



CALL AND NOTICE

For additional information, please call:
Fred Castro, (510) 464 7913

Agenda and attachments available at:
www.abag.ca.gov

CALL AND NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF BAY AREA GOVERNMENTS

As Vice Chair of the Administrative Committee of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), I am calling a special meeting of the ABAG Administrative Committee as follows:

Friday, February 8, 2013, 9:30 AM

Special Meeting with the MTC Planning Committee

MetroCenter, 101—8th Street, Auditorium, Oakland, California

The business to be transacted will include:

Approval of Minutes of January 11, 2013

ABAG Administrative Committee/MTC Planning Committee ACTION

Air Quality Conformity Redetermination

MTC Planning Committee ACTION

Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) and Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Planning Programs

MTC Planning Committee ACTION

The ABAG Administrative Committee may act on any item on the agenda.

Call and Notice
Administrative Committee
February 8, 2013
2

Members of the public shall be provided an opportunity to directly address the ABAG Administrative Committee concerning any item described in this notice before consideration of that item.

Agendas and materials will be posted and distributed for this meeting by ABAG staff in the normal course of business.



Julie Plerce
Vice Chair, Administrative Committee

February 4, 2013
Date



AGENDA

ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEE

Friday, February 8, 2013, 9:30 AM

Special Meeting with the MTC Planning Committee

Location

MetroCenter, 101—8th Street, Auditorium, Oakland, CA

For additional information, please call:
Fred Castro, (510) 464 7913

Agenda and attachments available at:
www.abag.ca.gov

The ABAG Administrative Committee may act on any item on this agenda.

1. **Call to Order/Confirm Quorum**
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Compensation Announcement**
4. **Consent Calendar**

A. Approval of Minutes of January 11, 2013

ABAG Administrative Committee/MTC Planning Committee ACTION

Attachment: Minutes of January 11, 2013

B. Air Quality Conformity Redetermination

MTC Planning Committee ACTION

Carolyn Clevenger, MTC. MTC must accommodate the transportation conformity requirements for the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards ("2008 ozone NAAQS") by July 20, 2013. Staff will request the Committee forward the Air Quality Conformity Redetermination to the Commission for approval.

Attachment: Air Quality Conformity Redetermination

5. Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) and Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Planning Programs

MTC Planning Committee ACTION

Ken Kirkey, MTC, and Miriam Chion, ABAG, will provide funding recommendations for the Regional PDA and PCA Planning Programs.

Attachment: PDA PCA Planning Program Recommendations

6. Public Comment / Other Business / Adjournment

Information

Next Meeting:

Friday, March 8, 2013 at 9:30 a.m.

Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium

101 8th Street, Oakland, CA 94607



Ezra Rapport
Secretary-Treasurer

February 4, 2013

Date



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
EMAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair
San Mateo County

Amy Rein Worth, Vice Chair
Cities of Contra Costa County

Alicia C. Aguirre
Cities of San Mateo County

Tom Azumbrado
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

David Campos
City and County of San Francisco

Dave Cortese
Santa Clara County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacopini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Scott Haggerty
Alameda County

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Mark Luce
Association of Bay Area Governments

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Joe Pirzynski
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jean Quan
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Scott Wiener
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

MTC PLANNING COMMITTEE
January 11, 2013
MINUTES

ATTENDANCE

Chair Sperring called the MTC Planning Committee meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Planning Committee members in attendance were: Commissioners Haggerty, Halsted, Liccardo, Mackenzie, Pirzynski, and Quan. Commission Vice-Chair Rein-Worth was present in her ex-officio voting member capacity. Other Commissioners present as ad hoc non-voting members of the Committee were Bates, Cortese, and Wiener.

ABAG Administrative Committee members in attendance were: Luce, Cortese, Haggerty, Liccardo, Pierce, and Sperring.

CONSENT CALENDAR: a) Minutes of December 14, 2012

Commissioner Halsted moved approval of the Consent Calendar, Commissioner Haggerty seconded. ABAG Administrative Committee Councilmember Pierce moved approval, Supervisor Gioia seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

REGIONAL PROSPERITY PLAN: Assignment of Sub-Grant Project Selection and Funding Solicitation to the Plan Steering Committee

Mr. Doug Johnson, accompanied by Ms. Sailaja Kurella, ABAG, stated that MTC and ABAG have formed the following committees and working groups to implement the Prosperity Plan, and engage local and regional stakeholders in developing the recommendations, consistent with MTC's grant application and approved work plan: 1) Economic Prosperity Working Group; 2) Housing Working Group, 3) Equity Collaborative; and 4) Plan Steering Committee.

He noted that while the working groups will develop principles for the sub-grants and funding solicitations, the Steering Committee will select the projects and recommend them to MTC for approval.

In conclusion, Mr. Johnson recommended that the MTC Planning Committee and the ABAG Administrative Committee delegate sub-grant project selection and funding solicitations for the Prosperity Plan to the Plan Steering Committee. Recommendations from the Steering Committee would be presented to MTC's Administration Committee for approval of funding agreements with project sponsors.

Commissioner Halsted moved approval of staff's recommendation, Commissioner Rein-Worth seconded. ABAG Administrative Committee Councilmember Pierce moved approval, Supervisor Gioia seconded. Motion passed by both committees unanimously.

**REGIONAL PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT ARE PLANNING (PDA) PROGRAM
AND THE TRANSIT ORIENTED AFFORDABLE HOUSING (TOAH) FUND**

Ms. Miriam Chion, ABAG, provided an overview of the efforts that have supported the Regional PDA Planning Program. She summarized MTC and ABAG's experience with administering the PDA Planning Grant Program, which seeks to intensify land uses in and around transit stations and along corridors in PDAs throughout the region. She stated that the program supports local jurisdictions' efforts to do comprehensive planning and supports the development of the programmatic EIRs to simplify the development process. Lastly, Ms. Chion mentioned that there have been 52 PDA Planning Grants awarded throughout the nine Bay Area counties encompassing planning capacity for 44,000 housing units and 80,000 new jobs.

Mr. Ken Kirkey described the Downtown San Leandro transit oriented development strategy, which served as a model for the program. He then summarized the second major implementation program, Smart Growth Technical Assistance, which awards up to \$60,000 in consultant assistance to jurisdictions on a competitive basis to complete discrete short-term projects to address specific PDA implementation challenges. Such projects include parking and development feasibility.

Mr. Kirkey introduced Mr. Brian Prater, TOAH Fund Manager through LIIF, who summarized the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund. He noted that MTC provided \$10 million as a seed investment and an additional \$40 million was provided by private capital from community development financial institutions, foundations, and private banks to create a \$50 million revolving loan fund for affordable housing projects near transit in PDAs throughout the region.

Mr. Prater described the TOAH fund priorities and stated that 85% of fund capital is targeted to support the creation and preservation of affordable housing. Up to 15% of fund capital may be used to support community facilities, and the fund is committed to deploying capital in Priority Development Areas in all nine Bay Area counties. The types of loans available through TOAH include: redevelopment, acquisition, construction bridge, construction-to-mini-permanent, and leveraged loans. He noted that the fund has closed five loans totaling \$20 million, and an additional four loans totaling \$19 million are expected to be approved within the next three months. The remaining funding pipeline includes an additional 13 projects.

In conclusion, he stated that while funds will return to TOAH as loans are repaid, the larger gap in financing for affordable housing/mixed use in today's environment is in construction and permanent financing.

Committee comments:

- Supervisor Gioia asked if there is a comprehensive set of guidelines that applicants look at, and where could they be found regards to the TOAH fund that exists today. Mr. Prater stated that when the program was started they developed a website (www.Bayareatod.com) which contains information about the fund, guidelines, and profiles of all the projects completed.

- Commissioner Rein-Worth requested staff to amplify how the TOAH money is tied to milestones, and what can staff do to bring in more banks and foundations from around the country with this incredible challenge in California given land costs and population pressures. Mr. Prater stated that when a developer brings a potential project to the TOAH fund, there is a credit committee that looks at the transaction and asks for milestones, and dates of when they expect to hit those milestones. He noted that it is an actively managed process. He also stated that the Ford Foundation and Living Cities and their members are very pleased with how the TOAH funds have been allocated and many other entities will be willing to participate as the fund grows further.
- Commissioner Bates expressed his interest in looking into the ability to acquire sites that would be land-banked for the opportunity for low-income housing. He also asked whether additional investment in TOAH would be leveraged as with the first investment. Mr. Prater believes there will be interest from banks, current TOAH investors, and potentially some additional foundation support. Mr. Kirkey noted that these are transportation dollars and there is a limit in terms of how much money can be exchanged for this purpose.
- Commissioner Quan asked what the criteria are for fund distribution. Mr. Prater stated that if the projects are ready to go, they will be prioritized assuming they meet all the programmatic criteria that are mentioned in the Business Plan. He stated that every project has to be in a PDA, and has a high level of transit accessibility.
- Commissioner Quan noted that many of the affordable housing staffing was cut with the loss of redevelopment funding, and asked if this will keep cities from finishing their existing planning grants. Mr. Kirkey stated that in terms of the PDA planning grants underway in Oakland, staff recently worked with Mr. Fred Blackwell to extend those grant deadlines. He also noted staff had been looking at the potential of using some of the regional PDA planning funding in cities that are taking on a lot of growth to fund planner assistance that could work on a specific set of objectives to implement the Plan.
- Commissioner Liccardo asked what a typical source of local funding would be swapped in order to move forward with housing investments. Mr. Steve Heminger stated that the first big source of funds was the original Santa Clara County sales tax. He stated that staff is in search of another partner like that because in recent years staff has been doing fairly small deals with individual agencies on individual projects and what is really needed is something on the scale of \$25 - \$100 million so there will be funds available for all sorts of projects.
- Commissioner Liccardo asked whether TOAH/LIIF coordinated with local housing trust funds in counties like Santa Clara County in order to identify the most efficient way to use the dollars to build units. Mr. Prater stated that TOAH requires that the developers get a letter of local support from all of the local governmental entities involved in the proposed development.
- Commissioner Liccardo expressed concern with what MTC is doing and hopes that regionally or at the state level, there will be a means through tax increment financing, or housing impact fees where staff can start to come up with a real source of affordable housing commensurate for the need. MTC is spending a lot of time trying to figure out how to exchange federal dollars that are targeted for transportation to serve housing, child

care, retail at the ground floor, etc. He noted that he hopes that there will be a state and regional solution that will take MTC transportation funding out of the housing business.

- Supervisor Luce asked what the motivations are for the banks to participate. Mr. Prater stated that the banks benefit from the Federal Reinvestment Act, as they receive a return on their investment including interest.
- Commissioner Weiner agreed with Commissioner Liccardo's comments about whether or not MTC is the best agency to deal with the affordable housing issue, he sees where transit money gets reallocated to other uses. He mentioned that he is a big supporter of investment in affordable housing, but is very skeptical of efforts to take transit money to use for other purposes even if they are important goals.

Mr. Heminger stated that housing can be a very effective transportation strategy and in this region, some transit projects have not been all that effective because of the lack of alignment with appropriate levels of housing development. MTC is trying to deal with the transportation problems by addressing the housing problem.

Public comment:

- Jeff Hobson, Transform, stated that all three points that have been discussed today are excellent transportation investments – not housing investments that don't do anything for transportation. He stated that MTC's investments in land use linkages are really some of MTC's most important. It's vital to make sure that the \$20 million that did go to the CMAs, that staff provide some really good help to them to make sure that they administer that windfall so that it's as effective as the regional programs.
- Kate White, San Francisco Foundation, stated that they are investing in the TOAH fund through their investment pool. She commented on oversight of the funds, and whether MTC is the appropriate agency to be investing into this fund. She stated that there is an Oversight Committee that makes sure that the money is spent very well, highest and best use, and getting lots of leverage. She also stated that MTC is the appropriate agency to invest in this fund because they have tremendous experience managing very complicated infrastructure investments, and financial programs.

OTHER BUSINESS/PUBLIC COMMENT

There being no other business, the meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m. The Committee's next meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 8, 2013 at 9:30 a.m. in the Lawrence D. Dahms Auditorium, Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter, Oakland, CA.



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
TEL 510.817.5700
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

Memorandum

TO: Planning Committee

DATE: February 1, 2013

FR: Executive Director

W.I.:

RE: Approval of Final Transportation 2035 Conformity Redetermination Analysis

In December, the Commission released the Draft Transportation 2035 Conformity Redetermination Analysis for a 30-day public review and comment period. The public comment period ended on January 14, 2013; no comments were received. Staff is requesting the Committee approve and refer to the Commission the Final Transportation 2035 Conformity Redetermination for approval at its February 27, 2013 meeting.

Background

On June 20, 2007, the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) strengthened the national ambient air quality standards for ground-level ozone. Following a lengthy litigation process, these updated standards, established as the 2008 ozone national ambient air quality standards (2008 ozone NAAQS), became effective July 20, 2012. Areas that do not meet the 2008 ozone NAAQS, including the Bay Area, are designated as nonattainment areas and must complete transportation conformity within one year of the effective date, or by **July 20, 2013**.

The nine-county San Francisco Bay Area region is designated by EPA as being in nonattainment for the 2008 ozone NAAQS and must show compliance with these new requirements by the July 20, 2013 deadline. Compliance would typically be completed through the transportation conformity process, which conforms the most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The current schedule for Plan Bay Area, the region's next RTP, calls for adoption in June 2013.

The transportation conformity rule designated by EPA allows for the reliance on the previous regional emissions analysis for conformity redeterminations. To ensure that MTC will be in compliance with the 2008 ozone NAAQS by July 20, 2013, and to ensure that any delays to the RTP schedule do not put the region at risk of a lapse in conformity, MTC has prepared a conformity redetermination using the latest conformity analysis for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program. A full new conformity analysis will be completed later this year concurrent with the adoption of Plan Bay Area and the next TIP.

Attached for your information is the Final Transportation 2035 Conformity Redetermination Analysis. No changes were made to the Draft approved by this Committee in December for release for the public review and comment period. In addition, staff has reviewed the analysis with the Air Quality Conformity Task Force in December and January, and no additional comments were received.

Staff requests the Committee approve and refer the Final Transportation 2035 Conformity Redetermination Analysis to the Commission for approval at its February 27, 2013 meeting.



Steve Heminger

SH:cc
Attachment

J:\COMMITTE\Planning Committee\2013\February\Conformity_Memo_2012013.doc

**TRANSPORTATION-AIR QUALITY CONFORMITY ANALYSIS
FOR THE
TRANSPORTATION 2035 PLAN &
2011 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM**

Draft: August 6, 2010

Final: October 27, 2010

Draft Redetermination: December 14, 2012

Final Redetermination: February 1, 2013



**METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION**

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-4700
PHONE 510.817.5700
TTY/TDD 510.817.5769
FAX 510.817.5848
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

MTC Project Staff

Ken Kirkey
Director, Planning

Carolyn Clevenger
Ashley Nguyen
Project Managers

Planning & Programming and Allocations Staff

Harold Brazil
Brenda Dix
Ben Espinoza
Stefanie Hom
Shimon Israel
Ross McKeown
David Ory
Rupinder Singh
Sri Srinivasan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction	1
Purpose of Conformity Analysis	1
Status of Regional Transportation Plan.....	2
Status of Transportation Improvement Program	3
II. Bay Area Air Pollutant Designations	4
National 1-Hour Ozone Standard	4
National 8-Hour Ozone Standard	4
National 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Standard	6
National PM _{2.5} Standard	6
Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets and Conformity Tests	7
III. Conformity Analysis & Results	8
Approach to Conformity Analysis	8
Consultation Process	9
Comparison of Motor Vehicle Emissions To Budgets	9
Build/No Build Emissions Test for PM _{2.5}	12
IV. Transportation Control Measures	13
History of Transportation Control Measures.....	13
Status of Transportation Control Measures.....	16
V. Response to Public Comments	19
VI. Conformity Findings	21

APPENDICES

- A: List of Projects in the Transportation 2035 Plan
- B: List of Projects in the 2011 Transportation Improvement Program
- C: Travel Forecasting Assumptions
- D: List of Transportation Control Measures (TCM) Projects
- E: Comments on the Draft Conformity Analysis (*Forthcoming*)
- F: Methodology for Bay Area Conformity Determinations

LIST OF TABLES

- 1: VOC and NO_x Emissions Budgets from 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan
- 2: Vehicle Activity Forecasts
- 3A: Emission Budget Comparisons for Ozone Precursors
- 3B: Emission Budget Comparisons for Carbon Monoxide
- 4: Vehicle Activity Forecasts for PM_{2.5} Build/No Build Test
- 5: Emissions Comparison for Build/No Build Test for PM_{2.5}
- 6: Emissions Reductions for Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) A – E
- 7: Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the State Implementation Plan
- 8: Federal Transportation Control Measures for Ozone (TCMs A – E)

I. INTRODUCTION

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) prepares a transportation air quality conformity analysis when MTC amends or updates its long-range regional transportation plan (RTP), or adds or deletes regionally significant, non-exempt projects into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

The purpose of this conformity analysis is to conform the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program in accordance with the latest U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) transportation conformity regulations and the Bay Area Conformity State Implementation Plan (Conformity SIP), which is also known as the Bay Area Air Quality Conformity Protocol (MTC Resolution No. 3757). This conformity analysis addresses the national 8-hour ozone standard, national carbon monoxide standard, and for the first-time, the national 24-hour fine particulate matter (PM_{2.5}) standard.

This report explains the basis for the conformity analysis and provides the results used by MTC to make a positive conformity finding on the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 TIP.

Purpose of Conformity Analysis

The Federal Clean Air Act, as amended in 1990 (CAAA) outlines requirements for ensuring that federal transportation plans, programs and projects are consistent with (“conform to”) the purpose of the State Implementation Plan (SIP). Conformity to the purpose of the SIP means that transportation activities will not cause new air quality violations, worsen existing violations, or delay timely attainment of the relevant national ambient air quality standards. A conformity finding demonstrates that the total emissions projected for a RTP or TIP are within the emissions limits (“budgets”) established by the SIP, and that transportation control measures (TCMs) are implemented in a timely fashion.

Conformity requirements apply in all nonattainment and maintenance areas for transportation-related criteria pollutants and precursor. For the Bay Area, the criteria pollutants to be addressed are ground-level ozone, carbon monoxide, and PM_{2.5}; and the precursor pollutants to be addressed include volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) for ozone and NO_x for PM_{2.5}. EPA’s most recent revisions to its transportation conformity regulations to implement the 1990 Federal Clean Air Act section 175A were published in the Federal Register on March 14, 2012¹.

Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as MTC are required to follow these regulations, and any other procedures and criteria contained in the EPA-approved Conformity SIP (Transportation Air Quality Conformity Protocol) for the Bay Area. In the Bay Area,

¹ The current version of the regulations is available on EPA’s Transportation Conformity website at <http://www.epa.gov/otaq/stateresources/transconf/regs/420b12013.pdf>.

procedures were first adopted in September 1994 to comply with the 1990 CAAA. Four subsequent amendments to the transportation conformity procedures in August 1995, November 1995, August 1997, and July 2006 have been adopted by the three co-lead agencies (MTC, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), and Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)). MTC Resolution 3757 represents the latest San Francisco Bay Area Transportation Air Quality Conformity Protocol adopted by the three agencies in July 2006. Acting on behalf of the three agencies, the BAAQMD submitted this latest Protocol to California Air Resources Board (CARB) as a revision to the Bay Area Conformity SIP. CARB approved this proposed revision to the Bay Area's Conformity SIP in December 2006, and transmitted it to EPA for final action. EPA approved the Bay Area Conformity SIP in December 2007 (40 CFR Part 52).

These regulations and resolutions state in part that, MTC cannot approve any transportation plan, program or project unless these activities conform to the purpose of the federal air quality plan (officially titled the State Implementation Plan, or SIP). "Transportation plan" refers to the RTP. "Program" refers to the TIP, which is a financially realistic set of highway and transit projects to be funded over the next four years. A "transportation project" is any highway or transit improvement, which is included in the RTP and TIP and requires funding or approval from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Conformity regulations also affect regionally significant non-federally funded projects which must be included in a conforming transportation plan and program.

Status of Regional Transportation Plan

A Regional Transportation Plan, or RTP, is a long-range plan which includes both long-range and short-range strategies/actions that lead to the development of an integrated multimodal transportation system to facilitate the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in addressing current and future transportation demand. By federal law, the RTP covers a minimum planning horizon of 20 years and is updated every four years in areas which do not meet federal air quality standards. The RTP is financially constrained to the projected transportation revenues that will be reasonably available to the region over the planning period. Once adopted, the RTP guides the development of the TIP for the region.

The latest conforming RTP is the *Transportation 2035 Plan: Change in Motion*. The Transportation 2035 Plan represents a strategic investment plan to improve asset condition and system performance for Bay Area travelers over the next 25 years and includes a set of highway, transit, local roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian projects identified through regional and local transportation planning processes. As required by federal and state planning regulations, the long-range plan is financially constrained, identifying investments that are funded within the \$218 billion 25-year revenue estimate.

The Commission adopted the Transportation 2035 Plan in April 2009 (MTC Resolution 3893). The FHWA and FTA approved MTC's conformity determination for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2009 Transportation Improvement Program/Amendment #09-

06 on May 29, 2009. The Transportation 2035 Plan was subsequently amended on May 25, 2010 via an administrative modification. This administrative modification did not trigger a new conformity determination because there are no changes to project scopes for projects previously identified in the plan and no additions of regionally significant, non-exempt projects to the plan.

This conformity analysis serves to re-conform the Transportation 2035 Plan, particularly with regards to its conformance with the national PM_{2.5} standard.

Refer to **Appendix A** for detailed project listing of projects/programs included in the proposed Transportation 2035 Plan. See MTC's Transportation 2035 Plan (April 2009) for full details about the plan².

Status of Transportation Improvement Program

The federally required Transportation Improvement Program, or TIP, is a comprehensive listing of Bay Area surface transportation projects that receive federal funds or are subject to a federally required action, or are considered regionally significant for air quality conformity purposes. MTC prepares and adopts the TIP every two years. The TIP must cover at least a four-year period and contain a priority list of projects grouped by year. The TIP is also financially constrained – meaning that the amount of funding programmed does not exceed the amount of funding reasonably expected to be available. Adoption of the TIP must be accompanied by an air quality conformity analysis and finding, and all projects included in the TIP must be derived from and/or be consistent with the RTP. Whenever a new RTP is adopted, a new air quality conformity analysis must be prepared for the TIP, to ensure consistency between the current Plan (RTP) and Program (TIP).

MTC prepared the 2011 TIP, which covers FY 2010-11 through FY 2013-14. The FHWA approved the 2011 TIP on December 14, 2010. The 2011 TIP does not include any new regionally significant projects beyond those included in the Transportation 2035 Plan. This conformity analysis serves to reconfirm the 2011 TIP and Transportation 2035 Plan.

Refer to **Appendix B** for detailed project listing of projects/programs in the 2011 TIP. Note that specific funding sources are identified in the TIP itself. See MTC's 2011 TIP for full details about the TIP.

² See MTC's *Transportation 2035 Plan: Change in Motion* (April 2009) at: http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/2035_plan/index.htm

II. BAY AREA AIR POLLUTANT DESIGNATIONS

National 1-Hour Ozone Standard

On November 6, 1991, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) designated the Bay Area as a moderate ozone non-attainment area. Based on “clean” air monitoring data from 1990 to 1993, the co-lead agencies—BAAQMD, MTC, and ABAG—determined that no ozone violations had occurred and requested the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to forward a redesignation request and an ozone maintenance plan to U.S. EPA.

On May 25, 1995, the Bay Area was classified as an ozone maintenance area, having attained the 1-hour national ozone standard for five years (1990-1994). However, on July 10, 1998 the U.S. EPA published a Notice of Final Rulemaking redesignating the Bay Area back to an ozone non-attainment (unclassified) area. This action was due to violations of the 1-hour standard that occurred during the summers of 1995 and 1996, and became final on August 10, 1998.

On October 31, 2003, U.S. EPA proposed a finding of attainment of the national 1-hour ozone standard for the Bay Area. The proposed finding was based on air quality monitoring data from the 2001, 2002, and 2003 ozone seasons. In April 2004, U.S. EPA made a final finding that the Bay Area had attained the national 1-hour ozone standard. Because of this finding, some of the elements of the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan, submitted to EPA to demonstrate attainment of the 1-hour standard, were suspended. The finding of attainment did not mean the Bay Area had been reclassified as an attainment area for the 1-hour standard. To be reclassified, the region would have had to submit a formal redesignation request to EPA, along with a maintenance plan showing how the region would continue to attain the standard for ten years. However, this redesignation request was no longer necessary upon the establishment of the new national 8-hour ozone standard.

National 8-Hour Ozone Standard

On April 15, 2004, EPA issued the first phase of the final implementation rule designating and classifying areas not meeting the federal 8-hour ozone standard. This phase of the implementation rule explained how EPA was classifying areas not meeting the national air quality standard for 8-hour ozone. It also established a process for transitioning from implementing the 1-hour standard for ozone to implementing the more protective 8-hour ozone standard. The rule also established attainment dates for the 8-hour standard and the timing of emissions reductions needed for attainment. The 8-hour designations and classifications took effect on June 15, 2004; and one year following this effective date, EPA revoked the 1-hour standard.

In July 1997, U.S. EPA revised the ozone standard, setting it to 0.08 parts per million in concentration-based form, specifically the 3-year average of the annual 4th highest daily maximum 8-hour ozone concentrations. In April 2004, EPA issued final designations for

attainment and non-attainment areas. The Bay Area monitoring stations recorded concentrations that exceeded the national 8-hour ozone standard for 2001, 2002 and 2003. In June 2004, EPA formally designated the Bay Area as a non-attainment area for national 8-hour ozone, and classified the region as “marginal” based on five classes of non-attainment areas for ozone, ranging from marginal to extreme. Marginal, non-attainment areas must attain the national 8-hour ozone standard by June 15, 2007.

On July 1, 2004, EPA published a final rule amending the transportation conformity rule to address the new national 8-hour ozone standard. The amended rule stated that Plans and TIPs in nonattainment areas must be found to conform against the new standard by one year after the effective date of designation – by June 15, 2005 for 8-hour ozone areas. Conformity for the 1-hour ozone standard will no longer apply in existing 1-hour ozone nonattainment and maintenance areas once the 1-hour ozone standard is revoked; this occurred on June 15, 2005. Furthermore, prior to 8-hour budgets being established, all areas with adequate or approved 1-hour motor vehicle emission budgets must use them to demonstrate conformity with the 8-hour ozone standard, unless it is determined through interagency consultation that using the interim emissions tests is more appropriate. The conformity finding in this report is based on the approved 1-hour motor vehicle emissions budget.

In March 2008, EPA lowered the national 8-hour ozone standard from 0.80 parts per million to 0.75 parts per million. On March 12, 2009, ARB submitted its recommendations for area designations for the revised national 8-hour ozone standard. These recommendations were based on ozone air quality data collected during 2006 through 2008. The ARB recommended that the Bay Area be designated as nonattainment for the national 8-hour ozone standard. EPA had one year to review the recommendations and were to notify states by November 12, 2009 if they planned to modify the state-recommended areas. EPA were to issue final designations by March 12, 2010 based on more recent monitoring data.

On January 6, 2010, the EPA extended the deadline for designating areas for the March 2008 national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for ground-level ozone. This was in light of EPA’s decision to reconsider the ground-level ozone standards set in 2008 because the Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, EPA’s panel of science advisors, found the ozone standards not as protective to the health and welfare of the public as recommended. Based on the scientific studies, EPA proposed to set different primary and secondary 8-hour ozone standards to protect public health.

EPA’s final rule designating nonattainment areas for the 2008 ozone NAAQS was published in the Federal Register on May 21, 2012 and is effective July 20, 2012. This rule established initial air quality designations and classifications for the 2008 ozone NAAQS for most areas in the United States, including areas of Indian country.

Concurrent with this designation rule, EPA released an additional final rule that established the approach for classifying nonattainment areas, set attainment deadlines, granted reclassification for selected nonattainment areas in California, and revoked the 1997 ozone standard for transportation conformity purposes. The grace period for showing conformity to

the 2008 O₃ standard was started by the May 21, 2012 (77 FR 30088) publication of designations for this standard. The grace period for completing these conformity analysis ends on July 20, 2013 and MTC will need to continue to include conformity to the 1997 ozone standard until the grace period is finished.

National 8-Hour Carbon Monoxide Standard

In April 1998, the Bay Area was redesignated to a “maintenance area” for the national 8-hour carbon monoxide (CO) standard, having demonstrated attainment of the standards. As a maintenance area, the region must assure continued attainment of the CO standard.

National PM_{2.5} Standard

In 1987, The EPA established a standard for particle pollution equal to or smaller than 10 micrometers in diameter. A decade later, the 1997 revision to the standard set the stage for change, when a separate standard was set for fine particulate matter, which are 2.5 micrometers in diameter and smaller. Citing the link between serious health problems and premature death in people with heart or lung disease, the 1997 revision ultimately distinguished and set forth regulation on particle pollutants known as particulate matter 2.5 (PM_{2.5}) and particulate matter 10 (PM₁₀).

In 2006 the EPA revised the air quality standards for particle pollution. Regulations for PM_{2.5} were tightened for the 24-hour fine particle standard, which lowered the level from 65 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) to 35 µg/ m³. The annual fine particle standard at 15 µg/ m³ remained the same. In that same year, the EPA published a final ruling which established transportation conformity criteria and procedures to determine transportation projects that required analysis for local air quality impacts for PM_{2.5} in non-attainment and maintenance areas. From the 2006 revision, EPA had to complete designations of nonattainment areas by December 2009 for national standard for PM_{2.5}. The newly established criteria and procedures require those area designated as nonattainment areas must undergo a regional conformity analysis for PM_{2.5}. Furthermore, the procedures also mandates areas designated as nonattainment must complete an additional project-level PM_{2.5} hot-spot analysis of localized impacts for transportation projects of air quality concern.

On December 14, 2009, EPA designated the Bay Area as nonattainment for the national 24-hour PM_{2.5} standard based upon violations of the standard over the three-year period from 2007 through 2009. Pursuant to the Clean Air Act, the Bay Area is subject to the following requirements:

- Beginning on December 14, 2010, MTC must demonstrate that the RTP and Transportation Improvement Program TIP conform to the SIP.
- Beginning on December 14, 2010, certain roadway and transit projects that involve significant levels of diesel vehicle traffic must prepare PM_{2.5} hot-spot analyses.

- By December 14, 2012, the BAAQMD, in partnership with MTC and ABAG, must prepare a SIP outlining how the region will attain and maintain the standard by reducing air pollutant emissions contributing to fine particle concentrations.

Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets and Conformity Tests

The Bay Area has conformity requirements for national ozone, CO, and PM_{2.5} standards. Under the ozone and CO standard, the Bay Area has to meet a motor vehicle emission “budget” test. Because the Bay Area does not have motor vehicle emission budgets for PM_{2.5} that have been determined to be adequate by EPA, it has to meet a motor vehicle emission interim test for the PM_{2.5} standard. To make a positive conformity finding for ozone and CO, MTC must demonstrate that the calculated motor vehicle emissions in the region are lower than the approved budgets. To make a positive “interim” conformity finding for PM_{2.5}, MTC must meet “build not greater than no build” or “build not greater than baseline year” tests based on PM_{2.5} exhaust, tire wear, and brake wear, and NO_x as a PM_{2.5} precursor, emissions.

Motor vehicle emissions budgets for Volatile Organic Compounds (VOC) and Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x), which are ozone precursors, were developed for the 2006 attainment year as part of the 2001 1-hour Ozone Attainment Plan. The VOC and NO_x budgets were found to be adequate by EPA on February 14, 2002 (67 FR 8017) and were subsequently approved by EPA on April 22, 2004 (69 FR 21717). ~~The ozone budgets were approved by the Federal Register on March 27, 2008.~~³ Note that under EPA’s conformity rule for the national 8-hour ozone standard, the existing 1-hour motor vehicle emission budgets are to be used for conformity analyses until they are replaced.

For CO, the applicable motor vehicle emissions budget was developed for the 2004 Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide (herein referred to as the 2004 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan).

The motor vehicle emission budgets are listed below:

VOC:	164 tons per day (2006 and beyond)
NO _x :	270.3 tons per day (2006 and beyond)
CO:	1,850 tons per day (2003 and 2018 and beyond)

For PM_{2.5}, the Bay Area is required to prepare a SIP by December 2012. Since an approved motor vehicle emissions budget for PM_{2.5} is not yet available for use in a budget test, MTC must complete one of the two interim emissions tests: (1) the build-no-greater-than-no-build test (“build/no build test”) or (2) the no-greater-than-baseline-year emissions test (“baseline year test”). Per the interagency consultation via the Air Quality Conformity Task Force meeting dated January 28, 2010, MTC elects to use the build/no build test. In this test, conformity would be demonstrated if in each analysis year, the transportation emissions

3

reflected the RTP or TIP (the “build” scenario) were less than or equal to emissions from the transportation system that would result from current programs (the “baseline scenario” or “no build” scenario).

Analysis Years

The analysis years for the budget and build/no build tests are to be a year within five years from the date the analysis is done, the last year of the RTP, and intermediate years as necessary so that analysis years are not more than 10 years apart. For this conformity analysis, the analysis years are 2015, 2025, and 2035 for the 1997 and 2008 ozone and PM_{2.5} standards. The attainment year for the 1997 ozone standard is 2007, and the attainment year for the 2008 ozone standard is 2015. For CO, the analysis years are 2015, 2018, 2025, and 2035. Travel forecast data for year 2018 were interpolated between 2015 and 2025. MTC has prepared separate travel forecasts for the Bay Area for each of these years. These travel forecasts are then used to calculate motor vehicle emissions.

III. CONFORMITY ANALYSIS & RESULTS

Approach to Conformity Analysis

MTC has used the latest planning assumptions for the purpose of preparing this conformity analysis. Regional on-road motor vehicle emissions for future years are estimated using MTC’s travel demand forecast model (BAYCAST-90), which estimates vehicle activity in the Bay Area, in conjunction with the ARB’s latest model for determining motor vehicle emissions (EMFAC2007, Version 2.3).

The MTC travel demand model requires various inputs – demographic assumptions, pricing assumptions, travel behavior assumptions and highway and transit network assumptions. This conformity analysis uses the latest socio-economic/land use forecast series *Projections 2009* developed and adopted by ABAG in March 2009 and the latest validated version of the MTC travel demand model (BAYCAST-90).

In addition, pricing assumptions include projected parking prices, gasoline and non-gasoline auto operating costs, fuel economy, bridge tolls, transit fares, and express lanes. Travel behavior assumptions include trip peaking factors, vehicle occupancy factors, and estimates of interregional commuters. Highway and transit networks were updated for each analysis year to reflect investments in the proposed Transportation 2035 Plan (see Appendix A) and 2011 TIP (see Appendix B).

Regional VMT and engine starts (which are needed for emission calculations) are forecasted using a combination of output from MTC’s travel demand forecasting model and base year (2000) VMT information provided by the ARB. For conformity purposes, MTC agreed to follow ARB’s protocol for estimating VMT.

Refer to **Appendix C** for detailed travel and air quality modeling assumptions used in this conformity analysis.

Consultation Process

MTC has consulted on the preparation of this conformity analysis and other conformity related issues with the Bay Area's Air Quality Conformity Task Force. The Conformity Task Force is composed of representatives of U.S. EPA, ARB, FHWA, FTA, Caltrans, MTC, BAAQMD, ABAG, the nine county Congestion Management Agencies, and Bay Area transit operators. The Conformity Task Force reviews the assumptions going into the analysis, consults on TCM implementation issues, and reviews the results of the conformity analysis. The task force meetings are open to the public and are regularly attended by interested members of the public. Topics covered in past meetings of the Air Quality Conformity Task Force include the following:

January 2010

- Draft Bay Area Interagency Consultation Procedures for Fine Particulate Matter (PM_{2.5}) Hot-Spot Analyses
- Proposed Approach to Conformity Analysis for the 2011 Transportation Improvement Program, including PM_{2.5} Conformity
- Air Quality Updates

July 2010

- Review of Administrative Draft Conformity Analysis for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program
- Air Quality Updates

November 2012

- Review of Conformity Analysis for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program Redetermination

Comparison of Motor Vehicle Emissions To Budgets

As explained earlier, motor vehicle emissions budgets are established in the SIP for VOCs, NO_x and carbon monoxide (CO). To make a positive conformity finding, the regional motor vehicle emissions must be equal to or less than these budgets. The results of the vehicle activity forecasts and motor vehicle emission calculations are shown below for each separate analysis year.

Ozone Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets

For VOC and NO_x, the motor vehicle emission budget also reflects anticipated emission reductions from five Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) incorporated in the 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan (Table 1).

**TABLE 1
 VOC AND NO_x EMISSIONS BUDGETS FROM 2001 OZONE ATTAINMENT PLAN (TONS/DAY)**

VOC	
2006 On Road Motor Vehicle Emissions	168.5
2006 Mobile Source Control Measure Benefits	(4.0)
2006 TCM Benefits	<u>(0.5)</u>
2006 Emissions Budget	164.0
NO_x	
2006 On Road Motor Vehicle Emissions	271.0
2006 TCM Benefits	<u>(0.7)</u>
2006 Emissions Budget	<u>270.3</u>

**TABLE 2
 VEHICLE ACTIVITY FORECASTS**

	2015	2025	2035
VEHICLES IN USE	5,188,500	5,843,400	6,323,000
Daily VMT (1000s)	165,000	183,600	198,200
Engine Starts	34,401,600	38,428,400	41,477,100

Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan Budget

The budget for carbon monoxide is derived from the 2004 Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan. The emission budget for the Bay Area is 1,850 tons per day. This budget applies to all subsequent analysis years as required by federal conformity regulation, including: any interim year conformity analyses, the 2018 horizon year, and years beyond 2018.

Comparison of Estimated Regional Motor Vehicle Emissions to the Ozone Precursor and CO Budgets

The motor vehicle activity forecasts for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 TIP for the various horizon years are converted to motor vehicle emission estimates by MTC using EMFAC2007.

Table 3A and 3B compares the results of the various analyses with the applicable budgets. The analyses indicate that the motor vehicle emissions are substantially below the budget, due in large part to recent improvements in ARB’s latest EMFAC model which reflect the effects of cleaner vehicles in the California fleet and the enhanced Smog Check program now in effect in the Bay Area. With respect to the new Maintenance Plan motor vehicle emission budget for CO, Table 3B shows that calculated motor vehicle emissions will be well below the new budget of 1,850 tons per day in 2018 as well.

The estimated effectiveness of the various Transportation Control Measures, given their current implementation status is shown in Table 4. TCMs A through E are fully implemented. They have achieved the required cumulative total emission reductions of 0.5 tons per day of VOC and 0.7 tons per day of NO_x by 2006.

**TABLE 3A
EMISSIONS BUDGET COMPARISONS FOR OZONE PRECUSORS
(TONS/DAY)**

Year	VOC Budget**	On-Road Motor Vehicles VOC	TCMs***	Net Emissions
2015	164.0	69.08	(0.3)	68.78
2025	164.0	46.98	(0.3)	46.68
2035	164.0	35.19	(0.3)	34.89

Year	NO_x Budget	On-Road Motor Vehicles NO_x	TCMs**	Net Emissions
2015	270.3	103.07	(0.5)	102.57
2025	270.3	59.96	(0.5)	59.46
2035	270.3	40.80	(0.5)	40.30

Emissions for summertime

**2001 Ozone Attainment Plan

***The transit services for TCM A Regional Express Bus Program were modeled. The emission benefits from TCM A are therefore included in the On-Road Motor Vehicles VOC and NO_x emission inventories for 2006 and beyond.

**TABLE 3B
EMISSIONS BUDGET COMPARISONS FOR CARBON MONOXIDE
(TONS/DAY)***

Year	2004 CO Budget**	Estimated CO
2015	1,850	581.84
2018	1,850	506.63***
2025	1,850	331.15
2035	1,850	252.99

*Emissions for summertime and wintertime

**2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide, Updated Maintenance Plan for 10 Federal Planning Areas

***Estimated CO emissions for 2018 is extrapolated from the 2015 and 2025 analysis years.

**TABLE 4
EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES (TCMS) A – E IN
STATE IMPLEMENTATION PLAN THROUGH DECEMBER 2006 (TONS PER DAY)**

TCM	VOC Emission Reductions through December 2006	NO_x Emission Reductions through December 2006
TCM A Regional Express Bus Program	0.20	0.20
TCM B Bicycle/Pedestrian Program	0.04	0.03
TCM C Transportation for Livable Communities	0.08	0.12
TCM D Expansion of Freeway Service Patrol	0.10	0.25
TCM E Transit Access to Airports	0.09	0.13
Total Reductions	0.5	0.7

Build/No Build Emissions Test for PM_{2.5}

In the Build/No Build test, the motor vehicle emissions from the RTP and TIP (Build scenario) must be less than or equal to emissions from the transportation system based on current programs (No Build scenario) to demonstrate conformity.

The motor vehicle activity forecasts for the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 TIP for the No Build and Build scenarios across the various horizon years are shown in Table 5. These forecasts are converted to motor vehicle emission estimates by MTC using EMFAC2007.

Table 6 presents the results of the Build No/Build test for the PM_{2.5} emissions and the NO_x precursor. The analyses indicate that the motor vehicle emissions are lower under the Build scenario when compared to the No Build scenario. This is due in large part to the transportation investments included in the Build scenario (such as transit services, express lanes, freeway operational improvements, roadway improvements, etc.) and its responsiveness to growth in population and associated travel demand over the next 25 years.

**TABLE 5
VEHICLE ACTIVITY FORECASTS FOR PM_{2.5} BUILD/NO BUILD TEST**

	2015		2025		2035	
	No Build	Build	No Build	Build	No Build	Build
Vehicles In Use	5,322,900	5,188,500	5,856,400	5,843,400	6,363,800	6,323,000
Daily VMT (1000s)	169,200	165,000	184,000	183,600	199,400	198,200
Engine Starts	35,295,600	34,401,600	38,515,800	38,428,400	41,747,800	41,477,100

**TABLE 6
EMISSIONS COMPARISON FOR THE BUILD/NO BUILD TEST FOR PM_{2.5}***

	2015		2025		2035	
	No Build	Build	No Build	Build	No Build	Build
PM_{2.5}	5.92	5.66	5.87	5.78	6.36	6.14
NO_x	112.63	109.55	60.36	60.16	42.87	42.85

*Emissions for wintertime only

IV. TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES

History of Transportation Control Measures

Transportation control measures (TCMs) are strategies to reduce vehicle emissions. They include such strategies as improved transit service and transit coordination, ridesharing services and new carpool lanes, signal timing, freeway incident management, increased gas taxes and bridge tolls to encourage use of alternative modes, etc. The original set of TCMs plus the five new TCMs (A-E) have been fully implemented. The TCMs were added over successive revisions to the SIP (see Table 7). For more information on TCMs 1-28, which are completed, see the *Transportation Air Quality Conformity Analysis for the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan and FY 2001 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment 01-32 (February 2002)*. This report can be found in the MTC/ABAG Library.

- Twelve (12) ozone measures were originally listed in the 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan.
- In response to a 1990 lawsuit in the federal District Court, sixteen (16) additional TCMs were subsequently adopted by MTC in February 1990 as contingency measures to bring the region back on the “Reasonable Further Progress” (RFP) line. The Federal District order issued on May 11, 1992, found that these contingency TCMs were sufficient to bring the region back on the RFP track anticipated in the SIP. These measures became part of the SIP when U.S. EPA approved the 1994 Ozone Maintenance Plan.
- Two (2) transportation control measures from the 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan apply to Carbon Monoxide control strategies, for which the region is in attainment

with the federal standard, and primarily targeted downtown San Jose (which had the most significant CO problem at that time.) MTC also adopted a set of TCM enhancements in November 1991 to eliminate a shortfall in regional carbon monoxide emissions identified in the District Court's April 19, 1991 order. Carbon monoxide standards have been achieved primarily through the use of oxygenated/reformulated fuels in cars and with improvements in the Smog Check program.

- As part of EPA's partial approval/partial disapproval of the 1999 Ozone Attainment Plan, four (4) TCMs were deleted from the ozone plan (but two of these remain in the Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan).
- Five (5) new Transportation Control Measures were adopted as part of the new 2001 1-Hour Ozone Attainment Plan and are fully funded in the TIP and 2001 Regional Transportation Plan.

With respect to TCM 2 from the 1982 SIP, there has been a protracted debate, leading to a citizens lawsuit in federal court, about the obligations associated with this TCM. On April 6, 2004 MTC prevailed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit which concluded that TCM 2 does not impose any additional enforceable obligation on MTC to increase ridership on public transit ridership by 15% over 1982-83 levels by November 2006 (Bayview Hunters Point Community Advocates v. Metropolitan Transportation Com'n, (2004 WL 728247, 4 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 2919, 2004 Daily Journal D.A.R. 4209, 9th Cir.(Cal.), Apr 06, 2004)). Thus TCM 2 has been resolved, and there are no further implementation issues to address in this TCM.

**TABLE 7
Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the State Implementation Plan**

<i>TCM</i>	<i>Description</i>
<i>Original TCMs from 1982 Bay Area Air Quality Plan</i>	
TCM 1	Reaffirm Commitment to 28 percent Transit Ridership Increase Between 1978 and 1983
TCM 2	Support Post-1983 Improvements in the Operators' Five-Year Plans and, After Consultation with the Operators, Adopt Ridership Increase Target for the Period 1983 through 1987
TCM 3	Seek to Expand and Improve Public Transit Beyond Committed Levels
TCM 4	High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Lanes and Ramp Metering
TCM 5	Support RIDES Efforts
TCM 6*	Continue Efforts to Obtain Funding to Support Long Range Transit Improvements
TCM 7	Preferential Parking
TCM 8	Shared Use Park and Ride Lots
TCM 9	Expand Commute Alternatives Program
TCM 10	Information Program for Local Governments
TCM 11**	Gasoline Conservation Awareness Program (GasCAP)
TCM 12**	Santa Clara County Commuter Transportation Program
<i>Contingency Plan TCMs Adopted by MTC in February 1990 (MTC Resolution 2131)</i>	
TCM 13	Increase Bridge Tolls to \$1.00 on All Bridges
TCM 14	Bay Bridge Surcharge of \$1.00
TCM 15	Increase State Gas Tax by 9 Cents
TCM 16*	Implement MTC Resolution 1876, Revised — New Rail Starts
TCM 17	Continue Post-Earthquake Transit Services
TCM 18	Sacramento-Bay Area Amtrak Service
TCM 19	Upgrade Caltrain Service
TCM 20	Regional HOV System Plan
TCM 21	Regional Transit Coordination
TCM 22	Expand Regional Transit Connection Ticket Distribution
TCM 23	Employer Audits
TCM 24	Expand Signal Timing Program to New Cities
TCM 25	Maintain Existing Signal Timing Programs
TCM 26	Incident Management on Bay Area Freeways
TCM 27	Update MTC Guidance on Development of Local TSM Programs
TCM 28	Local Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Initiatives
<i>New TCMs in 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan</i>	
TCM A	Regional Express Bus Program
TCM B	Bicycle/Pedestrian Program
TCM C	Transportation for Livable Communities
TCM D	Expansion of Freeway Service Patrol
TCM E	Transit Access to Airports
*Deleted by EPA action from ozone plan	
**Deleted by EPA action from ozone plan, but retained in Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan.	

Source: Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Metropolitan Transportation Commission, 2001.

Status of Transportation Control Measures

TCMs A-E were approved into the SIP as part of EPA's Finding of Attainment for the San Francisco Bay Area (April 2004). The conformity analysis must demonstrate that TCMs are being implemented on schedule (40 CFR 93.113). TCMs A-E have specific implementation steps which are used to determine progress in advancing these TCMs (see Table 8). TCMs A-E are now fully implemented.

**TABLE 8
IMPLEMENTATION STATUS OF FEDERAL TRANSPORTATION CONTROL MEASURES FOR OZONE (TCMS A – E)**

#	TCM	Description	Ozone Attainment Plan Implementation Schedule	Implementation Status
A	Regional Express Bus Program	Program includes purchase of approximately 90 low emission buses to operate new or enhanced express bus services. Buses will meet all applicable ARB standards, and will include particulate traps or filters. MTC will approve \$40 million in funding to various transit operators for bus acquisition. Program assumes transit operators can sustain service for a five year period. Actual emission reductions will be determined based on routes selected by MTC.	FY 2003. Complete once \$40 million in funding pursuant to Government Code Section 14556.40 is approved by the California Transportation Commission and obligated by bus operators	\$40 million for this program was allocated by the CTC in August 2001. The participating transit operators have ordered and received a total of 94 buses. All buses are currently in operations. TCM A is fully implemented.
B	Bicycle / Pedestrian Program	Fund high priority projects in countywide plans consistent with TDA funding availability. MTC would fund only projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant environmental impacts, or adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts. Actual emission reductions will be determined based on the projects funded.	FY 2004 – 2006. Complete once \$15 million in TDA Article 3 is allocated by MTC.	MTC allocated over \$20 million in TDA Article 3 funds during FY2004, FY2005, and FY2006. TCM B is fully implemented.

*Final Transportation-Air Quality Conformity Analysis
Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program*

#	TCM	Description	Ozone Attainment Plan Implementation Schedule	Implementation Status
C	Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)	Program provides planning grants, technical assistance, and capital grants to help cities and nonprofit agencies link transportation projects with community plans. MTC would fund only projects that are exempt from CEQA, have no significant environmental impacts, or adequately mitigate any adverse environmental impacts. Actual emission reductions will be based on the projects funded.	FY 2004 – 2006. Complete once \$27 million in TLC grant funding is approved by MTC	In December 2003, the Commission reaffirmed its commitment of \$27 million annually over 25 years for the TLC program as part of Phase 1 of the Transportation 2030 Plan. MTC and the county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) have approved over \$27 million in TLC grant funding by FY 2006. In November 2004, MTC approved \$500,000 for regional TLC Community Design Planning Program, and in December 2004, MTC approved \$18.4 million in TLC funding for the regional TLC Capital program. As of December 2006, CMAs in Alameda, Marin and Sonoma counties approved an additional \$12.4 million in their county-level TLC Capital programs for a regional total of \$31.2 million. TCM C is fully implemented.
D	Additional Freeway Service Patrol	Operation of 55 lane miles of new roving tow truck patrols beyond routes which existed in 2000. TCM commitment would be satisfied by any combination for routes adding 55 miles. Tow trucks used in service are new vehicles meeting all applicable ARB standards.	FY 2001. Complete by maintaining increase in FSP mileage through December 2006	FSP continues to maintain the operation of the 55 lane miles of new roving tow truck coverage. This level of service was maintained through 2006. FSP continues to expand its service areas. TCM D is fully implemented.
E	Transit Access to Airports	Take credit for emission reductions from air passengers who use BART to SFO, as these reductions are not included in the Baseline.	BART – SFO service to start in FY 2003. Complete by maintaining service through December 2006	Service began June 2003. Service adjustments have been made since start of revenue service. The BART to SFO service has been maintained through 2006 and is continued. TCM E is fully implemented.

V. RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee released the Draft Conformity Analysis for a 30-day public review period from August 6, 2010 to September 10, 2010. A public hearing on the 2011 TIP and draft conformity analysis was held on September 8, 2010. The comment period was subsequently extended to September 30, 2010 to allow for more time for public comment on the 2011 TIP; and a second public hearing was held on September 22, 2010.

The Draft Conformity Analysis Redetermination will be released for a 30-day public review period from December 14, 2012 to January 14, 2013. This section will be updated to reflect comments received and staff responses.

MTC received the following comments on the draft conformity analysis released on August 6, 2010. MTC staff responses to those comments are as follows:

Commenter: Charlie Cameron (Postcard)

Comment #1:

The fares for 1990 as cited in the fares table used in Appendix C are incorrect. Further, the sources stated in the table were not correct and that the 2007 TIP conformity analysis had different information.

Response #1:

The fare table included in Appendix C includes the Spring 2010 fares expressed in year 2010 dollars as well as year 1990 dollars (which MTC inputs into the travel model) -- prices are expressed in this manner throughout the appendix. Previous versions of Appendix C presented the transit fares in 1990 in year 1990 dollars (as well as 1985 fares in year 1985 dollars, etc); the two numbers would only match if transit fares increased exactly with inflation, which they do not.

Commenter: Hilda Lafebre, Caltrain (Letter dated September 24, 2010)

Comment #1:

The JPB agrees with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) conformity findings.

Response #1:

MTC staff appreciates Caltrain staff's review of the conformity analysis and letter of support.

Commenter: David Schonbrunn, TransDef (Letter Dated September 30, 2010)

Comment #1:

What level of transit service was assumed in the air quality conformity analysis? Does it correspond to current levels, to the recent service cut levels, or to some other level? The assumed transit service level must be based on reasonably available funding for operations, which has declined significantly in recent years.

Response #1:

As documented in Appendix C and discussed with the Air Quality Conformity Task Force, MTC staff notes that the economic downturn that began in earnest in 2008 has had a significant impact on the Bay Area's transit providers. So for the 2015 analysis year, the transit network reflected in the MTC travel model is the transit service in place as of Spring 2010 plus added/replaced transit projects in the TIP and RTP. In contrast, for the 2025 and 2035 analysis years, the transit network in the model is that of transit service in place as of 2006 and added/replaced transit projects in the TIP and RTP. Because more service was in place in 2006 than in 2010, MTC is assuming the current reduction in transit service is temporary and that service will increase as the economy recovers. The transit fares for the 2015 analysis year are the transit fares in place as of Spring 2010 while the transit fares for the 2025 and 2035 analysis years are the transit fares in place as of Spring 2008.

VI. CONFORMITY FINDINGS

Based on the analysis, the following conformity findings are made:

- This conformity assessment was conducted consistent with U.S. EPA's transportation conformity regulations and with the Bay Area Air Quality Conformity Protocol adopted by MTC as Resolution No. 3757.
- The Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program provide for implementation of TCMs pursuant to the following federal regulation:
 - (1) *An examination of the specific steps and funding source(s) needed to fully implement each TCM indicates that TCMs which are eligible for funding under title 23 U.S.C. or the Federal Transit Laws are on or ahead of the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, or, if such TCMs are behind the schedule established in the applicable implementation plan, the MPO and DOT have determined that past obstacles to implementation of the TCMs have been identified and have been or are being overcome, and that all State and local agencies with influence over approvals or funding for TCMs are given maximum priority to approval or funding to TCMs over other projects within their control, including projects in locations outside the non-attainment or maintenance area.*
 - (2) *If TCMs in the applicable implementation plan have previously been programmed for Federal funding but the funds have not been obligated and the TCMs are behind the schedule in the implementation plan, then the TIP cannot be found to conform if the funds intended for those TCMs are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than TCMs, or if there are no other TCMs in the TIP, if the funds are reallocated to projects in the TIP other than projects which are eligible for Federal funding intended for air quality improvements projects, e.g., the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program.*
 - (3) *Nothing in the TIP may interfere with the implementation of any TCM in the applicable implementation plan. (40 CFR Part 93.113(c)).*
- For carbon monoxide, motor vehicle emissions in the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program are lower than the transportation conformity budget in the SIP.
- For the two ground-level ozone precursors (VOC and NO_x), motor vehicle emissions in the Transportation 2035 Plan and 2011 Transportation Improvement Program are lower than the applicable motor vehicle emission budgets for the 1997 and the 2008 national 8-hour ozone standards.

- For PM_{2.5} and NO_x, the Build/No Build test shows that the motor vehicle emissions are lower under the Build scenario when compared to the No Build scenario.

Plan BayArea

TO: MTC Planning Committee, ABAG Administrative Committee DATE: February 1, 2013
 FR: Executive Director, MTC W.I.
 RE: Regional Priority Development Area (PDA) and Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program Funding Recommendations

The OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) Program includes the continuation of the regional PDA Planning Program and a new funding program for Priority Conservation Areas. This memorandum presents staff's recommendations for the approach to expending funds from these two programs.

Regional PDA Planning Grant Program

At its November meeting, the Commission approved several clarifications for implementing its action to redirect \$20 million of the \$40 million Regional PDA Planning Program included in the OneBayArea Grant (OBAG) framework (Resolution 4035) to the county Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs). Three options for the remaining \$20 million Regional Program were presented for preliminary feedback. The Commission directed staff to return in early 2013 for action on the Regional Program following review with MTC's Policy Advisory Council. Additional information about the components of the Regional Program was presented to this joint committee and MTC's Policy Advisory Council in January.

Staff Recommendation

Based on feedback from MTC's Policy Advisory Council, staff recommends the following allocation of funds:

- \$10 million to the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund;
- \$8 million to Regional PDA Planning and Technical Assistance; and
- \$2 million to ABAG for its research and planning activities.

Similar to the initial investment in the TOAH Fund, staff recommends the following conditions: 1) MTC is able to exchange the \$10 million in federal transportation funds for local funds because they cannot be used directly for housing investment; 2) Foundation or other sources of funding would be matched by MTC funds on a minimum 3:1 basis to reach a minimum fund of \$40 million, and 3) the TOAH fund would be spent only in PDAs on projects that have the greatest potential to deliver affordable housing units with direct access to transit.

The Regional PDA Planning and Technical Assistance component will complement county PDA Planning efforts, but will target investments in jurisdictions taking on the majority of Plan Bay Area housing and job growth as recommended by the Policy Advisory Council. Funds would be used to support planning grants and technical assistance. Staff will recommend specific allocation of program funds later this year following review of funding priorities included in the PDA Investment and Growth Strategies developed by the CMAs.

Regional Priority Conservation Area Program

The PCA Program was originally conceived as a program to address conservation efforts in the North Bay by supporting PCAs in those counties with a budget of \$5 million over the four year OBAG period. Responding to further interest by Parks and Open Space Districts and other counties, the Commission set aside an additional \$5 million to fund projects outside of the North Bay, bringing the total to \$10 million.

In the summer of 2012, MTC and ABAG staff began discussing the PCA program with stakeholders to determine needs, funding interests, and program framework. To date staff have held meetings with Park and Open Space Districts, resource conservation agencies, foundations and nonprofit, agricultural interests, and county CMAs. Based on their input, staff recommends the framework for the PCA Funding Program as described in Attachment A.

The PCA funding framework includes one approach for the North Bay program (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second for the remaining five counties. In the North Bay, each CMA will take the lead to develop its own program building on PCA planning conducted to date and select projects for funding. For the remaining counties, staff recommends that MTC and ABAG partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. This approach would build upon the Coastal Conservancy's expertise and established relationships with agricultural interests, resource protection agencies, recreational agencies, other stakeholders, and funding foundations. Under this proposal, MTC would provide \$5 million to the Coastal Conservancy to manage the call for projects in coordination with their own program funds. By leveraging the coastal conservancy funds the program can support a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) than can be accommodated with federal transportation dollars alone. This will set the stage for subsequent funding cycles, based on the program successes and achieve the 3:1 minimum match as required by OBAG. MTC and ABAG staff will support the administration of the program.

Recommended Actions:

Forward to the full Commission for approval Resolution No. 4035, Revised, 1) to specify the allocation of the Regional PDA Planning Program funding with \$10 million to TOAH, \$8 million to Regional PDA Planning and Technical Assistance, and \$2 million to ABAG; and 2) to incorporate the allocation framework for the PCA program and confirm the funding split among the North Bay program (\$5 million) and the remaining counties (\$5 million). ABAG staff supports this recommendation.



Steve Heminger

ATTACHMENT A: PCA Program

Program Goals and Eligible Projects

The goal of the Priority Conservation Area Program is to support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands in the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. These values include globally unique ecosystems, productive agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, healthy fisheries, and climate protection (mitigation and adaptation), among others. The PCA Program should also be linked to SB 375 goals which direct MPOs to prepare sustainable community strategies which consider resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Section 65080.01 (attached). ABAG’s FOCUS program delineates both the Priority Development Areas and the Priority Conservation Areas.

Per MTC Resolution No. 4035, the PCA program is split into two elements:

1. North Bay Program (\$5 million)
2. Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program (\$5 million)

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

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

Funding Amount	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5 million
Screening Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCA Designation: If a project currently isn’t in or doesn’t connect to a PCA, the applicant must file an application with ABAG requesting a PCA designation. • Regionally Significant: Indicators of regional significance include a project’s contribution to goals stated in regional habitat, agricultural or open space plans (i.e. <i>San Francisco Bay Area Upland Habitat Goals Project Report</i> at http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/), countywide Plans or ABAG’s PCA designations. Applicants should describe who will benefit from the project and regional (greater-than-local need) it serves. • Open Space Protection In Place: Linkages to or location in a Greenbelt area that is policy protected from development. Land acquisition or easement projects would be permitted in an area without open space policy protections in place. • Non-Federal Local Match: 3:1 minimum match • Meets Program Goals: Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see next page): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protects or enhances “resource areas” or habitats as defined in California Government Code Section 65080.01. ○ Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems. ○ Supports the agricultural economy of the region.

DRAFT: PCA PROGRAM PROPOSAL (CONT.)

<p>Eligible Applicants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments (cities, counties, towns), county congestion management agencies, tribes, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area are invited to nominate projects. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate and partner with other entities on the nomination of projects, and partnerships that leverage additional funding will be given higher priority in the grant award process. Partnerships are necessary with cities, counties, or CMAs in order to access federal funds. Project must have an implementing agency that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (master agreement with Caltrans)
<p>Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects</p>	<p>Eligible Projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Activities Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities/ Infrastructure: On-road and off-road trail facilities, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming, lighting and other safety related infrastructure, and ADA compliance, conversion and use of abandoned rail corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists. Visual Enhancements: Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas. Habitat / Environmental Enhancements: Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way, reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats, mitigation of transportation project environmental impacts funded through the federal-aid surface transportation program. Protection (Land Acquisition or Easement) or Enhancement of Natural Resources, Open Space or Agricultural Lands: Parks and open space, staging areas or environmental facilities; or natural resources, such as listed species, identified priority habitat, wildlife corridors, wildlife corridors watersheds, or agricultural soils of importance.
<p>Project Selection</p>	<p>Coastal Conservancy* Partnership Program: MTC will provide \$5 million of federal transportation funds to the Conservancy which will be combined with the Conservancy’s program funding, and further leveraged by private foundation funding, as the basis for a regional call for projects. In addition a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) can be accommodated, which is not the case with federal transportation funds alone. The Conservancy will manage the program in collaboration with MTC and ABAG staff. This approach would harness the expertise of the coastal conservancy, expand the pool of eligible projects, and leverage up to \$10 million in additional resources through Coastal Conservancy, and the Moore Foundation**.</p>

*The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency and the primary public land conservation funding source in the Bay Area, providing funding for many different types of land conservation projects. For more information see <http://scc.ca.gov/>

**The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation seeks to advance environmental conservation, scientific research, and patient care--around the world and in the San Francisco Bay Area. For more information see <http://www.moore.org/>

Date: May 17, 2012
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: Planning
Revised: 10/24/12-C 11/28/12-C
12/19/12-C 01/23/13-C
02/27/13-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4035, Revised

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

The resolution includes the following attachments:

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

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

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

Attachment A (page 12) was revised on December 19, 2012 to provide an extension for the Complete Streets policy requirement. Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised to add new projects selected by the Solano Transportation Authority, Sonoma County Transportation

ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4035, Revised

Page 2

Authority and Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority; add funding for CMA Planning activities; and to shift funding between two San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency projects under the Transit Performance Initiatives Program.

Attachments B-1 and B-2 were revised on January 23, 2013 to add new projects selected by various Congestion Management Agencies and to add new projects selected by the Commission in the Transit Rehabilitation Program.

Attachments A and B-1 were revised and Appendix A-8 was added on February 27, 2013 to further define and add funding to the Regional PDA Planning Program, the Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund, and the Priority Conservation Program.

Further discussion of the Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policies is contained in the memorandum to the Joint Planning Committee dated May 11, 2012; to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated October 10, 2012; to the Commission dated November 28, 2012; and to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated December 12, 2012 and January 9, 2013 and to the Joint Planning Committee dated February 8, 2013.

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

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

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4035

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Adrienne J. Tissier, Chair

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

Date: May 17, 2012
W.I.: 1512
Referred by: Planning
Revised: 10/24/12-C
11/28/12-C
12/19/12-C
02/27/12-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4035

Cycle 2 Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy

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

Regional PDA Implementation:

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

Affordable TOD fund: This is a continuation of MTC's successful Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) fund into Cycle 2 which successfully has leveraged a significant amount of outside funding. The TOD fund provides financing for the development of affordable housing and other vital community services near transit lines throughout the Bay Area. Through the Fund, developers can access flexible, affordable capital to purchase or improve available property near transit lines for the development of affordable housing, retail space and other critical services, such as child care centers, fresh food outlets and health clinics. Similar to the initial investment in the TOAH Fund, the following are program conditions: 1) MTC is able to exchange the \$10 million in federal transportation funds for local funds because they cannot be used directly for housing investment; 2) Foundation or other sources of funding would be matched by MTC funds on a minimum 3:1 basis to reach a minimum fund of \$40 million, and 3) the TOAH fund would be spent only in PDAs on projects that have the greatest potential to deliver affordable housing units with direct access to transit.

PDA Planning Grants: MTC and ABAG's PDA Planning Grant Program will place an emphasis on affordable housing production and preservation in funding agreements with grantees. Grants will be made to jurisdictions to provide support in planning for PDAs in areas such as providing housing, jobs, intensified land use, promoting alternative modes of travel to the single occupancy vehicle, and parking management. These studies will place a special focus on selected PDAs with a greater potential for residential displacement and develop and implement community risk reduction plans. Grants will be made to local jurisdictions to provide planning support as needed to meet regional housing goals. Also program funds will establish a new local planning assistance program to provide staff resources directly to jurisdictions to support local land-use planning for PDAs. The Regional PDA Planning/Implementation component will complement county PDA Planning efforts, but will target investments in jurisdictions taking on the majority of Plan Bay Area housing and job growth. Funds would be used to support planning grants and technical assistance.

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

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

6. Climate Change Initiatives

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

7. Safe Routes to Schools

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

8. Transit Capital Rehabilitation

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

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

10. Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program: This is a new pilot program for the development of Priority Conservation Area (PCA) plans and projects to assist counties to ameliorate outward development expansion and maintain their rural character. The PCA funding program includes one approach for the North Bay program (Marin, Napa, Solano, and Sonoma) and a second for the remaining five counties. In the North Bay, each CMA will take the lead to develop its own program building on PCA planning conducted to date and select projects for funding. For the remaining counties, MTC and ABAG will partner with the Coastal Conservancy, a California State agency, to program the PCA funds. MTC will provide \$5 million to the Coastal Conservancy to manage the call for projects in coordination with the Coastal Conservancy's own program funds in order to support a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) than can be accommodated with federal transportation dollars alone and achieve the 3:1 minimum match as required by OBAG. MTC and ABAG staff will support the administration of the program. Appendix A-8 outlines the framework for this program including goals, project screening eligibility, eligible sponsors, and project selection.

APPENDIX A-8: Priority Conservation Area (PCA) Program

Program Goals and Eligible Projects

The goal of the Priority Conservation Area Program is to support Plan Bay Area by preserving and enhancing the natural, economic and social value of rural lands in the Bay Area, for residents and businesses. These values include globally unique ecosystems, productive agricultural lands, recreational opportunities, healthy fisheries, and climate protection (mitigation and adaptation), among others. The PCA Program should also be linked to SB 375 goals which direct MPOs to prepare sustainable community strategies which consider resource areas and farmland in the region as defined in Section 65080.01 (attached). ABAG's FOCUS program delineates both the Priority Development Areas and the Priority Conservation Areas.

Per MTC Resolution No. 4035, the PCA program is split into two elements:

1. North Bay Program (\$5 million)
2. Peninsula, Southern and Eastern Counties Program (\$5 million)

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

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

<p>Funding Amount</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5 million
<p>Screening Criteria</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCA Designation: If a project currently isn't in or doesn't connect to a PCA, the applicant must file an application with ABAG requesting a PCA designation. • Regionally Significant: Indicators of regional significance include a project's contribution to goals stated in regional habitat, agricultural or open space plans (i.e. <i>San Francisco Bay Area Upland Habitat Goals Project Report</i> at http://www.bayarealands.org/reports/), countywide Plans or ABAG's PCA designations. Applicants should describe who will benefit from the project and regional (greater-than-local need) it serves. • Open Space Protection In Place: Linkages to or location in a Greenbelt area that is policy protected from development. Land acquisition or easement projects would be permitted in an area without open space policy protections in place. • Non-Federal Local Match: 3:1 minimum match • Meets Program Goals: Projects that meet one of the following program goals (subject to funding eligibility—see next page): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Protects or enhances "resource areas" or habitats as defined in California Government Code Section 65080.01. ○ Provides or enhances bicycle and pedestrian access to open space / parkland resources. Notable examples are the Bay and Ridge Trail Systems. ○ Supports the agricultural economy of the region.

<p>Eligible Applicants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local governments (cities, counties, towns), county congestion management agencies, tribes, water/utility districts, resource conservation districts, park and/or open space districts, land trusts and other land/resource protection nonprofit organizations in the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area are invited to nominate projects. Applicants are strongly encouraged to collaborate and partner with other entities on the nomination of projects, and partnerships that leverage additional funding will be given higher priority in the grant award process. Partnerships are necessary with cities, counties, or CMAs in order to access federal funds. Project must have an implementing agency that is able to receive a federal-aid grant (master agreement with Caltrans)
<p>Emphasis Areas / Eligible Projects</p>	<p>Eligible Projects</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Activities Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities/ Infrastructure: On-road and off-road trail facilities, sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming, lighting and other safety related infrastructure, and ADA compliance, conversion and use of abandoned rail corridors for pedestrians and bicyclists. Visual Enhancements: Construction of turnouts, overlooks and viewing areas. Habitat / Environmental Enhancements: Vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way, reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats, mitigation of transportation project environmental impacts funded through the federal-aid surface transportation program. Protection (Land Acquisition or Easement) or Enhancement of Natural Resources, Open Space or Agricultural Lands: Parks and open space, staging areas or environmental facilities; or natural resources, such as listed species, identified priority habitat, wildlife corridors, wildlife corridors watersheds, or agricultural soils of importance.
<p>Project Selection</p>	<p>Coastal Conservancy* Partnership Program: MTC will provide \$5 million of federal transportation funds to the Conservancy which will be combined with the Conservancy's program funding, and further leveraged by private foundation funding, as the basis for a regional call for projects. In addition a broader range of projects (i.e. land acquisition and easement projects) can be accommodated, which is not the case with federal transportation funds alone. The Conservancy will manage the program in collaboration with MTC and ABAG staff. This approach would harness the expertise of the coastal conservancy, expand the pool of eligible projects, and leverage up to \$10 million in additional resources through Coastal Conservancy, and the Moore Foundation**.</p>

*The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency and the primary public land conservation funding source in the Bay Area, providing funding for many different types of land conservation projects. For more information see <http://scc.ca.gov/>
 **The Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation seeks to advance environmental conservation, scientific research, and patient care--around the world and in the San Francisco Bay Area. For more information see <http://www.moore.org/>

Cycle 2
Regional Programs Project List
FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
January 2013

DO NOT PRINT
 CLOSE GROUPING

Regional Programs Project List

Project Category and Title	County	Implementing Agency	STP	CMAQ	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP/TA/TFCA	Total Cycle 2
CYCLE 2 PROGRAMMING			\$231,167,451	\$204,019,549	\$435,187,000	\$40,000,000	\$475,187,000
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)							
ABAG Planning	Region-Wide	ABAG	\$2,673,000		\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
BCDC Planning	Region-Wide	BCDC	\$1,341,000		\$1,341,000	\$0	\$1,341,000
MTC Planning	Region-Wide	MTC	\$2,673,000		\$2,673,000	\$0	\$2,673,000
1. REGIONAL PLANNING ACTIVITIES (PL)			TOTAL:	\$0	\$6,687,000	\$0	\$6,687,000
2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)							
Clipper® Fare Media Collection	Region-Wide	MTC	\$12,300,000	\$9,100,000	\$21,400,000	\$0	\$21,400,000
511 - Traveler Information	Region-Wide	MTC	\$32,500,000	\$16,270,000	\$48,770,000	\$0	\$48,770,000
SUBTOTAL			\$44,800,000	\$25,370,000	\$70,170,000	\$0	\$70,170,000
FSP/Incident Management	Region-Wide	MTC/SAFE	\$14,290,000	\$10,840,000	\$25,130,000	\$0	\$25,130,000
SUBTOTAL			\$14,290,000	\$10,840,000	\$25,130,000	\$0	\$25,130,000
2. REGIONAL OPERATIONS (RO)			TOTAL:	\$36,210,000	\$95,300,000	\$0	\$95,300,000
3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)							
Regional Performance Initiatives Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC		\$5,750,000	\$5,750,000	\$0	\$5,750,000
Regional Performance Initiatives Corridor Implementation	Region-Wide	MTC	\$4,000,000	\$4,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000
Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS)	Region-Wide	MTC		\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000	\$0	\$5,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$4,000,000	\$14,750,000	\$18,750,000	\$0	\$18,750,000
Ramp Metering and TOS Elements							
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Liveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 1	Contra Costa	MTC/SAFE	\$750,000		\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
FPI - CC SR4 & SR242: Liveridge to Alhambra & I-680 to SR 4 Ph. 2	Contra Costa	Caltrans		\$11,800,000	\$11,800,000	\$0	\$11,800,000
FPI - Various Corridors Caltrans PE and Right of Way	Region-Wide	Caltrans		\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
FPI - SCL US 101: SBT Co. Line to SR 85	Santa Clara	Caltrans		\$29,700,000	\$29,700,000	\$0	\$29,700,000
FPI - ALA I-580: SJ Co. Line to Vasco & Foothill to Crow Canyon	Alameda	Caltrans		\$0	\$0	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
FPI - SOL I-80: I-505 to Yolo Co. Line.	Solano	Caltrans		\$0	\$0	\$23,000,000	\$23,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$750,000	\$42,500,000	\$43,250,000	\$34,000,000	\$77,250,000
3. FREEWAY PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (FPI)			TOTAL:	\$4,750,000	\$57,250,000	\$62,000,000	\$34,000,000
4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)							
Pavement Management Program (PMP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000	\$0	\$1,200,000
Pavement Technical Advisory Program (PTAP)	Region-Wide	MTC	\$6,000,000		\$6,000,000	\$0	\$6,000,000
4. PAVEMENT MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (PMP)			TOTAL:	\$0	\$7,200,000	\$0	\$7,200,000
5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) IMPLEMENTATION							
Regional PDA Implementation and Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)							
PDA Planning - ABAG	Region-Wide	MTC	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000
Regional PDA Planning	Region-Wide	MTC	\$8,000,000		\$8,000,000	\$0	\$8,000,000
Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH)	Various	MTC	\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
County PDA Planning							
PDA Planning - Alameda	Alameda	ACTC	\$3,905,000		\$3,905,000	\$0	\$3,905,000
PDA Planning - Contra Costa	Contra Costa	CCTA	\$2,745,000		\$2,745,000	\$0	\$2,745,000
PDA Planning - Marin	Marin	TAM	\$750,000		\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
PDA Planning - Napa	Napa	NCTPA	\$750,000		\$750,000	\$0	\$750,000
PDA Planning - San Francisco	San Francisco	SF City/County	\$2,380,000		\$2,380,000	\$0	\$2,380,000
PDA Planning - San Mateo	San Mateo	SMCCAG	\$1,608,000		\$1,608,000	\$0	\$1,608,000
PDA Planning - Santa Clara	Santa Clara	VTA	\$5,349,000		\$5,349,000	\$0	\$5,349,000
PDA Planning - Solano	Solano	STA	\$1,066,000		\$1,066,000	\$0	\$1,066,000
PDA Planning - Sonoma	Sonoma	SCTA	\$1,447,000		\$1,447,000	\$0	\$1,447,000
SUBTOTAL			\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$0	\$20,000,000
5. PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT AREA (PDA) IMPLEMENTATION			TOTAL:	\$40,000,000	\$0	\$40,000,000	\$0
6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)							
Climate Strategies	TBD	TBD		\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$6,000,000	\$20,000,000
6. CLIMATE INITIATIVES PROGRAM (CIP)			TOTAL:	\$0	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000	\$6,000,000
7. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S)							
<i>Specific projects TBD by CMAQs</i>							
SR2S - Alameda	Alameda	ACTC		\$4,293,000	\$4,293,000	\$0	\$4,293,000
SR2S - Contra Costa	Contra Costa	CCTA		\$3,289,000	\$3,289,000	\$0	\$3,289,000
SR2S - Marin	Marin	TAM		\$633,000	\$633,000	\$0	\$633,000
SR2S - Napa	Napa	NCTPA		\$420,000	\$420,000	\$0	\$420,000
SR2S - San Francisco	San Francisco	SFCTA		\$1,439,000	\$1,439,000	\$0	\$1,439,000
SR2S - San Mateo	San Mateo	SMCCAG		\$1,905,000	\$1,905,000	\$0	\$1,905,000
SR2S - Santa Clara	Santa Clara	VTA		\$5,386,000	\$5,386,000	\$0	\$5,386,000
SR2S - Solano	Solano	STA		\$1,256,000	\$1,256,000	\$0	\$1,256,000
SR2S - Sonoma	Sonoma	SCTA		\$1,379,000	\$1,379,000	\$0	\$1,379,000
7. SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SR2S)			TOTAL:	\$0	\$20,000,000	\$20,000,000	\$0
8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM							
Specific Transit Capital Rehabilitation Program projects	TBD	TBD	\$6,153,384		\$6,153,384	\$0	\$6,153,384
Specific Transit Performance Initiative Incentive Program projects	TBD	TBD		\$46,559,549	\$46,559,549	\$0	\$46,559,549
Specific Transit Performance Initiative Investment Program projects	TBD	TBD	\$52,000,000		\$52,000,000	\$0	\$52,000,000
SoTrans - Preventive Maintenance	Solano	SoTrans	\$1,000,000		\$1,000,000	\$0	\$1,000,000
Clipper Fare Collection Equipment Replacement	Regional	MTC	\$9,994,633		\$9,994,633	\$0	\$9,994,633
SFMTA - New 60' Flyer Trolley Bus Replacement	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$15,502,261		\$15,502,261	\$0	\$15,502,261
VTA Preventive Maintenance	Santa Clara	VTA	\$3,349,722		\$3,349,722	\$0	\$3,349,722
Unanticipated Cost Reserve	TBD	TBD	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000
AC Transit - Spectrum Ridership Growth Project	Alameda	AC Transit	\$1,802,676		\$1,802,676	\$0	\$1,802,676
ACE - Fare Collection Equipment *	Alameda	SJRRRC	\$22,575		\$22,575	\$0	\$22,575
Marin Transit - Preventive Maintenance (for Marin Transit low income youth pass)	Marin	Marin Transit	\$99,289		\$99,289	\$0	\$99,289
BART - Train Car Accident Repair	Regional	BART	\$1,493,189		\$1,493,189	\$0	\$1,493,189
BART - 24th Street Train Control Upgrade	San Francisco	BART	\$2,000,000		\$2,000,000	\$0	\$2,000,000
SFMTA - Preventive Maintenance (for SFMTA low income youth pass)	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$1,600,000		\$1,600,000	\$0	\$1,600,000
SFMTA - Light Rail Vehicle Rehabilitation	San Francisco	SFMTA	\$5,120,704		\$5,120,704	\$0	\$5,120,704
VTA - Preventive Maintenance (for VTA low income fare pilot)	Santa Clara	VTA	\$1,302,018		\$1,302,018	\$0	\$1,302,018
8. TRANSIT CAPITAL REHABILITATION PROGRAM			TOTAL:	\$103,440,451	\$46,559,549	\$150,000,000	\$0

Attachment B-1

MTC Res. No. 4035, Attachment B-1
 Adopted: 05/17/12-C
 Revised: 10/24/12-C
 11/28/12-C
 12/19/12-C
 01/23/13-C
 02/27/13-C

Cycle 2
 Regional Programs Project List
 FY 2012-13 through FY 2015-16
 January 2013

DO NOT PRINT
 CLOSE GROUPING

Regional Programs Project List

Project Category and Title	County	Implementing Agency	STP	CMAQ	Total STP/CMAQ	Total Other RTIP/TA/TFCA	Total Cycle 2
CYCLE 2 PROGRAMMING			\$231,167,451	\$204,019,549	\$435,187,000	\$40,000,000	\$475,187,000
* ACE - Fare Collection Equipment - Conditioned on MTC staff determination of project consistency with regional fare policy.							
9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)							
TPI - Capital Program							
AC Transit - Line 51 Corridor Speed Protection and Restoration	Alameda	AC Transit		\$10,515,624	\$10,515,624	\$0	\$10,515,624
SFMTA - Mission Mobility Maximization	San Francisco	SFMTA		\$5,383,109	\$5,383,109	\$0	\$5,383,109
SFMTA - N-Judah Mobility Maximization	San Francisco	SFMTA		\$5,383,860	\$5,383,860	\$0	\$5,383,860
SFMTA - Bus Stop Consolidation and Roadway Modifications	San Francisco	SFMTA		\$4,133,031	\$4,133,031	\$0	\$4,133,031
VTA - Light Rail Transit Signal Priority	Santa Clara	VTA		\$1,587,176	\$1,587,176	\$0	\$1,587,176
VTA - Stevens Creek - Limited 323 Transit Signal Priority	Santa Clara	VTA		\$712,888	\$712,888	\$0	\$712,888
Unprogrammed Transit Performance Initiative Reserve	TBD	TBD		\$2,284,312	\$2,284,312	\$0	\$2,284,312
9. TRANSIT PERFORMANCE INITIATIVE (TPI)			TOTAL:	\$0	\$30,000,000	\$30,000,000	\$0
10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)							
North Bay PCA Program	TBD	TBD	\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000
Peninsula, South Bay, East Bay PCA Program	TBD	TBD	\$5,000,000		\$5,000,000	\$0	\$5,000,000
10. PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREA (PCA)			TOTAL:	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$10,000,000	\$0
Cycle 2 Total			TOTAL:	\$231,167,451	\$204,019,549	\$435,187,000	\$40,000,000

J:\COMMITTEE\Planning Committee\2013\February\RES-4035_Attach_B-1_PlanningFeb.xlsx\Attach B-1 01-23-13