



625 Burnell Street • Napa, CA 94559-3420
Tel: (707) 259-8631
Fax: (707) 259-8638

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

AGENDA

Thursday, March 7, 2013
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, click on Minutes and Agendas – TAC or go to <http://www.nctpa.net/technical-advisory-committee-tac>.

ITEMS

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Introductions
4. Approval of Meeting Minutes – February 7, 2013
5. Public Comments
6. TAC Member and Staff Comments
7. Standing
 - Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report

- Legislative Report
- Project Monitoring Funding Programs
- SR29 Improvement Plan Study Update
- Transit Dashboard
- Vine Trail Report
- Caltrans Report (*Attachment 1*)

REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS

RECOMMENDATION

8.	<p>Transit Manager Services Update (Tom Roberts) (<i>Pages 10-12</i>)</p> <p>TAC will receive an update on VINE transit services.</p>	INFORMATION
9.	<p>VINE Performance Service Standards and Policies – Draft Review (Tom Roberts) (<i>Pages 13-20</i>)</p> <p>TAC will review the VINE Performance Service Standards and Policies to be submitted to the NCTPA Board on March 20, 2013 for their approval.</p>	INFORMATION
10.	<p>Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) – Call for Projects FY 2013-14 (Danielle Schmitz) (<i>Pages 21-38</i>)</p> <p>TAC will review TFCA guidelines and application due to the Air District by March 29, 2013.</p>	INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION
11.	<p>Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy – Draft Review** (Danielle Schmitz) (<i>Pages 39-41</i>)</p> <p>TAC will 1) review draft PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and 2) provide comments to NCTPA by March 29, 2013.</p>	INFORMATION/ ACTION
12.	<p>Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Cycle 2 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Projects – Final List (Danielle Schmitz) (<i>Pages 42-53</i>)</p> <p>TAC will 1) review final OBAG project list for FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 and 2) recommend its final approval by the NCTPA Board at their March 20, 2013 meeting.</p>	ACTION
13.	<p>2013 Federal and State Legislative Program and Project Priorities (Kate Miller) (<i>Pages 54-57</i>)</p> <p>TAC will review the 2013 Federal and State Legislative Advocacy programs established by NCTPA and recommend its approval to the NCTPA Board at their March 20, 2013 meeting.</p>	ACTION

**Item will be made available at the meeting

14.	NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for March 20, 2013 (Draft) (Kate Miller) <i>(Pages 58-62)</i> Preview draft version of the NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for March 20, 2013.	INFORMATION
15.	Topics for Next Meeting o Discussion of topics for next meeting by TAC members	DISCUSSION
16.	Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of April 4 , 2013 and Adjournment	APPROVE

**Technical Advisory Committee
(TAC)**

MINUTES

Thursday, February 7, 2013

ITEMS

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 2:04PM (local).

Brent Cooper	City of American Canyon
Michael Throne	City of American Canyon
Lynn Goldberg	City of Calistoga
Eric Whan, Chair	City of Napa
Rick Tooker	City of Napa
Debra Hight, Vice Chair	City of St. Helena
Graham Wadsworth	Town of Yountville
Rick Marshall	County of Napa

2. Pledge of Allegiance

3. Introductions

Lynn Goldberg, Planning and Building Director, City of Calistoga.

4. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Action

MSC* THRONE / TOOKER for APPROVAL

5. Public Comments

None.

6. TAC Member and Staff Comments

City of Napa – The City inquired who to contact, or the procedures to address the incomplete fencing segment(s) along SR 29. Staff advised the City to forward listing to NCTPA, who will endorse and route request through the appropriate Caltrans channels.

NCTPA -

- Jameson Canyon tour scheduled for Monday, February 25, 2013. Transportation to/ from location is provided and reservations are required.
- Soscog Gateway Transit Center Grand Opening Ceremony is scheduled for February 20, 11:30AM (local). Reservations are not required.
- MTC Joint Partnership Local Streets and Roads/Programming and Delivery Working Group (LSRPDWG) project schedule and meeting notes of the February 4 meeting were provided to TAC.

7. Standing

- **Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report** - Staff attended latest CMA Planning Manager's meeting. OBAG program still remains the main topic, further subjects included the Employer Commute Program and highway design updates.
 - Legislative Report – Latest overview provided on current federal and state legislative events. Special note: On January 29, Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced leaving his post once a successor has been appointed.
 - Project Monitoring Funding Program Report – Staff provided TAC with the latest project reporting data and deadline updates.
 - Transit Dashboard – Staff provided TAC with the *new* transit data report.
 - Vine Trail Report – No report. Rick Marshall, County of Napa, mentioned that the Vine Trail has received an anonymous monetary donation designated for the Calistoga trail project.
- **Caltrans Report** – TAC reviewed the current project report provided by Caltrans. Members requested future reports be marked identifying changes made to previous project report.

8. Selection and Nomination of Vine Trail Representatives

Action

Members unanimously voted Rick Marshall, County of Napa, to represent TAC at 2013 Vine Trail meetings.

9. Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) – Call for Projects FY 2013-14

Action

TAC reviewed, adopted and recommended the approval in opening the call for projects by the Board.

MSC* MARSHALL / COOPER for APPROVAL

10. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Call for Projects

Action

TAC reviewed and recommended its approval by the Board to open the call for projects with the following change to be incorporated under Program Goals – Eligible Project Types, Item 5: Farm to Market Capital Projects – Improvements should be targeted *to preservation and safety of farm to market and community interconnectivity transportation routes*. These include but are not limited to improving shoulders, intersections, alignments and safety improvements to accommodate large vehicles; pavement maintenance addressing axle loads. Surface parking and SOV projects are not eligible.

MSC* MARSHALL / HIGHT for APPROVAL

11. Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy

Information

Staff provided latest outline of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy for review and comment by TAC. A draft strategy, combining City of American Canyon and City of Napa data, will be presented at the next TAC meeting in March 2013 for review. Final working draft must be recommended for approval by the Board at their April 2013 meeting in order to meet Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) first submittal deadline in May 2013.

12. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Cycle 2 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Call for Projects

Information/Action

TAC reviewed and discussed suggested project prioritization and funding resources. Item was deferred for action to March 7, 2013 with Staff to provide proposed project data spreadsheet, funding allocations and corresponding formulas.

13. NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for February 20, 2013

Information

TAC previewed draft version of the NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for February 20, 2013.

14. Topics for Next Meeting

Discussion

- PDA Investment and Growth Strategy – Draft
- RTP Cycle 2 OBAG Call for Projects – Draft
- SR 29 Committee Update

15. Approval of Next Regular Meeting Date of March 7, 2013

Approve

Meeting adjourned at 4:23PM (local)

CALTRANS REPORT

January 2013

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT

EA 0A500

Pedestrian Circulation from Rio Del Mar to Eucalyptus , NAP 29-PM 1.6/1.8; In City of American Canyon

Scope: Repair curb ramps, cross walk and sidewalk

EA 0G650

Garnett Creek Bridge Replacement NAP 29-PM 39.1: In Napa County

Scope: Scour Mitigation at Garnett Creek

Status: Not programmed in 2012 SHOPP and No Preferred Alternative have been selected.

EA 3G140

ADA Curb Ramps NAP 29 and 128: In County of Napa

Scope: Update and Construct curb ramps at various locations.

Silverado/Lincoln Roundabout NAP 29-PM 37.9; In City of Calistoga

Scope: Modify intersection with a Roundabout Design at Silverado Intersection

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

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

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

Scope: Bridge Repair

ENVIRONMENTAL

EA 28120

Soscol Flyover NAP 221 PM 0.0/0.7 NAP 29 PM 5.0/7.1; In Napa County

Scope: Flyover Structure at SR 221/29/12, Alternative 5 Option 2

Cost Estimate: \$35M Construction Capital

Schedule **DED TBD** PAED TBD

EA 4A090

Troutdale Creek NAP 29-PM 47.0/47.2; In Napa County

Scope: Bridge replacement at Troutdale Creek

Cost Estimate: \$17M Construction Capital

Schedule: **PAED 3/2013** PSE 3/2014 RWC 5/2014 RTL 5/2014 CCA 4/2016

EA 1G430

Conn Creek Bridge Scour Mitigation NAP 128-PM R7.4: In Napa County

Scope: Repair the pier walls for scour at Conn Creek Bridge

Cost Estimate: \$5M Capital

Schedule: **PAED 7/2015** PSE 12/2016 RWC 4/2017 RTL 4/2017 CCA 11/2019

EA 3G640

Napa River Bridge Scour Mitigation NAP 29 37.0: In City of Calistoga

Scope: Reconstruct a bridge at Napa River Bridge

Cost Estimate: \$10M Capital

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

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)

[Yellow Box] = denotes changes from previous report

DESIGN

EA 2A320

Sarco Creek NAP 121-PM 9.3/9.5; In Napa County Near City of Napa

Scope: Bridge replacement at Sarco Creek

Cost Estimate: \$8M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 6/28/12 PSE 12/2013 RWC 4/2014 RTL 4/2014 CCA 12/2018

EA 2A110

Capell Creek NAP 121-PM 20.2/20.4; In Napa County

Scope: Bridge replacement at Capell Creek

Cost Estimate: \$5M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 6/22/11 PSE 8/16/12 RWC 4/2013 RTL 4/2013 CCA 08/2015

EA 25940

Channelization NAP 29-PM 25.5/28.4; In and Near City of St. Helena

Scope: Left-turn channelization and pavement rehabilitation from Mee Lane to Charter Oak Avenue

Cost Estimate: \$24M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 6/29/07 PSE 2/2014 RWC 6/2014 RTL 6/2014 CCA 12/2016

EA 3E220

Pavement Digouts Nap-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 PSE 9/2012 RWC 8/2012 RTL 10/2012 CCA 12/2013

EA 3E270

Pavement Overlay NAP-29 PM29.3/36.9 RHMA Overlay; In Napa County

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

Cost Estimate: \$2M Construction Capital

Schedule: PSE 8/2012 RTL 10/2012 ADV 1/2013 CCA 12/2013

EA 3E370

Pavement Digouts Nap-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 7/2012 PSE 8/2012 RWC 9/2012 RTL 11/2012 CCA 3/2014

EA 3E400

Pavement Seal Coat Nap-128 PM19.0/34.2 Asphalt Rubber Seal Coat; In Napa County

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

Cost Estimate: \$2.7M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 07/2012 PSE 08/2012 RWC 09/2012 RTL 11/2012 CCA 3/2014

CONSTRUCTION

EA 4442A

Duhig Landscape Nap 12-PM 0.3/2.0 On route 121; in Napa County

Scope: Mitigation and tree Planting from 0 5km North of Sonoma County line to Duhig Road

Cost Estimate: \$920K Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 8/26/05 RTL 11/10/10 AWD 9/23/11(Parker Landscape Inc.) CCA 6/2015

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 26413

Jameson Canyon NAP 12-PM 0.2/3.3; In Napa County

Scope: Jameson Canyon: Widen 2 lane to 4 lanes, construct a concrete median from SR 29 to the County Line.

Cost Estimate: \$29.2M

Schedule: PAED 1/31/08 RTL 11/19/10 AWD 1/26/12 (Ghillotti Bros.) CCA 12/2013

EA 26414

Jameson Canyon SOL 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 12/1/2010 AWD 1/11/12 (Ghillotti Const.) CCA 12/2014

EA 2E580

Pavement Repair NAP 128 PM 19.1/34.2; In Napa County

Scope: Pavement Digouts from Knoxville Road to the County Line

Cost Estimate: \$1.4M Construction Capital,

Schedule: PAED 9/1/11 RTL 1/23/12 AWD 4/9/12 (Vintage Paving) CCA 7/17/12

EA 2E650

Resurfacing NAP 121 PM 9.4/22.0; In Napa County

Scope: Place Rubberized Hot Mix Asphalt from Trancas Street to the County Line

Cost Estimate: \$3.2M Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 10/3/11 RTL 1/24/12 AWD 6/27/12 (Masconi Argonaut Const) CCA 12/21/12

EA 1E400

Bridge Repair NAP 29 PM R6.6/19.0; In Napa County

Scope: Place Polyester Concrete at 5th Ave Undercrossing, 1st St Overcrossing, California Dr Undercrossing, and Dry Creek.

Cost Estimate: \$960K Construction Capital

Schedule: PAED 5/11/10 RTL 2/11 AWD 6/3/11(LEGG Inc) CCA 12/2012Delayed

EA 4S020

Storm Damage NAP 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 ADV 9/4/12 BO 10/2012 CCA 11/2018

EA 4S030

Storm Damage NAP 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 ADV 9/17/12 BO 10/2012 CCA 10/2017

ACTION ITEMS

SR 29 Traffic Signals Timing Changes– Delayed due to inclement weather. Operation being re-scheduled for later in January or early February 2013.

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 7, 2012
TAC Agenda Item 8
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: Tom Roberts, Manager of Public Transit
(707) 259-8635 / Email: troberts@nctpa.net
SUBJECT: Transit Manager Service Update

RECOMMENDATION

Receive an update from the Manager of Public Transit regarding VINE service changes.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In December 2013, the VINE bus system underwent a significant change in service design and delivery. Since the change, ridership system-wide has increased significantly over the comparable period from the prior year. On-time performance has also increased. Based on public feedback, staff plans to make minor service adjustments between the spring and summer of 2013.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Information only.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Approximately thirteen years ago the VINE transported over a million passengers annually. At that time major changes to the bus system were instituted that resulted in eliminating convenient transfers between routes and the institution of long and indirect routes that significantly increased passenger travel time. The result was the bus system lost nearly half its ridership. Beginning in 2010, NCTPA undertook a variety of studies to ascertain what changes both riders and non-riders wanted to see in the bus system. Specifically, on-board passenger surveys, in-person focus groups, and telephone surveys were conducted. The result was clear direction to the agency that the community desired a bus system that provided more direct paths of travel, more travel options, shorter travel times, and more frequent service.

In December 2012, a completely redesigned transit system was launched connecting neighborhoods more directly with centers of health, education, retail and employment. Overlapping routes and a concept of “transfer anywhere” were introduced along with increased bus frequency and the creation of a rapid transit corridor along Trancas Street and Soscol Avenue. Combined, the changes provided a service that significantly reduced average travel times while providing for more direct trips and travel options for the vast majority of riders. Buses largely travel down the same streets as before. Therefore, the walking distance to bus stops was not changed for residents in 95% of the service area.

Since the introduction of the new service, comments have been received from riders voicing concerns or offering suggestions about the changes. The majority of complaints expressed have been associated with understanding how to navigate the new system and were easily resolved with additional rider education.

In addition, some excellent observations regarding needed adjustments have been expressed. Among these:

- Additional bus stop locations have been proposed by riders
- The Route 6 cannot be completed in the allotted 30 minutes, is running chronically late, and needs to better service Kaiser Permanente
- The Route 1 is running so ahead of schedule it may as well go back to servicing the upper Brown’s Valley neighborhood that was eliminated from service
- The timing is off between bus routes at certain logical transfer points
- The later southbound runs of the Route 10 should terminate at the Transit Center
- The Route 10 and 11 schedules need to be adjusted by time of day to promote better on-time performance
- Because the Route 29 mid-day runs do not service the park and ride lots and the morning runs of the route do not service the transit center, it is impractical to take the Route 29 in the morning and return home mid-day

Staff agrees with these comments and proposes to address them. New stops continue to be added where safe and practical. Changes to the Routes 1 and 6 can be addressed within the next 60 days. Because changes in transfer point timing can impact the schedules of virtually all routes and the changes required for the Routes 10, 11 and 29 may impact driver shift assignments, these will take more lead time to implement.

Conventional transit wisdom suggests that after such significant service changes ridership should initially decrease until people adjust to the new system. System-wide ridership in December 2012 and January 2013 increased over the prior year 12.5% and 19% respectively. System-wide on-time performance increased 2%. Significantly, the new Route 10 exceeded 81% on-time up from 61% a year ago. At 67% on-time, the new Route 11 still requires schedule adjustments to compensate for the traffic through

American Canyon.

Staff proposes to make the service changes noted above at the earliest opportunity.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

None.



March 7, 2012
TAC Agenda Item 9
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: Tom Roberts, Manager of Public Transit
(707) 259-8635 / Email: troberts@nctpa.net
SUBJECT: Performance and Service Standards and Policies - Draft

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review proposed VINE performance and service standards and policies and forward them to the NCTPA Board for adoption.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Public transit agencies are required by federal law to meet Title VI requirements which, in part, include establishing performance and service standards to measure effectiveness and guide the agency toward consistent transit policy development and equitable allocation of services. Staff is proposing that a variety of standards and measures be adopted to meet federal requirements and guide agency management decisions to achieve future transit service planning and expansion objectives.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Information only.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Transit agencies seek to provide quality, effective and efficient service to the public. Performance standards provide a set of metrics by which the agency can identify areas in need of improvement, establish priorities for the allocation of staff and financial resources, and inform strategic management decisions. In addition, service standards can provide a mechanism to ensure the greatest community needs are being addressed and public priorities are met.

Staff requests the TAC review the proposed performance and service policies and forward to the NCTPA Board for adoption.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachments: (1) Performance and Service Standards

SERVICE STANDARDS AND DESIGN

PURPOSE

To accomplish the goal of providing efficient and effective service to the residents of Napa County, the Agency has developed a series of service standards that provide a framework for service allocation as well as measures to continually examine the service to ensure that services meet efficiency and effectiveness standards in accordance with stated objectives. Additionally, these standards are also a requirement of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in order to ensure that service is allocated and assessed without regard to race, color, or national origin.

SERVICE DEFINITIONS

A matrix depicting the service standards and goals for the various types of service is contained in Attachment 1 to this policy. The section below provides a definition for each service type operated by NCTPA:

Local – These are the services operating on corridors where residential densities are approximately 5,000 to 4,000 residents per square mile (or comparable commercial densities). These routes operate along the arterial streets as well as local or residential roads, and provide the highest level of service due to the general mobility needs within the urbanized area.

Regional - Provides inter-city service along arterials, highways or freeways to major focal points, destinations and trip attractors. These routes provide connections to regional rail or other transportation options and may include express-type services. Service features wide stop-spacing or areas with closed door operation (most often on the freeway). Underlying local service also contributes to a greater aggregate service frequency along arterials during operating hours.

Community Circulators – These are primarily routes operating in areas of very low density (fewer than 4,000 residents per square mile). Provide service that operates to focal points within the community.

City Dial a Ride – These are services that serve designated areas within the two cities of Calistoga and Yountville. Demand responsive service provides a more flexible operation than traditional fixed route services for areas of very low density where fixed route service may not be warranted. There are largely no allocation standards for these services, as they are generally based on each city's financial contribution toward the operation.

DENSITY STANDARDS

To ensure that the service is able to be both cost efficient and useful, areas with higher density of population or commercial development should be allocated service that is more frequent, with routes and bus stops spaced closer together, and operates more consistently throughout the day. Within each service category, service will be allocated primarily on the basis of demand or use, provided that minimum service levels are provided.

Service Span refers the number of hours that the service operates on any given day. It is generally indicated with beginning and end periods. However, this may be changed based on demand for earlier or later service to meet specific needs of the community.

For example, within the Fixed Route Local category, service will be provided at a minimum of every 30 minutes for at least 11 hours a day for every day except Sunday. More frequent service allocation will be provided on the basis of a combination of demand for service and density.

Route Spacing refers to the general availability of routes within the service area. For Regional routes, due to the nature of operation and design of the service, gaps between routes may be greater than a mile. For local routes, spacing is generally closer and follows the grip of the city.

Table 1: Density, Frequency and Service Span Standard

Persons per Square Mile	Route Spacing	Route Structure	Weekday Frequency Standard	Service Span
5,000 – 4,000 (Medium Density) [such as urban area of Napa]	½ mile	Modified Grid	Local: 30 minutes Peak 60 minutes off peak	7 am to 6 pm (Monday to Saturday)
4,000 – 3,000 (Low Density)	½-1 mile	Focal Point	Community: 45 minutes Peak 90 minutes off peak	7 am to 3 pm (Monday to Friday)
4,000 – 3,000 (Low Density)	½-1 mile	Focal Point	Regional 120 minutes Peak No Midday Service	6 am to 5 pm (Monday to Friday)
3,000 and below	N/A	Focal Point	City Dial a Ride: No Standard	No Standard

VEHICLE LOAD STANDARDS

A Vehicle Load Factor is the ratio of the number of seats on a vehicle to the number of passengers on-board. Load factor is an indicator of the extent or probability of overcrowding, and may indicate the need for additional vehicles to maintain useful service.

The Load factor is determined by taking the number of seats on a specific route which pass the peak load point during the peak hour, and dividing that number into the number of passengers that are actually carried past that point during that hour.

Load factors can vary by service type. Different Vehicle Load thresholds shall be used to measure service effectiveness or to determine remediation. The following thresholds shall be monitored, as reflected in Table 2:

Table 2: Vehicle Load Factor by Route Type

Route Type	Vehicle Load Factor
Local	1.25 (25% standees)
Regional (Urban)	1.00 (no standees)*
Regional (Rural)	1.00 (no standees)*
Community	1.25 (25% standees)

*For purposes of measuring the Vehicle Load Factor for Regional Service, the Vehicle Load Factor shall be measured as the route enters the “non-revenue area” and is operating closed-door, which is generally on the freeway or highway.

SERVICE AVAILABILITY

Service availability refers to the general measure of how the routes are distributed within the NCTPA service area. It can be defined as a measure of the distance a person must travel to gain access to transit service.

NCTPA fixed route bus service will serve 85% of the dwelling units within the urbanized area of Napa within one quarter mile. 90% of the major activity centers will be within one quarter mile of a bus route.

ON-TIME PERFORMANCE

For all fixed route services, regardless of service type, 90% of service will operate on time (between 0 minutes early and 5 minutes late). For City Dial a Ride (demand responsive) 90% of the service will arrive within 30 minutes of call requesting pick up.

PASSENGER PER HOUR

In order to account for Regional service, which can sometimes operate closed-door for large portions of the route, the standards for passenger activity assumes that closed

door portions of the route will not be counted toward overall passengers per hour. Table 3 presents the following thresholds that should be monitored:

Table 3: Passenger Activity by Route Type

Route Type	Passenger Activity
Local	12 passengers per hour
Regional (Urban)	7 passengers per hour
Regional (Rural)	5 passengers per hour
Community	5 passengers per hour
City Dial a Ride	2 passengers per hour

FAREBOX RECOVERY RATIO

Farebox recovery ratio is an efficiency metric that gauges the amount of cost that is covered by passenger fares. In certain instances, outside funding can be used to supplant passenger fares, as is the case of the City Dial a Ride services. Table 4 presents the farebox recovery standard by service type.

Table 4: Farebox Recovery Ratio

Route Type	Farebox Recovery Ratio
Local	Meet or exceed 17%
Regional (Urban)	Meet or exceed 17%
Regional (Rural)	Meet or exceed 15%
Community	Meet or exceed 10%
City Dial a Ride	Meet or exceed 10%

TRANSIT AMENITIES

Transit amenities are those items installed by NCTPA that provide improvements to the traditional bus stop pole and sign. This includes shelters, canopies, benches or other betterments intended to provide comfort or convenience to the rider. In 2012, NCTPA completed a project that prioritized locations for bus stop improvements followed by implementation.

Future implementation of amenities will be based upon availability of funding for improvements, while prioritizing services that operate at 60 minutes or worse at stops with the greatest number of riders per day.

APPLICATION OF STANDARDS

To determine service effectiveness, staff will conduct ridership analyses on a regular basis. This information will be used to determine evaluative components such as passengers per vehicle hour, vehicle load factor, passengers per trip and hour, and farebox recovery ratio.

An assessment of route performance within the service categories will be conducted annually to determine if corrective action is required. Minority Transit routes (those routes that have at least 1/3 of the total route mileage in a census tract with a percentage of minority population greater than the percentage of minority population in the service area) will also be identified in the evaluation.

Service that falls below the standard for all routes within its category will be analyzed for the following:

- Schedule adjustments, if service frequencies exceed the standards provided in this Policy.
- Running time adjustments or minor route changes to improve efficiency or improve route performance.
- Route improvements, including route consolidation or through-routing to improve efficiency and effectiveness.
- Route discontinuance, should there be no other means to improve efficiency or provide a well-used transit product.
- Other actions, such as grant funded opportunities or targeted marketing, to improve route performance.

NCTPA Service Characteristics and Standards

Attachment 1: Service Standards

Service Type	Peak and Base Frequencies*	Service Span*	Scheduling	Route Structure	Load Factor*	Vehicles	Stop Spacing	Stop Amenities*	Farebox Recovery	Passengers per hour	On-time Performance*
Local (Routes 1 through 11)	Not to exceed 30 minutes in the peak and 60 minutes midday	7 am to 6 pm (Monday to Saturday)	Clock Headways preferred	Modified Grid: uses the lay out of the urban area	1.25	Standard 40' or smaller vehicle to meet load	1/4 to 1/2 mile depending on density	Shelters based on high ridership routes in areas with lower frequency	Meet or exceed 17%	12 passengers per hour	90% of service will operate on time (between 0 minutes early and 5 minutes late)
Regional (Urban) (Routes 20 & 28)	Not to exceed 2 hours in the peak. No midday standard.	6 am to 5 pm (Monday to Friday)	Scheduled to meet regional connections	Focal Point: provides access between two focal areas to provide regional and intercity connectivity	1.00	Standard 40' or smaller vehicle to meet load	1/2 to 1 mile depending on density of trip generators and attractors (such as school, shopping, medical)	Shelters based on high ridership routes in areas with lower frequency	Meet or exceed 17%	7 passengers per hour	90% of service will operate on time (between 0 minutes early and 5 minutes late)
Regional (Rural) (Routes 25)	Not to exceed 2 hours in the peak. No midday standard.	6 am to 5 pm (Monday to Friday)	Scheduled to meet regional connections	Focal Point: provides access to connect rural focal area and regional hubs	1.00	Standard 40' or smaller vehicle to meet load	1 to 2 mile depending on density of trip generators and attractors (such as school, shopping, medical)	Shelters based on high ridership routes in areas with lower frequency	Meet or exceed 15%	5 passengers per hour	90% of service will operate on time (between 0 minutes early and 5 minutes late)
Community (American Canyon and St. Helena)	Not to exceed 45 minutes in the peak and 90 minutes midday	7 am to 5 pm (Monday to Friday)	As required to meet demand	Focal Point: provides access between focal areas within a small community	1.25	30' vehicle or smaller	1/2 to 2/3 mile depending on density of trip generators and attractors (such as school, shopping, medical)	Shelters based on high ridership routes in areas with lower frequency	Meet or exceed 10%	5 passenger per hour	90% of service will operate on time (between 0 minutes early and 5 minutes late)
City Dial a Ride (Calistoga and Yountville)	Upon call in, service will arrive within 15 - 30 minutes.	Service based upon available funds	As requested	No standard	No standard	30' vehicle or smaller	No standard	Shelter locations are responsibility of city partners	Meet or Exceed 10% (includes City or other sponsor funding)	2 passengers per hour	90% of service will arrive within 30 minutes of call in

*Required by Title VI for Fixed Route Service Only



March 7, 2013
TAC Agenda Item 10
Continued From: NEW

Action Requested: INFORMATION/DISCUSSION

NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Danielle Schmitz, Assoc. Program Planner
(707) 259-5968 / Email: dschmitz@nctpa.net
SUBJECT: Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) - Call for Projects
FY 2013-14

RECOMMENDATION

Information only.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) annually allocates funds generated under AB 434. The funds come from a four-dollar vehicle license fee imposed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) and are known as Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA).

40% of these funds are returned to the NCTPA for distribution to local projects. Projects must be beneficial to air quality and be cost effective. The remaining 60% is allocated by the BAAQMD on an area wide competitive basis. The Program Expenditure Plan for the Program Managers Funds is due to the Air District on March 4, 2013.

In general the Air District TFCA policies only allow funds to be retained for two (2) years, unless the NCTPA originally requests additional time or the project is making reasonable progress and is granted a one (1) year extension.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? Yes. Approximately \$189,168 in TFCA funds for FY 2013-14.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Annually the NCTPA adopts a list of projects for the TFCA Program Manager funds. NCTPA receives about \$185,000 each year in DMV revenues. Five percent of the revenues can be used for administration of the program. For FY 2013-14 there are approximately \$189,000 to program.

APPLICATIONS

Applications are due Friday, March 29, 2013 by 5:00 PM. Applications can be emailed to Danielle Schmitz at dschmitz@ncpta.net. Applications may be in the form of a Completed Application Form (Appendix A) to Application and Guidance or in the form of a letter containing the following:

1. The name of the agency applying.
2. A contact person in the agency.
3. A brief description of the project of no more than one (1) page.
4. Cost of the project in both TFCA funds and all other dollars, by source.
5. A schedule for the project.
6. Sufficient information to determine if the project improves air quality as determined by the Air District assumptions.
7. Assurance that the proposed project meets all the Air District policies for 40% projects.
8. Assurances that the project is an allowed type.

Basic Eligibility

1. Reduction of emissions.
2. TFCA cost-effectiveness.
3. Eligible recipients.
4. Consistent with existing plans and programs.
5. Public agencies applying on behalf of non-public Entities.
6. Consistent with existing plans and programs.

TFCA Project Types

1. Bicycle Facility Improvements
2. Arterial Management
3. Transit or Vanpool Incentive Programs
4. Shuttle/Vanpool Feeder Program
5. Smart Growth

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachments: (1) TFCA Napa County Application and Guidance



Guide and Application for the
Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program
(TFCA) for Napa County Program Manager Funds



BAY AREA
AIR QUALITY
MANAGEMENT
DISTRICT

FY 2013-14 Applications Due to NCTPA: Friday, March 29, 2013

NCTPA
625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559
Phone: 707-259-8631
Fax: 707-259-8638
www.nctpa.net

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 4

YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES AS PROJECT SPONSOR: 5

BASIC ELIGIBILITY 6

USE OF TFCA FUNDS 8

TFCA PROJECT TYPES 9

DATES OF IMPORTANCE10

TFCA PROGRAM MANAGER SELECTION CRITERIA FOR NAPA COUNTY11

APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS:12

TFCA DO'S AND DON'TS13

CONTACT INFORMATION14

APPENDIX A15



January 24, 2013

Greetings Participants!

The Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency is pleased to announce a "Call for Projects" for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air, Program Manager Funds.

The Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) is a grant program, funded by a \$4 surcharge on motor vehicles registered in the Bay Area. This generates approximately \$22 million per year in revenues. The purpose of the TFCA program is to provide grants to implement the most cost-effective projects in the Bay Area that will decrease motor vehicle emissions, and thereby improve air quality. Projects must be consistent with the 1988 California Clean Air Act and the Bay Area Ozone Strategy.

The TFCA program can fund a wide range of project types, including the construction of new bicycle lanes; shuttle and feeder bus services to train stations; ridesharing programs to encourage carpool and transit use; bicycle facility improvements such as bicycle racks and lockers; and arterial management projects that reduce traffic congestion such as signal interconnect projects.

NCTPA is pleased that your agency or organization has chosen the TFCA program as a potential funding source to complete your eligible project. This packet has been created to help guide you in submitting a successful application for funding.

The available funding for Napa County TFCA projects for FY 2013-14 will be approximately \$189,168 dollars. The TFCA Applications for FY 2013-14 will be due to NCTPA by 5:00 PM on Friday, March 29th.

If you have any questions, you may contact Danielle Schmitz, TFCA Program Manager at: NCTPA TFCA Program

625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559
Phone: 707-259-8631

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kate Miller', is written over a light blue horizontal line.

Kate Miller
Executive Director
Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency

Introduction

On-road motor vehicles, including cars, trucks, and buses, constitute the most significant source of air pollution in the Bay Area. Vehicle emissions contribute to unhealthy levels of ozone (summertime "smog") and particulate matter.

To protect public health, the State Legislature enacted the California Clean Air Act in 1988. As part of the requirements, the Air District prepared the Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP) and the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy, which describes how the region will work toward compliance with the State one-hour ozone standard. To reduce emissions from motor vehicles, the Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy contains transportation control measures (TCMs) and mobile source measures (MSMs). A TCM is defined as "any strategy to reduce vehicle trips, vehicle use, vehicle miles traveled, vehicle idling, or traffic congestion for the purpose of reducing motor vehicle emissions." MSMs encourage the retirement of older, more polluting vehicles and the introduction of newer, less polluting motor vehicle technologies, which result not only in the reduction of ozone precursor emissions, but also of greenhouse gas emissions.

The TFCA Program

To fund the implementation of TCMs and MSMs, the State Legislature authorized the Bay Area Air Quality Management District to impose a \$4 surcharge on motor vehicle registration fees paid within the San Francisco Bay Area. These revenues are allocated by the Air District through the Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA). TFCA grants are awarded to public and private entities to implement eligible projects.

TFCA-funded projects have many benefits, including the following:

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

Forty percent (40%) of these funds are allocated to the designated program manager within each county and are referred to as the TFCA Program Manager Fund. Sixty percent (60%) of these funds are awarded directly by the Air District through the TFCA Regional Fund.

Your Responsibilities as Project Sponsor:

1. Submit projects to the Program Manager that comply with Air District policies.
2. Prepare and submit your project's information form and cost-effectiveness worksheet to the Program Manager.
3. Adhere to the Program Manager's timeline and submit deliverables on time.
4. Submit project status report forms on time.
5. Complete your TFCA project two years from the effective date of the Master Agreement between the Program Manager and the Air District.
6. Provide proof of Air District credit for vehicles purchased, published materials, and construction funded or partially funded through the TFCA program.
7. Provide itemized invoices to the Program Manager for reimbursement of your project.

NCTPA's Responsibilities as Program Manager:

1. Provide guidance, offer technical support to project sponsors.
2. Review Project Sponsor's Project Information forms, cost-effectiveness sheets, and reporting forms.
3. Administer program in accordance with applicable legislation, including Health and Safety Code Sections 44233, 44241, and 44242, and with Air District Board-Adopted TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies
4. Hold one or more public meeting each year for the purpose of adopting criteria for the expenditure of the funds and to review expenditure of revenues received.
5. Provide funds only to projects that comply with Air District Policies and Procedures.
6. Encumber and expend funds within two years of the receipt of funds.
7. Provide information to the Air District and to auditors on the expenditures of TFCA funds.

Basic Eligibility

1. Reduction of Emissions: Only projects that result in the reduction of motor vehicle emissions within the Air District's jurisdiction are eligible.

Projects must conform to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 44220 et seq. and the Air District Board of Directors adopted TFCA Program Manager Fund Policies for FY 2013-14.

Projects must achieve surplus emission reductions, beyond what is currently required through regulations, ordinances, contracts, or other legally binding obligations at the time of the execution of a funding agreement between the Program Manager and the sub-awardee.

2. TFCA Cost-Effectiveness: Projects must achieve TFCA cost-effectiveness, on an individual project basis, equal to or less than \$90,000 of TFCA funds per ton of total of emissions reduced, unless a different value is specified in the Program Manager Guidance for that project type. Cost-effectiveness is based on the ratio of TFCA funds awarded divided by the sum of total tons of reactive organic gases (ROG), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and weighted particulate matter 10 microns in diameter and smaller (PM10) reduced (\$/ton).

3. Eligible Projects and Case-by-Case Approval: Eligible projects are those that conform to the provisions of the California Health and Safety Code (HSC) section 44241, Air District Board adopted policies and Air District guidance. On a case-by-case basis, Program Managers must receive approval by the Air District for projects that are authorized by the HSC Section 44241 and achieve Board-adopted TFCA cost-effectiveness, but do not fully meet other Board-adopted Policies.

4. Consistent with Existing Plans and Programs: All projects must comply with the transportation control measures and mobile source measures included in the Air District's most recently approved plan for achieving and maintaining State and national ambient air quality standards, those plans and programs established pursuant to California Health and Safety Code (HSC) sections 40233, 40717 and 40919, and, when applicable, with other adopted State, regional, and local plans and programs.

5. Eligible Recipients: Grant recipients must be responsible for the implementation of the project, have the authority and capability to complete the project, and be an applicant in good standing with the Air District.

A. Public agencies are eligible to apply for all project categories.

B. Non-public entities are only eligible to apply for new alternative-fuel (light, medium, and heavy-duty) vehicle and infrastructure projects, and advanced technology demonstrations that are permitted pursuant to HSC section 44241(b)(7).

6. Readiness: Projects must commence in calendar year 2014 or sooner. For purposes of this policy, —commence can mean the issuance of a purchase order to secure project vehicles, and equipment, the delivery of the award letter for a service contract or the delivery of the award letter for a construction contract.

7. Maximum Two Years Operating Costs: Projects that provide a service, such as ridesharing programs and shuttle and feeder bus projects, are eligible to apply for a period of up to two (2) years. Grant applicants that seek TFCA funds for additional years must reapply for funding in the subsequent funding cycles.

Applicant in Good Standing

8. Failed Audit: Project sponsors who have failed either the fiscal audit or the performance audit for a prior TFCA-funded project will be excluded from future funding for five (5) years, or duration determined by the Air District Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Existing TFCA funds already awarded to the project sponsor will not be released until all audit recommendations and remedies have been satisfactorily implemented. A failed fiscal audit means an uncorrected audit finding that confirms an ineligible expenditure of TFCA funds. A failed performance audit means that the project was not implemented as set forth in the project funding agreement.

In case of a failed audit, a Program Manager may be subject to a reduction of future revenue in an amount equal to the amount which was inappropriately expended pursuant to the provisions of HSC Section 44242(c)(3).

9. Authorization for County Program Manager to Proceed: Only a fully executed funding agreement (i.e., signed by both the Air District and the County Program Manager) constitutes the Air District's award of funds for a project. Program Managers may only incur costs (i.e., an obligation made to pay funds that cannot be refunded) after the funding agreement with the Air District has been executed.

10. Insurance: Each County Program Manager and project sponsor must maintain general liability insurance, workers compensation insurance, and additional insurance as appropriate for specific projects, with estimated coverage amounts provided in Air District guidance and final amounts specified in the respective funding agreements throughout the life of the projects.

Use of TFCA Funds

1. Cost of Developing Proposals: The costs of developing grant applications for TFCA funding are not eligible to be reimbursed with TFCA funds.

2. Combined Funds: TFCA County Program Manager Funds may be combined with TFCA Regional Funds for the funding of an eligible project with the exception of clean air vehicle projects. For the purpose of calculating TFCA cost-effectiveness, the combined sum of TFCA County Program Manager Funds and TFCA Regional Funds shall be used to calculate the TFCA cost of the project.

3. Expend Funds within Two Years: County Program Manager Funds must be expended within two (2) years of receipt of the first transfer of funds from the Air District to the County Program Manager in the applicable fiscal year. A County Program Manager may, if it finds that significant progress has been made on a project, approve no more than two (2) one-year (1-year) schedule extensions for a project. Any subsequent schedule extensions for projects can only be given on a case-by-case basis, if the Air District finds that significant progress has been made on a project, and the funding agreement between the Program Manager and the Air District is amended to reflect the revised schedule.

TFCA Project Types

- 1. Ridesharing projects**
- 2. Shuttle/Feeder Bus**
- 3. Bicycle Facility Improvements**
- 4. Smart Growth**
- 5. Clean Air Vehicle Purchase**
- 6. Arterial Management**

Ineligible Project Types

1. Duplication: Grant applications for projects that duplicate existing TFCA-funded projects (including Bicycle Facility Program projects) and therefore do not achieve additional emission reductions are ineligible. Combining TFCA County Program Manager Funds with TFCA Regional Funds to achieve greater emission reductions for a single project is not considered project duplication.

2. Planning Activities: Feasibility studies are not eligible, nor are projects that only involve planning activities and that do not include an implementation phase.

3. Employee Subsidies: Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy or shuttle/feeder bus service exclusively to employees of the project sponsor are not eligible.

Recent Project Examples in Napa County

<u>Project Name</u>	<u>Sponsor</u>	<u>TFCA Funds</u>	<u>Total Project \$</u>
Bicycle Incentive Program	City of Calistoga	\$8,500	\$13,000
Signal Timing Project	City of Napa	\$177,693	\$195,000
Class II Bike Lane	County of Napa	\$51,000	\$89,000
Commuter Incentives & Marketing Materials	SNCI	\$40,000	\$40,000

Dates of Importance

- Mar. 29, 2013** **Project submittals are due to NCTPA**
- Aug.1, 2013** **Deadline: Within three months of Board approval, Program Manager submits request for Air District approval of any projects that do not conform to TFCA policies (date tentative)**
- Nov. 1, 2013** **Deadline: Within six months of Board approval, Program Manager (NCTPA) provides Cost-Effectiveness Worksheets and Project Information forms for new FYE 2013 projects to the Air District (date tentative)**

Project Selection Process

The project selection process is as follows. The NCTPA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), with representation from all six Napa County jurisdictions, will serve as the selection and prioritization committee. NCTPA staff will run the prospective projects through an initial qualification process based on project eligibility, and present their findings to the TAC. TAC's recommendations will be forwarded to the NCTPA Board.

Projects will be evaluated on a cost effective and project readiness basis.

TFCA Program Manager Selection Criteria for Napa County

- 1) The proposed project must improve the quality of the air as determined by the BAAQMD.
- 2) The project must fall into one or more of the statutory expenditure categories, which are:
 - The implementation of ridesharing programs.
 - The purchase or lease of clean fuel buses for school districts and transit operators.
 - The provision of local feeder bus or shuttle service to rail and ferry stations and to airports.
 - Implementation and maintenance of local arterial traffic management.
 - Implementation of rail-bus integration and regional transit information systems.
 - Implementation of low-emission and zero-emission vehicle programs and of demonstration projects in telecommuting and in congestion pricing of highways, bridges, and public transit.
 - Implementation of a smoking vehicles program (Air District project).
 - Implementation of an automobile buy-back scrappage program operated by a governmental agency (Air District project).
 - Implementation of bicycle facility improvement projects that are included in an adopted countywide bicycle plan or congestion management program.
 - The design and construction by local public agencies of physical improvements that support development projects that achieve motor vehicle emission reductions.
- 3) Geographic equity in the Napa region.
- 4) The project proponent has expended past allocations of funds in a timely manner.

Application Instructions:

TFCA project applications for FY 2013-14 must be submitted to NCTPA by 5:00 pm on Friday, March 29, 2013. Applications may be emailed to Danielle Schmitz at dschmitz@nctpa.net. Applications may be in the form of a completed Project Information Form or in the form of a letter containing the following:

1. The name of the project;
2. A contact person in the agency;
3. A description of the project of no more than one page;
4. Cost of the project: Total cost and amount of TFCA funds requested;
5. A schedule for the project;
6. Sufficient information to determine if the project improves air quality as determined by the Air District assumptions found in Program Manager Guide for FYE 2013;
7. Assurance that the proposed project meets all the Air District policies for forty percent projects; and
8. Assurances that the project is an allowed type

What Happens After Submission?

After applications are submitted to NCTPA the evaluation process will begin. NCTPA plans on the following action timeline:

- April – May 2013 – NCTPA will evaluate the potential 2013-14 TFCA projects
- May 7, 2013 – NCTPA will take proposed 2013-14 TFCA projects to the NCTPA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for recommendation to NCTPA Board
- May 15, 2013 – NCTPA will take proposed final projects for FY 2013-14 to the NCTPA Board for approval (date tentative)
- July 2013 – NCTPA sends out agreements to project sponsors (date tentative)

TFCA Do's and Don'ts

Do

- Establish a clear link to the air quality benefits of your project
- Provide clear and detailed cost estimates
- Have good back-up documentation including maps and pictures
- Have a clearly defined project scope and timeline
- Keep NCTPA in “the loop” the greater understanding the Program Manager has of your project the better

Don't

- Bite off more than you can chew – if the project cannot be completed in two years apply for funding in phases, it will not hurt your chances of eligibility
- Scope creep – when you fill out your **Project Information Form** this is your application. You have to adhere to the project description you write on this form
- Forget to ask for help – NCTPA is here as a resource, do not assume, rather ask for clarification
- Apply for the TFCA funds now, and figure out where the rest of your project's funding is going to come from later

Frequently Asked Questions

1. Is there a local match requirement to apply for TFCA funding?

No, there is no requirement for a local match.

2. Can TFCA Program Manager Funds be combined with TFCA Regional Funds?

Yes, TFCA Program Manager Funds may be combined with Regional Funds for the funding of an eligible project with the exception of clean air vehicle projects.

3. What is the TFCA funding limit for alternative fuel vehicles?

TFCA funds awarded to alternative fuel vehicle projects may not exceed incremental cost after all other applicable manufacturer and local/state rebates, tax credits, and cash equivalent incentives are applied. Incremental cost is the difference in cost between the purchase or lease price of the vehicle and/or retrofit and its new conventional vehicle counterpart that meets, but does not exceed, 2011 emissions standards.

Contact Information

Napa County TFCA Program Manager:
Danielle Schmitz
625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559
Phone: (707) 259-5968
dschmitz@nctpa.net

NCTPA Main Office
625 Burnell Street
Napa, CA 94559
Phone: (707) 259-8631
Fax: (707) 259-8638
www.nctpa.net

Bay Area Air Quality Management District:
Geraldina Grunbaum
Supervising Environmental Planner
Phone: (415) 749-4956
ggrunbaum@baaqmd.gov

Appendix A

PROJECT INFORMATION

A. Project Number: 13NAP01

Use consecutive numbers for projects funded, with year, county code, and number, e.g., 13MAR01, 13MAR02 for Marin County. Zero (e.g., 13MAR00) is reserved for County Program Manager TFCA funds allocated for administration costs.

B. Project Title: _____

Provide a concise, descriptive title for the project (e.g., "Elm Ave. Signal Interconnect" or "Purchase Ten Gasoline-Electric Hybrid Light-Duty Vehicles").

C. TFCA Program Manager Funds Allocated: \$ _____

D. TFCA Regional Funds Awarded (if applicable):\$ _____

E. Total TFCA Funds Allocated (sum of C and D):\$ _____

F. Total Project Cost: \$ _____

Indicate the TFCA dollars allocated (C, D and E) and total project cost (D). Data from Line E (Total TFCA Funds) should be used to calculate C-E.

G. Project Description:

Project sponsor will use TFCA funds to _____. Include information sufficient to evaluate the eligibility and cost-effectiveness of the project. Ex. of the information needed include but are not limited to: what will be accomplished by whom, how many pieces of equipment are involved, how frequently it is used, the location, the length of roadway segments, the size of target population, etc. Background information should be brief. For shuttle/feeder bus projects, indicate the hours of operation, frequency of service, and rail station and employment areas served.

H. Final Report Content: Final Report form and final Cost Effectiveness Worksheet

Reference the appropriate Final Report form that will be completed and submitted after project completion. See <http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-Sources/TFCA/County-Program-Manager-Fund.aspx> for a listing of the following forms:

- *Form for Ridesharing, Shuttles, Transit Information, Rail/Bus Integration, Smart Growth, and Traffic Calming Projects. (Includes Transit Bus Signal Priority.)*
- *Form for Clean Air Vehicle and Infrastructure Projects*
- *Form for Bicycle Projects*
- *Form for Arterial Management Projects*

- I. Attach a completed Cost-effectiveness Worksheet and any other information used to evaluate the proposed project. *For example, for vehicle projects, include the California Air Resources Board Executive Orders for all engines and diesel emission control systems. Note, Cost-effectiveness Worksheets are not needed for TFCA County Program Managers' own administrative costs.*

- J. Comments (if any):
Add any relevant clarifying information in this section.



March 7, 2013
TAC Agenda Item 11
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, Assoc. Program Planner
(707) 259-5968 / Email: dschmitz@nctpa.net
SUBJECT: Priority Development Area (PDA) Investment and Growth Strategy –
Draft Outline Review

RECOMMENDATION

TAC review draft PDA Investment and Growth Strategy Outline and provide comments back to Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCPTA) **by Friday, March 29, 2013, 5:00 PM (local)**.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SB 375 requires the state's 18 metropolitan areas, including the Bay Area, to develop strategies to reduce transportation-related greenhouse gas emissions. The law 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.

This PDA development strategy will be a working document to assist in priority-setting

for transportation funding such as the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG), which supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs. Recognizing the diversity of Napa County's PDAs will require different strategies.

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

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 in programming funds, to allow each PDA to meet its housing and job goals. The first step in the PDA process is to prepare an inventory of the PDAs and the current conditions within the PDA, document any planning that has already occurred, and identify the planning and capital needs of the PDA. There are two different PDAs within Napa County that have different PDA statuses. The City of American Canyon has a potential PDA, and the City of Napa has a planned PDA. The main difference between these two PDA designations is that a potential PDA needs assistance with further detailed planning. This planning would include a specific plan, area plan, master plan, redevelopment plan, or more detailed section of the general plan that has been adopted by the city council. Planned PDAs already have a more detailed PDA plan and have the necessary zoning and general plan updates so that all planning documents and development regulations are consistent, and the necessary CEQA review has been completed.

This Investment and Growth Strategy document is not only a requirement of NCTPA under MTC's Resolution 4015, it is meant to be used as an ongoing tool for the CMAs and their member jurisdictions. Due to time constraints and available data, this PDA document will focus primarily on the existing conditions of the PDAs within Napa County and what future transportation infrastructure and strategies are needed to help the PDA meet its goals. This document is the beginning piece in a working process that allows for CMAs such as NCTPA, to monitor more closely land use policies and development within its jurisdictions to help achieve the goals of Plan Bay Area such as reduction of GHG and more transit oriented development. Topics addressed in the PDA assessment may include: current development status, pipeline projects, investment strategies, community support, transportation assets, bike and pedestrian infrastructure, incentives to attract market development, etc.

The PDA Investment and Growth Strategy document will be a living and working document for NCTPA. Staff hopes to have a completed adopted PDA Investment and Growth Strategy approved by the NCTPA Board at its April Board meeting. MTC is requiring all CMAs to turn in a first draft of their PDA investment and growth strategy on

May 1, 2013. NCTPA, along with the other CMAs, will be giving a presentation to the MTC Commission on its PDA Investment and Growth Strategy in the spring.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachments: (1) PDA Investment and Growth Strategy – Draft (*to be provided at meeting*)



March 7, 2013
TAC Agenda Item 12
Continued From: February 2013
Action Requested: ACTION

NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

TO: Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
FROM: Kate Miller, Executive Director
REPORT BY: Danielle Schmitz, Associate Program Planner
(707) 259-5968 / Email: dschmitz@nctpa.net
SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Cycle 2 One Bay Area Grant
(OBAG) Projects – Final List and Safe Routes to School (SRTS)
Project Submittals

RECOMMENDATION

TAC will review and make a recommendation to the NCTPA Board to approve final OBAG projects for FY 2012-13 through 2015-16 and review SRTS project submittals.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The NCTPA Board opened a call for Cycle 2 projects at their October 17, 2012 meeting. Project submittals were due to NCTPA by 5:00 PM on December 14, 2012. The TAC is the review committee for Cycle 2 projects and will recommend a final list of projects to the NCTPA Board.

NCTPA received 18 project submittals totaling \$15.7 million. Of the 18 projects, 7 of them, totaling \$8 million, meet the PDA minimum requirement of \$2 million.

At the January 2013 TAC meeting, each jurisdiction was asked to resubmit their projects in priority order. On January 24, 2013, TAC held a working group meeting and discussed prioritization of the OBAG funding. At the February 7, 2013, TAC meeting TAC agreed on a tentative breakdown of funds. Staff asked TAC to resubmit their priority project(s) based on their allocation of OBAG funding. TAC will make a recommendation to the NCTPA Board for final approval of OBAG projects at their March 20, 2013, meeting.

Tentative OBAG Funding Breakdown:

City of Napa	\$1,804,769
American Canyon	\$1,153,928
County of Napa	\$ 793,811
Calistoga	\$ 57,228
St. Helena	\$ 121,036
Yountville	\$ 57,228
Total	\$3,988,000

FISCAL IMPACT

Is there a Fiscal Impact? The applications will determine which projects are best suited to receive federal aid funding through Cycle 2 OBAG – approximately \$4 million.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

The OBAG Program will allocate approximately \$4 million to Napa County jurisdictions for the 4-year cycle FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16. The OBAG Program will require that Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) program at least 50% of the countywide OBAG funds in Priority Development Areas (PDA) or to projects that provide “proximate access” to PDAs. All OBAG funds will be contingent on a series of requirements, including the establishment of a local “Complete Streets” program as well as having a General Plan housing element approved by the State Housing and Community Development Department. NCTPA will be responsible for ensuring compliance of these requirements.

The OBAG Program strives to better integrate the region’s federal transportation program with California’s climate law (Senate Bill 375, Steinberg, 2008) and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) mandated by that legislation. According to MTC, funding distribution to the nine (9) Bay Area counties will consider progress toward achieving local land-use and housing policies by:

- Rewarding jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing using transportation dollars as incentives.
- Supporting Bay Area SCS by promoting transportation investments in PDAs and by initiating a pilot program that will support open space preservation in Priority Conservation Areas (PCA). Additional funding for each county has been set aside to support these efforts and additional information regarding these opportunities will follow in December.

- Providing a higher proportion of funding to local agencies and additional investment flexibility by eliminating required program investment targets (the OBAG program allows each county the flexibility to invest in transportation categories, such as Transportation for Livable Communities, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning activities, while also providing specific funding opportunities for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) and PCA.

The OBAG Program establishes program commitments and policies for investing roughly \$320 million over RTP Cycle 2, a 4-year period (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16), funded through the new federal transportation legislation, "MAP-21".

At the January 2013 TAC meeting, each jurisdiction was asked to resubmit their projects in priority order. On January 24, 2013, TAC held a working group meeting and discussed prioritization of the OBAG funding. At the February 7, 2013, TAC meeting TAC agreed on a tentative breakdown of OBAG funds by jurisdiction. Staff asked TAC to re-submit their priority project/s based on their allocation of OBAG funding. TAC is being asked to make a recommendation to the NCTPA Board for final approval of OBAG projects at their March 20, 2013, meeting.

At the last TAC meeting, the City of Napa stated it could take on the funding exchange with the smaller jurisdictions, providing local funds in exchange for OBAG funds. The City of Napa is proposing a 75% exchange rate in taking on this responsibility due to the local assistance process and the high cost of spending federal dollars (see attachment 2). TAC will need to agree on the terms of the exchange before the projects are sent to the Board for final approval.

OBAG projects that are submitted to MTC by the April 1st deadline will be included in the last amendment of the 2011 TIP approved by the FWHA on May 31, 2013. Funds could then be obligated in August 2013 timeframe. OBAG projects submitted to MTC by the August 1st deadline will be approved in the first amendment of the 2013 TIP, scheduled for September 2013. Funds could then be obligated in November 2013 timeframe.

Deadline to Submit to MTC	MTC approval	FHWA Approval	NCTPA Projects
Feb 21	2013 TIP	Dec 2013	Carry over 2011 TIP
Apr 1	2011 TIP	May 30, 2013	Carry over 2011 TIP OBAG
Aug 1	2013 TIP	September 30, 2013	Remaining OBAG

During the unified call for Cycle 2 projects NCTPA also asked jurisdictions to submit projects for the Regional Safe Routes to School Program. Two specific Safe Routes to School Projects were submitted, City of Napa Browns Valley Sidewalk Improvements, and the Napa County Office of Education Safe Routes to School Program.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

- Attachments:
- (1) Cycle 2 Funding Tables
 - (2) City of Napa's Funding Proposal
 - (3) Proposed Final OBAG Program of Projects
 - (4) Proposed Final OBAG Program including City of Napa Proposal
 - (5) Safe Route to School Project Submittals

RTP- Cycle 2 Funds

1) All Cycle 2 Funds FY 12/13 through FY 15/16:

SR2S	STP	TE	CMAQ	TOTAL
\$420,000	\$4,787,000	\$431,000	\$1,443,000	\$7,081,000

This does not include PCA funds which is a \$5 million dollar competitive program for 4 North Bay Counties

2) One Bay Area Grant Funds (does not include SR2S or PCA):

Napa County	STP	CMAQ	RTIP TE	Total
Specific Projects TBD by Napa	\$2,114,000	\$1,443,000	\$431,000	\$3,988,000
<i>CMA Planning Activities (NCTPA)</i>	<i>\$2,673,000</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$0</i>	<i>\$2,673,000</i>
Total	\$4,787,000	\$1,443,000	\$431,000	\$6,661,000

3) Planning Funds (NCTPA) – STP \$\$

	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	STP TOTAL
NCTPA	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000

4) STP/CMAQ split

	STP - 72%	CMAQ - 22%	TE – 7%	Total
Napa County	\$4,787,000	\$1,443,000	\$431,000	\$6,661,000

5) PDA Minimum Requirement

	OBAG funds	PDA/Anywhere split	PDA	Anywhere
Napa County	\$6,661,000	50/50	\$3,330,500*	\$3,330,500

*50% of NCTPA planning funds (\$1,336,500) *can* count toward the PDA minimum requirement

6) OBAG funds: STP/CMAQ/TE after planning funds are taken off the top

	FY 12-13	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	TOTAL
Napa County	\$997,000	\$997,000	\$997,000	\$997,000	\$3,988,000

7) OBAG Funding Breakdown Options

	TOTAL FUNDS (STP,CMAQ, TE)	PDA	Anywhere
Option 1	\$3,988,000	\$3,330,500	\$657,500
Option 2 - 50% of Planning funds count toward PDA Minimum	\$3,988,000	\$1,994,000	\$1,994,000

Cycle 2 Funds Criteria:

STP Funds: \$2,114,000 – Available for projects – subject to One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) requirements

Eligible projects are any project on the any federal aid highway, including the national highway system; bridges on any public highway; transit capital projects; and inter-city/intra-city bus terminals and facilities.

Eligible project types (Title 23 USC, Chapter 1, Section 133) include:

- Construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration and operational improvements for highway and bridge projects, including bridge seismic retrofit, painting and application of calcium magnesium acetate, sodium acetate/formate, or other environmentally acceptable, minimally corrosive anti-icing and de-icing compositions. Also included are the necessary engineering, right-of-way and environmental mitigation for these activities.
- Transit capital projects under Chapter 53 of 49 USC including vehicles and facilities, whether publicly or privately owned, that are used to provide inter-city passenger service by bus.
- Carpool projects, fringe and corridor parking facilities, bicycle facilities and non-construction projects, pedestrian walkways, and modification of public sidewalks to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 USC 12101 et seq.).
- Highway and transit safety infrastructure projects, hazard eliminations, projects to mitigate hazards caused by wildlife, and railway-highway grade crossing elimination or improvement.
- Highway and transit research and development and technology transfer programs.
- Capital and operating costs for traffic monitoring, management and control facilities and programs.
- Surface transportation planning programs.
- Transportation enhancement activities.
- Transportation control measures listed in Section 108(f)(1)(A) of the Clean Air Act excluding clause (xvi).
- Development and establishment of management systems under Title 23 USC, section 303.
- Wetlands mitigation and natural habitat efforts related to projects funded under Title 23 USC.
- Capital improvements for infrastructure-based intelligent transportation systems.
- Environmental restoration and pollution abatement projects, including retrofit or construction of stormwater treatment facilities (limited to 20% of the total cost of reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, or restoration projects).

CMAQ: \$1,443,000 – subject to OBAG requirements

The general eligibility criteria for CMAQ funding is for projects to have expected reductions in carbon monoxide, ozone precursor, or PM emissions.

Eligible Project Types:

- Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)
- Extreme Low-Temperature Cold Start Programs
- Alternative Fuels and Vehicles
- Congestion Reduction & Traffic Flow Improvements
- Transit Improvements
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities and Programs

- Travel Demand Management
- Public Education and Outreach Activities
- Transportation Management Associations
- Carpooling and Vanpooling
- Freight/Intermodal
- Diesel Engine Retrofits & Other Advanced Truck Technologies
- Idle Reduction
- Training for Transportation Workforce
- Inspection/Maintenance (I/M) Programs
- Experimental Pilot Projects

TE: \$431,000 – subject to OBAG requirements

Transportation Enhancement activities must have a direct relationship – by function, proximity or impact – to the surface transportation system. Activities must be over and above normal projects, including mitigation.

This list is exclusive. Only these activities are eligible to be accounted for as Transportation Enhancement activities. They are:

1. Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles.
2. Provision of safety and educational activities for pedestrians and bicyclists.
3. Acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites (including historic battlefields).
4. Scenic or historic highway programs (including the provision of tourist and welcome center facilities).
5. Landscaping and other scenic beautification.
6. Historic preservation.
7. Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures or facilities (including historic railroad facilities and canals).
8. Preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian or bicycle trails).
9. Inventory, control and removal of outdoor advertising.
10. Archaeological planning and research.
11. Environmental mitigation to address water pollution due to highway runoff or reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity
12. Establishment of transportation museums.

SR2S: \$420,000 –

Eligible projects include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. SR2S is CMAQ funded and therefore has an emphasis on air quality improvement rather than children's health and safety. Nevertheless CMAQ can fund all specific improvements that are eligible in the State and Federal SR2S Programs with the following exceptions: walking audits and other planning activities, crossing guards and vehicle speed feedback devices, traffic control that is primarily oriented to vehicular traffic rather than bicyclists and pedestrians, and material incentives that lack an educational message or exceeding a nominal cost. Refer to the following link for detailed examples of eligible projects: <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ>

PCA: Competitive –

This is a \$10 million dollar grant of which the first \$5 million is only available to the 4 North Bay counties: Marin, Sonoma, Napa, and Solano.

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

Project Delivery and Monitoring -

MTC's guidelines for project delivering and monitoring are outlined below. In addition to the guidelines below, projects that are not obligated 2 months prior to the deadline will be re-programmed to an existing federalized project. The first priority will be to another jurisdiction in the county. Future programming may be reduced for project sponsors with project revenues that are not obligated by the deadline or in any way result in the loss of STP CMAQ funding to the countywide funds. NCTPA has implemented a project monitoring process and will remind project sponsors of specific deadlines associated with managing the STP/CMAQ revenues. Jurisdictions are responsible for reviewing, understanding and adhering to the guidelines in MTC's Resolution 3606 and OBAG Resolution 4035.

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

All Cycle 2 funding is subject to the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and any subsequent revisions (MTC Resolution No. 3606 at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf). Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy. All funds are subject to obligation, award, invoicing, reimbursement and project close out requirements. The failure to meet these deadlines may result in the de-programming and redirection to other projects.

To further facilitate project delivery and ensure all federal funds in the region are meeting federal and state regulations and deadlines, every recipient of Cycle 2 funding will need to identify a staff position that serves as the single point of contact for the implementation of all FHWA-administered funds within that agency. The person in this position must have sufficient knowledge and expertise in the federal-aid delivery process to coordinate issues and questions that may arise from project inception to project close-out. The agency is required to identify the contact information for this position at the time of

programming of funds in the federal TIP. This person will be expected to work closely with FHWA, Caltrans, MTC and the respective CMA on all issues related to federal funding for all FHWA-funded projects implemented by the recipient.

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

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

Local Match –

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

City of Napa Proposal

Sponsor	Funding Distribution Amount	RTIP ID	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location (Include specific street names and limits)	Funding Request	Identify Phase: ROW/PE/CON	Local Match	Total Project Cost	Type of Fund (STP/CMAQ/TA)	Start Year	Notes
City of Napa	\$1,504,769 (\$1,073,769 + \$431,000)	22746	First & Second St Roundabouts	Construct roundabouts at the intersections of First St/California Blvd and Second	First/California; Second/California	\$1,740,261 (\$1,504,769 + \$235,492)	PE/ROW/CON	\$2,778,739	\$4,519,000	CMAQ = \$1,073,769; TA = \$431,000; STP = \$235,492	2013	Funding includes \$235,492 in STP from smaller cities through funding exchange
City of Napa	\$300,000	240612	Napa North/South Bike Connection	Construct Class II bike lanes on California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	\$300,000	CON	\$312,000	\$884,000	CMAQ	2013	This is a Cycle I project. It is designed and ready for submittal to Caltrans for construction obligation (E76). Additional \$300,000 needed for construction due to change in project design resulting from previously unknown field conditions.
American Canyon	\$1,153,928					\$1,153,928				STP = \$1,084,697; CMAQ = \$69,231		
County	\$793,811					\$793,811				STP		
Calistoga	\$57,228					\$42,921		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value
St. Helena	\$121,036					\$90,777		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value
Yountville	\$57,228					\$42,921		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value

Final OBAG Proposal

Sponsor	Funding Distribution Amount	RTIP ID	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location (Include specific street names and limits)	Funding Request	Identify Phase: ROW/PE/CON	Local Match	Total Project Cost	Type of Fund (STP/CMAQ/TA)	Start Year	Notes
City of Napa	\$1,504,769 (\$1,073,769 + \$431,000)	22746	First & Second St Roundabouts	Construct roundabouts at the intersections of First St/California Blvd and Second	First/California; Second/California	\$1,504,769	PE/ROW/CON	\$2,778,739	\$4,519,000	CMAQ = \$1,073,769; TA = \$431,000	2013	
City of Napa	\$300,000	240612	Napa North/South Bike Connection	Construct Class II bike lanes on California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	\$300,000	CON	\$312,000	\$884,000	CMAQ	2013	This is a Cycle I project. It is designed and ready for submittal to Caltrans for construction obligation (E76). Additional \$300,000 needed for construction due to change in project design resulting from previously unknown field conditions.
American Canyon	\$1,153,928	240057	Eucalyptus Drive Reroute	Reroutes Eucalyptus Dr. from Theresa Rd. to intersection with Hwy 29; removes signal at Rio Del Mar constructs auxiallary lane southbound Hwy 29 between Napa Jct Rd and Rio del Mar; Reroutes pedestrians to new Eucalyptus/Hwy 29 crosswalk	Eucalyptus Dr. west from Hwy 29 to 1,500 feet west and south from Los Altos to Rio del Mar; Theresa Ave from Los Altos to 1,000 feet north; Hwy 29 from 300-ft south of Eucalyptus Dr to Napa Jct Rd; Rio del Mar intersection	\$1,153,928	ENV/PE/RW	\$149,500	\$4,523,000	STP = \$1,084,697; CMAQ = \$69,231	2013	ENV - \$73,500; PE- \$371,800; R/W - \$708,200
Napa County	\$793,811	230695	Silverado Trail Phase "H" Overlay	Overlay from Howell Mountain Road to Zinfadel Lane; existing class II bike lanes will be enhanced	Silverado Trail Howell Mountain Road to Zinfadel Lane	\$793,811	CON	\$890,184	\$1,684,000	STP	2014	
Calistoga	\$57,228							\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa?
St. Helena	\$121,036							\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa?
Yountville	\$57,228							\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa?

Final OBAG Program Including Napa Proposal

Sponsor	Funding Distribution Amount	RTIP ID	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location (Include specific street names and limits)	Funding Request	Identify Phase: ROW/PE/CON	Local Match	Total Project Cost	Type of Fund (STP/CMAQ/TA)	Start Year	Notes
City of Napa	\$1,504,769 (\$1,073,769 + \$431,000)	22746	First & Second St Roundabouts	Construct roundabouts at the intersections of First St/California Blvd and Second	First/California; Second/California	\$1,740,261 (\$1,504,769 + \$235,492)	PE/ROW/CON	\$2,778,739	\$4,519,000	CMAQ = \$1,073,769; TA = \$431,000; STP = \$235,492	2013	Funding includes \$235,492 in STP from smaller cities through funding exchange
City of Napa	\$300,000	240612	Napa North/South Bike Connection	Construct Class II bike lanes on California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	California Blvd between Pueblo Ave and Permanente Way	\$300,000	CON	\$312,000	\$884,000	CMAQ	2013	This is a Cycle I project. It is designed and ready for submittal to Caltrans for construction obligation (E76). Additional \$300,000 needed for construction due to change in project design resulting from previously unknown field conditions.
American Canyon	\$1,153,928	240057	Eucalyptus Drive Reroute	Retoutes Eucalyptus Dr. from Theresa Rd. to intersection with Hwy 29; removes signal at Rio Del Mar constructs auxiallary lane southbound Hwy 29 between Napa Jct Rd and Rio del Mar; Reroutes pedestrians to new Eucalyptus/Hwy 29 crosswalk	Eucalyptus Dr. west from Hwy 29 to 1,500 feet west and south from Los Altos to Rio del Mar; Theresa Ave from Los Altos to 1,000 feet north; Hwy 29 from 300-ft south of Eucalyptus Dr to Napa Jct Rd; Rio del Mar intersection	\$1,153,928	ENV/PE/RW	\$149,500	\$4,523,000	STP = \$1,084,697; CMAQ = \$69,231	2013	ENV - \$73,500; PE- \$371,800; R/W - \$708,200
Napa County	\$793,811	230695	Silverado Trail Phase "H" Overlay	Overlay from Howell Mountain Road to Zinfadel Lane; existing class II bike lanes will be enhanced	Silverado Trail Howell Mountain Road to Zinfadel Lane	\$793,811	CON	\$890,184	\$1,684,000	STP	2014	
Total						\$3,988,000						
Non-federal Funds												
Calistoga	\$57,228					\$42,921		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value
St. Helena	\$121,036					\$90,777		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value
Yountville	\$57,228					\$42,921		\$0		Local Gas Tax		Funding Exchange with Cityof Napa at 75% value



March 7, 2013
TAC Agenda Item 13
Continued From: NEW
Action Requested: ACTION

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
SUBJECT: 2013 Federal and State Legislative Program and Project Priorities

RECOMMENDATION

That the TAC review the 2013 State and Federal Legislative Advocacy programs and refer it to the NCTPA Board for approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Attachment 1 contains the proposed 2013 Federal and State Legislative Agenda and Project Priorities. The Agenda and Priorities is a strategy to help focus agency efforts in order to meet key goals and objectives.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

Is there a fiscal impact? No.

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

Adopting the 2013 Federal and State Legislative Agenda and Project Priorities is part of a larger initiative to better focus agency resources and efforts in order to attain critical goals and objectives. The process is intended to help guide the Board's direction to staff on legislative advocacy and regulatory issues affecting the agency and transportation and land use issues in Napa County.

The proposed federal and state priorities focus largely on funding, streamlining project delivery, reducing congestion and improving the environment. The projects listed are key priorities currently in various stages of planning that are not fully funded and have been deemed significant by the public and/or NCTPA's transportation partners.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

Attachment: (1) 2013 Federal and State Legislative Advocacy Programs and Project
Priorities

2013 Federal and State Legislative Advocacy Program and Project Priorities

Federal Legislative Advocacy Program

- Revenues
 - Work closely with legislators, Caltrans, regional agencies, and transportation partners on a new Transportation Authorization that sufficiently increases transportation revenues builds on framework established by MAP-21.
 - Support efforts that would restore revenues to the Highway Trust Fund and Mass Transit Account.
 - Support efforts that protect transportation programs subject to sequestration.
 - Increase appropriations levels for Small Starts projects.

State Legislative Advocacy Program

- Revenues
 - Work closely with state legislators and agencies to maximize AB 32 Cap and Trade revenues for transportation projects and initiatives.
 - Support efforts to lower the 2/3rds voting threshold for local transportation sales tax measures.
 - Support efforts that identify longer term and permanent solutions to address transportation infrastructure funding shortfalls.
 - Protect transportation funds from strategies that allow diversion of these revenues for general fund purposes.
 - Maximize the sub-allocation of MAP-21 federal transportation funds to metropolitan areas.
 - Support efforts to identify revenues and mechanisms to implement redevelopment projects and support priority development areas.
- Project Delivery
 - Support efforts to streamline project delivery requirements and reduce costs for delivering projects.
 - Support efforts that streamline California Environmental Quality Act processes.
- Environment
 - Support regulatory and legislative efforts to encourage van pools, transit use, and alternative commute options.
 - Support regulatory efforts that encourage green business practices.

- Congestion Relief
 - Support efforts to establish and maintain HOV lanes on state highways.
 - Support Caltrans efforts to expand traveler information and other solutions that reduce congestion and increase throughput.
- Regulatory Reform
 - Support legislation to exempt public transit vehicles from state and local truck route ordinances.

Project Priorities

- Improvements to State Route 29 prioritized in the State Route 29 Gateway Corridor Plan
- Transit Maintenance Facility
- Fueling Facility
- Upgrades to Soscal Gateway Transit Center



625 Burnell Street, Napa CA 94559

March 7, 2013
TAC Agenda Item 14
Continued From: NEW
Action requested: INFORMATION

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA)

Board of Directors

AGENDA

Wednesday, March 20, 2013
1:30 p.m.

NCTPA/NVTA Conference Room
625 Burnell Street
Napa CA 94559
(Note Meeting Location)

General Information

All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the NCTPA Board of Directors are posted on our website at www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12 at least 72 hours prior to the meeting and will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Secretary of the NCTPA Board of Directors, 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 the present members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the NCTPA Board 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 Board on any item at the time the Board 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 Board Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board 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 Karrie Sanderlin, NCTPA Board Secretary, at (707) 259-8631 during regular business hours, at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

This Agenda may also be viewed online by visiting the NCTPA website at www.nctpa.net, click on Minutes and Agendas – NCTPA Board or go to www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12

ITEMS

1. Call to Order – Chair Keith Caldwell
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call

Members:

- | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Joan Bennett | City of American Canyon |
| Leon Garcia, Mayor | City of American Canyon |
| Chris Canning, Mayor | City of Calistoga |
| Michael Dunsford | City of Calistoga |
| Scott Sedgley | City of Napa |
| Jill Techel, Mayor | City of Napa |
| Keith Caldwell, BOS Chair | County of Napa |
| Bill Dodd | County of Napa |
| Ann Nevero, Mayor | City of St. Helena |
| Peter White | City of St. Helena |
| Lewis Chilton | Town of Yountville |
| John F. Dunbar, Mayor | Town of Yountville |
| JoAnn Busenbark | Paratransit Coordinating Council |

4. Public Comment
5. Chairperson, Board Members' and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Update
6. Directors Update
7. Caltrans' Update

8. **CONSENT ITEMS (8.1 – 8.7)**

RECOMMENDATION

8.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes of February 20, 2013 (Karrie Sanderlin) (Pages x-xx) APPROVE

8.2 Wilber Smith Contract Amendment (Tom Roberts/Lawrence Gawell) (Pages xx-xx) APPROVE

Board action will approve an amendment to NCTPA Agreement No. XXXXX with Wilbur Smith for XXXXXXXXX

8.3 Notice of Acceptance Soscol Gateway Transit Center (SGTC) (Lawrence Gawell) (Pages xx-xx) APPROVE

Board action will approve issuing a Notice of Acceptance to begin construction close out of the Soscal Gateway Transit Center.

- 8.4 Soscol Gateway Transit Center (SGTC) Public Restrooms Update (Lawrence Gawell) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION/
ACTION

Board action will
- 8.5 Napa Valley Travel Behavior Study (Lawrence Gawell) *(Pages x-x)* APPROVE

Board action will approve award of the Napa Valley Travel Behavior Study contract to XXXXX in an amount not to exceed \$\$\$\$\$\$.
- 8.6 Approval for Disposal of Agency Vehicle (Antonio Onorato) *(Pages xx-xx)* APPROVE

Board action will.
- 8.7 Approval of Resolution No. 13-XX Authorizing the Submittal of an Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5311 Grant Application (Antonio Onorato) *(Page xxxxx)* APPROVE

Board action will
- 9. **PUBLIC HEARING** **TIME CERTIN**
1.30 P.M.
APPROVE
 - 9.1 Public Hearing and Approval of Resolution No. 13-XX Authorizing the Submittal of a Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 Grant Application (Tom Roberts) *(Pages xx-xx)*

Board action will approve
- 10. **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS** **RECOMMENDATION**
 - 10.1 Legislative Update and Action (Kate Miller) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION/
ACTION
 - a. Introduction of Platinum Advisors and State Legislative Update

Board action will receive State Legislative Update
 - b. 2013 State and Federal Legislative Agenda

Board action will approve the 2013 State and Federal legislative agendas.

10.2 Priority Development Area (PDA) Growth Strategy (Danielle Schmitz) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION

Board action will

10.3 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Cycle 2 One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Projects – Final List (Danielle Schmitz) *(Pages xx-xx)* APPROVE

Board action will approve the final list OBAG project list for FY 2012-13.

10.4 Joint Powers Authority (JPA) Agreement Weighted Vote Review (Karrie Sanderlin) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION

Board action will receive staff report.

10.5 Professional Legal Services (Kate Miller) *(Pages xx-xx)* APPROVE

Board action will

10.6 SR 29 Corridor Study Plan and SR29 Projects Update (Eliot Hurwitz) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION

Staff will provide an update on all SR 29 Corridor projects.

10.7 Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) (Tom Roberts) *(Pages xx-xx)* APPROVE

Board action will

10.8 Request for Proposal (RFP) Process Review (Lawrence Gawell) *(Pages xx-xx)* INFORMATION

Staff will review the process for issuance of an RFP.

10.9 Approval of Resolution No. 13-XX Authorizing the Submittal of an Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5317 Grant Application (Tom Roberts) *(Pages xx-xx)* APPROVE

Board action will

11. **INTERJURISDICTIONAL ISSUES FORUM**

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.1 Interjurisdictional Issues Discussion Forum and Information Exchange

INFORMATION/
ACTION

Board Members are encouraged to share specific new projects with interjurisdictional impacts.

12. **ADJOURNMENT**

RECOMMENDATION

- 12.1 Approval of Meeting Date of April 17, 2013 and Adjournment

APPROVE

I hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location freely accessible to members of the public at the NCTPA offices, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, CA, by 5:00 p.m., Friday March 15, 2013.

Karalyn E. Sanderlin, NCTPA Board Secretary

DRAFT