speak to the TAC on any item at the time the TAC is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located on the table near the entryway, and then present the slip to the TAC Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the TAC on any issue not on today's agenda under Public Comment. Speakers are limited to three minutes.

This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternate formats to persons with a disability. Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact the Administrative Assistant, at (707) 259-8631 during regular business hours, at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

This Agenda may also be viewed online by visiting the NCTPA website at www.nctpa.net, click on Minutes and Agendas – TAC or go to www.nctpa.net/bod-c/adv-committees/tac.html

ITEMS

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of Meeting Minutes – May 3, 2012
3. Public Comments
4. TAC Member and Staff Comments
5. Standing
   - Caltrans Report *(Attachment 1)*
   - CMA Report

- SB 375/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- RHNA/Sub-Region Formation
- Housing/SCS Methodology Committee
- Vine Trail Report
- RTIP/STIP

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS		**RECOMMENDATION**
6.	Napa Transit Routes Service Redesign (Tom Roberts) ***(Pages 9-11)*** Presentation to TAC on the planned Napa transit service redesign of local and regional bus routes.	INFORMATION
7.	Cycle 2 and OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) – Update (Danielle Schmitz) ***(Pages 12-42)*** Provide TAC with the latest information released by MTC on Cycle 2 funding allocations and OBAG program eligibilities.	INFORMATION
8.	Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) – FY12/13 Project List Update (Danielle Schmitz) ***(Pages 43-57)*** TAC review and recommend to staff on how to proceed with submitted FY12/13 TFCA projects.	ACTION
9.	Topics for Next Meeting o Discussion of topics for next meeting by TAC members.	DISCUSSION
10.	Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of July 5, 2012 and Adjournment	APPROVE

CALTRANS REPORT

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT

EA 0A500
Pedestrian Circulation from Rio Del Mar to Eucalyptus , NAP 29-PM 1.6/1.8; In City of American Canyon
Scope: Repair curb ramps, cross walk and sidewalk
Cost Estimate: TBD

EA 0G650
Garnett Creek Bridge Replacement NAP 29-PM 39.1: In Napa County
Scope: Scour Mitigation at Garnett Creek
Status: Not programmed in 2012 SHOPP and No Preferred Alternative has been selected.

EA 1G430
Conn Creek Bridge Scour Mitigation NAP 128-PM R7.4: In Napa County
Scope: Repair the pier walls for scour at Conn Creek Bridge
Cost Estimate: $5M Capital

EA 3G640
Napa River Bridge Scour Mitigation NAP 29 37.0: In City of Calistoga
Scope: Reconstruct a bridge at Napa River Bridge
Cost Estimate: $10M Capital

EA 3G140
ADA Curb Ramps NAP 29 and 128 : In County of Napa
Scope: Update and Construct curb ramps at various locations.
Cost Estimate: $1.5M Capital

Silverado/Lincoln Roundabout NAP 29-PM 37.9; In City of Calistoga
Scope: Modify intersection with a Roundabout Design at Silverado Intersection
Cost Estimate: $3.6M Construction Capital

ENVIRONMENTAL

EA 28120
Soscol Flyover NAP 221 PM 0.0/0.7 NAP 29 PM 5.0/7.1; In Napa County
Scope: Flyover Structure at SR 221/29/12, Alternative 5 Option 2
Cost Estimate: $35M Construction Capital
Schedule **DED** 8/2012 **PAED** 12/2012

EA 2A320
Sarco Creek NAP 121-PM 9.3/9.5; In Napa County Near City of Napa
Scope: Bridge replacement at Sarco Creek
Cost Estimate: $8M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 6/2012 **PSE** 12/2013 **RWC** 4/2014 **RTL** 4/2014 **CCA** 12/2018

EA 4A090
Troutdale Creek NAP 29-PM 47.0/47.2; In Napa County
Scope: Bridge replacement at Troutdate Creek
Cost Estimate: $17M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 10/2012 **PSE** 3/2014 **RWC** 5/2014 **RTL** 5/2014 **CCA** 4/2016

= denotes addition/change to previous report

PID (Project Initiation Document) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

DESIGN

EA 4S020
Storm Damage NAP 29 PM41.0; In Napa County
Scope: Reconstruct slope and replace culvert, 1.6 miles north of Tubbs Lane,
Cost Estimate: $2.4M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 8/2/10 **PSE** 3/30/12 **RWC** 6/2012 **RTL** 6/2012 **CCA** 11/2017

EA 4S030
Storm Damage NAP 128 PM10.3; In Napa County near Lake Hennessy
Scope: Construct sheet pile wall at 2.8 miles east of Silverado Trail
Cost Estimate: $1.3M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 8/2/10 **PSE** 2/1/12 **RWC** 3/6/12 **RTL** 5/1/12 **CCA** 10/2017

EA 2A110
Capell Creek NAP 121-PM 20.2/20.4; In Napa County
Scope: Bridge replacement at Capell Creek
Cost Estimate: $5M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 6/22/11 **PSE** 10/2012 **RWC** 4/2013 **RTL** 4/2013 **CCA** 08/2015

EA 25940
Channelization NAP 29-PM 25.5/28.4; In and Near City of St. Helena
Scope: Left-turn channelization and pavement rehabilitation from Mee Lane to Charter Oak Avenue
Cost Estimate: $24M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 6/29/07 **PSE** 2/2014 **RWC** 6/2014 **RTL** 6/2014 **CCA** 12/2016

EA 20940
Tulucay Creek Bridge NAP 121-PM6.1/6.2; In City of Napa
Scope: Bridge Replacement
Cost Estimate: $5.9M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 1/30/04 **PSE** TBD **RWC** TBD **RTL** TBD **CCA** TBD

CONSTRUCTION

EA 4442A
Duhig Landscape Nap 12-PM 0.3/2.0 On route 121; in Napa County
Scope: Mitigation and tree Planting from 0 5km North of Sonoma County line to Duhig Road
Cost Estimate: $920K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED 8/26/05** **RTL** 11/10/10 **AWD** 9/23/11(Parker Landscape Inc.) **CCA** 4/2015

EA 26413
Jameson Canyon NAP 12-PM 0.2/3.3,; In Napa County
Scope: Jameson Canyon: Widen 2 lane to 4 lanes, construct a concrete median from SR 29 to the County Line.
Cost Estimate: $25M (Construction Capital)
Schedule: **PAED** 1/31/08 **RTL** 11/19/10 **AWD** 1/26/12 (Ghilotti Bros.) **CCA** 12/2013

EA 26414
Jameson Canyon SOL 12-PM0.0/2.6; In Solano County
Scope: Jameson Canyon: Widen 2 lane to 4 lanes, construct a concrete median from the County Line to Red Top.
Cost Estimate: $44M (Construction Capital)
Schedule: **PAED** 1/31/08 **RTL** 12/1/2010 **AWD** 1/11/12 (Ghilloti Const.) **CCA** 12/2013

PID (Project Initiation Document) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

EA 4C351
Pavement Repair NAP 128 PM 4.0/4.6 Minor A; In City of Calistoga
Scope: Pavement Resurfacing and culvert repair from High Street to Lincoln Avenue
Cost Estimate: $700K Construction Capital – Currently working on awarding to the lowest responsible bidder.
Schedule: **PAED** 8/14/09 **RTL** 9/30/11 **AWD** 3/15/12 (MCK Service) **CCA** 12/2012

EA 0G530
Pavement Maintenance NAP 29-PM 36.9/38.1; In Calistoga
Scope: Pavement resurfacing with asphalt from SR 128 Junction to Silverado Trail
Cost Estimate: $810K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 9/20/11 **RTL** 9/30/11 **AWD** 3/19/12 (MCK Service) **CCA** 12/2012

EA 2E430
Pavement Repair NAP 29 PM 24.6/35.6; In Napa County
Scope: Pavement Digouts from SR 128 Junction to Diamond Mountain Creek
Cost Estimate: $960K Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 10/14/11 **RTL** 1/24/12 **AWD** 4/27/12 (Synergy Proj Inc.) **CCA** 5/2013

EA 2E580
Pavement Repair NAP 128 PM 19.1/34.2; In Napa County
Scope: Pavement Digouts from Knoxville Road to the County Line
Cost Estimate: $1.4M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 9/1/11 **RTL** 1/23/12 **AWD** 4/9/12 (Vintage Paving) **CCA** 5/2013

EA 2E650
Pavement Repair NAP 121 PM 9.4/22.0; In Napa County
Scope: Place rubberized Bonded Wearing Course from Trancas Street to the County Line
Cost Estimate: $3.2M Construction Capital
Schedule: **PAED** 10/3/11 **RTL** 1/24/12 **ADV** 4/2012 **BO** 5/2/12 (6 Bidders) **CCA** 5/2013

ACTION ITEMS:

PID (Project Initiation Document) **PSR** (Project Study Report) **DED** (Draft Environmental Document)
PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document) **PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)
RWC (Right of Way Certification) **RTL** (Ready to List) **CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)
ADV (Advertise Contract) **BO** (Bid Open) **AWD** (Award Contract)

June 7, 2012
TAC Agenda Item 6
Continued From: New
Action Requested: INFORMATION

NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY
TAC Agenda Letter

TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

FROM: Paul W. Price, Executive Director

REPORT BY: Tom Roberts, Program Manager-Public Transit
(707) 259-8635 / Email: troberts@nctpa.net

SUBJECT: Napa Transit Routes Service Redesign

RECOMMENDATION

TAC receive a presentation on the planned service redesign for local bus routes in the City of Napa and the reconfiguration of regional Route 10.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Beginning in 2010, extensive studies were conducted of current transit service in the City of Napa. Based upon the findings of those efforts, NCTPA staff developed, and the Board approved, service improvements to address concerns regarding bus frequency, on-time performance, providing more travel options to passengers, and splitting the regional Route 10 into two overlapping routes.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Yes, additional $957,000 in annual costs.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

In the past few years the agency has laid the foundation for improving public transit by making significant investments in its public transit infrastructure including:

- New bus shelters and stop improvements system-wide
- 36 new buses here or on the way
- New Park and Ride lots
- "Where's My Bus" technology
- New Transit Center under construction

In addition, recent service redesigns in American Canyon, Yountville and Calistoga (soon to be followed by St. Helena) have proven that residents of the Napa Valley will use well designed, responsive, public transit.

Beginning in 2010, extensive studies were conducted by Wilbur Smith Associates of the current transit service in the City of Napa. In addition, NCTPA engaged Ilium Associates, Inc. to conduct telephone surveys and focus groups with Napa County residents to assess their willingness to ride public transit. Their research found:

"Commuters represent the largest potential market for increasing VINE ridership. A total of 25% of all commuters (defined as traveling to work or school three or more days a week) indicate they will very likely ride VINE service if improvements are made."

"Commuters were asked to rate the importance of a number of transit service characteristics, based on how they influence their decision to begin riding VINE service. The results show routing (directness of travel to/from the destination) and on-time performance, as the two highest rated characteristics. More than eight in ten commuters rated both characteristics as very important in their decision to begin riding. The third highest rated was service frequency at 78%."

THE BACKBONE

The VINE Route 10 regional line, which runs from Calistoga to Vallejo and provides local service within the City of Napa, is currently the system's highest performing route providing over a quarter-million trips a year. Running with varying frequency between 6 AM and roughly 9:45 PM, it also has the unfortunate distinction of having the worst on-time performance, with buses running late 50% - 60% of the time. This is largely caused by the unpredictability of nearly daily traffic incidents between American Canyon and Vallejo and/or up-Valley between Yountville and St. Helena. When an incident occurs at any one point in this very long route, the entire system in both directions is impacted.

In addition, the varying frequency provides too few, and unpredictable, runs during commute times, which combined with the on-time performance problems, make the route unreliable and unpredictable. This discourages transit ridership. Further, as the Route 10 is the lynch pin in linking the local transit services in each community in the valley and beyond, its performance failures effect ridership system-wide.

LOCAL NAPA ROUTES

Presently, the VINE transit service in the City of Napa suffers from a number of deficiencies discouraging ridership including:

- Poor frequency (a bus only once an hour)

- Long, circuitous/indirect routes, one-way loops (site seeing tour of Napa)
- Few direct choices to get between points "A" and "B"
- Inadequate on-time performance
- Too few opportunities for passengers to transfer
- Service not suited to valley-wide commuters

Collectively, these deficiencies have stifled ridership growth.

CONCLUSION

Building a transit system people will use depends upon several factors:

- Good frequency of service
- Dependability of service
- Coverage of service
- Connectivity
- Directness of travel
- Options for travel
- Easy to understand

In an attempt to address the concerns identified and develop more responsive transit service, staff will be presenting to the TAC planned service improvements benefitting residents of the City of Napa and valley-wide commuters.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None.

June 7, 2012
TAC Agenda Item 7
Continued From: May 2012
Action Requested: INFORMATION

NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY
TAC Agenda Letter

TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

FROM: Paul W. Price, Executive Director

REPORT BY: Danielle Schmitz, Associate Program Planner
(707) 259-5968 / Email: dschmitz@nctpa.net

SUBJECT: Cycle 2 and OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Update

RECOMMENDATION

Information only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Every six (6) years, U.S. Congress enacts a surface transportation act. The current act (SAFETEA) originally scheduled to expire on September 30, 2009 is still in effect through several legislative extensions. The funding provided to our area through this legislation includes Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. Allocation of funds are being planned in two (2) cycles. The first cycle (FY09/10 through 11/12) has been allocated and is in process of project delivery.

For the second cycle Metropolitan Transportation Committee (MTC) is proposing a 4-year funding cycle (FY12/13 through 15/16). MTC is also proposing a funding model that better integrates the region's federal transportation program with land use and housing policies pursuant to SB 375 (and the statewide effort to integrate land use and transportation planning). In this new Cycle 2 funding model, MTC proposes to provide incentives for the production of housing with supportive transportation investments through the "OneBayArea Grant" program. Under this new grant program the Napa County region is eligible to receive $6.6 million dollars (Attachment 1). In determining the fund source distribution of OBAG each county was guaranteed at least what they would have otherwise received in Cycle 2 under the original Class 1 & 2 framework. This resulted in Napa County receiving $1.3 million in CMAQ funds off the top before the distribution formula was applied.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? N/A

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

OneBayArea Grant Program Eligibility
The following project types are eligible to receive OBAG funds:

- Local Streets and Roads Preservation
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
- Transportation for Livable Communities
- Safe Routes to School/Transit
- Priority Conservation Area
- Planning and Outreach Activities

Priority Development Area (PDA) Policy
North Bay counties must direct 50% of their OBAG funds to PDAs. A project lying outside the limits of a PDA may count towards the minimum if it directly connects or provides proximate access to a PDA. In Napa County up to 50% of planning funds can count towards the 50% minimum PDA funding target. PDA boundary delineation can be found at http://geocommons.com/maps/141979 and will be updated by ABAG staff as PDAs are approved.

Defining "proximate access" to PDAs will fall upon the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to make the determination for their counties. For projects not geographically located in a PDA the CMAs must map projects and designate which projects are considered to support a PDA along with policy justifications. MTC staff will evaluate and report to the Commission on how well this approach achieves the OBAG objectives prior to the next programming cycle.

By May 1, 2013 CMAs shall prepare and adopt a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to guide transportation investments that are supportive of PDAs. An existing Investment and Growth Strategy by the County will be considered as meeting requirements if it satisfies the general terms in Appendix A-6 (Attachment 2 - A-6).

North Bay Priority Conservation Areas
The Priority Conservation Area Program now has $10 million dollars in funding. The first $5 million dollars will be dedicated solely to North Bay counties. Eligible projects would include planning, land/easement acquisition, open space access projects, and farm-to-market capital projects. Priority would be given to projects that can partner with state agencies, regional districts and private foundations to leverage funds. The additional $5 million will be available outside of the North Bay counties for sponsors that can provide a 3:1 match. MTC will be developing specific program guidelines over the next several months.

Performance and Accountability Policies

Jurisdictions need to comply with the following to be able to receive OBAG funding:

- Complete Streets Policy - A jurisdiction would have to adopt a complete streets policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement by having a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. MTC will provide minimum requirements based on best practices for the resolution.
- A jurisdiction is required to have a certified housing element by the HCD prior to January 31, 2013.
- For FY 2015-16 OBAG cycle jurisdictions will need to have approved housing elements prior to October 31, 2014.
- CMAs will be required to track jurisdictions in meeting OBAG requirements. CMAs will provide documentation for the following before programming projects in the TIP:
  - The approach used to select OBAG projects including outreach and Board adopted list of projects.
  - Compliance with MTC's complete streets policy.
  - A map outlining projects selected outside a PDA indicating those that are in proximate access to a PDA.

Project Selection

CMAs or substitute agencies are given responsibility to develop a project selection process, evaluation criteria, issue a call for projects, conduct outreach and select projects.

- Public outreach process must be followed in the administering of OBAG funds.
- CMAs are requested to issue a unified call for projects for OBAG with a final project list due to MTC by June 30, 2013. All projects must be submitted using the Fund Management System (FMS) no later than July 30, 2013.
- Delivery Deadlines: CMAs must program their block grants over the 4 year period of Cycle 2. The expectation is that CMA planning activities would use capacity of the first year to provide more time for delivery as contrasted to other programs which tend to have more complex environmental and design challenges.
  - Half of OBAG funds, including all funds programmed for the PE phase, must be obligated by March 31, 2015.
  - All remaining OBAG funds must be obligated by March 31, 2016 (obligation = E76 issuance).

Project Delivery and Monitoring

To further facilitate project delivery and ensure all federal funds in the region are meeting deadlines, every recipient (jurisdiction) of Cycle 2 funding will need to identify a staff position that serves as the single point of contact (POC) for the implementation of all FHWA-administered funds within the 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 a project. The agency must identify this contact when they program the funds in the federal TIP. This POC will be expected to work closely with the CMA, MTC, Caltrans, and FHWA. Project sponsors that continue to miss delivery milestones for any federal funds are required to prepare and update a delivery status report on all projects with FHWA-administered funds, and participate in a consultation meeting with MTC, their CMA and Caltrans prior to MTC approving any further Cycle funding.

- Minimum grant size: Minimum grant amounts are $500,000 for counties with a population over 1 million and $250,000 for counties with a population under 1 million. To provide further flexibility a CMA may program grant amounts with a $100,000 dollar minimum for any project as long as the overall average of all grant amounts within their OBAG program meets the county minimum grant amount threshold.

- Local Match: Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funds requires a non-federal local match. Based on California's share of the nation's federal lands, local match for STP and CMAQ is 11.47% of the total project cost.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachments:
(1) OBAG Funding Estimates per County
(2) Cycle 2 Program Selection Criteria and Policy
(3) Cycle 2 – Regional Program and OBAG Funds
(4) OBAG Planning and Outreach Funds

Appendix A-4

Cycle 2
OBAG County Fund Distribution
FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
May 2012

OBAG Geographic Funding Distribution

County	OBAG Funds	PDA/Anywhere Split	PDA	Anywhere
Alameda	$63,732,000	70/30	$44,612,000	$19,120,000
Contra Costa	$44,787,000	70/30	$31,351,000	$13,436,000
Marin	$10,047,000	50/50	$5,024,000	$5,023,000
Napa	$6,653,000	50/50	$3,327,000	$3,326,000
San Francisco	$38,837,000	70/30	$27,186,000	$11,651,000
San Mateo	$26,246,000	70/30	$18,372,000	$7,874,000
Santa Clara	$87,284,000	70/30	$61,099,000	$26,185,000
Solano	$18,801,000	50/50	$9,401,000	$9,400,000
Sonoma	$23,613,000	50/50	$11,807,000	$11,806,000
Total:	$320,000,000		$212,179,000	$107,821,000

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

OBAG amounts are draft estimates until final adoption of RHNA, expected July 2012.

ATTACHMENT 2
TAC Agenda Item 7
Date: May 17, 2012 **June 7, 2012**
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: Planning

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4035

Cycle 2 Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

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

Cycle 2 Program
Policy and Programming

Table of Contents

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

Appendices

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

BACKGROUND

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

Cycle 2 covers the four years from FY 2012-13 to FY 2015-2016 pending the enactment of the new authorization and/or continuation of SAFETEA.

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

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

CYCLE 2 REVENUE ESTIMATES AND FEDERAL PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE

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

Revenues: A revenue growth rate of 3% over prior federal apportionments is assumed for the first year – FY 2012-13. Due to continued uncertainties with federal funding, the estimated revenues for the later years of the program, FY 2013-14 through FY 2015-16, have not been escalated, but held steady at the estimated FY 2012-13 apportionment amount. If there are significant reductions in federal apportionments over the Cycle 2 time period, as in the past, MTC will reconcile the revenue levels following enactment of the New Act by making adjustments later if needed, by postponement of projects or adjustments to subsequent programming cycles.

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

NEW FUNDING APPROACH FOR CYCLE 2—THE ONEBAYAREA GRANT

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

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

Project List

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

OneBayArea Grant Fund Distribution Formula

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

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

OBAG Fund Distribution Factors

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

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

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

The Commission, working with ABAG, will revisit the funding distribution formula for the next cycle (post FY2015-16) to further evaluate how to best incentivize housing production across all income levels and other Plan Bay Area performance objectives.

CYCLE 2 GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. **Environmental Clearance.** Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REGIONAL PROGRAMS

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

1. Regional Planning Activities

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

2. Regional Operations

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

3. Freeway Performance Initiative

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

4. Pavement Management Program

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

5. Priority Development Area (PDA) Activities

Funding in this regional program implements the following three regional programs:

Affordable TOD fund: This is a continuation of MTC's successful Transit Oriented Development (TOD) fund into Cycle 2 which successfully has leveraged a significant amount of outside funding. The TOD fund provides financing for the development of affordable housing and other vital

community services near transit lines throughout the Bay Area. Through the Fund, developers can access flexible, affordable capital to purchase or improve available property near transit lines for the development of affordable housing, retail space and other critical services, such as child care centers, fresh food outlets and health clinics.

PDA Planning Grants: MTC and ABAG's PDA Planning Grant Program will place an emphasis on affordable housing production and preservation in funding agreements with grantees. Grants will be made to jurisdictions to provide support in planning for PDAs in areas such as providing housing, jobs, intensified land use, promoting alternative modes of travel to the single occupancy vehicle, and parking management. These studies will place a special focus on selected PDAs with a greater potential for residential displacement and develop and implement community risk reduction plans. Also program funds will establish a new local planning assistance program to provide staff resources directly to jurisdictions to support local land-use planning for PDAs.

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

PDA Planning Assistance: Grants will be made to local jurisdictions to provide planning support as needed to meet regional housing goals.

6. Climate Change Initiatives

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

7. Safe Routes to Schools

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

8. Transit Capital Rehabilitation

The program objective is to assist transit operators to fund major fleet replacements, fixed guideway rehabilitation and other high-scoring capital needs, consistent with the FTA Transit Capital Priorities program. This includes a set-aside of $1 million to support the consolidation and transition of Vallejo and Benicia bus services to Soltrans

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

10. Priority Conservation Area: This $10 million program is regionally competitive. The first $5 million would be dedicated to the North Bay counties of Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma.

Eligible projects would include planning, land/easement acquisition, open space access projects, and farm-to-market capital projects. Priority would be given to projects that can partner with state agencies, regional districts and private foundations to leverage outside funds, particularly for land acquisition and open space access. An additional $5 million will be available outside of the North Bay counties for sponsors that can provide a 3:1 match. Program guidelines will be developed over the next several months. Prior to the call for projects, a meeting will be held with stakeholders to discuss the program framework and project eligibility. The program guidelines will be approved by the Commission following those discussions. Note that tribal consultation for Plan Bay Area highlighted the need for CMAs in Sonoma and Contra Costa counties to involve tribes in PCA planning and project delivery.

ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAMMING POLICIES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- To be eligible for OBAG funds, a jurisdiction will need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. Staff will provide minimum requirements based on best practices for the resolution. As discussed below, jurisdictions will be expected to have a general plan that complies within the Complete Streets Act of 2008 to be eligible for the next round of funding.

- A jurisdiction is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-14 RHNA prior to January 31, 2013. If a jurisdiction submits its housing element to the state on a timely basis for review, but the State's comment letter identifies deficiencies that the local jurisdictions must address in order to receive HCD certification, then the local jurisdiction may submit a request to the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee for a time extension to address the deficiencies and resubmit its revised draft housing element to HCD for re-consideration and certification.
- For the OBAG cycle subsequent to FY 2015-16, jurisdictions must adopt housing elements by October 31, 2014 (based on an April 2013 SCS adoption date); therefore, jurisdictions will be required to have General Plans with approved housing elements and that comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 by that time to be eligible for funding. This schedule allows jurisdictions to meet the housing and complete streets policies through one general plan amendment.
- OBAG funds may not be programmed to any jurisdiction out of compliance with OBAG policies and other requirements specified in this attachment. The CMA will be responsible for tracking progress towards these requirements and affirming to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance prior to MTC programming OBAG funds to its projects in the TIP.
- For a transit agency project sponsor under a JPA or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction), the jurisdiction where the project (such as station/stop improvements) is located will need to comply with these policies before funds may be programmed to the transit agency project sponsor. However, this is not required if the project is transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or transit maintenance facility.
- CMAs will provide documentation for the following prior to programming projects in the TIP:
    - The approach used to select OBAG projects including outreach and a board adopted list of projects
    - Compliance with MTC's complete streets policy
    - A map delineating projects selected outside of PDAs indicating those that are considered to provide proximate access to a PDA including their justifications as outlined on the previous page. CMA staff is expected to use this exhibit when it presents its program of projects to explain the how "proximate access" is defined to their board and the public.
- MTC staff will report on the outcome of the CMA project selection process in late 2013. This information will include, but not be limited to, the following:
    - Mix of project types selected;
    - Projects funded within PDAs and outside of PDAs and how proximity and direct connections were used and justified through the county process;
    - Complete streets elements that were funded;
    - Adherence to the performance and accountability requirements;

- Amount of funding to various jurisdictions and how this related to the distribution formula that includes population, RHNA housing allocations and housing production, as well as low-income housing factors.
- Public participation process.

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

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

- Public Involvement: The decision making authority to select projects for federal funding accompanies responsibilities to ensure that the process complies with federal statutes and regulations. In order to ensure that the CMA process for administering OBAG is in compliance, CMAs are required to lead a public outreach process as directed by Appendix A-5.
- Unified Call for Projects: CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects for their One Bay Area grant, with a final project list due to MTC by June 30, 2013. CMA staff need to ensure that all projects are submitted using the Fund Management System (FMS) no later than July 30, 2013. The goal of this process is to reduce staff time, coordinate all programs to respond to larger multi-modal projects, and provide project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects.
- Project Programming Targets and Delivery Deadlines: CMAs must program their block grant funds over the four-year period of Cycle 2 (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16). The expectation is that the CMA planning activities \ project would use capacity of the first year to provide more time for delivery as contrasted to other programs which tend to have more complex environmental and design challenges, but this is not a requirement. The funding is subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606 or its successor) including the Request for Authorization (RFA) submittal deadline and federal authorization/obligation deadline. Furthermore the following funding deadlines apply for each county, with earlier delivery strongly encouraged:
  - Half of the OBAG funds, including all funds programmed for the PE phase, must be obligated (federal authorization/E-76) by March 31, 2015.
  - All remaining OBAG funds must be obligated by March 31, 2016.

CYCLE 2 COUNTY ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROJECT GUIDANCE

The categories below comprise the Cycle 2 County One Bay Area Grant Program, administered by the county congestion management agencies. Project selection should ensure that all of the eligibility requirements below are met. MTC staff will work with CMAs and project sponsors to resolve any eligibility issues which may arise, including air quality conformity exceptions and requirements.

1. CMA Planning and Outreach

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

2. Local Streets and Roads Preservation

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

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

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

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

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

current standards), and any pavement application not recommended by the Pavement Management Program unless otherwise allowed above.

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

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

3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

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

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

4. Transportation for Livable Communities

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

General project categories include the following:

- Station Improvements such as plazas, station access pocket parks, bicycle parking
- Complete streets improvements that encourage bicycle and pedestrian access
- Transportation Demand Management projects including carsharing, vanpooling traveler coordination and information or Clipper®-related projects

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

5. Safe Routes to School

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

Non-Infrastructure Projects

Public Education and Outreach Activities

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

Infrastructure Projects

Bicycle/Pedestrian Use:

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

Exclusions found to be ineligible uses of CMAQ funds:

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

6. Priority Conservation Areas

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

PROGRAM SCHEDULE

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

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

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

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

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

   - ***Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.*** CMAs are to provide MTC with:
     - A description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects selected for OBAG funding. Specify whether public input was gathered at forums held specifically for the OBAG project solicitation or as part of a separate planning or programming outreach effort;

- A description of how the public engagement process met the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan, including how the CMA ensured full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project submittal process.
- A summary of comments received from the public and a description of how public comments informed the recommended list of projects submitted by the CMA.

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

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

Appendix A-6: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

MTC shall consult with the CMAs and amend the scope of activities identified below, as necessary, to minimize administrative workload and to avoid duplication of effort. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting to MTC and/or ABAG. Such changes will be formalized through a future amendment to this appendix.

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG funding that supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

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

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Encourage community participation throughout the planning process and in determining project priorities
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans.
- Help develop protocols with MTC, ABAG and Air District staff to assess toxic-air contaminants and particulate matter, as well as related mitigation strategies, as part of regional PDA Planning Program.

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

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

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

- **Projects located in high impact project areas.** Key factors defining high impact areas include:
  a. Housing – PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units and percentage change), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production
  b. Jobs in proximity to housing and transit (both current levels and those included in the SCS),
  c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
  d. Consistency with regional TLC design guidelines or design that encourages multi-modal access: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc/2009_TLC_Design_Guidelines.pdf
  e. Project areas with parking management and pricing policies
- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC see: http://geocommons.com/maps/110983
- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies or policies
- **PDAs that overlap with Air District CARE Communities and/or are in proximity to freight transport infrastructure** – Favorably consider projects located in PDAs with highest exposure to particulate matter and toxic air contaminants where jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate exposure.

Process/Timeline

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

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

Appendix A-1

Cycle 2
Regional and County Programs
FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
May 2012

Proposed Cycle 2 Funding Commitments

Regional Program (millions $ - rounded)		4-Year Total
Regional Categories		
1	Regional Planning Activities	$7
2	Regional Operations	$95
3	Freeway Performance Initiative	$96
4	Pavement Management Program	$7
5	Priority Development Activities	$40
6	Climate Initiatives	$20
7	Safe Routes To School	$20
8	Transit Capital Rehabilitation	$150
9	Transit Performance Initiative	$30
10	Priority Conservation Area	$10
	Regional Program Total:*	**$475**
		60%

One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) (millions $ - rounded)		4-Year Total
Counties		
1	Alameda	$63
2	Contra Costa	$44
3	Marin	$10
4	Napa	$6
5	San Francisco	$38
6	San Mateo	$26
7	Santa Clara	$87
8	Solano	$18
9	Sonoma	$23
	OBAG Total:*	**$320**
		40%

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

Cycle 2 Total Total:*	**$795**

* Amounts may not total due to rounding
* OBAG amounts are draft estimates until final adoption of RHNA, expected July 2012.

Appendix A-2

Cycle 2
Planning & Outreach
FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
May 2012

OBAG - County CMA Planning

County	Agency	Cycle 2 OBAG County CMA Planning 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	STP Total
Alameda	ACTC	$916,000	$944,000	$973,000	$1,003,000	$3,836,000
Contra Costa	CCTA	$725,000	$747,000	$770,000	$794,000	$3,036,000
Marin	TAM	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
Napa	NCTPA	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
San Francisco	SFCTA	$667,000	$688,000	$709,000	$731,000	$2,795,000
San Mateo	SMCCAG	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
Santa Clara	VTA	$1,014,000	$1,045,000	$1,077,000	$1,110,000	$4,246,000
Solano	STA	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
Sonoma	SCTA	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
County CMAs Total:		$6,512,000	$6,714,000	$6,919,000	$7,133,000	$27,278,000

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

Regional Agency Planning

Regional Agency		Cycle 2 Regional Agency Planning 2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	STP Total
ABAG	ABAG	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
BCDC	BCDC	$320,000	$330,000	$340,000	$351,000	$1,341,000
MTC	MTC	$638,000	$658,000	$678,000	$699,000	$2,673,000
Regional Agencies Total:		$1,596,000	$1,646,000	$1,696,000	$1,749,000	$6,687,000

$33,965,000

June 7, 2012
TAC Agenda Item 8
Continued From: March 1, 2012
Action Requested: ACTION

NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY
TAC Agenda Letter

TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

FROM: Paul W. Price, Executive Director

REPORT BY: Danielle Schmitz, Associate Program Planner
(707) 259-5968 / Email: dschmitz@nctpa.net

SUBJECT: Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) – FY12/13 Project List Update

---

RECOMMENDATION

TAC review TFCA projects submitted for FY12/13 and make a recommendation to staff on how to proceed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The NCTPA annually allocates funds generated under AB 434. The monies come from a four-dollar vehicle license fee imposed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and are known as TFCA. Forty percent of these funds are returned to the NCTPA for distribution to local projects. Projects must be beneficial to air quality and be cost effective. The remaining sixty- percent is allocated by the BAAQMD on an area wide competitive basis. Generally, the District rules and statutes only allow funds to be retained for two years unless the NCTPA originally requests added time or the project is making reasonable further progress and is granted a one year extension.

On March 21th the NCTPA Board opened a call for projects for the TFCA Program Manager Funds. NCTPA held a public workshop on March 23rd for all to attend to learn about the program guidelines and application. The call for projects was closed on April 27, 2012.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Yes. $183,231.00 TFCA funds for FY 12/13.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Annually the NCTPA adopts a list of projects for the TFCA Program Manager funds. Napa County has approximately $183,231.00 dollars to expend for FY 12/13. In the call for projects that closed on April 27th NCPTA received four (4) project submittals totaling $250,557.00 dollars for TFCA funding. These projects are as follows:

1) City of Napa – The City would like to construct of 2,500 Linear Feet of Class II Bike Lane on California Boulevard between Pueblo Avenue and Permanente Way. This bike lane will close a gap between existing bike lane on California Boulevard South of Pueblo and North of Permanente Way. (Funding Request $112,600)

2) City of American Canyon – The City would like to synchronize 10 traffic lights on three different arterials: Broadway (SR 29), American Canyon Rd., and Flosden Rd. (Funding Request $25,987)

3) County of Napa – The County would like to purchase 11 light-duty hybrid vehicles for various County Department fleet. (Funding Request $11,990)

4) County of Napa – The County of Napa would like to use TFCA funds to supplement the Proximity Workforce Housing Program by supplementing 4 applications for loan funds in the amount of $25,000 dollars each. (Funding Request $100,000)

Though the program has received 4 project submittals, not all projects meet current requirements of the program. In particular, the City of American Canyon Signal Synchronization and the County of Napa Proximity Housing projects do not comply with all the TFCA Program Manager Fund requirements.

- Signal Synchronization – The TFCA Program requires signal timing projects to be on an arterial with an average daily traffic volume of 20,000 motor vehicles or more, or an average peak hour traffic volume of 2,000 motor vehicles or more. Both American Canyon Road and Broadway (SR 29) meet this requirement with ADT over 20,000, but Flosden Road's ADT is 19,118 vehicles, just missing this threshold. The City can move forward with the project and omit the 2 signals on Flosden or can move forward with the project as proposed and seek approval from the Air District's Board of Directors to include the signal on Flosden.

- Proximity Housing – This project does not qualify under the allowable project types under Health and Safety Code Section 44241(b). If NCTPA did wish to pursue funding for this project it would have to get an exemption from the Air District Board.

Options to move forward:

1. The TAC recommends moving forward with the first three projects: City of Napa Class II bike lane, City of American Canyon Signal Timing (with or without Flosden Road), and County of Napa light-duty vehicle purchase. These 4 projects add up to a total of $150,577.000 dollars meaning it leaves $32,654 dollars on the table needing to be programmed. The TAC would need to recommend to the NCTPA Board to continue the call for projects until September 7, 2012.

2. The TAC recommends pursuing TFCA funding for the Proximity Housing Project in that case having to select which projects to fund with the available $183,231 dollars and also recommend staff to pitch the Proximity Housing Project as an allowable project type to the Air District Executive Board.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachments: (1) FY 12/13 Expenditure Plan
(2) Submitted Projects for FY 12/13
(3) Proximity Housing Project Information
(4) Project Selection Criteria (examples)

SUMMARY INFORMATION

Program Manager Agency Name: Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

Address: 707 Randolph Street, Ste 100, Napa, CA 94559

PART A: NEW TFCA FUNDS

1. Estimated FYE 2013 DMV revenues (based on projected CY2011 revenues): Line 1: $185,717.00
2. Difference between prior-year estimate and actual revenue: Line 2: $ 301.12
   a. Actual FYE 2011 DMV revenues (based on CY2010): $187,531.12
   b. Estimated FYE 2011 DMV revenues (based on CY2010): $187,230.00
   ('a' minus 'b' equals Line 2.)
3. Estimated New Allocation *(Sum of Lines 1 and 2)*: Line 3: $186,018.12
4. Interest income. List interest earned on TFCA funds in calendar year 2011. Line 4: $5,770.36
5. Estimated TFCA funds budgeted for administration:[1] Line 5: $9,300.90
   (Note: This amount may not exceed 5% of Line 3.)
6. **Total new TFCA funds available in FYE 2013 for projects and administration Line 6:** $191,788.48
   (Add Lines 3 and 4. These funds are subject to the six-month allocation deadline.)

PART B: TFCA FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR REPROGRAMMING

7. **Total amount from previously funded projects available for reprogramming to other projects.** *(Enter zero (0) if none.)* **Line 7:** $743.41
   (Note: Reprogrammed funds originating from pre-2006 projects are not subject to the six-month allocation deadline.)

PART C: TOTAL AVAILABLE TFCA FUNDS

8. **Total Available TFCA Funds** *(Sum of Lines 6 and 7)* **Line 8:** $192,531.89
9. Estimated Total TFCA funds available for projects *(Line 8 minus Line 5)* Line 9: $183,230.99

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this application is complete and accurate.

Executive Director Signature: [signature] Date: 3/27/2012

[1] The "Estimated TFCA funds budgeted for administration" amount is listed for informational purposes only. Per California Health and Safety Code Section 44233, Program Managers must limit their administrative costs to no more than 5% of the actual total revenue received from the Air District.

SUMMARY INFORMATION - ADDENDUM

Complete if there are TFCA Funds available for reprogramming.

Project #	Project Sponsor	Project Name	$ TFCA Funds Allocated	$ TFCA Funds Expended	$ TFCA Funds Available	Code*
09NAP04	City of Napa	Bicycle lockers and Racks	$11,500	$10,756.59	$743.41	UB

TOTAL TFCA FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR REPROGRAMMING $743.41

(Enter this amount in Part B, Line 7 of Summary Information form)

** Enter UB (for projects that were completed under budget) and CP (for cancelled project).*

TFCA CALL FOR PROJECTS LIST 12/13 - Available Funds = $183,231

Project Title	Project Sponsor	Contact Person	Total Project Cost	Amount of TFCA funds requested	Description	Air Quality Enhancement	Comments
California Blvd Class II	City of Napa	Eric Vandeburgt	$450,000	$112600	2,500 linear feet of new Class II bike lane between Pueblo and Permanente Rd. It will close existing gap of class II lane north of permanente and sout of pueblo on California.	Encourage the public including students at Napa High School to bike.	
Traffic Signal Synchronization	City of American Canyon	Micahel Throne	$25,897	$25,987	ADT for Flosden does not meet the AD requirments of 20,000 ADT or more or 2,000 peak hour	Better flow of traffic to reduce idling time and vehicle emissions	The American Canyon Road and SR 29 arterials meet requirements. Signals on these arterials can be timed and project could move forward. To include Flosden, AC would have to pitch to Air District Executive Board.
Hybrid Vehicle Purchase	County of Napa	Rick Marshall	$369,000.00	$11,990.00	County would like to purchase 11 light duty hybrid vehicles for use in eight county departments. The County anticipates each vehicle will be driven 20,000 miles per year.	Emissions reduction through hybrid technology	
	County of Napa	Nancy McDonnell	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	County would like to subsidize proximity housing for 4 applicants at $25,000 dollars a piece with TFCA funds.	Emissions reduction based on lesser vehicle commute	This project does not currently qualify for the TFCA Program Manager funds as it does not fall within the selection criteria. However we may make a case to the Mocile Source Committee that we would like to pilot this project with these funds.
				$250,577.00	qualifies	qualifies but needs more information	

ATTACHMENT 2
TAC Agenda Item 8
June 7, 2012

TFCA CALL FOR PROJECTS LIST 12/13 - Available Funds = $183,231

Project Title	Project Sponsor	Contact Person	Total Project Cost	Amount of TFCA funds requested	Description	Air Quality Enhancement	Comments
California Blvd Class II	City of Napa	Eric Vandeburgt	$450,000	$112600	2,500 linear feet of new Class II bike lane between Pueblo and Permanente Rd. It will close existing gap of class II lane north of permanente and sout of pueblo on California.	Encourage the public including students at Napa High School to bike.	
Traffic Signal Synchronization	City of American Canyon	Micahel Throne	$25,897	$25,987	ADT for Flosden does not meet the AD requirments of 20,000 ADT or more or 2,000 peak hour	Better flow of traffic to reduce idling time and vehicle emissions	The American Canyon Road and SR 29 arterials meet requirements. Signals on these arterials can be timed and project could move forward. To include Flosden, AC would have to pitch to Air District Executive Board.
Hybrid Vehicle Purchase	County of Napa	Rick Marshall	$369,000.00	$11,990.00	County would like to purchase 11 light duty hybrid vehicles for use in eight county departments. The County anticipates each vehicle will be driven 20,000 miles per year.	Emissions reduction through hybrid technology	
[redacted]	County of Napa	Nancy McDonnell	$100,000.00	$100,000.00	County would like to subsidize proximity housing for 4 applicants at $25,000 dollars a piece with TFCA funds.	Emissions reduction based on lesser vehicle commute	This project does not currently qualify for the TFCA Program Manager funds as it does not fall within the selection criteria. However we may make a case to the Mocile Source Committee that we would like to pilot this project with these funds.
				$250,577.00	qualifies	qualifies but needs more information	[redacted]

1195 Third St.
Suite 310
Napa, CA 94559
www.countyofnapa.org

Main: (707) 253-4421
Fax: (707) 253-4176

Keith Caldwell
Chairman

A Tradition of Stewardship
A Commitment to Service

April 24, 2012

Danielle Sinclair, TFCA Program Manager
Napa County Transportation Planning Agency
707 Randolph Street, Suite 100
Napa, CA 94559

Subject: Grant Proposal for FYE 2013 Program Manager Funds

Dear Ms. Sinclair,

The Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs Division of the County Executive Office of Napa County is pleased to submit the enclosed application for funding from the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA). The project we propose is to expand our Proximity Housing loan program with additional funds through this grant opportunity. The grant Guide and Application for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program lists the following goals of projects funded by this program:

- Conserving energy and helping to reduce greenhouse gas emissions;
- Reduce air pollution, including air toxics such as benzene and diesel particles;
- Improving water quality by decreasing contaminated runoff from roadways;
- Improving transportation options; and
- Reducing traffic congestion.

By reducing the number of vehicle miles driven per day, the County's Proximity Workforce Housing Assistance Program (the "Proximity Housing Program") accomplishes all of the above goals. The program does so in two ways: 1) Directly reduces the commute of proximity workers in Napa County, and 2) Preventatively reduces the commute of proximity workers by converting current renters into homeowners, preventing these proximity workers from moving to more affordable areas such as Solano, Fairfield and Vallejo.

The Proximity Housing Program is designed to assist low and moderate income households in purchasing a home close to their place of work. The Proximity Housing Program is an effort to increase housing opportunities affordable to members of the Proximity Workforce and to stimulate responsible development strategies aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled, by strongly encouraging the creation of a jobs-to-housing nexus for members of the Proximity Workforce.

This grant program offers a unique opportunity for the County. There have been a number of households interested in this program, but do not qualify due to the requirements of our funding source. The current funding source for this program, the Affordable Housing Fund , requires that household income be no greater than 120% of the area mediam income. Workforce Housing applicants earn between 120% and 18% of Area Median Income (AMI). With an additional funding source, such as the TFCA funds, the County can accommodate this population of proximity workers.

The total cost of the proposed project is estimated at $100,000. This amount will service four applications for loan funds in the amount of $25,000 each, during the upcoming fiscal year. This funding will allow the County to explore the expansion of this program and will target proximity workers who currently live outside of the County. As these funds are distributed as loans, the funds will come back to the County at the end of a 55 year term, or at the time of transfer, so they may be lent out again to new proximity workers.

For any additional information on our current program, please contact Nancy McDonnell in my office at (707) 253-4825 or nancy.mcdonnell@countyofnapa.org. Thank you for the opportunity to apply for this grant.

Sincerely,

Nancy McDonnell

for: Larry Florin
Director, Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs

PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Number: 13NAPXX

B. Project title: Proximity Workforce Housing Assistance Program

C. TFCA Program Manager Funds Allocated: $100,000

D. Total Project Cost: $100,000

E. Project Description:

Housing and Intergovernmental Affairs currently administers the County's Proximity Workforce Housing Assistance Program. This program provides ten percent down payment assistance loans, in the form of second mortgages, to homebuyers who currently work within the County. This loan program actively reduces CO2 emissions by reducing the commuting miles of our workforce.

This program began in early spring of 2011 and the County has closed nine loans to date. This totals a reduction of 25 tons of CO2 emissions over the course of one year. The current program is funded form the County's Affordable Housing Fund, requiring that applicant households earn less than 120% of the Area Median Income. Napa County would like to expand this program to include our workforce households (120% to 180% AMI) and encourage this population to live closer to their workplace.

Additionally, the current program is open to current renters within the County as well as renters/owners outside the County. This grant will be restricted to renters or homeowners who currently work within the County and commute from outside. This will allow the program to better target the commuters who are currently on the roads today. While there is great benefit to the preventative nature of converting a renter within the County into a homeowner, the program would benefit from directly reducing vehicles miles driven.

F. Final Report: See Attached Report demonstrating the program's cost effectiveness.

G. See Attached Spreadsheet: CO2 Emissions Reduced Via Napa County Worker Proximity Housing loan program.

H. Comments:

The total project will be funded with TFCA funds to expand on the Napa County's pilot program, which is gaining attention throughout the state and is being nominated for a CSAC 2012 Challenge award.

RIDESHARING, BICYCLE, SHUTTLE, AND SMART GROWTH PROJECTS
FY2010/2011 TFCA Progam Manager Fund Worksheet
Version 1.0, updated 2/25/10

General Information Tab: Complete areas shaded in yellow.

Project Number (10XXXYY)	12NAPXX
Project Title	Proximity Workforce Housing Assistance Program
Project Type Code (e.g., 7a)	9c
County (3-character abbreviation)	NAP
Worksheet Calculated By	Nancy McDonnell
Date of Submission	4/27/2012
Project Sponsor	
Project Sponsor Organization	County of Napa
Public Agency? (Y or N)	Y
Contact Name	Nancy McDonnell
Email Address	nancy.mcdonnell@countyofnapa.org
Phone Number	(707) 253-4825
Mailing Address	1195 Third Street
City	Napa
State	CA
Zip	94559
Project Schedule	
Project Start Date	7/1/2012
Project Completion Date	6/30/2013
Final Report to CMA	7/30/2013

RIDESHARING, BICYCLE, SHUTTLE, AND SMART GROWTH PROJECTS
FY2010/2011 TFCA Progam Manager Fund Worksheet

Version 1.0, updated 2/25/10

Calculations Tab: Complete areas shaded in yellow only.

SAMPLE ENTRIES ARE SHOWN IN LIGHT BLUE

Cost Effectiveness Inputs	
# Years Effectiveness:	55
Total Project Cost:	$100,000
TFCA Cost 40%:	$100,000
TFCA Cost 60%:	
Total TFCA Cost:	$100,000

Emission Reduction Calculations

Step 1 - Emissions for Eliminated Trips

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I
# Trips/Day (1-way)	Days/Yr	Trip Length (1-way)	VMT	ROG Emissions (gr/yr)	NOx Emissions (gr/yr)	Exhaust &Trip End PM10 Emissions (gr/yr) *	Other PM10 Emissions (gr/yr) *	CO2 Emissions (gr/yr)
			0	0	0	0	0	0
8	240	17.6	33,792	7,819	7,518	807	6,894	14,724,822
			0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	33,792	7,819	7,518	807	6,894	14,724,822

Step 2 - Emissions for New Trips to Access Transit /Ridesharing

			0	0	0	0	0	0
			0	0	0	0	0	0
			0	0	0	0	0	0
		Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Step 3A - Emissions for Shuttle/Vanpool Vehicles up to GVW of 14,000 lbs.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
			See Emission Factor Tab, ARB Table 2 or 7										
# Vehicles, Model Year	Emission Std.	Vehicle GVW	ROG Factor (gr/mi)	NOx Factor (g/mi)	Exhaust PM10 Factor (g/mi)	Total PM10 Factor (g/mi)	CO2 Factor (g/mi) (See CO2 Table for LD)	Total Annual VMT (sum all vehicles)	ROG Emissions (gr/yr)	NOx Emissions (gr/yr)	Exhaust PM10 Emissions (gr/yr)	Other PM10 Emissions (gr/yr)	CO2 Emissions (gr/yr)
			0.23	0.40	0.12	0.33	869	8000	1,840	3,200	960	1,680	6,880,000
									0	0	0	0	0
									0	0	0	0	0
							Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Step 3B - Emissions for Buses

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
			See Emission Factors Tab, Emissions for Buses Table										
# Vehicles	Engine Year, Make, & Model	Retrofit Device Name	ROG Factor (gr/mi)	NOx Factor (g/mi)	Exhaust PM10 Factor (g/mi)	Other PM10 Factor (g/mi)	CO2 Factor (g/mi)	Total Annual VMT (sum all vehicles)	ROG Emissions (gr/yr)	NOx Emissions (gr/yr)	Exhaust PM10 Emissions (gr/yr)	Other PM10 Emissions (gr/yr)	CO2 Emissions (gr/yr)
									0	0	0	0	0
									0	0	0	0	0
							Total	0	0	0	0	0	0

Cost Effectiveness Results	Annual	Lifetime	
1. VMT Reduced	33,792	1,858,560	Miles
2. Trips Reduced	1,920	105,600	Trips
3. ROG Emissions Reduced	0.01	0.47	Tons
4. NOx Emissions Reduced	0.01	0.46	Tons
5. PM Emissions Reduced	0.01	0.45	Tons
6. PM Weighted Emissions Reduced	0.02	1.15	Tons
7. CO2 Emissions Reduced	16.2	892.7	Tons
8. Emission Reductions (ROG, NOx & PM)	0.03	1.38	Tons
9. TFCA Project Cost - Cost Effectiveness (ROG, Nox & PM)		$72,227	/Ton
10. TFCA Project Cost - Cost Effectiveness (ROG, NOx & Weighted PM). THIS VALUE MUST MEET POLICY REQUIREMENTS.		$47,988	/Ton

Notes & Assumptions

Air District's years effectiveness default = 55 years as this is the term of the loan, and loan funds paid back early will be lent out again
Days per year = 240 days, default.
Average Daily Distance of commute from City Center of Napa to City Center of Fairfield (20.8); Vallejo (16.2); and Sonoma (15.9) = 17.6 Average
Based upon average loan amounts, this propgram will lend $25,000, totaling 4 loans and a reduction of 8 vehicle trips per day (see spreadsheet)
Assumption is that this pilot program will allow proximity workers to reduce their daily commute by 17.6 miles per trip
Average Vehicle gets 20.4 miles per gallon per (EPA website)
One gallon gasoline produces 19.4 lbs of CO_2 (BART Website)

CO2 EMISSIONS REDUCED VIA NAPA COUNTY WORKER PROXIMITY HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

NUMBER(S) IN HOUSEHOLD	OWN/RENT	Assistance Amount	OLD COMMUTE MILES	NEW COMMUTE MILES	MILES REDUCED / INCREASED	RENTER PREVENTION CREDIT*	NET REDUCTION PER TRIP	MILES REDUCED PER YEAR	GALLONS REDUCED PER YEAR	POUNDS OF CO2 REDUCED PER YEAR	TONS OF CO2 REDUCED PER YEAR
1	Local Renter	34,000	5.8	8.3	2.5	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	INCREASE	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
4	Local Renter	23,500	6.1	9.6	3.5	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	INCREASE	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
1	Local Renter	27,332	1.8	3.4	1.6	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	INCREASE	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
4	Local Renter	22,500	1	0.9	0.1	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	REDUCTION	MILES	17.6	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
3	Local Renter	28,900	3.7	0.7	3	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	REDUCTION	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
5	Local Renter	46,730	11.3	4.7	6.6	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	REDUCTION	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
4	Local Renter	35,000	1.9	2.2	0.3	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	INCREASE	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
3	Local Renter	14,500	5.4	3.1	2.3	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	REDUCTION	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
1	Local Renter	34,100	1	2.5	1.5	17.6	17.6	9152	448.63	8703.37	4.35
			MILES	MILES	INCREASE	MILES	MILES	MILES	GALLONS	POUNDS	TONS
											39.17

* AVERAGE DISTANCE OF COMMUTE FROM CITY CENTER OF NAPA TO CITY CENTER OF FAIRFIELD(20.8); VALLEJO (16.2); AND SONOMA (15.9) = 17.6 AVERAGE

*ASSUMPTIONS: AVERAGE VEHICLES GETS 20.4 MILES PER GALLON PER EPA WEBSITE; ONE GALLON PRODUCES 19.4 LBS OF CO2 PER BART WEBSITE

39.15 TONS REDUCED FOR 9 RENTERS BASED ON THE ASSUMPTION OF THE RENTER PREVENTION CREDIT

Examples

Project Selection Process

Staff representation from all six Napa County jurisdictions, will serve as selection and prioritization committee. Selection and Prioritization committee recommendations will be forwarded through the respective NCTPA Advisory Committees (Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC); Vine Consumer Advisory Committee (VCAC) and the Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)) and then to the TAC for their consideration and recommendation for approval by the NCTPA Board of Directors.

The master list of countywide prioritized projects will be reviewed and updated by TAC semi-annually.

Project Selection Criteria – to be reviewed and adopted by TAC

1. **Project fulfills an identified need and will have a broad public support.** **0-30 Points**
   - Description of Proposed Project. (Current condition and proposed improvement).
   - Project Justification (Reasons for proposed project and problem project addresses).

2. **Project is consistent with regional/local plans.**
   - Project is contained in a plan/study. 5 points
   - Project is listed in Capital Facility Plan. 5 points
   - Project supports the Regional/State Transportation Plan 5 points

3. **Project has regional/local support.**
   - Letters of Support (Agencies/Organization) 0-8 points
   - Financially Involvement of Businesses/Other Agencies 0-7 points

4. **Project is ready to proceed/implement.**
   - Right of Way completed or not needed 0-5 points
   - Design is completed 0-5 points
   - Environmental permits approved 0-5 points

5. **Multi-modal (Maximum 5 Points)**
   - Bicycle 3 points
   - Pedestrian 3 points
   - Transit 3 points
   - Auto 2 points
   - Other Mode: _____ 2 points

6. **Appropriateness/Match of Project to Funding Source** **0-4 points**

7. **Leverage of Local Match**
   - Local match of 20% 2 points
   - Local match of 25% 4 points

- Local match of 30% — 6 points
- Local match of 35% — 8 points
- Local match of 40% or more — 10 points

8. Adjoining Highway System (Maximum 5 Points)

- Arterial/Interstate — 0-5 points
- Collector — 0-3 points
- Eligible off System — 0-2 points

9. Project is time sensitive? — 1-5 points

RTP- Project Selection Criteria

Review by TAC - April 7, 2011

1. Project fulfills an identified need including: • **Maintenance** • **Safety** • **Land Use** • **Support for Alternative Mode** • **Goods Movement**	50 Points
2. Project is consistent with regional/ plans and meets MTC criteria.	40 Points
3. Adjoining Highway System	5 Points
4. Project is time sensitive?	5 Points

Jurisdictions with a "credit balance" in the countywide accounting will be credited with such a balance in the choice of projects.