

Date: May 17, 2012  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: Planning  
Revised: 10/24/12-C  
11/28/12-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4035, Revised

This resolution adopts the Project Selection Policies and Programming for federal Surface Transportation Authorization Act following the Safe, Accountable, Flexible and Efficient Transportation Equity Act (SAFETEA), and any extensions of SAFETEA in the interim. The Project Selection Policies contain the project categories that are to be funded with various fund sources including federal surface transportation act funding available to MTC for its programming discretion to be included in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The resolution includes the following attachments:

- Attachment A – Project Selection Policies
- Attachment B-1 – Regional Program Project List
- Attachment B-2 – OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Project List

Attachment A (page 13) was revised on October 24, 2012 to update the PDA Investment & Growth Strategy (Appendix A-6) and to update county OBAG fund distributions using the most current RHNA data (Appendix A-1 and Appendix A-4). The Commission also directed \$20 million of the \$40 million in the regional PDA Implementation program to eight CMAAs and the San Francisco Planning Department for local PDA planning implementation. Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to add new projects selected by the Solano Transportation Authority and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and to add projects under the Freeway Performance Initiative and to reflect the redirection of the \$20 million in PDA planning implementation funds.

Attachment A (pages 8, 9 and 13) was revised on November 28, 2012 to confirm and clarify the actions on October 24, 2012 with respect to the County PDA Planning Program.

Further discussion of the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policies is contained in the memorandum to the Joint Planning Committee dated May 11, 2012; and to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated October 10, 2012.

Date: May 17, 2012  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred By: Planning

RE: Federal Cycle 2 Program covering FY 2012-13, FY 2013-14, FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16:  
Project Selection Policies and Programming

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. 4035

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region and is required to prepare and endorse a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which includes federal funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated recipient for federal funding administered by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) assigned to the MPO/RTPA of the San Francisco Bay Area for the programming of projects (regional federal funds); and

WHEREAS, the federal funds assigned to the MPOs/RTPAs for their discretion are subject to availability and must be used within prescribed funding deadlines regardless of project readiness; and

WHEREAS, MTC, in cooperation with the Association of Bay Area Governments, (ABAG), the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC), California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), transit operators, counties, cities, and interested stakeholders, has developed criteria, policies and procedures to be used in the selection of projects to be funded with various funding including regional federal funds as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution, incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS, using the policies set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution, MTC, in cooperation with the Bay Area Partnership and interested stakeholders, has or will develop a program of projects to be funded with these funds for inclusion in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), as set forth in Attachments B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution, incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and

WHEREAS the federal TIP and subsequent TIP amendments and updates are subject to public review and comment; now therefore be it

RESOLVED that MTC approves the "Project Selection Policies and Programming" for projects to be funded with Cycle 2 Program funds as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that the federal funding shall be pooled and redistributed on a regional basis for implementation of Project Selection Criteria, Policies, Procedures and Programming, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and be it further

RESOLVED that the projects will be included in the federal TIP subject to final federal approval; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or his designee can make technical adjustments and other non-substantial revisions, including updates to fund distributions to reflect final 2014-2022 FHWA figures; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee is authorized to revise Attachments B-1 and B-2 as necessary to reflect the programming of projects as the projects are selected and included in the federal TIP; and be it further

RESOLVED that the Executive Director shall make available a copy of this resolution, and such other information as may be required, to the Governor, Caltrans, and to other such agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at the regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California, on May 17, 2012

Date: May 17, 2012  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: Planning  
Revised: 10/24/12-C  
11/28/12-C

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 4035

# **Cycle 2 Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy**

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

*This page intentionally left blank*

# Cycle 2 Program Policy and Programming

## Table of Contents

**BACKGROUND.....1**  
**CYCLE 2 REVENUE ESTIMATES AND FEDERAL PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE .....1**  
**NEW FUNDING APPROACH FOR CYCLE 2—THE ONEBAYAREA GRANT.....2**  
**CYCLE 2 GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES .....3**  
**REGIONAL PROGRAMS .....8**  
**ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAMMING POLICIES.....10**  
**CYCLE 2 COUNTY ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROJECT GUIDANCE .....14**  
**PROGRAM SCHEDULE .....18**

**Appendices**

**Appendix A-1      Cycle 2 Regional and County Programs**  
**Appendix A-2      Cycle 2 Planning Activities**  
**Appendix A-3      Safe Routes to School County Fund Distribution**  
**Appendix A-4      OBAG County Fund Distribution**  
**Appendix A-5      OBAG Call for Projects Guidance**  
**Appendix A-6      PDA Investment and Growth Strategy**  
**Appendix A-7      County PDA Implementation**

## **BACKGROUND**

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

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

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

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

## **CYCLE 2 REVENUE ESTIMATES AND FEDERAL PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE**

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

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

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

## **NEW FUNDING APPROACH FOR CYCLE 2—THE ONEBAYAREA GRANT**

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

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

### Project List

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

### OneBayArea Grant Fund Distribution Formula

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

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

### **OBAG Fund Distribution Factors**

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

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

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

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

## **CYCLE 2 GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES**

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

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

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

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

2. **Commission Approval of Programs and Projects and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).** Projects approved as part of the Cycle 2 Program must be amended into the federal TIP. The federally required TIP is a comprehensive listing of all San Francisco Bay Area surface transportation projects that receive federal funds, and/or are subject to a federally required action, such as federal environmental clearance, and/or are regionally significant for air quality conformity or modeling purposes. It is the project sponsor's responsibility to ensure their project is properly programmed in the TIP in a timely manner. Where CMAs are responsible for project selection the Commission will revise the TIP to include the resulting projects and Attachment B to this Resolution may be amended by MTC staff to reflect these revisions. Where responsibility for project selection in the framework of a Cycle 2 funding program is assigned to MTC, TIP amendments and a revision to Attachment B will be reviewed and approved by the Commission.
3. **Minimum Grant Size.** The objective of a grant minimum requirement is to maximize the efficient use of federal funds and minimize the number of federal-aid projects which place administrative burdens on project sponsors, CMAs, MTC, Caltrans, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) staff. Funding grants per project must therefore be a minimum of \$500,000 for counties with a population over 1 million (Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties) and \$250,000 for counties with a population under one million (Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma counties).

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

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

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

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

5. **Environmental Clearance.** Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.
6. **Application, Resolution of Local Support.** Project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding through MTC’s Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) an application submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff, and 2) Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor’s governing board or council. A template for the resolution of local support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link:  
[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP\\_CMAQ\\_LocalSupportReso.doc](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP_CMAQ_LocalSupportReso.doc)
7. **Project Screening and Compliance with Regional and Federal Requirements.** MTC staff will perform a review of projects proposed for the Cycle 2 Program to ensure 1) eligibility; 2) consistency with the RTP; and 3) project readiness. In addition, project sponsors must adhere to directives such as “Complete Streets” (MTC Routine Accommodations for Bicyclists and Pedestrians); and the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy as outlined below; and provide the required matching funds. Project sponsors should note that fund source programs, eligibility criteria, and regulations may change as a result of the passage of new surface transportation authorization legislation. In this situation, MTC staff will work to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission.
  - ▶ **Federal Project Eligibility:** STP has a wide range of projects that are eligible for consideration in the TIP. Eligible projects include, federal-aid highway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational), mitigation related to an STP project, public transit capital improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, and transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.

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

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

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

- ▶ **RTP Consistency**: Projects included in the Cycle 2 Program must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), according to federal planning regulations. Each project included in the Cycle 2 Program must identify its relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, and where applicable, the RTP ID number or reference.
  
- ▶ **Complete Streets (MTC Routine Accommodations of Pedestrians and Bicyclists) Policy**: Federal, state and regional policies and directives emphasize the accommodation of bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. MTC's Complete Streets policy (Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure that the accommodation of non-motorized travelers are considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are considered by the county for funds and submitted to MTC. CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review prior to CMAs' project selection actions for Cycle 2.

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

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

All Cycle 2 funding is subject to the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and any subsequent revisions (MTC Resolution No. 3606 at [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC\\_Res\\_3606.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf)) . Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by

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

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

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

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

- ▶ Local Match. Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funding requires a non-federal local match. Based on California's share of the nation's federal lands, the local match for STP and CMAQ is currently 11.47% of the total project cost. The FHWA will reimburse up to 88.53% of the total project cost. Project sponsors are required to provide the required match, which is subject to change.
- ▶ Fixed Program and Specific Project Selection. Projects are chosen for the program based on eligibility, project merit, and deliverability within established deadlines. The Cycle 2 program is project specific and the funds programmed to projects are for those projects alone. The Cycle 2 Program funding is fixed at the programmed amount; therefore, any cost increase may not be covered by additional Cycle 2 funds. Project sponsors are responsible for securing the necessary match, and for cost increases or additional funding needed to complete the project including contingencies.

## **REGIONAL PROGRAMS**

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

### ***1. Regional Planning Activities***

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

### ***2. Regional Operations***

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

### ***3. Freeway Performance Initiative***

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

### ***4. Pavement Management Program***

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

### ***5. Priority Development Area (PDA) Implementation***

Funding in this program implements the following:

**Regional PDA Implementation:**

**ABAG Funding:** Funds directed to ABAG for implementation of PDAs.

**Affordable TOD fund:** This is a continuation of MTC's successful Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund into Cycle 2 which successfully has leveraged a significant amount of outside funding. The TOD fund provides financing for the development of affordable housing and other vital community services near transit lines throughout the Bay Area. Through the Fund, developers can access flexible, affordable capital to purchase or improve available property near transit lines for the development of affordable housing, retail space and other critical services, such as child care centers, fresh food outlets and health clinics.

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

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

**Local PDA Planning & Implementation:** Funds are made available to support local jurisdictions in their planning and implementation of PDAs in each of the nine counties, developed through the county PDA Investment & Growth Strategy in consultation with ABAG and MTC. Funding is distributed to the county CMAs (with funds for San Francisco distributed to the City/County of San Francisco planning department) using the OBAG distribution formula with no county receiving less than \$750,000 as shown in Appendix 5. Local jurisdictions will either directly access these funds through Caltrans Local Assistance similar to other OBAG grants provided to them by the CMAs, the CMAs may choose to provide individual grants to local jurisdictions through a single program administered by the CMA, or the CMA may request that ABAG administer the grants in cooperation with the local jurisdictions. CMA grants to local jurisdictions and the expenditure of funds by the San Francisco Planning Department are to be aligned with the recommendations and priorities identified in their adopted PDA Growth and Investment Strategy; as well as to the PDA Planning Program guidelines as they apply only to those activities relevant to those guidelines. The CMAs are limited to using no more than 5% of the funds for program administration.

**6. Climate Change Initiatives**

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

### **7. Safe Routes to Schools**

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

### **8. Transit Capital Rehabilitation**

The program objective is to assist transit operators to fund major fleet replacements, fixed guideway rehabilitation and other high-scoring capital needs, and implement elements of the Transit Sustainability Project, consistent with the FTA Transit Capital Priorities program (MTC Resolution 4072 or successor resolution). This includes a set-aside of \$1 million to support the consolidation and transition of Vallejo and Benicia bus services to SolTrans.

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

## **ONEBAYAREA GRANT PROGRAMMING POLICIES**

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

- ▶ **Program Eligibility:** The congestion management agency may program funds from its One Bay Area Grant fund distribution to projects that meet the eligibility requirements for any of the following transportation improvement types:
  - Local Streets and Roads Preservation
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
  - Transportation for Livable Communities
  - Safe Routes To School/Transit
  - Priority Conservation Area
  - Planning and Outreach Activities
  
- ▶ **Fund Source Distribution:** OBAG is funded primarily from three federal fund sources: STP, CMAQ and TE. Although the new federal surface transportation authorization act now under consideration may alter the actual fund sources available for MTC's programming discretion it is anticipated that any new federal programs would overlap to a large extent with existing programs. The CMAs will be provided a breakdown of specific OBAG fund sources, with the understanding that actual fund sources may change as a result of the new federal surface transportation act. In this situation, MTC staff will work with the CMAs to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments

approved by the Commission. Furthermore, due to strict funding availability and eligibility requirements, the CMAs must adhere to the fund source limitations provided. Exceptions may be granted by MTC staff based on actual fund sources available and final apportionment levels.

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

► Priority Development Area (PDA) Policies

- PDA minimum: CMAs in larger counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) shall direct at least 70% of their OBAG investments to the PDAs. For North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) this minimum target is 50% to reflect the more rural nature of these counties. A project lying outside the limits of a PDA may count towards the minimum provided that it directly connects to or provides proximate access to a PDA. Depending on the county, CMA planning costs would partially count towards PDA targets (70% or 50%) in line with its PDA funding target. At MTC staff discretion, consideration may be given to counties that provided higher investments in PDAs in Cycle 1 as part of an overall Cycle 1 and 2 investment package. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) investments do not count towards PDA targets and must use “anywhere” funds. The PDA/’anywhere’ funding split is shown in Appendix A-4.
- PDA Boundary Delineation: Refer to <http://geocommons.com/maps/141979> which provides a GIS overlay of the PDAs in the Bay Area to exact map boundaries including transportation facilities. As ABAG considers and approves new PDA designations this map will be updated.
- Defining “proximate access to PDAs”: The CMAs make the determination for projects to count toward the PDA minimum that are not otherwise geographically located within a PDA. For projects not geographically within a PDA, CMAs are required to map projects and designate which projects are considered to support a PDA along with policy justifications. This analysis would be subject to public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions. This should allow decision makers, stakeholders, and the public to understand how an investment outside of a PDA is to be considered to support a PDA and to be

credited towards the PDA investment minimum target. MTC staff will evaluate and report to the Commission on how well this approach achieves the OBAG objectives prior to the next programming cycle.

- PDA Investment & Growth Strategy: By May 1, 2013, CMAs shall prepare and adopt a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy to guide transportation investments that are supportive of PDAs. An existing Investment and Growth Strategy adopted by the County will be considered as meeting this requirement if it satisfies the general terms in Appendix A-6. See Appendix A-6 for details.
- Performance and Accountability Policies: Jurisdictions need to comply with the following policies in order to be eligible recipients of OBAG funds.
- To be eligible for OBAG funds, a jurisdiction will need to address complete streets policies at the local level through the adoption of a complete streets policy resolution no later than January 31, 2013. A jurisdiction can also meet this requirement through a general plan that complies with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. Staff will provide minimum requirements based on best practices for the resolution. As discussed below, jurisdictions will be expected to have a general plan that complies within the Complete Streets Act of 2008 to be eligible for the next round of funding.
  - A jurisdiction is required to have its general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2007-14 RHNA prior to January 31, 2013. If a jurisdiction submits its housing element to the state on a timely basis for review, but the State's comment letter identifies deficiencies that the local jurisdictions must address in order to receive HCD certification, then the local jurisdiction may submit a request to the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee for a time extension to address the deficiencies and resubmit its revised draft housing element to HCD for re-consideration and certification.
  - For the OBAG cycle subsequent to FY 2015-16, jurisdictions must adopt housing elements by October 31, 2014 (based on an April 2013 SCS adoption date); therefore, jurisdictions will be required to have General Plans with approved housing elements and that comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008 by that time to be eligible for funding. This schedule allows jurisdictions to meet the housing and complete streets policies through one general plan amendment.
  - OBAG funds may not be programmed to any jurisdiction out of compliance with OBAG policies and other requirements specified in this attachment. The CMA will be responsible for tracking progress towards these requirements and affirming to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance prior to MTC programming OBAG funds to its projects in the TIP.
  - For a transit agency project sponsor under a JPA or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction), the jurisdiction where the project (such as station/stop improvements) is located will need to comply with these policies before funds may be programmed to the transit agency project sponsor. However,

this is not required if the project is transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or transit maintenance facility.

- CMAs will provide documentation for the following prior to programming projects in the TIP:
    - The approach used to select OBAG projects including outreach and a board adopted list of projects
    - Compliance with MTC's complete streets policy
    - A map delineating projects selected outside of PDAs indicating those that are considered to provide proximate access to a PDA including their justifications as outlined on the previous page. CMA staff is expected to use this exhibit when it presents its program of projects to explain the how "proximate access" is defined to their board and the public.
    - Self-certification that the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy, Performance and Accountability Measures, and Outreach have been met using the checklist developed by MTC and the CMAs.
  - MTC staff will report on the outcome of the CMA project selection process in late 2013. This information will include, but not be limited to, the following:
    - Mix of project types selected;
    - Projects funded within PDAs and outside of PDAs and how proximity and direct connections were used and justified through the county process;
    - Complete streets elements that were funded;
    - Adherence to the performance and accountability requirements;
    - Amount of funding to various jurisdictions and how this related to the distribution formula that includes population, RHNA housing allocations and housing production, as well as low-income housing factors.
    - Public participation process.
  - The CMAs will also be required to present their PDA Growth Strategy to the Joint MTC Planning / ABAG Administrative Committee.
- **Project Selection:** County congestion management agencies or substitute agencies are given the responsibility to develop a project selection process along with evaluation criteria, issue a call for projects, conduct outreach, and select projects
- **Public Involvement:** The decision making authority to select projects for federal funding accompanies responsibilities to ensure that the process complies with federal statutes and regulations. In order to ensure that the CMA process for administering OBAG is in compliance, CMAs are required to lead a public outreach process as directed by Appendix A-5.
  - **Unified Call for Projects:** CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects for their One Bay Area grant, with a final project list due to MTC by June 30, 2013. CMA staff need to ensure that all projects are submitted using the Fund Management System (FMS) no later than July 30, 2013. The goal of this process is to reduce staff time, coordinate all programs to respond to larger multi-modal projects, and provide project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects.

- **Project Programming Targets and Delivery Deadlines:** CMAs must program their block grant funds over the four-year period of Cycle 2 (FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16). The expectation is that the CMA planning activities \ project would use capacity of the first year to provide more time for delivery as contrasted to other programs which tend to have more complex environmental and design challenges, but this is not a requirement. The funding is subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606 or its successor) including the Request for Authorization (RFA) submittal deadline and federal authorization/obligation deadline. Furthermore the following funding deadlines apply for each county, with earlier delivery strongly encouraged:
  - Half of the OBAG funds, including all funds programmed for the PE phase, must be obligated (federal authorization/E-76) by March 31, 2015.
  - All remaining OBAG funds must be obligated by March 31, 2016.

## **CYCLE 2 COUNTY ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROJECT GUIDANCE**

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

### ***1. CMA Planning and Outreach***

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

### ***2. Local Streets and Roads Preservation***

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federally-eligible system. To be eligible for funding of any Local Streets and Roads (LSR) preservation project, the jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). The needs analysis ensures that streets recommended for treatment are cost effective. Pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status. The

certification status can be found at [www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html](http://www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html). Specific eligibility requirements are included below:

**Pavement Rehabilitation:**

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

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

**Non-Pavement:**

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

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

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

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

***3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements***

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

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

#### ***4. Transportation for Livable Communities***

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

General project categories include the following:

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

#### ***5. Safe Routes to School***

The county Safe Routes to School Program continues to be a regional program. The funding is distributed directly to the CMAs by formula through the Cycle 2 regional program (see Appendix A-3). However, a CMA may use OBAG funding to augment this amount. Eligible projects include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. It is important to note that CMAQ is used to fund this program which is targeted towards air quality improvement rather than children's health or safety. Nevertheless CMAQ eligibility overlaps with Safe Routes to School Program projects that are eligible under the federal and state

programs with few exceptions which are noted below. Refer to the following link for detailed examples of eligible projects which is followed by CMAQ funding eligibility parameters:  
[http://mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/7\\_SR2S\\_Eligibility\\_Matrix.pdf](http://mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/7_SR2S_Eligibility_Matrix.pdf)

### Non-Infrastructure Projects

#### Public Education and Outreach Activities

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

### Infrastructure Projects

#### Bicycle/Pedestrian Use:

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

### Exclusions found to be ineligible uses of CMAQ funds:

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

### **6. Priority Conservation Areas**

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

## **PROGRAM SCHEDULE**

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

## Appendix A-1

### Cycle 2 Regional and County Programs FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 October 24, 2012

#### Proposed Cycle 2 Funding Commitments

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

<b>One Bay Area Grant (OBAG)</b> (millions \$ - rounded)		<b>4-Year Total</b>
<b>Counties</b>		
1	Alameda	<u><b>\$63</b></u>
2	Contra Costa	<u><b>\$45</b></u>
3	Marin	<u><b>\$10</b></u>
4	Napa	<u><b>\$6</b></u>
5	San Francisco	<u><b>\$38</b></u>
6	San Mateo	<u><b>\$26</b></u>
7	Santa Clara	<u><b>\$88</b></u>
8	Solano	<u><b>\$18</b></u>
9	Sonoma	<u><b>\$23</b></u>
<b>OBAG Total: *</b>		<b>\$320</b>
		<b>40%</b>

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

<b>Cycle 2 Total Total: *</b>	<b>\$795</b>
-------------------------------	--------------

\* Amounts may not total due to rounding

\* OBAG amounts revised October 2012 to reflect revised RHNA, released July 2012.

Appendix A-2

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

OBAG - County CMA Planning

County	Agency	TIP ID	3.0%	Cycle 2 OBAG County CMA Planning					STP Total
			2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16		
Alameda	ACTC	ALA090030	\$889,000	\$916,000	\$944,000	\$973,000	\$1,003,000	\$3,836,000	
Contra Costa	CCTA	CC-090035	\$703,000	\$725,000	\$747,000	\$770,000	\$794,000	\$3,036,000	
Marin	TAM	MRN090020	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
Napa	NCTPA	NAP090002	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
San Francisco	SFCTA	SF-090030	\$647,000	\$667,000	\$688,000	\$709,000	\$731,000	\$2,795,000	
San Mateo	SMCCAG	SM-090024	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
Santa Clara	VTA	SCL090035	\$984,000	\$1,014,000	\$1,045,000	\$1,077,000	\$1,110,000	\$4,246,000	
Solano	STA	SOLO90006	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
Sonoma	SCTA	SON090008	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
<b>County CMAs Total:</b>			<b>\$6,318,000</b>	<b>\$6,512,000</b>	<b>\$6,714,000</b>	<b>\$6,919,000</b>	<b>\$7,133,000</b>	<b>\$27,278,000</b>	

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

Regional Agency Planning

Regional Agency	Agency	TIP ID	3.0%	Cycle 2 Regional Agency Planning					STP Total
			2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16		
ABAG	ABAG	REG090040	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
BCDC	BCDC	REG090041	\$310,000	\$320,000	\$330,000	\$340,000	\$351,000	\$1,341,000	
MTC	MTC	REG090038	\$619,000	\$638,000	\$658,000	\$678,000	\$699,000	\$2,673,000	
<b>Regional Agencies Total:</b>			<b>\$1,548,000</b>	<b>\$1,596,000</b>	<b>\$1,646,000</b>	<b>\$1,696,000</b>	<b>\$1,749,000</b>	<b>\$6,687,000</b>	

**\$33,965,000**

Appendix A-3

Cycle 2  
 Safe Routes to School County Distribution  
 FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16  
 May 2012

Safe Routes To School County Distribution

County	Public School Enrollment (K-12) *	Private School Enrollment (K-12) *	Total School Enrollment (K-12) *	Percentage	Annual Funding	Total Funding	Total Funding
					\$5,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000
Alameda	214,626	24,537	239,163	21%	\$1,073,184	\$4,292,737	\$4,293,000
Contra Costa	166,956	16,274	183,230	16%	\$822,199	\$3,288,796	\$3,289,000
Marin	29,615	5,645	35,260	3%	\$158,220	\$632,882	\$633,000
Napa	20,370	3,036	23,406	2%	\$105,029	\$420,114	\$420,000
San Francisco	56,454	23,723	80,177	7%	\$359,774	\$1,439,097	\$1,439,000
San Mateo	89,971	16,189	106,160	10%	\$476,367	\$1,905,466	\$1,905,000
Santa Clara	261,945	38,119	300,064	27%	\$1,346,462	\$5,385,850	\$5,386,000
Solano	67,117	2,855	69,972	6%	\$313,982	\$1,255,928	\$1,256,000
Sonoma	71,049	5,787	76,836	7%	\$344,782	\$1,379,130	\$1,379,000
<b>Total:</b>	<b>978,103</b>	<b>136,165</b>	<b>1,114,268</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$5,000,000</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\Imp-4035\_OBAG\Imp-4035\_Appendices to Att-A.xlsx\A-3 REG SR25

\* From California Department of Education for FY 2010-11

# Appendix A-4

## Cycle 2 OBAG County Fund Distribution FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 October 24, 2012

### OBAG Geographic Funding Distribution

County	OBAG Funds	PDA/Anywhere Split	PDA	Anywhere
Alameda	<u>\$63,065,000</u>	70/30	<u>\$44,146,000</u>	<u>\$18,919,000</u>
Contra Costa	<u>\$45,204,000</u>	70/30	<u>\$31,643,000</u>	<u>\$13,561,000</u>
Marin	<u>\$10,028,000</u>	50/50	<u>\$5,014,000</u>	<u>\$5,014,000</u>
Napa	<u>\$6,661,000</u>	50/50	<u>\$3,331,000</u>	<u>\$3,330,000</u>
San Francisco	<u>\$38,584,000</u>	70/30	<u>\$27,009,000</u>	<u>\$11,575,000</u>
San Mateo	<u>\$26,524,000</u>	70/30	<u>\$18,567,000</u>	<u>\$7,957,000</u>
Santa Clara	<u>\$88,126,000</u>	70/30	<u>\$61,688,000</u>	<u>\$26,438,000</u>
Solano	<u>\$18,769,000</u>	50/50	<u>\$9,385,000</u>	<u>\$9,384,000</u>
Sonoma	<u>\$23,039,000</u>	50/50	<u>\$11,520,000</u>	<u>\$11,519,000</u>
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$320,000,000</b>		<b>\$212,303,000</b>	<b>\$107,697,000</b>

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

OBAG amounts revised October 2012 to reflect revised RHNA, released July 2012.

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

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

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

### 1. Public Involvement and Outreach

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

gathered at forums held specifically for the OBAG project solicitation or as part of a separate planning or programming outreach effort;

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

## 2. Agency Coordination

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

## 3. Title VI Responsibilities

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

## Appendix A-6: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG funding that supports and encourages development in the region's PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. From time to time, MTC shall consult with the CMAs to evaluate progress on the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting among MTC, ABAG and the CMAs. Significant modifications to the scope of activities may be formalized through future revisions to this resolution. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

### (1) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies

- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Encourage community participation throughout the planning process and in determining project priorities
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans.

### (2) Planning Objectives – to Inform Project Priorities

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

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

- **Projects located in high impact project areas.** Key factors defining high impact areas include:
  - a. Housing – PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units and percentage change), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production

---

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

- b. Jobs in proximity to housing and transit (both current levels and those included in the SCS),
- c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
- d. Consistency with regional TLC design guidelines or design that encourages multi-modal access: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart\\_growth/tlc/2009\\_TLC\\_Design\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/smart_growth/tlc/2009_TLC_Design_Guidelines.pdf)
- e. Project areas with parking management and pricing policies
- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC (see: <http://geocommons.com/maps/110983> ) or as defined by CMAs according to local priorities
- **PDA's with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation and creation strategies or policies
- **PDA's that overlap or are colocated with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure** –Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

**Process/Timeline**

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

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

## Appendix A-7

### Cycle 2 County PDA Implementation FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 November 2012

#### County PDA Implementation

County	Administering Agency	OBAG Formula	PDA Planning Share *	County PDA Implementation Total
Alameda	ACTC	20.2%	19.5%	<b>\$3,905,000</b>
Contra Costa	CCTA	14.2%	13.7%	<b>\$2,745,000</b>
Marin	TAM	2.8%	3.8%	<b>\$750,000</b>
Napa	NCTPA	1.7%	3.8%	<b>\$750,000</b>
San Francisco **	City/County of SF	12.3%	11.9%	<b>\$2,380,000</b>
San Mateo	SMCCAG	8.3%	8.0%	<b>\$1,608,000</b>
Santa Clara	VTA	27.6%	26.7%	<b>\$5,349,000</b>
Solano	STA	5.5%	5.3%	<b>\$1,066,000</b>
Sonoma	SCTA	7.5%	7.2%	<b>\$1,447,000</b>
<b>County PDA Implementation Total:</b>		100.0%	100.0%	<b>\$20,000,000</b>

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T4 - New Act\T4 - STP-CMAQ\T4 Cycle Programming\T4 Second Cycle\Cycle 2 Policy Dev\One Bay Area Grant\Cycle 2 STP-CMAQ-TE Fund Source Distribution.xls\CMA Planning

\* County minimum of \$750,000 for Marin and Napa results in actual PDA Implementation share different than OBAG formula share

\*\* Funding for San Francisco to be provided to San Francisco City/County planning department

Attachment B-1

Cycle 2  
 Regional Programs Project List  
 FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16  
 November 2012

Regional Programs Project List

Project Category and Title	County	Implementing Agency	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP/TA/TFCA	Total Cycle 2
<b>CYCLE 2 PROGRAMMING</b>			<b>\$435,187,000</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>	<b>\$475,187,000</b>
<b>1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)</b>					
ABAG Planning	Region-Wide	ABAG	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
BCDC Planning	Region-Wide	BCDC	\$1,341,000	\$0	\$1,341,000
MTC Planning	Region-Wide	MTC	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$6,687,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$6,687,000</b>
<b>2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)</b>					
Clipper® Fare Media Collection	Region-Wide	MTC	\$21,400,000	\$0	\$21,400,000
511 - Traveler Information	Region-Wide	MTC	\$48,770,000	\$0	\$48,770,000
SUBTOTAL			\$70,170,000	\$0	\$70,170,000
FSP/Incident Management	Region-Wide	MTC/SAFE	\$25,130,000	\$0	\$25,130,000
SUBTOTAL			\$25,130,000	\$0	\$25,130,000
<b>2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$95,300,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$95,300,000</b>
<b>3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)</b>					
Regional Performance Initiatives Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC	\$5,750,000	\$0	\$5,750,000
Regional Performance Initiatives Corridor Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000
Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$5,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$18,750,000	\$0	\$18,750,000
<b>Ramp Metering and TOS Elements</b>					
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 1	Contra Costa	MTC/SAFE	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Loveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 2	Contra Costa	Caltrans	\$11,800,000	\$0	\$11,800,000
FPI - Various Corridors Caltrans PE and Right of Way	Region-Wide	Caltrans	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
FPI - SCL US 101: SBT Co. Line to SR 85	Santa Clara	Caltrans	\$29,700,000	\$0	\$29,700,000
FPI - ALA I-580: SJ Co. Line to Vasco & Foothill to Crow Canyon	Alameda	Caltrans	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
FPI - SOL I-80: I-505 to Yolo Co. Line.	Solano	Caltrans	\$0	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$43,250,000	\$34,000,000	\$77,250,000
<b>3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$62,000,000</b>	<b>\$34,000,000</b>	<b>\$96,000,000</b>
<b>4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)</b>					
Pavement Management Program (PMP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$1,200,000	\$0	\$1,200,000
Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$6,000,000	\$0	\$6,000,000
<b>4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$7,200,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$7,200,000</b>
<b>5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (PDA) REVISED Per Below</b>					
<b>PDA Planning</b>					
Specific projects TBD by Commission	TBD	TBD	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)</b>					
Specific projects TBD by Commission	Region-Wide	MTC	\$0	\$0	\$0
SUBTOTAL			\$0	\$0	\$0
<b>5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES (PDA) REVISED Per Below</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
<b>5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) IMPLEMENTATION</b>					
<b>Regional PDA Implementation and Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)</b>					
Specific Projects TBD by Commission	TBD	TBD	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
<b>County PDA Planning</b>					
PDA Planning - Alameda	Alameda	TBD	\$3,905,000	\$0	\$3,905,000
PDA Planning - Contra Costa	Contra Costa	TBD	\$2,745,000	\$0	\$2,745,000
PDA Planning - Marin	Marin	TBD	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
PDA Planning - Napa	Napa	TBD	\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
PDA Planning - San Francisco	San Francisco	SF City/County	\$2,380,000	\$0	\$2,380,000
PDA Planning - San Mateo	San Mateo	TBD	\$1,608,000	\$0	\$1,608,000
PDA Planning - Santa Clara	Santa Clara	TBD	\$5,349,000	\$0	\$5,349,000
PDA Planning - Solano	Solano	TBD	\$1,066,000	\$0	\$1,066,000
PDA Planning - Sonoma	Sonoma	TBD	\$1,447,000	\$0	\$1,447,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
<b>5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) IMPLEMENTATION</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$40,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>
<b>6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)</b>					
Climate Strategies	TBD	TBD	\$14,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$20,000,000
<b>6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$14,000,000</b>	<b>\$6,000,000</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>
<b>7. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S)</b>					
<i>Specific projects TBD by CMAQs</i>					
SR2S - Alameda	Alameda	ACTC	\$4,293,000	\$0	\$4,293,000
SR2S - Contra Costa	Contra Costa	CCTA	\$3,289,000	\$0	\$3,289,000
SR2S - Marin	Marin	TAM	\$633,000	\$0	\$633,000
SR2S - Napa	Napa	NCTPA	\$420,000	\$0	\$420,000
SR2S - San Francisco	San Francisco	SFCTA	\$1,439,000	\$0	\$1,439,000
SR2S - San Mateo	San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$1,905,000	\$0	\$1,905,000
SR2S - Santa Clara	Santa Clara	SCVTA	\$5,386,000	\$0	\$5,386,000
SR2S - Solano	Solano	STA	\$1,256,000	\$0	\$1,256,000
SR2S - Sonoma	Sonoma	SCTA	\$1,379,000	\$0	\$1,379,000
<b>7. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$20,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$20,000,000</b>

Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1  
 Adopted: 05/17/12-C  
 Revised: 10/24/12-C  
 Revised: 11/28/12-C

Cycle 2  
 Regional Programs Project List  
 FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16  
 November 2012

Regional Programs Project List

Project Category and Title	County	Implementing Agency	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP/TA/TFCA	Total Cycle 2
<b>CYCLE 2 PROGRAMMING</b>			<b>\$435,187,000</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>	<b>\$475,187,000</b>
<b>8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM</b>					
<i>Specific projects TBD by Transit Operators</i>					
SolTrans - Preventive Maintenance	Solano	SolTrans	\$149,000,000	\$0	\$149,000,000
<b>8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$150,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$150,000,000</b>
<b>9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)</b>					
<b>TPI - Capital Program</b>					
AC Transit - Line 51 Corridor Speed Protection and Restoration	Alameda	AC Transit	\$10,515,624	\$0	\$10,515,624
SFMTA - Mission Mobility Maximization	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$7,016,395	\$0	\$7,016,395
SFMTA - N-Judah Mobility Maximization	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$3,750,574	\$0	\$3,750,574
SFMTA - Bus Stop Consolidation and Roadway Modifications	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$4,133,031	\$0	\$4,133,031
SCVTA - Light Rail Transit Signal Priority	Santa Clara	SCVTA	\$1,587,176	\$0	\$1,587,176
SCVTA - Steven Creek - Limited 323 Transit Signal Priority	Santa Clara	SCVTA	\$712,888	\$0	\$712,888
Unprogrammed Transit Performance Initiative Reserve	TBD	TBD	\$2,284,312	\$0	\$2,284,312
<b>9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$30,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$30,000,000</b>
<b>10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)</b>					
<i>Specific projects TBD by Commission</i>					
	TBD	TBD	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
<b>10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$10,000,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$10,000,000</b>
<b>Cycle 2 Total</b>			<b>TOTAL: \$435,187,000</b>	<b>\$40,000,000</b>	<b>\$475,187,000</b>

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-4035\_OBAG\RES-4035\_Attach\_B-1.xlsx\Attach B-1 11-28-12 Revised

# Attachment B-2

## Cycle 2 OBAG Project List FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16 October 2012

### OBAG Program Project List

Project Category and Title	Implementing Agency	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP-TA	Total Cycle 2
<b>CYCLE 2 COUNTY OBAG PROGRAMMING</b>		<b>\$301,964,000</b>	<b>\$18,036,000</b>	<b>\$320,000,000</b>
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Alameda CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$55,503,000</b>	\$3,726,000	<b>\$59,229,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Alameda	ACTC	\$3,836,000	\$0	\$3,836,000
<b>ALAMEDA COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$59,339,000</b>	<b>\$3,726,000</b>	<b>\$63,065,000</b>
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Contra Costa CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$39,784,000</b>	\$2,384,000	<b>\$42,168,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Contra Costa	CCTA	\$3,036,000	\$0	\$3,036,000
<b>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$42,820,000</b>	<b>\$2,384,000</b>	<b>\$45,204,000</b>
<b>MARIN COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Marin CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$6,648,000</b>	\$707,000	<b>\$7,355,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Marin	TAM	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>MARIN COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$9,321,000</b>	<b>\$707,000</b>	<b>\$10,028,000</b>
<b>NAPA COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Napa</i>	TBD	<b>\$3,557,000</b>	\$431,000	<b>\$3,988,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Napa	NCTPA	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>NAPA COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$6,230,000</b>	<b>\$431,000</b>	<b>\$6,661,000</b>
<b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by San Francisco CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$33,879,000</b>	\$1,910,000	<b>\$35,789,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - San Francisco	SFCTA	\$2,795,000	\$0	\$2,795,000
<b>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$36,674,000</b>	<b>\$1,910,000</b>	<b>\$38,584,000</b>
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by San Mateo CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$21,860,000</b>	\$1,991,000	<b>\$23,851,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>SAN MATEO COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$24,533,000</b>	<b>\$1,991,000</b>	<b>\$26,524,000</b>
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Santa Clara CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$77,776,000</b>	\$4,350,000	<b>\$82,126,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Santa Clara	SCVTA	\$4,246,000	\$0	\$4,246,000
<b>CMA Planning Activities Augmentation - Santa Clara</b>	<b>SCVTA</b>	<b>\$1,754,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$1,754,000</b>
<b>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$83,776,000</b>	<b>\$4,350,000</b>	<b>\$88,126,000</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Solano CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$13,561,000</b>	\$0	<b>\$13,561,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Solano	STA	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>West B Street Bicycle/Pedestrian RxR Undercrossing Dixon</b>		<b>\$1,394,000</b>	<b>\$1,141,000</b>	<b>\$2,535,000</b>
<b>SOLANO COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$17,628,000</b>	<b>\$1,141,000</b>	<b>\$18,769,000</b>
<b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>				
<i>Specific projects TBD by Sonoma CMA</i>	TBD	<b>\$18,970,000</b>	\$1,396,000	<b>\$20,366,000</b>
CMA Base Planning Activities - Sonoma	SCTA	\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
<b>SONOMA COUNTY</b>	<b>TOTAL:</b>	<b>\$21,643,000</b>	<b>\$1,396,000</b>	<b>\$23,039,000</b>
<b>Cycle 2 Total</b>		<b>TOTAL: \$301,964,000</b>	<b>\$18,036,000</b>	<b>\$320,000,000</b>

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-4035\_OBAG\RES-4035\_Attach\_B-2.xlsxJT4 Cycle 2 Attach B-2 10-24-12