



Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Agenda Thursday, February 4, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

Due to the statewide stay at home order and the Alameda County Shelter in Place Order, and pursuant to the Executive Order issued by Governor Gavin Newsom (Executive Order N-29-20), the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee will not be convening at its Committee Room but will instead move to a remote meeting.

Members of the public wishing to submit a public comment may do so by emailing Angie Ayers at aayers@alamedactc.org by 5:00 p.m. the day before the scheduled meeting. Submitted comments will be read aloud to the Committee and those listening telephonically or electronically; if the comments are more than three minutes in length the comments will be summarized. Members of the public may also make comments during the meeting by using Zoom's "Raise Hand" feature on their phone, tablet or other device during the relevant agenda item, and waiting to be recognized by the Chair. If calling into the meeting from a telephone, you can use "Star (*) 9" to raise/ lower your hand. Comments will generally be limited to three minutes in length, or as specified by the Chair.

Committee Chair: Tess Lengyel

Staff Liaison: [Gary Huisinigh](#)

Clerk: [Vanessa Lee](#)

Location Information:

Virtual Meeting Information: <https://zoom.us/j/98331974940?pwd=a2hkZ2Q3YzJsYVVqeUJQO2VvbXZFUT09>
Webinar ID: 983 3197 4940
Passcode: 386517

For Public Access Dial-in Information: (669) 900-6833
Webinar ID: 983 3197 4940
Passcode: 386517

To request accommodation or assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Angie Ayers, at least 48 hours prior to the meeting date at: aayers@alamedactc.org

Meeting Agenda

1. Call to Order

2. Introductions/Roll Call

3. Public Comment

4. Consent Calendar	Page/Action
4.1. Approve the January 7, 2021 ACTAC Meeting Minutes	1 A
4.2. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects Update	5 I
5. Planning / Programs / Monitoring	
5.1. Approve Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) FY 2021-22 Expenditure Plan Application and Call for Projects	11 A
5.2. Safe Routes to Schools-Mini Grant Program Update	31 I
5.3. 2020 Multimodal Performance Report Update	43 I
5.4. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Grant Program	45 I
6. Member Reports	
7. Staff Reports	
8. Adjournment	

Next Meeting: Thursday, March 4, 2021

Notes:

- All items on the agenda are subject to action and/or change by the Commission.
- To comment on an item not on the agenda (3-minute limit), submit a speaker card to the clerk.
- Call 510.208.7450 (Voice) or 1.800.855.7100 (TTY) five days in advance to request a sign-language interpreter.
- If information is needed in another language, contact 510.208.7400. Hard copies available only by request.
- Call 510.208.7400 48 hours in advance to request accommodation or assistance at this meeting.
- Meeting agendas and staff reports are available on the [website calendar](#).
- Alameda CTC is located near 12th St. Oakland City Center BART station and AC Transit bus lines. [Directions and parking information](#) are available online.



Alameda CTC Schedule of Upcoming Meetings February through March 2021

Commission Chair

Mayor Pauline Russo Cutter
City of San Leandro

Commission Vice Chair

Councilmember John Bauters
City of Emeryville

AC Transit

Board President Elsa Ortiz

Alameda County

Supervisor David Haubert, District 1
Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2
Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3
Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4
Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5

BART

Vice President Rebecca Saltzman

City of Alameda

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft

City of Albany

Councilmember Rochelle Nason

City of Berkeley

Councilmember Lori Droste

City of Dublin

Mayor Melissa Hernandez

City of Fremont

Mayor Lily Mei

City of Hayward

Mayor Barbara Halliday

City of Livermore

Mayor Bob Woerner

City of Newark

Councilmember Luis Freitas

City of Oakland

Councilmember At-Large
Rebecca Kaplan
Councilmember Sheng Thao

City of Piedmont

Councilmember Jen Cavanaugh

City of Pleasanton

Mayor Karla Brown

City of Union City

Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci

Executive Director

Tess Lengyel

Commission and Committee Meetings

Time	Description	Date
2:00 p.m.	Alameda CTC Commission Meeting	February 25, 2021 March 25, 2021
9:00 a.m.	Finance and Administration Committee (FAC)	March 8, 2021
10:00 a.m.	Programs and Projects Committee (PPC)	
11:30 a.m.	Planning, Policy and Legislation Committee (PPLC)	

Advisory Committee Meetings

1:30 p.m.	Joint Paratransit Advisory and Planning Committee and Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee (PAPCO/ParaTAC)	February 22, 2021
1:30 p.m.	Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee (ACTAC)	March 4, 2021
5:30 p.m.	Independent Watchdog Committee (IWC)	March 8 2021
9:30 a.m.	Paratransit Technical Advisory Committee (ParaTAC)	March 9, 2021

Due to the statewide stay at home order and the Alameda County Shelter in Place Order, and pursuant to the Executive Order issued by Governor Gavin Newsom (Executive Order N-29-20), the Commission will not be convening at its Commission Room but will instead move to a remote meeting.

Meeting materials, directions and parking information are all available on the [Alameda CTC website](http://www.AlamedaCTC.org). Meetings subject to change.

This page intentionally left blank



Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes Thursday, January 7, 2021, 1:30 p.m.

4.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

1. Call to Order

Gary Huisingsh called the meeting to order. Mr. Huisingsh provided instructions to the Committee regarding technology procedures including instructions on administering public comments during the meeting.

2. Roll Call/Introductions

Introductions were conducted. All members were present with the exception of Kevin Connolly, Lt. Austin Danmeier, Anthony Fournier, Johnny Jaramillo, Matt Maloney and John Xu.

3. Public Comment

There were no public comments.

4. Consent Calendar

4.1. Approval of November 5, 2020 ACTAC Meeting Minutes

4.2. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects Update

Farid Javandel made a motion to approve the consent calendar. Donna Lee seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following roll call votes:

Yes: Ayupan, Bhatia, Chiu, Cooke, Evans, Fried, Huisingsh, Imai, Javandel, Kelley, Larsen, Lee, Gopika, Ng, Novenario, Payne, Raphael, Ripperda, Radiah, Yeamans

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Connolly, Danmeier, Fournier, Jaramillo, Maloney, Xu

5. Programs/Projects/Monitoring

5.1. State and federal legislative activities update and approval of the 2021 Legislative Program

Carolyn Clevenger stated that the Commission will receive an update on federal, state, regional, and local legislative activities and will be asked to approve the 2021 Alameda CTC legislative program. Ms. Clevenger introduced Maisha Everhart, who the Alameda CTC's Director of Government Affairs and Communications. Ms. Everhart noted that in January, Alameda CTC's federal lobbyists will provide an update to the Planning, Policy & Legislation Committee (PPLC) and the full Commission. She encouraged the members to listen in to the PPLC or Commission Meetings to hear their presentations. Ms. Everhart provided an update on the state legislative activities and presented the 2021 Legislative Program for approval. She noted that Alameda CTC staff will schedule virtual

legislative visits with staff in the Spring to meet with representatives of the state delegation. Also, both the Senate and Assembly released appointments of committee chairs and committee members, which were included as attachments to the staff report. Ms. Everhart stated that each year, Alameda CTC adopts a Legislative Program to provide direction for its legislative and policy activities for the year. The 2021 Alameda CTC Legislative Program retains many of the 2020 priorities and is divided into five sections: Transportation Funding; Multimodal Transportation, Land Use, Safety and Equity; Project Delivery and Operations; Climate Change and Technology; and Partnerships.

Ms. Everhart stated that the City of Fremont reached out to the agency to add to the legislative program a new priority item, "Enhance Transportation Safety", under the Multimodal Transportation Land Use, Safety and Equity section. The following items will be included in the legislative program:

- Support efforts to enable automated speed enforcement,
- Allow local flexibility to set safer speed limits (thereby getting rid of the 85th percentile rule), and
- Regulate navigation apps from directing regional commute traffic onto local neighborhood streets as a bypass for freeway traffic congestion.

Keith Cooke suggested Alameda CTC include a strategy to advocate for cooperation and partnership with railroads to advance projects, with a particular interest in rail safety projects.

Gail Payne request including new strategies under the greenhouse gas emissions priority to:

- Support efforts to address sea level rise adaptation including planning, funding and implementation support,
- Support for safer vehicles and telecommuting, and
- Support equitable access to the internet and digital inclusion.

Hans Larsen made a motion to approve this item. Farid Javandel seconded the motion. The motion passed with the following roll call votes:

Yes: Ayupan, Bhatia, Chiu, Cooke, Evans, Fried, Huisingsh, Imai, Javandel, Kelley, Larsen, Lee, Gopika, Ng, Novenario, Payne, Raphael, Ripperda, Radiah, Yeamans

No: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Connolly, Danmeier, Fournier, Jaramillo, Maloney, Zu

6. Members Report

Keith Cooke introduced Sheila Marquises as the new ACTAC representative for the City of San Leandro.

Hans Larsen shared that the Walnut Avenue Bikeway project is a new bikeway facility in the City of Fremont that is now open. The project is 1.2 miles long and extends along Walnut Avenue from Mission Boulevard to Paseo Padre Parkway. Mr. Larsen noted that Alameda CTC provided funding to this project and BART provided a Safe Routes to BART Grant.

Amber Evans stated that the City of Emeryville swiveled a span of the pedestrian overcrossing bridge over the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. In addition, the first concrete platform for paid parking kiosk platform will be opened the week of January 11, 2021.

Julie Chiu informed the Committee that Joanna Liu will be the interim ACTAC representative for the City of Livermore through July, because she is going on maternity leave.

Fred Kelley informed the committee that this is his last ACTAC meeting and Alex Ameri, Director of Public Works, will be the interim ACTAC representative for the City of Hayward.

7. Staff Report

Vivek Bhat reminded the Committee the 2022 Comprehensive Investment Plan applications are due by February 1, 2021. Mr. Bhat also reminded the Committee that the COVID-19 Rapid Response Grant Program expenditure deadline is March 31, 2021. He noted that for this particular grant program there are no extensions provided.

Mr. Bhat announced that the Commission approved \$1.7 million specifically for the Safe Routes to Schools mini-grant program and Alameda CTC is ready to implement the findings from the school site assessments as mini capital projects. Alameda CTC staff will bring to the jurisdictions the methodology of the distribution of funding next month. Lastly, Mr. Bhat stated that Alameda CTC is updating the Project Funding Agreement and staff will provide the agreement and amendment updates to the cities this Spring.

8. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for February 4, 2021.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

4.2

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: January 28, 2021

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
Jacki Taylor, Senior Program Analyst

SUBJECT: Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects Update

Recommendation

ACTAC members are requested to review the current Caltrans Inactive Projects list (Attachment A), which identifies federal funding at risk for deobligation due to delayed invoicing and to review the actions required by the project sponsor to keep the funding obligation active and in compliance with Caltrans requirements. This is an information item.

Summary

Federal regulations require local agencies receiving federal funds to regularly invoice against each federal obligation. Caltrans maintains a list of inactive obligations and projects are added to the list when there has been no invoice activity for the past six months. If Caltrans does not receive an invoice during the subsequent six-month period the project's federal funds will be at risk for deobligation by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). ACTAC members are requested to review the latest inactive projects list (Attachment A), which identifies the federal funds at risk and the actions required to avoid deobligation. Local agencies are expected to regularly submit invoices and close out projects in a timely manner. To reduce the occurrence of inactive projects, local agencies are encouraged to implement quarterly invoicing. Project sponsors with inactive projects are to work directly with Caltrans Local Assistance to clear the inactive invoicing status and provide periodic status updates to Alameda CTC programming staff until projects are removed from the Caltrans report.

Background

In response to FHWA's requirements for processing inactive obligations, Caltrans Local Assistance proactively manages federal obligations, as follows:

- If Caltrans has not received an invoice for obligated funds in over six months, the project will be deemed inactive and added to the list of Federal Inactive

Obligations. The list is posted on the Caltrans website and updated weekly:
<https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/projects/inactive-projects>.

- Caltrans will notify local agencies the first time a project becomes inactive.
- If Caltrans does not receive an invoice within the following six months (12 months without invoicing), Caltrans will deobligate the unexpended balances. The deobligation process is further detailed in [FHWA's Obligation Funds Management Guide](#), which states that project costs incurred after deobligation are not considered allowable costs for federal participation and are therefore ineligible for future federal reimbursement.

It is the responsibility of local agencies to work in collaboration with their DLAE to ensure projects are removed from the inactive list and avoid deobligation.

Regional Requirements

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Regional Project Delivery Policy, MTC Resolution 3606, states that *"Agencies with projects that have not been invoiced against at least once in the previous six months or have not received a reimbursement within the previous nine months have missed the invoicing /reimbursement deadlines and are subject to restrictions placed on future regional discretionary funds and the programming of additional federal funds in the federal TIP until the project receives a reimbursement."* Additionally, MTC may delay the obligation of currently programmed regional discretionary funding to a future year. Thus, agencies with inactive projects must resolve their inactive status promptly to avoid restrictions on future federal funds. MTC actively monitors inactive obligations and periodically contacts project sponsors for status updates. MTC encourages Local Agencies to invoice more frequently than the 6-month minimum and preferably on a quarterly basis.

Invoice Submittal

Due to COVID-19, Caltrans has temporarily exempted its requirement for wet signatures on invoice documents in order to process for payment. Until further notice, Districts will be accepting scanned copies of invoices. Local Assistance Procedures Manual (LAPM) forms, including Exhibit 5-A Local Agency Invoice form can be found [here](#).

Next Steps

ACTAC members are requested to ensure timely invoicing against each federal obligation and work directly with Local Assistance to resolve invoicing issues. Sponsors with inactive projects are requested to provide periodic status updates to Alameda CTC until the project is removed from the report. Email status updates to Jacki Taylor, JTaylor@alamedactc.org.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact. This is an information item.

Attachment:

- A. Alameda County Federal Inactive Projects List, dated 1/21/21.

Alameda County Inactive Obligations

Updated by Caltrans 1/21/2021

Project Balances > \$50,000

Updated on 01/21/2021

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	Project Prefix	Agency	Project Description	Potential Deobligation Date	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5014041	Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE.	STPL	Alameda	PACIFIC AVE: MAIN ST TO FOURTH ST & OTIS DR: PARK ST TO BROADWAY ROADWAY	9/16/2020	9/17/2019	1/30/2014	9/17/2019	10/14/2020	16	\$1,339,448	\$634,900	\$125,673	\$509,227
5014038	Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE.	HSIPL	Alameda	PARK STREET, PARK STREET DRAW BRIDGE TO ENCINAL AVE, INSTALL LEFT TURN	3/24/2021	3/24/2020	1/18/2012	3/24/2020	3/24/2020	10	\$964,300	\$733,400	\$466,736	\$266,664
6480021	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	FERPL17	Alameda County Transportation Commission	BUBLIN BLVD: NORTH CANYON PARKWAY FROM FALLON RD TO DOOLAN RD DUBLIN BLVD. -	5/7/2021	5/7/2020	5/7/2020		5/7/2020		\$6,754,176	\$539,940	\$0	\$539,940
6480007	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	STPL	Alameda County Transportation Commission	ALAMEDA COUNTY - COUNTYWIDE, COMMUNITY - BASED TRANSPORTATION	6/2/2021	6/2/2020	10/29/2013	6/2/2020	6/2/2020		\$593,750	\$475,000	\$387,613	\$87,387
6480010	Inactive	Final invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	ATPL	Alameda County Transportation Commission	THE EAST BAY GREENWAY-OAKLAND-HAYWARD, CLASS I BIKE FACILITY	1/25/2020	1/25/2019	3/26/2015	1/25/2019	1/25/2019	24	\$3,000,000	\$2,656,000	\$2,575,508	\$80,492
5322019	Inactive	Final Voucher Complete-Sent to Fed Reimbursement	BRLZ	Fremont	NILES BLVD.OVERHEAD (BART/UPRR),BR#33C0128 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT (TC)	2/27/2021	2/28/2020	3/1/2001	2/28/2020	2/28/2020	11	\$14,791,794	\$13,490,483	\$12,948,026	\$542,457
5050047	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	STPL	Hayward	WANTON AVE. - HESPERIAN BLVD TO SANTA CLARA ST. REHAB PAVEMENT, UPGRADE	6/23/2021	6/23/2020	6/23/2020		6/23/2020		\$101,200	\$88,000	\$0	\$88,000
5050041	Inactive	Final Voucher Removed from Inventory	STPL	Hayward	INDUSTRIAL BLVD. - CLAWITER RD. TO 659 FT. SOUTH OF DEPOT RD. PAVEMENT	4/10/2020	4/11/2019	1/23/2014	4/11/2019	4/11/2019	21	\$1,538,563	\$1,335,000	\$1,266,235	\$68,765
5053031	Inactive	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	STPL	Livermore	NORTH LIVERMORE AVE. FROM 1100 FEET SOUTH OF LAS POSITAS RD TO QUESTAVILLE ST. SOUTH	5/11/2021	5/11/2020	5/11/2020		11/24/2020		\$2,024,250	\$1,382,000	\$0	\$1,382,000
5012147	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	HSIPL	Oakland	ON BANCROFT AVE. FROM HAVENSCOURT BLVD AND 98TH AVE. INSTALL HAWKS	6/23/2021	6/23/2020	10/13/2017	6/23/2020	6/23/2020		\$4,322,000	\$3,257,174	\$702,374	\$2,554,800
5012141	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	HSIPL	Oakland	MARKET ST. BETWEEN 4TH AND 7TH ST. & 18TH TO 19TH ST. INTERSECTION AT MARKET	5/6/2020	5/7/2019	10/21/2016	5/7/2019	12/20/2019	20	\$2,685,282	\$1,425,870	\$183,600	\$1,242,270
5012142	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	HSIPL	Oakland	TELEGRAPH AVENUE BETWEEN 29TH AND 45TH ST. STRIPING AND SIGN ROAD	7/23/2020	7/24/2019	10/14/2016	7/24/2019	10/17/2019	18	\$2,212,347	\$1,344,510	\$199,260	\$1,145,250
5012140	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	HSIPL	Oakland	SHATTUCK AVE AT 49TH ST, 51ST, 59TH, ALCATRAZ AVE; AND CLAREMONT AVE	6/23/2021	6/23/2020	12/15/2016	6/23/2020	6/23/2020		\$1,363,072	\$1,221,072	\$183,390	\$1,037,682
5012028	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	STPLZ	Oakland	23RD AVE BR 33C0148, CAMPUS DR BR 33C0238 & COLISEUM WAY BR 33C0253	5/14/2021	5/14/2020	9/1/1996	5/14/2020	1/7/2021		\$3,312,953	\$2,897,545	\$2,278,206	\$619,339
5012134	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	STPL	Oakland	7TH STREET FROM WOOD ST TO PERALTA ST. ROAD DIET, BICYCLE LANES, SIDEWALK	4/9/2021	4/9/2020	4/6/2017	4/9/2020	4/9/2020	9	\$3,744,000	\$3,288,000	\$3,222,240	\$65,760
5012127	Inactive	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE.	CML	Oakland	ON PERALTA ST FROM 7TH ST TO 10TH ST AND FROM 32ND ST TO HAVEN STREET.	2/26/2020	2/26/2019	2/16/2016	2/26/2019	2/26/2019	23	\$3,943,753	\$3,098,415	\$3,036,697	\$61,718
5101031	Inactive	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	STPL	Pleasanton	CHABOT DRIVE, WILLOW ROAD, GILBRALTAR DRIVE, HACIENDA DRIVE,	3/19/2021	3/19/2020	3/19/2020		8/11/2020	10	\$2,639,852	\$1,095,000	\$0	\$1,095,000
5041046	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	HSIPL	San Leandro	IN SAN LEANDRO AT THE INTERSECTION OF EAST 14 TH STREET (SR 185) AND	6/23/2021	6/23/2020	10/13/2017	6/23/2020	6/25/2020		\$341,900	\$335,250	\$39,968	\$295,282
5041045	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	HSIPL	San Leandro	IN SAN LEANDRO AT THE INTERSECTION OF DAVIS ST AND CARPENTIER ST. INSTALL	11/27/2019	11/27/2018	4/21/2017	11/27/2018	10/17/2019	26	\$292,655	\$254,405	\$37,655	\$216,750

Alameda County Inactive Obligations

Updated by Caltrans 1/21/2021

Project Balances > \$50,000

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	Project Prefix	Agency	Project Description	Potential Deobligation Date	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5354039	Inactive	Final invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	HSIPL	Union City	WHIPPLE ROAD/CENTRAL AVENUE AND DECOTO ROAD/PERRY ROAD UPGRADE	1/1/2021	1/2/2020	10/21/2016	1/2/2020	1/2/2020	12	\$552,716	\$437,700	\$119,654	\$318,046
5933146	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	STPL	Alameda County	UNINCORPORATED ALAMEDA COUNTY: VARIOUS ROADWAYS: STANLEY BLVD,	9/3/2021	9/3/2020	5/16/2018	9/3/2020	9/3/2020		\$2,489,750	\$1,874,915	\$91,201	\$1,783,714
5933126	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HPLUL	Alameda County	EAST 14TH ST/MISSION BLVD FROM 162ND AVE TO RUFUS CT, CONSTRUCT BULB OUTS	9/15/2021	9/15/2020	4/9/2014	9/15/2020	9/15/2020		\$674,940	\$539,940	\$100,839	\$439,101
5933154	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Alameda County	CROW CANYON ROAD, PALOMARES ROAD, NORTH VASCO ROAD, AND ALTAMONT	9/29/2021	9/29/2020	11/19/2019	9/29/2020	9/29/2020		\$334,940	\$301,430	\$6,938	\$294,492
5933155	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Alameda County	TESLA ROAD BETWEEN EAGLES RUN ROAD AND MCLAUGHLIN ROAD.	8/28/2021	8/28/2020	10/31/2019	8/28/2020	8/28/2020		\$87,000	\$87,000	\$26,615	\$60,385
5933143	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	ATPL	Alameda County	IN CASTRO VALLEY: ON ANITA AVENUE BETWEEN CASTRO VALLEY BLVD. AND SOMERSET	8/20/2021	8/20/2020	2/15/2018	8/20/2020	8/20/2020		\$310,000	\$250,000	\$194,156	\$55,844
6480017	Future	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	TCESB 1L	Alameda County Transportation Commission	IN THE CITY OF OAKLAND, WITHIN THE PORT OF OAKLAND'S SEAPORT	8/19/2021	8/19/2020	8/28/2018	8/19/2020	8/19/2020		\$28,562,849	\$9,741,364	\$539,719	\$9,201,645
6480013	Future	Invoice returned to agency. Contact DLAE.	STPCM LNI	Alameda County Transportation Commission	COUNTY WIDE- APPROXIMATELY 300 PUBLIC SCHOOL ALAMEDA COUNTY	7/7/2021	7/7/2020	6/15/2017	7/7/2020	7/7/2020		\$9,842,182	\$8,709,066	\$4,287,927	\$4,421,139
5322060	Future	Invoice under review by Caltrans. Monitor for progress.	CML	Fremont	COMPLETE STREETS UPGRADE OF RELINQUISHED SR84. THORNTON AVE -	7/28/2021	7/28/2020	11/11/2018	7/28/2020	10/7/2020		\$1,339,000	\$1,185,000	\$118,915	\$1,066,086
5050046	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	STPCM L	Hayward	MAIN STREET FROM MCKEEVER AVENUE TO D STREET REDUCE ROADWAY	8/4/2021	8/4/2020	1/14/2019	8/4/2020	8/4/2020		\$350,000	\$175,000	\$550	\$174,450
5012152	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Oakland	HIGH STREET FROM SAN LEANDRO STREET TO PORTER STREET CONSTRUCT	8/19/2021	8/19/2020	10/13/2017	8/19/2020	8/19/2020		\$2,097,060	\$1,580,570	\$351,733	\$1,228,837
5012148	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Oakland	IN OAKLAND AT 27 LOCATIONS:701&777 PANORAMIC WAY, 5727	8/26/2021	8/26/2020	10/13/2017	8/26/2020	8/26/2020		\$1,198,204	\$1,003,570	\$149,061	\$854,509
5012161	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	BRLS	Oakland	BRIDGE NO. 33C0373L, EDGEWATER DRIVE NB OVER ELMHURST CANAL, 0.2 MI N/W	9/9/2021	9/9/2020	2/18/2020	9/9/2020	9/9/2020		\$800,000	\$708,240	\$14,548	\$693,692
5012160	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	BRLS	Oakland	BRIDGE NO. 33C0373R, EDGEWATER DRIVE NB OVER ELMHURST CANAL, 0.2 MI N/W	9/1/2021	9/1/2020	2/18/2020	9/1/2020	9/1/2020		\$800,000	\$708,240	\$14,548	\$693,692
5012123	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	STPL	Oakland	LAKESIDE DR. FROM MADISON ST. TO HARRISON, HARRISON ST FROM 19TH AVE TO GRAND	8/20/2021	8/20/2020	2/9/2016	8/20/2020	8/20/2020		\$12,643,334	\$9,200,000	\$8,586,493	\$613,507
5012151	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Oakland	DOWNTOWN OAKLAND INTERSECTIONS: AREA BOUNDED BY: BROADWAY,	9/9/2021	9/9/2020	10/13/2017	9/9/2020	9/9/2020		\$1,030,275	\$527,040	\$93,783	\$433,257
5012103	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	BHLO	Oakland	ADELINE STREET BRIDGE OVER UPRR AMTRAK, BRIDGE# 33C0028 SEISMIC RETROFIT	7/7/2021	7/7/2020	5/4/2011	7/7/2020	7/7/2020		\$712,000	\$630,334	\$387,711	\$242,623
5012124	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	STPLZ	Oakland	LEIMERT BLVD. BRIDGE OVER SAUSAL CREEK. BR. # 33C0215 SEISMIC RETROFIT.	9/25/2021	9/25/2020	4/27/2014	9/25/2020	1/7/2021		\$1,588,000	\$1,405,857	\$1,165,936	\$239,921
5012133	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	CMLNI	Oakland	CITYWIDE, OAKLAND CARSHARE AND OUTREACH PROGRAM	8/26/2021	8/26/2020	9/8/2015	8/26/2020	8/26/2020		\$384,631	\$320,526	\$241,040	\$79,486

Alameda County Inactive Obligations

Updated by Caltrans 1/21/2021

Project Balances < \$50,000

Updated on 01/21/2021

Project Number	Status	Agency Action Required	Project Prefix	Agency	Project Description	Potential Deobligation Date	Latest Date	Earliest Authorization Date	Latest Payment Date	Last Action Date	Months of No Activity	Total Cost Amount	Obligations Amount	Expenditure Amount	Unexpended Balance
5014040	Inactive	Final Voucher Package Received	TCSPL	Alameda	INTERSECTIONS OF PARK ST/LINCOLN AVE AND PARK ST/BUENA VISTA AVE, PEDESTRIAN SAFETY	3/7/2018	3/7/2017	3/22/2013	3/7/2017	3/7/2017	46	\$319,633	\$282,885	\$253,486	\$29,399
5014043	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	ATPLNI	Alameda	JEAN SWEENEY OPEN SPACE: RAIL TO TRAIL CONVERSION OF THE FORMER ALAMEDA BELTLINE. CROSS ALAMEDA	6/18/2021	6/18/2020	4/17/2017	6/18/2020	6/18/2020		\$141,000	\$123,000	\$105,048	\$17,952
5057043	Inactive	Final Voucher Package Received	ATPL	Berkeley	NEAR LECONTE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ALONG SHATTUCK AVE, AT WARD, STUART AND RUSSELL STREETS AND MERGE	6/23/2021	6/23/2020	9/14/2016	6/23/2020	6/23/2020		\$510,567	\$452,004	\$409,050	\$42,954
5012131	Inactive	Project is inactive. Funds at risk. Invoice immediately. Provide status to DLAE.	ATPL	Oakland	MACARTHUR BLVD FROM HIGH ST TO RICHARDS ST. INSTALLATION OF BIKE LANES (CLASS I/II) TRAFFIC AND	8/14/2020	8/15/2019	4/6/2017	8/15/2019	8/15/2019	17	\$4,999,047	\$3,598,000	\$3,558,000	\$40,000
6000060	Inactive	Invoice overdue. Contact DLAE.	STPLZ	San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District	A LINE: STATIONS: FRUITVALE AND COLISEUM SEISMIC RETROFIT	5/28/2021	5/28/2020	4/15/2015	5/28/2020	5/28/2020		\$18,737,500	\$3,016,056	\$2,969,120	\$46,936
5012139	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	HSIPL	Oakland	IN OAKLAND: AT THE INTERSECTIONS OF: 10TH/OAK, 10TH/JACKSON, 10TH/HARRISON.	9/11/2021	9/11/2020	10/14/2016	9/11/2020	9/11/2020		\$466,888	\$420,199	\$398,648	\$21,551
5012128	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	CML	Oakland	MARTIN LUTHER KING WAY FROM 32ND ST TO 35 TH ST. AND STRIPING FR. WEST GRAND TO 40TH ST. STREET	9/15/2021	9/15/2020	2/16/2016	9/15/2020	9/15/2020		\$3,015,722	\$2,352,857	\$2,341,791	\$11,066
5101029	Future	Invoice ASAP to avoid inactivity.	BPMP	Pleasanton	CITY OF PLEASANTON: 5 BRIDGES, 33C0454, 33C0099, 33C0453, 33C0461, AND 33C0462 BRIDGE PREVENTIVE	9/11/2021	9/11/2020	12/19/2015	9/11/2020	9/11/2020		\$1,575,426	\$134,532	\$131,090	\$3,442

Color Key

	Project is inactive for more than 12 months and is carried over from last quarter inactive project list.
	Invoice / Final invoice is under review
	Project is in final voucher process. District can contact Final voucher unit to verify and get an update.
	Invoice is returned and agency needs to contact DLAE to resubmit the invoice.
	Invoice Overdue. Agency needs to provide justification to DLAE.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

5.1

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• PH: (510) 208-7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: January 28, 2021

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Vivek Bhat, Director of Programming and Project Controls
Jacki Taylor, Senior Program Analyst

SUBJECT: Approve Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) FY 2021-22
Expenditure Plan Application and Call for Projects

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Commission approve Resolution 21-002 regarding the TFCA County Program Manager (CPM) FY 2021-22 Expenditure Plan Application, due to the Air District by March 3, 2021.

Summary

As the designated TFCA County Program Manager (CPM) for Alameda County, the Alameda CTC is required to annually program the TFCA CPM revenue received from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (Air District). It is recommended the Commission approve Resolution 21-002 (Attachment A), regarding the fiscal year (FY) 2021-22 TFCA CPM Expenditure Plan Application (Attachment B) and its submittal to the Air District. The FY 2021-22 TFCA Expenditure Plan Application identifies approximately \$2.8 million of FY 2021-22 funding available for programming and is due to the Air District by March 3, 2021, prior to a detailed program of projects. In lieu of a stand-alone TFCA call for projects this year, the FY 2021-22 funding, along with \$829,425 of unprogrammed FY 2020-21 funding, was included in the fund estimate for the 2022 Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) call for projects, released December 2020.

Background

TFCA funding is generated by a four-dollar vehicle registration fee administered by the Air District. Projects eligible for TFCA funding are to result in the reduction of motor vehicle emissions and achieve surplus emission reductions beyond what is currently required through regulations, ordinances, contracts, or other legally binding obligations. Projects eligible for TFCA include shuttles, bike lanes and bike parking, signal timing and transit signal priority, travel demand management (TDM) programs and alternative fuel vehicles

and fueling/charging infrastructure. The Alameda CTC is responsible for programming 40 percent of the revenue generated within Alameda County for this program. A total of 6.25% percent of new revenue is set aside for Alameda CTC's administration of the program. Per the distribution formula for Alameda County's share of TFCA funding, 70 percent of the available funds are to be allocated to the cities and County based on population, with a minimum of \$10,000 to each jurisdiction. The remaining 30 percent of funds are to be allocated to transit-related projects on a discretionary basis. A jurisdiction's projected future share may be borrowed against in order for a project to receive more funds in the current year, which helps facilitate the required annual programming of all available funds.

For reference, a draft FY 2021-22 TFCA fund estimate (Attachment C) identifies how the funding in the FY 2021-22 Expenditure Plan Application is distributed per the county-level funding formula and reflects any adjustments from returned funds from closed projects and unprogrammed balances from prior cycles. Projects proposed for TFCA funding through the 2022 CIP are to be consistent with the Air District's TFCA CPM Fund Policies (Attachment D) and cost-effectiveness requirements. There are no substantive changes to the CPM Fund Policies from last year. Consistent with the 2022 CIP Guidelines, the available FY 2021-22 TFCA funding will be focused towards bicycle and pedestrian and transit projects.

FY 2021-22 Revenue

The FY 2021-22 TFCA Expenditure Plan Application establishes the amount of TFCA funds available for programming to projects and program administration and is based on the Air District's Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) revenue estimates for the same period. Additionally, previously programmed TFCA funds remaining from closed (i.e., cancelled or completed) projects are returned to the Alameda CTC's fund estimate for reprogramming. These adjustments are detailed on the second page of the Expenditure Plan Application. Returned funds that were initially programmed from the 70 percent cities/county portion of the fund estimate are credited back to the project sponsor's share.

As summarized below, the Expenditure Plan Application's estimated total amount available for projects is the sum of the new allocation (projected revenue), funds to reprogram, and earned interest, less 6.25 percent of the new allocation, which is reserved for the Alameda CTC's administration of the TFCA program. An additional \$829,425 unprogrammed balance from FY 2020-21 is included in the grand total available to projects.

FY 2021-22 Estimated New Allocation:	\$1,838,900
<u>Less 6.25% of new allocation for TFCA administration:</u>	<u>(- \$114,931)</u>
Estimated new allocation for projects:	\$1,723,969
Earned interest for calendar year 2020:	\$71,347
<u>Funds from closed projects to reprogram, as of 10/31/20:</u>	<u>\$417,000</u>
FY 2021-22 Total funding available for projects:	\$2,281,020
<u>Subtotal unprogrammed balance from prior year:</u>	<u>\$829,425</u>
Grand/Adjusted Total FY 2021-22 Available to Program:	\$3,041,741

FY 2021-22 Program Development

The Air District's TFCA CPM Policies require the Estimated New Allocation portion of the distributed revenue to be fully programmed on an annual basis. Any unprogrammed balance from the Estimated New Allocation remaining after the Air District's programming deadline may be redirected by the Air District to other projects in the region. The programming of TFCA funding is incorporated into the Alameda CTC's biennial Comprehensive Investment Plan (CIP) process when possible, but due to the annual programming deadline for these funds, releasing stand-alone TFCA calls for projects is periodically required. The FY 2021-22 TFCA revenue was included in the 2022 CIP Fund Estimate and applications were due February 1st. Staff will evaluate the proposed projects for TFCA eligibility and cost-effectiveness and include a FY 2021-22 TFCA program recommendation within the staff recommendation for the 2022 CIP, scheduled for consideration by the Commission in April or May 2020. If an unprogrammed TFCA balance remains when the 2022 CIP is adopted, a separate programming recommendation for the balance will be presented in the fall 2021 timeframe.

The Air District requires an approved program of TFCA projects to be submitted no later than six months from the date the Air District Board approves the TFCA CPM expenditure plan applications. This year, a complete FY 2021-22 TFCA program of projects is estimated to be due to the Air District by November 2021.

Next Steps

The Alameda CTC FY 2021-22 TFCA Expenditure Plan Application is to be signed by the Executive Director and is due to the Air District by March 3, 2021. A TFCA funding recommendation will be included in the 2022 CIP schedule for consideration April or May 2021.

Updated TFCA program guidelines, including the attached Air District FY 2021-22 TFCA Policies, fund estimate and funding recommendations, will be incorporated into the adopted Alameda CTC's 2022 CIP. A complete TFCA FY 2021-22 program of projects is due to the Air District by November 2021.

Fiscal Impact: This recommended action has no significant fiscal impact. TFCA funding is made available by the Air District and will be included in the Alameda CTC's FY 2021-22 budget.

Attachments:

- A. Alameda CTC Resolution 21-002
- B. Alameda CTC FY 2021-22 TFCA Expenditure Plan Application
- C. Alameda CTC Draft FY 2021-22 TFCA Fund Estimate
- D. Air District's FY 2021-22 TFCA County Program Manager Fund Policies

**Commission Chair**

Mayor Pauline Russo Cutter
City of San Leandro

Commission Vice Chair

Councilmember John Bauters
City of Emeryville

AC Transit

Board President Elsa Ortiz

Alameda County

Supervisor David Haubert, District 1
Supervisor Richard Valle, District 2
Supervisor Wilma Chan, District 3
Supervisor Nate Miley, District 4
Supervisor Keith Carson, District 5

BART

Vice President Rebecca Saltzman

City of Alameda

Mayor Marilyn Ezzy Ashcraft

City of Albany

Councilmember Rochelle Nason

City of Berkeley

Councilmember Lori Droste

City of Dublin

Melissa Hernandez, Mayor

City of Fremont

Mayor Lily Mei

City of Hayward

Mayor Barbara Halliday

City of Livermore

Mayor Bob Woerner

City of Newark

Councilmember Luis Freitas

City of Oakland

Councilmember At-Large
Rebecca Kaplan
Councilmember Sheng Thao

City of Piedmont

Councilmember Jen Cavanaugh

City of Pleasanton

Mayor Karla Brown

City of Union City

Mayor Carol Dutra-Vernaci

Executive Director

Tess Lengyel

ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**RESOLUTION 21-002**

**Approval of the Alameda County FY 2021-22
Transportation Fund for Clean Air County Program Manager Fund
Expenditure Plan Application**

WHEREAS, as of July 2010, the Alameda County Transportation Commission ("Alameda CTC") was designated as the overall Program Manager for the Transportation Fund for Clean Air ("TFCA") County Program Manager Fund for Alameda County;

WHEREAS, the TFCA Program requires the Program Manager to submit an Expenditure Plan Application for FY 2021-22 TFCA funding to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District ("Air District") by March 3, 2021.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Alameda CTC Commission will program the estimated \$2,281,020 available to projects, consistent with the attached FY 2021-22 TFCA County Program Manager Fund Expenditure Plan Application;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Alameda CTC Commission will approve a program of projects that includes at minimum the Estimated New Allocation of \$1,792,673 within six months of the Air District's approval of the FY2021-22 Expenditure Plan Application; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Alameda CTC Commission authorizes the Executive Director to execute any necessary fund transfer agreements related to this funding with the Air District and project sponsors.

DULY PASSED AND ADOPTED by the Alameda CTC at the regular Commission meeting held on Thursday, February 25, 2021 in Oakland, California, by the following vote:

AYES:**NOES:****ABSTAIN:****ABSENT:**

SIGNED:

ATTEST:

Pauline Russo Cutter
Chair, Alameda CTC

Vanessa Lee
Clerk of the Commission

TFCA FYE22 Expenditure Plan Application

Summary Information

County Program Manager (CPM) Agency : Alameda County Transportation Commission

Address: 1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

CPM to complete the yellow highlighted cells.

PART A: NEW TFCA FUNDS

		Project	Admin (default 6.25%)	Total (Project + Admin)
1. Estimated FYE 2022 DMV revenues (based on projected CY2020 revenues):	Line 1	\$1,723,969	\$ 114,931	\$ 1,838,900
2. Difference between prior-year estimate and actual revenue:	Line 2	\$64,410	\$4,294	\$68,704
a. Actual FYE 2020 DMV revenues (based on CY2019):	2a	\$1,921,223	\$ 128,082	\$ 2,049,304
b. Estimated FYE 2020 DMV revenues:	2b	\$1,856,813	\$ 123,788	\$ 1,980,600
<i>('a' minus 'b' equals Line 2.)</i>				
3. Estimated New Allocation (Sum of Lines 1 and 2) :	Line 3	\$1,792,673	\$119,225	\$1,907,604

PART B: INTEREST FOR PROGRAMMING AND TFCA FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR REPROGRAMMING

		Project	Admin	Total
4. Total available for programming/reprogramming to other projects.	Line 4	\$488,347	\$0	\$488,347
a. Amount available from previously funded projects (see Addendum, page 2) :	4a	\$417,000		
b. Admin expended in FYE 2020:	4b		\$128,081.51	
c. Interest income earned on TFCA funds in CY 2020:	4c	\$71,347		\$71,347
<i>(Project equals '4a' plus '4c' equals Line 4. Admin equals '2a' minus '4b'.)</i>				

PART C: TOTAL AVAILABLE TFCA FUNDS

		Project	Admin	Total
5. Total Available TFCA Funds (Sum of Lines 3 and 4)	Line 5	\$2,281,020	\$114,931	\$2,395,951

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

Executive Director Signature

Date

[1] The "Estimated TFCA funds budgeted for administration" amount is listed for informational purposes only. Per California Health and Safety Code Section 44233, County Program Managers must limit their administrative costs to no more than 6.25% of the actual total revenue received from the Air District.

TFCA FYE22 Expenditure Plan Application

Summary Information - Addendum

TFCA funds programmed to projects with balances available for reprogramming

Index	Project #	Project Sponsor	Project Name	\$ TFCA Funds Allocated	\$ TFCA Funds Expended	\$ TFCA Funds Available	Code*
1.	18ALA01	Berkeley	Berkeley Citywide Bike Parking Program	\$180,000	\$0	\$180,000	CP
2.	19ALA05	Oakland	E. 12th St Bikeway	\$140,000	\$0	\$140,000	CP
3.	19ALA06	Oakland	Broadway Shuttle, FY 2019-20	\$338,000	\$253,500	\$84,500	UB
4.	19ALA07	CSUEB	CSU East Bay Campus to Hayward BART Shuttle, FYs 2018-19 & 2019-20	\$75,000	\$62,500	\$12,500	UB

TOTAL TFCA FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR REPROGRAMMING

\$417,000

(Enter this amount in Part B, Line 4.a. of Summary Information form)

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

Alameda CTC TFCA County Program Manager Fund: FY 2021-22 Fund Estimate

				A	B	C	D	E (B-C+D)	F (A+E)
Agency	Population (Estimate ¹)	% Population	Total % of Funding	TFCA Funds Available (new this FY)	Balance from Previous FY	Programmed Last Cycle	Funds Available from Closed Projects	Rollover (Debits/ Credits)	TFCA Balance (New + Rollover)
Alameda	81,312	4.87%	4.86%	\$ 61,054	\$ (123,557)	\$ 22,549	\$ -	\$ (146,106)	\$ (85,053)
Alameda County	148,452	8.88%	8.87%	\$ 111,466	\$ 422,056	\$ 179,512	\$ -	\$ 242,544	\$ 354,010
Albany	18,937	1.13%	1.13%	\$ 14,219	\$ (8,664)	\$ 5,513	\$ -	\$ (14,177)	\$ 42
Berkeley	122,580	7.34%	7.32%	\$ 92,040	\$ 256,733	\$ 152,061	\$ 180,000	\$ 284,672	\$ 376,712
Dublin	65,716	3.93%	3.93%	\$ 49,343	\$ (732,642)	\$ 18,359	\$ -	\$ (751,000)	\$ (701,657)
Emeryville	12,298	0.74%	0.80%	\$ 10,000	\$ (181,705)	\$ 3,379	\$ -	\$ (185,084)	\$ (175,084)
Fremont	234,220	14.02%	13.99%	\$ 175,865	\$ 275,043	\$ 66,107	\$ -	\$ 208,937	\$ 384,802
Hayward	160,311	9.59%	9.58%	\$ 120,370	\$ 279,959	\$ 45,325	\$ -	\$ 234,634	\$ 355,004
Livermore	91,861	5.50%	5.49%	\$ 68,974	\$ 660,912	\$ 25,882	\$ -	\$ 635,030	\$ 704,004
Newark	48,966	2.93%	2.93%	\$ 36,766	\$ 511,601	\$ 13,848	\$ -	\$ 497,752	\$ 534,519
Oakland	433,697	25.96%	25.91%	\$ 325,644	\$ 94,461	\$ 525,069	\$ 224,500	\$ (206,108)	\$ 119,536
Piedmont	11,453	0.69%	0.80%	\$ 10,000	\$ 120,063	\$ 123,280	\$ -	\$ (3,216)	\$ 6,784
Pleasanton	79,464	4.76%	4.75%	\$ 59,666	\$ 128,195	\$ 22,883	\$ -	\$ 105,312	\$ 164,978
San Leandro	87,930	5.26%	5.25%	\$ 66,023	\$ 412,412	\$ 153,536	\$ -	\$ 258,875	\$ 324,898
Union City	73,637	4.41%	4.40%	\$ 55,291	\$ 217,859	\$ 21,298	\$ -	\$ 196,561	\$ 251,852
TOTAL 70% Cities/County:	1,670,834	100%	100%	\$ 1,256,721	\$ 2,332,726	\$ 1,378,600	\$ 404,500	\$ 1,358,626	\$ 2,615,347

FY 2021-22 TFCA New Revenue	\$ 1,838,900
<i>Less 6.25% for Program Administration</i>	<i>\$ (114,931)</i>
Subtotal New Programming Capacity	\$ 1,723,969
<i>Calendar Year 2020 Interest Earned</i>	<i>\$ 71,347</i>
Total New Programming Capacity	\$ 1,795,316

	Totals	Cities/County (Shares) 70%	Transit (Discretionary) 30%
Total New Programming Capacity	\$ 1,795,316	\$ 1,256,721	\$ 538,595
<i>Funds Available from Closed Projects Adjustment</i>	<i>\$ 417,000</i>	<i>\$ 404,500</i>	<i>\$ 12,500</i>
<i>FY 2020-21 Rollover (debit/credit) Adjustment</i>	<i>\$ 829,425</i>	<i>\$ 954,126</i>	<i>\$ (124,701)</i>
Total Adjustments ²	\$ 1,246,425	\$ 1,358,626	\$ (112,201)
Adjusted Total Available to Program	\$ 3,041,741	\$ 2,615,347	\$ 426,394

Notes:

1. Dept. of Finance (www.dof.ca.gov) population estimates as of 1/01/2020 (released May 2020).
2. Includes TFCA programming actions and returned funds from closed projects as of 10/31/20.

This page intentionally left blank

Appendix D: Board-Adopted Policies for FYE 2022

Adopted November 18, 2020

The following Policies apply to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (Air District) Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) County Program Manager Fund for fiscal year ending (FYE) 2022.

BASIC ELIGIBILITY

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

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

Projects must achieve surplus emission reductions, i.e., reductions that are beyond what is required through regulations, ordinances, contracts, and other legally binding obligations at the time of the execution of a grant agreement between the County Program Manager and the grantee. Projects must also achieve surplus emission reductions at the time of an amendment to a grant agreement if the amendment modifies the project scope or extends the project completion deadline.

2. **TFCA Cost-Effectiveness:** Projects must not exceed the maximum cost-effectiveness (C-E) limit specified in Table 1. Cost-effectiveness (\$/weighted ton) is the ratio of TFCA funds awarded to the sum of surplus emissions reduced, during a project's operational period, of reactive organic gases (ROG), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and weighted PM10 (particulate matter 10 microns in diameter and smaller). All TFCA-generated funds (e.g., reprogrammed TFCA funds) that are awarded or applied to a project must be included in the evaluation. For projects that involve more than one independent component (e.g., more than one vehicle purchased, more than one shuttle route), each component must achieve this cost-effectiveness requirement.

County Program Manager administrative costs are excluded from the calculation of a project's TFCA cost-effectiveness.

Table 1: Maximum Cost-Effectiveness for TFCA County Program Manager Fund Projects

Policy No.	Project Category	Maximum C-E (\$/weighted ton)
22	Alternative Fuel Light- and Medium-Duty Vehicles	500,000
23	Reserved	Reserved
24	Alternative Fuel Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses	500,000
25	On-Road Truck Replacements	90,000
26	Alternative Fuel Infrastructure	500,000
27	Ridesharing Projects – Existing	150,000
28	Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service – Existing	200,000; 250,000 for services in CARE Areas or PDAs

29.a.	Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service – Pilot shuttle projects not in CARE Areas or PDAs. <i>These projects will be evaluated every year.</i>	Year 1 - 500,000 Year 2 and beyond - see Policy #28 shuttle is considered existing
	Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service – Pilot shuttle projects located in Highly Impacted Communities as defined in the Air District CARE Program and/or a Planned or Potential PDA may receive TFCA Funds under the Pilot designation. <i>These projects will be evaluated every year.</i>	Years 1 & 2 - 500,000 Year 3 and beyond - see Policy #28 shuttle is considered existing
29.b.	Pilot Trip Reduction	500,000
30.a.	Bicycle Parking	250,000
30.b.	Bikeways	500,000
31	Bike Share	500,000
32	Arterial Management	250,000
33	Infrastructure Improvements for Trip Reduction	250,000
34	Telecommuting	150,000

3. **Eligible Projects and Case-by-Case Approval:** Eligible projects are those that conform to the provisions of the HSC section 44241, Air District Board-adopted policies, and Air District guidance. On a case-by-case basis, County Program Managers must receive approval by the Air District for projects that are authorized by the HSC section 44241 and achieve Board-adopted TFCA cost-effectiveness but do not fully meet other Board-adopted Policies.
4. **Consistent with Existing Plans and Programs:** All projects must comply with the Transportation Control and Mobile Source Control Measures included in the Air District's most recently approved strategies for achieving and maintaining State and national ozone standards ([2017 Clean Air Plan](#)), those plans and programs established pursuant to HSC sections 40233, 40717, and 40919; and, when specified, other adopted federal, State, regional, and local plans and programs.
5. **Eligible Recipients:** Grant recipients must be responsible for the implementation of the project, have the authority and capability to complete the project, and be an applicant in good standing with the Air District (Policies #8-10).
 - a. **Public agencies** are eligible to apply for all project categories.
 - b. **Non-public entities** are eligible to apply for only new alternative-fuel (light, medium, and heavy-duty) vehicle and infrastructure projects, and advanced technology demonstrations that are permitted pursuant to HSC section 44241(b)(7).
6. **Readiness:** Projects must commence by the end of calendar year 2022 or within 24 months from the date of execution of the funding agreement with the subgrantee. For purposes of this policy, “commence” means a tangible preparatory action taken in connection with the project’s operation or implementation, for which the grantee can provide documentation of the commencement date and action performed. “Commence” includes, but is not limited to, the issuance of a purchase order to secure project vehicles and equipment, commencement of shuttle/feeder bus and ridesharing service, or the delivery of the award letter for a construction contract.

7. **Maximum Two Years Operating Costs for Service-Based Projects:** Unless otherwise specified in policies #22 through #33, TFCA County Program Manager Funds may be used to support up to two years of operating costs for service-based projects (e.g., ridesharing, shuttle and feeder bus service). Grant applicants that seek TFCA funds for additional years must reapply for funding in the subsequent funding cycles.

APPLICANT IN GOOD STANDING

8. **Independent Air District Audit Findings and Determinations:** Grantees who have failed either the financial statement audit or the compliance audit for a prior TFCA-funded project awarded by either County Program Managers or the Air District are excluded from receiving an award of any TFCA funds for three (3) years from the date of the Air District's final audit determination in accordance with HSC section 44242 or for a duration determined by the Air District Air Pollution Control Officer (APCO). Existing TFCA funds already awarded to the project sponsor will not be released until all audit recommendations and remedies have been satisfactorily implemented. A failed financial statement audit means a final audit report that includes an uncorrected audit finding that confirms an ineligible expenditure of TFCA funds. A failed compliance audit means an uncorrected audit finding that confirms a program or project was not implemented in accordance with the applicable Funding Agreement or grant agreement.

A failed financial statement or compliance audit of the County Program Manager or its grantee may subject the County Program Manager to a reduction of future revenue in an amount equal to the amount which was inappropriately expended pursuant to the provisions of HSC section 44242(c)(3).

9. **Authorization for County Program Manager to Proceed:** Only a fully executed Funding Agreement (i.e., signed by both the Air District and the County Program Manager) constitutes the Air District's award of County Program Manager Funds. County Program Managers may incur costs (i.e., contractually obligate itself to allocate County Program Manager Funds) only after the Funding Agreement with the Air District has been executed.
10. **Maintain Appropriate Insurance:** Both the County Program Manager and each grantee must obtain and maintain general liability insurance, workers compensation insurance, and additional insurance as appropriate for specific projects, with required coverage amounts provided in Air District guidance and final amounts specified in the respective grant agreements.

INELIGIBLE PROJECTS

11. **Duplication:** Projects that have previously received any TFCA funds, e.g., TFCA Regional Funds or County Program Manager Funds, and that do not propose to achieve additional emission reductions are not eligible.
12. **Planning Activities:** The costs of preparing or conducting feasibility studies are not eligible. Planning activities are not eligible unless they are directly related to the implementation of a specific project or program.
13. **Reserved.**
14. **Cost of Developing Proposals and Grant Applications:** The costs to prepare proposals and/or grant applications are not eligible.

USE OF TFCA FUNDS

15. **Combined Funds:** TFCA County Program Manager Funds may not be combined with TFCA Regional Funds to fund a County Program Manager Fund project. Projects that are funded by the TFCA County Program Manager Fund are not eligible for additional funding from other funding sources that claim emissions reduction credits. However, County Program Manager-funded projects may be combined with funds that do not require emissions reductions for funding eligibility.

16. **Administrative Costs:** The County Program Manager may not expend more than 6.25 percent of its County Program Manager Funds for its administrative costs. The County Program Manager's costs to prepare and execute its Funding Agreement with the Air District are eligible administrative costs. Interest earned on County Program Manager Funds shall not be included in the calculation of the administrative costs. To be eligible for reimbursement, administrative costs must be clearly identified in the expenditure plan application and in the Funding Agreement, and must be reported to the Air District.
17. **Expend Funds within Two Years:** County Program Manager Funds must be expended within two (2) years of receipt of the first transfer of funds from the Air District to the County Program Manager in the applicable fiscal year, unless a County Program Manager has made the determination based on an application for funding that the eligible project will take longer than two years to implement. Additionally, a County Program Manager may, if it finds that significant progress has been made on a project, approve no more than two one-year schedule extensions for a project. Any subsequent schedule extensions for projects can only be given on a case-by-case basis, if the Air District finds that significant progress has been made on a project, and the Funding Agreement is amended to reflect the revised schedule.
18. **Unallocated Funds:** Pursuant to HSC 44241(f), any County Program Manager Funds that are not allocated to a project within six months of the Air District Board of Directors approval of the County Program Manager's Expenditure Plan may be allocated to eligible projects by the Air District. The Air District shall make reasonable effort to award these funds to eligible projects in the Air District within the same county from which the funds originated.
19. Reserved.
20. Reserved.
21. Reserved.

ELIGIBLE PROJECT CATEGORIES

Clean Air Vehicle Projects

22. Alternative Fuel Light- and Medium-Duty Vehicles:

These projects are intended to accelerate the deployment of zero- and partial-zero emissions motorcycles, cars, and light-duty vehicles. All of the following conditions must be met for a project to be eligible for TFCA funds:

- a. Vehicles must have a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 8,500 lbs. or lower;
- b. Vehicles may be purchased or leased;
- c. Eligible vehicle types include plug-in hybrid-electric, plug-in electric, fuel cell vehicles, and neighborhood electric vehicles (NEV) as defined in the California Vehicle Code. Vehicles must also be approved by the CARB;
- d. Vehicles that are solely powered by gasoline, diesel, or natural gas, and retrofit projects are not eligible;
- e. The total amount of TFCA funds awarded may not exceed 90% of the project's eligible cost; the sum of TFCA funds awarded with all other grants and applicable manufacturer and local/state/federal rebates and discounts may not exceed total project costs;
- f. Grantees may request authorization of up to 100% of the TFCA Funds awarded for each vehicle to be used to pay for costs directly related to the purchase and installation of alternative fueling infrastructure and/or equipment used to power the new vehicle; and

- g. Projects that seek to replace a vehicle in the same weight-class as the proposed new vehicle may qualify for additional TFCA funding. Costs related to the scrapping and/or dismantling of the existing vehicle are not eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds.

23. Reserved.

24. Alternative Fuel Heavy-Duty Trucks and Buses:

These projects are intended to accelerate the deployment of qualifying alternative fuel vehicles that operate within the Air District's jurisdiction by encouraging the replacement of older, compliant trucks and buses with the cleanest available technology. If replacing heavy-duty vehicles and buses with light-duty vehicles, light-duty vehicles must meet Policy #22. All of the following conditions must be met for a project to be eligible for TFCA Funds:

- a. Each vehicle must be new and have a GVWR greater than 8,500 lbs.;
- b. Vehicles may be purchased or leased;
- c. Eligible vehicle types include plug-in hybrid, plug-in electric, and fuel cell vehicles. Vehicles must also be approved by the CARB;
- d. Vehicles that are solely powered by gasoline, diesel, or natural gas and retrofit projects are not eligible;
- e. The total amount of TFCA funds awarded may not exceed 90% of the project's eligible cost; the sum of TFCA funds awarded with all other grants and applicable manufacturer and local/state/federal rebates and discounts may not exceed total project costs;
- f. Grantees may request authorization of up to 100% of the TFCA Funds awarded for each vehicle to be used to pay for costs directly related to the purchase and installation of alternative fueling infrastructure and/or equipment used to power the new vehicle; and
- g. Projects that seek to replace a vehicle in the same weight-class as the proposed new vehicle may qualify for additional TFCA funding. Costs related to the scrapping and/or dismantling of the existing vehicle are not eligible for reimbursement with TFCA funds.

25. On-Road Truck Replacements: These projects will replace Class 6, Class 7, and Class 8 diesel-powered trucks that have a gross vehicle weight rating (GVWR) of 19,501 lbs. or greater (per vehicle weight classification definition used by Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) with new or used trucks that have an engine certified to the 2010 CARB emissions standards or cleaner. The existing truck(s) to be replaced must be registered with the California Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to an address within the Air District's jurisdiction and must be scrapped after replacement.

26. Alternative Fuel Infrastructure: These projects are intended to accelerate the adoption of zero-emissions vehicles through the deployment of alternative fuel infrastructure, i.e., electric vehicle charging sites, hydrogen fueling stations.

Eligible refueling infrastructure projects include new dispensing and charging facilities, or additional equipment or upgrades and improvements that expand access to existing alternative fuel fueling/charging sites. This includes upgrading or modifying private fueling/charging sites or stations to allow public and/or shared fleet access. TFCA funds may be used to cover the cost of equipment and installation. TFCA funds may also be used to upgrade infrastructure projects previously funded with TFCA funds as long as the equipment was maintained and has exceeded the duration of its useful life after being placed into service.

Equipment and infrastructure must be designed, installed, and maintained as required by the existing recognized codes and standards and as approved by the local/state authority.

TFCA funds may not be used to pay for fuel, electricity, operation, and maintenance costs.

Trip Reduction Projects

27. Existing Ridesharing Services: The project provides carpool, vanpool, or other rideshare services.

Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy are also eligible under this category. Projects that provide a direct or indirect financial transit or rideshare subsidy *exclusively* to employees of the grantee are not eligible.

28. Existing Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service:

The project reduces single-occupancy vehicle trips by providing short-distance connections between mass transit and commercial hubs or employment centers. All the following conditions must be met for a project to be eligible for TFCA funds:

- a. The service must provide direct connections between a mass transit hub (e.g., a rail or Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) station, ferry or bus terminal, or airport) and a distinct commercial or employment location.
- b. The service's schedule, which is not limited to commute hours, must be coordinated to have a timely connection with corresponding mass transit service.
- c. The service must be available for use by all members of the public.
- d. TFCA funds may be used to fund only shuttle services to locations that are under-served and lack other comparable service. For the purposes of this policy, "comparable service" means that there exists, either currently or within the last three years, a direct, timed, and publicly accessible service that brings passengers to within one-third (1/3) mile of the proposed commercial or employment location from a mass transit hub. A proposed service will not be deemed "comparable" to an existing service if the passengers' proposed travel time will be at least 15 minutes shorter and at least 33% shorter than the existing service's travel time to the proposed destination.
- e. Reserved.
- f. Grantees must be either: (1) a public transit agency or transit district that directly operates the shuttle/feeder bus service; or (2) a city, county, or any other public agency.
- g. Applicants must submit a letter of concurrence from all transit districts or transit agencies that provide service in the area of the proposed route, certifying that the service does not conflict with existing service.
- h. Each route must meet the cost-effectiveness requirement in Policy #2. Projects that would operate in Highly Impacted Communities or Episodic Areas as defined in the Air District Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program, or in Priority Development Areas (PDAs), may qualify for funding at a higher cost-effectiveness limit (see Policy #2).

29. Pilot Projects:

a. Pilot Shuttle/Feeder Bus Service:

The project provides new shuttle/feeder bus service that is at least 70% unique and operates where no other service was provided within the past three years. In addition to meeting the conditions listed in Policy #28 for shuttle/feeder bus service, project applicants must also comply with the following application criteria and agree to comply with the project implementation requirements:

- i. Demonstrate the project will reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips and result in a reduction in emissions of criteria pollutants.

- ii. Provide data and/or other evidence demonstrating the public's need for the service, such as a demand assessment survey and letters of support from potential users.
- iii. Provide a written plan showing how the service will be financed in the future and require minimal, if any, TFCA funds to maintain its operation after the pilot period.
- iv. If the local transit provider is not a partner, the applicant must demonstrate that they have attempted to have the service provided by the local transit agency. The transit provider must have been given the first right of refusal and determined that the proposed project does not conflict with existing service;
- v. Projects located in Highly Impacted Communities as defined in the Air District CARE Program and/or a Planned or Potential PDA may receive a maximum of two years of TFCA County Program Manager Funds under the Pilot designation. For these projects, the project applicants understand and must agree that such projects will be evaluated every year, and continued funding will be contingent upon the projects meeting the following requirements:
 - 1. During the first year and by the end of the second year of operation, projects must not exceed a cost-effectiveness of \$500,000/ton
 - 2. Projects entering a third year of operation and beyond are subject to all of the requirements, including cost-effectiveness limit, of Policy #28 (existing shuttles).
- vi. Projects located outside of CARE areas and PDAs may receive a maximum of two years of TFCA County Program Manager Funds under this designation. For these projects, the project applicant understands and must agree that such projects will be evaluated every year, and continued funding will be contingent upon the projects meeting the following requirements:
 - 1. By the end of the first year of operation, projects shall meet a cost-effectiveness of \$500,000/ton, and
 - 2. By the end of the second year of operation, projects shall meet all of the requirements, including cost-effectiveness limit, of Policy #28 (existing shuttles).

b. Pilot Trip Reduction:

The project reduces single-occupancy commute vehicle trips by encouraging mode-shift to other forms of shared transportation. Pilot projects are defined as projects that serve an area where no similar service was available within the past three years, or that will result in significantly expanded service to an existing area. Funding is designed to provide the necessary initial capital to a public agency for the start-up of a pilot project so that by the end of the third year of the trip reduction project's operation, the project will be financially self-sustaining or require minimal public funds, such as grants, to maintain its operation.

- i. Applicants must demonstrate the project will reduce single-occupancy commute vehicle trips and result in a reduction in emissions of criteria pollutants;
- ii. The proposed service must be available for use by all members of the public;
- iii. Applicants must provide a written plan showing how the service will be financed in the future and require minimal, if any, TFCA funds to maintain its operation by the end of the third year;
- iv. If the local transit provider is not a partner, the applicant must demonstrate that they have attempted to have the service provided by the local transit agency. The

transit provider must have been given the first right of refusal and determined that the proposed project does not conflict with existing service;

- v. Applicants must provide data and any other evidence demonstrating the public's need for the service, such as a demand assessment survey and letters of support from potential users;
- vi. Pilot trip reduction projects that propose to provide ridesharing service projects must comply with all applicable requirements in policy #27.

30. Bicycle Projects:

These projects expand public access to bicycle facilities. New bicycle facility projects or upgrades to an existing bicycle facility that are included in an adopted countywide bicycle plan, Congestion Management Program (CMP), countywide transportation plan (CTP), city plan, or the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Bicycle Plan are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Projects that are included in an adopted city general plan or area-specific plan must specify that the purpose of the bicycle facility is to reduce motor vehicle emissions or traffic congestion.

a. Bicycle Parking:

The project expands the public's access to new bicycle parking facilities (e.g., electronic bicycle lockers, bicycle racks), which must be publicly accessible and available for use by all members of the public. Eligible projects are limited to the purchase and installation of the following types of bike parking facilities that result in motor vehicle emission reductions:

- i. Bicycle racks, including bicycle racks on transit buses, trains, shuttle vehicles, and ferry vessels;
- ii. Electronic bicycle lockers; and
- iii. Capital costs for attended bicycle storage facilities.

b. Bikeways:

The project constructs and/or installs bikeways for the purpose of reducing motor vehicle emissions or traffic congestion. Bikeways for exclusively recreational use are ineligible. Projects are limited to the following types of bikeways:

- i. Class I Bikeway (bike path), new or upgrade improvement from Class II or Class III bikeway;
- ii. New Class II Bikeway (bike lane);
- iii. New Class III Bikeway (bike route); and
- iv. Class IV Bikeway (separated bikeway), new or upgrade improvement from Class II or Class III bikeway.

All bikeway projects must, where applicable, be consistent with design standards published in the California Highway Design Manual or conform to the provisions of the Protected Bikeway Act of 2014. Projects must have completed all applicable environmental reviews and either have been deemed exempt by the lead agency or have been issued the applicable negative declaration or environmental impact report or statement.

31. Bike Share:

Projects that make bicycles available to individuals for shared use for completing first- and last-mile trips in conjunction with regional transit and stand-alone short distance trips are eligible for TFCA funds, subject to all the following conditions:

- a. Projects must either increase the fleet size of existing service areas or expand existing service areas to include new Bay Area communities.
- b. Projects must have a completed and approved environmental plan and a suitability study demonstrating the viability of bicycle sharing.
- c. Projects must have shared membership and/or be interoperable with the Bay Area Bike Share (BABS) project when they are placed into service, in order to streamline transit for end users by reducing the number of separate operators that would comprise bike trips. Projects that meet one or more of the following conditions are exempt from this requirement:
 - i. Projects that do not require membership or any fees for use;
 - ii. Projects that were provided funding under MTC's Bike Share Capital Program to start a new or expand an existing bike share program; or
 - iii. Projects that attempted to coordinate with, but were refused by, the current BABS operator to have shared membership or be interoperable with BABS. Applicants must provide documentation showing proof of refusal.

TFCA funds may be awarded to pay for up to five years of operations, including the purchase of two-wheeled or three-wheeled vehicles (self-propelled or electric), plus mounted equipment required for the intended service and helmets.

32. Arterial Management:

Arterial management grant applications must identify a specific arterial segment and define what improvement(s) will be made to affect traffic flow on the identified arterial segment. Projects that provide routine maintenance (e.g., responding to citizen complaints about malfunctioning signal equipment) are not eligible to receive TFCA funds. Incident management projects on arterials are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Transit improvement projects include, but are not limited to, bus rapid transit and transit priority projects. Signal timing projects are eligible to receive TFCA funds. Each arterial segment must meet the cost-effectiveness requirement in Policy #2.

33. Infrastructure Improvements for Trip Reduction:

The project expands the public's access to alternative transportation modes through the design and construction of physical improvements that support development projects that achieve motor vehicle emission reductions.

- a. The development project and the physical improvement must be identified in an approved area-specific plan, redevelopment plan, general plan, bicycle plan, pedestrian plan, traffic-calming plan, or other similar plan.
- b. The project must implement one or more transportation control measures (TCMs) in the most recently adopted Air District plan for State and national ambient air quality standards. Pedestrian projects are eligible to receive TFCA funds.
- c. The project must have a completed and approved environmental plan. If a project is exempt from preparing an environmental plan as determined by the public agency or lead agency, then that project has met this requirement.

34. Telecommuting: Implementation of demonstration projects in telecommuting. No funds expended pursuant to this paragraph for telecommuting projects shall be used for the purchase of personal computing equipment for an individual's home use.

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

5.2

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

510.208.7400

www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: January 28, 2021

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Maisha Everhart, Director of Government Affairs and Communications
Denise Turner, Safe Routes to Schools Program Manager
Aleida Andrino-Chavez, Associate Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: Safe Routes to Schools Mini-Grant Program Update

Recommendation

This item is to provide the Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee with an update on the Safe Routes to Schools Mini-Grant Program. This is an informational item only.

Summary

Alameda CTC proposes the Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Mini-Grant Program (Program) to support local jurisdictions' efforts in implementing bicycle and pedestrian safety and access improvements around school sites across Alameda County.

Since 2007, as part of the Alameda CTC's SR2S Program, Alameda CTC has been proactive in working with member jurisdictions in conducting School Site Assessments (SSA). These SSAs identified specific transportation safety improvements around schools in the County to make traveling to school safer and more accessible through biking, walking, transit, and carpooling. In addition, jurisdictions in Alameda County have also funded and conducted site assessments as part of local efforts to advance safety near schools.

The Program contains \$1.7 M in Measure B Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Discretionary Funds and CMA TIP Funds that are proposed to be distributed on a formulaic distribution share based on Alameda County's student population, with a minimum of \$15,000 available to the all eligible jurisdictions (fourteen cities and County of Alameda).

Background

The Alameda CTC's SR2S Program is committed to creating safe environments around schools to facilitate the use of active transportation, carpooling and transit for trips to and from schools throughout Alameda County. Alameda CTC has been diligently

working with its member agencies conducting SSAs since 2007. The SSAs are a core component of the Engineering "E" element of the SR2S Program, which together with the other components of the SR2S Program, deliver a comprehensive curriculum to support active transportation to schools.

Alameda CTC is launching the Alameda County SR2S Mini-Grant Program (Program), which aims to support member agencies to implement the recommended transportation improvements identified through an SSA conducted by the Alameda CTC SR2S Program or by a similar local effort. The complete Program Guidelines are included in Attachment A: Alameda CTC's SR2S Mini-Grant Grant Program Guidelines.

School Population Funding Distribution

The Program contains \$1.7M in Measure B Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Discretionary Funds and CMA TIP Funds to support local jurisdictions' efforts to implement the countermeasures recommended in the SSAs.

Staff proposes funds be distributed on a non-competitive, formulaic distribution methodology based on an eligible jurisdiction's share of Alameda County's student population. Staff reviewed two main distribution options using the 2019-20 school population data as described below.

- Option 1: This option distributes funds based on an eligible jurisdiction's share of Alameda County's student population. This results in funding distributions between \$5,000 and \$388,000 per jurisdiction based on student population share.
- Option 2: Upon review of Option 1 findings, this option distributes funds based on an eligible jurisdiction's share of Alameda County's student population, with a minimum of \$15,000 available to all eligible jurisdictions. The distribution formula is based on an eligible jurisdiction's share of Alameda County's student population (which does not include the student population of a jurisdiction that received a minimum amount). This results in funding distributions between \$15,000 and \$386,000 per jurisdiction based on student population share.

Attachment B provides a comparative distribution summary of these two options.

Upon review of the various formula options, the Program funds will be distributed based on the Option 2 formula to ensure all jurisdictions receive a minimum amount of \$15,000 and have the ability to implement bicycle and pedestrian improvements around local school sites. The Alameda CTC's SR2S Program Guidelines incorporates this recommended formula distribution.

Program Guidelines

The Program offers eligible recipients (cities and the County of Alameda) a single, maximum grant award of up to their designated share amount detailed in the Program Guidelines for transportation improvements that achieve the following program goals:

- Create, support, and enhance safe access and mobility to schools;
- Implement safety countermeasures identified in a School Site Assessment (SSA) conducted by Alameda CTC or by a local SR2S School program;

- Encourage students to bike and walk to school; and
- Support capital improvements that are implementation-ready to provide immediate benefits to bicycle, pedestrian and transit travel to schools.

All eligible jurisdictions that propose an eligible project with a required 1:1 match funds to funds requested will receive program funding. Per the Alameda CTC's Small Cities Program Policy, the Cities of Albany, Emeryville, and Piedmont are not required to provide a match. Projects must be completed by June 30, 2023.

The applicant must provide sufficient detail on the proposed improvement(s), including location and limits of the proposed improvements in relationship to nearby schools, documentation of consistency with an SSA improvement or similar effort, a detailed schedule, confirmation of matching commitments, and project cost details to determine Program eligibility.

Program Schedule

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| • Release Call for Projects | February 4, 2021 |
| • Application Deadline | March 15, 2021 |
| • Funding Recommendation | April - May 2021 |
| • Execute Project Funding Agreements | July 1, 2021 |
| • Project Completion/Expenditure Deadline | June 30, 2023 |
| • Project Open to Public | July 1, 2023 |

Alameda CTC is accepting applications through March 15, 2021. All unclaimed Program funds remaining after the application deadline will be reprogrammed through Alameda CTC's future discretionary processes. Please visit the link below to download the SR2S Mini Grant Application:

<https://www.alamedactc.org/funding/funding-opportunities/>.

Fiscal Impact: The requested action will encumber \$1.5M of Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Countywide Discretionary funds and \$200,000 CMA TIP funds to eligible recipients for use through fiscal year 2021-22 and 2022-23.

Attachments:

- A. Alameda CTC SR2S Mini-Grant Program Guidelines
- B. SRS2 Funding Distribution Options

This page intentionally left blank



ALAMEDA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Safe Routes to Schools

Mini-Grant Program Guidelines

The Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S) Program is committed to creating safe environments around schools that facilitate active transportation, carpooling and transit ridership for trips to and from school.

Alameda CTC's Safe Routes to Schools Mini-Grant Program (Program) aims to support capital improvements that enhance the conditions for pedestrians and cyclists and transit riders traveling to and from school in Alameda County.

The Program's goals are to:

- Create, support, and enhance safe access and mobility to schools;
- Implement safety countermeasures identified in a School Site Assessment (SSA) conducted by Alameda CTC or by a local SR2S School program;
- Encourage students to bike and walk to school; and
- Support capital improvements that are implementation-ready to provide immediate benefits to bicycle, pedestrian and transit travel to schools.

The Program contains \$1.7M in Measure B sale tax program funds and CMA TIP funds. Program funds will be distributed on a formulaic distribution share based on student population, with a minimum of \$15,000 to each jurisdiction.

Eligible jurisdictions have until March 15, 2021 to submit a funding request for eligible bicycle, pedestrian and transit improvements that achieve the Program goals and meet the Program requirements further described within these guidelines.

Project Sponsors may propose SSA-identified improvements at one school location or propose a package of improvements at multiple school locations.

Projects must be implemented and open to the public by July 1, 2023.

PROGRAM GUIDELINES

1. Eligible Recipients / Project Sponsors

- Cities of Alameda, Albany, Berkeley, Dublin, Emeryville, Fremont, Hayward, Livermore, Newark, Oakland, Piedmont, Pleasanton, San Leandro, and Union City; County of Alameda

Entities (such as school districts) that are not identified above as eligible direct recipients may be eligible to receive funds as sub-recipients by partnering with an eligible direct recipient that is willing to pass through the funds to a sub-recipient.

2. Student Population Based Funding Formula Distribution and Matching Requirements

Formula Distribution:

The Program contains \$1.7M in Measure B Bicycle and Pedestrian Funds and CMA TIP program funds that will be distributed to eligible recipients based on a formula share of student population across Alameda County, with a minimum of \$15,000 to each jurisdiction. Table 1 shows the funding distribution by jurisdiction.

Table 1: Distribution of SR2S Funds - Student Population Based Formula	
North	Amount
Albany	\$27,000
Berkeley	\$74,000
Emeryville	\$15,000
Piedmont	\$19,000
Oakland	\$386,000
Alameda	\$84,000
Total North	\$605,000
Central	
San Leandro	\$84,000
Alameda County (CV, San Lorenzo)	\$134,000
Hayward	\$175,000
Total Central	\$393,000
South	
Fremont	\$267,000
Union City	\$81,000
Newark	\$43,000
Total South	\$390,000
East	
Dublin	\$94,000
Livermore	\$103,000
Pleasanton	\$112,000
Alameda County-Sunol Elem. (Alameda County)	\$2,000
Total East	\$312,000
Grand Total	\$1,700,000

Note: The County's distribution in East and Central are to be considered a total available to the County.

Matching Requirements

The following considerations apply to this program:

- Each eligible recipient/jurisdiction is limited to one (1) grant award of up to a maximum of the amount identified in Table 1.
- There is a 1:1 match requirement.
 - Per the Alameda CTC's Small Cities Program Policy, the Cities of Albany, Emeryville, and Piedmont are not required to provide a match.

3. Eligible Projects

Projects will be reviewed and recommended for funding based on the below eligibility criteria. Projects must be clearly defined, demonstrate project readiness, and have local coordination/support to implement the project by Program's implementation deadline.

- Projects must be capital improvements identified in an SSA or a similar project level evaluation that identifies safety and accessibility improvements to school(s). Projects may differ from the recommendations included in the SSAs, and in cases where this occurs, a justification must be provided. For Projects not identified in an SSA, projects sponsors must demonstrate how the Project will specifically improve safety at the school(s).
- Projects must improve safety for cyclists, pedestrians, carpoolers, transit riders, and/or other forms of active transportation to school.
- Projects may include, but are not limited to, new or modified bicycle/pedestrian facilities, street reconfigurations, lane striping, flashing beacons, crosswalk striping, designated pedestrian path markings, signage/signals, bus shelters, transit stop improvements, sidewalk repair or construction around schools.
- Projects may be at a single school location or may consist of a set of improvements at multiple school locations.
- Jurisdictions are encouraged to prioritize investments at schools located in Communities of Concern, as defined by MTC.
- Projects must be implemented and open to the public by July 1, 2023.

4. Eligible Costs

- Eligible costs include consultant or contracted costs, and other direct costs to implement the proposed improvement(s), including local jurisdiction staff time for developing design and engineering drawings (PS&E).
- Local staff time is eligible for project-specific work that is implemented directly by the city, such as project scoping, construction supervision, and development of

PS&E. Jurisdictions choosing this approach have to document staff time for these tasks on their invoices to Alameda CTC.

- Local jurisdiction's staff/labor cost for administration and contract oversight are not eligible for reimbursement, but may be included as cost matching.
- The deadline to incur eligible costs is June 30, 2023.

5. Application Process

Eligible recipients may submit one (1) SR2S Mini-Grant Program application for Alameda CTC's consideration. Application package must include:

1. SR2S Mini-Grant Program Application
2. Project Vicinity Map clearly showing the location and limits of the proposed improvements in relationship to nearby schools and Communities of Concern, if applicable.
3. Project Improvement Map provided in the SSA, or similar project-level evaluation that clearly identifies which improvements are included in the application.

6. Application Deadline

Eligible recipients may submit one (1) SR2S Mini-Grant Program application to Alameda CTC by 5:00 p.m. on March 15, 2021. Send completed applications electronically to the staff contacts identified at the end of these guidelines.

All unclaimed Program funds remaining after the application deadline will be reprogrammed through Alameda CTC's future discretionary processes.

7. Application Review and Grant Award Process

Alameda CTC staff will review applications to ensure proposed projects meet the Program goals and eligibility requirements. Alameda CTC may request additional information from an applicant during this review. Upon successful determination of project and funding eligibility, Alameda CTC staff will forward a Program funding recommendation to the Commission for consideration.

8. Post Funding Award and Allocation Requirements

Once funding is awarded, Project Sponsors are required to:

- Submit a governing body-approved resolution that accepts Alameda CTC funds, confirms local matching commitments, project delivery strategy, and local support for the project. A resolution is to be received prior to entering into a project funding agreement with Alameda CTC.
- Enter into a project funding agreement between the Alameda CTC. Agreements will include project scope, cost, schedule, performance measures, reporting requirements, publicity requirements, audit requirements, task deliverables,

effective date of reimbursable costs, etc. The current agreement requirements are located here: https://www.alamedactc.org/app_pages/view/19025.

- Comply with Alameda CTC's Local Business Equity Program requirements: <https://www.alamedactc.org/get-involved/contract-equity/>

9. Reimbursement

The Program operates on a reimbursement basis for eligible, incurred costs. Eligible costs are based on the Project Sponsor's funding application, and further defined in the executed funding agreement between Alameda CTC and the Project Sponsor.

After a funding agreement has been executed, requests for reimbursement will only be approved for payment upon receipt of satisfactory documentation of eligible costs incurred by the Project Sponsor.

10. Other Requirements/Considerations

- Upon project completion, Project Sponsors must provide a Final Report that documents the project's accomplishments.
- All requests for reimbursement must be submitted no less than sixty (60) days prior to the funding agreement expiration date.

11. Resources

Refer to the link below to Alameda CTC's Safe Routes to Schools Program, including the completed SSAs: <https://www.alamedactc.org/programs-projects/safe-routes-to-schools/>

12. Schedule

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| • Release Call for Projects | February 4, 2021 |
| • Application Deadline | March 15, 2021 |
| • Funding Recommendation | April - May 2021 |
| • Execute Project Funding Agreements | July 1, 2021 |
| • Project Completion/Expenditure Deadline | June 30, 2023 |
| • Project Open to Public | July 1, 2023 |

Staff Contacts

John Nguyen
Principal Transportation Planner
(510) 208-7419
jnguyen@alamedactc.org

Aleida Andrino-Chavez
Associate Transportation Planner
(510) 208-7480
aandrino-chavez@alamedactc.org

This page intentionally left blank

Alameda County Transportation Commission

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Mini-Grant Program
Funding Distribution Options

	Student Population	%	Student Population (w/o Emeryville)	%
North				
Albany	3,575	2%	3,575	2%
Berkeley	9,801	4%	9,801	4%
Emeryville	721	0%		0%
Piedmont	2,559	1%	2,559	1%
Oakland	51,134	23%	51,134	23%
Alameda	11,077	5%	11,077	5%
Total North	78,867	35%	78,146	35%
Central				
San Leandro	11,073	5%	11,073	5%
Alameda County (CV, San Lorenzo)	17,798	8%	17,798	8%
Hayward	23,208	10%	23,208	10%
Total Central	52,079	23%	52,079	23%
South				
Fremont	35,345	16%	35,345	16%
Union City	10,699	5%	10,699	5%
Newark	5,660	3%	5,660	3%
Total South	51,704	23%	51,704	23%
East				
Dublin	12,497	6%	12,497	6%
Livermore	13,704	6%	13,704	6%
Pleasanton	14,798	7%	14,798	7%
Alameda County-Sunol Elem.	306	0%	306	0%
Total East	41,305	18%	41,305	19%
County Total	223,955	100%	223,234	100%

Notes:

BASELINE: Straight Population

This option is based on a straight population share methodology (jurisdictions' student population over the County total)

RECOMMENDATION: Fixed Minimum of \$15,000 to Emeryville

This option considers a minimum fixed amount of \$15,000 to Emeryville and distributing the remaining amount to the other jurisdictions based on their student populations over the County total (excluding Emeryville's student populations).

Dollars are rounded.

SRS2 Capital Programming Capacity

\$1,700,000

	Baseline		Recommendation	
	Share By Student Pop		Share By Student Pop. (w/ \$15k min. to Emeryville)	
North	Amount	%	Amount	%
Albany	\$27,000	2%	\$27,000	2%
Berkeley	\$74,000	4%	\$74,000	4%
Emeryville	\$5,000	0%	\$15,000	1%
Piedmont	\$19,000	1%	\$19,000	1%
Oakland	\$388,000	23%	\$386,000	23%
Alameda	\$84,000	5%	\$84,000	5%
Total North	\$599,000	35%	\$605,000	36%
Central				
San Leandro	\$84,000	5%	\$84,000	5%
Alameda County (CV, San Lorenzo)	\$135,000	8%	\$134,000	8%
Hayward	\$176,000	10%	\$175,000	10%
Total Central	\$395,000	23%	\$393,000	23%
South				
Fremont	\$268,000	16%	\$267,000	16%
Union City	\$81,000	5%	\$81,000	5%
Newark	\$43,000	3%	\$43,000	3%
Total South	\$392,000	23%	\$390,000	23%
East				
Dublin	\$95,000	6%	\$94,000	6%
Livermore	\$104,000	6%	\$103,000	6%
Pleasanton	\$112,000	7%	\$112,000	7%
Alameda County-Sunol Elem.	\$2,000	0%	\$2,000	0%
Total East	\$314,000	18%	\$312,000	18%
Grand Total	\$1,700,000	100%	\$1,700,000	100%

This page intentionally left blank



Memorandum

5.3

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: January 28, 2021

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Cathleen Sullivan, Director of Planning
Chris G. Marks, Associate Transportation Planner

SUBJECT: 2020 Multimodal Performance Report

Recommendation

This item is to provide the Commission with an update on the Congestion Management Program 2020 Multimodal Performance Report, focused on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on transportation in Alameda County. This item is for information only.

Summary

Each year, the Alameda County Transportation Commission (Alameda CTC) prepares a summary of the state of the transportation system within Alameda County, tracking a series of key performance metrics for the countywide multimodal transportation system. The purpose of this report is to elucidate emerging trends which shape policy and decision-making throughout the agency.

Typically, the annual performance report reflects multi-year shifts and gradual trends over a variety of important indicators. However, 2020 was a year unlike any other and the COVID-19 pandemic altered transportation in Alameda County so quickly and so radically that many of the standard instruments of measurement typically used for the performance report would fail to capture the current state of the system. The 2020 performance report therefore was developed using a new methodologically in order to shed light on the transportation system with a more real-time analysis of available metrics.

The 2020 Multimodal Performance Report, included here as Attachment A, briefly examines transportation as of early 2020, before the onset of the pandemic in Alameda County, and then presents available data for transit, autos, goods movement and active transportation in the months following March 2020. Key findings from this report include:

- Transit Ridership fell more than 90 percent in Alameda County as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. Ridership in more low-income communities has recovered faster than in higher-income communities.

- Average freeway speeds increased more than 20 percent. However, this did not correlate to a comparable decrease in vehicle travel: vehicle trips across the Bay Bridge and total vehicle miles traveled were only down about 10 percent.
- Average speeds on major arterials increased by more than 14 percent during the afternoon peak commute. Speeds on suburban arterials rose more than urban arterials.
- Pedestrian volumes were down almost 60 percent in downtown areas.
- Bicycle sales were up 75 percent year-over-year in the spring of 2020.
- Imports and exports through the Port of Oakland fell just two percent while passenger volumes at the Oakland Airport fell 95 percent.
- Work from home skyrocketed.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact. This is an information item only.

Attachment:

- A. [2020 Multimodal Performance Report: Transportation and COVID-19 in Alameda County](#) (*hyperlinked to web*)



Memorandum

5.4

1111 Broadway, Suite 800, Oakland, CA 94607

• 510.208.7400

• www.AlamedaCTC.org

DATE: January 28, 2021

TO: Alameda County Technical Advisory Committee

FROM: Carolyn Clevenger, Deputy Executive Director of Planning and Policy
Cathleen Sullivan, Director of Planning

SUBJECT: The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Grant Program

Recommendation

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has requested jurisdiction review of the 2018 and 2019 status reports for the Housing Incentive Pool grant program.

Summary

In 2018, MTC established a Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) grant program. Each year MTC puts together a status report, and updates the MTC Commission. Attached are the draft status reports for 2018 and 2019. MTC requests that jurisdictions review the data and contact MTC with any questions or corrections.

Housing Incentive Program Status Report

In 2018, MTC established the [Housing Incentive Pool \(HIP\) grant program](#) to incentivize Bay Area jurisdictions to accelerate the production of affordable housing and preservation of existing affordable housing stock. Through the HIP program, MTC will award approximately \$70 million in federal transportation funds to the 15 jurisdictions that build or preserve the greatest number of affordable housing units in Priority Development Areas or Transit Priority Areas from 2018 through 2022. Please note that the HIP grant program is based on a 5-year timeframe, so no funding will be awarded until after 2022.

Each year MTC puts together a status report and updates the MTC Commission on the program. MTC staff recently released reports for 2018 and 2019. MTC is requesting that jurisdictions review the data in these reports and contact MTC with any corrections that are needed in the number or categorization of units or any other questions. There is no immediate deadline for providing data corrections, as data for the HIP program is considered draft until the final rankings and funding awards are determined after 2022. However, MTC staff anticipates providing a progress report on the HIP program, including the current standings, to the Commission in February or March 2021.

Attached are the HIP Status Reports for 2018 & 2019 (Attachment A), as well as a more detailed summary of all new housing units per year (Attachment B).

For housing data questions or corrections, city and county staff may reach out to Ada Chan at achan@bayareametro.gov. For general questions about the HIP program, contact Mallory Atkinson at matkinson@bayareametro.gov.

Criteria and Data Sources

Details on the criteria for qualifying units and data sources used for this program are provided here.

HIP Qualifying Units

- Units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels, as categorized by California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD).
- Units must be located within Priority Development Areas (PDAs) or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- New units are measured by certificates of occupancy.
- New units must be deed-restricted.
- Preserved units must include a deed-restriction of at least 55 years to receive full credit; partial HIP credit is provided for shorter lengths of deed-restriction.
- Preserved units may either be multi-family units newly acquired and protected as affordable or the extension of protections on existing multi-family units that are identified as “very-high risk” or “high risk” of converting to market-rate rents.

HIP Housing Data Sources

Certificates of occupancy data are derived from Housing Element Annual Progress Reports submitted to HCD.

Data for preserved units are provided by California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC), who review annual Tax Credit Allocation Committee (TCAC) affordable housing development reports to identify qualifying preserved units for HIP. CHPC and MTC staff are working to identify other preservation projects which may not be reported through TCAC but would still qualify for HIP. Housing data compiled and analyzed by MTC staff to confirm spatial relationship of new and preserved units with PDAs and TPAs.

Fiscal Impact: There is no fiscal impact associated with the requested action.

Attachments:

- A. Housing Incentive Program: Status Reports for 2018 and 2019
- B. Housing Incentive Program: Summary of all new housing units by year

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program Status Report - 2018 & 2019

Current Rank	Jurisdiction	2018			2019			Total		
		Qualifying New Units	Qualifying Preserved Units	Total	Qualifying New Units	Qualifying Preserved Units	Total	Qualifying New Units	Qualifying Preserved Units	Total
1	San Francisco	504	-	504	1,279	23	1,302	1,783	23	1,806
2	San Jose	-	-	-	215	-	215	215	-	215
3	Oakland	39	66	105	4	98	102	43	164	207
4	Sunnyvale	55	23	78	91	-	91	146	23	169
5	Fremont	1	-	1	100	-	100	101	-	101
6	Mountain View	16	-	16	67	-	67	83	-	83
7	Santa Rosa	79	-	79	-	-	-	79	-	79
8	Emeryville	1	-	1	77	-	77	78	-	78
9	El Cerrito	15	-	15	62	-	62	77	-	77
10	Oakley	-	-	-	74	-	74	74	-	74
11	Livermore	-	-	-	72	-	72	72	-	72
12	American Canyon	-	-	-	69	-	69	69	-	69
13	Fairfield	-	-	-	-	64	64	-	64	64
14	Walnut Creek	58	-	58	-	-	-	58	-	58
15	Campbell	18	-	18	25	-	25	43	-	43
16	Contra Costa County	-	-	-	42	-	42	42	-	42
17	Pleasanton	33	-	33	-	-	-	33	-	33
18	Morgan Hill	-	-	-	25	-	25	25	-	25
19	San Mateo	16	-	16	-	-	-	16	-	16
20	Lafayette	7	-	7	-	-	-	7	-	7
21	Redwood City	-	-	-	7	-	7	7	-	7
22	Santa Clara	7	-	7	-	-	-	7	-	7
23	Daly City	3	-	3	-	-	-	3	-	3
24	Menlo Park	-	-	-	3	-	3	3	-	3
25	South San Francisco	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
26	Los Gatos	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	1
		854	89	943	2,212	185	2,397	3,066	274	3,340

Current rankings are shown for informational purposes only, and do not imply or guarantee a funding award. Final rankings and funding awards will not be determined until after 2022. Only jurisdictions with at least one qualifying HIP unit in 2018 or 2019 are shown.

HIP Unit Qualifying Criteria

- The HIP program compiles eligible units from 2018 through 2022.
- Newly built or preserved units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels.
- Newly built or preserved units must be located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- Newly built or preserved units must be deed-restricted.
- Newly built units are measured by certificates of occupancy submitted to California Department of Housing and Community Development through a jurisdiction's Housing Element Annual Progress Report.

- Preserved units must be: (1) Multi-family units that receive governmental assistance consistent with the funding sources in Government Code Section 65863.10(a)(3) that are identified as "very-high risk" or "high risk" of converting to market-rate rents by the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC); or (2) The acquisition/preservation of existing unrestricted multi-family affordable housing units upon which restrictions are newly placed.

- A preserved unit that has deed restrictions for at least 55 years will be counted as one HIP unit. Units with deed restrictions for a shorter duration will receive a pro-rated share of one unit based on the 55-year standard.

This page intentionally left blank

Bay Area Housing Production: 2018

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
All New Units						New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Alameda County	76	47	49	3,787	3,959	69	17	5	2,252	2,343	56	17	1	74
Alameda County	-	11	-	57	68	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Albany	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	-	-
Berkeley	13	-	-	216	229	13	-	-	171	184	-	-	-	-
Dublin	-	-	12	1,008	1,020	-	-	-	349	349	-	-	-	-
Emeryville	1	-	-	5	6	1	-	-	5	6	1	-	-	1
Fremont	-	-	1	404	405	-	-	1	155	156	-	-	1	1
Hayward	-	-	-	197	197	-	-	-	43	43	-	-	-	-
Livermore	-	8	15	198	221	-	-	1	100	101	-	-	-	-
Newark	-	-	-	442	442	-	-	-	367	367	-	-	-	-
Oakland	26	13	1	646	686	26	13	1	618	658	26	13	-	39
Piedmont	-	3	1	12	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pleasanton	36	12	15	358	421	29	4	-	199	232	29	4	-	33
Union City	-	-	1	244	245	-	-	-	244	244	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa County	135	22	49	1,339	1,545	50	14	20	371	455	50	13	17	80
Antioch	85	1	-	49	135	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brentwood	-	-	6	161	167	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	60	60	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa County	-	-	-	76	76	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Danville	-	6	7	40	53	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Cerrito	-	5	10	71	86	-	5	10	66	81	-	5	10	15
Hercules	-	-	-	72	72	-	-	-	71	71	-	-	-	-
Lafayette	-	-	13	74	87	-	-	8	63	71	-	-	7	7
Moraga	-	-	-	9	9	-	-	-	6	6	-	-	-	-
Oakley	-	-	-	229	229	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orinda	-	-	4	36	40	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pittsburg	-	-	2	25	27	-	-	2	10	12	-	-	-	-
Pleasant Hill	-	-	3	12	15	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-
Richmond	-	-	-	11	11	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-
San Pablo	-	1	-	5	6	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
San Ramon	-	-	-	214	214	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Walnut Creek	50	9	4	193	256	50	9	-	142	201	50	8	-	58

Bay Area Housing Production: 2018

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
Jurisdiction	All New Units					New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Marin County	12	24	12	52	100	-	5	-	3	8	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	2	-	2	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfax	2	3	-	-	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Larkspur	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Marin County	4	-	-	26	30	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mill Valley	2	1	3	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Novato	1	1	-	5	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ross	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Anselmo	1	1	2	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Rafael	-	17	3	14	34	-	5	-	2	7	-	-	-	-
Sausalito	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tiburon	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	23	7	3	63	96	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
American Canyon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Calistoga	23	7	2	5	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	-	-	51	51	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	-	-	1	2	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Francisco County	40	401	205	2,045	2,691	40	401	203	2,043	2,687	40	401	63	504
San Francisco	40	401	205	2,045	2,691	40	401	203	2,043	2,687	40	401	63	504
San Mateo County	59	131	63	1,320	1,573	14	14	14	669	711	12	3	5	20
Atherton	1	-	-	20	21	1	-	-	3	4	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	2	2	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Brisbane	-	-	1	3	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
Colma	-	-	-	7	7	-	-	-	7	7	-	-	-	-
Daly City	-	27	32	67	126	-	6	10	59	75	-	-	3	3
Foster City	9	31	9	172	221	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	4	31	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Bay Area Housing Production: 2018

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
Jurisdiction	All New Units					New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Menlo Park	24	14	-	277	315	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Millbrae	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pacifica	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portola Valley	2	1	1	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	-	24	-	402	426	-	2	-	402	404	-	-	-	-
San Bruno	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Carlos	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	12	3	3	202	220	12	3	1	166	182	12	3	1	16
San Mateo County	7	30	-	84	121	-	3	-	3	6	-	-	-	-
South San Francisco	-	-	10	30	40	-	-	3	24	27	-	-	1	1
Woodside	4	1	1	7	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara County	75	15	79	2,651	2,820	41	12	46	2,296	2,395	41	12	44	97
Campbell	9	1	8	211	229	9	1	8	206	224	9	1	8	18
Gilroy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Altos Hills	2	3	1	11	17	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Gatos	-	-	10	11	21	-	-	2	5	7	-	-	1	1
Milpitas	-	-	-	414	414	-	-	-	368	368	-	-	-	-
Monte Sereno	2	-	-	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan Hill	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mountain View	5	11	-	530	546	5	11	-	483	499	5	11	-	16
Palo Alto	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Jose	30	-	-	797	827	-	-	-	705	705	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara	-	-	7	29	36	-	-	7	2	9	-	-	7	7
Saratoga	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	27	-	53	645	725	27	-	29	527	583	27	-	28	55
Solano County	-	5	4	483	492	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	-	241	241	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rio Vista	-	-	3	6	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	5	1	3	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	11	11	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	207	207	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Bay Area Housing Production: 2018

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
Jurisdiction	All New Units					New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Vallejo	-	-	-	15	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	139	174	123	773	1,209	56	25	9	47	137	56	23	-	79
Cloverdale	-	-	-	19	19	-	-	-	16	16	-	-	-	-
Cotati	-	-	2	-	2	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Healdsburg	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Petaluma	-	-	5	101	106	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohnert Park	-	-	-	290	290	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	83	29	14	197	323	56	23	4	29	112	56	23	-	79
Sebastopol	4	4	4	2	14	-	2	4	2	8	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	-	14	8	4	26	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	52	127	89	158	426	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Windsor	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	559	826	587	12,513	14,485	270	488	297	7,681	8,736	255	469	130	854
Share of Total	4%	6%	4%	86%	100%	3%	6%	3%	88%	100%	30%	55%	15%	100%

Certificate of occupancy data from California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) from local jurisdictions Housing Element Annual Progress Reports; data compiled and analyzed by MTC staff to confirm spatial relationship with PDAs/TPAs.

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Unit Qualifying Criteria

- The HIP program compiles eligible units from 2018 through 2022.
- Newly built or preserved units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels.
- Newly built or preserved units must be located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- Newly built or preserved units must be deed-restricted.
- Newly built units are measured by certificates of occupancy submitted to California Department of Housing and Community Development through a jurisdiction's Housing Element Annual Progress Report.

- Preserved units must be: (1) Multi-family units that receive governmental assistance consistent with the funding sources in Government Code Section 65863.10(a)(3) that are identified as "very-high risk" or "high risk" of converting to market-rate rents by the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC); or (2) The acquisition/preservation of existing unrestricted multi-family affordable housing units upon which restrictions are newly placed.
- A preserved unit that has deed restrictions for at least 55 years will be counted as one HIP unit. Units with deed restrictions for a shorter duration will receive a pro-rated share of one unit based on the 55-year standard.

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T5-FAST\OBAG2\Implementation\Regional Program\HIP\HIP\New Unit Data_2018-2019.xlsx\2018-2019 Combined

Bay Area Housing Production: 2019

Certificates of Occupancy

New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program														
All New Units						New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Alameda County	272	126	68	3,183	3,649	212	32	19	2,002	2,265	212	28	13	253
Alameda County	-	19	-	65	84	-	3	-	1	4	-	-	-	-
Albany	-	-	9	-	9	-	-	5	-	5	-	-	-	-
Berkeley	-	-	-	52	52	-	-	-	18	18	-	-	-	-
Dublin	-	-	18	603	621	-	-	-	244	244	-	-	-	-
Emeryville	46	22	9	110	187	46	22	9	110	187	46	22	9	77
Fremont	125	50	4	717	896	90	6	4	535	635	90	6	4	100
Hayward	-	-	4	181	185	-	-	-	46	46	-	-	-	-
Livermore	72	3	16	151	242	72	-	1	79	152	72	-	-	72
Newark	-	-	-	329	329	-	-	-	133	133	-	-	-	-
Oakland	4	-	-	882	886	4	-	-	836	840	4	-	-	4
Piedmont	-	4	7	7	18	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Pleasanton	25	28	1	86	140	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa County	127	312	111	1,278	1,828	104	75	3	234	416	104	74	-	178
Antioch	-	1	11	109	121	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Brentwood	-	-	6	166	172	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Concord	-	-	-	28	28	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-
Contra Costa County	42	-	-	197	239	42	-	-	16	58	42	-	-	42
Danville	-	7	7	38	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
El Cerrito	62	-	-	13	75	62	-	-	6	68	62	-	-	62
Hercules	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	-	17	17	-	-	-	-
Lafayette	-	1	5	33	39	-	-	1	3	4	-	-	-	-
Moraga	-	-	-	19	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Oakley	-	74	-	145	219	-	74	-	1	75	-	74	-	74
Orinda	-	-	6	51	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pinole	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pittsburg	23	205	64	38	330	-	-	2	9	11	-	-	-	-
Pleasant Hill	-	19	4	28	51	-	-	-	14	14	-	-	-	-
Richmond	-	-	-	236	236	-	-	-	165	165	-	-	-	-
San Pablo	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Ramon	-	-	-	118	118	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Walnut Creek	-	5	7	41	53	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-

Bay Area Housing Production: 2019

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
Jurisdiction	All New Units					New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Marin County	15	12	9	62	98	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Corte Madera	2	1	3	14	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfax	-	5	2	1	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Larkspur	-	-	-	2	2	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Marin County	3	1	-	37	41	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mill Valley	1	1	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Novato	7	1	-	1	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ross	2	1	1	2	6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Anselmo	-	-	2	3	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Rafael	-	2	-	2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sausalito	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tiburon	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	49	27	12	79	167	49	20	-	1	70	49	20	-	69
American Canyon	49	21	1	1	72	49	20	-	1	70	49	20	-	69
Calistoga	-	-	2	7	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa	-	6	5	57	68	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saint Helena	-	-	-	13	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Yountville	-	-	4	1	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
San Francisco County	880	335	241	3,648	5,104	880	335	237	3,639	5,091	880	335	64	1,279
San Francisco	880	335	241	3,648	5,104	880	335	237	3,639	5,091	880	335	64	1,279
San Mateo County	18	76	68	778	940	8	20	20	654	702	7	1	2	10
Atherton	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Belmont	-	-	10	3	13	-	-	3	1	4	-	-	-	-
Brisbane	-	-	4	9	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Burlingame	-	-	-	5	5	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-
Colma	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Daly City	-	42	41	13	96	-	17	14	7	38	-	-	-	-
Foster City	-	-	-	50	50	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Half Moon Bay	-	-	6	13	19	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Bay Area Housing Production: 2019

Certificates of Occupancy

New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program														
All New Units						New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
Jurisdiction	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Menlo Park	5	3	2	23	33	1	1	2	22	26	-	1	2	3
Millbrae	1	2	-	5	8	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Pacifica	-	-	-	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portola Valley	5	-	2	1	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Redwood City	7	19	-	232	258	7	1	-	232	240	7	-	-	7
San Bruno	-	5	-	83	88	-	1	-	83	84	-	-	-	-
San Carlos	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
San Mateo	-	-	-	11	11	-	-	-	7	7	-	-	-	-
San Mateo County	-	5	-	12	17	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
South San Francisco	-	-	3	295	298	-	-	1	295	296	-	-	-	-
Woodside	-	-	-	9	9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Clara County	353	64	111	3,099	3,627	337	48	40	1,691	2,116	337	48	38	423
Campbell	13	2	10	272	297	13	2	10	256	281	13	2	10	25
Gilroy	-	-	6	115	121	-	-	1	1	2	-	-	-	-
Los Altos Hills	5	6	2	39	52	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Los Gatos	-	-	20	15	35	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Milpitas	-	-	-	625	625	-	-	-	529	529	-	-	-	-
Monte Sereno	11	-	1	3	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Morgan Hill	14	15	25	252	306	14	9	2	62	87	14	9	2	25
Mountain View	49	18	-	352	419	49	18	-	309	376	49	18	-	67
Palo Alto	-	-	-	14	14	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
San Jose	215	-	-	433	648	215	-	-	298	513	215	-	-	215
Santa Clara	-	-	1	777	778	-	-	-	42	42	-	-	-	-
Saratoga	-	4	4	-	8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sunnyvale	46	19	42	202	309	46	19	27	193	285	46	19	26	91
Solano County	-	-	15	707	722	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	-
Dixon	-	-	14	27	41	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Fairfield	-	-	1	351	352	-	-	-	3	3	-	-	-	-
Rio Vista	-	-	-	216	216	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Solano County	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Suisun City	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	-	-	-	42	42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Bay Area Housing Production: 2019

Certificates of Occupancy

											New Units Qualifying for MTC's Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Program			
Jurisdiction	All New Units					New Units in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs)					New Units in PDAs and/or TPAs that are Deed-Restricted			
	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Above Moderate	Total	Very Low	Low	Moderate	Total
Vallejo	-	-	-	71	71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	1	42	113	907	1,063	-	2	14	140	156	-	-	-	-
Cloverdale	-	-	-	21	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Cotati	1	3	-	3	7	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Healdsburg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Petaluma	-	-	3	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rohnert Park	-	-	5	203	208	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa	-	-	39	207	246	-	-	14	111	125	-	-	-	-
Sebastopol	-	1	-	9	10	-	1	-	4	5	-	-	-	-
Sonoma	-	-	2	11	13	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County	-	38	64	449	551	-	-	-	24	24	-	-	-	-
Windsor	-	-	-	4	4	-	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	-
Total	1,715	994	748	13,741	17,198	1,590	532	333	8,366	10,821	1,589	506	117	2,212
Share of Total	7%	6%	4%	83%	100%	10%	5%	3%	82%	100%	60%	32%	8%	100%

Certificate of occupancy data from California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) from local jurisdictions Housing Element Annual Progress Reports; data compiled and analyzed by MTC staff to confirm spatial relationship with PDAs/TPAs.

Housing Incentive Pool (HIP) Unit Qualifying Criteria

- The HIP program compiles eligible units from 2018 through 2022.
- Newly built or preserved units must be affordable to households at the very low-, low-, or moderate-income levels.
- Newly built or preserved units must be located in Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and/or Transit Priority Areas (TPAs).
- Newly built or preserved units must be deed-restricted.
- Newly built units are measured by certificates of occupancy submitted to California Department of Housing and Community Development through a jurisdiction's Housing Element Annual Progress Report.

- Preserved units must be: (1) Multi-family units that receive governmental assistance consistent with the funding sources in Government Code Section 65863.10(a)(3) that are identified as "very-high risk" or "high risk" of converting to market-rate rents by the California Housing Partnership Corporation (CHPC); or (2) The acquisition/preservation of existing unrestricted multi-family affordable housing units upon which restrictions are newly placed.
- A preserved unit that has deed restrictions for at least 55 years will be counted as one HIP unit. Units with deed restrictions for a shorter duration will receive a pro-rated share of one unit based on the 55-year standard.

J:\PROJECT\Funding\T5-FAST\OBAG2\Implementation\Regional Program\HIP\HIP\New Unit Data_2018-2019.xlsx]2018-2019 Combined