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1. **Introductions/Roll Call**

   Chair: Arthur L. Dao, Alameda CTC Executive Director

   Staff Liaison: Vivek Bhat

   Public Meeting Coordinator: Angie Ayers

2. **Public Comment**

3. **Administration**

   3.1. June 9, 2016 ACTAC Meeting Minutes: Approve the June 9, 2016 meeting minutes

4. **Programs/Projects/Monitoring**

   4.1. One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 2 Principles for Alameda County: Approval of the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County

   4.2. Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan Update 2016 Update: Approval of the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update

   4.3. One Bay Area Grant Cycle 1 Program: Approval of the Funding Strategy for City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project

   4.4. Draft FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan

   4.5. Cycle 3 Active Transportation Program Summary of Applications

   4.6. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List: June 2016 Update

   4.7. FY 2016-17 Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Calendar

5. **Policy and Transportation Planning**

   5.1. Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Count Program

6. **Member Reports**

   6.1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Local Streets and Roads Working Group

   6.2. Other Reports
7. **Adjournment/Next Meeting**  
    Thursday, September 8, 2016

All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the committee.
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1. **Introductions/Roll Call**
   Arthur L. Dao called the meeting to order. The meeting began with introductions, and the chair confirmed a quorum. Representatives from all cities and agencies were present, except for the following: Jean Banker, Miriam Chion, Sergeant Ed Clarke, Kevin Connoly, Anthony Fournier, Cindy Horvath, Matt Maloney, Michael Stella, and Gary Taylor.

   Cindy Horvath arrived during agenda item 6.1.

2. **Public Comment**
   There were no public comments.

3. **Administration**
   **3.1. Approval of May 5, 2016 Minutes**
   Obaid Khan moved to approve the May 5, 2016 meeting minutes. Mike Tassano seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

   | Yes:       | Bell, Campbell, Dao, Fajeau, Izon, Javandel, Khan, Lee, Miyasato, Parikh, Patel, Payne, Ruark, Sunak, Tassano, Wegener, Williams, Xu |
   | No:        | None |
   | Abstain:   | Andrino-Chavez, Evans, Gavin |
   | Absent:    | Banker, Chion, Clarke, Connoly, Fournier, Horvath, Maloney, Stella, Taylor |

4. **Policy and Transportation Planning**
   **4.1. Draft Alameda Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan**
   Saravana Suthanthira gave a report from the Multimodal Arterial Plan Technical Advisory Committee meeting. She expressed her appreciation of ACTAC members’ support, comments, and feedback on each phase of the plan development that added value to the plan. The comments included California Department of Transportation’s (Caltrans’) involvement with the plan development and their level of support for implementation on state routes, the Plan’s flexibility to retain the local context, and confirming that this is a planning framework and not a programming document. She mentioned that Caltrans is in complete support of this plan and is showcasing it in SMART Mobility forums around the state as an example of a multimodal plan for a larger network. Saravana recommended that ACTAC approve the Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan.

   Farid Javandel moved to approve the draft Countywide Multimodal Arterial Plan. Thomas Ruark seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

   | Yes:       | Andrino-Chavez, Bell, Campbell, Dao, Evans, Fajeau, Gavin, Izon, Javandel, Khan, Lee, Miyasato, Parikh, Patel, Payne, Ruark, Sunak, Tassano, Wegener, Williams, Xu |
   | No:        | None |
   | Abstain:   | None |
   | Absent:    | Banker, Chion, Clarke, Connoly, Fournier, Horvath, Maloney, Stella, Taylor |
4.2. Alameda Countywide Transit Plan
Tess Lengyel recommended that ACTAC members approve the final Alameda Countywide Transit Plan.

Obaid Khan moved to approve the Alameda Countywide Transit Plan. Mike Tassano seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following votes:

Yes: Andrino-Chavez, Bell, Campbell, Dao, Evans, Fajeau, Gavin, Izon, Javandel, Khan, Lee, Miyasato, Parikh, Patel, Payne, Ruark, Sunak, Tassano, Wegener, Williams, Xu
No: None
Abstain: None
Absent: Banker, Chion, Clarke, Connoly, Fournier, Horvath, Maloney, Stella, Taylor

4.3. 2016 Level of Service Monitoring Study Results
Daniel Wu gave an update on the 2016 Level of Service (LOS) Monitoring Study results and reviewed the following next steps:

- A deficiency determination will be made by the week of June 20, 2016.
- The final 2016 LOS Monitoring Report will be published in August 2016.
- The Congestion Management Program network and segmentation will be updated based on roadway characteristics and land use as part of the 2017 Congestion Management Plan update.

5. Programs/Projects/Monitoring
5.1. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List: May 2016 Update
Vivek Bhat provided an update on the May 2016 federal inactive projects list. He encouraged committee members to stay current with their invoicing activity.

6. Member Reports
6.1. Metropolitan Transportation Commission Local Streets and Roads Working Group Update
Vivek Bhat informed the committee that a joint meeting was held by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Local Streets and Roads Working Group and the Programming and Delivery Working Group on May 12, 2016. Vivek highlighted a few items from the meeting:

- Local Highway Safety Improvement Program Cycle 8 project applications are due by August 12, 2016.
- Active Transportation Cycle 3 project applications are due on June 15, 2016.
- MTC discussed the FY2015-16 Annual Obligation Plan, and Vivek noted that Jacki Taylor sent an email to project sponsors during the week of May 30, 2016.
- MTC discussed the FY2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan, and MTC will release the draft in July 2016.

Vivek noted that this is the last year for Cycle 1 of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program, and Alameda County project sponsors must meet their deadlines.
Discussion took place regarding OBAG Cycle 2. Alameda CTC agreed to email the committee Alameda CTC’s letter to MTC regarding OBAG Cycle 2 additional federal revenues.

6.2. Other Reports
Tess Lengyel introduced new Alameda CTC staff: Krystle Pasco, Cathleen Sullivan, and Daniel Wu.

Bruce Williams (Oakland) informed the committee that Jeffery Tumlin from Nelson\Nygaard will be the Interim Director of Transportation for the City of Oakland. He noted that the City of Oakland is considering an infrastructure bond for local streets and roads improvements.

Donna Lee (BART) informed the committee that the BART Board of Directors voted to place a parcel tax bond measure on the 2016 November ballot.

Mika Miyasato (AC Transit) informed the committee that AC Transit will place a parcel tax measure on the 2016 November ballot to extend Measure VV.

7. Adjournment and Next Meeting
The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m. The next meeting is:

Date/Time: Thursday, July 7, 2016 at 1:30 p.m.
Location: Alameda CTC Offices, 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

Attested by:

_________________________
Angie Ayers,
Public Meeting Coordinator
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DATE:        July 1, 2016

SUBJECT:    One Bay Area Grant Program Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County

RECOMMENDATION:   Approve the One Bay Area Grant Cycle 2 Programming Principles for Alameda County.

Summary

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program provides federal funding to the county congestion management agencies (CMAs) for programming to projects, programs and planning activities that advance the goals and objectives of Plan Bay Area. In November 2015, MTC adopted Resolution 4202 (Attachment A), the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for the OBAG Cycle 2 (OBAG 2) Program.

Alameda County’s estimated share of OBAG 2 is approximately $70.2 million of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds spread over five fiscal years (FYs 2017-18 through 2021-22). Similar to OBAG 1, 70 percent of OBAG 2 funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and 30 percent may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere within the county.

MTC is scheduled to adopt an updated Resolution 4202 in July 2016. The County CMAs will be required to provide a final program of projects to MTC by summer 2017. The proposed programming principles for Alameda County’s OBAG 2 program are outlined in this memo and are intended to be consistent with the goals and objectives of MTC’s Resolution 4202, the Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP).

Background

The OBAG program is intended to support the implementation of Plan Bay Area, the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). In November 2015, MTC adopted Resolution 4202, the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for OBAG 2 (Attachment A) which outlines the proposed revenue estimates, funding approach, programming policies, project guidance, and program timeline for both the Regional and County programs. Through MTC’s OBAG 2 county distribution formula, included in Attachment A, counties receive approximately 40% of the total funding available.
Alameda County’s estimated share of OBAG 2 funding is approximately $70.2 million of federal STP and CMAQ spread over five fiscal years (FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22). Similar to OBAG 1, 70 percent of the OBAG funding must be programmed to transportation projects that support Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and 30 percent may be programmed for transportation projects anywhere in the county.

**OBAG 2 Eligibility**

The programming of OBAG 2 funding is constrained to transportation projects that conform to the eligibility requirements of federal STP and CMAQ funds. In addition, projects receiving OBAG funds will need to comply with MTC’s OBAG 2 requirements (MTC Resolution 4202) as well as any local criteria that will be used by Alameda CTC to evaluate projects in Alameda County.

*Local Agency/Sponsor eligibility requirements*

Pursuant to MTC Resolution 4202, OBAG 2 eligibility is limited to public agencies qualified to receive federal funds. In addition, there are two key requirements that must be met in order for local jurisdictions to receive OBAG 2 funds: (1) adoption of a complete streets resolution and (2) certification of the general plan’s housing element.

To meet the complete streets requirement, jurisdictions must adopt a complete streets resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC that incorporates the required complete streets elements as outlined in MTC’s Complete Streets Guidance. Alternatively, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010 and before the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC.

To meet the Housing Element requirement, jurisdictions must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015. Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding. Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this requirement during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or their OBAG 2 funding may be deprogrammed.

The complete streets and housing requirements are not required for jurisdictions without a general plan or land use authority such as Caltrans, CMAs or transit agencies under a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction). However, in such instances the jurisdiction in which the project is physically located must meet these requirements, except for transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a maintenance facility.
OBAG 2 County Program Categories

The OBAG 2 County Program fund estimate makes funds available for programming to the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Program Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMA Planning</td>
<td>8,489,000</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads State of Good Repair</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA Supportive Transportation Investment:</td>
<td>35,985,000</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Transportation for Livable Communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (SR2S)</td>
<td>5,990,000</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) (To County of Alameda for unincorporated areas)</td>
<td>1,779,000</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70,243,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principles for the Alameda County OBAG 2 Program

Key features of each County Program category are described below. In addition to MTC’s requirements for each of these programs, which are detailed in Attachment A, staff recommends additional programming principles be applied, as follows:

OBAG 2 Planning, Programming and Outreach

In order to maintain compliance with various federal, State and regional requirements, CMAs are required to perform a mix of countywide planning and programming, monitoring and outreach functions. Although the “traditional” CMA functions include the programming of federal STP and CMAQ funds, because MTC requires CMAs to perform additional planning, programming, monitoring and outreach efforts through the OBAG program, as with OBAG 1, CMAs may choose to designate additional funding from their County Program to augment their efforts. The Alameda CTC’s “traditional” and OBAG responsibilities are listed below:

Traditional:

- Congestion Management Program (CMP)
- Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP)
- Countywide Bike and Pedestrian Plans
- Countywide modal plans and corridor planning
- Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)
- Travel Demand Model Support
- Evaluation of Transportation and Land Use Policies
- State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Programming
- Federal STP and CMAQ Programming
• Lifeline Transportation Program (LTP)
• Performing ongoing Monitoring Tasks

OBAG 2:
• Updating the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy
• Preparing the PDA Strategic Plan and/or programs to provide PDA technical assistance to local agencies
• Enhanced monitoring due to PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and Complete Streets
• Multi-jurisdictional PDA Coordination
• Updating the Comprehensive Investment Plan
• Countywide Bike and Pedestrian Plan related Planning efforts
• Complete Streets Policy Planning efforts (Ensuring local compliance with MTC’s Complete Streets policy) and complete streets policy implementation
• Outreach efforts (Expanding public outreach and communication with stakeholders) to meet Title VI requirements
• Priority Conservation Areas related Planning / Programming efforts
• Development of a Comprehensive Multi-modal Strategic Plan with Bus, Rail, Parking, TDM, land use and Bike and Pedestrian elements
• Enhanced OBAG project monitoring/ compliance with MTC’s Regional Project Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution 3606) and Annual Obligation Plan requirements

These additional planning and programming efforts are eligible only for the STP funds made available through OBAG, not CMAQ. Staff recommends a total of $8.4 Million of OBAG 2 STP funds be programmed for Alameda CTC planning and programming activities related to OBAG 2.

Local Streets and Roads Preservation/State of Good Repair

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid system to support a state of good repair. To be eligible for funding of any Local Streets and Roads (LSR) preservation project, the jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). In addition, selected pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. This requirement ensures that streets selected for investment are cost effective. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status of jurisdictions. The certification status of area jurisdictions can be found at http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/.

Under MTC Resolution 4202, LSR projects may be included in the PDA Supportive Transportation Investments category based on the location of the project. Staff
recommends approximately $18,000,000 be made available to jurisdictions within Alameda County for eligible LSR projects.

This programming will support the “fix it first” strategy as well as address the maintenance shortfall in Alameda County. The LSR funding is proposed to be sub-allocated cities/County based on 50% Population and 50% Lane Miles formula. The target numbers generated as a result of this formula will be the maximum LSR funds that may be received by a jurisdiction (Attachment B). The minimum LSR funds a jurisdiction may receive is $100,000 which is consistent with MTC’s minimum amount for OBAG 2 programming. Additional information on LSR project eligibility is included in MTC Resolution 4202.

**PDA Supportive Transportation Investments**

PDA supportive projects are anticipated to include bicycle, pedestrian, and Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) projects.

A wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements are eligible for federal STP and CMAQ funding, including bicycle facilities, bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking programs, sidewalks, ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges, user safety and supporting facilities, and traffic signal actuation.

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. This category may include projects within the geographic boundaries of a PDA as well as projects located outside of a PDA that provide proximate access to a PDA. As with Cycle 1, staff proposes to define Proximate Access as follows:

Transportation improvements not physically located within the boundaries of a PDA but providing benefits of travel to or from a PDA, between PDAs, or between a PDA and a job center or other important community services or areas.

Currently, there are 43 PDAs in Alameda County that have been voluntarily nominated by local jurisdictions and approved by Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) as part of the FOCUS program (Attachment C). Staff recommends all PDAs within Alameda County be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funds. Additional information on PDA Supportive Transportation Investment project eligibility is included in MTC Resolution 4202.

**Safe Routes to School (SR2S)**

MTC has identified about $5.34 million of SR2S funding within the county share of OBAG 2 funds for Alameda County. MTC guidelines stipulate, if additional resources are required, OBAG 2 funds are eligible to supplement the funding already identified. The current Alameda Countywide SR2S program has an annual budget of about $1.3 million.
recommends approximately $5,990,000 be made available of OBAG 2 funds for the SR2S program, to sustain and provide strategic expansion opportunities. Additional information on SR2S project eligibility is also included in MTC Resolution 4202.

**Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Shares**

The Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program, which directed funding to rural roads, was eliminated in 1991 with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). However, California statutes provide for the continuation of minimum funding levels to counties, guaranteeing their prior FAS shares for rural county roads.

Under the OBAG 2 program, $1,779,000 will be available to the County of Alameda based on the funding amounts determined by California’s Federal-Aid Secondary Highways Act (California Code § 2200-2214). This FAS funding is not subject to the minimum PDA investment requirement.

**Regional Priority Conservation Areas (PCA) Program**

The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program is available through MTC’s OBAG 2 Regional Program and provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands and open space. Generally, eligible projects include PCA planning activities, bicycle and pedestrian access to open space and parklands, visual enhancements and habitat/environmental enhancements. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses.

The PCA Program includes $16 million that is regionally competitive and Alameda County projects can compete for up to $8 million (the other $8 million is reserved for the North Bay counties). A 2:1 match is required for all projects outside of the North Bay Counties. Staff recommends that PCA project proposals should partner with agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District and other organizations such as the Tri Valley Conservancy for this regional competitive program.

**Role of Fund Exchanges**

In the past, fund exchanges have been used to fund large projects with a more restrictive funding source, allowing for the funding of multiple smaller projects with a local fund source. The OBAG 2 program has characteristics that make it a potential fit for an exchange scenario, which will be considered as part of the programming approach. If an exchange candidate is identified that is eligible to expend the federal funds within the required schedule, the final program of projects could benefit with more flexibility in the types of projects selected for the OBAG program. This is based on the assumption that OBAG 2 requirements would still need to be met for the exchanged funds.
**Action Summary**

The recommended programming principles for Alameda County’s OBAG 2 program are intended to be consistent with the goals and objectives of MTC’s Resolution 4202 as well as the Alameda CTC’s CTP and CIP. The below table summarizes the recommended Principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Category</th>
<th>Recommended Programming Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMA Planning</td>
<td>• Program a total of $8.4 Million of OBAG 2 STP funds for Alameda CTC planning and programming activities related to OBAG 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets and Roads</td>
<td>• Make available approximately $18,000,000 to LSR-eligible jurisdictions within Alameda County for eligible LSR projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sub-allocate the available LSR funding to LSR eligible cities/County based on 50% Population and 50% Lane Miles formula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA Supportive Transportation Investment</td>
<td>• Define Proximate Access as, “Transportation improvements not physically located within the boundaries of a PDA but providing benefits of travel to or from a PDA, between PDAs, or between a PDA and a job center or other important community services or areas.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• All 43 PDAs within Alameda County eligible to receive OBAG 2 funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR2S</td>
<td>• Program 5,990,000 OBAG 2 funds for the SR2S program to sustain and provide strategic expansion opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid Secondary (FAS)</td>
<td>• Program FAS to County of Alameda for unincorporated areas. <em>(The County is the only agency eligible for these funds)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Priority Conservation Areas (PCA)</td>
<td>• PCA project proposals should partner with agencies such as the East Bay Regional Park District and other organizations such as the Tri Valley Conservancy for this regional competitive program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next Steps

MTC is scheduled to adopt an updated Resolution 4202 in July 2016. The County CMAs will be required to provide a final program of projects to MTC by summer 2017. The OBAG 2 program of projects will be evaluated and recommended as a part of the Alameda County’s Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) 2018 programming process.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.
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ABSTRACT
Resolution No. 4202

Adoption of the project selection policies and project programming for the second round of the One Bay Area Grant program (OBAG 2). The project selection criteria and programming policy contain the project categories that are to be funded with various fund sources including federal surface transportation act funding available to MTC for its programming discretion to be included in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for the OBAG 2 funding period.

The resolution includes the following attachments:

- Attachment A  –  Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy
- Attachment B-1 – Regional Program Project List
- Attachment B-2 – County Program Project List

Further discussion of the project selection criteria and programming policy is contained in the memorandum to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated November 4, 2015.
WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 et seq.; and

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

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated recipient for state and federal funding assigned to the RTPA/MPO of the San Francisco Bay Area for the programming of projects; and

WHEREAS, state and federal funds assigned for RTPA/MPO programming discretion are subject to availability and must be used within prescribed funding deadlines regardless of project readiness; and

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

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

WHEREAS the federal TIP and subsequent TIP amendments and updates are subject to public review and comment; now therefore be it
RESOLVED that MTC approves the “Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy” for projects to be funded in the OBAG 2 Program as set forth in Attachments A, B-1 and B-2 of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED that the regional discretionary funding shall be pooled and distributed on a regional basis for implementation of project selection criteria, policies, procedures and programming, consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and be it further

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

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee may make technical adjustments and other non-substantial revisions, including updates to fund sources and distributions to reflect final funding criteria and availability; and be it further

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

RESOLVED that the Executive Director or designee shall make available a copy of this resolution, and attachements as may be required and appropriate.
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The One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2) is the second round of the federal funding program designed to support the implementation of Plan Bay Area, the region’s first Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). OBAG 2 covers the five-year period from FY 2017-18 to FY 2021-22. The proposed revenue estimates, funding approach, programming policies, project guidance, and timeline for OBAG 2 are outlined in this attachment.

BACKGROUND

The inaugural One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 1) was approved by the Commission in May 2012 (MTC Resolution 4035). The OBAG 1 program incorporated the following program features:

- Targeting project investments to the region’s Priority Development Areas (PDAs);
- Rewarding jurisdictions that accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process and produce housing;
- Supporting open space preservation in Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs); and
- Providing a larger and more flexible funding pot to deliver transportation projects in categories such as Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning activities, while also providing dedicated funding opportunities for Safe Routes to School activities and PCAs.

The early outcomes of the OBAG 1 program are documented in the One Bay Area Grant Report Card located at: (http://files.mtc.ca.gov/pdf/OBAG_Report_Card.pdf). The key findings of the report highlight a variety of improvements as compared to previous federal highway funding programs, including: increased grant and project size, complexity, and multi-modality; significant investments in active transportation and TLC projects; region wide achievement of PDA investment targets; and compliance with local performance and accountability requirements. Considering the positive results achieved in OBAG 1, and in order to further extend the timeframe for OBAG to meet its policy goals, OBAG 2 maintains largely the same framework and policies.

REVENUE ESTIMATES AND PROGRAM ARCHITECTURE

OBAG 2 funding is based on anticipated future federal transportation program apportionments from the regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Programs. The programming capacity estimated for OBAG 2 amounts to $790 million (down from $827 million programmed with OBAG 1). The decrease in revenues between program cycles reflects annual apportionment amounts in the federal surface transportation act (Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act, or MAP-21) authorized after approval of OBAG 1 not keeping pace with estimated growth rates, as well as changes in state and federal programs that impacted estimated regional funding levels (such as the elimination of the Transportation Enhancements (TE) program).

The OBAG 2 program continues to integrate the region’s federal transportation program with California’s climate statutes and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and contributes to
the implementation of the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan. Funding distribution formulas to the counties will continue to encourage land-use, housing and complete streets policies that support the production of housing with supportive transportation investments. This is accomplished through the following principles:

1. **Realistic Revenue Assumptions:**

   OBAG 2 funding is based on anticipated future federal transportation program apportionments. In recent years, the Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement programs (STP/CMAQ) have not grown, and changes in the federal and state programs (such as elimination of the Transportation Enhancement (TE) program) have resulted in decreases that were not anticipated when OBAG 1 was developed. For OBAG 2, a 2% annual escalation rate above current federal revenues is assumed, consistent with the mark-up of the Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy (DRIVE) Act by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee. Even with the 2% escalation, revenues for OBAG 2 are 4% less than OBAG 1 revenues.

   If there are significant changes in federal apportionments over the OBAG 2 time period, MTC will return to the Commission to recommend adjustments to the program. These adjustments could include increasing or decreasing funding amounts for one or more programs, postponement of projects, expansion of existing programs, development of new programs, or adjustments to subsequent programming cycles.

   Upon enactment and extension of the federal surface transportation authorizations expected during the OBAG funding period, MTC will need to closely monitor any new federal programs, their eligibility rules, and how funding is distributed to the states and regions. It is anticipated that any changes to the current federal programs would likely overlap to a large extent with projects that are currently eligible for funding under 23 U.S.C., although the actual fund sources may no longer mirror the current STP and CMAQ programs. Therefore, any reference to a specific fund source in the OBAG 2 programming serves as a proxy for replacement fund sources for which MTC has discretionary project selection and programming authority.

   OBAG 2 programming capacity is based on apportionment rather than obligation authority. Because obligation authority (the amount actually received) is less than the apportionment level, there is typically a carryover balance from year to year of unfunded commitments. MTC’s current negative obligation authority imbalance is $51 million, and has held steady the past few years as a result of the region’s excellent delivery record. Successful project delivery has allowed MTC to capture additional, unused obligation authority (OA) from other states, enabling the region to deliver additional projects each year. Because this negative balance has held steady, there does not appear to be a need to true-up the difference at this time. MTC staff will continue to monitor this OA shortfall throughout the OBAG 2 period and make adjustments as necessary in the next round of programming.
2. **Support Existing Programs:**

The OBAG program as a whole is expected to face declining revenues from $827 million in OBAG 1 to $790 million in OBAG 2. Therefore, no new programs are introduced with OBAG 2 and the funding reduction is spread among the various transportation needs supported in OBAG 1.

- The regional pot of funding decreases by 4%. With the exception of regional planning activities (which grows to account for escalation) and the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) program (which receives additional funds redirected from an OBAG 1 project), all other funding programs are either maintained at, or decreased from, their OBAG 1 funding levels.

- The base OBAG 2 county program decreases by 4%, primarily due to the elimination of the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) program which contributed to the OBAG 1 funding pot. As compared to the county program under OBAG 1, largely the same planning and project type activities are proposed to be eligible under OBAG 2.

The OBAG 2 program categories and commitments for the regional and county programs are outlined in Appendix A-1.

3. **Support Plan Bay Area’s Sustainable Communities Strategy by Linking OBAG Funding to Housing:**

   **County Program Distribution Formula**

   OBAG 1’s county distribution formula leveraged transportation dollars to reward jurisdictions that produce housing and accept housing allocations through the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA) process. The formula also considered the share of affordable housing within housing production and RHNA allocations.

   In OBAG 2, the county distribution formula is updated to use the latest housing data from the Association of Bay Area Government (ABAG). The formula is also based on housing over a longer time frame, considering housing production between 1999 and 2006 (weighted 30%) and between 2007 and 2014 (weighted 70%) in order to mitigate the effect of the recent recession and major swings in housing permit approvals.

   The OBAG 2 formula places additional emphasis on housing production and the share of affordable housing within both production and RHNA. The formula also expands the definition of affordable housing to include housing for moderate-income households in addition to low- and very low-income households. Furthermore, housing production is capped at the total RHNA allocation.

   The distribution formula factors for OBAG 2 are detailed in the table below.
**OBAG 2 County Distribution Formula Factors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBAG 2</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Housing RHNA</th>
<th>Housing Production</th>
<th>Housing Affordability *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OBAG 2 housing affordability factor includes housing at the very low, low and moderate income levels which are weighted within both housing production and RHNA allocation.

The distribution formula is further adjusted to ensure that CMA base planning funds are no more than 50% of the total distribution for that county. The resulting proposed county program formula distributions are presented in Appendix A-2.

**Priority Development Areas (PDAs)**

OBAG 2 continues to support the SCS for the Bay Area by promoting transportation investments in Priority Development Areas (PDAs).

- PDA Investment targets remain at OBAG 1 levels: 50% for the four North Bay counties and 70% for the remaining counties.
- PDA Investment and Growth Strategies should play a strong role in guiding the County CMA project selection and be aligned with the Plan Bay Area update cycle.

**Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)**

OBAG 2 maintains the two separate Priority Conservation Area (PCA) programs as introduced in OBAG 1, with one program dedicating funding to the four North Bay counties and one competitive program for the remaining counties.

**4. Continue Flexibility and Local Transportation Investment Decision Making:**

OBAG 2 continues to provide the same base share of the funding pot (40%) to the county CMAs for local decision-making. The program allows CMAs the flexibility to invest in various transportation categories, such as Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), bicycle and pedestrian improvements, local streets and roads preservation, and planning and outreach activities.

In addition to the base county program, two previously regional programs, Safe Routes to School and the Federal-Aid Secondary (rural roads), have been consolidated into the county program with guaranteed minimum funding amounts to ensure the programs continue to be funded at specified levels.

**5. Cultivate Linkages with Local Land-Use Planning:**

As a condition to access funds, local jurisdictions need to continue to align their general plans’ housing and complete streets policies as a part of OBAG 2 and as separately required by state law.
**Complete Streets Requirement**

Jurisdictions must adopt a complete streets resolution by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC, incorporating MTC’s required complete streets elements as outlined in MTC’s Complete Streets Guidance.

Alternatively, to recognize local jurisdictions’ efforts to update their general plan circulation element to incorporate the provisions of the 2008 Complete Streets Act in response to the provisions stated in OBAG 1, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010 and before the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC.

The approach above focuses on the adoption of local complete streets resolutions, while acknowledging the jurisdictions that took efforts to update their circulation element in anticipation of future OBAG requirements.

**Housing Element Requirement**

Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015. Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding.

Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this requirement during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or risk deprogramming of OBAG 2 funding.

The complete streets and housing requirements are not required for jurisdictions with no general plan or land use authority such as Caltrans, CMAs or transit agencies under a JPA or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction). However, in such instances the jurisdiction in which the project is physically located must meet these requirements, except for transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a maintenance facility.

**Anti-Displacement Policies Requirement**


6. **Continue Transparency and Outreach to the Public Throughout the Process:**

CMAs will continue to report on their outreach process as part of their solicitation and selection of projects for OBAG. Each CMA will develop a memorandum addressing outreach efforts, agency coordination, distribution methodology and Title VI compliance. CMA reporting requirements are provided in Appendix A-10, the Checklist for CMA and Local Jurisdiction Compliance with MTC Resolution 4202.
PROGRAM CATEGORIES AND PROJECT LIST

Appendix A-1 outlines the OBAG 2 program categories and commitments.

Attachment B of Resolution 4202 contains the list of projects to be programmed under the OBAG 2 program. Attachments B-1 and B-2 list the projects receiving OBAG 2 funding through the regional programs and county programs respectively. The project lists are subject to project selection actions (conducted by MTC for most of the regional programs and by the CMAs for the county programs and other funds distributed to them). MTC staff will update Attachments B-1 and B-2 as projects are selected or revised by the Commission and CMAs and are included in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

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

1. **Public Involvement.** MTC is committed to a public involvement process that is proactive and provides comprehensive information, timely public notice, public access to key decisions, and opportunities for continuing involvement. MTC provides many methods to fulfill this commitment, as outlined in the MTC Public Participation Plan, Resolution No. 4174. The Commission’s adoption of the OBAG 2 program, including policy and procedures, meets the provisions of the MTC Public Participation Plan. MTC’s advisory committees and the Bay Area Partnership have been consulted in the development of funding commitments and policies for this program; and opportunities to comment have been provided to other stakeholders and members of the public.

Furthermore, investments made in the OBAG 2 program must be consistent with federal Title VI requirements. Title VI prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, income, and national origin in programs and activities receiving federal financial assistance. Public outreach to and involvement of individuals in low income and minority communities covered under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and the Executive Order pertaining to Environmental Justice is critical to both local and regional decisions. Additionally, when CMAs select projects for funding at the county level, they must consider equitable solicitation and selection of project candidates in accordance with federal Title VI requirements (as set forth in Appendix A-7).

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

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

To provide flexibility, an alternative averaging approach may be used. For this approach, a CMA may program grant amounts no less than $100,000 for any project, provided that the overall average of all grant amounts within their County CMA Program meets the county minimum grant amount threshold. This lower threshold of $100,000 also applies to Safe Routes to School projects, which are typically of smaller scale.

Furthermore, all OBAG 2 programming amounts must be rounded to thousands.

4. **Air Quality Conformity.** In the Bay Area, it is the responsibility of MTC to make a regional air quality conformity determination for the TIP in accordance with federal Clean Air Act requirements and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity regulations. MTC evaluates the impact of the TIP on regional air quality during the update of the TIP. Non-exempt projects that are not incorporated in the current finding for the TIP will not be considered for funding in the OBAG 2 program until the development of a subsequent air quality finding for the TIP. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$).

Therefore, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed Projects of Air Quality Concern (POAQC) must complete a hot-spot analysis as required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally, POAQC are those projects that result in significant increases in, or concentrations of, emissions from diesel vehicles.

5. **Environmental Clearance.** Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section § 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with federal funds.

6. **Application and Resolution of Local Support.** Once a project has been selected for funding, project sponsors must submit a completed project application for each project through MTC’s Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) a project submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff through FMS, and 2) a Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor’s governing board or council and submitted in FMS. A template for the Resolution of Local Support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/obag2](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/obag2)
7. **Project Screening and Compliance with Regional and Federal Requirements.** MTC staff will perform a review of projects proposed for OBAG 2 to ensure 1) eligibility; 2) consistency with the region’s long-range plan; and 3) project readiness. In addition, project sponsors must adhere to directives such as the Complete Streets Requirements, Housing Element Requirements, and the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606), as outlined below, and provide the required matching funds. Project sponsors should note that fund source programs, eligibility criteria, and regulations may change as a result of the passage of new surface transportation authorization legislation. In this situation, MTC staff will work to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission.

- **Federal Project Eligibility:** STP is the most flexible source of federal funding, with a wide range of projects that may be considered eligible. Eligible projects include roadway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration), public transit capital improvements, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, mitigation related to an STP project, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in 23 U.S.C § 133 and at: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/stp.cfm](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/factsheets/stp.cfm).

  CMAQ is a more targeted funding source. In general, CMAQ funds may be used for new or expanded transportation projects, programs, and operations that help reduce emissions. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in an approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit expansion projects, new bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, and experimental pilot projects. For more detailed information, refer to FHWA’s revised guidance provided at: [http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/air_quality/cmaq/policy_and_guidance/).

  MTC reserves the right to assign specific fund sources to projects based on availability and eligibility requirements. In the event that a new surface transportation authorization is enacted during implementation of OBAG 2 that materially alters these programs, MTC staff will work with the CMAs and project sponsors to match projects with appropriate federal fund programs.

- **RTP Consistency:** Projects funded through OBAG 2 must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (currently *Plan Bay Area*). Project sponsors must identify each project’s relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, including the specific RTP ID number or reference. RTP consistency will be verified by MTC staff for all OBAG 2 projects. Projects in the County program will also be reviewed by CMA staff prior to submitting selected projects to MTC.
**Complete Streets Policy:** Federal, state and regional policies and directives emphasize the accommodation of bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. MTC’s Complete Streets Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure the accommodation of non-motorized travelers is considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county CMAs ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are considered by the county for OBAG 2 funding and submitted to MTC. The CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review prior to CMAs’ project selection actions.

Related state policies include: Caltrans Complete Streets Policy Deputy Directive 64 R1, which stipulates pedestrians, bicyclists and persons with disabilities must be considered in all programming, planning, maintenance, construction, operations, and project development activities and products; and the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, which requires local agency general plan circulation elements to address all travel modes.

**Project Delivery and Monitoring:** OBAG 2 funding is available in the following five federal fiscal years: 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, and 2021-22. Funds may be programmed in any of these years, conditioned upon the availability of federal apportionment and obligation authority (OA), and subject to TIP financial constraint requirements. In addition, in order to provide uninterrupted funding to ongoing efforts and to provide more time to prepare for the effective delivery of capital projects, priority of funding for the first year of programming apportionment (FY 2017-18) will be provided to ongoing programs, such as regional and CMA planning, non-infrastructure projects, and the preliminary engineering phase of capital projects.

Specific programming timelines will be determined through the development of the Annual Obligation Plan, which is developed by MTC staff in collaboration with the Bay Area Partnership technical working groups and project sponsors. Once programmed in the TIP, the funds must be obligated by FHWA or transferred to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) within the federal fiscal year the funds are programmed in the TIP. Additionally, all OBAG 2 funds **must** be obligated no later than January 31, 2023.

Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606 and any subsequent revisions). All funds are subject to obligation, award, invoicing, reimbursement and project close-out requirements. The failure to meet these deadlines may result in the de-programming and redirection of funds to other projects.

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

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

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

- **Funding Exchange**: Sometimes federal funds may not be the best fit for projects being implemented to meet plan and program goals and objectives. In such cases, federal OBAG funding may be exchanged with non-federal funds. MTC staff will work with the CMAs when such opportunities arise. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC’s fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331) and the locally-funded project must be included in the federal TIP.

- **Local Match**: Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funding require a non-federal local match. Although local match requirements are subject to change, the current local match requirement for STP and CMAQ funded projects in California is 11.47% of the total project cost, with FHWA providing up to 88.53% of the total project cost through reimbursements. For capital projects, sponsors that fully fund the project development or Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase with non-federal funds may use toll credits in lieu of a match for the construction phase. For these projects, sponsors must still meet all federal requirements for the PE phase.

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

**REGIONAL PROGRAMS**

The programs below comprise the OBAG 2 Regional Programs, managed by MTC. Funding amounts for each program are included in Appendix A-1. Individual projects will be added to Attachment B-1 and B-2 as they are selected and included in the federal TIP.

1. **Regional Planning Activities**
   This program provides funding to support regional planning and outreach activities.
   Appendix A-3 details the funding amounts and distribution for planning and outreach activities.

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

   To support the collection and analysis of local roads asset conditions for regional planning efforts and statewide funding advocacy, to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding for local streets and roads, a jurisdiction must:
   - Have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent) updated at least once every three years (with a one-year extension allowed); and
   - Fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey (including any assigned funding contribution); and
   - Provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years (with a one-year grace period allowed).

3. **Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) Planning & Implementation**
   Funding in this program implements the following:

   *Regional PDA Planning and Implementation:* The PDA Planning Program places an emphasis on intensifying land uses at and near transit stations and along transit corridors in PDAs. The key goals of the program are to: increase supply of affordable and market rate housing, jobs and services within the PDA planning area; boost transit ridership and thereby reduce vehicle miles traveled by PDA residents, employees and visitors; increase walking and bicycling by improving
multi-modal access and effectively managing parking; and locate key services and retail within the PDA planning area. Funding is available for regional planning and implementation efforts and grants to jurisdictions to provide PDA planning support, and typically fund specific plans and programmatic Environmental Impact Reports. PDA plans funded through the program focus on a range of transit-supportive elements including market demand analysis, affordable housing strategies, multi-modal connectivity including pedestrian-friendly design standards, parking demand analysis, infrastructure development, implementation planning and financing strategies and strategies to advance the Air District’s Planning Healthy Places guidelines. The PDA Planning Program will give priority to cities with high risk of displacement in order to support the development of local policies and programs.

4. Climate Initiatives Program
The purpose of the OBAG 2 Climate Initiatives Program is to support the implementation of strategies identified in Plan Bay Area to achieve the required CO₂ emissions reductions per SB375 and federal criteria pollutant reductions. Investments focus on projects and programs with effective greenhouse gas emission reduction results.

5. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program
The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands and open space amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. The PCA program includes one approach for the North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second approach for the remaining five counties.

In the North Bay, each of the four CMAs will take the lead to develop a county-wide program, building on PCA planning conducted to date to select projects for funding.

For the remaining counties, MTC will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. MTC will provide federal funding which will be combined with the Coastal Conservancy’s own program funds in order to support a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) than can be accommodated with federal transportation dollars alone. The Coastal Conservancy, MTC, and ABAG staff will cooperatively manage the call for proposals.

The minimum non-federal match required for PCA-program funding is 2:1.

As a part of the update to Plan Bay Area, MTC is exploring implementing a Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) Program. RAMP would mitigate certain environmental impacts from multiple planned transportation projects, rather than mitigating on a less-efficient per-project level. Partnering arrangements can be established to leverage multiple fund sources in order to maximize benefits of the RAMP and PCA programs. As such, PCA funds may be used to deliver net environmental benefits to a RAMP program project.

---

1 Guidance will be developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff pending the release of these guidelines in early 2016.
In instances where federal funds may not be used for this purpose, sponsors may exchange OBAG 2 funds with eligible non-federal funds. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC’s fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).

Appendix A-9 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening, eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.

6. Regional Active Operational Management

This program is administered at the regional level by MTC to actively manage congestion through cost-effective operational strategies that improve mobility and system efficiency across freeways, arterials and transit modes. Funding continues to be directed to evolving MTC operational programs such as next generation 511, Freeway Service Patrol (FSP), incident management program, managed lanes and regional rideshare program. Funding will also be directed to new initiatives such as the Columbus Day Initiative that deploys advanced technologies and Transportation Management Systems that ensures the existing and new technology infrastructure is operational and well-maintained.

Columbus Day Initiative

The Columbus Day Initiative (CDI) builds on the proven success of its predecessor program (the Freeway Performance Initiative), which implemented traditional fixed time-of-day freeway ramp metering and arterial signal timing projects that achieved significant delay reduction and safety on Bay Area freeways and arterials at a fraction of the cost of traditional highway widening projects. The CDI aims to deliver cost-effective, technology-driven operational improvement projects such as, adaptive ramp metering, hard shoulder running lanes, queue warning signs, connected vehicle technologies, shared mobility technologies, and regional arterial operations strategies. Projects would target priority freeway and arterial corridors with significant congestion. Funding for performance monitoring activities and corridor studies is included to monitor the state of the system and to identify and assess the feasibility of operational strategies to be deployed.

Transportation Management Systems

This program includes the operations and management of highway operations field equipment; critical freeway and incident management functions; and Transportation Management Center (TMC) staff resources needed to actively operate and maintain the highway system.

7. Transit Priorities Program

The objective of the Transit Priorities Program is to assist transit operators to fund major fleet replacements, including the BART Car Replacement Phase 1 project, fixed guideway rehabilitation and other high-scoring capital needs, including replacement of Clipper equipment and development of Clipper 2.0, that are consistent with MTC’s Transit Capital Priorities policy for programming federal transit funds (MTC Resolution 4140 or successor resolution).

The program also implements elements of the Transit Sustainability Project by making transit-supportive investments in major transit corridors that can be carried out within two years through the Transit Performance Initiative (TPI). The focus of TPI is on making cost-effective operational improvements on significant trunk lines which carry the largest number of
passengers in the Bay Area including transit signal prioritization, passenger circulation improvements at major hubs, boarding/stop improvements and other improvements to improve the passenger experience.

**COUNTY PROGRAMMING POLICIES**

The policies below apply to the programs managed by the county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) or substitute agency:

- **Program Eligibility:** The CMA, or substitute agency, may program funds from its OBAG 2 county fund distribution to projects that meet the eligibility requirements for any of the following transportation improvement types:
  - Planning and Outreach Activities
  - Local Streets and Roads Preservation
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
  - Transportation for Livable Communities
  - Safe Routes To School
  - Priority Conservation Areas
  - Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Improvements

- **Fund Sources & Formula Distribution:** OBAG 2 is funded primarily from two federal fund sources: STP and CMAQ. The CMAs will be provided a breakdown of specific OBAG 2 fund sources, with the understanding that actual fund sources are subject to change. Should there be significant changes to federal fund sources, MTC staff will work with the CMAs to identify and realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission. Furthermore, due to strict funding availability and eligibility requirements, the CMAs must adhere to the fund source limitations provided. Exceptions may be granted by MTC staff based on actual fund source availability and final federal apportionment levels.

Consistent with OBAG 1, 60% of available OBAG 2 funding is assigned to Regional Programs and 40% assigned to the base County CMA Programs. The Safe Routes to School (SRTS) and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) programs augment the county base funding, bringing the final proportionate share to 55% regional and 45% county. The Base county funds (SRTS & FAS have their own formula distribution) are distributed to each county based on the OBAG 2 county distribution formula (see page 3). Counties are further guaranteed that the funding amount for planning purposes will not exceed 50% of their total distribution. This results in the county of Napa receiving additional funding. This planning guarantee clause results in a slight deviation in the final OBAG 2 fund distribution for each county. The base County CMA Program fund distribution after the planning guarantee adjustment is shown in Appendix A-2.

- **Priority Development Area (PDA) Policies**
  - PDA minimum investment: CMAs in larger counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) shall direct at least 70% of their
OBAG 2 investments to PDAs. For North Bay counties (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) this minimum target is 50% to reflect the more rural nature of these counties. CMA planning and outreach costs partially count towards PDA minimum investment targets (70% or 50%, in line with each county’s PDA minimum investment target). The guaranteed minimum for Priority Conservation Area (PCA), Safe Routes to School (SRTS), and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) do not count towards PDA targets. The PDA/non-PDA funding split is shown in Appendix A-2.

- PDA boundary delineation: Refer to [http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive_maps/](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/interactive_maps/) which provides a GIS overlay of the PDAs in the Bay Area to exact map boundaries including transportation facilities. This map is updated as ABAG approves new PDA designations.

- Defining proximate access to PDAs: The CMAs may determine that a project located outside of a PDA provides proximate access to the PDA, and thus counts towards the county’s minimum PDA investment target. The CMA is required to map these projects along with the associated PDA(s) and provide a policy justification for designating the project as supporting a PDA through proximate access. This information should assist decision makers, stakeholders, and the public in evaluating the impact of the investment on a nearby PDA, to determine whether or not the investment should be credited towards the county’s PDA minimum investment target. This information must be presented for public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG programming decisions.

- PDA Investment & Growth Strategy: Updates to each county’s PDA Investment & Growth Strategy are required every four years and must be adopted by the CMA Board. The updates should be coordinated with the countywide plan and Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) updates to inform RTP development decisions. Interim status reports are required two years after each update to address needed revisions and provide an activity and progress status. See Appendix A-8 for details.

- **Project Selection:** County CMAs or substitute agencies are given the responsibility to develop a project selection process. The process should include solicitation of projects, identifying evaluation criteria, conducting outreach, evaluating project applications, and selecting projects.

  - Public Involvement: In selecting projects for federal funding, the decision making authority is responsible for ensuring that the process complies with federal statutes and regulations. In order to ensure that the CMA process for administering OBAG 2 is in compliance with federal regulations, CMAs are required to lead a public outreach process as directed by Appendix A-7.

  - Unified Call for Projects: CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects for their OBAG 2 program. Final project lists are due to MTC by
January 31, 2017, with all associated project information submitted to MTC using the Fund Management System (FMS) by February 28, 2017. On a case-by-case basis and as approved in advance by MTC staff, these deadlines may be waived to allow coordination with other county-wide call for projects or programming needs. The goal is to coordinate the OBAG2 call for projects, and provide project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects.

- **Project Programming Targets and Delivery Deadlines**: CMAs must program their block grant funds over the OBAG 2 period (FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22). In general, the expectation is that on-going activities such as CMA planning, non-infrastructure projects and the Preliminary Engineering (PE) phase of projects would use capacity in the first year, followed by the capital phases of project in later years.

- **OBAG 2 funding is subject to the provisions of the Regional Project Delivery Policy** (MTC Resolution 3606, or its successor) including the deadlines for Request for Authorization (RFA) submittal and federal authorization/obligation. Additionally, the following funding deadlines apply for each county, with earlier delivery strongly encouraged:
  - At least half of the OBAG 2 funds must be obligated (federal authorization/FTA Transfer) by January 31, 2020.
  - All remaining OBAG 2 funds must be obligated by January 31, 2023.

  ▶ **Performance and Accountability Policies**: Jurisdictions need to comply with the following policies, as well as other requirements noted in the document, in order to be eligible recipients of OBAG 2 funds.

  - **Adopt a complete streets resolution** by the date the CMAs submit their OBAG 2 project recommendations to MTC, incorporating MTC’s required complete streets elements as outlined in [MTC’s Complete Streets Guidance](#). Alternatively, to recognize local jurisdiction’s efforts to update their general plan circulation element to incorporate the provisions of the 2008 Complete Streets Act in response to the provisions stated in OBAG 1, a jurisdiction may adopt a significant revision to the circulation element of the general plan that complies with the Act after January 1, 2010.

  For compliance, a substantial revision of the circulation element, passed after January 1, 2010, shall “…plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan,” while complying with the other provisions of CA Government Code Section 65302 and Complete Streets Act of 2008.
The approach above focuses on the adoption of local complete streets resolutions, while acknowledging the jurisdictions that took efforts to update their circulation element in anticipation of future OBAG requirements.

- Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015.

- Jurisdictions that have failed to meet this deadline must have their housing elements certified by HCD by June 30, 2016 in order to be eligible to receive OBAG 2 funding.

- Furthermore, under state statute, jurisdictions are required to submit Housing Element Annual Reports by April 1 every year. All cities and counties receiving OBAG 2 funding must comply with this statute during the entire OBAG 2 funding period or risk deprogramming of OBAG 2 funding.


- For jurisdictions with local public streets and roads, to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding, the jurisdiction must:
  - Have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent) updated at least once every three years (with a one-year extension allowed);
  - Fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey; and
  - Provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years (with a one-year grace period allowed).

- For a transit agency project sponsor under a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) or district (not under the governance of a local jurisdiction), or an agency where housing and complete streets policies do not apply, the jurisdiction where the project is located (such as station/stop improvements) will need to comply with the policies and other requirements specified in this attachment before funds may be programmed to the project sponsor. However, this is not required if the project is transit/rail agency property such as, track, rolling stock or a transit maintenance facility.

- OBAG 2 funds may not be programmed to any jurisdiction out of compliance with the policies and other requirements specified in this attachment.

- The CMA will be responsible for tracking progress towards all OBAG 2 requirements and affirming to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance prior to MTC programming OBAG 2 funds to its projects in the TIP. CMAs will
provide the following prior to programming projects in the TIP (see Appendix A-10):

- Documentation of the approach used to select OBAG 2 projects including outreach efforts, agency coordination, Title VI compliance, and the methodology used for distributing funds within the county;
- The board adopted list of projects recommended for OBAG 2 funding;
- Self-certification that all projects recommended for funding are consistent with the current RTP (including documentation) and have completed project-specific Complete Streets Checklists (including documentation);
- Identification of the Single-Point of Contact assigned by the jurisdiction for all FHWA-funded projects, including OBAG 2 projects;
- Documentation of local jurisdiction compliance with MTC's Complete Streets Policy, including a list of the status of each jurisdiction, a letter from the CMA for each jurisdiction describing how the jurisdiction meets the policy requirements, and supporting documentation for each local jurisdiction (resolutions and/or circulation elements);
- Documentation of local jurisdiction compliance with MTC's Housing Element requirements, including a list of the status of each jurisdiction's Annual Housing Element Progress Report as well as any supporting documentation for each jurisdiction (progress reports and copies of submittal letter to HCD). This documentation will be required annually from CMAs (April 30 each year) throughout the OBAG 2 programming period;
- Documentation for any projects recommended for funding that apply toward the county's minimum PDA investment target. This includes mapping of all mappable projects (projects with a physical location). For projects that are not physically located within a PDA, the CMA is required to map each project along with the associated PDA(s) and provide a policy justification for designating each project as supporting a PDA through proximate access. CMAs must also document that this information was used when presenting its program of projects to their board and the public; and
- Self-certification that the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy has been completed and adopted by the CMA Board, or will be adopted in coordination with the RTP update. Documentation of required updates and interim progress reports must also be submitted by the CMAs throughout the OBAG 2 period.
COUNTY PROGRAMS

The categories below comprise the eligible OBAG 2 County Programs, administered by the nine county CMAs. The CMAs should ensure that the project selection process and selected projects meet all of eligibility requirements throughout this document as well as in federal statutes and regulations. MTC staff will work with CMAs and project sponsors to resolve any eligibility issues which may arise, including air quality conformity exceptions and requirements.

County CMA Program

The base OBAG 2 County program accounts for 40% of the total funding available through OBAG 2 and is distributed to each county according to the OBAG 2 county formula after accounting for the CMA Planning minimum guarantee (see Appendices A-2 and A-3). This program includes CMA planning and outreach as well as the various projects selected through each county’s competitive call for projects. Projects selected through the base county program are subject to the PDA investment minimum requirements.

1. CMA Planning and Outreach

This category provides funding to the county Congestion Management Agency (CMA) or substitute agency to support programming, monitoring and outreach activities. Such efforts include, but are not limited to: county-based planning efforts for development of the RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS); development of PDA growth strategies; development and implementation of a complete streets compliance protocol; establishing land use and travel forecasting process and procedures consistent with ABAG/MTC; ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of federal-aid local projects; and undertaking the programming of assigned funding and solicitation of projects.

The minimum funding level for the CMA planning and outreach program continues OBAG 1 commitments by escalating FY 2016-17 amounts at 2% per year. In addition, counties are guaranteed that the base funding level for the CMA’s planning and outreach program will not exceed 50% of the county’s total OBAG 2 County Program distribution. Actual CMA planning and outreach amounts for each county, are shown in Appendix A-3.

At their discretion, the CMAs may choose to designate additional funding from their County Program to augment their planning and outreach efforts.

All funding and activities will be administered through an interagency agreement between MTC and the respective CMA.

2. Local Streets and Roads Preservation

This category is for the preservation of local streets and roads on the federal-aid system. To be eligible for funding of any Local Streets and Roads (LSR) preservation project, the jurisdiction must have a certified Pavement Management Program (StreetSaver® or equivalent). In addition, selected pavement projects should be based on the needs analysis resulting from the established Pavement Management Program (PMP) for the jurisdiction. This requirement ensures that streets selected for investment are cost effective. MTC is responsible for verifying
the certification status of jurisdictions. The current certification status of area jurisdictions can be found at [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/pmp/).

Furthermore, to support the collection and analysis of local roads asset conditions for comprehensive regional planning efforts and statewide funding advocacy, a jurisdiction must fully participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey to be eligible for OBAG 2 funding for pavement rehabilitation.

Eligibility requirements for specific project types are included below:

- **Pavement Rehabilitation:**
  
  All pavement rehabilitation projects, including projects with pavement segments with a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) below 70, must be consistent with segments recommended for treatment within the programming cycle by the jurisdiction's PMP.

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

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

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

**Federal-Aid Eligible Facilities:** Federal-aid highways as defined in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(6) are eligible for local streets and roads preservation funding. A federal-aid highway is a public road that is not classified as a rural minor collector or local road (residential) or lower. Project sponsors must confirm the eligibility of their roadway through the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) prior to the application for funding.

**3. Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements**

This category funds a wide range of bicycle and pedestrian improvements including Class I, II and III bicycle facilities; cycle tracks; bicycle education, outreach, sharing and parking; sidewalks,
ramps, pathways and pedestrian bridges; user safety and supporting facilities; and traffic signal actuation. Bicycle and pedestrian projects may be located on or off the federal-aid highway system.

Additional eligibility requirements will apply to bicycle and pedestrian projects that are funded with CMAQ funds rather than STP funds, given the more limited scope of the CMAQ funding program. According to CMAQ eligibility requirements, bicycle and pedestrian facilities must not be exclusively recreational and should reduce vehicle trips resulting in air pollution reductions. Also, the hours of operation need to be reasonable and support bicycle/pedestrian needs, particularly during commute periods. For example, the policy that a trail be closed to users before sunrise or after sunset may limit users from using the facility during the portions of peak commute hours, particularly during times of the year with shorter days.

4. Transportation for Livable Communities

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

General project categories include the following:

- Transit station improvements such as plazas, station access, pocket parks, and bicycle parking.
- Transit expansions serving PDAs.
- Complete Streets improvements that improve bicycle and pedestrian access and encourage use of alternative modes.
- Cost-effective, technology-driven active operational management strategies for local arterials and for highways when used to augment other fund sources or match challenge grants.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) projects including car sharing, vanpooling traveler coordination and information, and Clipper®-related projects.
- Transit access projects connecting high density housing/jobs/mixed land use to transit, such as bicycle/pedestrian paths and bridges and safe routes to transit.
- Streetscape projects focusing on high-impact, multi-modal improvements or associated with high density housing/mixed use and transit, such as bulb outs, sidewalk widening, crosswalk enhancements, audible signal modification, mid-block crossing and signals, new striping for bicycle lanes and road diets, pedestrian street lighting, medians, pedestrian refuges, wayfinding signage, tree grates, bollards, permanent bicycle racks, signal modification for bicycle detection, street trees, raised planters, planters, costs associated with on-site storm water management, permeable paving, and pedestrian-scaled street furniture including bus shelters, benches, magazine racks, garbage and recycling bins.
• Mobility management and coordination projects that meet the specific needs of seniors and individuals with disabilities and enhance transportation access for populations beyond those served by one agency or organization within a community. Examples include the integration and coordination of services for individuals with disabilities, seniors, and low-income individuals; individualized travel training and trip planning activities for customers; the development and operation of one-stop transportation traveler call centers to coordinate transportation information on all travel modes and to manage eligibility requirements and arrangements for customers among supporting programs; and the operation of transportation brokerages to coordinate providers, funding agencies and passengers. Selected projects may need to transfer the STP/CMAQ funds received to FTA.
• PDA planning and implementation, including projects that incentivize local PDA transit oriented development housing (within funding eligibility limitations unless exchanged).
• Density incentives projects and non-transportation infrastructure improvements that include density bonuses, sewer upgrade, land banking or site assembly (these projects require funding exchanges to address federal funding eligibility limitations).

Activities that are not eligible for funding include: air quality non-exempt projects (unless granted an exception by MTC staff), new roadways, roadway extensions, right of way acquisition for future expansion, operations, and routine maintenance.

Additional County Programs

In addition to the base County CMA Program, OBAG 2 directs additional funds to the CMAs to distribute to eligible project types. These programs are the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program, the Federal Aid Secondary Shares Continuation (FAS) program, and for the North Bay Counties, the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) program.

1. Safe Routes to School
Eligible projects for the Safe Routes to School (SRTS) program include infrastructure and non-infrastructure projects that facilitate reduction in vehicular travel to and from schools. It is important to note that this program is funded exclusively by the CMAQ funding program. Given the intent of the CMAQ program to reduce vehicular emissions, the OBAG 2 SRTS program is targeted towards air quality improvement rather than the health or safety of school-aged children. Despite this limitation, project eligibility under CMAQ largely overlaps with typical eligibility requirements for Safe Routes to School programs. Detailed examples of eligible projects are provided below:

Eligible Non-Infrastructure Projects

Public Education and Outreach Activities
• Public education and outreach can help communities reduce emissions and congestion by inducing drivers to change their transportation choices
• Activities that promote new or existing transportation services, developing messages and advertising materials (including market research, focus groups, and creative), placing
messages and materials, evaluating message and material dissemination and public awareness, technical assistance, programs that promote the Tax Code provision related to commute benefits, and any other activities that help forward less-polluting transportation options

- Air quality public education messages: Long-term public education and outreach can be effective in raising awareness that can lead to changes in travel behavior and ongoing emissions reductions; therefore, these activities may be funded indefinitely
- Non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use
- Travel Demand Management (TDM) activities including traveler information services, shuttle services, carpools, vanpools, parking pricing, etc.

Eligible Infrastructure Projects

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

Exclusions found to be ineligible uses of CMAQ funds

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

Within the SRTS program, funding is distributed among the nine Bay Area counties based on K-12 total enrollment for private and public schools as reported by the California Department of Education for FY 2013-14 (see Appendix A-5). SRTS funding distributed to CMAs based on enrollment is not subject to the PDA minimum investment requirements. However, if a CMA chooses to augment the SRTS program with additional funding from their base OBAG 2 County CMA program, this additional funding is subject to the PDA minimum investment requirements.

Before programming projects into the TIP, the CMAs shall provide the SRTS projects, recommended county program scope, budget, schedule, agency roles, and federal funding recipient.

In programming the funds in the TIP, project sponsors may consider using non-federal funds to fund SRTS activities ineligible for federal funding. In such instances, the sponsor is allowed to use toll credits for the federal project, conditioned upon a minimum of 11.47% in non-federal funds being dedicated for SRTS activities. Separate accounting of a federalized project and a non-federalized project to fund a single program can be challenging, so care should be taken when using this option.
CMAs with an established SRTS program may choose to program local funds for SRTS projects in lieu of OBAG 2 funds and use the OBAG 2 funding for other eligible OBAG 2 projects. In such instances the local SRTS project(s) must be identified at the time the CMA submits the county OBAG 2 program to MTC and subsequently programmed in the federal TIP.

2. Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Shares
The Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) program, which directed funding to rural roads, was eliminated in 1991 with the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). However, California statutes provide for the continuation of minimum funding levels to counties, guaranteeing their prior FAS shares for rural county roads.

The county CMAs are required to ensure the counties receive their guaranteed annual funding through the CMA-managed OBAG county program. The county of San Francisco has no rural roads, and therefore does not receive FAS funding. In addition, the counties of Marin, Napa, and San Mateo may exchange their annual guaranteed FAS funding with state funding from Caltrans, as permitted by state statute. Caltrans takes these federal funds “off the top” before distributing regional STP funds to MTC. The CMAs for these three counties are not required to provide FAS guaranteed funding to these three counties for years in which these counties request such an exchange, as the statutory requirement is met through this exchange with Caltrans.

Counties may access their FAS funding at any time within the OBAG 2 period for any project eligible for STP funding. Guaranteed minimum FAS funding amounts are determined by California’s Federal-Aid Secondary Highways Act (California Code § 2200-2214) and are listed in Appendix A-4. This FAS funding is not subject to the minimum PDA investment requirement. Any additional funding provided by the CMAs to the counties from the OBAG 2 county base formula distribution is subject to the minimum PDA investment requirements.

3. Priority Conservation Area (PCA)
The Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program provides funding for the development of plans and projects to assist in the preservation and enhancement of rural lands and open space. Generally, eligible projects include PCA planning activities, bicycle and pedestrian access to open space and parklands, visual enhancements and habitat/environmental enhancements. Specifically, projects must support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses.

Land acquisition for preservation purposes is not federally eligible, but may be facilitated through CMA-initiated funding exchanges.

The PCA funding program includes one approach for the North Bay program (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second for the remaining five counties. In the North Bay, each CMA will receive dedicated funding, lead a county-wide program building on PCA planning conducted to date, and select projects for funding. For the remaining counties, MTC will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. Appendix A-9 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.
Any CMA may use additional funding from its base OBAG 2 County Program to expand its dedicated PCA program (North Bay counties), augment grants received from the regionally competitive PCA program (remaining counties), or develop its own county PCA program (all counties).

The PCA program requires a 2:1 minimum non-federal match.

As a part of the update to Plan Bay Area, MTC is exploring implementing a Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) Program. RAMP would mitigate certain environmental impacts from multiple planned transportation projects, rather than mitigating on a less-efficient per-project level. Partnering arrangements can be established to leverage multiple fund sources in order to maximize benefits of the RAMP and PCA programs. As such, PCA funds may be used to deliver net environmental benefits to a RAMP program project.

In instances where federal funds may not be used for this purpose, sponsors may exchange OBAG 2 funds with eligible non-federal funds. Such exchanges must be consistent with MTC’s fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).
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OBAG 2

Program Categories
FY 2017-18 through FY 2019-22
November 18, 2015

Program Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Program</th>
<th>OBAG 1</th>
<th>OBAG 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Distribution</td>
<td>% Share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region **</td>
<td>$499.3</td>
<td>436.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Regional Planning Activities **</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pavement Management Program **</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Regional PDA Planning &amp; Implementation **</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Climate Initiatives **</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Priority Conservation Area **</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Regional Active Operational Management **</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>170.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Transit Capital Priorities **</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>189.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$454.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local PDA Planning (within county program for OBAG 2)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes To School (Moved to county program for OBAG 2)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal-Aid Secondary - FAS (within county program for OBAG 2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$499.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Program Total: 55% $436.5

OBAG 1: $827
OBAG 2: $790

County Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Base Formula STP/CMAQ/TE *</th>
<th>Final Distribution Including SRTS &amp; PDA</th>
<th>OBAG 1 Total: $327.4</th>
<th>OBAG 2 Total: $372.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>19.6% $64.1</td>
<td>19.7% $73.4</td>
<td>20.0% $63.3 $5.3 $1.8 $19.9% $70.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>14.1% $46.0</td>
<td>14.2% $52.9</td>
<td>14.6% $46.2 $4.1 $1.3 $14.6% $51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.3% $10.7</td>
<td>3.3% $12.3</td>
<td>2.6% $8.3 $0.9 $0.8 $2.8% $10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3% $7.4</td>
<td>2.3% $8.7</td>
<td>1.6% $5.0 $0.5 $1.2 $2.2% $7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>12.0% $39.3</td>
<td>11.7% $43.5</td>
<td>13.4% $42.2 $1.8 $0.0 $12.4% $43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.3% $27.2</td>
<td>8.4% $31.2</td>
<td>8.4% $26.6 $2.4 $0.9 $8.4% $29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>27.3% $89.3</td>
<td>27.2% $101.4</td>
<td>27.5% $87.0 $6.9 $1.7 $26.9% $95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>6.0% $19.5</td>
<td>5.9% $22.1</td>
<td>5.2% $16.6 $1.5 $1.5 $5.5% $19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.3% $23.8</td>
<td>7.2% $26.9</td>
<td>6.6% $20.8 $1.7 $3.3 $7.2% $25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$327.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>$372.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* OBAG 1: In OBAG 1, the county CMAs received $327 M with $18 M in RTIP-TE and $309 M in STP/CMAQ. RTIP-TE funding is no longer part of OBAG 2
** Base: Unadjusted raw county base formula amount
*** SRTS: SRTS moved to County Program and distributed based on FY 2013-14 K-12 school enrollment
**** FAS: Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS) distributed based on statutory requirements. San Francisco has no rural roads and therefore is not subject to State Statute requirements
**** OBAG2: Final county distribution rounded to nearest $1,000 and includes SRTS & FAS and adjusted so a county CMA's base planning is no more than 50% of total

OBAG Total: **$827**
OBAG 2: **$790**
OBAG 2
County Fund Distribution
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Total County Distribution *</th>
<th>OBAG 2 Adjusted Base **</th>
<th>PDA Percentage</th>
<th>PDA/Anywhere Split</th>
<th>PDA</th>
<th>Anywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>$70,243,000</td>
<td>$63,124,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>$44,187,000</td>
<td>$18,937,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>$51,461,000</td>
<td>$46,030,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>$32,221,000</td>
<td>$13,809,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>$10,025,000</td>
<td>$8,323,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>$4,162,000</td>
<td>$4,161,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>$7,644,000</td>
<td>$5,940,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>$2,970,000</td>
<td>$2,970,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$43,906,000</td>
<td>$42,109,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>$29,476,000</td>
<td>$12,633,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>$29,846,000</td>
<td>$26,560,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>$18,592,000</td>
<td>$7,968,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>$95,268,000</td>
<td>$86,689,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70/30</td>
<td>$60,682,000</td>
<td>$26,007,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>$19,499,000</td>
<td>$16,524,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>$8,262,000</td>
<td>$8,262,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>$25,620,000</td>
<td>$20,701,000</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50/50</td>
<td>$10,351,000</td>
<td>$10,350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$353,512,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$316,000,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$210,903,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,097,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total county distribution including SRTS, FAS and planning adjustment
** OBAG 2 adjusted base county amount subject to PDA investment - does not include SRTS, FAS or PCA. Rounded to thousands and adjusted to ensure a county's base planning activity is no more than 50% of the total distribution
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OBAG 2
Planning & Outreach
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

### OBAG 2 - County CMA Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>ACTC</td>
<td>$1,034,000</td>
<td>$1,055,000</td>
<td>$1,076,000</td>
<td>$1,097,000</td>
<td>$1,119,000</td>
<td>$1,142,000</td>
<td>$5,489,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>$818,000</td>
<td>$834,000</td>
<td>$851,000</td>
<td>$868,000</td>
<td>$885,000</td>
<td>$904,000</td>
<td>$4,342,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>TAM</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$749,000</td>
<td>$764,000</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$3,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>NCTPA</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$749,000</td>
<td>$764,000</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$3,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>SFCTA</td>
<td>$753,000</td>
<td>$768,000</td>
<td>$783,000</td>
<td>$799,000</td>
<td>$815,000</td>
<td>$832,000</td>
<td>$3,997,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>SMCCAG</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$749,000</td>
<td>$764,000</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$3,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>VTA</td>
<td>$1,145,000</td>
<td>$1,168,000</td>
<td>$1,191,000</td>
<td>$1,215,000</td>
<td>$1,239,000</td>
<td>$1,265,000</td>
<td>$6,078,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>STA</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$749,000</td>
<td>$764,000</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$3,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>SCTA</td>
<td>$720,000</td>
<td>$734,000</td>
<td>$749,000</td>
<td>$764,000</td>
<td>$779,000</td>
<td>$796,000</td>
<td>$3,822,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County CMAs Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,350,000</td>
<td>$7,495,000</td>
<td>$7,646,000</td>
<td>$7,799,000</td>
<td>$7,953,000</td>
<td>$8,123,000</td>
<td>$39,016,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBAG 2 - Regional Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.0%</th>
<th>2016-17</th>
<th>2017-18</th>
<th>2018-19</th>
<th>2019-20</th>
<th>2020-21</th>
<th>2021-22</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBAG 2 Regional Agency Planning - Base *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Planning Total:</td>
<td>$1,800,000</td>
<td>$1,835,000</td>
<td>$1,873,000</td>
<td>$1,910,000</td>
<td>$1,948,000</td>
<td>$1,989,000</td>
<td>$9,555,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 2% escalation from FY 2016-17 Planning Base

*J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\TEMP-RES\MTC\RES-4202_ongoing\[tmp-4202_Appendix-A1-A6.xlsx]A-1 Program Categories

$48,571,000
## OBAG 2
Federal-Aid Secondary
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

### OBAG 2 - Federal-Aid Secondary (FAS)

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

* As provided by Caltrans per State Statute

** San Francisco has no rural roads
## OBAG 2

### Safe Routes to School County

**FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22**

November 18, 2015

### OBAG 2 - Safe Routes To School County Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Public School Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>Private School Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>Total School Enrollment (K-12)</th>
<th>FY 2013-14 Percentage</th>
<th>Total OBAG 2 Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>222,681</td>
<td>24,036</td>
<td>246,717</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>$5,340,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>173,020</td>
<td>15,825</td>
<td>188,845</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>$4,088,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>32,793</td>
<td>7,104</td>
<td>39,897</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>$864,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>20,868</td>
<td>2,913</td>
<td>23,781</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>58,394</td>
<td>24,657</td>
<td>83,051</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>$1,797,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>94,667</td>
<td>15,927</td>
<td>110,594</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>$2,394,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>276,175</td>
<td>41,577</td>
<td>317,752</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>$6,878,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>63,825</td>
<td>4,051</td>
<td>67,876</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>$1,469,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>70,932</td>
<td>5,504</td>
<td>76,436</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>$1,655,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,013,355</strong></td>
<td><strong>141,594</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,154,949</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From California Department of Education for FY 2013-14*
Appendix A-6

OBAG 2
Priority Conservation Area
FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22
November 18, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PCA Program</th>
<th>Total OBAG 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northbay Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marin</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napa</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solano</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>$2,050,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$8,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Counties Competitive Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>$8,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$16,400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A-7: OBAG 2 – CMA One Bay Area Grant County Program Outreach

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) delegates authority for the county program project selection to the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs). The existing relationships the CMAs have with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their respective counties make them best suited for this role. As one of the requirements for distributing federal transportation funding, MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process during development of the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy and the solicitation and project selection for the OBAG 2 program. CMAs also serve as the main point of contact for local sponsoring agencies and members of the public submitting projects for consideration for inclusion in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

To comply with federal regulations, the CMAs must conduct a transparent process for the Call for Projects, and include the following activities:

1. Public Involvement and Outreach

   **Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.**

   CMAs are expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC’s Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 4174), which can be found at [http://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:

   o Execute effective and meaningful local engagement efforts during the call for projects by working closely with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and the public through the project solicitation process;

   o Explain the local call for projects process, informing stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comments on project ideas and when decisions are to be made on the list of projects to be submitted to MTC;

   o Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times that are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;

   o Post notices of public meetings and hearing(s) on their agency website; include information on how to request language translation for individuals with limited English proficiency. If agency protocol has not been established, please refer to MTC’s Plan for Assisting Limited English Proficient Populations at [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/lep.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/lep.htm);

   o Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting; and

   o Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with disabilities and by public transit.
**Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.** CMAs are to provide MTC with a:
- Description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects selected for OBAG 2 funding.

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

3. **Title VI Responsibilities**
- **Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.**
  - 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.
  - Document the steps taken to engage underserved communities.
  - For Title VI outreach strategies, please refer to MTC’s Public Participation Plan found at: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/participation_plan.htm).
  - Additional resources are available at:
    - [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DBE_CRLC.html#TitleVI](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/DBE_CRLC.html#TitleVI)
    - [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/rights/index.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/get_involved/rights/index.htm)
Appendix A-8: PDA Investment & Growth Strategy

The purpose of a PDA Investment & Growth Strategy is to ensure that CMAs have a transportation project priority-setting process for OBAG 2 funding that supports and encourages development in the region’s PDAs, recognizing that the diversity of PDAs will require a range of different strategies. Some of the planning activities noted below may be appropriate for CMAs to consider for jurisdictions or areas not currently designated as PDAs if those areas are still considering future housing and job growth. Regional agencies will provide support, as needed, for the PDA Investment & Growth Strategies. From time to time, MTC shall consult with the CMAs to evaluate progress on the PDA Investment and Growth Strategy. This consultation may result in specific work elements shifting among MTC, ABAG and the CMAs. Significant modifications to the scope of activities may be formalized through future revisions to this resolution. The following are activities CMAs need to undertake in order to develop a project priority-setting process:

(1) Engaging Regional/Local Agencies
- Develop or continue a process to regularly engage local planners and public works staff. Understand the needs of both groups and share information with MTC and ABAG.
- Encourage community participation throughout the development of the Investment and Growth Strategy, consistent with the OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidance (Appendix A-7).
- The CMA governing boards must adopt the final Investment & Growth Strategy.
- Participate as a TAC member in local jurisdiction planning processes funded through the regional PDA Planning Program or as requested by jurisdictions. Partner with MTC and ABAG staff to ensure that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans. Look for opportunities to support planning processes with technical or financial assistance.

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

PDA Investment & Growth Strategies will assess local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels and, where appropriate, assist local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals\(^2\). The locally crafted policies should be targeted to the specific circumstances of each PDA. For example, if the PDA currently has few moderate- or low-income households, any recommend policy changes should be aimed at promoting affordable housing. If the PDA currently is mostly low-income housing, any needed policy changes should be aimed at community stabilization.

\(^2\) 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.
(3) Establishing Local Funding Priorities

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

- **Projects located in high impact project areas.** Favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
  - a. PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units,
  - b. Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and TDM programs,
  - c. Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)

- **Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC or as defined by CMAs or Community Based Transportation Plans.

- **PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.

- **Investments that are consistent with Air District’s Planning Healthy Places**

- **PDAs that overlap or are co-located with:** 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District’s Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure – Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

**Process/Timeline**

CMAs will develop a new PDA Investment & Growth Strategy every four years, consistent with the update of the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy. The Investment & Growth Strategy must be adopted by the CMA Board (new for OBAG 2). CMAs will provide a status report update every two years.

---

3 Guidance will be developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff pending the release of these guidelines in early 2016, please see: [http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/planning-healthy-places](http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/planning-healthy-places).
APPENDIX A-9: Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program

Program Goals and Eligible Projects
The goal of the Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program is to support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands and open space in the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. These values include globally unique ecosystems, productive agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, urban greening, healthy fisheries, and climate protection (mitigation and adaptation), among others.

The PCA Program should also be linked to SB 375 goals which direct MPOs to prepare sustainable community strategies which consider resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Section 65080.01. One purpose of the PCA program is to reinforce efforts to target growth in existing neighborhoods (PDAs), rather than allowing growth to occur in an unplanned “project-by-project” approach.

The PCA program is split into two elements:
1. North Bay Program ($8 million)
2. Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program ($8 million)

The North Bay program framework is to be developed by the four North Bay county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), building on their PCA planning and priorities carried out to date. Project eligibility is limited by the eligibility of federal surface transportation funding; unless the CMA can exchange these funds or leverage new fund sources for their programs.

The Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program will be administered by the Coastal Conservancy* in partnership with MTC based on the proposal provided below. The table below outlines screening criteria, eligible applicants, and the proposed project selection and programming process for the Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
<th>$8 million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screening Criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCA Designation</strong>: Eligible projects must be within a designated PCA.</td>
<td>The list of adopted PCAs can be found at: <a href="http://abag.ca.gov/priority/conservation/">http://abag.ca.gov/priority/conservation/</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regionally Significant</strong>: Indicators of regional significance include a project’s contribution to goals stated in regional habitat, agricultural or open space plans (i.e. <em>San Francisco Bay Area Upland Habitat Goals Project Report</em> at <a href="http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/">http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/</a>), countywide Plans or ABAG’s PCA designations. Applicants should describe who will benefit from the project and the regional (greater-than-local) need it serves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Open Space Protection In Place</strong>: Linkages to or location in a Greenbelt area that is policy protected from development. Land acquisition or easement projects would be permitted in an area without open space policy protections in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Federal Local Match</strong>: 2:1 minimum match</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Meets Program Goals:** Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see below):
  o Protects or enhances “resource areas” or habitats as defined in California Government Code § 65080.01(a).
  o Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems.
  o Supports the agricultural economy of the region.
  o Includes existing and potential urban green spaces that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater.

**Eligible Applicants**

- Local governments (cities, counties, towns), county congestion management agencies, tribes, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area are invited to nominate projects. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate and partner with other entities on the nomination of projects, and partnerships that leverage additional funding will be given higher priority in the grant award process. **Partnerships are necessary with cities, counties, or CMAs in order to access federal funds. Federally-funded projects must have an implementing agency that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (master agreement with Caltrans).**

**Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects**

1. **Planning Activities**
2. **Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities/ Infrastructure:** On-road and off-road trail facilities, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming, lighting and other safety related infrastructure, and ADA compliance, conversion and use of abandoned rail corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists.
3. **Visual Enhancements:** Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas.
4. **Habitat / Environmental Enhancements:** Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way, reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats, mitigation of transportation project environmental impacts funded through the federal-aid surface transportation program.
5. **Protection (Land Acquisition or Easement) or Enhancement of Natural Resources, Open Space or Agricultural Lands:** Parks and
open space, staging areas or environmental facilities; or natural resources, such as listed species, identified priority habitat, wildlife corridors, wildlife corridors watersheds, or agricultural soils of importance.

6. **Urban Greening**: Existing and potential green spaces in cities that increase habitat connectivity, improve community health, capture carbon emissions, and address stormwater.

**Note**: MTC encourages PCA project applicants to partner with other agencies and programs to leverage other funds in order to maximize benefits. As such, PCA funded projects may become eligible to deliver net environmental benefits to a future Regional Advance Mitigation Planning (RAMP) program project, above any required mitigation requirements. Note that such projects may need to rely on funding exchanges with eligible non-federal funds because most land acquisition and habitat restoration projects that are not mitigation for transportation projects are not eligible for federal transportation funds. Any such funding exchange must be consistent with MTC’s fund exchange policy (MTC Resolution No. 3331).

**Project Selection**

**Coastal Conservancy Partnership Program**: MTC will provide $8 million of federal transportation funds which will be combined with the Coastal Conservancy’s own program funds in order to support a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) than can be accommodated with federal transportation dollars alone. The Coastal Conservancy, MTC, and ABAG staff will cooperatively manage the call for projects. This approach would harness the expertise of the Coastal Conservancy, expand the pool of eligible projects, and leverage additional resources through the Coastal Conservancy.

*The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency and the primary public land conservation funding source in the Bay Area, providing funding for many different types of land conservation projects. For more information see [http://scc.ca.gov/](http://scc.ca.gov/).
One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) Checklist for CMA Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202

Federal Program Covering FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

The intent of this checklist is to delineate the requirements included in the OBAG 2 Grant Program (Resolution No. 4202), as adopted by MTC on November 18, 2015. This checklist must be completed by Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) and submitted to MTC to certify compliance with the OBAG 2 requirements. MTC will not take action to program projects recommended by a CMA until a checklist demonstrating compliance has been submitted to MTC.

### CMA Call for Projects Guidance: Appendix A-7

1. Public Involvement and Outreach, Agency Coordination, and Title VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Engage with Regional and Local Jurisdictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If “No” or “N/A—Not Applicable” is marked in any box on the checklist, please include a statement at the end of the checklist to indicate why the item was not met.
b. Has the CMA encouraged community participation throughout the development of the Investment and Growth Strategy, consistent with the OBAG 2 Call for Projects Guidance (Appendix A-7)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Has the CMA governing board adopted the final Investment and Growth Strategy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Has the CMA’s staff or consultant designee participated in TAC meetings established through the local jurisdiction’s planning processes funded through the regional PDA planning program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Has the CMA worked with MTC and ABAG staff to confirm that regional policies are addressed in PDA plans?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Planning Objectives to Inform Project Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Has the CMA kept itself apprised of ongoing transportation and land-use planning efforts throughout the county?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Has the CMA encouraged local agencies to quantify transportation infrastructure needs and costs as part of their planning processes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Has the CMA encouraged and supported local jurisdictions in meeting their housing objectives established through their adopted Housing Elements and RHNA?

1. By May 1, 2013, has the CMA received and reviewed information submitted to the CMA by ABAG on the progress that local jurisdictions have made in implementing their housing element objectives and identifying current local housing policies that encourage affordable housing production and/or community stabilization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Starting in May 2014 and in all subsequent updates of its PDA Investment & Growth Strategy, has the CMA assessed local jurisdiction efforts in approving sufficient housing for all income levels through the RHNA process and, where appropriate, assisted local jurisdictions in implementing local policy changes to facilitate achieving these goals?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

a. Has the CMA developed funding guidelines for evaluating OBAG 2 projects that support multi-modal transportation priorities based on connections to housing, jobs and commercial activity and that emphasize the following factors?

   1. Projects located in high impact project areas – favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
      a) PDAs taking on significant housing growth (total number of units) in the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units;
      b) Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and Travel Demand Management (TDM) programs;
      c) Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.).

   2. Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC) as defined by MTC:
      a) CMAs may also include additional COCs beyond those defined by MTC, such as those defined by the CMAs according to local priorities or Community Based Transportation Plans.

   3. PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.

   4. Investments that are consistent with the Air District’s Planning Healthy Places guidelines.¹

   5. PDAs that overlap or are co-located with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants, as identified in the Air District’s Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight transport infrastructure.

¹ Guidance will be developed in partnership with BAAQMD, CMAs, ABAG, and city staff pending the release of these guidelines in early 2016, please see: http://www.baaqmd.gov/plans-and-climate/california-environmental-quality-act-ceqa/planning-healthy-places.

If “NO” or “N/A—Not Applicable” is marked in any box on the checklist, please include a statement at the end of the checklist to indicate why the item was not met.
b. Has the CMA provided a status report on their PDA Investment & Growth Strategy (required two years after the adoption of a PDA Investment and Growth Strategy)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Has the CMA committed to developing a new PDA Investment & Growth Strategy by May 1, 2017 (new PDA required every four years), consistent with the update of the RTP/SCS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PDA Policies

#### 5. PDA Minimum Investment Targets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA met its minimum PDA investment target (70% for Alameda, Contra Costa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and 50% for Marin, Napa, Sonoma, and Solano)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA defined the term “proximate access,” for projects located outside of a PDA that should be counted towards the county’s minimum PDA investment target?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA designated and mapped projects recommended for funding that are not geographically within a PDA but provide “proximate access” to a PDA, along with policy justifications for those determinations, and presented this information for public review when the CMA board acts on OBAG 2 programming decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA submitted the documentation from item 6c, above, to MTC as part of this Checklist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Project Selection Policies

#### 6. Project Selection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA documented and submitted the approach used to select OBAG 2 projects including outreach, coordination, and Title VI compliance?</td>
<td>(See 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA issued a unified call for projects?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the CMA submitted a board adopted list of projects to MTC by January 31, 2017?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Does the CMA acknowledge that all selected projects must be submitted into MTC’s Fund Management System (FMS) along with a Resolution of Local Support no later than February 28, 2017?

☐ ☐ ☐

e. Does the CMA affirm that the projects recommended for funding meet the following requirements?

1. Are consistent with the current Regional Transportation Plan (Plan Bay Area);

2. Have completed project-specific Complete Streets Checklists;

☐ ☐ ☐

f. Does the CMA acknowledge that OBAG 2 funding is subject to MTC’s Regional Project Delivery Policy (Resolution No. 3606, or successor resolution) in addition to the following OBAG 2 deadlines?

1. Half of the CMA’s OBAG 2 funds, must be obligated by January 31, 2020; and

2. All remaining OBAG 2 funds must be obligated by January 31, 2023.

Performance and Accountability Policies

7. Ensuring Local Compliance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Has the CMA received confirmation that local jurisdictions have met, or are making progress in meeting, the Performance and Accountability Policies requirements related to Complete Streets, local Housing Elements, local streets and roads, and transit agency project locations as set forth in pages 16-18 of MTC Resolution 4202? Note: CMAs can use the Local Jurisdiction OBAG 2 Requirement Checklist to help fulfill this requirement.

☐ ☐ ☐

b. Has the CMA affirmed to MTC that a jurisdiction is in compliance with the requirements of MTC Resolution 4202 prior to programming OBAG 2 funds to its projects in the TIP?

☐ ☐ ☐
8. Completion of Checklist

Has the CMA completed all section of this checklist? ☐ ☐ ☐

If the CMA has checked “NO” or “N/A” to any checklist items, please include which item and a description below as to why the requirement was not met or is considered Not Applicable:

Attachments

☐ Documentation of CMA efforts for public outreach, agency coordination, and Title VI compliance (Checklist Items 1, 2).

☐ Documentation of CMA compliance with PDA minimum investment targets, including documentation that the information was presented to the public during the decision-making process (Checklist Item 6).
Review and Approval of Checklist

This checklist was prepared by:

Signature _______________________________ Date _______________________________

Name & Title (print) _______________________________

Phone _______________________________ Email _______________________________

This checklist was approved for submission to MTC by:

Signature _______________________________ Date _______________________________

______________________________
CMA Executive Director
One Bay Area Grant (OBAG 2) Checklist for Local Compliance with MTC Resolution No. 4202

Federal Program Covering FY 2017-18 through FY 2021-22

The intent of this checklist is to delineate the requirements for local jurisdictions included in the OBAG Grant Program (Resolution No. 4202), as adopted by MTC on November 18, 2015. This checklist must be completed by local jurisdictions and submitted to the CMA to certify compliance with the OBAG 2 requirements listed in MTC Resolution No. 4202. MTC will not take action to program projects for a local jurisdiction until the CMA affirms that the jurisdiction has met all requirements included in OBAG 2.

1. Compliance with the Complete Streets Act of 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Has the jurisdiction met MTC’s Complete Street Requirements for OBAG 2 prior to the CMA submitting its program to MTC through either of the following methods?

1. Adopting a Complete Streets resolution incorporating MTC’s nine required complete streets elements; or


b. Has the jurisdiction submitted documentation of compliance with Item a. (copy of adopted resolution or circulation element) to the CMA as part of this Checklist?

c. Has the jurisdiction submitted a Complete Streets Checklist for any project for which the jurisdiction has applied for OBAG 2 funding?

2. Housing Element Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

a. Has the jurisdiction’s General Plan Housing Element been certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014-2022 RHNA prior to May 31, 2015? If not, has the jurisdiction’s Housing Element been fully certified by HCD by June 30, 2016?

b. Has the jurisdiction submitted the latest Annual Housing Element Report to HCD by April 1, 2016?

If “NO” or “N/A –Not Applicable” is marked in any box on the checklist, please include a statement at the end of the checklist to indicate why the item was not met.
c. Does the jurisdiction acknowledge that the Annual Housing Element Report must be submitted to HCD each year through the end of the OBAG 2 program (FY22) in order to be eligible to receive funding?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. Has the jurisdiction submitted documentation of compliance with Item 2 (copy of certified housing element or annual report, or letter of compliance from HCD) to the CMA as part of this Checklist?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Local Streets and Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Projects Sponsored by Other Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Regional Project Delivery Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Anti-Displacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Has the jurisdiction completed all sections of this checklist?  

YES  NO  N/A

If the jurisdiction has checked “NO” or “N/A” to any of the above questions, please provide an explanation below as to why the requirement was not met or is considered not applicable:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Documentation of local jurisdiction’s compliance with MTC’s Complete Streets Requirements, including copy of adopted resolution or circulation element (Checklist Item 1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Documentation of compliance with MTC’s Housing Element Requirements, such as a copy of certified housing element or annual report, or a letter of compliance from HCD (Checklist Item 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review and Approval of Checklist

This checklist was prepared by:

____________________________  ______________________
Signature                                      Date

____________________________
Name & Title (print)

____________________________  ______________________
Phone                                      Email

This checklist was approved for submission to <INSERT NAME>City/County by:

____________________________  ______________________
Signature                                      Date

____________________________
City Manager/Administrator or designee

If “NO” or “N/A –Not Applicable” is marked in any box on the checklist, please include a statement at the end of the checklist to indicate why the item was not met.
OBAG 2 Regional Programs Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>TOTAL OBAG 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,555,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PDA PLANNING &amp; IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CLIMATE INITIATIVES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$22,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. REGIONAL ACTIVE OPERATIONAL MANAGEMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$170,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. TRANSIT CAPITAL PRIORITIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$189,283,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAG 2 REGIONAL PROGRAMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$436,488,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# OBAG 2 County Programs Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT CATEGORY AND TITLE</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>TOTAL OBAG 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</td>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY</td>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $70,243,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</td>
<td>CONTRA COSTA COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $51,461,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MARIN COUNTY</td>
<td>MARIN COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $10,025,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAPA COUNTY</td>
<td>NAPA COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $7,644,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</td>
<td>SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $43,906,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SAN MATEO COUNTY</td>
<td>SAN MATEO COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $29,846,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</td>
<td>SANTA CLARA COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $95,268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOLANO COUNTY</td>
<td>SOLANO COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $19,499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SONOMA COUNTY</td>
<td>SONOMA COUNTY</td>
<td>TOTAL: $25,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAG 2 COUNTY PROGRAMS</td>
<td>TOTAL: $353,512,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OBAG 2 - Local Streets and Roads

### 50% Population + 50% Lane Miles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction in Alameda County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% Population</th>
<th>Lane Mileage</th>
<th>% Lane Mileage</th>
<th>50% Population + 50% Lane Miles</th>
<th>OBAG-2 LSR Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Alameda**</td>
<td>146,787</td>
<td>9.21%</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>12.51%</td>
<td>10.86%</td>
<td>$1,954,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>76,638</td>
<td>4.81%</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>$743,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>18,565</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>$171,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>118,780</td>
<td>7.45%</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>5.69%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
<td>$1,182,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>55,844</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
<td>$594,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>$112,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>226,551</td>
<td>14.21%</td>
<td>1,065</td>
<td>13.39%</td>
<td>13.80%</td>
<td>$2,483,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>152,889</td>
<td>9.59%</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>7.91%</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>$1,574,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livermore</td>
<td>85,990</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
<td>6.91%</td>
<td>$1,243,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>44,204</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>$532,521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>410,603</td>
<td>25.75%</td>
<td>1,964</td>
<td>24.69%</td>
<td>25.22%</td>
<td>$4,539,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>11,113</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0.99%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>$151,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasanton</td>
<td>74,850</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
<td>5.47%</td>
<td>$985,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>88,441</td>
<td>5.55%</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
<td>$943,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>72,744</td>
<td>4.56%</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>4.36%</td>
<td>$785,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COUNTY TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,594,569</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>7,954</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>$18,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** County of Alameda information includes Planning Area 2 and 4

Population Source - Department of Finance 01/01/2015
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## List of PDAs in Alameda County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Priority Development Area</th>
<th>Sponsoring Jurisdiction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naval Air Station</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Waterfront</td>
<td>City of Alameda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue/Solano Avenue</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adeline Street</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Pablo Avenue</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shattuck</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telegraph Avenue</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Avenue</td>
<td>City of Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use Core</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coliseum BART station area</td>
<td>City of Emeryville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown and Jack London Square</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastmont Town Center</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruitvale and Dimond areas</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Transit Village</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Oakland</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOD Corridors</td>
<td>City of Oakland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castro Valley BART</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 14th St and Mission Blvd Corridor</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesperian Blvd</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meekland Avenue Corridor</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hayward BART Corridor</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hayward BART Urban Neighborhood</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cannery</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Boulevard Corridor</td>
<td>City of Hayward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Fair BART Transit Village</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown TOD</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East 14th Street</td>
<td>City of San Leandro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centerville</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Center (Central Business District)</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvington District</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fremont/Warm Springs</td>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumbarton Transit Area TOD</td>
<td>City of Newark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Mixed Use Area</td>
<td>City of Newark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermodal Station District</td>
<td>City of Union City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Center</td>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Center/Dublin Crossing</td>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Specific Plan Area</td>
<td>City of Dublin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side Priority Development Area</td>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel Avenue/BART Station Planning</td>
<td>City of Livermore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hacienda</td>
<td>City of Pleasanton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan Update 2016 Update

RECOMMENDATION: Approve Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update

Summary

Alameda CTC’s Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) integrates existing planning and programming practices performed by the agency into a streamlined planning and programming effort, where feasible and appropriate. The CIP consolidates multiple planning and programming efforts, at both the local and countywide level, to create a strategic near-term transportation planning and programming tool that local agencies and Alameda CTC can use to direct staffing and financial resources to further the delivery of significant countywide transportation projects. The CIP also establishes the framework for policies, guidelines and procedures that guide Alameda CTC’s programming and allocations decisions, project selection, and the subsequent funding administration.

Alameda CTC updates the CIP annually, as needed, to reflect changes to the current programming and allocations approved throughout the fiscal year, and to incorporate new programming recommendations for projects and programs. Projects outside Alameda CTC’s five-year CIP period will be considered for inclusion in a future biennial CIP update, for which the five-year programming window will be shifted two years into the future to provide an opportunity for project sponsors to nominate projects for available funding.

The CIP 2016 Update includes a programming and allocation period from fiscal year 2015/16 through 2019/20, and reflects updates to the current CIP approved in June 2015. Approval of the programming recommendations for projects and programs included in the CIP 2016 Update will result in a total of $1.5 billion programmed from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, and $755 million allocated over the first two fiscal years.

This summer, Alameda CTC will begin the biennial update process for the CIP 2018, FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22 based on the framework of programming principles and selection methodology previously approved by the Commission, and described in the CIP. A nomination window will open September 2016 for sponsors to submit project information and funding requests for programming consideration in CIP 2018.
Discussion

Alameda CTC updates the CIP annually, as needed, to incorporate programming and allocations adjustments that reflect project schedule modifications, changes in priorities, policies and procedure updates, new regulations, and funding adjustments.

The CIP 2016 Update is available here:

The CIP 2016 Update includes additional programming and allocations, and technical adjustments to the current five-year programming and allocation window, from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20 to be approved concurrently with the CIP 2016 Update. The CIP 2016 Update includes $118.9 million of programming and allocation adjustments over the five-year programming window for projects in each of the four planning areas of the County, for multiple modes, and for multiple project delivery phases. These modifications are detailed in Appendix F of the CIP 2016 Update – Changes to Current Programming and Allocations.

A final five-year program summary is available in Appendix G of the CIP 2016 Update, which represents the combination of previous funding actions made prior to the CIP 2016 Update and the $118.9 million of adjustments to be approved concurrently with this update. Approval of the programming recommendations for projects and programs included in the CIP 2016 Update will result in a total of $1.5 billion programmed from FY 2015/16 to FY 2019/20, and $755 million in allocations over the first two fiscal years.

The recommended programming and allocations will fund a combination of projects nearing the final phase of implementation and the initial phases of programs and projects to establish a pipeline of programs and projects for future implementation. The pipeline established by the CIP 2016 Update will be the means by which the Alameda CTC will identify investments of transportation funding to provide benefits to the traveling public while infusing much needed funding into the sectors of the economy related to the transportation system. Additionally, the CIP includes priority programming and allocations recommendations to further the implementation of the Alameda CTC’s Measure BB Capital Project Delivery Plan, which includes larger countywide-significant projects implemented directly by the Alameda CTC.

The CIP programming principles and program guidelines established within the CIP 2016 Update provide a framework for programming and allocation decisions made by Alameda CTC. Projects must satisfy the following programming requirements to be considered for programming and allocation by Alameda CTC.

1. Projects must be included in and consistent with the most current adopted Regional Transportation Plan and Alameda CTC’s Countywide Transportation Plan.
2. Projects must demonstrate a public benefit towards building and maintaining the transportation infrastructure in Alameda County.
3. Projects must be publicly accessible and provide direct benefits to public transportation infrastructure and operations.
4. Projects must meet the goals and objectives of the funding sources and programs that are ultimately recommended by Alameda CTC.

5. Projects funded with 1986 Measure B, 2000 Measure B, 2014 Measure BB, and VRF must be consistent with requirements and priorities of their respective expenditure plans.

The CIP programming principles and guidelines are not intended to replace existing programming requirements of individual fund sources. Instead, the principles are intended to create a uniform consolidation of historically separate programming practices, where applicable, to more effectively coordinate funding towards highly beneficial transportation projects that address congestion, state of good repair, economic development, access, safety, and connectivity of a multimodal transportation system.

Alameda CTC’s programming capacity is limited to the funding anticipated during the period of delivery for projects included in the five-year programming and allocation horizon to establish a fiscally constrained plan. Projects beyond the programming horizon of a given CIP are to be considered in future updates. For the CIP 2016 and CIP 2016 Update, Alameda CTC used an abbreviated project selection process to begin initial programming and allocations of Alameda CTC funds. The CIP considers all available fund sources and prioritizes, evaluates and recommends funding to critical transportation infrastructure and operations needs that build and maintain the county’s transportation system.

Next year, the CIP 2018 will be the first shift of the programming window to include FY 2017/18 through FY 2021/22. Alameda CTC will initiate a project nomination process starting September 1, 2016 that will open the CIP to new programming and allocation recommendations. Projects will be evaluated using previously adopted Commission approved criteria for the CIP which includes an evaluation of project merits, readiness, leveraging and countywide transportation priorities further described in the CIP’s programming principles and program guidelines in Appendix C of the CIP 2016 Update. Alameda CTC will program funds to projects phase by phase to establish a pipeline of countywide project delivery from project initiation and development to construction, where feasible. The schedule for the CIP 2018 development is described below. Additional information pertaining to the CIP Nomination will be provided with the application release.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule for CIP 2018 (FY 2017/18 to FY 2021/22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-September 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March-April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open CIP Nomination Window and Release Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Application Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP Nominations Due to Alameda CTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP 2018 DRAFT Program Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP 2018 FINAL Program Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Schedule subject to change.

**Fiscal Impact:** The recommended actions will result in the allocation, encumbrance and subsequent expenditure of the funds allocated by the Commission. The corresponding
encumbrance amounts will be included in the annual budget of the Alameda CTC for the applicable fiscal year.

Staff Contact

Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
James O'Brien, Project Controls Team
John Nguyen, Senior Transportation Planner
DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: One Bay Area Grant Cycle 1 Program: Funding Strategy for City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project

RECOMMENDATION: Approve the funding strategy for City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project.

Summary

In 2013 the City of Berkeley received federal One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Cycle 1 funds to implement the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project. The City recently received bids for the construction contract with the lowest bidder approximately $800,000 above the engineer’s estimate, creating a significant funding shortfall. Alameda CTC along with City of Berkeley staff has developed a funding strategy to partially address the shortfall through a combination of reprogramming of OBAG Cycle 1 and Alameda CTC Local Exchange Program (CMA TIP) funds and programming of FY 2016-17 Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) funds.

The Commission is recommended to approve the below listed actions intended to partially address the funding shortfall for the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project:

1. Reprogram $100,000 of unused OBAG Cycle 1-Local Streets and Roads (LSR) funds from the City of Emeryville’s Hollis Street project to the Hearst Avenue project;
2. Reprogram $228,000 of CMA TIP funds programmed from two (2) other City of Berkeley projects to the Hearst Avenue project; and
3. Program $88,000 of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds to the bike lanes component of the Hearst Avenue project.

The City of Berkeley will be responsible for securing any additional funds needed to eliminate the shortfall and fully fund the project. Approval of this request will allow the City of Berkeley to proceed with the construction phase of the project.

Background

Through OBAG Cycle 1, the Alameda CTC programmed $2.156 million of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for the City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project. The City obligated the federal funds and advertised the construction contract in May 2016. The City recently received bids for the construction contract with the lowest bidder approximately $800,000 above the engineer’s estimate, creating a significant funding shortfall. The City is able to cover approximately half of the shortfall with its own local funds, but has requested the assistance of the Alameda CTC to help identify a funding strategy for the remaining balance.
Proposed Funding Strategy

The funding strategy proposes a combination of reprogramming of federal OBAG Cycle 1 and CMA TIP funds and programming of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds to the Hearst Avenue project.

Reprogramming of OBAG Cycle 1 funds

The OBAG Cycle 1 program included $100,000 of federal STP funds for the City of Emeryville’s Hollis Street LSR Preservation project. Subsequent to the programming of the OBAG funds the Hollis project was delivered using local funds, which created $100,000 of unused capacity within the OBAG Cycle 1 program. Alameda CTC staff proposes to reprogram these funds to the City of Berkeley’s Hearst Avenue project and to also account for this change by crediting the City of Emeryville through the LSR component of the upcoming OBAG Cycle 2 program. Alameda CTC has received concurrence on the proposal from both cities and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The proposed reprogramming is summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBAG Funding Cycle</th>
<th>Emeryville</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBAG Cycle 1 (LSR component)</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBAG Cycle 2 (LSR component)</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reprogramming of CMA TIP funds

A total of $228,000 of CMA TIP funds are currently programmed to the City of Berkeley for the following two LSR projects, (1) Spruce Street Safety (CMA TIP project No. 20-002) and (2) Piedmont Circle Pedestrian Safety (CMA TIP Project No. 20-003). Berkeley staff has submitted a letter to the Alameda CTC requesting the deprogramming of the CMA TIP funds from these projects for the purpose of reprogramming the funds to the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project (Attachment A). The CMA TIP funds are proposed to be reprogrammed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMA TIP Funding</th>
<th>Spruce Street Safety</th>
<th>Piedmont Circle Safety</th>
<th>Hearst Avenue Complete Streets</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current CMA TIP</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed CMA TIP</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td>($100,000)</td>
<td>($128,000)</td>
<td>$228,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Programming of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds

The City of Berkeley’s share of the FY 2016-17 TFCA fund estimate is $112,000. The Hearst Avenue Complete Streets project includes the installation of Class 2 and Class 4 bike lanes which are eligible for TFCA funding. Based on the information received to date from Berkeley staff, the project is cost-effective for up to $88,000 of FY 2016-17 TFCA funds. Revisions to the information provided may affect the project evaluation and result in a revised (lower) TFCA funding recommendation. The $88,000 is proposed to be programmed out of Berkeley’s $112,000 share.

Next Steps

The proposed programming actions are reflected in the Comprehensive Investment Plan 2016 Update, which is scheduled for approval by the Commission in July 2016. Subsequent to Commission approval, the MTC will amend the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to reflect the approved reprogramming of federal OBAG Cycle 1 LSR funds from the City of Emeryville to the City of Berkeley. Berkeley staff will then need to work directly with Caltrans Local Assistance to obligate the federal funds. The Alameda CTC will enter into funding agreements directly with the City of Berkeley for the CMA TIP and TFCA funding. The City of Berkeley will be responsible for securing any additional funds needed to eliminate the shortfall and fully fund the project. With approval of this request, the City of Berkeley anticipates to be in a position to proceed with the construction phase of the project.

Fiscal Impact: The $88,000 of TFCA funds is already accounted for in the Alameda CTC’s FY 2016-17 budget. The $228,000 of CMA TIP funds will be added to the Alameda CTC’s FY 2016-17 budget during the mid-year budget update.

Attachments

A. City of Berkeley’s CMA TIP Letter

Staff Contacts

Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
Jacki Taylor, Associate Program Analyst
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June 23, 2016

Vivek Bhat, P.E.
Director of Programming
Alameda County Transportation Commission
1111 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94607

Re: Deprogramming of CMA TIP Projects 20-002 and 20-003

Dear Vivek:

The City of Berkeley hereby requests that the following projects be deprogrammed from the CMA TIP for the purpose of reprogramming their remaining funds to the Hearst Avenue Complete Streets Project:

- Spruce St Safety Project (CMA TIP project No. 20-002)
- Piedmont Circle Pedestrian Safety Project (CMA TIP Project No. 20-003)

Please contact me if you have any further questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Farid Javandel
Transportation Manager
DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Draft FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan


Summary

Under the current Regional Project Delivery Policy Guidance (MTC Resolution 3606), prior to the beginning of each federal fiscal year, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is to develop an annual obligation plan in coordination with the region’s Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) and project sponsors. This plan will serve to prioritize delivery of FHWA-funded projects, and assist Caltrans Local Assistance in managing its workload for the federal fiscal year.

The FFY 2016-17 Obligation Plan is under development and will include all Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program, Active Transportation Program (ATP) and Local Safety Program (HBP, HSIP and SRTS) funds. For projects with these funds, MTC has requested project sponsors to review and confirm project information, including the program year and certain milestone dates. The sponsor updates received by the Alameda CTC by June 29th are reflected in Attachment A and will be used to inform MTC’s development of a final FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan.

For FFY 2016-17, MTC has proposed new conditions and requirements for inclusion in the annual obligation plan which are included as Attachment B.

Background

MTC Resolution 3606

The regional project delivery policy (MTC Resolution 3606) establishes certain deadlines and requirements for agencies accepting Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding. MTC has purposefully established regional deadlines in advance of state and federal funding deadlines to provide the opportunity for agencies to solve potential project delivery issues and bring projects back in-line in advance of losing funds due to a
missed funding deadline. The policy is also intended to assist in project delivery, and ensure funds are used in a timely manner.

An annual obligation plan will serve to prioritize delivery of FHWA-funded projects, and assist Caltrans Local Assistance in managing its workload for the federal fiscal year.

**Proposed Annual Obligation Plan Conditions and Requirements**

In recent years the Annual Obligation Plan has become an increasingly important tool for annually managing the delivery of FHWA-funding projects. MTC staff is proposing certain conditions and requirements for projects to be included the Annual Obligation Plan (Attachment B) to help address the following delivery issues: (1) projects being included in the annual obligation plan that are not yet ready to proceed, (2) better manage the availability of funds (primarily STP/CMAQ) for projects that are ready for delivery, (3) and facilitate timely project delivery within the region.

**FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan**

Per the Regional Project Delivery Policy (Resolution 3606, Revised), for STP/CMAQ funds listed in FFY 2016-17 of the TIP, the project sponsor must submit a complete Request For Authorization (RFA) or FTA transfer request to Caltrans Local Assistance by November 1, 2016 and receive the federal authorization to proceed (E-76 approval) or transfer to FTA by January 31, 2017. Project funding that cannot meet these deadlines should be moved to FY 2017-18.

Project sponsors were requested to review and confirm the project-specific information included in the attached Draft FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan. Additionally, Sponsors were requested to provide the Federal Project ID and an estimated or actual date for the Field Review and RFA Submittal milestones.

Updates were requested by Wednesday, June 29th and updates received by this time are reflected in Attachment A.

**Schedule**

MTC’s schedule for the development and implementation of the FFY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan is as follows:

- **September 2016**  Proposed Final Plan reviewed by MTC’s partnership working groups
- **October 1, 2016**  Final FY 2016-17 Obligation Plan submitted to Caltrans
- **November 1, 2016**  Deadline for submittal of Requests for Authorization to Caltrans
- **January 31, 2017**  Obligation deadline for funds in Annual Obligation Plan
- **February 1, 2017**  Unused Obligation Authority available first-come first-served
Next Steps

ACTAC is requested to review and confirm the updated information in Attachment A and provide corrections to Jacki Taylor, jtaylor@alamedactc.org, as soon as possible. MTC will circulate a proposed Final FFY 2016-17 Obligation Plan for comment in September and submit the Final FY 2016-17 Obligation Plan to Caltrans by October 1, 2016.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact.

Attachments

A. Draft FFY 2015-16 to FFY 2017-18 Annual Obligation Plan
B. MTC’s Proposed Annual Obligation Plan Requirements

Staff Contacts

Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
Jacki Taylor, Associate Program Analyst
4.4A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Agency</th>
<th>CIP Project #</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>STIP/F Yr 15/16</th>
<th>STIP/F Yr 16/17</th>
<th>STIP/F Yr 17/18</th>
<th>Contra Costa</th>
<th>Total Funding</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>ALA15001</td>
<td>AC Transit: East Bay Bus Rapid Transit</td>
<td>2190A</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>ALA15002</td>
<td>Construct a new trail with a on-street portion</td>
<td>2190B</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>ALA15003</td>
<td>Provide scope of project and brief description. Enter comments or additional information.</td>
<td>2190C</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>ALA15004</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements at LaLonde School</td>
<td>2190D</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Costa</td>
<td>ALA15005</td>
<td>Washington St. Safety improvements STIP-17</td>
<td>2190E</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>ALA15006</td>
<td>Upgrade traffic signals, install protected left-turn phasing, construct additional locations through a competitive RFP process.</td>
<td>2190F</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>ALA15007</td>
<td>Upgrade traffic signals</td>
<td>2190G</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>ALA15008</td>
<td>Develop and maintain traffic signals</td>
<td>2190H</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>ALA15009</td>
<td>Implement improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>2190I</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>ALA15010</td>
<td>Implement crosswalk and access improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists</td>
<td>2190J</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>ALA15011</td>
<td>Upgrade traffic signals</td>
<td>2190K</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>ALA15012</td>
<td>Update crosswalks, signage, striping, pedestrian signals, bus stops, and street medians</td>
<td>2190L</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>2,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please do not change, alter or modify this template.
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Memorandum
TO: Joint Partnership Working Groups
FR: Ross McKeown
RE: Annual Obligation Plan Requirements

**Background**
The regional project delivery policy (MTC Resolution 3606) establishes certain deadlines and requirements for agencies accepting Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding and including these funds in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The intent of the regional funding delivery policy is to ensure implementing agencies do not lose any funds due to missing a federal or state funding deadline, while providing maximum flexibility in delivering transportation projects. It is also intended to assist the region in managing Obligation Authority (OA) and meeting federal financial constraint requirements. MTC has purposefully established regional deadlines in advance of state and federal funding deadlines to provide the opportunity for implementing agencies, Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs), Caltrans, and MTC to solve potential project delivery issues and bring projects back in-line in advance of losing funds due to a missed funding deadline. The policy is also intended to assist in project delivery, and ensure funds are used in a timely manner.

As the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the agency serving as the Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for the nine-counties of the San Francisco Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for various funding and programming requirements, including but not limited to: development and submittal of the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP); managing and administering the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and project selection for designated federal funds (referred collectively as ‘Regional Discretionary Funding’). As a result of the responsibility to administer these funding programs, the region has established various deadlines for the delivery of regional discretionary funds including the regional Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program, regional Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) to ensure timely project delivery against state and federal funding deadlines. MTC Resolution 3606 establishes standard guidance and policy for enforcing project funding deadlines for these and other FHWA-administered federal funds.

One of the most important features of the delivery policy, and a key to the success of on-time delivery, is the obligation deadline. Regional discretionary funding, as well as other FHWA funds programmed in the TIP, must meet the Obligation/E-76/Authorization deadline established in the Policy. This ensures federal funds are being used in a timely manner, and that funds are not lost to the region.
FY 2015-16 Delivery Status
In 2014, the regional obligation deadline was changed from March 31 to January 31 for projects listed in the FY 2015-16 annual obligation plan. Although FY 2015-16 is a transition year (meaning unobligated funds will not be redirected to other projects until after March 31) it was still expected that project sponsors would meet the new obligation deadline. However, the delivery rate is not as good as hoped. As of January 31 less than 30% of the targeted STP/CMAQ OA has been obligated. In examining the low delivery rate, MTC staff has noticed many projects were not ready to proceed when placed in the FY 2015-16 Annual Obligation Plan, and therefore many project sponsors were unable to meet the November 1 Request for Authorization (RFA) deadline, even though the annual obligation plan was made final only a month earlier.

Increased Importance of Annual Obligation Plan
In recent years other regions and the state-managed local programs have improved upon their own annual delivery rate, and the region is once again hitting apportionment limits prior to the end of the fiscal year. These factors are reducing the flexibility the region has in advancing funds and allowing projects to move forward when ready. As a result, the annual obligation plan is becoming increasingly important to prioritize the funding available for projects to be delivered in a given year. It is anticipated that moving forward, the obligation plan will become a more vital tool in managing the delivery of FHWA-funding projects each year.

Proposed Annual Obligation Plan Conditions and Requirements
To address the issues of projects being included in the annual obligation plan that are not yet ready to proceed, and to better manage the availability of funds (primarily STP/CMAQ) for projects that are ready for delivery, and to facilitate timely project delivery within the region, MTC staff is proposing certain conditions and requirements for projects to be included the Annual Obligation Plan as outlined in Attachment 1. The obligation plan will serve to prioritize delivery of FHWA-funded projects, and assist Caltrans Local Assistance in managing its workload for the federal fiscal year. MTC staff is seeking comments and suggestions on this proposal prior to development of the FY 2016-17 obligation plan.

FY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan Schedule
The schedule for development and implementation of the FY 2016-17 Annual Obligation Plan is as follows:

| June 2016      | List of projects programmed in FY 2016-17 of TIP released for review |
| July 2016      | Draft Plan reviewed by partnership working groups                  |
| September 2016 | Proposed Final Plan reviewed by partnership working groups         |
| October 1, 2016| Final FY 2016-17 Obligation Plan submitted to Caltrans              |
| November 1, 2016| Deadline for submittal of Requests for Authorization to Caltrans    |
| January 31, 2017| Obligation deadline for funds in Annual Obligation Plan             |
| February 1, 2017| Unused Obligation Authority available first-come first-served       |

Attachment 1: Annual Obligation Plan Conditions and Requirements
Annual Obligation Plan Conditions and Requirements

To facilitate timely project delivery within the region, the following proposed conditions and requirements must be met for projects to be included the Annual Obligation. The obligation plan will serve to prioritize delivery of FHWA-funded projects for the federal fiscal year.

- **SPOC Involvement**
  Requests for projects to be included in the annual obligation plan must come from the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for that agency. This ensures the SPOC is aware of the federal-aid projects to be delivered that year, and to be available to assist the Project Manager(s) through the federal-aid delivery process. Any subsequent communication to MTC or applicable CMA regarding potential delays or missed deadlines of projects in the annual obligation plan must include the SPOC.

- **Missed Past Delivery Deadlines**
  For project sponsors that have missed delivery deadlines within the past year, the agency must prepare and submit a delivery status report on major delivery milestones for all federally active projects with FHWA-administered funds, and all projects with FHWA-administered funds programmed in the current TIP, before their project(s) may be added to the annual obligation plan. Furthermore, once projects for such agencies are accepted in the final obligation Plan, the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) for the agency must report monthly to the applicable Congestion Management Agency (CMA) and MTC staff on the status of all agency project(s) in the annual obligation plan, until the funds are obligated/authorized. The [FHWA-Funded Projects Status report template](http://mtc.ca.gov/sites/default/files/Template_FHWA_Funded_Projects_Status.xlsx) is located at:

- **Field Review**
  For the Preliminary Engineering phase of a project to be included in the draft plan, a field review must be scheduled to occur by June 30. To remain in the final plan the field review and related/required documentation must be completed by September 30.

  For the Right Of Way or Construction phase of a project to be included in the draft Annual Obligation Plan, the project must have undergone a field review with Caltrans AND all field review related/required documentation submitted, signed and accepted by Caltrans by June 30.

  This does not apply to projects for which Caltrans does not conduct a field review, such as FTA transfers, planning activities and most non-infrastructure projects.

- **HSIP Delivery Requirements**
  Because of the importance of timely delivery of safety projects, the following applies to agencies with Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) projects programmed in the federal TIP.

  **For project sponsors with HSIP funds in the PE phase of a project:** A complete and accurate Request for Authorization (RFA) must be submitted to Caltrans for the PE phase of all of the agency’s HSIP project(s) prior to any project being added to the Annual Obligation Plan for that agency. The Caltrans-managed HSIP program has an obligation deadline for the PE phase of September 30. To meet this deadline,
sponsors must have a field review (with all required documentation accepted by Caltrans) and submit the RFA for PE by June 30.

**For project sponsors with HSIP funds in the CON phase of a project:** A complete and accurate Request for Authorization (RFA) must be submitted to Caltrans for the CON phase of all of the agency’s HSIP project(s) subject to the delivery deadlines noted below, prior to any project being added to the Annual Obligation Plan for that agency.

**HSIP Deadlines for purposes of the Annual Obligation plan are outlined below:**

**Cycles 4&5 HSIP programs:**
- PE Authorization: Past Due
- CON Authorization: Past Due

**Cycle 6 HSIP program:**
- PE Authorization: Past Due
- CON Authorization: September 30, 2016 (RFA due June 30, 2016) (Unless a later date is identified in the Caltrans HSIP Project Listing at the following link: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/2016/jan/Complete_Project_Listing_2016_01_07.xlsx](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/HSIP/2016/jan/Complete_Project_Listing_2016_01_07.xlsx))

**Cycle 7 HSIP program:**
- PE Authorization: September 30, 2016 (RFA due June 30, 2016)
- CON Authorization: September 30, 2019 (RFA due June 30, 2019)

**Waiver request for unforeseen project delays:**
A jurisdiction that has been proceeding with a project in good faith and has encountered unforeseen delays may request special consideration. A sponsor may be allowed to add projects into the annual obligation plan even if it has an outstanding project delay, if Caltrans Local Assistance, MTC and the applicable CMA reach consensus that the delay was unforeseen, beyond the control of the project sponsor, and not a repeated occurrence for the agency.

- **OBAG Requirements**
  Projects funded in the One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG) will not be included in the annual obligation plan until the project sponsor has met applicable OBAG requirements, such as submittal of the annual housing element reports to HCD by April 1 of each year or fully participating in the statewide local streets and roads needs assessment survey or providing updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS).

- **Request for Authorization Review Period**
  For purposes of delivery of projects within the annual obligation plan, it is expected that sponsors schedule at least ninety days for Caltrans/FHWA review and approval of the Request for Authorization. This is to ensure delivery schedules adequately account for federal-aid process review.
- **SPOC Checklist**
  Starting in 2017, jurisdictions must have the SPOC checklist filled out and on file prior to projects being included in the annual obligation plan. A new checklist must be filled out whenever a new SPOC is assigned for that agency.
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DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Cycle 3 Active Transportation Program – Summary of Applications

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on Cycle 3 Active Transportation Program.

Summary

The Active Transportation Program (ATP), as articulated in SB 99 and AB 101, was signed into law on September 26, 2013. It replaced the existing system of small dedicated grant programs, which funded Safe Routes to Schools, bicycle programs, and Recreational Trails. The ATP Cycle 3 call for projects for the statewide and regional funds was released on April 15, 2016 with applications due on June 15, 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Programming Agency</th>
<th>Amount Available this Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statewide Competitive ATP</td>
<td>CTC, Caltrans</td>
<td>$120 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional ATP</td>
<td>MTC</td>
<td>$20 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is estimated the California Transportation Commission (CTC) has received approximately 450 applications under the statewide competitive program. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) received 61 applications, from jurisdictions across the Bay Area region, requesting approximately $173 million regional ATP funds. Out of these, Alameda County jurisdictions have submitted 23 project applications requesting approximately $66 million ATP funds.

A summary of applications submitted by Alameda County jurisdictions is listed on Attachment A.

More information on ATP Cycle 3 Statewide Program can be accessed by visiting: [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/cycle-3.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/cycle-3.html)

CTC is scheduled to adopt the Statewide program in December 2016 and the Regional program in March 2017.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachments**

A. ATP Cycle 3 - Alameda County Jurisdictions’ Application Summary

**Staff Contact**

[Vivek Bhat](mailto:), Director of Programming and Project Controls
## ATP CYCLE 3 - SUMMARY OF APPLICATIONS

### ALAMEDA COUNTY JURISDICTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref #</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Applied for State funds</th>
<th>Applied for Regional funds</th>
<th>ATP Amount ($ X 1,000)</th>
<th>Total Project Cost ($ X 1,000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alameda CTC</td>
<td>I-80/Gilman Interchange Bike/Ped Over-crossing &amp; Access Improvements</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8,418</td>
<td>33,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Castro Valley High School SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,170</td>
<td>2,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Fairview Elementary School SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Heyer Ave School Corridors SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Lewelling Blvd SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Proctor Elementary School SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Royal Ave SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>Somerset Ave School Corridor SRTS</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>3,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alameda County/ Public Health</td>
<td>Active Oakland Comprehensive SRTS Program</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>Central Avenue Complete Streets</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>7,326</td>
<td>12,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>Sacramento Street Complete Streets Improvements</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>SRTS Improvements for John Muir Elementary</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>SRTS Improvements for Oxford &amp; Jefferson Elementary Schools</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>East Bay Regional Parks District</td>
<td>Doolittle Dr Bay Trail, MLK Regional Shoreline</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>7,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Greenway Safety &amp; Connectivity Improvement Project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>Walnut Ave Complete Street Improvement</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5,189</td>
<td>5,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Hayward</td>
<td>Tennyson Rd Ped/Bike Bridge Project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>1,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>14th St Safe Routes in the City</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>10,578</td>
<td>13,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Fruitvale Alive Gap Closure Project</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>8,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>Oakland SRTS: Crossing to Safety</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,714</td>
<td>4,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>West Grand Ave Complete Streets</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>8,676</td>
<td>10,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Piedmont</td>
<td>Ped Safety &amp; Bike Lane Implementation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>3,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>Scramble Pedestrian Crosswalk at E 14th/ San Joaquin Ave Intersection</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Alameda County Total** 66,397 121,162
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DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List: June 2016 Update

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on the June 2016 Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects.

Summary

Federal regulations require that agencies receiving federal funds invoice against their obligations at least once every six months. Caltrans maintains, and updates weekly, a list of inactive obligations. Projects are added to the list when there has been no invoice activity over a six month period and if Caltrans and the Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) do not receive an invoice during the subsequent six-month period the project’s federal funds will be at risk for deobligation. The latest inactive projects list is provided as Attachment A and it indicates the federal funds at risk and the actions required to keep the funds from being deobligated.

Background

In response to FHWA’s guidance for processing Inactive Obligations, Caltrans developed guidelines for managing federal inactive obligations. In order to manage changes more proactively, Caltrans manages “inactive projects” as follows:

- If the Department does not receive an invoice for more than six months, the project will be deemed "inactive" and posted on the Department’s website. Local Agencies will be notified the first time projects are posted.
- If the Department does not receive an invoice within the following six months (12 months without invoicing), the Department will deobligate the unexpended balances.
- It is the responsibility of the Local Agencies to work in collaboration with their respective District Local Assistance Engineers to ensure their projects are removed from the inactive list to avoid deobligation.
- The Inactive project listing is posted at the following website and will be updated weekly: http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/Inactiveprojects.htm
**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Attachments**

A. Alameda County List of Federal Inactive Projects, Dated 06/24/16

**Staff Contact**

*Vivek Bhat*, Director of Programming and Project Controls

*Jacki Taylor*, Associate Program Analyst
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No.</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Agency Action Required</th>
<th>Prefix</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Latest Date</th>
<th>Authorization Date</th>
<th>Last Expenditure Date</th>
<th>Last Action Date</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
<th>Federal Funds</th>
<th>Expenditure Amt</th>
<th>Unexpended Ball</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5012100</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Final invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>ESPL</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>7TH STREET FROM UNION TO PERALTA STREETS, PEDESTRIAN TERRACE IMPROVE</td>
<td>05/26/2015</td>
<td>05/26/2015</td>
<td>05/26/2015</td>
<td>05/26/2015</td>
<td>$4,070,044.00</td>
<td>$3,630,000.00</td>
<td>$3,590,000.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012027</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Invoice Overdue. Provide status update to DLAE.</td>
<td>STPLZ</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>HEGENBERGER ROAD OH (WPRR) (BR NO 33C 0022), SEISMIC RETROFIT</td>
<td>05/14/2015</td>
<td>05/14/2015</td>
<td>05/14/2015</td>
<td>05/14/2015</td>
<td>$7,511,271.00</td>
<td>$6,640,876.00</td>
<td>$6,111,784.70</td>
<td>$529,091.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6073028</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Invoice Overdue. Provide status update to DLAE.</td>
<td>LTAP</td>
<td>University Of California</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER CENTER, LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>05/01/2015</td>
<td>$199,726.00</td>
<td>$99,863.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$99,863.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5178012</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>CML</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>BUCHANAN/MARIN STREET FROM PIERCE ST. TO SAN PABLO, BIKE LANE &amp; PED. WALKWAY</td>
<td>03/05/2015</td>
<td>03/05/2015</td>
<td>03/05/2015</td>
<td>03/05/2015</td>
<td>$2,484,942.00</td>
<td>$1,702,000.00</td>
<td>$1,524,222.60</td>
<td>$177,777.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5178013</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td>Invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>SRITSN</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS IN CITY OF ALBANY, SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL PROGRAM</td>
<td>06/18/2015</td>
<td>06/18/2015</td>
<td>06/18/2015</td>
<td>06/18/2015</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$185,000.00</td>
<td>$69,270.34</td>
<td>$115,729.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012121</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Final invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>BPMP</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>HEGENBERGER RD. OVER SAN LEANDRO STREETS: BRIDGE # 33C0022, BRIDGE PREVENTIVE MAINTENANCE</td>
<td>08/11/2015</td>
<td>08/11/2015</td>
<td>08/11/2015</td>
<td>08/11/2015</td>
<td>$761,250.00</td>
<td>$673,935.00</td>
<td>$429,243.43</td>
<td>$244,693.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5106008</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Invoice returned to agency. Resubmitt to District by 06/20/2016</td>
<td>SRTIL</td>
<td>Emeryville</td>
<td>SAN PAUL AVE (SR 121) BETWEEN 43RD &amp; 47TH AVE., PEDESTRIAN WALKWAY</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>08/18/2015</td>
<td>$617,290.00</td>
<td>$617,290.00</td>
<td>$69,203.31</td>
<td>$548,086.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5354036</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Invoice returned to agency. Resubmitt to District by 06/20/2016</td>
<td>STPL</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>WHIPPLE ROAD - AMARAL ST. TO ITHACA CT., PAVEMENT REHABILITATION</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>$1,015,273.00</td>
<td>$669,000.00</td>
<td>$582,307.18</td>
<td>$46,692.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012133</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>CMLNP</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CITYWIDE, OAKLAND CASHSHARE AND OUTREACH PROGRAM</td>
<td>09/08/2015</td>
<td>09/08/2015</td>
<td>09/08/2015</td>
<td>09/08/2015</td>
<td>$384,631.00</td>
<td>$320,526.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$320,526.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5041042</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>HSPL</td>
<td>San Leandro</td>
<td>BANCROFT AVE./ SYBL AVE., UPGRADE TRAFFIC SIGNALS</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>$77,000.00</td>
<td>$69,300.00</td>
<td>$4,983.66</td>
<td>$64,316.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6480008</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Invoice due to review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.</td>
<td>STPL</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY- VARIOUS LOCATION, PLANNING ASSISTANCE PASS THROUGH TO LOCAL JURISDI</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>$4,411,000.00</td>
<td>$3,905,000.00</td>
<td>$112,278.67</td>
<td>$3,792,721.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012125</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>STPL</td>
<td>Oakland</td>
<td>CITYWIDE STREETS - SEE STATE COMMENT SCREEN FOR ELIGIBLE LOCATIONS, ROAD REHAB &amp; DIETING, BIKE LANES, AND ADA UPGRADES</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>07/14/2015</td>
<td>$5,568,845.00</td>
<td>$4,422,000.00</td>
<td>$263,617.64</td>
<td>$4,158,382.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5014040</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>TCSPL</td>
<td>Alameda</td>
<td>INTERSECTIONS OF PARK SYLVAN AVE AND PARK ST/BUENA VISTA AVE, PEDESTRIAN SAFETY TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS</td>
<td>09/12/2015</td>
<td>09/12/2015</td>
<td>09/12/2015</td>
<td>09/12/2015</td>
<td>$319,633.00</td>
<td>$282,885.00</td>
<td>$4,218.00</td>
<td>$278,667.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5354027</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>STPLZ</td>
<td>Union City</td>
<td>DECOLO ROAD BRIDGE: BRIDGE # 33C-0111, SEISMIC RETROFIT</td>
<td>08/13/2015</td>
<td>08/13/2015</td>
<td>08/13/2015</td>
<td>08/13/2015</td>
<td>$4,913,055.00</td>
<td>$4,345,101.00</td>
<td>$4,026,298.70</td>
<td>$318,802.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5333090</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>SRTIL</td>
<td>Alameda County</td>
<td>MALIBU AVE./IN VICINITY OF FAIRVIEW ELEM. SCHL, CLOSE GAPS BTWN D.ST. &amp; KELLY</td>
<td>07/06/2015</td>
<td>07/06/2015</td>
<td>07/06/2015</td>
<td>07/06/2015</td>
<td>$1,042,310.00</td>
<td>$967,310.00</td>
<td>$792,149.01</td>
<td>$175,160.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6000025</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>STPLZ</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District</td>
<td>VARIOUS BART AERIAL STRUCTURES IN 4 COUNTIES, RETROFIT OF BART AERIAL STRUCTURES</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>07/24/2015</td>
<td>$30,242,133.00</td>
<td>$24,756,014.00</td>
<td>$19,843,944.75</td>
<td>$4,912,069.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6073030</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Submit invoice to District by 08/20/2016</td>
<td>VPPL</td>
<td>University Of California</td>
<td>WITHIN CITY OF BERKELEY, STUDY ON CAMPUS PARKING PRICING</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>09/10/2015</td>
<td>$211,585.00</td>
<td>$169,185.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$169,185.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: FY 2016-17 Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Calendar

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on the FY 2016-17 Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) meeting calendar

Summary

ACTAC members provide technical expertise, analysis and recommendations to the Alameda CTC Board related to transportation planning and programming. Some of the items discussed at ACTAC meetings are forwarded to Alameda CTC standing committees such as the Programs and Projects Committee (PPC) and the Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC) and subsequently to the Alameda CTC Board.

The PPC and the PPLC are held on the second Monday of the month. The ACTAC meets on the Thursday prior to the PPC and the PPLC standing committee meeting day. The ACTAC meeting dates for FY 2016-17 are detailed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY2016-17 ACTAC Meeting Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August, 2016 – No Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 8, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 6, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December – No meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 9, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 6, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 4, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Staff Contact:**

[Vivek Bhat](mailto:vivek.bhat@ctc.ca), Director of Programming and Project Controls
DATE: July 1, 2016

SUBJECT: Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Count Program

RECOMMENDATION: Receive an update on countywide bicycle/pedestrian count program. Provide input on proposed count locations.

Summary

Bicycle and pedestrian count data are important for a variety of planning and engineering purposes. Alameda CTC has collected bicycle and pedestrian count data in various forms dating back to 2002. The current program consists of annual in-person manual counts of bicyclists and pedestrians at 63 locations as well as a limited number of automated counters deployed around the county that are installed in the field and collect continuous data on biking and walking volumes. Manual counts are counts that rely on human processing while automated counts refer to use of a device that detects a bicyclist or pedestrian.

Alameda CTC seeks to expand its bicycle and pedestrian count program to provide more statistically robust data that supports a wider variety of planning applications. Alameda CTC plans to expand its manual count program to cover 150 locations, each counted biennially using video image processing. A draft set of locations will be distributed at the BPAC meeting, and Alameda CTC requests local feedback on these locations by July 29.

In addition, Alameda CTC seeks to partner with local agencies to expand the number of automated counters deployed around the county. Alameda CTC plans to purchase up to 20 automated counters, to be deployed in jurisdictions or on facilities where a local agency is willing to commit to maintaining the counter and paying for ongoing costs associated with data transmission and battery replacement for a period of time. Alameda CTC requests notification from jurisdictions interested in partnering in the installation of one or more automated counters by July 29.

Background

Program Goals

The Countywide Bicycle/Pedestrian Count Program is intended to achieve a range of goals and support a variety of planning applications. Notably, some goals require data at a large number of locations, whereas other goals require data over time. These goals include:
- **Baseline data and trends:** monitor if more people are biking and walking over time
- **Return on investment:** understand the usage of new facilities; understand how the buildout of a network increases bicycling and walking levels
- **Travel model enhancement:** enhancing the ability of the Alameda CTC travel model to represent bicycling and walking requires observed data to calibrate the model
- **Accurate safety analysis:** accurate safety analysis requires considering level of exposure (e.g. collisions per bicyclists/pedestrian) rather than simply number of collisions
- **Leverage funding:** provide required information for grant applications such as Active Transportation Program; assist local jurisdictions in providing such information
- **Communicate role of bicycle and pedestrian facilities in transportation system:** provide information that shows how bicycling and pedestrian facilities carry significant volumes of people and are used for transportation/commuting purposes
- **Provide data for interested researchers**

**Existing Program**

The current Alameda CTC count program has both manual and automated components. The manual count program consists of one-day counts conducted at 63 locations between September and October. Each location is counted for two 2-hour periods. All locations are counted during the PM peak period (4 pm – 6 pm). In addition, each location is counted during either a midday period (12 pm – 2 pm) or a school period (2 pm – 4 pm), as appropriate for that location. Counts are performed in the field by paid professionals. Information on gender and helmet usage is also collected.

The 63 locations were determined in 2010, and are distributed among Alameda County’s four planning areas in approximately equal proportion as population. The 63 locations were determined using criteria including inclusion in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, proximity to schools or trails, and availability of historic count data at that location.

The current automated count program consists of five automated bicycle/pedestrian counters installed around the county. The counters consist of a range technologies that were acquired and installed under a variety of circumstances. Three are installed in trail locations and count both bicyclists and pedestrians, and two are installed in bike lanes.

**Proposed Manual Count Program**

Manual counts are an important component of a bicycle/pedestrian count program. Manual counts are capable of achieving a high degree of spatial coverage, which is important for understanding relative differences in levels of biking and walking between different areas. In addition, manual counts are capable of collecting information on user attributes, counting both bicyclists and pedestrians, and can be used in on-street (i.e. non-trail) locations (which is not true of many automated count technologies).

Alameda CTC proposes to expand the number of count locations from 63 locations to 150 locations. In order to accommodate this increase in a budget neutral manner, locations are proposed to be counted only biennially, and some locations which are currently counted for
4-hours are proposed to be reduced to 2-hour counts. The proposed program will consist of two alternating years (Year A and Year B) as follows:

- **Year A**
  - 50 locations counted for 4 hours (two different 2 hour periods)
  - 25 locations counted for 2 hours
- **Year B**
  - 50 locations counted for 4 hours (two different 2 hour periods)
  - 25 locations counted for 2 hours

A draft set of 150 locations will be distributed at the July 7 meeting. The draft set of locations will retain all of the current 63 locations to take advantage of historic data. Additional locations will be allocated by population and sited based on proximity to transit, activity centers, schools, collision history, and overall spatial coverage (see Attachment A).

**Comments on the draft set of locations are due by July 29** (via email to Matthew Bomberg, mbomberg@alamedactc.org).

In addition to expanding the number of locations, Alameda CTC proposes to switch from in-person observation to video image processing. Video image processing is the preferred method of data collection firms and provides the ability to verify count accuracy but does not enable collection of information on gender. In order to continue to track gender, a small set of locations will be sampled using in person counts.

**Proposed Automated Count Program**

Automated counts are emerging as a best practice method for collecting information on bicycle and pedestrian volumes. Compared to manual counts which are typically collected for short duration and are therefore subject to statistical variability, automated counts can provide more reliable information on trends in biking and walking over time. Automated counts also enable analysis of variation in levels of biking and walking by time of day, day of week, and season.

Alameda CTC’s experience to date with automated counters has shown that the counters provide rich data and are an important component of a bicycle/pedestrian monitoring program. However, the installation and maintenance requirements have proved difficult for Alameda CTC, given the size of the county and the lack of dedicated maintenance staff.

Alameda CTC seeks to partner with local agencies to expand the deployment of automated count equipment in Alameda County. Alameda CTC proposes to fund the capital equipment purchase for up to 20 automated counters. Local agencies would be expected to commit to paying for ongoing costs and maintenance for the counters for a period of time. Priority will be given to locations on interjurisdictional trails and to achieving geographic coverage. Alameda CTC would enter into a Memorandum of Understanding to formalize agreement over responsibilities for the counter(s). Attachment B provides more details on two options available to local jurisdictions. **Alameda CTC requests notification from jurisdictions interested in partnering in the installation of one or more automated counters by July 29** (via email to Matthew Bomberg, mbomberg@alamedactc.org).
Attachments

A. Manual Count Location Selection Approach
B. Automated Counter Local Agency Options

Staff Contact
Tess Lengyel, Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy
Matthew Bomberg, Associate Transportation Planner
Attachment A: Manual Count Location Selection Approach

- Expand number of count locations to 150 sites
- Locations allocated according to population
- Locations sited based on a suitability score that takes into account:
  - Proximity to transit
  - Proximity to activity centers including downtowns, major commercial districts, regional parks, government buildings, venues, and colleges/universities
  - Proximity to school locations
  - History of injury or fatal bicycle or pedestrian collisions
- Locations selected to achieve overall coverage including ability to measure total bicycle/pedestrian volume at major “screenlines”
- Locations designated as either 2-hour or 4-hour count location
  - First priority for 4-hour counts given to school locations
  - Second priority for 4-hour counts given to downtown areas
Attachment B: Automated Counter Local Agency Options

Option A: Portable Trail Counter

- Capital purchase:
  - Alameda CTC purchases trail counter
- Installation:
  - Local agency agrees to install trail counter according to vendor instructions
  - Local agency agrees to conduct manual counts at time of installation to ensure proper installation
  - Optional - local agency may rotate to multiple locations
- Maintenance:
  - Local agency agrees to replace batteries as needed
  - Local agency agrees to troubleshoot with vendor as needed
- Data transmission:
  - Local agency agrees to download data from counter via in-person field visit OR
  - Local agency agrees to pay for ongoing data transmission cost
- Period of time: agreement to last at least 5 years

Option B: Permanently Installed Trail Counter

- Capital purchase:
  - Alameda CTC purchases trail counter
- Installation:
  - Local agency agrees to install trail counter according to vendor instructions
  - Local agency agrees to conduct manual counts at time of installation to ensure proper installation
- Maintenance:
  - Local agency agrees to replace batteries as needed
  - Local agency agrees to troubleshoot with vendor as needed
- Data transmission:
  - Local agency agrees to pay for ongoing data transmission cost
- Period of time: agreement to last at least 10 years
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### Memorandum

**DATE:** July 1, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s Local Streets and Roads Working Group

**RECOMMENDATION:** Nominate Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC) Local Streets and Roads Working Group (LSRWG) Representative for FY 2016-17

---

**Summary**

The Local Streets and Roads Working Group convenes on the second Thursday of each month at the Metropolitan Transportation Commission offices in Oakland. Staff proposes the City of Dublin to continue as ACTAC’s LSRWG representative for FY 2016-17. The role of the ACTAC LSRWG representative is to provide a summary of the LSRWG items to the ACTAC.

**Background**

The purpose of the LSRWG is to act as a forum to communicate new legislative policies related to pavement needs and to help advocate for revenues to meet those pavement needs by recommending policies to MTC’s Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC). Additionally, funding opportunities and project delivery requirements are communicated and/or discussed via this working group. This includes Federal, State, Regional and Caltrans Local Assistance issues. The target audience is local governments, Public works directors and/or engineers and programming staff.

In FY 2015-16 ACTAC was represented by City of Dublin at the LSRWG meetings. Staff is proposing City of Dublin to continue as ACTAC’s LSRWG representative FY 2016-17.

**Fiscal Impact:** There is no fiscal impact.

**Staff Contact**

*Vivek Bhat*, Director of Programming
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