

## Technical Advisory Committee

### MEETING AGENDA

**January 28, 2010**

**1:30 PM**

Sonoma County Transportation Authority  
SCTA Large Conference Room  
490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
Santa Rosa, California 95401

#### ITEM

1. Introductions
2. Public Comment
3. Approval of Minutes, December 3, 2009\*
4. TFCA/TDA3
  - 4.1. Quarterly Report\*
  - 4.2. Call for Projects\*
5. Community Based Transportation Plan – Update\*
6. Stimulus II
  - 6.1. Update
  - 6.2. Milestones for Delivery\*
7. New Transportation Act (STP/CMAQ)
  - 7.1. Block Grant Approach
8. State Local Partnership Program
  - 8.1. Update\*
9. Measure M
  - 9.1. LSR Distribution Ratios FY2010-2011\*
  - 9.2. Proposed Audit of Measure M Recipients\*
  - 9.3. Copeland Creek – remaining appropriation\*
10. Other Business / Comments / Announcements
11. Adjourn

\*Materials attached.

---

#### Board of Directors

◆ Mike Kerns, Chair, Sonoma County ◆ Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair, Rohnert Park ◆  
◆ Valerie Brown, Sonoma County ◆ Pat Gilardi, Cotati ◆ David Glass, Petaluma ◆ Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol ◆ Paul Kelley, Sonoma County ◆  
◆ Mike McGuire, Healdsburg ◆ Carol Russell, Cloverdale ◆ Sam Salmon, Windsor ◆ August Sebastiani, Sonoma ◆ Gary Wysocky, Santa Rosa ◆

The next **S C T A** meeting will be held **February 8, 2010**  
The next **TAC** meeting will be held **February 25, 2010**

Copies of the full Agenda Packet are available at [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org)

**DISABLED ACCOMMODATION:** If you have a disability that requires the agenda materials to be in an alternate format or that requires an interpreter or other person to assist you while attending this meeting, please contact SCTA at least 72 hours prior to the meeting to ensure arrangements for accommodation.

**SB 343 DOCUMENTS RELATED TO OPEN SESSION AGENDAS:** Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Technical Advisory Committee after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Sonoma County Transportation Authority office at 490 Mendocino Ave., Suite 206, during normal business hours.

Pagers, cellular telephones and all other communication devices should be turned off during the committee meeting to avoid electrical interference with the sound recording system.



490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
 Santa Rosa, CA 95401  
 (707) 565-5373

# Staff Report

**To: Technical Advisory Committee**

**From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner**

**Item: Quarterly Status Report for TFCA and TDA3 projects not fully expended**

**Date: January 28, 2010**

This quarterly report provides the status as of January 20th of TFCA and TDA3 projects that have not yet been fully expended.

Jurisdiction	Project	Programmed Amount	Funds Expended	Funds Remaining	Funds Expire
Cloverdale	TDA3 Bicycle Lane Striping (09-0010-16)	\$42,000.00	\$21,120.72	\$20,879.28	06/30/11
Healdsburg	TDA3 Foss Creek Pathway Segment 3 (09-0010-18)	\$110,000.00	-	\$110,000.00	06/30/11
Healdsburg	TDA3 Healdsburg Ave., Grove St., & Rosewood Drive, Class II Bike Lane Re-striping (09-0010-17)	\$18,000.00	-	\$18,000.00	06/30/11
Petaluma	TFCA Transit/Bike Marketing Program (07-SON-04)	\$143,528.00	\$67,292.10	\$76,235.90	06/2010
Petaluma	TFCA Washington St & Petaluma Blvd Corridor Signal Timing (09-SON-05)	\$45,000	-	\$45,000	01/13/12
Petaluma	TDA3 Lynch Creek Trail Extension (10-0010-01)	\$306,976.00	-	\$306,976.00	06/30/12
Rohnert Park	TDA3 Copeland Creek Multi-Use Path Overlay (09-0010-19)	\$142,000.00	\$122,205.95	\$19,794.05	06/30/11

Jurisdiction	Project	Programmed Amount	Funds Expended	Funds Remaining	Funds Expire
Rohnert Park	TDA3 Bike Path Striping Project (10-0010-02)	\$120,000	-	\$120,000	06/30/12
Rohnert Park	TFCA Commerce Boulevard Bike Lane Gap Closure (09-SON-07)	\$13,000	-	\$13,000	01/13/12
Rohnert Park	TFCA Redwood Drive Bike Lane Gap Closure (09-SON-08)	\$13,800	-	\$13,800	01/13/12
Santa Rosa	TFCA Student Pass Subsidy (08-SON-03)	\$88,000.00	\$59,591.44	\$28,408.56	12/19/10
Santa Rosa	TFCA Santa Rosa Free Ride Trip Reduction Program (09-SON-02)	\$158,932	-	\$158,932	01/13/12
Santa Rosa	TFCA FY 2009 Student/Youth Bus Pass Subsidy (09-SON-03)	\$80,000	-	\$80,000	01/13/12
Santa Rosa	TDA3 Santa Rosa Bicycle / Pedestrian Plan (08-0010-02)	\$248,934.00	\$125,402.46	\$123,531.54	06/30/10
Santa Rosa	TDA3 Sonoma Ave. Class II Bike Lanes & Public Education Campaign (09-0010-21)	\$31,500.00	\$13,791.49	\$17,708.51	06/30/11
Santa Rosa	TDA3 Class III (Citywide) Signage Phase I (10-0010-03)	\$40,000.00	-	\$40,000.00	06/30/12
Santa Rosa	TDA3 West College Avenue—Class II Bicycle Lanes (10-0010-04)	\$41,000.00	-	\$41,000.00	06/30/12
Santa Rosa	TDA3 Electronic Bicycle Locker Program (10-0010-05)	\$47,280.00	-	\$47,280.00	06/30/12
Sebastopol	TFCA City of Sebastopol Bike Rack Program & Bike Route Signage (09-SON-04)	\$20,000	-	\$20,000	01/13/12
Sonoma County	TFCA Transit Marketing Program (08-SON-02)	\$89,485.00	\$13,107.35	\$76,377.65	12/19/10

Jurisdiction	Project	Programmed Amount	Funds Expended	Funds Remaining	Funds Expire
Sonoma County	TFCA Cotati Intermodal Facility (08-SON-01)	\$360,000.00	\$2,182.16	\$357,817.84	12/19/10
Sonoma County	TDA3 Santa Rosa Creek Trail, Reach F (Son Regional Parks) (08-0010-03)	\$100,000.00	-	\$100,000.00	06/30/10
Sonoma County	TDA3 Central Sonoma Valley Trail (09-0010-23)	\$50,000.00	-	\$50,000.00	06/30/11
Sonoma County	TDA3 Share the Road Bicycle Caution Signs (09-0010-24)	\$5,000.00	-	\$5,000.00	06/30/11
Sonoma County	TDA3 Unincorporated Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (09-0010-25)	\$20,000.00	\$19,999.32	\$0.68	06/30/11
Sonoma County	TDA3 Arnold Drive Multi-use Pathway (09-0010-22)	\$100,000.00	-	\$100,000.00	06/30/11
Sonoma County	TDA3 Western Avenue Bicycle Shoulder Widening (10-0010-06)	\$500,000	-	\$500,000	06/30/12
Sonoma County	TFCA Replacement CNG Bus Purchase (09-SON-01)	\$160,186	-	\$160,186	01/13/12
Sonoma (city)	TFCA Comprehensive Class III Route Sign Program and South Fifth Street West Class II Lanes (09-SON-06)	\$135,542	-	\$135,542	01/13/12
Windsor	TFCA Mitchell Lane Class II Bicycle Lanes (08-SON-06)	\$10,400.00	-	\$10,400.00	12/19/10



490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
 Santa Rosa, CA 95401  
 (707) 565-5373

## Staff Report

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee  
**From:** Lynne March, Transportation Planner  
**Item:** TFCA and TDA 3 “Calls for Projects”  
**Date:** January 28, 2010

**Issue:**

2010 “Calls for Projects” are anticipated in February for Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Manager and Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funding cycles.

### TFCA Program Manager Funding

**Background:**

The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), awards funding to projects known to provide a benefit to air quality. These funds are generated through a \$4 surcharge on vehicle registrations in the Bay Area. Each county is guaranteed 40% of the funds generated within their county for the Program Manager Program.

SCTA is the “Program Manager” for these funds. In Sonoma County, only the southern portion of the County is within the Air District, therefore, Cloverdale and Healdsburg and the unincorporated areas north of Windsor do not receive funds from the TFCA program administered by the SCTA.

Funds received are to be distributed according to the criteria adopted by the SCTA Board on October 16, 2006. The criteria gives Santa Rosa and the County guaranteed funds according to their population, with the remainder of the funds applied for on a competitive basis.

The following table shows the **estimated available funding**, by category:

<b>FUND ESTIMATE</b>			
2010/2011 TFCA FUNDING CYCLE			
Santa Rosa	County	Competitive	Total Allocation for Projects
38.33%	25.47%	36.20%	100%
@ \$225,000	@ \$149,000	@ \$212,000	\$585,000

SCTA staff is awaiting the interest income figures and final BAAQMD policy guidance for this cycle. It is anticipated that the “Call for Projects” will be issued in mid-February. Proposed projects will be reviewed by staff, and then the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on April 22. A “Program of Projects” will be recommended to the May 10th SCTA Board by the TAC. SCTA will be asked to consider and approve a “Program of Projects” for submittal to BAAQMD, as well as authorizing the execution of a Funding Agreement between SCTA and BAAQMD.

## **TDA3**

### **Background:**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) established a statewide ¼ cent sales tax. TDA funding is distributed primarily for transit operations, with Article 3 set aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects---including bicycle lanes, pedestrian paths, and planning and marketing efforts. Each year Sonoma County is eligible for TDA3 funds that, after claiming planning and administration funding, totals approximately 2% of TDA available to the County and Sonoma County cities. Funding distribution is based on population. The SCTA approves TDA expenditure programs and tracks projects, while the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) administers the funds.

Each year an annual fund estimate (“entitlement”) is developed for each jurisdiction based on population, with unused entitlements allowed to accumulate from year to year as “credit.” A jurisdiction’s claim for any given year is not allowed to exceed the amount equal to the accumulated credit plus the following two years of projected entitlement. The methodology allows jurisdictions to gather sufficient amounts, from past and future entitlements, to fund projects.

A “Call for Projects” is anticipated in early February. Projects will be reviewed by the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (CBPAC) and Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in March. The CBPAC is charged with making a recommendation to the SCTA Board for a “Program of Projects.” Board consideration and approval is anticipated on April 12, for submittal to MTC.

Three entities (the County, Petaluma and Rohnert Park) “borrowed forward” last cycle, thus will have negative balances in 10/11. Exact funding amounts will not be available until early February however, the new revenues are projected to be less than last year. Used balances roll forward for use the following cycle and programming cannot exceed what is “in the bank” (Estimated at @\$721,000)

Here are the estimated amounts allocated to each jurisdiction for 2010 programming:  
Cloverdale \$13,000, Cotati: \$34,000, Healdsburg \$18,000, Santa Rosa \$524,000, Sebastopol \$30,000, Sonoma \$53,000 and Windsor \$171,000.

## Staff Report

**To: Technical Advisory Committee**

**From: Lynne March, Transportation Planner**

**Item: Community Based Transportation Plans**

**Date: January 28, 2010**

---

### Status of SCTA's CBTPs

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) identified four "Communities of Concern" in Sonoma County based on low-income status. MTC is providing funding to SCTA for the preparation of Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) for each of these areas. CBTPs create transportation plans based on community input. Planning focuses on involving the target community in the identification of transportation problems, as well as potential solutions.

- 1) The Roseland Community Based Transportation Plan was adopted in 2007, and can be found on the SCTA website at [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org) under "Reports."
- 2) The Lower Russian River Community Based Transportation Plan was the second CBTP to be completed for Sonoma County and can now be found in its final version on the SCTA website at [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org) under "Reports." It was adopted in May 2009.
- 3) The Healdsburg CBTP was adopted by the SCTA Board on January 11, 2010. The final version is posted at [www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org) under "Reports."
- 4) The last of the four CBTPs is currently underway. The plan's public outreach component has been conducted and finalization of The Springs Community Based Transportation Plan (for part of the Central Sonoma Valley) is anticipated in spring 2010.

Each plan provides historic and demographic information; describes existing and projected conditions; analyzes existing transit services and Lifeline objectives; presents the public outreach methodology and findings; and culminates in an action plan aimed at facilitating implementation of ideas to improve transportation access and mobility for each area's low-income residents. Each CBTP includes a prioritized list of transportation "solutions." Solutions have typically been for pedestrian, bicyclist, transit, paratransit, and roadway improvements.

The associated funding to MTC's CBTP Program is MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program (Lifeline). Solutions arising from the CBTP process are favored for funding by the Lifeline source.

# Jobs For Mainstreet (FHWA Funds) Potential Delivery Milestones Assuming Possible March 1, 2010 Enactment Date

as of January 12, 2010

50% of the Funds  
(90 Days to Award)

Project Delivery Milestone	Potential Deadlines
Project Listings Due to MTC from CMAs	January 21, 2010
Commission Approves TIP Amendment	January 27, 2010
Initiate Environmental Screening and Field Reviews	February 1, 2010
Caltrans Environmental Screening / Field Review Complete	February 12, 2010
Projects Entered into FMS by CMAs	February 19, 2010
NEPA Clearance & Permits Approved & Final PS&E Package Complete	February 26, 2010
<b>Jobs For Mainstreet Enacted</b>	<b>March 1, 2010</b>
E-76 Request For Authorization (RFA) Due to Caltrans District 4	March 1, 2010
E-76 Request For Authorization (RFA) Due to Caltrans HQ	March 15, 2010
FHWA Obligation (E-76 Authorization to Proceed)	March 31, 2010
Advertisement	April 15, 2010
Contract Award	May 15, 2010
<b>Execution of Contract (90-Day Deadline)</b>	<b>May 28, 2010</b>

S:\SCTA\02.SCTA Board and Committees\02.03 TAC\Agendas\2010\2010-01\6.2 Jobs Bill II Potential Milestone Deadlines.xls]Potential Stimulus II

Draft Block Grant Agenda  
January 22, 2010  
10 a.m. – noon  
MTC Auditorium

*Call-in number is 877-873-8017  
Access code is 9045636*

**Agenda Items:**

- |   |        |
|---|--------|
| 1. Introductions                                |        |
| 2. New Act STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 Background          | 10 min |
| 3. Program Policies and Block Grant Approach    | 35 min |
| 4. Project Selection Criteria                   | 45 min |
| • Regional Bicycle Program                      |        |
| • County Transportation for Livable Communities |        |
| • Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program     |        |
| 5. Other Programs                               | 10 min |
| 6. Project Delivery and Schedules               | 20 min |

**Attachments**

- Block Grant Program Guidance
- Updated County TLC Program Criteria\*
- Project Selection and TIP Revision Schedule\*

*\*Attachment to be distributed at meeting*

If you have questions about this meeting, please call Craig Goldblatt at (510) 817-5837.

# CONGESTION MANAGEMENT AGENCY BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM GUIDANCE NEW ACT CYCLE 1 STP/CMAQ

## INTRODUCTION

On December 16, 2009 the Commission approved the Cycle 1 Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy (MTC Resolution 3925) which guides the programming of the first three year increment (FY 2009-10, FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12) of federal funding in the Surface Transportation Authorization Act (pending further congressional development and action) and establishes as well an overall framework and funding estimate for the final three years (FY2012-13 through FY2014-2015).

Programming policies also established the CMA Block Grant approach, which delegates program management and project selection to the county congestion management agencies for three programs: the County Transportation for Livable Communities Program, the Regional Bicycle Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. The objective of the block grant is to provide additional flexibility to the CMAs.

The use of this guidance targets congestion management agency staff in order to facilitate the selection of projects, programming of STP/CMAQ funding in the Transportation Improvement Program, and timely use of these funds.

The guidance is structured as follows:

1. General Programming Policies, which apply to all federally funded projects
2. CMA Block Grant Approach
3. CMA Strategic Plan
4. Program Schedule
5. Project Selection Criteria for Each Program
6. MTC Staff Contacts

## 1. GENERAL PROGRAMMING POLICIES

The following programming policies apply to all projects, irrespective of their MTC program origin. The CMAs need to make potential applicants for STP/CMAQ funding aware of these obligations that apply to federal grants:

**Project Amendments:** The implementing agency or MTC may determine that circumstances may justify changes to the STP/CMAQ programming. These changes, or amendments to these regional programs, are not routine. All proposed changes will be reviewed by MTC staff before the Commission considers any formal actions on program amendments. All changes must follow MTC policies on the Public Involvement Process and Federal Air Quality Procedures and

Conformity Protocol. Changes must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), must not adversely affect the expeditious implementation of Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), must not negatively impact the deliverability of other projects in the regional programs, and must not affect the conformity finding in the TIP.

**Public Involvement.** MTC is committed to a public involvement process that is proactive and provides comprehensive information, timely public notice, full public access to key decisions, and opportunities for continuing involvement. MTC provides many methods to fulfill this commitment, as outlined in the *MTC Public Participation Plan*, Resolution No. 3821. The Commission's adoption of the STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 program, including policy and procedures meet the provisions of the *MTC Public Participation Plan*. MTC's advisory committees and the Bay Area Partnership have been consulted in the development of funding commitments and policies for this program; and opportunities have been provided to other stakeholders and members to comment.

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

**Inclusion into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).** Projects approved as part of the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ program must be amended into the 2009 TIP, or the subsequent 2011 TIP. The federally required TIP is a comprehensive listing of all San Francisco Bay Area transportation projects that receive federal funds, and/or are subject to a federally required action, such as federal environmental clearance, and/or are regionally significant for air quality conformity or modeling purposes.

**Air Quality Conformity.** In the Bay Area, it is the responsibility of MTC to make an air quality conformity determination for the TIP in accordance with federal Clean Air Act requirements and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) conformity regulations. MTC evaluates the impact of the TIP on regional air quality during the biennial update of the TIP. Since the 2009 air quality conformity finding has been completed for the 2009 TIP, no non-exempt projects that were not incorporated in the finding will be considered for funding in the Cycle 1 Program until the development of the 2011 TIP during spring 2010. Additionally, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for PM 2.5 starting December 14, 2009. Within 12 months of effective date of this classification, based on consultation with the MTC Air Quality Conformity Task Force, projects deemed "Projects of Air Quality Concern" must complete a hot-spot analysis required by the Transportation Conformity Rule. Generally Projects of Air Quality Concern are those projects result in significant increases in the number of or emissions from diesel vehicles. Owing to the nature of the programs funded through the CMA Block Grant, anticipated projects are expected to be exempt from air quality conformity.

**Environmental Clearance.** Project sponsors are responsible for compliance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.), the State Environmental Impact Report Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.), and the National Environmental Protection Act (42 USC Section 4-1 et seq.) standards and procedures for all projects with Federal funds.

**Application, Resolution of Local Support.** Project sponsors/ implementing agencies must submit a completed project application for each project proposed for funding through MTC's Funding Management System (FMS). The project application consists of two parts: 1) an application submittal and/or TIP revision request to MTC staff and 2) Resolution of Local Support approved by the project sponsor/ implementing agency's governing board or council. A template for the resolution of local support can be downloaded from the MTC website using the following link: [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP\\_CMAQ\\_LocalSupportReso.doc](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/STPCMAQ/STP_CMAQ_LocalSupportReso.doc) A project sponsor will submit the resolution of local support at the same time it requests a revision to the TIP adding its project and/or federal funding. This is done by attaching a pdf version of the adopted resolution to the project record in MTC's Fund Management System (FMS). Sponsors of projects that have previously received STP/CMAQ or State Improvement Program (STIP) funds may rely on the prior Resolution of local support prepared for the same project, provided that the project scope remains unchanged.

**Project Screening and Compliance with Regional and Federal Requirements.** MTC staff will perform a review of projects proposed for the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Program to ensure 1) eligibility; 2) RTP consistency; and 3) project readiness. In addition, project sponsors must adhere to directives such as "Complete Streets" (MTC Routine Accommodations for Bicyclists and Pedestrians); and the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy as outlined below; and provide the required non-federal matching funds. Project sponsors should note that fund source programs, eligibility criteria, and regulations may change as a result of the passage of new surface transportation authorization legislation. In this situation, MTC staff will work to realign new fund sources with the funding commitments approved by the Commission.

- ▶ **Federal Project Eligibility:** STP has a wide range of projects that are eligible for consideration in the TIP. Eligible projects include, federal-aid highway and bridge improvements (construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, resurfacing, restoration, and operational), mitigation related to an STP project, public transit capital improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, and transportation system management, transportation demand management, transportation control measures, surface transportation planning activities, and safety. More detailed eligibility requirements can be found in Section 133 of Title 23 of the United States Code.
- ▶ **CMAQ funding** applies to new or expanded transportation projects, programs, and operations that help reduce emissions. Eligible project categories that meet this basic criteria include: Transportation activities in approved State Implementation Plan (SIP), Transportation Control Measures (TCMs), public-private partnerships, alternative fuels, traffic flow improvements, transit projects (facilities, vehicles, operating assistance up to three years), bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, travel demand management, outreach and rideshare activities, telecommuting programs, intermodal freight, planning and project development activities, Inspection and maintenance programs, magnetic

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

► **MTC Program Eligibility:** MTC staff will review all projects nominated by the CMA for block grants, to ensure that they meet the eligibility requirements of the MTC established programs: Regional Bicycle Program, County TLC Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. Eligibility requirements for these programs are explained later in this guidance.

► **RTP Consistency:** Projects included in the Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ Program must be consistent with the adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), according to federal planning regulations. Each project included in the Cycle 1 Program must identify its relationship with meeting the goals and objectives of the RTP, and where applicable, the RTP ID number or reference.

► **Complete Streets (MTC Routine Accommodations of Pedestrians and Bicyclists) Policy:** Federal, state and regional policies and directives emphasize the accommodation of bicyclists, pedestrians, and persons with disabilities when designing transportation facilities. MTC's Complete Streets policy (Resolution No. 3765) created a checklist that is intended for use on projects to ensure that the accommodation of non-motorized travelers are considered at the earliest conception or design phase. The county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) ensure that project sponsors complete the checklist before projects are submitted to MTC. CMAs are required to make completed checklists available to their Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) for review prior to project programming in the TIP. Specific guidance and forms on this requirement are available at

[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine\\_accommodations.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/bicyclespedestrians/routine_accommodations.htm)

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

► **Regional Project Delivery Policy:** Cycle 1 STP/CMAQ funding is available in the following three fiscal years: FY 2009-10, 2010-11, and 2011-12. Block grant funds are available in the last two years of the program: 2010-11, and 2011-12. CMAs need to program 50% of their block grant funding in each of these years. Some flexibility may be granted conditioned upon the availability of obligation authority (OA). This will be determined through the development of an annual obligation plan, which is developed in concert with the Partnership and project sponsors. Funds designated for each project component will be available for obligation in the fiscal year in which the funds are programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). It is therefore very important that projects be ready to proceed in the year programmed. For example, a project that is assigned funds in FY 2010-11 is required to obligate by April 30, 2011. Obligation is defined FHWA's authorization of the funds or FHWA's transfer of funds to Federal Transit Administration (FTA).

All Cycle 1 funding is subject to the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy and any subsequent revisions (MTC Resolution No. 3606). Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy, which enforces fund obligation deadlines, and project substitution for STP and CMAQ funds. All funds are subject to award, invoicing and project close out requirements. Project sponsors must sign project supplementary agreements and award construction contracts within six months of obligation; and subsequently request reimbursements every six-twelve months to keep grants active. The failure to meet these deadlines will result in the deobligation of any unexpended fund balances for the project. Obligation deadlines, project substitutions and redirection of project savings also will continue to be governed by the MTC Regional Project Delivery Policy which enforces fund obligation deadlines and project substitution for STP and CMAQ funds (MTC Resolution No. 3606).

For specific details on the regional project delivery policy (MTC Resolution No. 3606), its deadlines, and other requirements refer to [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC\\_Res\\_3606.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/funding/delivery/MTC_Res_3606.pdf). It is the responsibility of the implementing agency at the time of programming, to ensure the regional, state and federal deadlines and provisions of the regional project delivery policy can be met.

MTC staff will actively monitor and report the obligation status of projects to the Programming Deliver Working Group (PDWG) of the Bay Area Partnership. The project sponsor is responsible for meeting all funding and delivery requirements and ensuring funds are not de-obligated from the project. Acceptance of funds from the CMA Block Grant Program indicates a project sponsor's acceptance of the federal regulations, state statutes, and regional policies as they pertain to the funding of the project and of the policies set forth in the Cycle 1 Program. The PDWG will monitor project delivery issues as they arise and make recommendations to the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) as necessary.

► **Local Match:** Projects funded with STP or CMAQ funding requires a non-federal local match. Based on California's share of the nation's federal lands, the local match for STP and CMAQ is 11.47% of the total project cost. The FHWA will reimburse up to 88.53% of the total project cost. Project sponsors are required to provide the non-federal match, which is subject to change. MTC will keep the CMAs and project sponsors aware of any new developments in match requirements.

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

► **Priority Development Areas (PDA) Based Funding Decisions:** In Transportation 2035, the Commission's transportation/land use and climate change policies seek to align

“focused growth” land use principles and transportation investments. As part of the ARRA program adoption in February 2009, the Commission directed staff to begin developing a PDA investment strategy in advance of the new federal authorization. As it relates to the New Act programming under the CMA block grant, the following policies support PDA based funding strategies:

- *Transportation for Livable Communities:* All TLC projects must be located in priority development areas with additional weight given in project evaluation depending on whether the projects are in planned or proposed PDAs and based on proposed development intensity.
- *Rehabilitation – Streets and Roads and Transit:* The current distribution formula prioritizes funding for local jurisdictions that are considered high-intensity PDAs. The allocation formula for streets and roads rehabilitation contains four factors, weighted 25% each, including population, lane mileage, arterial and collector shortfall, and preventive maintenance performance. The population and lane mileage factors result in the support of PDAs. To ensure this PDA emphasis, CMAs should, in general, use the same allocation formula for streets and roads distribution within the counties. The CMAs, through a required Strategic Plan, may propose some modifications, including deferring some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or using local funds, to address the competing objective of adhering to federal grant minimums.

## **2. CMA BLOCK GRANT APPROACH**

Program management responsibilities will generally be split between MTC and the congestion management agencies (CMAs) as outlined in Table 1. MTC management role is limited to program areas of regional scope or with a network impact. Congestion management agencies would manage programs with a local/community focus.

**Table 1: Program Administration**

<b>Transportation 2035 Core Programs</b>	<b>Manager</b>	<b>Block Grant</b>
Freeway Performance Initiative (FPI) and the Regional Signal Timing Program.	MTC, Caltrans and CMAs	
Climate Initiatives (Public Outreach/ Innovative Grants/ Evaluation)	MTC and Bay Area Air Quality Management District	
Climate Initiatives – Safe Routes to School	County – TBD and MTC regional coordination and assistance	
Regional Bicycle Program	CMAs	Yes
Climate Initiatives—Eastern Solano CMAQ	Solano Transportation Authority	
TLC – Regional	MTC	
TLC – County	CMAs	Yes
Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program	CMAs	Yes
Transit Capital Rehabilitation	MTC	

For core programs managed by the CMAs, MTC will be making funding available to the CMAs by means of a CMA block grant” to allow more flexibility and more strategic project selection. The block grant will encompass the Regional Bicycle Program, County TLC Program, and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program. Table 2 presents an overview of the funding made available to the CMAs under their block grants. The block grant program will function as follows:

- **Planning Activities:** Up to 4% may be used by CMAs for planning activities to be deducted proportionately from all Block Grant programs within the county. Contract amendments to the Regional Planning agreements in March/April are to capture any augmentations.
- **Flex provision:** Up to 20% of each program’s funds may be flexed from one Block Grant program to fund another in order to recognize practical project delivery considerations and unique county priorities. CMAs can request flexibility beyond the 20% through their Strategic Plan for consideration by the Commission. Before programming Cycle 2 MTC staff will provide a report on how the flex provision was applied for Cycle 1 funds for consideration by the Commission.
- **Minimum Grant Size:** STP/CMAQ grants per project cannot be programmed for less than \$500,000 for counties with a population over 1 million (Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties) and \$250,000 for counties with a population under 1 million (Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Solano, and Sonoma counties). CMAs may request exceptions through the strategic plan process, especially when balancing the objective of using the Local Streets and Road distribution formula. The objective of this requirement is to minimize the number of federal-aid projects, which place administrative burdens on project sponsor, MTC, Caltrans Local Assistance, and Federal Highway Administration

staff. Also for programming purposes, grants need to be rounded to the nearest thousand dollar place value.

- **Unified Call for Projects:** CMAs are requested to issue one unified call for projects addressing all of their respective Block Grant programs in early 2010. A strategic plan (discussed subsequently) will explain the CMA programming approach in general terms due by April 1, 2010; a final project list is due to MTC by July 30, 2010. The goal is to reduce staff resources, coordinate all programs to respond to larger multi-modal projects, and give project sponsors the maximum time to deliver projects. In the case of the County TLC program, final recommendations for the Regional TLC program will be going to the Commission in July 2010; so CMAs may request an additional month to submit County TLC projects to MTC if needed to coordinate their project selection for the County TLC program with the MTC adopted Regional TLC Program.

**Table 2: CMA Block Grant Program**  
(thousands \$)

Counties	Regional Bicycle	County TLC	LS&R Rehab.	County Total	CMA Planning (max. 4%)
Alameda	\$3,836	\$5,962	\$16,550	\$26,348	TBD
Contra Costa	\$2,367	\$4,152	\$10,742	\$17,261	TBD
Marin	\$1,649	\$1,010	\$2,435	\$5,094	TBD
Napa	\$605	\$540	\$1,880	\$3,025	TBD
San Francisco	\$1,368	\$3,115	\$7,745	\$12,228	TBD
San Mateo	\$1,739	\$2,878	\$6,790	\$11,407	TBD
Santa Clara	\$4,638	\$7,121	\$17,233	\$28,992	TBD
Solano	\$1,349	\$1,664	\$6,465	\$9,478	TBD
Sonoma	\$1,949	\$1,891	\$9,160	\$13,000	TBD
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$19,500</b>	<b>\$28,333</b>	<b>\$79,000</b>	<b>\$126,833</b>	TBD

### 3. CMA BLOCK GRANT STRATEGIC PLAN

By April 1, 2010, CMAs are asked to submit a Strategic Plan to MTC outlining their approach for programming their block grants as a preliminary step to final project selection by July 30, 2010. This plan is anticipated to summarize a county's overall thinking in a brief and concise way, communicating to MTC a given county's programming goals underlying the use of block grant funds, how the program requirements are being met, and needed flexibility. Specifically the plan is to address the following policies, not exceeding several pages in length:

- Amount of funds for CMA planning purposes and rationale behind any flexing of program amounts within the Block Grant Programs up to the 20% allowed. Examples might include flexibility to deliver on a complete streets approach or deliver investments that better support PDAs. Any request beyond 20% would need to be submitted to the Commission for approval.

- The approach used to select Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program projects, if it differs from the MTC distribution formula. A CMA needs to explain demonstrate that the alternate approach would not divert funds from PDAs within its jurisdiction. For added flexibility CMAs may elect to fund a few large projects, while making sales tax or other funding available to other jurisdictions. CMAs may also use Cycle 2 to defer grants to jurisdictions not receiving funding in Cycle 1.
- Federal Funding Minimums: Unique circumstances or hardships may allow for modifications to this policy, which need to be discussed with MTC staff beforehand and included in the plan. Also for the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program, in order to balance the objectives of streamlining federal fund expenditures through project minimums and the requirement that CMAs should adhere to the distribution formula down to the jurisdiction level, CMAs may propose to defer some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or to use local funds.
- Safe Routes to Schools Program (SR2S) recommended county approach, including lead agency for project selection and federal funding recipient, and any request for additional funding to expand implementation of creative school-related emission reduction strategies. MTC will coordinate the SR2S program, including review and approval of county programs by the Commission. The CMAs are requested to provide assistance in the development of objectives and the definition of agency roles for this program within their respective jurisdictions. These will vary throughout the region and even within a county. There are various lead agencies for current Safe Routes to School programs including bicycle and regional coalitions, departments of health, congestion management agencies, offices of education, and cities. As part of the CMA Block Grant Strategic Plan, the CMA would identify the lead agency for plan implementation, the allocation of funds to specific implementation actions, performance targets, and plan for sustaining the SR2S program beyond the allocation of CMAQ funds. CMAs should also include briefly a description of potential project submittals for the innovative component of the SR2S program (\$2 million), which is regionally competitive. A project solicitation will follow. Please note that this program does not fall under the CMA Grant Program.
- Complete Streets: A CMA should explore giving priority to funding projects that demonstrate a “complete streets” design approach by including pedestrian and/or bicycle projects in the project scope.
- Priority Development Area: The CMA should discuss its consideration of priority development areas and policies in its project selection approach. Information on PDA designations is available at <http://www.bayareavision.org/pda/>

## 4. PROGRAM SCHEDULE

Cycle 1 spans apportionments over three federal fiscal years: FY 2009-10, FY 2010-11, and FY 2011-12. Programming in the first year will generally be for the on-going regional operations and regional planning activities which can be delivered immediately, allowing the region to meet the obligation deadlines for use of FY 2009-10 funds. This strategy, at the same time, provides several months during FY 2009-10 for program managers to select projects and for MTC to program projects into the TIP to be obligated during the remaining second and third years of the Cycle 1 period.

As a starting point, core programs' STP/CMAQ funds will need to be programmed in the TIP and delivered (obligated), 50% of their funds in each of the FY 2010-11 and FY 2011-12 years. However; a program may potentially deviate from this 50-50 percent split, depending on whether other program funding needs can be offset accordingly, based on other Cycle 1 program requests. Within their block grant programs, CMAs have the flexibility to make this split in a combined fashion for the County TLC and Regional Bicycle programs, which both use CMAQ. In the summer, MTC staff will work all program managers and CMAs to develop a cash flow plan based on these needs prior to the start of Federal Fiscal year 2010-11 (July 30, 2010). Ultimately, all Cycle 1 projects must be delivered (funds obligated) by April 30, 2012.

## **5. PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR EACH PROGRAM**

### **Local Streets and Roads Shortfall (LSRS) Program**

#### **General Program Information**

MTC is committed to maintaining the regionally important system of state highways and local roads, identified as the Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS). To assist jurisdictions with the local streets and roads maintenance, MTC has set aside Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for local streets and roads pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects. State highway rehabilitation and maintenance is to be funded by Caltrans under the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP).

#### **Local Streets and Project Eligibility**

Purpose of Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance Projects. The purpose of pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects is to preserve and extend the service life of an existing facility. This includes work on non-pavement items listed in Table 3, placement of additional pavement surfacing and/or other work necessary to return an existing structure or roadway, including shoulders, to a serviceable condition. Pavement rehabilitation and preventive maintenance strategies should extend the service life of a facility for a minimum of 5 years. This program does not fund routine maintenance projects.

Pavement Management System. MTC recognizes the importance of having effective pavement management tools available to jurisdictions. MTC's pavement management system, StreetSaver<sup>®</sup>, is used by all 109 cities and counties in the Bay Area and the software has been instrumental in accurately establishing the rehabilitation needs of local streets and roads in the region. In addition to providing meaningful estimates on the future financial rehabilitation needs of the local streets and roads, the system also uses decision rules to help jurisdictions determine the most cost effective treatments for rehabilitating a facility.

The proposed projects must be based on the analysis results from an established PMS for a jurisdiction. Local jurisdictions can access their pavement management database at [www.streetsaveronline.com](http://www.streetsaveronline.com). The sponsoring agency must have a certified Pavement Management System (PMS), MTC's or equivalent, for submitting rehabilitation and preventive maintenance projects. MTC is responsible for verifying the certification status. A list of jurisdiction certification status can be found at [www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html](http://www.mtcpms.org/ptap/cert.html).

Project Eligibility. The LSRS Shortfall Program funding is reserved for pavement rehabilitation and preventative maintenance projects located on the Federal-Aid System. Capacity-expansion projects, right of way purchases, channelization, routine maintenance, spot application, seismic retrofit, and structural repair on bridges are not eligible activities. Non-pavement enhancements, such as streetscape projects and new traffic calming features, are also not eligible for this program. Generally, the non-pavement activities and projects are replacement of features that currently exist on the roadway facility. Refer to Table 3 for a list of eligible non-pavement project types.

Federal-Aid Eligible Facilities. All public roads functionally classified above rural minor collector are eligible for STP funding. The functional classification system for roadway facilities is further separated between urban and rural classification systems to reflect the fundamentally different travel characteristics of these two classes.

The urban functional classification system is hierarchically represented by four functional categories: 1) principal arterials, 2) minor arterials, 3) collector streets, and 4) local streets. Projects located on facilities classified as collector streets and above are eligible for funding in the urban system. Projects located on a facility classified as a local street in the urban functional classification is not eligible for funding.

The rural functional classification system is separated into five categories: 1) principal arterials, 2) minor arterials, 3) major collectors, 4) minor collectors, and 5) local streets. For facilities in the rural classification system, projects located on major collectors and above are eligible for funding. Projects located on facilities classified as minor collectors and local streets are not eligible for funding.

Caltrans maintains a database of the functional classifications for a majority of the roadways in California. For a general description of the functional classification system, please see [http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/func\\_clas.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/func_clas.html). The California Road System (CRS) maps are accessible online at [http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/crs\\_maps/index.php](http://dot.ca.gov/hq/tsip/hseb/crs_maps/index.php). For more information, please contact Malcolm Gilmour, District 4 Caltrans, at (510) 286-5553 for a functional classification change or verification of a particular roadway.

**County Funding Targets**

LSRS Program Fund Distribution: Under the Cycle 1 Program, \$79 million is available for the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall (LSRS) Program. Table 4 establishes funding targets for each jurisdiction to program local streets and roads projects. The Cycle 1 round of the local streets and roads rehabilitation program distributes funding to counties based on a performance-based formula that was developed and approved by the LS&R Working Group and the Partnership Board. The allocation formula contains four factors:

<b>Weight</b>	<b>Factor</b>
25%	Population
25%	Arterial and Collector Lane Mileage
25%	Arterial and Collector Shortfall

25%	Preventive Maintenance Performance
-----	------------------------------------

A distribution share is calculated for each jurisdiction using the four factors described above and the funding shares for all jurisdictions are summed at the county level for final distribution by the county congestion management agencies (CMA).

The distribution formula prioritizes funding for local jurisdictions that are considered high-intensity PDAs. The allocation formula for streets and roads rehabilitation contains four factors, weighted 25% each, including population, lane mileage, arterial and collector shortfall, and preventive maintenance performance. The population and lane mileage factors result in the support of PDAs. To ensure this PDA emphasis, CMAs should generally use the same allocation formula for streets and roads distribution within the counties. The CMAs, through a required Strategic Plan, may propose some modifications, including deferring some jurisdiction programming to Cycle 2 or using local funds, to address the competing objective of adhering to federal grant minimums.

**Table 3**  
**Pavement Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance Projects**  
**Eligible Project Costs**

Category: Pavement Rehabilitation and Preventive Maintenance

- |  |
|--|
| <p>A. Material cost</p> <p>B. Labor cost</p> <p>C. Rental equipment costs related to the project</p> <p>D. Pavement striping costs</p> <p>E. Replacement of loop detectors</p> <p>F. Necessary incidental repairs required by the roadway improvement (such as repairs/replacement of storm drains, culverts, drainage channels, curb &amp; gutter, driveway conforms)</p> <p>G. Staff costs</p> <p>H. Project design costs</p> <p>I. Construction engineering/management costs (up to 15% of construction cost)</p> <p>J. Contract procurement and advertising costs</p> <p>K. Adjustment of storm drain manholes/survey monuments/storm water inlets/utility covers and boxes</p> <p>L. Traffic control at project site</p> <p>M. Dust control measures</p> <p>N. Erosion control measures</p> <p>O. Repairs to shoulders</p> <p>P. Mobilization costs</p> |
|--|

**Non-Pavement Rehabilitation Project Types**

- |  |
|--|
| <p>1. Minor Structures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drainage –headwalls, CMP, etc</li> <li>• Retaining walls</li> <li>• Storm damage (slope protection, slide repair)</li> </ul> <p>2. ADA compliance – (ramps)</p> <p>3. NPDES / Permits</p> <p>4. Traffic Safety – Signs, signals, striping, etc</p> <p>5. Bike path – Class II / III only</p> <p>6. Pedestrian – Sidewalks</p> |
|--|

**Table 4  
Cycle 1 Local Streets & Roads (LS&R) Shortfall Program Fund Distribution**

(For programming purposes, CMAs need to refer to Table 2 for rounded target amounts)

**ALAMEDA COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Alameda	\$ 1,167,832
Alameda	\$ 872,194
Albany	\$ 122,023
Berkeley	\$ 994,629
Dublin	\$ 570,036
Emeryville	\$ 135,621
Fremont	\$ 3,028,368
Hayward	\$ 1,391,442
Livermore	\$ 1,070,502
Newark	\$ 710,725
Oakland	\$ 3,768,142
Piedmont	\$ 69,746
Pleasanton	\$ 912,261
San Leandro	\$ 840,217
Union City	\$ 896,412
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 16,550,149</b>

**CONTRA COSTA COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Contra Costa	\$ 1,608,148
Antioch	\$ 1,021,185
Brentwood	\$ 440,501
Clayton	\$ 152,858
Concord	\$ 1,149,694
Danville	\$ 369,404
El Cerrito	\$ 249,814
Hercules	\$ 278,080
Lafayette	\$ 231,129
Martinez	\$ 404,618
Moraga	\$ 280,677
Oakley	\$ 408,325
Orinda	\$ 218,486
Pinole	\$ 179,376
Pittsburg	\$ 454,372
Pleasant Hill	\$ 316,734
Richmond	\$ 1,362,912
San Pablo	\$ 180,159
San Ramon	\$ 441,969
Walnut Creek	\$ 993,717
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 10,742,158</b>

**MARIN COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Marin	\$ 873,788
Belvedere	\$ 23,556
Corte Madera	\$ 74,214
Fairfax	\$ 63,840
Larkspur	\$ 76,244
Mill Valley	\$ 128,163
Novato	\$ 371,718
Ross	\$ 19,390
San Anselmo	\$ 108,142
San Rafael	\$ 540,115
Sausalito	\$ 81,513
Tiburon	\$ 74,219
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 2,434,904</b>

**NAPA COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Napa	\$ 548,047
American Canyon	\$ 202,930
Calistoga	\$ 46,553
Napa	\$ 970,989
St. Helena	\$ 94,985
Yountville	\$ 16,489
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 1,879,992</b>

**SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
San Francisco	\$ 7,745,198
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 7,745,198</b>

**SAN MATEO COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of San Mateo	\$ 650,090
Atherton	\$ 98,193
Belmont	\$ 276,426
Brisbane	\$ 76,353
Burlingame	\$ 310,836
Colma	\$ 31,863
Daly City	\$ 835,767
East Palo Alto	\$ 266,321
Foster City	\$ 200,296
Half Moon Bay	\$ 78,404
Hillsborough	\$ 176,757
Menlo Park	\$ 250,119
Millbrae	\$ 242,031
Pacifica	\$ 400,648
Portola Valley	\$ 103,135
Redwood City	\$ 668,428
San Bruno	\$ 390,507
San Carlos	\$ 199,706
San Mateo	\$ 748,813
So. San Francisco	\$ 688,301
Woodside	\$ 97,202
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 6,790,197</b>

**SANTA CLARA COUNTY\***

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Santa Clara	\$ 1,756,931
Campbell	\$ 334,650
Cupertino	\$ 450,383
Gilroy	\$ 640,094
Los Altos	\$ 269,959
Los Altos Hills	\$ 98,166
Los Gatos	\$ 298,800
Milpitas	\$ 692,347
Monte Sereno	\$ 31,120
Morgan Hill	\$ 477,228
Mountain View	\$ 552,215
Palo Alto	\$ 572,327
San Jose	\$ 8,319,770
Santa Clara	\$ 1,211,962
Saratoga	\$ 336,183
Sunnyvale	\$ 1,191,206
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 17,233,340</b>

**SOLANO COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Solano	\$ 1,067,867
Benicia	\$ 301,570
Dixon	\$ 229,739
Fairfield	\$ 1,433,558
Rio Vista	\$ 89,091
Suisun City	\$ 457,586
Vacaville	\$ 1,216,032
Vallejo	\$ 1,669,077
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 6,464,521</b>

**SONOMA COUNTY**

Jurisdiction	Total Share
County of Sonoma	\$ 4,769,815
Cloverdale	\$ 56,626
Cotati	\$ 89,045
Healdsburg	\$ 177,125
Petaluma	\$ 1,015,233
Rohnert Park	\$ 534,215
Santa Rosa	\$ 2,032,465
Sebastopol	\$ 76,593
Sonoma	\$ 69,189
Windsor	\$ 339,235
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 9,159,541</b>

**BAY AREA SHARES**

Jurisdiction	Total Share	% Share
Alameda	16,550,149	20.9%
Contra Costa	10,742,158	13.6%
Marin	2,434,904	3.1%
Napa	1,879,992	2.4%
San Francisco	7,745,198	9.8%
San Mateo	6,790,197	8.6%
Santa Clara	17,233,340	21.8%
Solano	6,464,521	8.2%
Sonoma	9,159,541	11.6%
<b>Total</b>	<b>79,000,000</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

\*In the case of Santa Clara County additional flexibility shall be given with respect to the distribution formula. Specifically, the CMA needs to work with the County of Santa Clara in distributing the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program funds to account for the Santa Clara County expressway system.

# **REGIONAL BICYCLE PROGRAM**

## **General Program Information**

The Regional Bikeway Network (RBN) was developed in 2001 to define bicycling corridors of regional significance. The network includes high priority projects in county or local bicycle plans that fulfilled the criteria to provide connectivity to transit as well as major activity centers.

Transportation 2035 identifies an investment of \$1 billion over 25-years to complete the 2,100 mile long network. This funding will complete all bikeway facilities in every county with the exception of bicycle access over the three bridges (Richmond/San Rafael, San Francisco/Oakland Bay west span and San Mateo/Hayward) where no bicycle access currently exists.

Under the New Act STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 Program, \$19,500,000 has been made available to CMAs under the Block Grant Program to fund bicycle improvements.

## **Project Eligibility Criteria**

Projects selection to be funded with Regional Bicycle Program funds must meet the following eligibility criteria

1. Projects eligible for funding must be part of the Regional Bikeway Network as outlined in the Regional Bicycle Plan (2009 Update) or as incorporated into the network through the update process described below. Eligible projects are capital in nature, resulting in additional bicycle route mileage.
2. Note that Federal guidelines prohibit the use of CMAQ funds for projects purely intended for safety, recreational bicycle trails, as well as for basic repair and rehabilitation of bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition projects funded with CMAQ may not limit public access to the facility. The facility is to allow bicycle and pedestrian access 24 hours per day 7 days a week to maximize air quality improvements and the reduction of emissions.
3. As a general guideline, auxiliary elements (e.g. ADA access improvements, utility trenching, drainage work, fire hydrants, landscaping, cosmetic resurfacing, surface improvements, etc.) that are incidental to the overall project should not exceed 20% of the total project cost. Signage designating a bicycle or pedestrian facility is not considered auxiliary elements for this program. Exceptions may be allowed at the discretion of the CMA.

## Flexibility to Accommodate Funding Requests Not Currently on the Network

In the event that a MTC is interested providing a Regional Bicycle Program grant to a project supported by local planning, which has not been previously incorporated into the Regional Bicycle Network, flexibility will be provided. MTC will consider CMA requests to add projects that projects to the Regional Bikeway Network to make projects eligible for program funding through the following process:

- a) Submitted projects must meet at least one of the three network criteria (Table 5) as part of a regional destination, regional connection or regional route.

- b) A countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee (BPACs) (and if desired other committees with bicycle and pedestrian interests) must review the projects submitted to MTC for consideration for inclusion on the network.
- c) The Regional Bicycle Working Group must evaluate and recommend to staff which projects are included on the network. Staff will approve projects to be amended on the network.
- d) Any new projects submitted to the network will be indentified for inclusion in the next update to the Regional Bikeway Network prior to the next Regional Transportation Plan update. It is expected that Cycle 2 will be programmed after the RTP update and at that time we will decide whether to require a substitution process to constrain the network to the current cost estimates or to allow the network to grow in both mileage and costs

**Table 5: Regional Bikeways Criteria**

<p><b>1. Regional Destinations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Create connections to the regional transit system – including transit centers and ferry terminals (including BART stations, light rail stations, significant bus stops, airports and commuter rail) – from the four directions surrounding each station.</li> <li>• Provide access to and through the major central business districts of the region or sub region.</li> <li>• Establish connections to regionally significant activity centers, including selected commercial districts, universities and community colleges, hospitals, regional parks, and recreational venues.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Regional Connections</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Selected connections across county lines.</li> <li>• Selected connections across barriers created by the regional transportation system (e.g., freeways, interchanges, railroads) and natural barriers (e.g., rivers, creeks and bays.)</li> <li>• Within current or planned Priority Development Areas (PDAs)</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Regional Routes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• San Francisco Bay Trail.</li> <li>• Other regional bicycle routes that serve multiple jurisdictions or connect to adjoining regions (e.g., Iron Horse Trail, Pacific Coast Bikeway, SMART corridor).</li> </ul>
--

**County Funding Targets**

Under New Act Cycle 1, \$19.5 million is available for the projects on the Regional Bikeway Network. Table 6 shows the distribution per county to program bicycle projects, based on a formula and adjusted to reflect funds owed to counties from the previous cycle of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. Details follow below:

**Table 6**  
**Regional Bicycle Program (RBP) Cycle 1 Fund Distribution**  
**(thousands \$)**

<b>County</b>	<b>CMAQ Funds</b>
Alameda	\$3,836
Contra Costa	\$2,367
Marin	\$1,649
Napa	\$605
San Francisco	\$1,368
San Mateo	\$1,739
Santa Clara	\$4,638
Solano	\$1,349
Sonoma	\$1,949
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$19,500</b>

The performance based formula in Table 7 was developed in conjunction with the Regional Bicycle Working Group, P&D Working Group and the CMAs. The formula is comprised of the following factors:

**Table 7 Formula for Regional Bicycle Program**

<b>Weight</b>	<b>Factor</b>
25%	Costs of bikeway network
25%	Miles of bikeways
50%	Population share

Adjustment to Reconcile Population Share Guarantees from MTC Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program under SAFETEA-LU

The Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Program, guided by the *Transportation 2030 Plan* and funded under SAFETEA-LU, included \$32 million over six years divided up into two portions: 25% of the total funds towards a regionally competitive program (\$8 million) and the remaining 75% of the funds designated to the counties (\$24 million) based on their population share. All of these funds have been programmed. MTC Resolutions 3615, 3644 and 3625 call for all counties to receive their population share of the regional share (\$8 million) over twelve years. Due to the program's competitive nature, the mix of projects selected under the regional program resulted in over-programming to three counties by a total of \$1.8 million more than their population shares and under-programming to the remaining counties relative to their population shares.

Counties will be credited and debited their share from the previous program in the New Act bicycle program. \$1.8 million will be split between Cycle 1 and 2 off the top and be used to repay each of the six counties the amount it was under funded in the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program. A total of \$919 thousand will be deducted from Cycle 1; the remaining \$18.5 million would be allocated to each county by the formula adopted for the new Regional Bicycle Program.

## **County Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)**

### **General Program Information**

For the past ten years, the Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) program has served as one of the Bay Area's primary tools for fostering smart growth. By promoting compact, mixed-use development in existing communities, smart growth aims to accommodate a growing population by providing housing options, and reduced automobile dependency, while protecting open space and agricultural resources.

In September 2009, staff presented several recommendations to MTC's Planning Committee for the next TLC funding cycle. These recommendations were based on (1) the results of a program evaluation beginning in summer 2007, which included a review of completed TLC Planning, Housing Incentive Program (HIP), and the TLC Capital grants, and (2) a white paper completed by Reconnecting America's Center for Transit Oriented Development (CTOD). The white paper detailed various options and strategies for financing transit-oriented development in the Bay Area, and made several recommendations for revising the TLC program, including creating a flexible financing program that responds to different market conditions within the region.

The four elements for the regional TLC program framework approved by the Planning Committee include:

1. Incentivize development in Priority Development Areas (PDA)
2. Increase maximum grant size to \$6 million, no grant minimum.
3. Expand eligible program categories
4. Establish Regional/County shares – 2/3 regional, 1/3 local

### **County Funding Targets**

As mentioned above, MTC's Planning Committee approved 2/3 of the funds to be administered through the regional TLC Program, and 1/3 to be administered through the county programs. For Cycle 1, in December 2009, the Commission approved a total of \$85 million for the TLC program. \$56.7 million will be allocated to the region (2/3), while \$28.3 million will be allocated to the counties (1/3) based on population. The County TLC fund distribution to the county congestion management is shown in Table 8.

**Table 8: County TLC Fund Distribution**

(\$ in thousands)

Estimated Cost of Program	2007 Population	Percentage	Fund Distribution
<b>Regional TLC Program</b>			
Competitive	6,958,473		\$56,667
<b>Regional TLC Program Subtotal</b>			<b>\$56,667</b>
<b>County TLC Program</b>			
Alameda	1,464,202	21.0%	\$5,962
Contra Costa	1,019,640	14.7%	\$4,152
Marin	248,096	3.6%	\$1,010
Napa	132,565	1.9%	\$540
San Francisco	764,976	11.0%	\$3,115
San Mateo	706,984	10.2%	\$2,878
Santa Clara	1,748,976	25.1%	\$7,121
Solano	408,599	5.9%	\$1,664
Sonoma	464,435	6.7%	\$1,891
<b>County TLC Program Subtotal</b>	<b>6,958,473</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>\$28,333</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>			<b>\$85,000</b>

**Project Eligibility Criteria**

Consistent with the Planning Committee action in September, county TLC funds must be invested in FOCUS PDAs. MTC staff is encouraging CMAs to use the Commission-approved scoring criteria or similar to it. CMAs have the flexibility to set their own grant limits consistent with the PDA block grant approach adopted by the Commission in December 2009.

In September 2009, the Commission approved a 20% match for both the regional and county TLC programs. Local match, in conjunction with the scoring criteria, was revisited at the January 2010 Planning Committee. The Commission is scheduled to act on both the final scoring criteria and match requirement at their January 27 meeting. A copy of the proposed criteria and accompanying memo will be available at your January 22 meeting.

# **MTC PROGRAM CONTACTS**

For further assistance, please contact the following MTC Staff:

General Cycle 1 Programming Requirements and CMA Block Grant Administration  
Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program:

**Craig Goldblatt**                      **cgoldblatt@mtc.ca.gov**                      **(510) 817-5837**

Pavement Management System and Federal-Aid Classification System Requirements:

**Sui Tan**                                      **stan@mtc.ca.gov**                                      **(510) 817-5844**

Regional Bicycle Program:

**Sean Co**                                      **sco@mtc.ca.gov**                                      **(510) 817-5748**

County Transportation for Livable Communities Program  
Priority Development Areas:

**Doug Johnson**                      **djohnson@mtc.ca.gov**                      **(510) 817-5846**

TIP Revisions and the Online FMS Application Process:

**Sri Srinivasan**                      **ssrinivasan@mtc.ca.gov**                      **(510) 817-5793**



490 Mendocino Avenue, Suite 206  
Santa Rosa, CA 95401  
[www.sctainfo.org](http://www.sctainfo.org)  
(707) 565-5373

To: Technical Advisory Committee Members  
From: John Maitland, Deputy Director Projects & Programming  
Date: January 22, 2010  
Subject: Measure M LSR Distribution Ratios and Allocation Estimates and LBT Distribution Ratios For Fiscal Year 2010-11

Attached are the Measure M Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) Program distribution ratios and estimated allocations for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11. The FY 2010-11 estimates are based on a projected flat growth rate for sales tax revenues as compared to actual revenues collected over the last 12 months. Sales tax revenues for the first and second quarters for FY 2009-10 are within +1.6% of budgeted sales tax revenues. Also attached are the Local Bus Transit (LBT) distribution ratios for FY 2010-11.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 565-5377 or [jmaitla1@sctainfo.org](mailto:jmaitla1@sctainfo.org).

Board of Directors

◆ Mike Kerns, Chair, Sonoma County ◆ Jake Mackenzie, Vice Chair, Rohnert Park ◆  
◆ Valerie Brown, Sonoma County ◆ Pat Gilardi, Cotati ◆ David Glass, Petaluma ◆ Sarah Gurney, Sebastopol ◆ Paul Kelley, Sonoma County ◆  
◆ Mike McGuire, Healdsburg ◆ Carol Russell, Cloverdale ◆ Sam Salmon, Windsor ◆ Laurie Gallian, Sonoma ◆ Gary Wysocky, Santa Rosa ◆

# Measure M Local Bus Transit (LBT) Program Distribution Ratios

FY 2010/11

## Population As of January 1, 2009

Area	Population <sup>1</sup>	% Population
Cloverdale	8,595	1.7662%
Cotati	7,409	1.5225%
<b>Healdsburg</b>	<b>11,782</b>	<b>2.4211%</b>
<b>Petaluma</b>	<b>57,739</b>	<b>11.8651%</b>
Rohnert Park	43,020	8.8404%
<b>Santa Rosa</b>	<b>161,496</b>	<b>33.1866%</b>
Sebastopol	7,734	1.5893%
Sonoma	9,970	2.0488%
Windsor	26,676	5.4818%
<b>County</b>	<b>152,209</b>	<b>31.2782%</b> <sup>2</sup>
<b>Total</b>	<b>486,630</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance - January 1, 2009 - Based on published population by entity.

<sup>2</sup> See below for adjusted calculation for TDA formula

Local Bus Transit (LBT) Program Distribution Ratios For FY2010/11		
Distribution to Transit Operators based on TDA Population Percentages Above		
Healdsburg	11,782	2.4211%
Petaluma	57,739	11.8651%
Santa Rosa	161,496	33.1866%
County	255,613	52.5272%
<b>Total</b>	<b>486,630</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>

**Transit Program Funding - Distribution Ratios for FY2010/11**

Index Code	Project Code	Measure M Project	Percentage Share <sup>3</sup>	Vendor #	Sub Object
793505	M50014	Healdsburg	2.42114131886649%	032584	8010
793505	M50013	Petaluma	11.86507202597460%	002887	8010
793505	M50012	Santa Rosa	33.18660995006470%	026410	8010
793505	M50011	Sonoma County	52.52717670509420%	Split 75% to Index 292169, and 25% to Index 292268	2903
			<u>100.00000000000000%</u>		

<sup>3</sup>Distribution to Transit Operators based on TDA Population Percentages (California Department of Finance - January 1, 2009 - Based on published population by entity).

**FY08/09 Measure M Local Street Rehabilitation (LSR) Program Distribution Ratios**  
**FY 2010/11**

**Population As of January 1, 2009**

Jurisdiction	Population <sup>1</sup>	Percent	50%
Cloverdale	8,595	1.77%	0.88%
Cotati	7,409	1.52%	0.76%
Healdsburg	11,782	2.42%	1.21%
Petaluma	57,739	11.87%	5.93%
Rohnert Park	43,020	8.84%	4.42%
Santa Rosa	161,496	33.19%	16.59%
Sebastopol	7,734	1.59%	0.79%
Sonoma	9,970	2.05%	1.02%
Windsor	26,676	5.48%	2.74%
County	152,209	31.28%	15.64%
	<b>486,630</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>50.00%</b>

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance - January 1, 2009 - Based on published population by entity.

**Road Mileage (Center Line Miles)**

Jurisdiction	Center Line Miles	Percent Center Line Miles	50%
Cloverdale	31.36	1.32%	0.66%
Cotati	22.00	0.92%	0.46%
Healdsburg	43.30	1.82%	0.91%
Petaluma	171.00	7.19%	3.59%
Rohnert Park	88.89	3.74%	1.87%
Santa Rosa	497.55	20.91%	10.45%
Sebastopol	23.80	1.00%	0.50%
Sonoma	32.90	1.38%	0.69%
Windsor	84.42	3.55%	1.77%
County	1,384.62	58.18%	29.09%
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,379.84</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>50.00%</b>

**Local Street and Road Rehabilitation (LSR) Program Distribution Ratios**  
**Combined Population / Road Mile Formula (50/50 Split)**  
**As of January 2010 for FY2010/11 Distributions**

Jurisdiction	50/50 Split Percent Share
Cloverdale	1.54%
Cotati	1.22%
Healdsburg	2.12%
Petaluma	9.53%
Rohnert Park	6.29%
Santa Rosa	27.05%
Sebastopol	1.29%
Sonoma	1.72%
Windsor	4.51%
County	44.73%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

**Population As of January 1, 2009**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Population<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>50%</b>
Cloverdale	8,595	1.7662%	0.8831144812%
Cotati	7,409	1.5225%	0.7612559850%
Healdsburg	11,782	2.4211%	1.2105706594%
Petaluma	57,739	11.8651%	5.9325360130%
Rohnert Park	43,020	8.8404%	4.4201960422%
Santa Rosa	161,496	33.1866%	16.5933049750%
Sebastopol	7,734	1.5893%	0.7946489119%
Sonoma	9,970	2.0488%	1.0243922487%
Windsor	26,676	5.4818%	2.7408914370%
County	152,209	31.2782%	15.6390892465%
	<b>486,630</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	<b>50%</b>

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance - January 1, 2009 - Based on published population by entity.

**Road Mileage (Center Line Miles)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Center Line Miles</b>	<b>Percent Center Line Miles</b>	<b>50%</b>	
<b>Cloverdale</b>	<b>31.36</b>	<b>1.3177%</b>	<b>0.658867823%</b>	<b>Updated 9/15/09</b>
Cotati	22.00	0.9244%	0.462215947%	no change
Healdsburg	43.30	1.8195%	0.909725024%	no change
Petaluma	171.00	7.1854%	3.592678499%	no change
Rohnert Park	88.89	3.7351%	1.867562525%	no change
<b>Santa Rosa</b>	<b>497.55</b>	<b>20.9069%</b>	<b>10.453433844%</b>	<b>Updated 9/15/09</b>
Sebastopol	23.80	1.0001%	0.500033616%	no change
Sonoma	32.90	1.3824%	0.691222939%	no change
<b>Windsor</b>	<b>84.42</b>	<b>3.5473%</b>	<b>1.773648649%</b>	<b>Updated 9/15/09</b>
County	1,384.62	58.1812%	29.090611134%	no change
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,379.84</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>Updated 9/12/08</b>

**As of January 2010 fpr FY2010/11**

**Combined Population / Road Mile Formula (50/50 Split)**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>50/50 Split Percent Share</b>
Cloverdale	1.54198230427%
Cotati	1.22347193233%
Healdsburg	2.12029568296%
Petaluma	9.52521451238%
Rohnert Park	6.28775856738%
Santa Rosa	27.04673881932%
Sebastopol	1.29468252761%
Sonoma	1.71561518809%
Windsor	4.51454008567%
County	44.72970037997%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0000000000%</b>

## Measure M Allocation for LSR Fiscal Year 2010-11 Estimated Disbursements @ 3/31/2011

### Local Road Rehab Funding

			ALLOCATION AMOUNT	
Index Code	Project Code	Measure M Project	Revised Percentage Share*	Estimated 3/31/11
793208	M20001	Cloverdale	1.54198230427%	\$ 47,347.06
793208	M20002	Cotati	1.22347193233%	\$ 37,567.10
793208	M20003	Healdsburg	2.12029568296%	\$ 65,104.36
793208	M20004	Petaluma	9.52521451238%	\$ 292,474.77
793208	M20005	Rohnert Park	6.28775856738%	\$ 193,067.65
793208	M20006	Santa Rosa	27.04673881932%	\$ 830,478.81
793208	M20007	Sebastopol	1.29468252761%	\$ 39,753.64
793208	M20008	Sonoma	1.71561518809%	\$ 52,678.52
793208	M20009	Windsor	4.51454008567%	\$ 138,620.40
793208	M20010	Sonoma County	44.72970037997%	\$ 1,373,439.83
			<b>100.00000000000%</b>	<b>\$ 3,070,532.14</b>

Updated Percentage Share 1/13/2010 includes January 1, 2009 DOF population numbers.

\*Board of Equalization Actual Receipts - 2/26/09 to 1/14/10

LSR Deposits	Date Posted	Actual Receipts
AU0807337	2/19/2009	\$ 293,900.00
AU0808503	3/30/2009	\$ 264,870.46
AU0809103	4/15/2009	\$ 214,420.00
AU0810205	5/20/2009	\$ 227,420.00
AU0811367	6/26/2009	\$ 261,999.16
AU0900472	7/15/2009	\$ 220,640.00
AU0901621	8/20/2009	\$ 289,720.00
AU0902796	9/28/2009	\$ 272,119.76
AU0903504	10/22/2009	\$ 230,520.00
AU0904598	11/18/2009	\$ 251,620.00
AU0905775	12/28/2009	\$ 305,822.76
AU0906299	1/14/2010	\$ 237,480.00
<b>TID BOE Receipts as of 1/14/10</b>		<b>\$ 3,070,532.14</b>
Projected Total Growth		\$ -
<b>Total Estimated for 3/31/11**</b>		<b>\$ 3,070,532.14</b>

\*\*Estimate is based on actual revenues collected with a flat growth rate.

<b>Total Measure M FY09/10 Final LSR Budget***</b>	<b>\$ 3,054,035.00</b>
--	------------------------

\*\*\*Approved FY09/10 Final Measure M Budget reflects reduced revenue.

## Population As of January 1, 2009

Jurisdiction	Population <sup>1</sup>	Percent	50%
Cloverdale	8,595	1.7662%	0.8831144812%
Cotati	7,409	1.5225%	0.7612559850%
Healdsburg	11,782	2.4211%	1.2105706594%
Petaluma	57,739	11.8651%	5.9325360130%
Rohnert Park	43,020	8.8404%	4.4201960422%
Santa Rosa	161,496	33.1866%	16.5933049750%
Sebastopol	7,734	1.5893%	0.7946489119%
Sonoma	9,970	2.0488%	1.0243922487%
Windsor	26,676	5.4818%	2.7408914370%
County	152,209	31.2782%	15.6390892465%
	486,630	100.0000%	50%

<sup>1</sup> California Department of Finance - January 1, 2009 - Based on published population by entity.

## Road Mileage (Center Line Miles)

Jurisdiction	Center Line Miles	Percent Center Line Miles	50%
<b>Cloverdale</b>	<b>31.36</b>	<b>1.3177%</b>	<b>0.658867823%</b> Updated 9/15/09
Cotati	22.00	0.9244%	0.462215947% no change
Healdsburg	43.30	1.8195%	0.909725024% no change
Petaluma	171.00	7.1854%	3.592678499% no change
Rohnert Park	88.89	3.7351%	1.867562525% no change
<b>Santa Rosa</b>	<b>497.55</b>	<b>20.9069%</b>	<b>10.453433844%</b> Updated 9/15/09
Sebastopol	23.80	1.0001%	0.500033616% no change
Sonoma	32.90	1.3824%	0.691222939% no change
<b>Windsor</b>	<b>84.42</b>	<b>3.5473%</b>	<b>1.773648649%</b> Updated 9/15/09
County	1,384.62	58.1812%	29.090611134% no change
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,379.84</b>	<b>100.0000%</b>	<b>50%</b> Updated 9/12/09

Road Mileage (Center Line Miles) based on FY08/09 Annual Reporting Letter Submissions.

## As of January 2010 for FY10/11

## Combined Population / Road Mile Formula (50/50 Split)

Jurisdiction	50/50 Split Percent Share
Cloverdale	1.54198230427%
Cotati	1.22347193233%
Healdsburg	2.12029568296%
Petaluma	9.52521451238%
Rohnert Park	6.28775856738%
Santa Rosa	27.04673881932%
Sebastopol	1.29468252761%
Sonoma	1.71561518809%
Windsor	4.51454008567%
County	44.72970037997%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0000000000%</b>

---

## Staff Report

**To: SCTA - Technical Advisory Committee**

**From: Seana L. S. Gause, Program/Project Analyst**

**Item: 9.2 Proposed Audit of Measure M Recipients**

**Date: January 28, 2010**

---

**Issue:**

Shall the SCTA initiate random audits of Measure M recipients?

**Background:**

Of the six non-administration programs within Measure M, two are considered apportionment programs in that the funds are apportioned to designated sponsors within the program based on a formula. The expenditure plan does not call for specific projects within these programs. Local jurisdictions administer these funds and report on Measure M spending by submitting annual reporting letters. For the Local Bus Transit program, operators are required to also submit annual audits, however, no audits have yet been required for the Local Streets and Roads program.

The four remaining programs are considered project programs, in that the Measure M Expenditure Plan calls for one or more specific projects within the program. The Highway 101 projects are managed within SCTA and are subject to annual audits performed on SCTA records. In the three remaining programs (Local Streets Projects, Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects and Rail) project sponsors are required to submit annual reporting letters to the SCTA, however, no accounting audits of these programs have yet been conducted by SCTA.

As was established in the first Strategic Plan for Measure M, SCTA has always intended to perform random sample audits of the Measure M projects and maintenance programs (*2005 Strategic Plan, p7*). Since four full years have passed since the initiation of sales tax collection and distribution, adequate data will be available for auditing purposes.

An accounting firm such as Piseni & Brinker could be retained to conduct random audits of Measure M recipients. Such an audit would need to be paid for from the administration category of Measure M funds collected. As such, limiting the number of audits performed in a given year, but conducting audits for several years in a row, should provide the necessary level of review for all programs and project sponsors. Given that M recipients do not all receive the same types or amounts of funding (not all jurisdictions have LSP projects, for example), an audit conducted of Measure M recipients should review all programs where funds were received.

*[Insert recommendation of CAC here](#)*

**Policy Impacts:**

None, as this is within policy established in the Measure M Strategic Plan.

**Fiscal Impacts:**

Funds to accomplish an audit would need to be used from the administration category of Measure M dollars collected. Limiting the number of M recipients audited in a given year should allow for sufficient funds to be available each fiscal year.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the TAC consider forwarding a recommendation to the SCTA Board to conduct audits of two Measure M recipients per year for four consecutive years. The need for further audits could be assessed at the end of the first four years.

---

## Staff Report

**To: SCTA - Technical Advisory Committee**

**From: Seana L. S. Gause, Program/Project Analyst**

**Item: 9.3 Measure M Bicycle/Pedestrian Project – Copeland Creek Trail**

**Date: January 28, 2010**

---

**Issue:**

Shall the TAC recommend action to the SCTA Board regarding the remaining balance (\$52,771.86) of an appropriation for the Copeland Creek Trail Measure M bike/ped project?

**Background:**

The 2009 Measure M Strategic Plan identifies methods for the treatment of unspent Measure M funds allocated to specific projects in Policy 4.18. The policy identifies once funds become available for reallocation under one of the accepted criteria, there are three requirements for the treatment of the funds:

- Available funds can be reallocated only to projects within the same program category as the original listed project
- Reallocation of funds within a program category will be based first on project readiness and availability of matching funds. The next tier of criteria will include impact on congestion, cost-effectiveness, ranking in the Comprehensive Transportation Plan, and schedule adherence as determined by the SCTA
- An existing project within a program category, that needs additional funding not as a result of scope change, has priority over a newly proposed project but must maintain the match level from other funding sources required in the original Measure M expenditure Plan

Measure M, as passed by the voters cannot be changed without a vote of the people. However, the SCTA is vested with the authority to amend the expenditure plan up to once a year to account for unexpected revenues, or take into consideration unforeseen circumstances.

The Technical Advisory Committee recommended and the SCTA board recently approved a list of projects to be submitted for Transportation Enhancement funds, including a project in Rohnert Park along the Copeland Creek bike trail. The project limits for the proposed TE project do not overlap with the original Measure M project limits.

**Policy Impacts:****Fiscal Impacts:****Staff Recommendation:**