



625 Burnell Street · Napa, CA 94559

Tel: (707) 259-8631

Fax: (707) 259-8638

**Technical Advisory Committee  
(TAC)**

**AGENDA**

**Thursday, March 6, 2014  
2:00 p.m.**

**625 Burnell Street  
Napa CA 94559**

**General Information**

*All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (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, 625 Burnell Street, 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](http://www.nctpa.net), click on Minutes and Agendas – TAC or go to <http://www.nctpa.net/technical-advisory-committee-tac>.*

**ITEMS**

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
4. Public Comments
5. TAC Member and Staff Comments

- 6. Standing –
  - 6.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report
  - 6.2 Project Monitoring Funding Programs
  - 6.3 Transit Report (*VINE Ridership*)
  - 6.4 Vine Trail Report

7. Caltrans Report

<b><u>REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME*</u></b>
<p>8. Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy – Draft Update (Danielle Schmitz) (<b><i>Pages 22-35</i></b>)</p> <p>Staff will provide the draft PDA Investment Growth Strategy Update to TAC for review and comment.</p>	<p>INFORMATION/ ACTION</p>	<p>2:15 PM</p>
<p>9. Active Transportation Program (ATP) Update (Diana Meehan) (<b><i>Pages 36-82</i></b>)</p> <p>TAC will receive the latest ATP update.</p>	<p>INFORMATION/ DIRECTION</p>	<p>2:30 PM</p>
<p>10. SR 29 Corridor Improvement Plan Update (Kate Miller) (<b><i>Pages 83-84</i></b>)</p> <p>TAC will receive the schedule for completing the final phase of the SR 29 Gateway Corridor Plan.</p>	<p>INFORMATION</p>	<p>2:45 PM</p>
<p>11. Napa Countywide Transportation Plan - Update (Kate Miller) (<b><i>Pages 85-91</i></b>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Goals and Objectives (<i>Pages 85-88</i>)</li> <li>b) Citizen Advisory Committee (<i>Pages 89-90</i>)</li> <li>c) Countywide Plan Timeline (<i>Page 91</i>)</li> </ul> <p>Staff will provide TAC with the Napa Countywide Transportation Plan Update.</p>	<p>INFORMATION</p>	<p>3:00 PM</p>
<p>12. Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix** (Kate Miller)</p> <p>Staff will provide TAC with the latest Federal and State legislative update presented to the NCTPA Board.</p>	<p>INFORMATION</p>	<p>3: 15 PM</p>

- |     |                                                                                                                                |             |          |
|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| 13. | NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for March 19 , 2014 (Draft)** (Kate Miller)                                                    | INFORMATION | 3:25 PM  |
|     | Preview draft version of the NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for March 19, 2014.                                               |             |          |
| 14. | Topics for Next Meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>o Discussion of topics for next meeting by TAC members</li></ul> | DISCUSSION  | 3:30 PM  |
| 15. | Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of April 3, 2014 and Adjournment                                                         | APPROVE     | 3: 45 PM |

*\* Times shown are approximate only. \*\* Material will be made available at the meeting..*

**Technical Advisory Committee  
(TAC)**

**MINUTES**

**Thursday, January 2, 2014**

**ITEMS**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Holley called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM (local).

Jason Holley, Chair	City of American Canyon
Julie Lucido	City of Napa
Debra Hight	City of St. Helena
Mike Kirn	City of Calistoga
Graham Wadsworth	Town of Yountville
Rick Marshall	County of Napa
John McDowell	County of Napa

**2. Introductions**

None

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

Meeting minutes for December 5, 2013, motioned for approval and unanimously carried.

**MSC\* MARSHALL / HIGHT for APPROVAL**

**4. Public Comments** Mike Costanzo, Napa Valley Vine Trail Coalition (NVVTC), invited TAC members on behalf of the NVVTC, to accompany them to Davis to explore bike/ped lanes on May 10, 2014. Transportation will be provided.

**5. TAC Member and Staff Comments**

**County of Napa** – Member Marshall announced the completion of the partial Devlin Road extension. An invitation was extended to TAC to attend the Ribbon Cutting Ceremony on January 9, 2014, 11:30AM, South End.

**Town of Yountville** – Member Wadsworth announced

- Sandra Smith will assume duties as the Planning and Building Director effective 1/7/14.

- Town Hall Grand Opening on 2/4/14
- Reviewing and self-evaluating town's ADA transit plan and standards.
- Yountville/Madison design nearly 65% complete.

**City of American Canyon** - Chair Holley announced the South Broadway Improvement Project Dedication Ceremony on January 11, 2014, 9:00 AM.

## 6. Standing

- **Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report.** Staff informed TAC on the latest information discussed at the monthly CMA directors meeting. Major topics of discussion were CEQA guideline revisions; multimodal measures; CAP and Trade; and Active Transportation Plan (ATP) guidelines soon to be released.
  - *Project Monitoring Funding Program Report* – Staff provided TAC with the latest project reporting data and deadline updates. Members requested clarification on abbreviations listed next to project names.
  - *Transit Dashboard* – Staff provided TAC with the latest transit data report and ridership update.
  - *Vine Trail Report* – Member Marshall reported the implementation of ACE, an arts committee program already in place in some jurisdictions. Oak Knoll project is progressing.
- **Caltrans Report.** TAC reviewed current project report provided by Caltrans. Members requested clarification and/or meaning of abbreviations listed next to project names.

## 7. Active Transportation Program (ATP) Update

### *Information*

TAC reviewed the new ATP guidelines and its timelines. Guidelines are to be adopted by the CTC on March 20, 2014. TAC requested to provide their comments to NCTPA and revisit item in February 2014 with project prioritization.

## 8. Report on the Feasibility Study for a Transit Maintenance Yard and Fueling Facility

### *Information*

Staff provided TAC with the final report on the Transit Maintenance Yard and Fueling Facility Feasibility Study presented to the NCTPA Board at their December 2013 meeting for acceptance.

## 9. 2014 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Work Plan

### *Information/Action*

TAC reviewed and adopted the final draft of the 2014 TAC Work Plan.

**MSC\* MARSHALL / HIGHT for APPROVAL**

**10. Measure T Program Update**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with the latest update on the Measure T program. Next Ad Hoc committee meeting is scheduled for January 17, 2014.

**11. Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix.**

*Information*

Staff reviewed with TAC the recent actions taken by the NCTPA Board and provided a general legislative update.

**12. NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for January 15, 2014 (Draft)\*\***

*Information*

Draft agenda was not available for review at the time of the meeting.

**13. Topics for Next Meeting**

*Information*

- TFCA Expenditure Plan and Call for Projects
- ATP Update
- MTC Workshop – Project Delivery

**14. Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of February 6, 2014, and Adjournment.**

*Approve*

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 PM (local).

**15. DRAFT Countywide Transportation Plan Update**

*Information - Addenda item moved before item 12 for information/discussion.* TAC received the latest update on the draft Countywide Transportation Plan to be introduced to the NCTPA Board at the Board Retreat (Special Meeting) on January 15, 2014.

**16. Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA-3) Project Submission Review and Current Status of the Active Transportation Program**

*Information - Addenda item moved before item 12 for information/discussion.*

TAC reviewed TDA-3 project applications, various available funding programs and options, and the current status of the Active Transportation Program (ATP). Staff requested TAC's input on whether to combine two cycles of the TDA program. Rick Marshall suggested developing a list of projects in priority order to prepare for upcoming programs Member Lucido confirmed that the City has received a \$140K grant and could reduce the Tulocay Ped/Bike Bridge and Trail Project requested respectively. TAC directed staff to develop scoring criteria to prioritize ATP projects and to combine the two TDA programs.

**Technical Advisory Committee  
(TAC)**

***MINUTES***

**Thursday, February 6, 2014**

**ITEMS**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Holley called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM (local).

Jason Holley, Chair	City of American Canyon
Brent Cooper	City of American Canyon
Mike Kirn	City of Calistoga
Eric Whan, Vice Chair	City of Napa
Rick Tooker	City of Napa
Rick Marshall	County of Napa
Debra Hight	City of St. Helena
Graham Wadsworth	Town of Yountville

**2. Introductions**

Robert Bregoff, Caltrans  
Mike Costanzo, Napa Valley Vine Trail  
Philippe Sales, Napa Valley Vine Trail  
Ursula Vogler, MTC  
Doug Weir, PCC Chair  
Jeremy Sill, Riechers Spence & Associates

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes.**

January 2014 meeting minutes were not available and will be brought back in March for the Committee's consideration.

**4. Public Comments.** Public comment provided by Doug Weir, see Item 7.

**5. TAC Member and Staff Comments**

**City of American Canyon** – Chair Holley announced the pedestrian crossing/sidewalk construction project currently underway on Teresa/SR29 intersection running along City Hall to the local elementary school. City has also met its 20% water conservation goals and/or requirement.

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

**City of Calistoga** – Member Kirn participated in a meeting with Caltrans and the County regarding bridge, stream and fish property areas; field review on 3/11 for accepted pedestrians; and phase II water conservation met.

**City of Napa** – Vice Chair Whan announced the completion and opening of the City's Silverado Trail project. Currently working on the punch list and a ribbon cutting ceremony. Member Tooker informed the TAC of housing projects being challenged (Antonio; First/Oak Creek Terrace – 41 units).

**City of St. Helena** - Member Hight announced the near completion of their road project and are currently working on the punch list. AT&T will be pulling fiber from downtown south and splicing north on SR 29. City still recruiting for a Public Works Director and the City Clerk has just announced her retirement effective by the end of March 2014.

**Town of Yountville** – Member Wadsworth announced the re-opening of the Yountville Town Hall on February 5, 2014; phase I water rationing; recycle water project; and the continued progress of the Madison/Yount project (65%).

**NCTPA** – Staff informed TAC that Housing Element updates must comply with the Complete Streets Act effective 1/31/15; Travel Behavior Study is still active and data is still being collected by consultant; results expected by March/April 2014; and the PDA update is due May 1, 2014.

**6. Standing**

**6.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report.** Staff informed TAC of the latest information discussed at the monthly CMA directors meeting. Major topics of discussion Cap and Trade, MTC report on OBAG evaluation, Regional Measure 2 (10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary) – project evaluation in preparation for new program, SB 1143, CEQA guideline review and its impact on traffic, and greenhouse emissions reduction; comments due February 15, 2014.

**6.1.1 Project Monitoring Funding Program Report** – Staff provided TAC with the latest project reporting data and deadlines.

**6.1.2 Transit Dashboard** – No report available for February 2014.

**6.1.3 Vine Trail Report** – Member Marshall had no report.

**6.1.4 SR29 Corridor Improvement Plan Update** – Staff provided TAC with the latest information on the study progress and announced the meetings recently held by the SR29 committees, the upcoming public meetings to be held on February 10, 2014, 6:00 PM, in the City of American Canyon and February 12, 2014, 6:00 PM, in Napa. The SR29 Corridor Steering Committee (CSC) will be meeting on February 19, 2014, 11:30 AM, Napa, prior the NCTPA Board of Directors meeting, in which it will seek the endorsement of the study.

**Action Requested: APPROVE**

- 6.2. Caltrans Report.** TAC reviewed current project report provided by Caltrans and requested staff to investigate its accuracy, as the report appeared to have the same discrepancies published in December 2013.

**7. Transportation Development Act (TDA-3) - Update**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with the latest guidelines, updates, to include the current list of projects, and the proposed scoring criteria. TAC was advised of the TDA requirement changes announced by MTC which will require project re-submittals and updates to their respective resolutions. Projects are due to NCTPA by Friday, March 7, 2014. Public comment was provided by Doug Weir, PCC Chair, requesting that the TAC consider pedestrian/handicap safety and accessibility as part of the project prioritization process. Staff also updated TAC about the City of Napa's urgency regarding the Tulocay project and that the Board had requested that the project be brought back for early adoption into the program with the other projects submitted in the first cycle. NCTPA staff also presented its proposed scoring criteria for ATP projects which were based on the statewide ATP criteria. Member Whan submitted different scoring criteria for consideration. The committee did not act on either criterion.

**8. Active Transportation Program (ATP) - Update**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with the latest ATP updates and guidelines. A timeline was presented and TAC was advised of the CTC's adaptation of the ATP guidelines on March 20, 2014, and the opening of the call for projects on March 21, 2014. With the goals set in the ATP guidelines, TAC requested to revisit the ATP to discuss countywide project prioritization and the viable Vine Trail project which would fall within the ATP minimum requirement of \$250k and serve as a multi-jurisdictional project.

**9. Transportation for Clean Air (TFCA) Expenditure – FYE 2015 Call for Projects**

*Action*

TAC reviewed the FYE 2015 TFCA Expenditure Plan of \$219.45K and its selection criteria and recommendation for approval by the NCTPA Board at their February 19, 2014, meeting. The deadline for submittal of the Program Expenditure Plan is March 7, 2014, project applications are due to NCTPA on April 4, 2014.

**MSC\* MARSHALL / WHAN for APPROVAL.**

**10. 2014 Federal Project Priorities**

*Information/Discussion*

TAC reviewed and discussed the proposed priority list and requested the SR 29 project be added to the list:

**11. Caltrans Coordination and Outreach to Local Stakeholders**

*Information/Discussion*

Staff recommended to TAC that NCTPA assume the position as the multi-jurisdictional outreach coordinator to Caltrans. This would enhance the ease of interagency communication, project coordination and obtain improved responsiveness from Caltrans. TAC was in favor with this recommendation and staff will request a meeting with Caltrans to discuss further details.

**12. Napa County Transportation Plan - Update**

*Information*

TAC reviewed and provided comment on the Draft Countywide Transportation Plan, Schedule and TOC. Member Cooper recommended that the City of American Canyon be included in the Up-Valley representation. It was determined that each jurisdiction have a specifically designated member separate from the other categories proposed.

**13. Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with the latest legislative and State Bill updates. The bill matrix included the Ting bill (adding a Class IV bike classification to recognize cycle tracks). The Committee requested additional information about cycle tracks. A quorum was not present to act on the bill. Executive Director Miller informed the remaining members that it would go to the Board with no recommendations.

**14. NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for February 19, 2014 (Draft)**

*Approve*

TAC reviewed the Draft NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for February 19, 2014.

**15. Topics for Next Meeting**

*Information*

- Active Transportation Plan (ATP)
- Transportation Development Act Article 3 (TDA-3)
- Countywide Plan

**16. Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of March 6, 2014 and Adjournment**

*Approve*

Next regular meeting date of March 6, 2014, was approved and meeting was adjourned at 4:15 PM.

Inactive Obligations  
Local, State Administered/Locally Funded and Rail Projects

March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 6.2  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

Updated on  
02/20/2014

Project No (newly added projects highlighted in GREEN)	Status	Agency/District Action Required	State Project No	Prefix	District	County	Agency	RTPA	MPO
5470008	Inactive	Submit invoice by 02/20/2014— <b>Invoice past due. Contact DLAE.</b>	0400021135L	RPSTPLE	4	NAP	American Canyon	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
5395002	Inactive	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	0400020975L	RPSTPLE	4	NAP	Yountville	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
5061007	Future	Submit invoice to District by 05/20/2014	0413000375L	BRLO	4	NAP	Calistoga	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
5921010	Future	Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2014	04928133L	BRLO	4	NAP	Napa County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Inactive Obligations  
Local, State Administered/Locally Funded and Rail Projects

March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 6.2  
Continued From: NEW  
Action Requested: INFORMATION

Updated on  
02/20/2014

Project No (newly added projects highlighted in GREEN)	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Last Action Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal
5470008	NAPA JUNCTION ROAD FROM SR29 TO NAPA JUNCTION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENT	3/22/2013	3/22/2013		5/29/2013	L220	309,765.00	221,000.00	0	221,000.00
5395002	NORTH YOUNTVILLE BIKE ROUTE AND SIDEWALK EXTENSION, CROSSWALK IMPROVEMENTS, BIKE LANES & SIGNAGE (TC)	8/30/2011	8/30/2011		12/9/2013	L22E	139,000.00	127,989.00	0	127,989.00
5061007	BERRY ST. OVER NAPA RIVER, NEAR WASHINGTON ST., BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (TC)	5/28/2013	5/28/2013		5/28/2013	M233	319,000.00	319,000.00	0	319,000.00
5921010	04-NAP-0-CR, OAKVILLE CROSS RD AT NAPA RIVER, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, BR.NO. 21C	7/9/2013	7/30/1996	7/9/2013	7/9/2013	Q110 ,L11E ,H110 ,1170	905,000.00	548,000.00	520,170.90	27,829.10

**Green Zone Projects**

Inde	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title						
	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone
13	NAP110029	City of American Canyon	<b>Eucalyptus Drive Realignment Complete Streets</b>						
	CMAQ	\$723	CON	17/18	E76 for CON	2/1/18	G	project to be switched to STIP	
14	NAP110028	City of Napa	<b>California Blvd. Roundabouts</b>						
	CMAQ	\$2,894	CON	15/16	E76 for CON	2/1/16	G	project to be modified with OBAG and STIP funding	

Notes:

**Red Zone Projects**

Index	PP No. Source	Sponsor	Project Title		Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone
			Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)								
<b>1</b>	<b>2130H</b>	<b>Yountville</b>	<b>North Yountville bike lanes &amp; extend sidewalk (ext 6-12)</b>								
	RTIP-TE		\$43	PSE	10/11	complete					
	RTIP-TE		\$86	CON	11/12	resubmit invoice	2/20/14	R	Funds have been re-obligated	<b>R</b>	
<b>2</b>	<b>2130K</b>	<b>American Canyon</b>	<b>Lena Dr &amp; Stenson Dr, rehab</b>								
	RTIP		\$268	CON	15/16	Request Authurization	2/1/15	R	2014 STIP update will remove STIP funding; project sponsor to either delete or identify alternate funding source	G	
<b>3</b>	<b>2130L</b>	<b>Napa County</b>	<b>Silverado Trail Howell Mtn. Road &amp; Denaweal, rehab</b>								
	RTIP		\$1,595	CON	15/16	Request Authurization	2/1/15	R	2014 STIP update will remove STIP funding; project sponsor to either delete or identify alternate funding source	G	
<b>4</b>	<b>2130G</b>	<b>American Canyon</b>	<b>Napa Jct. Elementary School ped imprvements (ext 6-12)</b>								
	RTIP-TE		\$24	PSE	10/11	complete					
	RTIP-TE		\$14	CON	11/12	submit invoice to Caltrans or risk deobligation	2/20/14	R	Invoice past due was to be submitted 2/20/14 - contact DLA; next invoice due 8/20/14	<b>R</b>	
	RTIP-TE		\$183	CON	11/12	submit invoice to Caltrans or risk deobligation	2/20/14	R	Invoice past due was to be submitted 2/20/14 - contact DLA; next invoice due 8/20/14	<b>R</b>	

TDA 3 Project List - March 2014

<b>Index</b>	<b>TIP ID</b>	<b>Sponsor</b>	<b>Project Title</b>							
	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone	
1		<b>City of Napa</b>	<b>Rowena Ave Sidewalk Improvements</b>							
	TDA 3	\$169	CON	12/13	needs to closeout			construction complete; sent final bill to Caltrans		
2		<b>City of Napa</b>	<b>SR29 Undercrossing</b>							
	TDA 3	\$72	PE	12/13	construction			20% complete		
3		<b>American Canyon</b>	<b>Broadway Bike/Pedestrian Improvements</b>							
	TDA 3	\$190	CON	10/11	close out needed		G	funds invoiced and received	Y	
4		<b>Calistoga</b>	<b>ADA Curb Ramps</b>							
	TDA 3	\$60	CON		completed and closed out		G			
5		<b>City of Napa</b>	<b>Tulocay Creek Bridge and Trail Completion</b>							
	TDA 3	\$163	CON		recently approved by NCTPA Board			Awaiting MTC approval		

## FUNDING STATUS REPORT

### TFCA Project Tracking Sheet - March 2014

TFCA Project #	Project Title	Project Sponsor	Initial TFCA Funds Awarded	Current TFCA Funds Awarded, if Different from Initial	TFCA\$ Paid Out To Date	Funds from CP/UB	TFCA\$ Reprgm to Project# or FY	% Cmpl per CMA Update	Project Cmpl Date per CMA Update	Upcoming Required Activity	Date Required	Comments
10NAP01	Lincoln Class II Bike Lane	City of Napa	\$71,750.00		\$39,405.26	\$32,344.74	FYE 2015	100%	06/30/13			
10NAP04	SNCI Commuter Incentives and Marketing Materials	Solano Napa Commuter Information	\$40,000.00		\$38,917.46			95%	06/30/13			closeout documents needed
10NAP05	Lincoln Signal Interconnect Project	City of Napa	\$177,693.43		\$177,693.43			85%	06/30/13	<b>synchronize signals and final analysis</b>	<b>05/30/14</b>	Need to synchronize signals and do final analysis
11NAP01	Bicycle Racks and Bicycle Locker	City of Napa	\$10,443.00		\$10,026.44	UB	\$416.56	75%	06/30/13			Invoice submitted - need final report
11NAP02	Lincoln Ave Class II bike lane between Jefferson St. and Railroad Crossing	City of Napa	\$148,100.00		\$71,547.74			95%	06/30/13			Design work is 95% complete
12NAP01	California Bike Lane Gap Closure	City of Napa	\$112,600.00		\$1,427.06			20%	06/30/14			
12NAP02	American Canyon Signal Interconnect	American Canyon	\$25,987.00		\$0.00			30%	06/30/14	<b>agreement amended</b>		
12NAP03	Light Duty Hybrid Vehicle Purchase	County of Napa	\$11,990.00		\$6,540.00			50%	06/30/14			5 vehicles purchased
12NAP05	Saratoga Drive Class II Bike Lane	City of Napa	\$31,154.00		\$0.00			15%	06/30/14			
14NAP01	Napa Commute Challenge	SNCI	\$40,000		\$0			0%	7/1/2016			
14NAP02	Pope Street Class II Bike Lane	St. Helena	\$40,000		\$0			0%	7/1/2016	<b>Execute Agreement</b>	4/1/2014	

### FUNDING STATUS REPORT

14NAP03	City of American Canyon Park and Ride Lot and Signage	American Canyon	\$95,000		\$0			0%	7/1/2016			
14NAP04	City of Napa Electric Vehicle Charging Stations	City of Napa	\$14,140		\$0			0%	7/1/2016	Execute Agreement	4/1/2014	

Draft  
NCTPA - Caltrans Report

**PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT**

**EA 3G140**

**ADA Curb Ramps; NAPA 29 and 128; In County of Napa**

Scope: Upgrade and construct curb ramps at various locations.

**EA4G210**

**Widen Roadway at Huichica Creek; NAPA 121-PM 0.75; In County of Napa**

Scope: Remove existing triple box culvert and replace with a new bridge

**EA4G920**

**Tulucay Creek Bridge; NAPA 121-PM 6.1/6.2; In City of Napa**

Scope: Bridge Repair

**EA4G840**

**Capell Creek Bridge; NAPA 128-PM 20.2; In County of Napa**

Scope: Bridge Repair/Replacement

**EA4G490**

**Concrete Barrier at Solano Ave. Southbound Onramp; NAPA 29 PM 11.9; In City of Napa**

Scope: Install Concrete Barrier (Type 60)

**EA4G540**

**Signals at First Street Off Ramp; NAPA 29-PM 11.4; In City of Napa**

Scope: Install new traffic signal

**EA 4H200**

**Pavement Preservation from 0.4 mile north of Trancas St. to Mee Ln.; NAPA 29-PM 13.5/25.5; In County of Napa**

Scope: Resurface the existing pavement

**ENVIRONMENTAL**

**EA 28120**

**Soscol Junction; NAPA 221 PM 0.0/0.7 NAPA 29 PM 5.0/7.1; In Napa County**

Scope: Construct Flyover Structure at SR 221/29/12

Cost Estimate: \$35M Construction Capital

Schedule: **DED: 6/2014** PAED: 7/2015

**EA 1G430**

**Conn Creek Bridge Scour Mitigation; NAPA 128 PM R7.4; In Napa County**

Scope: Replace bridge at Conn Creek

Cost Estimate: \$7.1M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 7/2015 PSE: 12/2016 RWC: 4/2017 RTL: 4/2017 **CCA: 1/2020**

**EA 3G640**

**Napa River Bridge Scour Mitigation; NAPA 29 PM 37.0; In City of Calistoga**

Scope: Reconstruct bridge at Napa River Bridge

Cost Estimate: \$9.2M Construction Capital

Schedule: **PAED: 10/2014** PSE: 11/2015 RWC: 3/2016 RTL: 3/2016 CCA: 12/2017

YELLOW = Denotes changes from previous report

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

**EA 2G940**

**West. of Knoxville Road Storm Damage; NAPA 128 PM 17.9; Near Rutherford**

Scope: Construct Roadway Retaining System

Cost Estimate: \$1.6M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED : 5/2014 PSE: 8/2015 RWC: 11/2015 RTL: 11/2015 CCA: 11/2020

**DESIGN**

**EA 25941**

**Channelization; NAPA 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: \$19M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 6/29/07 PSE: 2/2014 RWC: 5/2014 RTL: 5/2014 CCA: 8/2017

**EA 4A090**

**Troutdale Creek Bridge Replacement; NAPA 29 PM 47.0/47.2; In Napa County**

Scope: Bridge replacement at Troutdale Creek

Cost Estimate: \$15M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 6/28/13 PSE: 3/2014 RWC: 6/2014 RTL: 6/2014 CCA: 12/2016

**EA 2A320**

**Sarco Creek Bridge Replacement; NAPA 121 PM 9.3/9.5; In Napa County Near City of Napa**

Scope: Bridge replacement at Sarco Creek

Cost Estimate: \$9.7M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 6/28/12 PSE: 12/2015 RWC: 4/2016 RTL: 4/2016 CCA: 12/2020

**EA 2G950**

**East of Wragg Canyon Road Storm Damage; NAPA 128 PM 29.7; Near Rutherford**

Scope: Construct Roadway Retaining System

Cost Estimate: \$2.1 M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 12/06/2012 PSE: 10/2014 RWC: 2/2015 RTL: 2/2015 CCA: 4/2019

**EA 3G760**

**Capell Creek Horizontal Drain; NAPA 128 PM 20.2; In Napa County**

Scope: Install slope inclinometer. Clean and install horizontal drains.

Cost Estimate: \$540K Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 5/30/13 PSE: 3/2014 RWC: 6/2014 RTL: 6/2014 CCA: 12/2015

**EA 3E270**

**Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt Pavement Overlay; NAPA 29 PM 29.3/36.9; In Napa County**

Scope: Pavement Resurfacing with Rubberized Asphalt from north of York Creek to Myrtle Street

Cost Estimate: \$2.5M Construction Capital

Schedule: PSE: 1/2014 RTL: 2/2014 CCA: 12/2015

**EA 3E520**

**Hopper Slough Bridge; NAPA 128 PM 5.1; In Napa County**

Scope: Repair Abutment

Cost Estimate: \$500K Construction Capital

Schedule: Director's Order Project – Spring 2014

PID (Project Initiation Document)

PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document)

RWC (Right of Way Certification)

ADV (Advertise Contract)

PSR (Project Study Report)

RTL (Ready to List)

BO (Bid Open)

DED (Draft Environmental Document)

PSE (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)

CCA (Construction Contract Acceptance)

AWD (Award Contract)

**CONSTRUCTION**

**EA 4442A**

**Duhig Project Landscaping; NAPA 12/121 PM 0.3/2.0; in Napa County**

Scope: Highway Planting from 0.3 mile 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: 6/2015

**EA 26413**

**Jameson Canyon; NAPA 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: \$29M

Schedule: PAED: 1/31/08                      RTL: 11/19/10    AWD: 1/26/12 (Ghillotti Bros.)                      CCA: 12/2015

**EA 26414**

**Jameson Canyon; SOLANO 12 PM 0.0/2.6; 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: \$52M

Schedule: PAED: 1/31/08                      RTL: 12/1/10    AWD: 1/11/12 (Ghillotti Const.)                      CCA: 12/2015

**EA 4S020**

**Storm Damage; NAPA 29 PM 41.0; 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                      RTL: 6/21/12    AWD: 12/27/12 (Gordon Ball)                      CCA: 1/10/2014

**EA 4S030**

**Storm Damage; NAPA 128 PM 10.3; 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                      RTL: 5/1/12    AWD: 2/6/2013(Gordon Ball)                      CCA: 10/2017

**EA 2A110**

**Capell Creek Bridge Replacement; NAPA 121 PM 20.2/20.4; In Napa County**

Scope: Bridge replacement at Capell Creek

Cost Estimate: \$3.4M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 6/22/11                      RTL: 3/14/13    AWD: 10/24/13 (Gordon Ball)                      CCA: 8/2015

**EA 3E220**

**Pavement Digouts; NAPA-29 PM 13.5/19.8; In City of Napa and Town of Yountville**

Scope: AC digouts from 0.5 Mile North of Trancas Street to Madison Street

Cost Estimate: \$1.1M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 7/2012                      RTL: 11/26/13    ADV: 2/2014                      CCA 12/2014

**EA 3E400**

**Rubberized Bonded Wearing Course Seal Coat; NAPA 128 PM 19.0/34.2; In Napa County**

Scope: Place asphalt rubber seal coat from Knoxville Road to the County Line

Cost Estimate: \$3.4M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED: 4/16/12                      RTL: 11/15/13    ADV: 1/13/14                      CCA: 12/2014

PID (Project Initiation Document)

PAED (Project Approval/ Environmental Document)

RWC (Right of Way Certification)

ADV (Advertise Contract)

PSR (Project Study Report)

RTL (Ready to List)

BO (Bid Open)

DED (Draft Environmental Document)

PSE (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)

CCA (Construction Contract Acceptance)

AWD (Award Contract)

**EA 3E370**

**Pavement Digouts; NAPA 29 PM 0.0/5.1; In and Near City of American Canyon**

**Scope:** AC Digouts from Solano County Line to north of SR12 Junction (Jameson Canyon/Airport)

**Cost Estimate:** \$700K Construction Capital

**Schedule: PAED:** 11/8/12

**RTL:** 11/15/13 **ADV:** 2/2014

**CCA:** 12/2014

**ACTION ITEMS**

**Hopper Slough Bridge**

**Work signs protocol**

**Litter program and Adopt-A-Highway program in Town of Yountville**

**PID** (Project Initiation Document)

**PAED** (Project Approval/ Environmental Document)

**RWC** (Right of Way Certification)

**ADV** (Advertise Contract)

**PSR** (Project Study Report)

**RTL** (Ready to List)

**BO** (Bid Open)

**DED** (Draft Environmental Document)

**PSE** (Plans, Specifications, and Estimate)

**CCA** (Construction Contract Acceptance)

**AWD** (Award Contract)



March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8  
Continued From: NEW

**Action Requested: INFORMATION/ACTION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Danielle Schmitz, Senior Planner  
(707) 259-5968 / Email: [dschmitz@nctpa.net](mailto:dschmitz@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy –  
Draft Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That TAC review the draft PDA Investment and Growth Strategy Update and provide comments to Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) **by Friday, March 21, 2014, 5:00 PM (local time).**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

In May 2013, the NCTPA completed a Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy (IGS) to comply with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Plan Bay Area. SB 375 requirements. SB 375 requires the metropolitan areas develop strategies that reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. The regional agencies required that the county's provide periodic updates to their PDA IGS.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None.

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

SB 375 requires that the current Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), Plan Bay Area, include a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which promotes compact, mixed-use commercial and residential development. To meet the goals of SB 375 more of the future development is planned to be walkable and bikable and close to public transit, jobs, schools, shopping, parks, recreation and other amenities.

To help achieve the goals of the SCS, the nine (9) Bay Area counties have gone through a self identification process where they have voluntarily designated PDAs in their jurisdiction that can accommodate a majority of their future growth. The purpose of a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs understand the opportunities and barriers to developing PDAs in the region, in particular what transportation investments should be made to best achieve the PDA's housing goals.

The purpose of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy is to have the transportation programming agency, NCTPA, be familiar with the transportation needs within each PDA in Napa County. This knowledge will help NCTPA to program funds, in order to meet PDA housing and job goals. The first step in the PDA process was to prepare an inventory of the PDAs and evaluate the current conditions within the PDA, document any planning that has already occurred, and identify the planning and capital needs of the PDA. This initial task was done in May 2013 with the idea that the PDA IGS would be a living and working document for NCTPA. This is the first annual update of the PDA IGS document.

Appendix A-6 of the MTC's Resolution 4035 outlines the details of the Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy and the subsequent yearly updates. NCTPA's May 2014 update is in the form of a memo and touches upon current and future work planned for Napa's PDAs in the areas of housing and transportation as well as an assessment of housing policies that will encourage future development. NCTPA staff is requesting that TAC comment on this update.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: (1) Draft PDA IGS May 2014 Update  
(2) Resolution 4035 Appendix A-6

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** February 18, 2014

**TO:** Metropolitan Transportation Commission and Association of Bay Area Governments

**FROM:** Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency

**SUBJECT:** PDA Investment and Growth Strategy: May 2014 Update

**Overview:**

The Napa County Priority Development Area Investment and Growth Strategy was completed in May 2013. On November 8, 2013 NCTPA staff joined other CMA staff in presenting an overview of their PDA IGS to the MTC Planning committee and ABAG Administrative Committee. The presentation was well received by the committees.

Since that time the PDAs of Napa County have been working on their individual PDA development strategies. The City of American Canyon received \$750,000 under the MTC Regional PDA Program to put towards its PDA Specific Plan. The City is currently working on retaining a consultant to assist with the specific plan which is scheduled to begin in spring 2014.

The City of Napa, which has a specific PDA plan, was awarded \$250,000 under the MTC Regional PDA Program to perform more specific PDA planning activities. The City will be using the funds to implement an infrastructure financing strategy, parking management strategy, and active transportation improvement project.

NCTPA has kicked-off the Napa Countywide Transportation Plan with a Board Retreat held on January 15, 2014. The countywide plan will set transportation goals and priorities. The focus of the transportation plan will be to set priorities for future transportation projects over the next 25 years. This plan will also respond to new policies such as SB 375, which mandate reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled.

NCTPA will also focus agency efforts on developing project specific plans and advocacy to bring greater attention to the County's (with focus on the PDAs) infrastructure needs and funding challenges. This will involve coordinating with federal, state, and regional partners to prioritize investments in the County's PDAs. NCTPA will stay abreast of funding and regulatory opportunities and identify financing mechanisms to support sustainable development, and encourage a rich mix of affordable housing and employment to remove barriers to PDA development and growth.

The Countywide Plan update will include projects and other improvements for new and existing roadways, including our major arterials and local streets and roads. It will also include public transit, and facilities and programs to support cycling and walking. This Plan update will also include an update to NCTPA’s “Community Based Transportation Plan” (CBTP) which specifically examines how our transportation system will meet the needs of the entire Napa community, including disadvantaged communities.

This plan, scheduled for adoption in May/June 2015, will be complete around the time that MTC solicits new projects for the next Bay Area Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) update and will position Napa County to participate in that exercise based on the most up to date local consideration of Napa’s transportation vision, goals and priorities.

**American Canyon Update:**

The City of American Canyon expects to release a request for proposal (RFP) for a planning consultant to assist with the PDA specific plan by the end of February 2014. American Canyon will also be releasing its RFP for its Housing Element update by the end of March 2014.

Housing Element Policies

The City of American Canyon has the following PDA relevant policies and programs that encourage affordable housing:

<b>Housing Element Policy/Program</b>	<b>Summary of progress in Implementation and Effectiveness</b>
Program 2.3.1 To ensure sufficient residential capacity is maintained to accommodate the RHNA need, the City maintain a formal ongoing project-by-project evaluation for housing projects pursuant to Government Code Section 65863 (No-Net Loss) for its impact on housing supply for multiple income levels. Should an approval of commercial development result in a reduction of capacity within mixed use zones below the residential capacity needed to accommodate the remaining need for lower-income households, the City will identify and, if needed, zone sufficient sites to accommodate the shortfall.	No commercial developments have been proposed on land that would result in a reduction of capacity within mixed use zones below the residential capacity needed to accommodate the remaining need for lower-income households. No further action required by this program is necessary.
Program 2.3.2 Maintain City staffing or contracted services at levels that are adequate to ensure the continued prompt	City has maintained staffing or contracted services at levels that are adequate to ensure the continued prompt consideration

<p>consideration of residential development applications.</p>	<p>of residential development applications by hiring two contract planners to process residential projects.</p>
<p>Policy 2.4.1 Allow flexibility in the type of units developed on vacant, residentially designated properties in master-planned communities and other planned developments.</p>	<p>The zoning code provides flexibility in the type of units developed on vacant, residentially designated properties in the Watson Ranch master-planned communities by requiring a Specific Plan.</p>
<p>Policy 2.4.2 Require larger projects to include a mix of housing types.</p>	<p>The General Plan requires a variety of housing types including single family attached and detached townhouses, condominiums, mixed-use and apartments in the Town Center (Watson Ranch) project which is the largest un-built project in the City.</p>
<p>Program 2.10.1 To promote the development of affordable housing units, the City will promote housing opportunities and assist developers and property owners with the consolidation of lots and the construction of affordable housing through the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Selling City owned land at a reduced cost to developers to build affordable housing through a Request for Proposals process.</li> </ul>	<p>This was accomplished with the Valley View affordable senior housing project in the PDA.</p>
<p>Program 2.10.2 Discourage proposals for residential down-zonings or reclassifications of residentially designated property to nonresidential uses that would impact the City's potential to meet its Quantified Objectives for affordable housing. Any proposal must demonstrate adequate alternatives and methods that would help minimize and mitigate any loss in potential housing for multiple income groups.</p>	<p>No proposals for residential down-zonings or reclassifications of residentially designated property to nonresidential uses that would impact the City's potential to meet its Quantified Objectives for affordable housing have been received during the reporting period.</p>
<p>Policy 2.11.1 Use federal, state, local and private funding assistance, to the extent that these opportunities exist, and are appropriate to American Canyon's needs, to encourage the development of</p>	<p>The City recently received CDBG funding for a low income housing rehabilitation program and STP Federal Funds to develop a specific plan for the City's Priority Development Area which will</p>

affordable housing.	include a significant amount of housing opportunities for lower income residents.
Program 2.11.1 Continue to partner with the City of Napa Housing Authority or similar entity to take advantage of administrative resources and receive a reasonable share of federal, state and private funding for housing. Housing Authority administered programs that City residents will continue to benefit from include the Rental Assistance and Section 8 Programs; programs in the foreseeable future may include CDBG funds.	The City is completing the second year of a two-year contract with the City of Napa Housing Authority to take advantage of administrative resources and receive a reasonable share of federal, state and private funding for housing. Housing Authority administered programs that City residents will continue to benefit from include the Rental Assistance and Section 8 Programs; programs in the foreseeable future may include CDBG funds.
Program 2.13.1 Require all residential projects of ten or more above moderate-income units to include affordable units.	The City is not currently able to require all residential projects of ten or more above moderate-income units to include affordable units because of the Palmer lawsuit that invalidated Inclusionary zoning ordinance programs. A new program that complies with Palmer is planned for the next year but is not yet in place.

Development

Transportation: Transportation Projects underway or planned for in the American Canyon PDA include:

- Napa Junction Elementary Pedestrian Program which consists of installing sidewalks on Napa Junction Road which is adjacent to City Hall and the Napa Junction Elementary School. This project is currently under construction.
- Theresa Avenue Sidewalk Improvements Phase 3 consists of various sidewalk improvements along Theresa Avenue. This project will go out for bid in March 2014.
- Eucalyptus Drive Complete Street Improvements consist of extending Eucalyptus Drive 1,500 feet west of Hwy 29 and south from Los Altos to Rio del Mar. This project will extend the road and provide complete street areas for pedestrians (sidewalks and paths) and cyclist (class I and II bike facilities) into the American Canyon PDA at the intersection of Eucalyptus Dr. and Hwy 29 by realigning Eucalyptus Dr. from Theresa Rd. to intersect with Hwy 29. This project is programmed through the Regional Transportation Improvement Program to receive construction funds in FY 18/19.
- The SR 29 Gateway Corridor Study will be complete in spring 2014 and provide a roadmap for future transportation infrastructure development along the Hwy 29 Corridor. The study will also address much needed bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along the corridor.

Housing: Within the PDA the City has an application for 180 apartments at the north-east corner of Napa Junction Road/SR-29 and 120 apartments at the north-west corner of Silver Oak/American Canyon Road. The Planning Commission also approved 70 affordable senior housing apartments on Theresa Avenue.

**City of Napa Update:**

The City of Napa is actively working on reviewing their housing element policies and programs that support PDA development:

<b>2009 Housing Element Policy/Program Title Ref. # and brief description Brief Description of program</b>	<b>Summary of progress in Implementation and Effectiveness</b>
<p><b>1.B Future Land Use Planning.</b> Address long term housing needs through Specific Plans or other land use plan updates, targeting Downtown, major transportation corridors near services, large sites and sites identified for potential future change.</p>	<p><i>Objective met.</i> The Downtown Napa Specific Plan was adopted in June 2012 (O2012 4; related resolutions). This Plan addressed several of the potential future change sites identified in 2009 HE Figure 6.9, and identified sites for 500-600 units long term. The Plan also reduced Downtown residential parking standards.</p>
<p><b>1.F Market Analyses.</b> During Specific Plans &amp; similar planning efforts, analyze housing and job types, numbers and incomes and develop strategies to improve linkages between housing and employment development.</p>	<p><i>Objective being met.</i> The Downtown Specific Plan adopted in 2012 analyzed future jobs and housing potential to assure that there are substantial and varied housing opportunities as well as employment development planned for and permitted by the Downtown Plan.</p>
<p><b>1.I Housing Sites Study.</b> Complete housing sites analysis for surplus or potentially surplus institutional lands and follow-up actions, such as prioritizing sites for purchase.</p>	<p><i>Objective partly met.</i> A citywide Housing Sites Study of all institutional lands (city/non city) has not been completed. However, the City completed a review of its Downtown land assets in part to inform the 2009-2012 Downtown Specific Plan effort. Certain City owned sites are identified in the Downtown Plan and Housing Element as potential housing opportunity sites. County offices on First Street are also identified in the Downtown Plan as having potential for future residential mixed uses. Other surplus City sites are also included in the Housing Element sites list.</p>

<p><b>2.A Added Multi Family Sites.</b> Complete sites study before Housing Element to identify other potential sites for multi-family use, or where increased densities may be appropriate.</p>	<p><i>Objective generally met.</i> The 2012 Downtown Plan conducted a sites analysis for that Plan area increasing the housing potential in the Downtown, and including higher densities in the Downtown Core. Higher minimum densities were also adopted citywide in the city’s mixed use areas and on certain multi-family sites in 2009.</p> <p>Early analysis of sites for the 2015-2023 Housing Element update indicated that <i>added</i> sites are not needed to meet state standards, and that current densities are high enough to meet housing needs at all income levels (as evidenced by recent mixed income and lower income apartment approvals) and state criteria.</p>
<p><b>2009 Housing Element Policy/Program Title Ref. # and brief description Brief Description of program</b></p>	<p><b>Summary of progress in Implementation and Effectiveness</b></p>
<p><b>3.L Transportation Element Amendment.</b> City shall proposed stronger General Plan policy[ies] and program[s] to strengthen concurrency of new development with infrastructure, particularly streets.</p>	<p><i>Objective partly addressed.</i> The 2012 Downtown Specific Plan Implementation Chapter identifies measures to be taken to develop infrastructure improvement fees (and other approaches) to improve their coordination with new development. City has received PDA planning grant funds to complete such a program.</p> <p>The General Plan Transportation Element already contains policy to implement improvements to accommodate future development (T1.3, T1.5), and all Napa County jurisdictions passed a sales tax measure to improve funding for road maintenance beginning in 2018.</p>
<p><b>5.N Community Outreach</b> Increase community outreach and education by:</p> <p>c. Using Downtown Plan and others to</p>	<p>The Downtown Plan conducted extensive community outreach – including a broad based committee, web surveys, “partner groups”, workshops, etc. in creating a vision for Downtown that includes substantial housing opportunities.</p>

create broad based visions that include housing opportunities;	
<b>5.R Public/Private Partnerships</b> Encourage use of private resources to help meet identified housing needs.	<i>Objectives met.</i> Housing impact fees collected from private development projects are being used to meet identified housing needs. Local non-profits (in particular the Vintners Association and Gasser Foundation) have provided significant funding towards meeting affordable housing needs. Further, private volunteers on committees, such as such as for the Downtown Specific Plan and Affordable Housing Task Force provide valuable assistance.

Development

Transportation: Transportation projects underway or planned for in the City of Napa include:

- California Roundabouts consists of constructing roundabouts at the intersections of First Street and California Boulevard and Second Street and California to better manage traffic congestion. The Roundabouts are being funded by OBAG and RTIP funds and are scheduled to be constructed in FY 16-17.
- Silverado Trail Five-way intersection improvements will provide intersection geometry improvements, lane widening, travel lane reconfiguration, and signal modification. The Silverado Trail five-way intersection is programmed to receive RTIP funds for construction in FY 17-18.
- Saratoga Drive Extension has been recently complete to include access to the new housing development that includes 27 affordable units at the Anton Napa site.
- The California North/South Bike Lane project will provide class II bike lanes along California Boulevard between Pueblo Avenue and Permanente Way. This project fills a missing gap of continuous class II that connects to the Napa PDA. Construction on this project will begin in spring 2014.
- The Napa Bike Path Undercrossing will provide critical east-west bicycle and pedestrian access and safe crossing of SR 29. The project will also provide transportation connectivity to the Napa PDA. The Napa Undercrossing is currently in the design phase.
- The Tulocay Creek Bridge and Trail project was recently awarded construction funds to complete this critical link to the Vine Trail. The project will complete a portion of the class I path that parallels the Napa River from Third Street to the Napa College. This project travels right through the heart of Napa's PDA.

Housing: Within or in proximate access to the PDA the following housing projects are underway:

- Anton Napa located at 190 Silverado Trail consists of 134 multi-family apartment units – including 27 units affordable to lower income households. Construction on this project has recently been completed and certificate of occupancy has been issued. The project is now open for tenants.
- The Tulocay Village Apartments located on 467 Soscol Avenue consist of 483 multi-family apartment units. The application was submitted for required land use entitlements but no Planning Commission hearing date has been set. The City of Napa is seeking commitment from the developer to provide 10% of the units as affordable, approximately 48 units.
- Black Elk Mixed-Use project is located on 728 First Street is a three story mixed-use building with 5,500 square feet of retail on ground floor, 4,500 square feet of office on second floor, and 3 residential condominiums on third floor. The project includes a proposed sub-grade “tuck-under” structured parking below the ground floor. An application has been submitted for required land use entitlements and the Planning Commission is scheduled to review the project on March 6, 2014.

### **Next Steps:**

#### Communities of Concern

In the coming year, one main area of focus for NCTPA will be defining Communities of Concern (COC) for Napa County. This will be crucial in securing future transportation funding for the Napa region. Language in the Active Transportation Program Guidelines states the following:

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>.
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at <http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html>.
- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filesesp.asp>. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project

area or, for projects not directly benefiting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

It also appears that COC will play a role in how Cap and Trade funds are distributed. MTC released a draft Cap and Trade funding framework which includes language that states, “All Investment Categories should include funding that benefits disadvantaged communities. The Communities are defined as MTC’s Communities of Concern.”

MTC/ABAG has not identified any COCs in Napa County. Currently MTC/ABAG determine Communities of Concern using eight specific factors. MTC/ABAG use travel-analysis-zones (TAZs) to study spatial analysis of the COCs in the region. COCs are defined “as those tracts having concentrations 4 or more factors listed below, or that have concentrations of both low-income and minority populations.”<sup>1</sup>

Disadvantage Factor	% of Regional Population	Concentration Thresholds
1. Minority Population	53%	70%
2. Low Income (< 200% of Poverty) Population	23%	30%
3. Limited English Proficiency Population	9%	20%
4. Zero Vehicle Households	9%	10%
5. Seniors 75 and older	6%	10%
6. Population with a Disability	18%	25%
7. Single-Parent Families	14%	20%
8. Cost-burdened Renters	10%	15%

Even though MTC/ABAG do not recognize any COCs in Napa County, there are still pockets of disadvantage communities that should be acknowledged. A recent Stanford Study, The California Poverty Measure: A New Look at the Social Safety Net, ranked Napa County as having one of the highest poverty rates in California. This was based on a new methodology called the California Poverty Measure (CPM) which takes into account social safety net programs received by individuals in a county, and factors in housing costs. This new methodology placed Napa in the “high cost county” category and also gave Napa County the second highest CMP rate, only behind Los Angeles County. The Stanford Study also shows Napa having the largest threshold between the Original Poverty Measure (OPM) and Stanford’s poverty measure, the California Poverty Measure (CPM).<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Appendix A to Plan Bay Area Equity Analysis

<sup>2</sup> The California Poverty Measure: A Portrait of Poverty within California Counties and Demographic Groups; The Stanford Center of Poverty and Inequality  
[http://www.stanford.edu/group/scspi/poverty/cpm/CPMBrief\\_CPI.pdf](http://www.stanford.edu/group/scspi/poverty/cpm/CPMBrief_CPI.pdf)

Further analysis will need to be completed by NCTPA and the regional agencies to establish an acceptable COC measure to address the specific challenges of Napa County. NCTPA has already started this process.

Countywide Plan

The next steps for the Countywide Plan are reaffirming the goals of the Countywide Plan with the NCTPA Board, creating the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC), and preparing a call for projects. The CAC will consist of a member from each jurisdiction in Napa County as well as other community stakeholders. NCTPA staff will be working on a series of Issue Papers over the coming months that will cover several different topics of the Countywide Plan, including land use and development which will include a PDA analysis. NCTPA will also be working on prioritizing transportation investments with the jurisdictions. This prioritized list of transportation projects should be complete by spring 2015 in time for the Bay Area RTP call for projects.

DRAFT

## 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<sup>1</sup>. 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:

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as inclusionary housing requirements, city-sponsored land-banking for affordable housing production, “just cause eviction” policies, policies or investments that preserve existing deed-restricted or “naturally” affordable housing, condo conversion ordinances that support stability and preserve affordable housing, etc.

- **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](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**

CMA's develop PDA Investment & Growth Strategy	June 2012 – May 2013
PDA Investment & Growth Strategy Presentations by CMA's to Joint MTC Planning and ABAG Administrative Committee	Summer/Fall 2013
CMA's amend PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to incorporate follow-up to local housing production and policies	May 2014
CMA's 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



March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 9  
Continued From: February  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION/DIRECTION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Diana Meehan, Assistant Program Planner/Administrator  
(707) 259-8327 / Email: [dmeehan@nctpa.net](mailto:dmeehan@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Active Transportation Program (ATP) Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Information Only

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The new ATP consolidates former federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and Safe Routes to School (SR2S). Due to carryover amounts the first round of funding is anticipated to be \$240M (\$130M in subsequent years) and is intended for projects that support non-auto transportation modes.

The ATP guidelines are scheduled to be adopted by the CTC on March 20, 2014 with the first statewide call for projects issued on March 21, 2014. The Application deadline is May 21, 2014.

Project selection for the state program will be August 21<sup>st</sup>. Applications not selected by the state program will be automatically submitted to the regional program call for projects. Regional project applications are tentatively due to MTC by July 24<sup>th</sup>. MTC's regional project recommendations are due to the CTC by September 30, 2014. All projects must be in the TIP prior to programming.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a fiscal impact? No

## **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

The draft guidelines for the ATP will be adopted by the CTC on March 20, 2014, with the first call for projects in the statewide competition issued immediately following on March 21, 2014. NCTPA staff recognizes that there are a number of unfunded bicycle and pedestrian needs in the county but cautions that a coordinated effort among jurisdictions will be necessary to be successful. A key component of this effort would include recommendations by the TAC and the ATAC for countywide project prioritization that achieve the stated goals for the new ATP.

At the February TAC meeting, the committee discussed projects that could be considered for ATP funding. As a reminder, the project minimum ATP is \$250,000. Bundling projects in to programs was discussed as an approach to achieve delivering multi-jurisdictional projects, however, the Vine Trail was identified as a possible priority project for the first statewide call for projects. A description of the Vine Trail project is included in attachment 4.

The application for the statewide program is also currently being developed and is scheduled to be approved by the CTC in April. The attached draft application is subject to change. A District 4 ATP application workshop will take place on April 29, 2014 at the Caltrans office located at 111 Grand Avenue, Parkview Conference Rm., 15<sup>th</sup> Floor, Oakland. For more information on the application workshop contact Jose Reyes at (510) 286-5233.

Important dates are listed in bold in the timeline below.

<b>Action-Statewide</b>	<b>Date</b>
Call for Projects	March 21, 2014
Application Approved/Released	April TBD
Applications Due	May 21, 2014
Adoption	August 20, 2014

<b>Action-MPO (MTC)</b>	<b>Date</b>
Call for Projects	May 21, 2014
Applications Due	July 24, 2014
Regional Adoption	September 24, 2014
CTC Adoption of Regional Projects	December 10, 2014

<b>Other</b>	<b>Date</b>
ATP Workshop	April 29, 2014

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- Attachments: (1) ATP Guidelines 1/29/14  
 (2) Draft Active Transportation Project Scoring Criteria  
 (3) Draft ATP Application  
 (4) Vine Trail Project Description

JAMES C. GHIEMMETTI, Chair  
CARL GUARDINO, Vice Chair  
BOB ALVARADO  
DARIUS ASSEMI  
YVONNE B. BURKE  
LUCETTA DUNN  
JAMES EARP  
DARIO FROMMER  
FRAN INMAN  
JAMES MADAFFER  
JOSEPH TAVAGLIONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA



SENATOR MARK DESAULNIER, Ex Officio  
ASSEMBLY MEMBER BONNIE LOWENTHAL, Ex Officio

Andre Boutros, Executive Director

## CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

1120 N STREET, MS-52  
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814  
P. O. BOX 942873  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94273-0001  
FAX (916) 653-2134  
(916) 654-4245  
<http://www.catc.ca.gov>

February 3, 2014

The Honorable Mark Leno  
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee  
California State Senate  
1020 N Street, Room 553  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Senator Leno:

The California Transportation Commission (Commission) is pleased to submit the draft guidelines for the Active Transportation Program. An electronic copy of the guidelines can be found on the Commission's website at [www.catc.ca.gov](http://www.catc.ca.gov).

Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) requires the Commission to submit draft guidelines to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee no later than 45 days prior to adopting the initial set of final guidelines for the Active Transportation Program. The Commission intends to adopt the guidelines at our March 20, 2014 meeting.

Also enclosed is the 2014 Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate (adopted December 11, 2013) which provides programming targets for each program component.

If you have any questions, please contact Mitchell Weiss at (916) 654-7179 or by email at [Mitchell.Weiss@dot.ca.gov](mailto:Mitchell.Weiss@dot.ca.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Andre Boutros".

ANDRE BOUTROS  
Executive Director

Enclosure

**DRAFT**  
**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM**  
**GUIDELINES**

**1/29/14**

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Background .....	1
Program Goals .....	1
Program Schedule.....	1
Funding .....	2
Source .....	2
Distribution.....	2
Matching Requirements.....	3
Funding For Active Transportation Plans .....	4
Reimbursement .....	4
Eligibility .....	4
Eligible Applicants .....	4
Partnering with Implementating Agencies.....	5
Eligible Projects .....	5
Minimum Request for Funds .....	6
Example Projects .....	6
Project Type Requirements.....	7
Disadvantaged Communities.....	7
Safe Routes to School Projects.....	7
Recreational Trails Projects.....	8
Technical Assistance Resource Center.....	8
Project Selection Process .....	8
Project Application.....	8
Sequential Project Selection.....	9
MPO Competitive Project Selection .....	9
Screening Criteria.....	10
Scoring Criteria.....	10

Project Evaluation Committee .....	11
Programming.....	12
Allocations .....	13
Project Delivery .....	13
Project Inactivity .....	14
Project Reporting .....	14
Roles and Responsibilities .....	15
California Transportation Commission (Commission).....	15
California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) .....	15
Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) with large urbanized areas .....	16
Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPAs) outside an MPO with Large Urbanized Areas and an MPO without Large Urbanized Areas.....	17
Project Applicant.....	17
Active Transportation Plan .....	17
Federal Requirements.....	19
Design Standards.....	19
Program Evaluation.....	20

## INTRODUCTION

### BACKGROUND

The Active Transportation Program was created by Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking.

These guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the Active Transportation Program. The guidelines were developed in consultation with the Active Transportation Program Workgroup. The workgroup includes representatives from Caltrans, other government agencies, and active transportation stakeholder organizations with expertise in pedestrian and bicycle issues, including Safe Routes to School programs.

The California Transportation Commission (Commission) must hold at least two public hearings prior to adopting the Active Transportation Program guidelines. The Commission may amend the adopted guidelines after conducting at least one public hearing. The Commission must make a reasonable effort to amend the guidelines prior to a call for projects or may extend the deadline for project submission in order to comply with the amended guidelines.

### PROGRAM GOALS

Pursuant to statute, the goals of the Active Transportation Program are to:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) and Senate Bill 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009).
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding.
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

### PROGRAM SCHEDULE

The guidelines for an initial two-year program of projects must be adopted by March 26, 2014 (within six months of enactment of the authorizing legislation). No later than 45 days prior to adopting the initial set of guidelines for the Active Transportation Program, the Commission must submit the draft guidelines to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee.

Subsequent programs must be adopted not later than April 1 of each odd-numbered year, however, the Commission may alternatively elect to adopt a program annually.

The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2014 Active Transportation Program:

Commission adopts Fund Estimate	December 11, 2013
Guidelines hearing, South	January 22, 2014
Guidelines hearing, North	January 29, 2014
Guidelines submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee	February 3, 2014
Commission adopts Active Transportation Program Guidelines	March 20, 2014
Call for projects	March 21, 2014
Project applications to Caltrans	May 21, 2014
Large MPOs submit optional guidelines to Caltrans	May 21, 2014
Commission approves or rejects MPO guidelines	June 25, 2014
Staff recommendation for statewide and rural/small urban portions of the program	August 8, 2014
Commission adopts statewide and rural/small urban portions of the program	August 20, 2014
Projects not programmed distributed to large MPOs based on location	August 20, 2014
Deadline for MPO project programming recommendations to the Commission	September 30, 2014
Commission adopts MPO selected projects	November 2014

## FUNDING

### SOURCE

The Active Transportation Program is funded from various federal and state funds appropriated in the annual Budget Act. These are:

- 100% of the federal Transportation Alternative Program funds, except for federal Recreation Trail Program funds appropriated to the Department of Parks and Recreation.
- \$21 million of federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds or other federal funds.
- State Highway Account funds.

In addition to furthering the goals of this program, all Active Transportation Program projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to at least one of the Active Transportation Program's funding sources.

### DISTRIBUTION

State and federal law segregate the Active Transportation Program into multiple, overlapping components. The Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate must indicate the funds available for each of the program components. Consistent with these requirements, the Active Transportation Program funds must be distributed as follows:

1. Forty percent to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000.

These funds must be distributed based on total MPO population. The funds programmed and allocated under this paragraph must be selected through a competitive process by the MPOs in accordance with these guidelines.

Projects selected by MPOs may be in either large urban, small urban, or rural areas.

A minimum of 25% of the funds distributed to each MPO must benefit disadvantaged communities.

The following statutory requirements apply specifically to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG)

- SCAG must consult with county transportation commissions, the Commission, and Caltrans in the development of competitive project selection criteria.
  - The criteria used by SCAG should include consideration of geographic equity, consistent with program objectives.
  - SCAG must place priority on projects that are consistent with plans adopted by local and regional governments within the county where the project is located.
  - SCAG must obtain concurrence from the county transportation commissions.
2. Ten percent to small urban and rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less, with projects competitively awarded by the Commission to projects in those regions. Federal law segregates the Transportation Alternative Program into separate small urban and rural competitions based upon their relative share of the state population. Small Urban areas are those with populations of 5,001 to 200,000. Rural areas are those with populations of 5,000 or less.

A minimum of 25% of the funds in the Small Urban and Rural programs must benefit disadvantaged communities.

Projects within the boundaries of an MPO with an urban area with a population of greater than 200,000 are not eligible for funding in the Small Urban or Rural programs.

3. Fifty percent to projects competitively awarded by the Commission on a statewide basis.

A minimum of 25% of the funds in the statewide competitive program must benefit disadvantaged communities.

In the initial program, a minimum of \$24 million per year of the statewide competitive program is available for safe routes to schools projects, with at least \$7.2 million for non-infrastructure grants, including funding for a state technical assistance resource center.

## MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

Projects must include at least 11.47% in matching funds except for projects predominantly benefiting a disadvantaged community, stand-alone non-infrastructure projects and safe routes to schools projects. The source of the matching funds may be any combination of local, private, state or federal funds. Matching funds must be expended in the same project phase (permits and environmental studies; plans, specifications, and estimates; right-of-way capital outlay; support for right-of-way acquisition; construction capital outlay; and construction engineering) as the Active Transportation Program funding. Matching funds cannot be expended prior to the Commission allocation of Active Transportation Program funds. Matching funds, except matching funds over and above the required 11.47%, must be expended concurrently and proportionally to the Active Transportation Program funds.

Large MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may require a different funding match for projects selected through their competitive process. Applicants from within a large MPO should be aware that the match requirements may differ between the MPO and statewide competitive programs.

## FUNDING FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS

Funding from the Active Transportation Program may be used to fund the development of bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities.

The Commission intends to set aside up to 5% of the funds in the statewide competitive program and in the rural and small urban program for funding active transportation plans in communities predominantly disadvantaged. A large MPO, in administering its portion of the program, may make up to 5% of its funding available for active transportation plans in disadvantaged communities within the MPO boundaries.

The first priority for the funding of active transportation plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, MPOs, school districts, or transit districts that have neither a bicycle plan, a pedestrian plan, a safe routes to schools plan, nor an active transportation plan. The second priority for the funding of active transportation plans will be for cities, counties, county transportation commissions, regional transportation planning agencies, or MPOs that have a bicycle plan or a pedestrian plan but not both.

## REIMBURSEMENT

The Active Transportation Program is a reimbursement program for costs incurred. Reimbursement is requested through the invoice process detailed in Chapter 5, Accounting/Invoices, Local Assistance Procedures Manual. Costs incurred prior to Commission allocation and, for federally funded projects, Federal Highway Administration project approval (i.e. Authorization to Proceed) are not eligible for reimbursement.

## ELIGIBILITY

### ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

The applicant for Active Transportation Program funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants must be able to comply with all the federal and state laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to enter into a Local Administering Agency-State Master Agreement (Master Agreement). Refer to Chapter 4, Agreements, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on Master Agreements. The following entities, within the State of California, are eligible to apply for Active Transportation Program funds:

- Local, Regional or State Agencies- Examples include city, county, MPO\*, and Regional Transportation Planning Agency.
- Caltrans\*
- Transit Agencies - Any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds under the Federal Transit Administration.
- Natural Resource or Public Land Agencies - Federal, Tribal, State, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration Examples include:
  - State or local park or forest agencies
  - State or local fish and game or wildlife agencies
  - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies
  - U.S. Forest Service

- Public schools or School districts.
- Tribal Governments - Federally-recognized Native American Tribes.
- Private nonprofit tax-exempt organizations may apply for projects eligible for Recreational Trail Program funds. Projects must benefit the general public, and not only a private entity.
- Any other entity with responsibility for oversight of transportation or recreational trails that the Commission determines to be eligible.

For funding awarded to a tribal government, a fund transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be necessary. A tribal government may also partner with another eligible entity to apply if desired.

*\* Caltrans and MPOs, except for MPOs that are also regional transportation planning agencies, are not eligible project applicants for the federal Transportation Alternative Program funds appropriated to the Active Transportation Program. Therefore, funding awarded to projects submitted directly by Caltrans and MPOs are limited to other Active Transportation Program funds. Caltrans and MPOs may partner with an eligible entity to expand funding opportunities.*

## PARTNERING WITH IMPLEMENTATING AGENCIES

Entities that are unable to apply for Active Transportation Program funds or that are unable to enter into a Master Agreement with the State must partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. Entities that are unfamiliar with the requirements to administer a Federal-Aid Highway Program project may partner with an eligible applicant that can implement the project. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

The implementing agency will be responsible and accountable for the use and expenditure of program funds.

## ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

All projects must be selected through a competitive process and must meet one or more of the program goals. Because the majority of funds in the Active Transportation Program are federal funds, most projects must be federal-aid eligible:

- Infrastructure Projects: Capital improvements that will further the goals of this program. This typically includes the planning, design, and construction of facilities.
- Non-infrastructure Projects: Education, encouragement, enforcement, and planning activities that further the goals of this program. The Commission intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure projects on pilot and start-up projects that can demonstrate funding for ongoing efforts. The Active Transportation Program funds are not intended to fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students.
- Infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

## MINIMUM REQUEST FOR FUNDS

In order to maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into a comprehensive bundle of projects, the minimum request for Active Transportation Program funds that will be considered is \$250,000. This minimum does not apply to non-infrastructure projects, Safe Routes to Schools projects, and Recreational Trails projects.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may use a different minimum funding size. Use of a minimum project size greater than \$500,000 must be approved by the Commission prior to an MPO's call for projects.

---

## EXAMPLE PROJECTS

Below is a list of projects considered generally eligible for Active Transportation Program funding. This list is not intended to be comprehensive; other types of projects that are not on this list may also be eligible if they further the goals of the program.

- Development of new bikeways and walkways that improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
- Improvements to existing bikeways and walkways, which improve mobility, access, or safety for non-motorized users.
  - Elimination of hazardous conditions on existing bikeways and walkways.
  - Preventative maintenance of bikeways and walkways with the primary goal of extending the service life of the facility.
- Installation of traffic control devices to improve the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists.
- Safe Routes to School projects that improve the safety of children walking and bicycling to school, in accordance with Section 1404 of Public Law 109-59.
- Safe routes to transit projects, which will encourage transit by improving biking and walking routes to mass transportation facilities and school bus stops.
- Secure bicycle parking at employment centers, park and ride lots, rail and transit stations, and ferry docks and landings.
- Bicycle-carrying facilities on public transit, including rail and ferries.
- Establishment or expansion of a bike share program.
- Recreational trails and trailheads, park projects that facilitate trail linkages or connectivity to non-motorized corridors, and conversion of abandoned railroad corridors to trails.
- Development of a bike, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or active transportation plan in a disadvantaged community.
- Education programs to increase bicycling and walking, and other non-infrastructure investments that demonstrate effectiveness in increasing active transportation, including but not limited to:
  - Development and implementation of bike-to-work or walk-to-work school day/month programs.
  - Conducting bicycle and/or pedestrian counts, walkability and/or bikability assessments or audits, or pedestrian and/or bicycle safety analysis to inform plans and projects.
  - Conducting pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.
  - Development and publishing of community walking and biking maps, including school route/travel plans.
  - Development and implementation of walking school bus or bike train programs.

- Components of open streets events directly linked to the promotion of a new infrastructure project.
- Targeted enforcement activities around high pedestrian and/or bicycle injury and/or fatality locations (intersections or corridors). These activities cannot be general traffic enforcement but must be tied to improving pedestrian and bicyclist safety.
- School crossing guard training.
- School bicycle clinics.
- Development and implementation of programs and tools that maximize use of available and emerging technologies to implement the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

## PROJECT TYPE REQUIREMENTS

As discussed in the Funding Distribution section (above), State and Federal law segregate the Active Transportation Program into multiple, overlapping components. Below is an explanation of the requirements specific to these components.

## DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES

For a project to contribute toward the Disadvantaged Communities funding requirement, the project must clearly demonstrate a benefit to a community that meets any of the following criteria:

- The median household income is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current census tract level data from the American Community Survey. Data is available at <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state according to latest versions of the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen) scores. Scores are available at <http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces11.html>.
- At least 75% of public school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at <http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/files/sp.asp>. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area or, for projects not directly benefiting school students, explain why this measure is representative of the larger community.

If a project applicant believes a project benefits a disadvantaged community but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria, the applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment of why the community should be considered disadvantaged.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, may use different criteria for determining which projects benefit Disadvantaged Communities if the criteria are approved by the Commission prior to an MPO's call for projects.

## SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROJECTS

For a project to contribute toward the Safe Routes to School funding requirement, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

---

## RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROJECTS

For trail projects that are primarily recreational to be eligible for Active Transportation Program funding, the projects must meet the federal requirements of the Recreational Trails Program as such projects may not be eligible for funding from other sources ([http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational\\_trails/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recreational_trails/)). Multi-purpose trails and paths that serve both recreational and transportation purposes are generally eligible in the Active Transportation Program, so long as they are consistent with one or more goals of the program.

---

## TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE RESOURCE CENTER

In 2009, the University of California, San Francisco was awarded federal Safe Routes to School funds to act as the Technical Assistance Resource Center for the purpose of building and supporting local regional Safe Routes School non-infrastructure projects.

Typical center roles have included:

- Providing technical assistance and training to help agencies deliver existing and future projects and to strengthen community involvement in future projects including those in disadvantaged communities.
- Developing and providing educational materials to local communities by developing a community awareness kit, creating an enhanced Safe Routes to Schools website, and providing other educational tools and resources.
- Participating in and assisting with the Safe Routes to Schools Advisory Committee.
- Assisting with program evaluation.

The Commission intends to comply with the statutory requirement to fund a state technical assistance center by expanding the existing Safe Routes to Schools Technical Assistance Resource Center interagency agreement to serve all Active Transportation Program non-infrastructure projects.

---

## PROJECT SELECTION PROCESS

### PROJECT APPLICATION

Active Transportation Program project applications will be available at [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html).

A project application must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant's governing board. Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, documentation of the agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency must be submitted with the project application. A project application must also include documentation of all other funds committed to the projects.

Project applications should be addressed or delivered to:

Caltrans  
Division of Local Assistance, MS-1  
Attention: Chief, Office of Active Transportation and Special Programs  
P.O. Box 942874  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Except for applications submitted through an optional MPO supplemental call for project, the Commission will consider only projects for which five hard copies and one electronic copy (via cd or portable hard drive) of a complete application are received by *May 21, 2014*. By the same date, an additional copy must also be sent to the Regional Transportation Planning Agency or County Transportation Commission within which the project is located and to the MPO (a contact list can be found at [www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/orip/)).

## SEQUENTIAL PROJECT SELECTION

All project applications, except for applications submitted through an optional MPO supplemental call for projects, must be submitted to Caltrans for consideration in the statewide competition. The Commission will consider approval of a competitive grant only when it finds that the grant request meets the requirements of statute and that the project has a commitment of any supplementary funding needed for a full funding plan.

Projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition must be considered in the large MPO run competitions or the state run Small Urban or Rural competitions.

A large urban MPO may elect to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects. The projects received in this call must be considered along with those not selected through the statewide competition.

## MPO COMPETITIVE PROJECT SELECTION

As stated above, projects not selected for programming in the statewide competition must be considered by the MPOs in administering a competitive selection process.

An MPO choosing to use the same project selection criteria and weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and definition of disadvantage communities as used by the Commission for the statewide competition may defer its project selection to the Commission. An MPO deferring its project select to the Commission may not conduct a supplemental call for projects.

An MPO, with Commission approval, may use a different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities for its competitive selection process. Use of a minimum project size of \$500,000 or less, or of a different match requirement than in the statewide competitive program does not require prior Commission approval. An MPO may also elect to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects. The projects received in this call must be considered along with those not selected through the statewide competition.

In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must use a multidisciplinary advisory group to assist in evaluating project applications. Following its competitive selection process, an MPO must submit its programming recommendations to the Commission along with a list of the members of its multidisciplinary advisory group. If the MPO submitted a project application and that project is recommended for programming, the MPO must explain how its evaluation process resulted in an unbiased evaluation of projects.

## SCREENING CRITERIA

Demonstrated needs of the applicant: A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. The Commission will make an exception to this policy by allowing the supplanting of federal funds on a project for the 2014 Active Transportation Program.

Consistency with a regional transportation plan: All projects submitted must be consistent with the relevant adopted regional transportation plan that has been developed and updated pursuant to Government Code Section 65080.

## SCORING CRITERIA

Proposed projects will be rated and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria. Project programming recommendations may not be based strictly on the rating criteria given the various components of the Active Transportation Program and requirements of the various fund sources.

- Potential for increased walking and bicycling, especially among students, including the identification of walking and bicycling routes to and from schools, transit facilities, community centers, employment centers, and other destinations; and including increasing and improving connectivity and mobility of non-motorized users. (0 to 30 points)
- Potential for reducing the number and/or rate of pedestrian and bicyclist fatalities and injuries, including the identification of safety hazards for pedestrians and bicyclists. (0 to 25 points)
- Public participation and Planning. (0 to 15 points)

Identification of the community-based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal, which may include noticed meetings and consultation with local stakeholders. Project applicants must clearly articulate how the local participation process resulted in the identification and prioritization of the proposed project.

For projects costing \$1 million or more, an emphasis will be placed on projects that are prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pursuant to Section 891.2, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, or circulation element of a general plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation plan. In future funding cycles, the Commission expects to make consistency with an approved active transportation plan a requirement for large projects.

- Cost-effectiveness. (0 to 10 points)

Applicants must:

- Discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of alternatives considered.
- Quantify the safety and mobility benefit in relationship to both the total project cost and the funds provided.

Caltrans must develop a benefit/cost model for infrastructure and non-infrastructure active transportation projects in order to improve information available to decision makers at the state and MPO level in future programming cycles by September 30, 2014.

- Improved public health through the targeting of populations with high risk factors for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma or other health issues. (0 to 10 points)
- Benefit to disadvantaged communities. (0 to 10 points)
- Use of the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps, as defined in Section 14507.5 of the Public Resources Code, as partners to undertake or construct applicable projects in accordance with Section 1524 of Public Law 112-141. Points will be deducted if an applicant does not seek corps participation or if an applicant intends not to utilize a corps in a project in which the corps can participate. (0 to -5 points)

The California Conservation Corps can be contacted at [ccc.ca.gov](http://ccc.ca.gov). Community conservation corps can be contacted at [californialocalconservationcorps.org](http://californialocalconservationcorps.org).

Direct contracting with the California Conservation Corps or a qualified community conservation corps without bidding is permissible provided that the implementing agency demonstrates cost effectiveness per 23 CFR 635.204 and obtains approval from Caltrans. A copy of the agreement between the implementing agency and the proposed conservation corps must be included in the project application as supporting documentation.

- Applicant's performance on past grants. This may include project delivery, project benefits (anticipated v. actual), and use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps (planned v. actual). Applications from agencies with documented poor performance records on past grants may be excluded from competing or may be penalized in scoring. (0 to -10 points)

## PROJECT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

Commission staff will form a multidisciplinary Project Evaluation Committee to assist in evaluating project applications. In forming the Project Evaluation Committee, staff will seek participants with expertise in bicycling and pedestrian transportation, including Safe Routes to Schools type projects, and in projects benefiting disadvantaged communities, and will seek geographically balanced representation from state agencies, large MPOs, regional transportation planning agencies, local jurisdictions in small urban and rural areas, and non-governmental organizations. Priority for participation in the evaluation committee will be given to those who do not represent a project applicant, or will not benefit from projects submitted by others.

In reviewing and selecting projects to be funded with federal Recreational Trails program funds, the Commission staff will collaborate with the Department of Parks and Recreation to evaluate proposed projects.

MPOs, in administering a competitive selection process, must use a multidisciplinary advisory group, similar to the aforementioned Project Evaluation Committee, to assist in evaluating project applications.

## PROGRAMMING

Following at least one public hearing, the Commission will adopt a program of projects for the Active Transportation Program, by April 1 of each odd numbered year. The Active Transportation Program must be developed consistent with the fund estimate and the amount programmed in each fiscal year must not exceed the amount identified in the fund estimate.

The program of projects for each fiscal year will include, for each project, the amount to be funded from the Active Transportation Program, and the estimated total cost of the project. Project costs in the Active Transportation Program will include all project support costs and all project listings will specify costs for each of the following components: (1) completion of all permits and environmental studies; (2) preparation of plans, specifications, and estimates; (3) right-of-way capital outlay (4) support for right-of-way acquisition; (5) construction capital outlay; and (6) construction management and engineering, including surveys and inspection. The cost of each project component will be listed in the Active Transportation Program no earlier than in the fiscal year in which the particular project component can be implemented.

When proposing to fund only preconstruction components for a project, the applicant must demonstrate the means by which it intends to fund the construction of a useable segment, consistent with the regional transportation plan or the Caltrans interregional transportation strategic plan.

When project design, right-of-way or construction are programmed before the implementing agency completes the environmental process, updated cost estimates, updated analysis of the project's cost effectiveness, and updated analysis of the project's ability to further the goals of the program must be submitted to the Commission following completion of the environmental process. If this updated information indicates that a project is expected to accomplish fewer benefits or is less cost effective as compared with the initial project application, future funding for the project may be deleted from the program. For the MPO selected competitions, this information must be submitted to the MPO. It is the responsibility of the MPO to recommend that the project be deleted from the program if warranted.

The Commission will program and allocate funding to projects in whole thousands of dollars and will include a project only if it is fully funded from a combination of Active Transportation Program and other committed funding. The Commission will regard funds as committed when they are programmed by the Commission or when the agency with discretionary authority over the funds has made its commitment to the project by ordinance or resolution. For federal formula funds, including Surface Transportation Program, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program, and federal formula transit funds, the commitment may be by Federal approval of the Federal Statewide Transportation Improvement Program. For federal discretionary funds, the commitment may be by federal approval of a full funding grant agreement or by grant approval.

If the program of projects adopted by the Commission does not program the full capacity identified in the fund estimate for a given fiscal year, the balance will remain available to advance programmed projects. Subject to the availability of federal funds, a balance not programmed in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.

The intent of the Commission is to consolidate the allocation of federal funds to as few projects as practicable. Therefore, the smallest project may be designated, at the time of programming, for state-only funding.

## ALLOCATIONS

The Commission will consider the allocation of funds for a project when it receives an allocation request and recommendation from Caltrans in the same manner as for the STIP (see section 64 of the STIP guidelines). The recommendation will include a determination of project readiness, the availability of appropriated funding, and the availability of all identified and committed supplementary funding.

Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, the allocation request must include a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency.

The Commission will approve the allocation if the funds are available and the allocation is necessary to implement the project as included in the adopted Active Transportation Program.

In order to ensure the timely use of all program funds, the Commission will, in the last quarter of the fiscal year, allocate funds to projects programmed in a future fiscal year on a first-come, first served basis. If there are insufficient funds, the Commission may delay the allocation of funds to a project until the next fiscal year without requiring an extension. Should requests for allocations exceed available capacity, the Commission will give priority to projects programmed in the current-year.

Allocation requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must include a recommendation by the MPO.

In compliance with Section 21150 of the Public Resources Code, the Commission will not allocate funds for design, right-of-way, or construction prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the California Environmental Quality Act. As a matter of policy, the Commission will not allocate funds for design, right-of-way, or construction of a federally funded project prior to documentation of environmental clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act. Exceptions to this policy may be made in instances where federal law allows for the acquisition of right-of-way prior to completion of National Environmental Policy Act review.

If an implementing agency requests an allocation of funds in an amount that is less than the amount programmed, the balance of the programmed amount may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. An MPO, in administering its competitive portion of the Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission. Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.

## PROJECT DELIVERY

Active Transportation Program allocations must be requested in the fiscal year of project programming, and are valid for award for six months from the date of allocation unless the Commission approves an extension. Applicants may submit and the Commission will evaluate extension requests in the same manner as for STIP projects (see section 66 of the STIP guidelines) except that extension to the period for project allocation and for project award will be limited to twelve months. Extension requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must include a recommendation by the MPO, consistent with the preceding requirements.

If there are insufficient funds, the Commission may delay the allocation of funds to a project until the next fiscal year without requiring an extension.

Whenever programmed funds are not allocated within the fiscal year they programmed or within the time allowed by an approved extension, the project will be deleted from the Active Transportation Program. Funds available following the deletion of a project may be allocated to a programmed project advanced from a future fiscal year. An MPO, in administering its competitive portion of the Active Transportation Program, must determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission. Unallocated funds in one fiscal year will carry over and be available for projects in the following fiscal year.

The implementing agency must enter into a cooperative agreement with Caltrans and, if the project is federally funded, obligate the federal funds within six months.

Funds allocated for project development or right of way costs must be expended by the end of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated. After the award of a contract, the implementing agency has up to 36 months to complete (accept) the contract. At the time of fund allocation, the Commission may extend the deadline for completion of work and the liquidation of funds if necessary to accommodate the proposed expenditure plan for the project. The implementing agency has six months after contract acceptance to make the final payment to the contractor or vendor, prepare the Final Report of Expenditures and submit the final invoice to Caltrans for reimbursement.

It is incumbent upon the implementing agency to develop accurate project cost estimates. If the amount of a contract award is less than the amount allocated, or if the final cost of a component is less than the amount awarded, the savings generated will not be available for future programming.

Caltrans will track the delivery of Active Transportation Program projects and submit to the Commission a semiannual report showing the delivery of each project phase.

## PROJECT INACTIVITY

Once funds for a project are encumbered, project applicants are expected to invoice on a regular basis (for federal funds, see 23 CFR 630.106 and the Caltrans' Inactive Obligation Policy). Failure to do so will result in the project being deemed "inactive" and subject to deobligation if proper justification is not provided.

## PROJECT REPORTING

As a condition of the project allocation, the Commission will require the implementing agency to submit semi-annual reports on the activities and progress made toward implementation of the project and a final delivery report. An agency implementing a project in the MPO selected portion of the program must also submit copies of its semi-annual reports and of its final delivery report to the MPO. The purpose of the reports is to ensure that the project is executed in a timely fashion and is within the scope and budget identified when the decision was made to fund the project.

Within one year of the project becoming operable, the implementing agency must provide a final delivery report to the Commission which includes:

- The scope of the completed project as compared to the programmed project.
- Before and after photos documenting the project.
- The final costs as compared to the approved project budget.
- Its duration as compared to the project schedule in the project application.

- Performance outcomes derived from the project as compared to those described in the project application. This should include before and after pedestrian and/or bicycle counts, and an explanation of the methodology for conduction counts.
- Actual use of the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps as compared to the use in the project application.

Please note that the final delivery report required by this section is in addition to the aforementioned Final Report of Expenditures.

For the purpose of this section, a project becomes operable when the construction contract is accepted or acquired equipment is received, or in the case of non-infrastructure activities, when the activities are complete.

Caltrans must audit a sample of Active Transportation Program projects to evaluate the performance of the project, determine whether project costs incurred and reimbursed are in compliance with the executed project agreement or approved amendments thereof; state and federal laws and regulations; contract provisions; and Commission guidelines, and whether project deliverables (outputs) and outcomes are consistent with the project scope, schedule and benefits described in the executed project agreement or approved amendments thereof. A report on the projects audited must be submitted to the Commission annually.

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (COMMISSION)

The Commission responsibilities include:

- Adopt guidelines and policies for the Active Transportation Program.
- Adopt Active Transportation Program Fund Estimate.
- Evaluate projects, including the forming of the Project Evaluation Committee.
- Adopt a program of projects, including:
  - The statewide portion of the Active Transportation Program,
  - The rural portion of the Active Transportation Program,
  - The small urban portion of the Active Transportation Program, and
  - The MPO selected portion of the program based on the recommendations of the MPOs.
  - Ensure that at least 25% of the funds benefit disadvantage communities.
- Allocate funds to projects.
- Evaluate and report to the legislature.

### CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (CALTRANS)

Caltrans has the primary responsibility for the administration of the Active Transportation Program. Responsibilities include:

- Provide statewide program and procedural guidance (i.e. provide project evaluation of materials and instructions), conducts outreach through various networks such as, but not limited to, the Active Transportation Program website, and at conferences, meetings, or workgroups.
- Provide program training.
- Solicit project applications for the program.

- Facilitate the Project Evaluation Committee.
- Perform eligibility reviews of Active Transportation Program projects.
- Evaluate, score, and rank applications.
- Recommend projects to the Commission for programming and allocation.
- Notify applicants of the results after each call for projects.
- Track and report on project implementation.
- Audit a selection of projects
- Serve as the main point of contact in project implementation, including the technical assistance resource center, after notifying successful applicants of award.

## METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATIONS (MPOS) WITH LARGE URBANIZED AREAS

MPOs with large urbanized areas are responsible for overseeing a competitive project selection process in accordance with these guidelines. The responsibilities include:

- Ensure that at least 25% of the funds in each MPO must benefit disadvantage communities.
- If using different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, or definition of disadvantage communities for its competitive selection process, the MPO must obtain Commission approval prior to the MPO's call for projects. Use of a minimum project size of \$500,000 or less, or of a different match requirement than in the statewide competitive program does not require prior Commission approval.
- If electing to have a supplemental MPO specific call for projects, the projects within the MPO boundaries that were not selected through the statewide competition must be considered along with those received in the supplemental call for projects. An MPO must notify the Commission of their intent to have a supplemental call no later than May 21, 2014.
- In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must use a multidisciplinary advisory group to assist in evaluating project applications.
- In administering a competitive selection process, an MPO must explain how the projects recommended for programming by the MPO include a broad spectrum of projects to benefit pedestrians and bicyclists. The explanation must include a discussion of how the recommended projects benefit students walking and cycling to school.
- An MPO choosing to use the same project selection criteria and weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and definition of disadvantage communities as used by the Commission for the statewide competition may defer its project selection to the Commission. An MPO deferring its project select to the Commission must notify the Commission my May 21, 2014, and may not conduct a supplemental call for projects.
- Approve amendments to the MPO selected portion of the program prior to Commission approval.
- Recommend allocation requests for a project in the MPO selected portion of the program.
- Determine which projects to advance and make that recommendation to the Commission.
- Submit an annual assessment of its portion of the program it terms of its effectiveness in achieving the goals of the Active Transportation Program.

In addition, the following statutory requirements apply specifically to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG):

- SCAG must consult with county transportation commissions, the Commission, and Caltrans in the development of competitive project selection criteria. The criteria should include consideration of geographic equity, consistent with program objectives.

- SCAG must place priority on projects that are consistent with plans adopted by local and regional governments within the county where the project is located.
- SCAG must obtain concurrence from the county transportation commissions.

## REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING AGENCIES (RTPAS) OUTSIDE AN MPO WITH LARGE URBANIZED AREAS AND AN MPO WITHOUT LARGE URBANIZED AREAS

These Regional Transportation Planning Agencies and MPOs may make recommendations or provide input to the Commission regarding the projects within their boundaries that are applying for Active Transportation Program funding.

## PROJECT APPLICANT

Project applicants nominate Active Transportation Program projects for funding consideration. If awarded Active Transportation Program funding for a submitted project, the project applicant (or partnering implementing agency if applicable) has contractual responsibility for carrying out the project to completion and complying with reporting requirements in accordance with federal, state, and local laws and regulations, and these guidelines.

For capital projects off the state highway system, the project applicant will be responsible for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

## ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

A city, county, county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district, or transit district may prepare an active transportation plan. An active transportation plan prepared by a city or county may be integrated into the circulation element of its general plan or a separate plan which is compliant or will be brought into compliance with the Complete Streets Act, Assembly Bill 1358 (Chapter 657, Statutes of 2008). An active transportation plan must include, but not be limited to, the following components or explain why the component is not applicable:

- a) The estimated number of existing bicycle trips and pedestrian trips in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all trips, and the estimated increase in the number of bicycle trips and pedestrian trips resulting from implementation of the plan.
- b) The number and location of collisions, serious injuries, and fatalities suffered by bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area, both in absolute numbers and as a percentage of all collisions and injuries, and a goal for collision, serious injury, and fatality reduction after implementation of the plan.
- c) A map and description of existing and proposed land use and settlement patterns which must include, but not be limited to, locations of residential neighborhoods, schools, shopping centers, public buildings, major employment centers, and other destinations.
- d) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transportation facilities.
- e) A map and description of existing and proposed end-of-trip bicycle parking facilities.
- f) A description of existing and proposed policies related to bicycle parking in public locations, private parking garages and parking lots and in new commercial and residential developments.

- g) A map and description of existing and proposed bicycle transport and parking facilities for connections with and use of other transportation modes. These must include, but not be limited to, parking facilities at transit stops, rail and transit terminals, ferry docks and landings, park and ride lots, and provisions for transporting bicyclists and bicycles on transit or rail vehicles or ferry vessels.
- h) A map and description of existing and proposed pedestrian facilities at major transit hubs. These must include, but are not limited to, rail and transit terminals, and ferry docks and landings.
- i) A description of proposed signage providing wayfinding along bicycle and pedestrian networks to designated destinations.
- j) A description of the policies and procedures for maintaining existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities, including, but not limited to, the maintenance of smooth pavement, freedom from encroaching vegetation, maintenance of traffic control devices including striping and other pavement markings, and lighting.
- k) A description of bicycle and pedestrian safety, education, and encouragement programs conducted in the area included within the plan, efforts by the law enforcement agency having primary traffic law enforcement responsibility in the area to enforce provisions of the law impacting bicycle and pedestrian safety, and the resulting effect on accidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians.
- l) A description of the extent of community involvement in development of the plan, including disadvantaged and underserved communities.
- m) A description of how the active transportation plan has been coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, including school districts within the plan area, and is consistent with other local or regional transportation, air quality, or energy conservation plans, including, but not limited to, general plans and a Sustainable Community Strategy in a Regional Transportation Plan.
- n) A description of the projects and programs proposed in the plan and a listing of their priorities for implementation, including the methodology for project prioritization and a proposed timeline for implementation.
- o) A description of past expenditures for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, and future financial needs for projects and programs that improve safety and convenience for bicyclists and pedestrians in the plan area. Include anticipated revenue sources and potential grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian uses.
- p) A description of steps necessary to implement the plan and the reporting process that will be used to keep the adopting agency and community informed of the progress being made in implementing the plan.
- q) A resolution showing adoption of the plan by the city, county or district. If the active transportation plan was prepared by a county transportation commission, regional transportation planning agency, MPO, school district or transit district, the plan should indicate the support via resolution of the city(s) or county(s) in which the proposed facilities would be located.

A city, county, school district, or transit district that has prepared an active transportation plan may submit the plan to the county transportation commission or transportation planning agency for approval. The city, county, school district, or transit district may submit an approved plan to Caltrans in connection with an application for funds active transportation facilities which will implement the plan.

Additional information related to active transportation plans can be found in the sections on Funding for Active Transportation Plans and Scoring Criteria.

## FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

Unless programmed for state-only funding, project applicants must comply with the provisions of Title 23 of the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations and with the processes and procedures contained in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual and the Master Agreement with Caltrans. Below are examples of federal requirements that must be met when administering Active Transportation Program projects.

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance and documentation is required on all projects. Refer to Chapter 6, Environmental Procedures, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual for guidance and procedures on complying with NEPA and other federal environmentally related laws.
- Project applicants may not proceed with the final design of a project or request "Authorization to proceed with Right-of-Way" or "Authorization to proceed with Construction" until Caltrans has signed a Categorical Exclusion, a Finding of No Significant Impact, or a Record of Decision. Failure to follow this requirement will make the project ineligible for federal reimbursement.
- If the project requires the purchase of right of way (the acquisition of real property), the provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 apply. For more information, refer to Chapter 13, Right of Way, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual.
- If the project applicant requires the consultation services of architects, landscape architects, land surveyors, or engineers, the procedures in the Chapter 10, Consultant Selection, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual must be followed.
- Contract documents are required to incorporate applicable federal requirements such as Davis Bacon wage rates, competitive bidding, Disadvantaged Business Enterprises/Equal Employment Opportunity provisions, etc. For more information, refer to Chapter 9, Civil Rights and Disadvantaged Business Enterprises, and Chapter 12, Plans, Specifications & Estimate, of the Local Assistance Procedures Manual

Failure to comply with federal requirements may result in the repayment to the State of Active Transportation Program funds.

## DESIGN STANDARDS

Streets and Highways Code Section 891 requires that all city, county, regional, and other local agencies responsible for the development or operation of bikeways or roadways where bicycle travel is permitted utilize all minimum safety design criteria established by Caltrans. Chapter 11, Design Standards, of the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual describes statewide design standards, specifications, procedures, guides, and references that are acceptable in the geometric, drainage, and structural design of Local Assistance projects. The chapter also describes design exception approval procedures, including the delegation of design exception approval authority to the City and County Public Works Directors for projects not on the state highway system. These standards and procedures, including the exception approval process, must be used for all Active Transportation Program projects.

For capital projects off the state highway system, the project applicant will be responsible for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility. If another entity agrees to assume responsibility for the ongoing operations and maintenance of the facility, documentation of the agreement must be submitted with the project application, and a copy of the Memorandum of Understanding or Interagency Agreement between the parties must be submitted with the request for allocation.

All facilities constructed using Active Transportation Program funds cannot revert to a non-Active Transportation Program use for a minimum of 20 years or its actual useful life as documented in the project application, whichever is less, without approval of the Commission.

## PROGRAM EVALUATION

The Active Transportation Program will be evaluated for its effectiveness in increasing the use of active modes of transportation in California. Applicants that receive funding for a project must collect and submit data to Caltrans as described in the "Project Reporting" section.

By December 31, 2014, the Commission will post on its website information about the initial program of projects, including a list of all projects programmed and allocated in each portion of the program, by region, and by project type, along with information on grants awarded to disadvantaged communities,

After 2014, the Commission will include in its annual report to the Legislature a discussion on the effectiveness of the program in terms of planned and achieved improvement in mobility and safety and timely use of funds, and will include a summary of its activities relative to the administration of the Active Transportation Program including:

- Projects programmed,
- Projects allocated,
- Projects completed to date by project type,
- Projects completed to date by geographic distribution,
- Projects completed to date by benefit to disadvantaged communities, and
- Projects completed to date with the California Conservation Corps or qualified community conservation corps.

# Memorandum

**TAB 25**

To: CHAIR AND COMMISSIONERS  
CALIFORNIA TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

CTC Meeting: December 11-12, 2013

Reference No.: 4.4  
Action Item

From:   
STEVEN KECK  
Acting Chief Financial Officer



Prepared by: Ron Sheppard  
Division Chief  
Budgets

Subject: **2014 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM FUND ESTIMATE**  
**RESOLUTION G-13-17**

## **RECOMMENDATION:**

The California Department of Transportation (Department) requests the California Transportation Commission (Commission) approve the 2014 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Fund Estimate.

## **ISSUE:**

The 2014 ATP Fund Estimate's program capacities are based on Senate Bill (SB) 99 and Assembly Bill (AB) 101, along with the Federal Highway Administration, Commission and California State Transportation Agency guidance. The Department will work with Commission Staff to make any needed updates or amendments.

In addition, the following assumptions were used to calculate the 2014 ATP Fund Estimate's program capacities:

1. Distribution to Metropolitan Planning Organizations is based upon total population.
  - Federal Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) funding distributed according to Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP21) guidance.
  - Other federal funds distributed by total population.
2. Recreational Trails not subject to Federal TAP distribution guidelines.
3. Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program funds will not be used in the ATP.
4. 95 percent obligation authority for all federal funding apportionments.
5. Fiscal year 2014-15 of the ATP Fund Estimate includes fiscal year 2013-14 carry over funds.
6. Population based on 2010 census data.
7. State and federal resources will remain stable throughout the fund estimate period.

## **BACKGROUND:**

The Administration proposed the ATP in the January 2013 Governor's Budget proposal, but due to the complex nature of the programs, and the scope of the changes proposed, the Legislature chose to defer action on this proposal when adopting the June 15<sup>th</sup> Budget package and instead froze funds for these purposes and inserted intent language that the ATP would be developed before the end of the 2014 legislative session.

The new ATP will divide approximately \$124.2 million for active transportation projects between the state and regions subject to guidelines that will be adopted by the Commission.

This replaces the current system of small-dedicated grant programs, which fund programs like Safe Routes to Schools, bicycle programs, and recreational trails. The intent of combining this funding is to improve flexibility and reduce the administrative burden of having several small independent grant programs.

The ATP, as articulated in SB 99 and AB 101, signed into law September 26, 2013, differs from the Administration's initial proposal in several areas. These changes reflect compromises reached with various stakeholders and mirror concerns raised about the proposal in budget hearings, including:

1. Funding for the Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Program continues to remain a stand-alone program administered by the Natural Resource Agency instead of being consolidated in the ATP.
2. The Safe Routes to Schools program is guaranteed at least \$24 million of funding from the Program funds for three years. Of this amount, at least \$7.2 million is available for non-infrastructure program needs including the continuation of technical assistance by the state. In the original proposal, the Safe Routes to Schools program had no funding minimum.
3. This proposal includes a requirement that 25 percent of all ATP funds benefit disadvantaged communities, an addition to the January proposal.
4. The state will not exercise its option to opt out of using federal funds transportation funds for recreational trails, which was initially part of the administration's proposal. In addition, the Department of Parks and Recreation will retain \$3.4 million of federal funds for recreational trails.

**RESOLUTION G-13-17:**

BE IT RESOLVED that the California Transportation Commission does hereby adopt the 2014 ATP Fund Estimate, as presented by the Department on December 11, 2013, with programming in the 2014 ATP to be based on the statutory funding identified.

Attachment

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP) PROPOSAL**  
**FUND ESTIMATE**  
(\$ in thousands)

	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2-Year Total	3-Year Total
<b>RESOURCES</b>					
<b>STATE RESOURCES</b>					
Beginning Balance	\$0				\$0
State Highway Account	34,200	34,200	34,200	68,400	102,600
<b>State Resources Subtotal</b>	<b>\$34,200</b>	<b>\$34,200</b>	<b>\$34,200</b>	<b>\$68,400</b>	<b>\$102,600</b>
<b>FEDERAL RESOURCES</b>					
Transportation Alternative Program (TAP)	\$63,650	\$63,650	\$63,650	\$127,300	\$190,950
TAP Recreational Trails	1,900	1,900	1,900	3,800	5,700
Other Federal	19,950	19,950	19,950	39,900	59,850
<b>Federal Resources Subtotal</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$85,500</b>	<b>\$171,000</b>	<b>\$256,500</b>
<b>TOTAL RESOURCES AVAILABLE</b>	<b>\$119,700</b>	<b>\$119,700</b>	<b>\$119,700</b>	<b>\$239,400</b>	<b>\$359,100</b>
<b>DISTRIBUTION</b>					
<b>URBAN REGIONS (MPO Administered)</b>					
State	(\$13,221)	(\$13,221)	(\$13,221)	(\$26,442)	(\$39,663)
Federal	(34,659)	(34,659)	(34,659)	(69,318)	(103,977)
<b>Urban Regions Subtotal</b>	<b>(\$47,880)</b>	<b>(\$47,880)</b>	<b>(\$47,880)</b>	<b>(\$95,760)</b>	<b>(\$143,640)</b>
<b>SMALL URBAN &amp; RURAL REGIONS (State Administered)</b>					
State	(\$4,829)	(\$4,829)	(\$4,829)	(\$9,658)	(\$14,487)
Federal	(7,141)	(7,141)	(7,141)	(14,282)	(21,423)
<b>Small Urban &amp; Rural Regions Subtotal</b>	<b>(\$11,970)</b>	<b>(\$11,970)</b>	<b>(\$11,970)</b>	<b>(\$23,940)</b>	<b>(\$35,910)</b>
<b>STATEWIDE COMPETITION (State Administered)</b>					
State	(\$16,150)	(\$16,150)	(\$16,150)	(\$32,300)	(\$48,450)
Federal	(43,700)	(43,700)	(43,700)	(87,400)	(131,100)
<b>Statewide Competition Subtotal</b>	<b>(\$59,850)</b>	<b>(\$59,850)</b>	<b>(\$59,850)</b>	<b>(\$119,700)</b>	<b>(\$179,550)</b>
<b>TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS</b>	<b>(\$119,700)</b>	<b>(\$119,700)</b>	<b>(\$119,700)</b>	<b>(\$239,400)</b>	<b>(\$359,100)</b>

Notes: Individual numbers may not add to total due to independent rounding. Final dollar amounts may vary based on actual apportionment and obligational authority by FHWA or any changes in Federal guidance.

**ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP) PROPOSAL**  
**URBAN REGION SHARES**  
(\$ in thousands)

**FISCAL YEAR 2014-15**

URBAN REGIONS	FEDERAL TAP	FEDERAL OTHER	STATE	TOTAL
MTC Region	\$ 10,503	\$ 3,829	\$ 5,816	\$ 20,149
SACOG Region	2,945	1,218	2,247	6,410
SCAG Region	28,985	9,667	12,213	50,865
Fresno COG (Fresno UZA)	1,118	498	1,005	2,622
Kern COG (Bakersfield)	895	450	1,021	2,366
SANDAG (San Diego UZA)	5,052	1,658	2,013	8,722
San Joaquin COG (Stockton)	633	367	931	1,931
Stanislaus COG (Modesto)	612	275	562	1,450
Tulare CAG (Visalia)	375	237	634	1,246
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 51,119</b>	<b>\$ 18,199</b>	<b>\$ 26,442</b>	<b>\$ 95,760</b>



Disadvantaged Communities*
\$ 5,037
1,602
12,716
655
591
2,180
483
362
311
<b>\$ 23,940</b>

**FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**

URBAN REGIONS	FEDERAL TAP	FEDERAL OTHER	STATE	TOTAL
MTC Region	\$ 5,252	\$ 1,915	\$ 2,908	\$ 10,075
SACOG Region	1,472	609	1,123	3,205
SCAG Region	14,493	4,833	6,106	25,432
Fresno COG (Fresno UZA)	559	249	503	1,311
Kern COG (Bakersfield)	448	225	510	1,183
SANDAG (San Diego UZA)	2,526	829	1,006	4,361
San Joaquin COG (Stockton)	317	183	465	966
Stanislaus COG (Modesto)	306	138	281	725
Tulare CAG (Visalia)	187	118	317	623
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 25,559</b>	<b>\$ 9,100</b>	<b>\$ 13,221</b>	<b>\$ 47,880</b>



Disadvantaged Communities*
\$ 2,519
801
6,358
328
296
1,090
241
181
156
<b>\$ 11,970</b>

Notes: Individual numbers may not add to total due to independent rounding. Final dollar amounts may vary based on actual apportionment and obligational authority by FHWA or any changes in Federal guidance.

\*Per Senate Bill 99, ATP guidelines shall include a process to ensure no less than 25 percent of overall program funds benefit disadvantaged communities.

**Potential Scoring Criteria**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Scoring</b>
Effectiveness	Potential for increased walking and/or biking/multimodal	0-25
Safety	Potential to reduce bicycle/pedestrian injuries	0-25
Plan Consistency	Project is included in a City/County adopted bicycle/pedestrian or specific plan	0-10
Connectivity	“gap” closure connectivity (trail, lane, or sidewalk gap closure)	0-5
	Connectivity to major destination (school, shopping, employment center or transit hub)	0-5
	Inter-jurisdiction connectivity (city to city; city to county; county to county)	0-5
Benefit to seniors and/or disabled	Improves safety and access for seniors and persons with disabilities	0-5
Benefit to disadvantaged communities	Potential to provide health and safety benefits, access to transit	0-5
Cost Effectiveness	Project cost vs potential for increased walking and/or bicycling including VMT reduction	0-5
Project Readiness	Timeline for improvements	0-5
Funding	Funding from additional sources/local match	0-5

**APPLICATION FOR  
CYCLE 1 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM (ATP)**

For Caltrans use only: \_\_\_TAP \_\_\_STP \_\_\_RTP \_\_\_SRTS \_\_\_SRTS-NI \_\_\_SHA  
\_\_\_DAC \_\_\_Non-DAC

**I. PROJECT INFORMATION**

PROJECT NAME:	ATP funds Requested	\$ _____
APPLICANT (Agency name, address and zip code)	Matching Funds	\$ _____
	Other Project funds	\$ _____
	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$ _____
APPLICANT CONTACT PERSON (Name, title, e-mail, phone #)	APPLICANT CONTACT PERSON (Address & zip code)	
PROJECT COUNTY(IES): Application # _____ of _____	CALTRANS DISTRICT#: Choose an item.	

**Project Location** (limited to 325 characters MAX)

**Project Co-ordinates** (decimal) Latitude  Longitude

**Project Description** (**DO NOT** exceed the space provided, see instructions)

**Project Readiness:** (Describe the current status the project)

**Area Description:**

MPO <input type="text"/> Choose an item.	SELECT 1 OF THE FOLLOWING <input type="text"/> Choose an item.
------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------

**Partner Information:**

Partner Name:	Partner Type
Contact Information (Name & e-mail)	Contact Address & zip code
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, An MOU or Interagency Agreement is attached	

**Master Agreements (MAs)-**

Yes, the Implementing Agency has a FEDERAL MA with Caltrans.   
 Yes, the Implementing Agency has a STATE MA with Caltrans.

If the Implementing agency doesn't not have an MA. Do you meet the Master Agreement requirements?  
 Y/N  The Implementing Agency MUST be able to enter into MAs with Caltrans

**Project Type** (Select only 1)

Infrastructure (IF)      
 Non-Infrastructure only (NI)      
 Combined (IF & NI)

**Sub-Project Type** (Select all that apply)

Develop a plan in a Disadvantaged community  
     o Bicycle                                      o Safe Routes to School    o Pedestrian  
     o Active Transportation  
 (if applying for Active Trans Plan- check any of the following that you already have)  
     \_Bike plan, \_Ped plan, \_SRTS plan, \_ATP

Bicycle and/or Pedestrian infrastructure  
     Bicycle Path                      o Class I                      o Class II                      o Class III  
     o Sidewalk                              o Multi-use trail  
     o Other:

Recreational Trails (  Yes a Recreational Trails Projects approval/signature is on the application signature page, or  Yes a signed Letter of Recommendation, from the State Parks RTP Manager)

Safe Routes to School Projects (SRTS)

If Safe Routes to School is selected, provide the following information

FULL SCHOOL NAME:	SCHOOL ADDRESS:
SCHOOL DISTRICT NAME:	SCHOOL DISTRICT ADDRESS:

## **II. SCREENING CRITERIA**

### **Demonstrated Needs of the Applicant**

Describe your agency's need for funding. A project that is already fully funded will not be considered for funding in the Active Transportation Program. The Commission will make an exception to this policy by allowing the supplanting of federal funds on a project for the 2014 Active Transportation Program.

### **Consistency with Regional Transportation Plan**

Explain how this project is consistent with your Regional Transportation Plan, include adoption date of the plan.

### **III. NARRATIVE QUESTIONS**

**1. POTENTIAL FOR INCREASED WALKING AND BICYCLING, ESPECIALLY AMONG STUDENTS, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF WALKING AND BICYCLING ROUTES TO AND FROM SCHOOLS, TRANSIT FACILITIES, COMMUNITY CENTERS, EMPLOYMENT CENTERS, AND OTHER DESTINATIONS; AND INCLUDING INCREASING AND IMPROVING CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY OF NON-MOTORIZED USERS. (0-30 POINTS)**

- A. Describe how your project encourages increased walking and bicycling, especially among students.
- B. Describe how this project improves walking and bicycling routes to and from, connects to, or is part of a school or school facility, transit facility, community center, employment center, state or national trail system, points of interest, and/or park.
- C. Describe how this project increases and/or improves connectivity, removes a barrier to mobility and/or closes a gap in a non-motorized facility.
- D. Describe the number and type of possible users and their destinations and the percentage increase in users upon completion of your project.

- Projects with significant potential- 21 to 30 points
- Projects with moderate potential- 11 to 20 points
- Projects with minimal potential- 1 to 10 points
- Projects with no potential- 0 points

**2. POTENTIAL FOR REDUCING THE NUMBER AND/OR RATE OF PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FATALITIES AND INJURIES, INCLUDING THE IDENTIFICATION OF SAFETY HAZARDS FOR PRDESTRIANS AND BICYCLISTS. (0-25 POINTS)**

- A. Describe how the project will reduce pedestrian and/or serious bicycle injuries or fatalities.
- B. Describe if/how your project will mitigate each of the following safety hazards - bicycle/pedestrian collisions within the project limits (or within 2 miles of target school), inadequate or no crosswalks, bike lanes and/or sidewalks or children walking or biking in the street, low visibility of bicyclists or pedestrians, high speed vehicles, poor sight distances, no traffic control devices, inadequate enforcement of speed limits, or other.
- C. Describe the extent and severity of each safety hazard, how each was determined to be a risk/hazard (e.g. accident reports, community observation, surveys, audits) and how the project will mitigate each?

- Projects with significant potential- 16 to 25 points
- Projects with moderate potential- 8 to 15 points
- Projects with minimal potential- 1 to 7 points
- Projects with no potential- 0 points

**3. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION and PLANNING (0-15 POINTS)**

- A. Describe the community based public participation process that culminated in the project proposal, such as noticed meetings/public hearings, consultation with stakeholders, etc.
- B. Describe the local participation process that resulted in the identification and prioritization of the project:
- C. Planning- Is the project cost over \$1 Million? Y/N

If Yes- is the project Prioritized in an adopted city or county bicycle transportation plan, pedestrian plan, safe routes to school plan, active transportation plan, trail plan, or circulation element of a general plan that incorporated elements of an active transportation ? Y/N

- Projects with significant participation- 11 to 15 points
- Projects with moderate participation - 6 to 10 points
- Projects with minimal participation - 1 to 5 points
- Projects with no participation - 0 points

**4. COST EFFECTIVENESS (preferred and other alternatives). (0-10 POINTS)**

- A. Describe the alternatives that were considered.
- B. Discuss the relative costs and benefits of the range of all the alternatives.
- C. Quantify the safety for each alternative, in relationship to both the total cost and the funds provided.
- D. Quantify the mobility benefit for each alternative, in relationship to both the total and the funds provided.

- Applicant exceptionally described alternatives and quantified safety and mobility- 7 to 10 points
- Applicant adequately described alternatives and quantified safety and mobility - 4 to 6 points
- Applicant minimally described alternatives and quantified safety and mobility - 1 to 3 points
- Applicant did not describe alternatives or quantify safety or mobility - 0 points

**5. IMPROVED PUBLIC HEALTH** (0-10 points)

- A. Describe how the project will improve public health through the targeting of populations who have a high risk factor for obesity, physical inactivity, asthma, or other health issues.

- Applicant exceptionally described how the project will improve public health- 7 to 10 points
- Applicant adequately described how the project will improve public health - 4 to 6 points
- Applicant minimally described how the project will improve public health - 1 to 3 points
- Applicant did not described how the project will improve public health - 0 points

**6. BENEFIT TO DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITIES** (0-10 points)

A. Does the project predominately benefit a disadvantaged community? Y/N

a. Which criteria does the project meet? (Select all that apply)

- median household income < 80% of the statewide median
- among the most disadvantaged 10% in the state
- at least 75% of the public school students are eligible for the NSLP
- CTC approved other

B. Describe the disadvantaged community and their benefit from the project:

- Project benefits a disadvantaged community- 10 points
- Project does not benefit a disadvantage community- 0 points

**7. USE OF CALIFORNIA CONSERVATION CORPS (CCC) OR A QUALIFIED COMMUNITY CONSERVATION CORPS** (0 to -5 points)

Pending CCC and CALCC approval

- A. The applicant has submitted the project application to CCC, Y/N
- B. The applicant has submitted the project application to CALCC, Y/N

- The applicant has submitted the project application to CCC and CALCC - 0 points
- The applicant has not submitted the project application to CCC and CALCC (-)5 points

8. **APPLICANT'S PERFORMANCE ON PAST GRANTS** ( 0 to -10 points) (for future ATP solicitations)

A. This may include :

- a. Project delivery
- b. Project benefits (anticipated v. actual)
- c. Use of the California Corps or qualified community conversation corps (planned v. actual)

- The applicant has performed satisfactorily on past grants - 0 points
- The applicant has not performed satisfactorily on past grants (-)10 points

### III. PROJECT COST ESTIMATE

All project costs MUST be accounted for on this form, including elements of the overall project that will be, or has been funded by other sources.

The information in the shaded fields will be calculated automatically. All costs will automatically be rounded up to the next \$100.

Phase		ATP funds	Other funds	TOTAL FUNDS
<b>Preliminary Engineering (PE)</b>	Environmental	\$	\$	\$
	PS&E	\$	\$	\$
	<b>PE subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> This application is not requesting funds for the PE phase				
<b>Right of Way (ROW)</b>	Right of way Engineering	\$	\$	\$
	Appraisals, Acquisitions & Utilities	\$	\$	\$
	<b>ROW subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> This application is not requesting funds for the ROW phase				
<b>Construction (CON)</b>	Construction Engineering (CE)	\$	\$	\$
	Construction (Con)	\$	\$	\$
	<b>CON subtotal</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> This application is not requesting funds for the CON phase				
<b>Non-Infrastructure (NI)</b>	Non-Infrastructure (NI)	\$	\$	\$
<input type="checkbox"/> This application is not requesting funds for a NI phase				
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>

**ATP funds (If applicable)**

Request for Safe Routes to Schools Infrastructure work	\$
Request for Safe Routes to Schools Non-Infrastructure work	\$
Request for other Non-Infrastructure work	\$
Request for Disadvantage Community work	\$
Request for Recreational Trails work	\$

### IV. PROJECT SCHEDULE

#### **Project Approval & Environmental Doc (PA & ED)**

#### **Proposed Date**

PA & ED Allocation  PE Authorization

Project Initiation document Approved (or Field review/PES submittal)

Begin Environmental (PA & ED) Phase

Circulate Draft Environmental Document (for EIS or FONSI)

Environmental Document Type: **CEQA-** CE  ND/MND  EIR   
**NEPA-** CE  EA/FONSI  EIS

Draft Project Report (for EIS or FONSI)

End Environmental Phase (PA&ED Milestone)

#### **PS&E**

CTC PS&E Allocation

Begin Design (PS&E) Phase

End Design Phase (Ready to List or Advertise)

#### **Right of Way (ROW)**

CTC ROW Allocation  ROW Authorization

Begin ROW Phase

End of ROW Phase (ROW Certification Milestone)

#### **Construction (CON)**

CTC CON Allocation  CON Authorization

Begin CON Phase (Contract Award Milestone)

End CON Phase (Contract Acceptance Milestone)

#### **Closeout**

Begin Closeout Phase

End Closeout Phase (Final Report of Expenditures)

### V. APPLICATION SIGNATURES

**Local Agency Official (City Engineer or Public Works Director):** The undersigned affirms that the statements contained in the application package are true and complete to the best of their knowledge.

Signature:	Date:
Name:	Phone:
Title:	e-mail:

**School Official:** The undersigned affirms that the school(s) benefited by this application is not on a school closure list.

Signature:	Date:
Name:	Phone:
Title:	e-mail:

#### Caltrans District Traffic Operations Office Approval

If the application's project proposes improvements on a freeway or state highway that affects the safety or operations of the facility, it is required that the proposed improvements be reviewed by the district traffic operations office and either a letter of support from the traffic operations office be attached ( ) or the signature of the traffic personnel be secured below.

Signature:	Date:
Name:	Phone:
Title:	e-mail:

#### California Highway Patrol Approval

If the application proposes improvements on a freeway, state highway, or county road having California Highway Patrol (CHP) enforcement authority, the proposed project must be reviewed by a CHP officer who either writes a letter of support ( ) or signs below to show support of the project.

Signature:	Date:
Name:	Phone:
Title:	e-mail:

#### Local Law Enforced Agency Approval

If the application proposes improvements that are outside of CHP enforcement authority, it is recommended that the proposed project be reviewed by a local law enforcement agency who either writes a letter of support ( ) or signs below to show support of the project.

Signature:	Date:
Name:	Phone:
Title:	e-mail:

## VI. APPLICATION ATTACHMENTS

Check all attachments included with this application.

- Vicinity/Location Map
  - North Arrow
  - Label street names and highway route numbers
- Photos and/or Video of Existing Location
  - Minimum of one labeled color photo of the existing project location
  - Minimum photo size 3 x 5 inches
  - Optional Video
- Preliminary Plans
  - Must include a north arrow
  - Label the scale of the drawing
  - Typical Cross sections where applicable with property or right-of-way lines
  - Label street names, highway route numbers and easements
- Detailed Engineer's Estimate (Construction phase only)
  - Estimate must be true and accurate. Applicant is responsible for verifying costs prior to submittal
  - Must show a breakdown of all bid items by unit and cost.
  - Must show all items that are eligible for ATP funding
  - Contingency is limited to 10% of funds being requested
- Proof of application receipt from BOTH the CALCC and CCC
- Letters of Support from Caltrans (Required for projects on the State Highway System(SHS))
- MOU or Interagency Agreement (Required when an Administering agency is being used)
- Approved Plan (Bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, active transportation, general, recreation, trails, city/county or regional master plan(s)), if applicable
- Non-Infrastructure (NI) Activity Worksheet and NI Cost Estimate (Required when applicable)
- Additional narration, documentation, letters of support, etc (optional)

**PROJECT – OAK KNOLL DISTRICT OF THE VINE TRAIL  
Information for the NCTPA TAC**

Description

The project will construct a Class I path between Redwood Road in the City of Napa and California Drive in the Town of Yountville. The path will be located between the Napa Valley Wine Train right of way and Solano Avenue. All but six parcels for Solano Ave are within public right of way. The project will connect Park & Ride facilities in the City of Napa and Town of Yountville. It will cross seven local streets with safety improvements being installed including two warranted traffic signals at the Wine Country Ave. & Salvador Ave. crossings.

Approximately 100 trees are planned to be removed with 300 native species planted as mitigation. About 50% of the trees planned for removal are either damaged or suppressed. Bridge crossings at Dry Creek, Hinman Channel and Salvador Channel are being planned. Two to three miles of the alignment lie within the floodplain.

Funding

The current funding package is as follows:

TCSP (fed)	\$2,500,000
Vine Trail (TCSP match)	\$ 324,000
CMAQ (Co. pledge)	\$ 211,000
Vine Trail (CMAQ match)	\$ 28,000
County	\$ 30,000
City	\$ 10,000
TOTAL	\$3,103,000

The preliminary engineering, environmental determination and design budget is \$1,000,000. At 35% design the construction budget was \$6,000,000. Based on current funding the shortfall for construction is approx. \$3,900,000. 65% design will be completed in two weeks and the budget will be revised based on new developments.

Schedule

Currently the design is scheduled to be completed by June 2014. NEPA determination is expected in April. Construction could begin in late summer if all goes well. At this time the project has been divided into two phases. Phase 1 would be constructed based on the current available funding, Redwood Road to approx. Orchard Ave. Phase 2 would complete the project to Yountville, pending securing additional funding.



March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 10  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
(707) 259-8634 / Email: [kmiller@nctpa.net](mailto:kmiller@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** SR 29 Gateway Corridor Plan Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That TAC receive the schedule for completing the final phase of the SR 29 Gateway Corridor Plan to include the microsimulation recommended for the American Canyon segment, project scoring and prioritization elements.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The NCTPA Board formally received the preliminary corridor plan at its February 20, 2014 meeting. This plan received was recognized as a preliminary plan to meet the requirements of the Caltrans Community Based Transportation Planning grant. It was recommended that further analysis be completed to assess how intersections would perform in American Canyon under the two scenarios evaluated; the Boulevard and Modified Boulevard. Further discussions also need to occur to select proposed improvements in the corridor. The Corridor Technical Advisory Committee will also work with NCTPA staff to prioritize projects for the Board's consideration and for inclusion in NCTPA's Countywide Transportation Plan. This memo is to recommend a schedule for completing these tasks.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None.

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

The proposed schedule to complete the microsimulation, scoring, and to establish project priorities is included as Table A below.

Table A: Project Schedule

<b>Item</b>	<b>Committee Review</b>	<b>Date</b>
Assumptions Memo Released for Comments	Ad Hoc Staff Technical Group	March 7
Assumptions Memo Comments Due	Ad Hoc Staff Technical Group	March 14
Revised Memo Released (Final assumptions to be carried forward to Vissim Analysis)	Corridor Technical Advisory Committee	
Vissim Analysis		March 24- April 4
Release Draft Videos & Results	Ad Hoc Staff Technical Group	April 11
Submit Comments	Ad Hoc Staff Technical Group	April 18
Meet with Caltrans	Ad Hoc Staff Technical Group	April 21
Release Final Analysis/Receive Comments/Scoring Matrix/Project Priorities	Corridor Technical Advisory Committee [Meeting]	May 7
Release Draft Revised Plan for Review/Comment	Corridor Technical Advisory Committee	May 14
Comments Due	Corridor Technical Advisory Committee	May 21
Final Analysis and Report Out Recommendations from CTAC	Citizen Advisory Committee [Meeting]	May 28
Final Analysis and Report Out Recommendations from CTAC and CAC/Adopt Revised Plan	Corridor Steering Committee/NCTPA Board [Meetings]	June 18

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: None



March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 11a  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
(707) 259-8634 / Email: [kmiller@nctpa.net](mailto:kmiller@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** 2015 Countywide Transportation Plan Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC receive the draft updated goals and objectives in response to Board comments at its January 14, 2014 2015 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) kickoff retreat.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

NCTPA staff and its consulting team developed a new set of goals and objectives based upon the NCTPA Board feedback at its January 15, 2014 CWTP kickoff retreat. This memo presents the existing vision and goals from the 2009 plan, and a draft set of proposed goals and objectives for the 2015 CWTP.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Staff presented 2009 transportation plan goals for the Board's consideration with two amendments at its January 15, 2014 CWTP kickoff retreat to elicit the Board's feedback. In response, the board requested that the number of goals be limited to five goals. The Board supported expanding the goals to ensure all users were served and that safety should be paramount for all modes. They further suggested refining the goals to separate goals from objectives. A new goal was added, *Use Taxpayer Dollars Efficiently*, to recognize that there are effective, less costly solutions to address traffic congestion.

The 2009 goals, proposed amendments, and 2015 refined goals and objectives are outlined below.

## **1** Vision and Goals from 2009 Napa's Transportation Future

---

### **1.1** Vision

For Napa County in 2035 we envision an attractive, flexible, fully integrated transportation system, with a broad range of options and modes, enabling individuals and goods to move throughout the county in an efficient manner.

### **1.2** Goals

1. Reduce/restrain growth of automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
2. Spread the travel load from peak times to non-peak times
3. Improve the quality and safety of our street and road infrastructure
4. Shift travel from Single-Occupancy Vehicles to other modes
5. Reduce overall energy use and greenhouse gas (ghg) emissions

## **2** Additional Goals Presented to Board 1/15/14

---

6. Create a transportation system that supports a healthy economy throughout Napa County.
7. Create a transportation network that provides access and mobility to all Napa County residents, workers and visitors.

## **3** Proposed Goals and Objectives for 2015 CWTP

---

Preamble:

The goals and objects for the 2015 Napa Countywide Transportation Plan are based on the following key facts.

- Napa County has a number of constraints that prevent and/or limit expanding the highway and road system as a means to eliminate congestion.
- Peak travel in Napa County is often associated with visitors, and commuters that travel through Napa to/from adjacent counties, rather than employees or residents.
- The County's senior population is expected to double over the next 30 years.

- In 2010, approximately 1% of Napa County commuters biked to work, and approximately 4% walked to work, while 76% drove alone.<sup>1</sup>
- Housing costs in Napa make it a challenge to provide sufficient housing stock for its growing work force.

*Goal 1: Serve the transportation needs of the entire community regardless of age, income or physical ability.*

Objectives:

1. Provide safe access to jobs, schools, recreation and other daily needs for Napa's residents and visitors.
2. Endeavor to serve the special transportation needs of seniors, children and the disabled.
3. Coordinate transportation services for disabled persons, seniors, children and other groups so each serves as many people as possible.
4. Provide affordable transportation solutions to ensure access to jobs, education, goods, and services for all members of the community.

*Goal 2: Improve system safety in order to support all modes and serve all users.*

Objectives:

1. Design roadways and other transportation facilities to enhance coexistence of users of all modes.
2. Educate all roadway users so they may safely coexist.
3. Work with Napa jurisdictions to adopt complete streets policies to meet the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's funding eligibility requirements.<sup>2</sup>
4. Ensure Measure T roadway funds are maximized to benefit all transportation modes to the extent possible under the ordinance.
5. Prioritize f projects that expand travel options for cyclists and pedestrians.

*Goal 3: Use taxpayer dollars efficiently.*

Objectives:

1. Continue to prioritize local streets and road maintenance, consistent with Measure T.
  2. Invest in fast and reliable bus service and infrastructure, so public transit is an attractive alternative to driving alone.
  3. Identify alternative solutions that minimize costs and maximize system performance.
  4. Provide real-time traffic and transportation information via MTC's 511 or similar system by 2017.
  5. Explore new transportation funding sources, including fees associated with new development.
  6. Develop partnerships with Caltrans, California Transportation Commission (CTC), Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and Napa's state legislators to support expanded transportation funding.
-

**Goal 4: Support Napa County's economic vitality.****Objectives:**

1. Identify and improve key goods movement routes.
2. Work with employers to improve access to employment centers, as well as dispersed agricultural employment sites.
3. Improve transportation services aimed at visitors, including alternatives to driving.
4. Use transportation demand management techniques to shift travel from peak to non-peak times.

**Goal 5: Minimize the energy and other resources required to move people and goods.****Objectives:**

1. Reduce transportation-related energy use in Napa County and associated greenhouse gas (ghg) emissions by 7% by 2020 and 15% by 2035.<sup>3</sup>
2. Increase mode share for transit, walking, and bicycling to 10% by 2035.<sup>4</sup>
3. Reduce the growth of automobile vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by shifting trips to other modes.
4. Encourage the provision of alternative fuel infrastructure.
5. Invest in improvements to the transportation network that serve land use, consistent with SB 375.<sup>5</sup>

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: None

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Census Bureau, 2010-2012 American Community Survey.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> MTC requires that jurisdictions adopt a complete streets policy and update their general plans to be consistent with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 in order to receive funding after FY 2015-16 OBAG programming cycle.

<sup>3</sup> Based on Plan Bay Area target. <http://onebayarea.org/plan-bay-area/targets.html>, accessed on 2/10/14. Compared to 2008 energy use and emissions.

<sup>4</sup> Based on Plan Bay Area target. <http://onebayarea.org/plan-bay-area/targets.html>, accessed on 2/10/14. Compared to 2008 mode share.

<sup>5</sup> SB 375 requires California's 18 metro areas to integrate transportation, land-use and housing as part of an SCS to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from cars and light-duty trucks. Source: <http://onebayarea.org/about/faq.html>, accessed on 2/21/14.



March 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 11b  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
(707) 259-8634 / Email: [kmiller@nctpa.net](mailto:kmiller@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** 2015 Countywide Transportation Plan Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC receive information soliciting community members to serve on the 2015 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) Citizens' Advisory Committee.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

NCTPA staff sent out a press release and posted on its website a solicitation for interested community members to serve on the NCTPA 2015 CWTP Citizens' Advisory Committee. Staff is requesting TAC's help in disseminating information and identifying interested individuals in their communities to serve on the Committee.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

NCTPA is soliciting members of the community to service on the 2015 CWTP Citizens' Advisory Committee. Based on upon feedback from TAC, the ideal committee will be made up of the following:

- a. One member representing the City of American Canyon
- b. One member representing the City of Calistoga
- c. One member representing the City of Napa
- d. One member representing the County of Napa
- e. One member representing the City of St. Helena

- 
- f. One member representing the Town of Yountville
  - g. One member representing a Chamber of Commerce
  - h. One member representing the Agricultural industry
  - i. One member representing the Wine industry
  - j. One member representing the Hospitality industry
  - k. One member representing Transit interests
  - l. One member representing Environmental interests
  - m. One member representing Active Transportation (bicycle/pedestrian, etc) interests
  - n. One member representing Goods Movement (Trucking industry)
  - o. One member representing the Senior and Disabled community
  - p. One member representing the Hospital/Medical/Health industry
  - q. One member representing Land Use/Development

Applicants have been directed to NCTPA's website to complete the application process (<http://www.nctpa.net/napa-countywide-transportation-plan-citizens-advisory-committee-application>). Applications are due to NCTPA on March 7<sup>th</sup>. The due date will be extended if necessary to fill the majority of the categories above.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: None

Countywide Plan Schedule																Action Requested: INFORMATION	
	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15
<b>Item/Milestone</b>	<b>ALL</b>																
Project Kick-off																	
Meetings (NCTPA Advisory Committees throughout)			B Co x6 C CM	P x3		B C	CM		B C	CM		B C	CM		C	B CM	B CM
Kick-off Board Retreat - Review of Goals																	
Prepare Revised Goals and Circulate for Comment																	
Virtual Outreach																	
CBTP In-Person Outreach																	
Develop Call for Programs/Projects (w/performance measures and scoring system)																	
Release Call for Programs/Projects																	
Current and Future Transportation Conditions -- background section of CWTP																	
CBTP Analysis (including transit needs assessment)																	
<i>Issue Papers/Other plans:</i>																	
<i>Identify inputs needed from consultant team</i>																	
Federal, State, Regional, Local Policy/Plan Evaluation																	
Land Use Evaluation /Development																	
Travel Behavior																	
Economy (Jobs/Goods Movement)																	
Demographics																	
Mobility and Equity Analysis - Summary of CBTP Analysis																	
Environment																	
Travel Demand-Mode Shift																	
Update Socio-Economic Model Base Data and Projections for Napa-Solano Transport Model																	
Identify CBTP Programs/Projects																	
Prioritize CBTP Programs/Projects																	
Program/Project Submittals Due																	
Updated NCTPA financial forecast																	
Review of Program/Projects Submittals																	
Resolve any deficiencies in applications with applicants																	
Transportation Network Review																	
Investment Plan Review																	
Prepare Draft CWTP (including CBTP)		Outline															
Release Draft CWTP (including CBTP)																	
Board Adoption of CWTP (including CBTP)																	
	Jan-14	Feb-14	Mar-14	Apr-14	May-14	Jun-14	Jul-14	Aug-14	Sep-14	Oct-14	Nov-14	Dec-14	Jan-15	Feb-15	Mar-15	Apr-15	May-15

Responsibility	Meetings
NCTPA	B = Board
Arup	CM = City Manager
Eisen   Letunic	C = Citizen Steering Committee
Nancy Whelan Consulting	P = Public Meeting
Cambridge Systematics	Co = Council/BOS meetings