



**PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC)
MEETING AGENDA**

6:00 – 7:30 P.M.

April 6, 2011
Solano Transportation Authority, Conference Room 1
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585-2473

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>COMMITTEE/STAFF PERSON</u>
I. CALL TO ORDER/SELF-INTRODUCTIONS	Larry Mork, Chair
II. CONFIRM QUORUM	Larry Mork, Chair
III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA	Larry Mork, Chair
IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT	Larry Mork, Chair
V. MINUTES FROM MEETING OF JANUARY 20, 2011. <i>Recommendation:</i> <i>Approve the STA PAC Meeting Minutes of January 20, 2011.</i> Pg. 1	Larry Mork, Chair
VI. ACTION ITEMS	
A. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP Call for Projects) <i>Recommendation:</i> <i>Recommend that the STA Board include the projects and programs identified in the Countywide Bicycle Master Plan and Countywide Pedestrian Master Plan be submitted as part of the STA RTP Project List in Programmatic Categories 1, 2 and 3 (6:05 p.m.)</i> Pg..	Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning

<u>Larry Mork</u> Chair Rio Vista	<u>Lynne Williams</u> Vice Chair City of Vallejo	<u>Vacant</u> City of Benicia	<u>Bil Paul</u> City of Dixon	<u>Betty Livingston</u> City of Fairfield	<u>Michael Hudson</u> City of Suisun City	<u>Joel Brick</u> City of Vacaville
<u>Thomas Kiernan</u> County of Solano	<u>Allan Deal</u> Member at Large	<u>Carol Day</u> Bay Area Ridge Trail Council	<u>Vacant</u> San Francisco Bay Trail	<u>Frank Morris</u> Solano Land Trust	<u>Brian Travis</u> Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Group	

B. Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Study

Sara Woo,
Associate Planner

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to adopt the SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan (6:20 p.m.)

Pg.

VII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Solano Countywide Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update

Sara Woo,
Associate Planner

(6:30p.m.)

Pg.

B. Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update

Robert Guerrero,
Senior Planner

(6:50 p.m.)

Pg.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS- NO DISCUSSION

A. Funding Opportunities

Sara Woo, STA

Informational

IX. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Larry Mork, Chair

X. ADJOURNMENT

Larry Mork, Chair

2011 PAC MEETING SCHEDULE

Please mark your calendars for these dates

May 19, 2011 (confirmed)

July 21, 2011 (confirmed)

September 15, 2011 (confirmed)

November 17, 2011 (confirmed)

Please contact STA staff, Sara Woo at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com if you have any questions regarding the agenda items or need special accommodations for attending the meeting.

A			
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments	MIS	Major Investment Study
ACTC	Alameda County Transportation Commission	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
ADA	American Disabilities Act	MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
AVA	Abandoned Vehicle Abatement	MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
APDE	Advanced Project Development Element (STIP)	MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
AQMD	Air Quality Management District	N	
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	NCTPA	Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency
B		NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	NHS	National Highway System
BABC	Bay Area Bicycle Coalition	NOP	Notice of Preparation
BAC	Bicycle Advisory Committee	O	
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit	OTS	Office of Traffic Safety
BATA	Bay Area Toll Authority	P	
BCDC	Bay Conservation & Development Commission	PAC	Pedestrian Advisory Committee
BT&H	Business, Transportation & Housing Agency	PCC	Paratransit Coordinating Council
C		PCRP	Planning & Congestion Relief Program
CAF	Clean Air Funds	PSR	Project Study Report
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation	PDS	Project Development Support
CARB	California Air Resources Board	PDT	Project Delivery Team
CCCC (4'Cs)	City County Coordinating Council	PDWG	Project Delivery Working Group
CCCTA (3CTA)	Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	PMP	Pavement Management Program
CCJPA	Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority	PMS	Pavement Management System
CCTA	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	PNR	Park & Ride
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	PPM	Planning, Programming & Monitoring
CHP	California Highway Patrol	PPP (P3)	Public Private Partnership
CIP	Capital Improvement Program	PS&E	Plans, Specifications & Estimate
CMA	Congestion Management Agency	PSR	Project Study Report
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program	PTA	Public Transportation Account
CMP	Congestion Management Plan	PTAC	Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (MTC)
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas	R	
CTC	California Transportation Commission	RABA	Revenue Alignment Budget Authority
D		RBWG	Regional Bicycle Working Group
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise	RFP	Request for Proposal
DOT	Department of Transportation	RFQ	Request for Qualification
E		RM 2	Regional Measure 2 (Bridge Toll)
ECMAQ	Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program	RPC	Regional Pedestrian Committee
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	RRP	Regional Rideshare Program
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	RTEP	Regional Transit Expansion Policy
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	RTIF	Regional Transportation Impact Fee
EV	Electric Vehicle	RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
F		RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report	RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	S	
FPI	Freeway Performance Initiative	SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equality Act-a Legacy for Users
G			Sustainable Community Strategy
GHG	Greenhouse Gas	SCS	Sonoma County Transportation Authority
GIS	Geographic Information System	SCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
H		SFCTA	San Joaquin Council of Governments
HIP	Housing Incentive Program	SJCOG	State Highway Operations & Protection Program
HOT	High Occupancy Toll	SHOPP	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle	SMAQMD	San Mateo City-County Association of Governments
I			Solano Napa Commuter Information
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act	SMCCAG	Solano Highway Improvement Plan
ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program	SNCI	Single Occupant Vehicle
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System	SoHip	State Planning & Research
J		SOV	State Route
JARC	Jobs Access Reverse Commute Program	SP&R	Safe Routes to School
JPA	Joint Powers Agreement	SR	Safe Routes to Transit
L		SR2S	State Transit Assistance Fund
LATIP	Local Area Transportation Improvement Program	SR2T	State Transportation Improvement Program
LEV	Low Emission Vehicle	STAF	Federal Surface Transportation Program
LIFT	Low Income Flexible Transportation Program	STIP	
LOS	Level of Service	STP	
LS&R	Local Streets & Roads	T	
M		TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
		TAM	Transportation of Marin
		TAZ	Transportation Analysis Zone
		TCI	Transportation Capital Improvement
		TCM	Transportation Control Measure

TCRP	Transportation Congestion Relief Program
TDA	Transportation Development Act
TDM	Transportation Demand Management
TE	Transportation Enhancement Program
TEA-21	Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21 st Century
TFCA	Transportation Funds for Clean Air Program
TIF	Transportation Investment Fund
TIP	Transportation Improvement Program
TLC	Transportation for Livable Communities
TMA	Transportation Management Association
TMP	Transportation Management Plan
TMS	Transportation Management System
TOD	Transportation Operations Systems
TOS	Traffic Operation System
T-Plus	Transportation Planning and Land Use Solutions
TRAC	Trails Advisory Committee
TSM	Transportation System Management

U, V, W, Y, & Z

UZA	Urbanized Area
VHD	Vehicle Hours of Delay
VMT	Vehicle Miles Traveled
VTA	Valley Transportation Authority (Santa Clara)
W2W	Welfare to Work
WCCTAC	West Costa County Transportation Advisory Committee
WETA	Water Emergency Transportation Authority
YCTD	Yolo County Transit District
YSAQMD	Yolo/Solano Air Quality Management District
ZEV	Zero Emission Vehicle



Solano Transportation Authority

Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)

Meeting Minutes of

Thursday, January 20, 2011

6:00 – 7:30 p.m.

STA Conference Room
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585-2473

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Larry Mork called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Larry Mork, Chair	City of Rio Vista
Lynne Williams, Vice Chair	City of Vallejo
Carol Day	City of Benicia
Betty Livingston	City of Fairfield
Michael Hudson	City of Suisun City
Joel Brick	City of Vacaville
Allan Deal	Member-At-Large
Brian Travis	Tri-City and County Cooperative Planning Group

MEMBERS ABSENT:

VACANT	City of Dixon
Thomas Kiernan	County of Solano

STAFF PRESENT:

Sara Woo	STA, Associate Planner
----------	------------------------

ALSO PRESENT:

<i>In Alphabetical Order by Agency:</i>	
James Loomis	City of Vacaville Public Works
Matt Tuggle	Solano County Public Works

II. CONFIRM QUORUM

A quorum was confirmed.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Member Williams and second by Member Morris, the PAC unanimously approved the agenda.

IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None presented.

V. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES OF July 15, 2010

On a motion by Member Deal, and a second by Member Williams, the PAC unanimously approved the minutes of April 22, 2010 with the changes (underlined) listed below. Member Morris abstained from the vote.

- "...the committee would like to receive a monthly update"
- "March 10, 2010 STA Board meeting."
- "...the working group had taken a tour of the corridor on May 11, 2010"

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. 2011 Pedestrian Advisory Committee Work – (Sara Woo, STA)

Recommendation:

Approve the 2011 STA Pedestrian Advisory Committee Work Plan.

Sara Woo provided an overview of the Pedestrian Plan Work Plan for the 2011 calendar year. She highlighted the new items on the work plan including involvement with Safe Routes to School, Safe Routes to Transit, and development of a Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Signage Plan. No comments were provided by the committee.

On a motion from Member Williams and a second from Member Livingston, the PAC unanimously approved the recommendation to approve the 2011 STA Pedestrian Advisory Committee Work Plan.

B. Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program Update and Advisory Committee Representative – (Sam Shelton, STA)

Recommendation:

Appoint a PAC member and alternate to represent the committee on the Safe Routes to School Advisory Committee.

Sam Shelton explained the current update to the SR2S Plan and the opportunity for participation. He walked through the work plan with the committee and noted that a large grant from MTC would enable staff to develop maps for each school in the program. He explained that the meetings would be held at lunch time. The committee members expressed enthusiasm and support for the upcoming update. Chair Mork appointed Member Williams as the SR2S committee representative and Member Hudson as the alternate.

C. Safe Routes to Transit Program and Advisory Committee Representatives – (Robert Guerrero, STA)

Recommendation:

Appoint a PAC member and alternate to represent the committee on the Safe Routes to Transit Advisory Committee.

Robert Guerrero explained the current development of a SR2T Plan and the opportunity for participation. He explained the purpose of the plan to identify specific improvements to make transit services more convenient and attractive for local residents. He noted that the meetings would be held during the day at business hours. Chair Mork appointed Member Deal as the SR2T committee representative and Member Livingston as the alternate.

VIII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS

A. Solano Countywide Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update – (Sara Woo, STA)

Sara Woo provided the committee with an update to the Pedestrian Plan update schedule. She provided a walkthrough of the Introduction, Goals and Objectives, and some of the Existing Conditions Chapter. She explained that the committee would review follow up chapters in subsequent meetings.

B. State Route (SR) 12 Jameson Canyon Road Bicycle and Pedestrian Corridor Study – (Sara Woo, STA)

Sara Woo provided an update regarding the SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan. She explained that the plan would be finalized by March for the committee's review and approval. No comments were provided by the committee.

C. Funded Countywide Pedestrian Priority Projects Status Report

Sara Woo provided a brief overview of the funded projects that have been completed and in progress. She noted that all projects in progress are moving forward and that the project sponsors would provide presentations of their projects at a later meeting. These projects were:

- West B Street Bicycle and Pedestrian Undercrossing (City of Dixon)
- Grizzly Island Trail (City of Suisun City)
- Downtown Streetscape Improvements (City of Vallejo)

D. Bicycle and Pedestrian Wayfinding Sign Plan – (Sara Woo, STA)

Sara Woo discussed the need and desire to develop a countywide signage system for the bicycle and pedestrian transportation systems. She explained that a plan would include a general description of wayfinding, define its importance, and design guidelines that local agencies can adopt reference. She noted that the plan would be developed in collaboration with each member agency. No comments from Committee members.

IX. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS – NO DISCUSSION

A. Funding Opportunities Summary

X. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Member Hudson commented that there could be some benefit to the use of mobile applications and social media resources to share maps and other information with the public. Committee members generally agreed and asked that STA staff bring the item to the committee at a later meeting.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:58 p.m. The next meeting of the STA PAC is currently scheduled for May 19, 2011.

Minutes prepared by STA staff, Sara Woo, (707) 399-3214, swoo@sta-snci.com



DATE: March 31, 2011
TO: STA PAC
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning
RE: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update and Solano Call for Projects
Draft List

Background:

The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is the long-range transportation plan for the 9-county Bay Area. It is prepared every 4 years by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The RTP sets out a 25-year vision for the region's transportation system, establishes goals and milestones for achieving that vision, and lists projects that are designed to help meet those goals. The RTP is a financially constrained document; only projects that can be funded through reasonably-anticipated revenues can be included in the RTP.

Projects that receive federal and/or state financing must be listed in the RTP. In addition, local projects that have no federal or state funds may still be listed in the RTP in order to undergo air quality conformity analysis as part of the RTP review. It is therefore beneficial to have a project included in the RTP.

Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 is intended to substantially reduce the emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHG), primarily carbon dioxide. Senate Bill (SB) 375, approved in 2008, is designed to implement a portion of AB 32 by integrating regional decisions on land use planning and transportation investment. This is primarily accomplished by requiring regional Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) that:

- Accommodates all of the region's growth, both in total numbers and by economic groups;
- Specifies the general location and density of housing development; and
- Ties transportation investments through the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to new development or redevelopment, in order to reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), the proxy measure for GHG emissions.

SB 375 only addresses emission reductions from reductions in VMT for cars and light trucks. Other initiatives under AB 32 deal with improved vehicle fleet fuel economy, lower carbon fuels, and reduced emissions from heavy trucks, transit and non-transportation sources.

In order to provide a transportation network for the SCS analysis and the next RTP (which will use a horizon year of 2040, and will be known as T2040), MTC has already begun the process of updating the current RTP (T2035).

In addition to its use in developing the next RTP, the SCS will determine the base numbers for the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA). The Cities and the County are required to develop General Plan Housing Elements that accommodate their share of the RHNA. In previous years, the RHNA and RTP processes were separate.

At its meeting of February 9, 2011, the STA Board approved a schedule for review of the draft RTP Project List, including a public outreach component. That schedule is included as Attachment A. Because of the SCS/RTP update schedule, only a short amount of time is allocated by MTC for STA to develop Solano County's RTP project list. All projects must be submitted to MTC by April 29, 2011.

MTC has adopted Performance Measures to be used in development of the SCS and RTP. These measures will be used to compare the base case (business as usual) land use development and transportation network with several alternative scenarios. The adopted Performance Measures are included as Attachment B.

Discussion:

Attachment C is the Draft Solano RTP Project List. Projects are listed in four categories:

- A. Projects in T2035 that have been completed.
- B. Projects that are in T2035 that have not been completed.
- C. Projects proposed by STA staff for inclusion in T2040.
- D. Projects that fit into exempt categories, such as operations and maintenance.

MTC has provided STA with its fund estimates for the RTP. This estimate is based upon the funds MTC believes are 'reasonably available' (\$1.92 billion), plus a mark-up of 75%. The resultant STA fund estimate is \$3.36 billion. Because the RTP is a fiscally constrained document, only projects that in total will cost no more than the available funds can be included in the RTP. In preparing T2035, MTC provided STA with a fund estimate of approximately \$1.5 billion, but later reduced that amount to \$600 million. STA staff believes the \$3.36 billion fund estimate significantly exceeds the amount that will ultimately be available for local projects. Projects that are funded entirely with local funds may be listed in the RTP without being counted against Solano County RTP fiscal limits.

In preparing the proposed RTP Project List, STA staff began with projects currently included in the T2035 list and projects proposed by the member agencies in 2010 for inclusion in the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP). From that master list, STA staff then identified projects that; a) have a reasonable likelihood of completion in the next 10 years; b) support efficient use or improvements to safety for the existing system, rather than major capacity expansion; c) that help improve the overall capacity of the Solano system, rather than act as stand-alone components; and d) are consistent with the existing RTP goals and the RTP and SCS Performance Measures.

Some programs are designed to maintain the current system, such as local streets and roads or transit maintenance. Other projects are individually small, but together make-up a larger regional program, such as development of the Regional Bicycle Network. Programs and projects that fit into those categories do not have to be submitted individually by local agencies and the CMAs. The Programmatic Categories are listed in Attachment D. The complete MTC Call for Projects letter and supporting attachments is included as Attachment E.

Programmatic categories 1 and 2 are specifically for bicycle and pedestrian facilities expansion and enhancement; category 3 is for bicycle and pedestrian rehabilitation. STA anticipated assigning a portion of the countywide financial target to these three categories, and specifying that the projects and programs in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans are the targets for this funding.

All projects must be submitted to MTC by April 29, 2011. To meet this timeline, the Draft Solano RTP Project List must be released for public comment by March 9th along with the call for projects. The document released by the Board will be presented to the public via the STA website and at meetings targeting low income and senior and disabled transit users and other STA Advisory Committees in March. STA staff is also available to provide presentations at local jurisdiction Planning Commission or Board or Council meetings to assist in obtaining public input. All proposed additions, deletions or changes to the project list must be received by April 8, 2011. The STA Board is scheduled to hold a public hearing on the Draft RTP Project List at its April 13, 2011 meeting. The final list will then be reviewed by the STA TAC on April 27th, and a final action will be taken by the STA Board on May 11th.

STA member agencies and members of the public (including advocacy groups) are requested to identify projects that they believe should or should not be on the RTP Project List. For members of the public recommending projects be added to the list, they must identify a public agency sponsor to submit the project on their behalf.

At their February 23, 2011 meetings, the Solano Express Intercity Transit Consortium and the STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the Call for Projects and the initial project list. TAC members recommended several edits to project descriptions in Category B (existing RTP) projects in Attachment C. Both TAC and Consortium members recommended the addition of several projects to Category C (new projects), and the deletion of 2 projects from Category B due to lack of a viable funding strategy. All of those changes are reflected in Attachment C. At its meeting of March 9, 2011, the STA Board issued a formal Call for Projects, based upon the schedule and project list described above.

Fiscal Impact:

None at this time. However, the RTP project list will identify those projects that are covered under the RTP federal air quality attainment conformity analysis and which projects are eligible for state or federal funds, both of which strongly influence STA and member agency spending options.

Recommendation:

Recommend that the STA Board include the projects and programs identified in the Countywide Bicycle Master Plan and Countywide Pedestrian Master Plan be submitted as a part of the STA RTP Project List in Programmatic Categories 1, 2 and 3.

Attachments:

- A. RTP Draft Project List Review Schedule
- B. MTC Adopted RTP Performance Measures
- C. Draft Solano RTP Project List
- D. Programmatic Categories
- E. MTC Call for Projects Letter and Attachments

Schedule of Actions to Select STA's Projects for Submittal to MTC for the next RTP:

Action	Date
MTC issues formal Call for Projects to CMAs (and major transit providers)	February 10
STA Technical Advisory Committee and Solano Express Intercity Transit Consortium review Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	February 23
STA Board reviews Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 9
MTC Release of County-Level Financial Projections	March 11
Community Outreach Meeting for low income and ADA transit users on Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List (Paratransit Coordinating Council) – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 17
Community Outreach Meeting for Senior and Disabled Transit Users on Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List (Senior and Disabled Transit Committee) – <i>public input meeting</i>	April ____
Bicycle Advisory Committee review Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 17
Pedestrian Advisory Committee review Preliminary Solano Prioritized Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	March 24
STA Board Public Hearing on Prioritized Solano Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	April 13
STA Technical Advisory Committee and Solano Express Intercity Transit Consortium meetings on Final Prioritized Solano Project List – <i>public input meeting</i>	April 27
STA Board Public Hearing on Final Solano Project List	May 11

Date: January 26, 2011
 W.I.: 1121
 Referred by: Planning Committee

Attachment A
 Resolution No. 3987
 Page 1 of 2

Performance Targets for the Sustainable Communities Strategy/Regional Transportation Plan

GOAL/OUTCOME	#	RECOMMENDED TARGET <i>Unless noted, all targets are for year 2035 compared to a year 2005 base</i>
CLIMATE PROTECTION	1	Reduce per-capita CO ₂ emissions from cars and light-duty trucks by 15% <i>Statutory - Source: California Air Resources Board, as required by SB 375</i>
ADEQUATE HOUSING	2	House 100% of the region's projected 25-year growth by income level (very-low, low, moderate, above-moderate) without displacing current low-income residents <i>Statutory - Source: ABAG adopted methodology, as required by SB 375</i>
HEALTHY & SAFE COMMUNITIES	3	Reduce premature deaths from exposure to particulate emissions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce premature deaths from exposure to fine particulates (PM_{2.5}) by 10% • Reduce coarse particulate emissions (PM₁₀) by 30% • Achieve greater reductions in highly impacted areas <i>Source: Adapted from federal and state air quality standards by BAAQMD</i> Associated Indicators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incidence of asthma attributable to particulate emissions • Diesel particulate emissions
	4	Reduce by 50% the number of injuries and fatalities from all collisions (including bike and pedestrian) <i>Source: Adapted from California State Highway Strategic Safety Plan</i>
	5	Increase the average daily time walking or biking per person for transportation by 60% (for an average of 15 minutes per person per day) <i>Source: Adapted from U.S. Surgeon General's guidelines</i>

Attachment A
Resolution No. 3987
Page 2 of 2

GOAL/OUTCOME	#	RECOMMENDED TARGET <i>Unless noted, all targets are for year 2035 compared to a year 2005 base</i>
OPEN SPACE AND AGRICULTURAL PRESERVATION	6	Direct all non-agricultural development within the urban footprint (existing urban development and urban growth boundaries) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenarios will be compared to 2010 urban footprint for analytical purposes only. <i>Source: Adapted from SB 375</i>
EQUITABLE ACCESS	7	Decrease by 10% the share of low-income and lower-middle income residents' household income consumed by transportation and housing <i>Source: Adapted from Center for Housing Policy</i>
ECONOMIC VITALITY	8	Increase gross regional product (GRP) by 90% – an average annual growth rate of approximately 2% (in current dollars) <i>Source: Bay Area Business Community</i>
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decrease average per-trip travel time by 10% for non-auto modes • Decrease automobile vehicle miles traveled per capita by 10% <i>Source: Adapted from Caltrans Smart Mobility 2010</i>
	10	Maintain the transportation system in a state of good repair: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase local road pavement condition index (PCI) to 75 or better • Decrease distressed lane-miles of state highways to less than 10% of total lane-miles • Reduce average transit asset age to 50% of useful life <i>Source: Regional and state plans</i>

SOLANO COUNTY

RTP Reference Number	Project/Program	Total Project Cost	Committed Funds1	Discretionary Funds2	Project Notes
CATEGORY A - COMPLETED PROJECTS					
22631	Construct Route 12 westbound truck climbing lane at Red Top Road	\$13.2	\$13.2	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22634	Construct an adjacent 200-space, at-grade parking lot at the Vacaville intermodal Station (Phase 1)	\$12.9	\$12.9	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22700	Construct parallel corridor north of I-80 from Red Top Road to Abernathy Road	\$69.0	\$60.5	\$8.5	3 segments completed; segment 4 is part of 230326, I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange
230650	Widen I-80 from Red Top Road to Airbase Parkway to add HOV lanes in both directions (includes pavement rehabilitation and ramp metering)	\$94.9	\$94.9	\$0.0	COMPLETED
22629	Construct new Vallejo Baylink Ferry Terminal (includes additional parking, upgrade of bus transfer facilities and pedestrian access improvements) - Phase A				COMPLETED
CATEGORY B - PROJECTS IN T2035 NOT COMPLETED					
21341	Construct new Fairfield/Vacaville multimodal train station for Capitol Corridor intercity rail service (Phase 1)	\$39.6	\$29.6	\$10.0	Partially funded with Regional measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds
22629	Construct new Vallejo Baylink Ferry Terminal (includes additional parking, upgrade of bus transfer facilities and pedestrian access improvements) - Phase B	\$85.6	\$75.6	\$10.0	Partially funded with Regional measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds, project under construction.
22630	Improve Dixon facilities associated with the Dixon Rail Station: 1) Parkway Boulevard overcrossing, 2) B Street Ped Undercrossing, 3) West A Street Undercrossing	\$12.4	\$12.4	\$0.0	
22632	American Road/Hiddenbrook Parkway Operational Improvements	\$10.7	\$10.7	\$0.0	
22633	Widen Azuar Drive/Cedar Avenue on Mare Island, Vallejo, from 2 to 4 lanes between P-Street and Residential Parkway (includes bicycle lanes, railroad signals and rehabilitation improvements)	\$11.7	\$11.7	\$0.0	
94151	Construct 4-lane Jepson Parkway from Route 12 to Leisure Town Road	\$194.0	\$134.0	\$60.0	CEQA clearance completed.
230311	Widen and improve Peterson Road (south gate to Travis AFB) with the addition of a truck-stacking lane (includes drainage improvements)	\$2.6	\$2.6	\$0.0	
230322	Rebuild and relocate eastbound Cordelia Truck Scales Facility (includes a new 4-lane bridge across Suisun Creek and new ramps at eastbound Route 12 and eastbound I-80)	\$100.9	\$100.9	\$0.0	Scheduled for construction 2011.
230326	Improve I-80/I-680/Route 12 Interchange, including connecting I-680 northbound to Route 12 westbound (Jamieson Canyon), adding connectors and reconstructing local interchanges (Phase 1) and including west end of the North Connector and conversion of HOV to Express Lane	\$487.9	\$134.4	\$353.5	Partially funded with Regional Measure 2 Toll Bridge Program funds, scheduled for construction in 2012.
230468	Provide auxiliary lanes on I-80 in eastbound and westbound directions from I-680 to Air Base Parkway (includes a new eastbound mixed-flow lane from Route 12 east to Air Base Parkway)	\$50.0	\$0.0	\$50.0	
230635	Construct new 400-space parking garage at the Vacaville Intermodal Station (Phase 2)	\$10.0	\$0.0	\$10.0	for Phase 1, see Solano project #22634

RTP Reference Number	Project/Program	Total Project Cost	Committed Funds1	Discretionary Funds2	Project Notes
230708	Improve local interchanges and auxiliary lanes and make local streets and roads improvements (includes street channelization, overcrossing, bicycle and pedestrian access, and safety improvements)	\$15.0	\$15.0	\$0.0	

CATEGORY C NEW PROJECTS PROPOSED FOR ADDITION TO RTP

Fairfield Transportation Center Expansion - construct additional parking structure for net addition of ____ spaces					
Curtola Transit Center Expansion - construct parking structure at site of existing surface parking lot to support express bus and rideshare. Net increase of 880 spaces.					
Benicia Park and Ride Lots					RM2 funded
Benicia Intermodal Center					RM2 funded
Redwood Parkway/Fairgrounds Interchange -					PSR approved.
I-505/Vaca Valley Parkway Interchange - reconstruct existing overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes plus Class II bike lane; reconstruct ramps to modified cloverleaf design.					\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project
I-80/I-505 Interchange redesign to accommodate Express Lane and eliminate lane drop from WB I-80 at I-505.					
I-80 California Drive Overcrossing in Vacaville - construct new overcrossing with no freeway connection					\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project
I-80 Lagoon Valley Road interchange - reconstruct existing overcrossing from 2 to 4 lanes; rebuild ramps					\$0.0 Local Development Impact Fees fully fund project
SR-12/SR-113 intersection - non-capacity improvements to existing intersection to add turn lanes and signalize intersection					May be SHOPP Eligible
SR-12/Church Intersection - non-capacity improvements to realign existing roadways and add turn lanes; may also include park-and-ride lot					May be SHOPP Eligible
Construct the Vallejo Ferry Maintenance Building					
Widen Peabody Road to 4 lanes from the Fairfield city limits to the Vacaville city limits.					

CATEGORY D PROGRAMATIC PROJECTS

230699	Local streets and roads maintenance	\$2,559.0	\$716.0	\$524.0	Shortfall remains
	Convert express and local buses to alternative fuels				

Attachment A.2 Programmatic Categories

Programmatic categories are groups of similar projects, programs, and strategies that are included under a single group for ease of listing in the RTP/SCS. Projects within programmatic categories must be exempt from regional transportation conformity. Many projects which address the concerns of communities, such as pedestrian bulbouts, bicycle lanes, transit passenger shelters, ridesharing, etc. are often taken into account in a programmatic category. Therefore individual projects of this nature do not need to be specified. Projects grouped in a programmatic category are viewed as a program of multiple projects. Projects that add capacity or expand the network are not included in a programmatic category. Projects that do not fit within the identified programmatic categories are listed separately in the RTP/SCS. Programmatic categories to be used include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Expansion** (new facilities, expansion of existing bike/pedestrian network)
2. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Enhancements** (enhancements, streetscapes, TODs, ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements)
3. **Bicycle/Pedestrian Facilities Rehabilitation**
4. **Lifeline Transportation** (Community Based Transportation Plans projects such as information/outreach projects, dial-a-ride, guaranteed ride home, paratransit, non-operational transit capital enhancements (i.e. bus shelters). Does not include fixed route transit projects.)
5. **Transit Enhancements** (ADA compliance, mobility and access improvements, passenger shelters, informational kiosks)
6. **Transit Management Systems** (TransLink[®], Transit GPS tracking systems (i.e. Next Bus))
7. **Transit Safety and Security Improvements** (Installation of security cameras)
8. **Transit Guideway Rehabilitation**
9. **Transit Station Rehabilitation**
10. **Transit Vehicle Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
11. **Transit O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, preventive maintenance)
12. **Transit Operations Support** (purchase of operating equipment such as fareboxes, lifts, radios, office and shop equipment, support vehicles)
13. **Local Road Safety** (shoulder widening, realignment, non-coordinated signals)
14. **Highway Safety** (implementation of Highway Safety Improvement Program, Strategic Highway Safety Program, shoulder improvements, guardrails, medians, barriers, crash cushions, lighting improvements, fencing, increasing sight distance, emergency truck pullovers)
15. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Intersection Modifications and Channelization**
16. **Non-Capacity Increasing State Highway Enhancements** (noise attenuation, landscaping, roadside rest areas, sign removal, directional and informational signs)
17. **Freeway/Expressway Incident Management** (freeway service patrol, call boxes)
18. **Non-Capacity Increasing Freeway/Expressway Interchange Modifications** (signal coordination, signal retiming, synchronization)
19. **Freeway/Expressway Performance Management** (Non-ITS Elements, performance monitoring, corridor studies)
20. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Road Rehabilitation** (Pavement resurfacing, skid treatments)
21. **Non-Capacity Increasing Local Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
22. **State Highway Preservation** (Caltrans SHOPP, excluding system management)
23. **Toll Bridge Rehabilitation/Replacement/Retrofit**
24. **Local Streets and Roads O&M** (Ongoing non-capital costs, routine maintenance)
25. **State Highway O&M** (Caltrans non-SHOPP maintenance, minor 'A' and 'B' programs)
26. **Regional Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting regional air quality and climate protection strategies)
27. **Local Air Quality and Climate Protection Strategies** (outreach programs and non-capacity projects specifically targeting local air quality and climate protection strategies)
28. **Regional Planning and Outreach** (regionwide planning, marketing, and outreach)
29. **Transportation Demand Management** (continuation of ridesharing, shuttle, or vanpooling at current levels)
30. **Parking Management** (Parking cash out, variable pricing, etc.)



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
E-MAIL info@mtc.ca.gov
WEB www.mtc.ca.gov

February 14, 2011

RECEIVED

FEB 15 2011

SOLANO TRANSPORTATION
AUTHORITY

Scott Haggerty, Chair
Alameda County

Adrienne J. Tissier, Vice Chair
San Mateo County

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

Tom Bates
Cities of Alameda County

Dave Cortese
Santa Clara County

Bill Dodd
Napa County and Cities

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

Mark Green
Association of Bay Area Governments

Anne W. Halsted
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

Steve Kinsey
Marin County and Cities

Sam Liccardo
Cities of Santa Clara County

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Kevin Mullin
Cities of San Mateo County

Jon Rubin
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Bijan Sartipi
State Business, Transportation
and Housing Agency

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

Amy Rein Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Vacancy
City and County of San Francisco

Steve Heminger
Executive Director

Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

Mr. Daryl Halls
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA 94585

RE: Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy – Call for Projects

To: Caltrans, Congestion Management Agencies, and Multi-County Transit Operators

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is issuing an open “call for projects” for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). MTC requests the assistance of each of the nine Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to coordinate project submittals for their county. Caltrans and multi-county transit operators may submit directly to MTC, but coordination with the CMAs are encouraged. Attached is the Call for Projects Guidance that lays out required elements to be carried out in the local call for projects.

Project submittals are due to MTC on April 29, 2011. Projects/programs will undergo a project-level performance evaluation, which MTC will initiate starting in May 2011. MTC requests all partner agencies to adhere to this deadline. The results of the project performance assessment will inform the upcoming detailed alternatives analysis and investment trade-off discussions, ultimately leading to a preferred RTP/SCS early next year with adoption occurring a year later. As such, there will be ongoing opportunities for these discussions to occur.

The SCS legislation requires closer integration between land use and transportation planning. With this in mind, MTC and ABAG have adopted goals that direct local agencies to consider how their projects support SCS principals as promulgated by SB 375.

MTC is developing a web-based application form for sponsors to fill out and submit their projects. Sponsors will be able to (a) remove projects in the current plan (Transportation 2035) that are either now complete and open for service or no longer being pursued, (b) update projects in the current plan that should be carried forward in the RTP/SCS, and (c) add new projects. The web-based project application will be available

on March 1, 2011. At that time, MTC will provide instructions to CMAs on how to access and use the web-based form. Upon request, MTC staff will also provide a brief tutorial to the CMAs and its technical advisory committee.

MTC looks forward to receiving your project submittals. If you have any questions about the submittal process, please contact Grace Cho of my staff at (510) 817-5826 or gcho@mtc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Ann Flemer
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

AF: GC

J:\PROJECT\2013 RTP_SCS\Call for Projects\Final Version\Call for Projects Letters\Call for Projects Letter - STA.doc

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Call for Projects Guidance
- Attachment A.1: Goals and Performance Targets
- Attachment A.2: Programmatic Categories
- Attachment A.3: MTC's Draft Transportation Project Performance Assessment Methodology
- Attachment A.4: MTC Policy Advisory Council Members

Attachment A Call for Projects Guidance

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) requests the assistance of the nine Bay Area Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to help with the Call for Projects within their counties. CMAs are best suited for this role because of their existing relationships with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community organizations and stakeholders, and members of the public within their counties. MTC expects the CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process to solicit candidate projects to be submitted to MTC for consideration in the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS).

Project sponsors with projects vying for future state or federal funding must have their project identified in the financially constrained RTP/SCS. CMAs will be the main point of contact for local sponsoring agencies and members of the public submitting projects for consideration for inclusion in the 2013 SCS/RTP. Sponsors of multi-county projects (i.e. Caltrans, BART, Caltrain, etc.) may submit directly to MTC, but communication and coordination with CMAs is encouraged. Members of the public are eligible to submit projects, but must secure a public agency sponsor and coordinate the project submittal with their CMA.

CMAs will assist MTC with the Call for Projects by carrying out the following activities:

1. Public Involvement and Outreach

- ***Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas.***
CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, will be expected to implement their public outreach efforts in a manner consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan (MTC Resolution No. 3821), which can be found at http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm. CMAs are expected, at a minimum, to:
 - Execute effective and meaningful local engagement efforts during the Call for Projects by working closely with local jurisdictions, elected officials, transit agencies, community-based organizations, and the public through the project solicitation process. In addition to the CMAs' citizen advisors, MTC's Policy Advisory Council members are a good resource to the CMAs to help plan community outreach events, engage members of the public, and identify candidate projects. Please see **Attachment A.4** for a list of MTC's Policy Advisory Council members.
 - Explain the local Call for Projects process, informing stakeholders and the public about the opportunities for public comments on project ideas and when decisions are to be made on the list of projects to be submitted to MTC;
 - Hold public meetings and/or workshops at times which are conducive to public participation to solicit public input on project ideas to submit;
 - Hold at least one public hearing providing opportunity for public comment on the list of potential projects prior to submittal to MTC;
 - Post notices of public meetings and hearing(s) on their agency website; include information on how to request language translation for individuals with limited English proficiency. If agency protocol has not been established, please refer to MTC's Plan for Assisting Limited English Proficient Populations.
 - CMA staff will be expected to provide MTC with a link so the information can also be viewed on the website OneBayArea.org;
 - Hold public meetings in central locations that are accessible for people with people with disabilities and by public transit;

- Offer language translations and accommodations for people with disabilities, if requested at least three days in advance of the meeting.
- ***Document the outreach effort undertaken for the local call for projects.*** CMAs, as well as multi-county transit operators and Caltrans, are to provide MTC with:
 - A description of how the public was involved in the process for nominating and/or commenting on projects for inclusion in the RTP/SCS. Specify whether public input was gathered at forums held specifically for the RTP/SCS or as part of an outreach effort associated with, for example, an update to a countywide plan;
 - A description of how the public engagement process met the outreach requirements of MTC's Public Participation Plan, including how the CMA ensured full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the project submittal process.
 - A summary of comments received from the public and a description of how public comments informed the recommended list of projects submitted by the CMA. Conversely, rationale must be provided if comments or projects from the public were not able to be accommodated in the list of candidate projects and a description of how the CMA, in future project nomination processes, plans to address the comments or projects suggested by the public.

2. Agency Coordination

- ***Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS.*** CMAs will assist with agency coordination by:
 - Communicating this Call for Projects guidance to local jurisdictions, transit agencies, Caltrans, and stakeholders and coordinate with them on the online project application form by assigning passwords, fielding questions about the project application form, reviewing and verifying project information, and submitting projects as ready for review by MTC
 - Working with members of the public interested in advancing a project idea to find a public agency project sponsor, and assisting them with submitting the project to MTC;
 - Developing freeway operations and capacity enhancement projects in coordination with MTC and Caltrans staff.
 - Developing transit improvements in coordination with MTC and transit agency staff.

3. Title VI Responsibilities

- ***Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process as in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.***
 - Assist community-based organizations, communities of concern, and any other underserved community interested in submitting projects;
 - Remove barriers for persons with limited English proficiency to have access to the project submittal process;
 - For additional Title IV outreach strategies, please refer to MTC's Public Participation Plan found at: http://www.onebayarea.org/get_involved.htm

4. County Target Budgets

- **Ensure that the County project list fits within the target budget defined by MTC for the county.**
 - To establish the county target budgets, MTC used the discretionary funding amount (\$32 billion) from the Transportation 2035 Plan and assigned counties a target budget based on a population share formula with an additional 75% mark up. County target budgets can be seen below. This formula approach is consistent with the formula used in Transportation 2035 Plan.
 - County target budgets are intended as a starting point to guide each CMA in recommending a project list to MTC by providing an upper financial limit.
 - County target budgets are not intended as the financially constrained RTP/SCS budget. CMAs and MTC will continue to discuss further and select projects later in the process that fit the RTP/SCS financially constrained envelope.

County Target Budgets (in billions)

Alameda: \$11.76

Contra Costa: \$7.84

Marin: \$2.24

Napa: \$1.12

San Francisco: \$6.16

San Mateo: \$5.60

Santa Clara: \$14.0

Solano: \$3.36

Sonoma: \$3.92

5. Cost Estimation Review

- **Establish guidelines for estimating project costs.** CMAs are to establish cost estimation guidelines for use by project sponsors. The guidelines may be developed by the CMAs or CMAs can elect to use other accepted guidelines produced by local, state or federal agencies. MTC has identified the following cost estimation guidelines available for use:
 - Federal: National Cooperative Highway Research Program's Guidance for Cost Estimation and Management for Highway Projects During Planning, Programming, and Preconstruction (http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/nchrp/nchrp_w98.pdf)
 - State: Caltrans' Project Development Procedures Manual Chapter 20, Project Development Cost Estimates (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/oppd/pdpm/chap_pdf/chapt20.pdf)
 - Local: Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) Cost Estimation Guide (http://ccta.net/assets/documents/Cost_Est_Guide_Documentation.pdf)
- **Review and verify with MTC that each project has developed an appropriate cost estimate prior to submittal.**

6. General Project Criteria

- **Identify whether projects meet basic project parameters as outlined by MTC.** CMAs will encourage project sponsors to submit projects which meet one or more of the general criteria listed below, keeping in consideration that projects should support SCS principals promulgated by SB 375:
 - Supports the goals and performance targets of the RTP/SCS (see **Attachment A.1**).
 - Serves as a regionally significant component of the regional transportation network. A regionally significant transportation project serves regional transportation needs (such as access to and from the area outside of the region, major activity centers in the region,

- major planned developments such as new retail malls, sports complexes, etc., or transportation terminals as well as most terminals themselves).
 - Supports focused growth by serving existing housing and employment centers FOCUS Priority Development Areas.
 - Derives from an adopted plan, corridor study, or project study report (e.g., community-based transportation plans, countywide transportation plan, regional bicycle plan, climate action plans, etc.).
- **Assess how well the project meets basic criteria**
 Project sponsors are welcome to use MTC’s qualitative/quantitative approach or some hybrid thereof to develop and evaluate project priorities (See **Attachment A.3**). Sponsors may include qualitative discussion and/or quantitative data to demonstrate how proposed projects meet the RTP/SCS goals and targets, the magnitude of project impacts and cost effectiveness. MTC will provide a function in the on-line application for this information and may use it to inform the Goals Assessment portion of MTC's evaluation.

7. Programmatic Categories

- CMAs should group similar projects, which are exempt from regional air quality conformity that do not add capacity or expand the transportation network, into broader programmatic categories rather than submitting them as individual projects for consideration in the RTP/SCS. These individual projects may address a concern of the community (e.g., improved pedestrian ways to transit, curb bulb-outs to calm traffic, etc.), but do not have to be individually specified for the purposes of air quality conformity. See **Attachment A.2** for guidance on the programmatic categories.

Timeline

Task	Date
Issue Call for Projects Letter to CMAs, Caltrans, and Multi-County Transit Operators	February 10, 2011
Open Online Project Application Form for Use by CMAs/ Project Sponsors	March 1, 2011
Close of Project Submittal Period	April 29, 2011
MTC Conducts Project-Level Performance Assessment and Selection Process for Projects for Detailed SCS Scenarios	May – July 2011



DATE: March 31, 2011
TO: STA PAC
FROM: Sara Woo, Associate Planner
RE: State Route (SR) 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan

Background:

The SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan began in late 2008 through a \$55,000 grant awarded to STA by the San Francisco Ridge Trail Council. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the possibility for an off-street bicycle and pedestrian path within the SR 12 West corridor, while redefining the existing plans. Ultimately, many agencies were involved and worked together to find out a single bike-ped route that could be agreed upon by all participants. Key participants of the Technical Working Group included staff from Caltrans, City of Fairfield, Napa County, NCT&PA, San Francisco Ridge Trail Council, and Solano County.

The Plan development was placed on hold for approximately one year, resuming in late 2009, due to state budget restrictions on available funding. Over the past several months, the Plan's working group and consultant team has worked to refine the study to finalize the document.

Discussion:

For the PAC's review, the SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan is made up of the following chapters:

1. Executive Summary
2. Introduction
3. SR 12 Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Partnership
4. Goals, Objectives, and Policies
5. Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans/Projects Inventory
6. Opportunities and Constraints
7. Concept Design and Alignment Options
8. Trail Design Guidelines
9. Cost Analysis, Funding, and Implementation

In January 2011, the PAC was provided an update to the Plan's Open House and follow up analysis of design and alignment options. Since January, public comments and revisions suggested by the Technical Working Group have been incorporated into the Plan. The primary recommendation of the study was to pursue the development of a Class II bicycle lane along SR

12 as well as the local connections at each terminus of the corridor. In addition, the study identifies a potential trail corridor for future study based on existing environmental constraints. Developing a shared use trail corridor through Jameson Canyon is constrained by many physical and environmental characteristics. There are also ownership and land use issues that provide both opportunities and constraints for trail placement. A benefit-cost analysis was prepared and showed that the cost to develop a Class I facility on the terrain exceeds the benefit.

If approved by the PAC, the STA Board would follow with an action item at their April 13, 2011 meeting for a formal adoption of the SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan

Separate Enclosure (see STA website at www.sta.ca.gov)

A. SR 12 Jameson Canyon Corridor Bicycle and Pedestrian Connections Plan



DATE: March 31, 2011
TO: STA PAC
FROM: Sara Woo, Associate Planner
RE: Informational Items – Discussion

VII.A Countywide Pedestrian Transportation Plan Update – (Sara Woo, STA)

Background:

STA staff is in the final stages of the Pedestrian Plan development. Currently, the Introductory Chapter/Background, Countywide Pedestrian Plan Goals and Objectives, and Countywide Pedestrian Projects list, and Existing Conditions, and Pedestrian Guidelines Chapters have been completed. The final sections that still need to be completed are the Performance Measures and Implementation Strategies. STA staff will present the Plan's status at the April 6, 2011 meeting. The remaining plan chapters will be mailed to the group and participants for comment shortly after the April 6th meeting, with the anticipation to bring the completed final draft to the PAC at the May 19, 2011 meeting.

No Attachments.

VII.B Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) Update – (Robert Guerrero, STA)

There are several planning efforts underway related to the CTP Update. The Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) was actively involved in the Alternative Modes Element development over the last year and half, particularly with the Countywide Pedestrian Plan Update. Over the next several months, STA staff will be seeking the PAC's input in the development the County's first Safe Routes to Transit Plan and an update of the 2004 Countywide Transportation for Livable Communities Plan. At the January 20, 2011 PAC meeting, the Allan Deal and Betty Livingston (alternate) were appointed for the SR2T Plan development committee. STA staff is anticipating having kick off meetings for the both plans in May with the goal to complete them by April 2012. STA staff will provide a presentation on the schedule and additional details of the scope and purpose of the plans at the upcoming PAC meeting. In addition, STA staff will present the CTP Land Use Element for PAC member comments. This element lays out the existing and anticipated land uses in the 7 cities and Solano County, as well as setting the regional context.

A copy of the draft Land Use Element is included as Attachment VIII.B.

2010 SOLANO CTP – LAND USE CHAPTER

Which comes first – the chicken or the egg?

Land use and transportation decisions are much like the chicken and the egg (neither really proceeds the other). They influence and react to each other, and develop as a system, rather than as individual, unrelated topics. Since the Solano CTP is primarily a transportation document, the majority of the Plan will address that topic. But given the close association of land use and transportation, it is important to start out with an overview of existing and projected local and regional land uses.

LOCAL

The STA has 8 member agencies: Solano County, and the cities of Benicia, Dixon, Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville and Vallejo. Their existing and planned land uses have the greatest influence on Solano’s countywide transportation system. Each of the eight jurisdictions is statistically described in this Chapter, with a more detailed community profile found in Appendix ____.

Solano County is part of the San Francisco Bay Area, and is also part of the larger Northern California Mega Region. The Northern California Mega Region covers the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento regions, with strong connections to San Joaquin County and lesser connections to the Monterey, North Coast and upper and lower Central Valley areas, and even to the Lake Tahoe/Reno region to the east. Because of the concentration of economic, governmental and cultural resources in the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento, those areas and their land uses are also described below.

One of the most fundamental facts regarding the connection of land use and transportation decisions is that local governments have the statutory authority for land use decisions within their jurisdiction, subject to the requirements of state law. This is established in both the fundamental state land use laws regarding general plans, zoning and subdivision maps, as well as issue-specific legislation such as SB 375. This fundamental principle is recognized in the Solano CTP Goal #4:

“The Solano CTP will identify a transportation system that supports the existing and planned land uses of Solano County’s seven cities and the County of Solano.

- a) The Solano CTP recognizes that land use decisions are the responsibility of the local agencies.
- b) Recognize the interaction between land use and transportation plans, with neither taking precedence over the other.
- c) The CTP will help identify regional and state land use initiatives linked to transportation, and support local land use plans and projects that seek to take advantage of those programs.”

Solano County and the 7 Cities

Population

The population information below is taken from the decennial census for 1990 and 2000, and from the California Department of Finance annual population estimate for 2010. The raw population numbers are:

Table X1 – Solano Population, 1990 to 2010

Jurisdiction	1990	2000	2010	% of Total Population	20-year # growth	20-year % Growth
Benicia	24,437	26,865	28,086	6.6%	3,649	14.9%
Dixon	10,417	16,103	17,605	4.1%	7,188	69.0%
Fairfield	78,650	96,178	105,955	24.8%	27,305	34.7%
Rio Vista	3,316	4,571	8,324	1.9%	5,008	151.0%
Suisun City	22,704	26,118	28,962	6.8%	6,258	27.6%
Vacaville	71,476	88,642	97,305	22.7%	25,829	36.1%
Vallejo	109,199	117,148	121,435	28.4%	12,236	11.2%
Balance Of County	19,272	19,305	20,165	4.7%	893	4.6%
TOTAL	339,471	394,930	427,837	100.0%	88,366	26.0%

Vallejo is the largest city in the county, with 28.4% of the 2010 population. Benicia and Vallejo, which share a three and a half mile common border, account for 35% of the county total, while Fairfield (the County seat), Suisun City and Vacaville, all located in the center of the county, account for 54.3% of the county population. More than 89% of the County population is located on one of two urban clusters in the southwest and central portions of the county.

The low population figure for the unincorporated County is largely a result of the Solano Orderly Growth Initiative (aka Proposition A), approved by the voters in 1984 and subsequently renewed in 2008. The Solano Orderly Growth Initiative assigns urban growth almost exclusively to the incorporated cities, and severely limits rezoning of agricultural lands in the unincorporated County.

The two smallest communities in the county – Dixon and Rio Vista – are also not ‘clustered’ with other communities. Dixon is located on I-80, approximately half-way between Vacaville and Davis. Rio Vista is located on SR 12, approximately 20 miles east of Fairfield/Suisun City, and adjacent to the Sacramento River. Dixon’s access to I-80 provides it with good regional mobility, but Rio Vista’s almost complete reliance on SR 12 significantly restricts access to and from (as well as within) the city. In addition, year-round agricultural and interregional goods movement traffic on SR 12, and summer-season recreational traffic accessing the Delta, further impact SR 12 and access to Rio Vista. Dixon’s growth since 1990 has in part been limited by local ordinance, and by a City decision to not allow urban development on the north side of I-80. Rio Vista has entitled ___ residential units, but has not seen development of many of these created lots.

Employment

Until the mid-1990s, Vallejo was the employment center of the county as well as the population center. As seen in the table below, Vallejo accounted for ___ % of the county's jobs.

Table X2 – Solano Employment, 1990 to 2010

Jurisdiction	1990	2000	% of Total 2000 Employment	2010	% of Total 2010 Employment	20-year # growth	20-year % Growth
Benicia		14,400	10.5%	13,680	9.8%	13,680	
Dixon		4,790	3.5%	5,290	3.8%	5,290	
Fairfield		45,810	33.5%	45,120	32.2%	45,120	
Rio Vista		2,250	1.6%	2,870	2.0%	2,870	
Suisun City		3,390	2.5%	3,870	2.8%	3,870	
Vacaville		25,660	18.8%	28,380	20.3%	28,380	
Vallejo		31,260	22.9%	32,190	23.0%	32,190	
Balance Of County		9,140	6.7%	8,720	6.2%	8,720	
TOTAL		136,700	100.0%	140,120	100.0%	140,120	

In 1996, the Mare Island Naval Ship Yard in Vallejo was closed, and approximately 1,500 jobs disappeared. With this closure, the county employment center shifted from Vallejo to Fairfield, with almost one-third of the county-wide jobs located in Fairfield in 2000, and almost four in ten by 2010. Vallejo and Benicia combined account for 32.8% of the county's 2010 jobs, while Fairfield, Suisun City and Vacaville account for 55.3% of the jobs.

Although small, Dixon is well balanced between county wide population and employment, with 4.1% of the county population and 3.8% of the county jobs. Rio Vista has 1.9% of the county population and 2% of the county jobs. While Rio Vista lacks any regional job centers, Dixon has regionally-important retail and employers such as Genentech and Gymboree.

Projected Changes

There are two views of future development for Solano County and the 7 cities; those in each jurisdiction's general plans, and those of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Since 2007, ABAG has changed its Projections series of documents to reflect a policy choice giving preference to household and job creation in the inner Bay Area, in communities served by high-capacity, high frequency public transit. The following table shows each Solano jurisdiction's projected 2035 population and employment, based upon ABAG's Projections 2009. While the projections are not the certain result of 25 years of development and change by each jurisdiction, they do provide a reasonably-possible future image of Solano County and the 7 cities.

Table X3 – Solano Population and Employment Projections, 2035

Jurisdiction	2035 Population	% of Total 2035 Population	2035 Employment	% of 2035 Employment
Benicia	30,100	5.9%	18,850	8.9%
Dixon	23,900	4.7%	10,440	4.9%
Fairfield	127,000	25.1%	70,520	33.3%
Rio Vista	15,300	3.0%	5,990	2.8%
Suisun City	34,300	6.8%	6,090	2.9%
Vacaville	111,100	21.9%	42,110	19.9%
Vallejo	138,900	27.4%	45,920	21.7%
Balance Of County	25,900	5.1%	11,960	5.6%
TOTAL	506,500		211,880	

The projected 2035 distribution of population and employment is not significantly different from the existing conditions. Vallejo will remain the largest city in terms of population at 27.4%, and Fairfield will have the largest number of jobs at 33.3%. Population and jobs will be centered in the two city clusters of Benicia-Vallejo and Fairfield-Suisun City-Vacaville.

As with population, Dixon and Rio Vista are stand-alone communities with job growth prospects influenced by their access to the larger region. Dixon, with its close proximity to Davis and the University of California campus there, and its easy access by rail and freeway, has significant job growth potential. Rio Vista, however, has significant employment growth challenges because of its relative isolation. Because of the low base from which it starts, however, Rio Vista’s relative growth is substantial.

Even though the general location and proportion of residential and employment development are not expected to change over the next 25 years, the type of development may change. This is especially true of residential development. The primary reason for this is the current emphasis from MTC, ABAG and even national agencies on transit-oriented development (TOD). TOD is more than just housing near transit; it is communities designed to emphasize transit use over single-occupant auto trips. Typical features of TOD are higher density residential developments, easy access to public transit and to bicycle and pedestrian networks, and reductions in parking requirements (often upper limits on the number of parking spaces rather than lower limits.)

In the Bay Area, MTC and ABAG support TOD projects through the FOCUS program’s Priority Development Area (PDAs) designation, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) planning and capital grants, and Station Area Plan grants.

There are 9 PDAs designated in Solano County. Each PDA is described in more detail in the Alternative Modes element of the Solano CTP, and in the Solano TLC Plan, a separate document that is being updated in 2011. The Solano TLC Plan focuses on the existing and potential PDAs, but will also recognize

that there are areas in the County and cities that can accommodate development that supports transit and bicycle and pedestrian use, but that do not qualify for PDA designation.

Table X4 – Solano Priority Development Areas, Population and Employment, 2035

	Population			Jobs		
	2010	2035	Change	2010	2035	Change
Downtown Benicia	1,447	1,673	226	1,789	2,087	298
Fairfield Downtown South	1,581	2,352	771	1,494	4,479	2,985
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	2,309	9,773	7,464	183	1,167	984
Fairfield North Texas Street Core	3,628	5,505	1,877	560	2,617	2,057
Fairfield West Texas Street Gateway	2,485	3,770	1,285	836	2,700	1,864
Suisun City Downtown & Waterfront District	3,839	7,258	3,419	764	1,444	680
Downtown Vacaville	1,298	4,538	3,240	1,807	6,261	4,454
Vacaville Allison Area	1,457	1,885	428	739	1,755	1,016
Vallejo Downtown & Waterfront	4,165	12,775	8,610	1,727	6,671	4,944
Total Solano County PDAs	22,209	49,529	27,320	9,899	29,181	19,282

The nine PDAs have the potential to account for almost 35% of the projected 25-year growth in Solano County and the 7 cities, as shown in Table X5 below. More important than the county-wide figure is the PDA proportion in 4 of the 5 cities that have PDAs: Fairfield, 54.2% of potential growth, Suisun City 64.1% of potential growth, Vacaville 26.6% of potential growth and Vallejo 49.3% of potential growth.

Table X5 – Solano Priority Development Areas, Population and Employment Growth, 2010 to 2035

Jurisdiction	2010 Population	2035 Population	25 Year Growth	PDA 25 Year Growth	PDA % of 25-Year Growth
Benicia	28,086	30,100	2,014	226	11.2%
Dixon	17,605	23,900	6,295	0	0.0%
Fairfield	105,955	127,000	21,045	11,397	54.2%
Rio Vista	8,324	15,300	6,976	0	0.0%
Suisun City	28,962	34,300	5,338	3,419	64.1%
Vacaville	97,305	111,100	13,795	3,668	26.6%
Vallejo	121,435	138,900	17,465	8,610	49.3%
Balance Of County	20,165	25,900	5,735	0	0.0%
TOTAL	427,837	506,500	78,663	27,320	34.7%

Most of these PDAs are centered around existing transit centers. The Fairfield Downtown and Suisun City Downtown and Waterfront District PDAs are immediately adjacent to the Suisun City Capitol Corridor train station. The Fairfield West Texas Gateway PDA includes the Fairfield Transportation

Center. The Downtown Vacaville PDA is a quarter mile from the Davis Street park-and-ride lot, while the Vacaville Allison Area PDA includes the Vacaville Transit Center. The Vallejo Downtown and Waterfront PDA includes the Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) ferry terminal and the Vallejo Station parking garage. Finally, the Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station PDA is centered around a planned transit center that includes a Capitol Corridor train stop, bus connections and a park-and-ride lot.

This means that about one-third of the projected 2010 to 2035 residential growth can be accommodated in areas that provide immediate access to transit. By giving funding priority to projects in or directly supporting PDAs, STA has the opportunity to support those decisions that help create a more efficient use of the transportation system.

REGION

Solano County is part of the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area. The other counties are Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara and Sonoma. The eastern segment of Solano County is also functionally a part of the Central Valley, with close connections to the Sacramento and San Joaquin metropolitan areas and the Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta.

San Francisco Bay Area

As of the beginning of 2010, the Bay Area population was 7.3 million, with 5.1 million of those residents in Santa Clara, Alameda and Contra Costa counties and the city of San Francisco. The region's employment is similarly concentrated in those areas, with 2.6 million of the region's 3.5 million jobs in those areas.

The Bay Area's demographics and transportation are in large part shaped by geology. The mountain ranges of the Coast Range run north-south. The San Francisco Bay has both north-south and east-west portions. The result is a series of barriers that focus traffic on a few choke points, such as toll bridges and passes or tunnels through mountains. When the combination of concentrated jobs and traffic choke points is brought together, the Bay Area produces severe gridlock in some areas, especially those approaching the jobs centers in San Francisco and San Jose.

ABAG projects an 80% growth in the Bay Area's population from 2010 to 2035, and a 74% increase in employment. The rate of population growth in two of the core Bay Area cities – Oakland and San Francisco – will be less than that in outlying areas such as Solano County, but the total number of both new residents and new jobs in these areas will still be greater than the comparable aggregate total for all eight Solano jurisdictions. The concentration of jobs in the inner Bay Area, and inability to create new, high-capacity means of transporting workers in to those jobs, means that existing in-commute and resultant congestion will only get worse.

As noted above, ABAG and MTC are working on a program to concentrate growth in identified nodes that are served by frequent, high-density transit. This program, if carried out to its full potential, would substantially decrease the growth of in-commuting to the inner Bay Area and the related production of greenhouse gasses. However, many PDAs in the inner Bay Area are either at risk from projected sea level rise or are in areas with a high concentration of small particulate air pollution (PM 2.5), primarily

related to diesel engines. In addition, there are a number of non-transportation infrastructure deficiencies that impact these PDAs, as well as potential local political opposition. It appears unlikely that the Bay Area PDAs will be developed to their full potential.

Central Valley

The Sacramento metropolitan area is the largest urban concentration in the northern Central Valley, with Stockton and its environs being a distant second. Solano County's association with the Sacramento area is in some ways as strong as that with the Bay Area.

The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) covers the counties of El Dorado, Placer, Sacramento, Sutter, Yolo and Yuba. SACOG projects the region's population will grow from a 2005 total of just over 2 million to a 2035 total of 3.4 million. Sacramento County has the largest number of residents, both at the current time and in the 2035 projections. Unlike many Bay Area communities, however, much of Sacramento County's population lives in the unincorporated county (527,790 of 1,283,234 in 2005). By 2035, the proportion of residents in the unincorporated county will have fallen from 41% to 38%, but will still be larger than any of the incorporated cities.

Sacramento holds a similar preponderance of regional jobs. In 2005, Sacramento County was home to 678,503 out of the region's 1,000,157 total jobs (68%). In 2035, the proportion is projected to be 63% (967,986 out of 1,536,097).

The SACOG area does not have the same physical constrictions of transportation routes as does the Bay Area. Although the Sacramento and American rivers transverse the area, they are much easier to cross than is the San Francisco bay. None of the bridges require a toll. In addition, the region is not divided by the steep hills that characterize the Bay Area.

One result of this lack of obstacles has been a lower density urban development pattern, with a higher proportion of single family homes and a lower density downtown business core. This lower density makes it harder for public transportation to achieve a high farebox recovery rate. In addition, the Sacramento Area is served by a limited number of freeways: Interstates 80 and 5, State Highways 99 and 50 and the Capitol City Freeway. Sacramento's freeway congestion is generally not considered as bad as that of the Bay Area, but the region does experience significant commute-hour delays, as well as non-commute delays from seasonal recreational traffic traveling to and from the Lake Tahoe region.

San Joaquin County is projected to grow from a 2010 population of 681,600 to a 2035 population of 1,000,200, with Stockton and Lodi remaining the two largest communities in the county. Employment for San Joaquin County is expected to grow from a 2010 total of 214,000 to a 2035 figure of 293,400.

San Joaquin County faces geographical, population density and transportation issues similar to those of Sacramento. Few Solano residents commute to San Joaquin County for employment. However, important recreational and agricultural traffic travels to and through both Solano and San Joaquin Counties on Highway 12.

Local and Regional Projection Differences

Projections for growth are a frequent source of tension between local and regional governments, and the Solano County relationship with ABAG is no exception. Many communities seek to emphasize retail and industrial expansion and minimize residential growth for a number of reasons, with impact to the local tax base being a common concern. In the 1990s and early 2000's most Solano County communities objected to ABAG's projections for residential growth as being too high, essentially forcing suburban Solano County to accept residential growth that the inner Bay Area communities were unwilling to accept. Residential growth projections are especially important because they form the basis of the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) process required by the State, and the subsequent development of local General Plan Housing Elements that must be in conformance with the RHNA numbers. At the same time, ABAG job projections were typically lower than local communities desired. This lower employment projection lacks the impact of the housing projections because there is no requirement or obstacle placed in the way of retail and industrial growth to match the RHNA and Housing Element requirements.

Since ABAG's Projections 2007, the situation has begun to reverse itself. ABAG is now projecting significantly lower population growth in Solano County as a matter of policy, and has revised its employment projections to: a) reflect a lower expected rate of employment growth, and b) concentrate more of that growth in the inner Bay Area.

One result of these differences in growth projections is that the local general plans have different projected population and employment numbers than do the ABAG projections. In the case of retail and industrial growth, local governments (both in Solano County and elsewhere in the Bay Area) typically aggressively seek out new development.

CONCLUSION

No matter which projections are used, Solano County will see continued residential, retail and industrial growth from 2010 to 2035. The location and type of this growth will be important, but will probably not change the fundamental traffic patterns that exist today. This is because the projected 25-year growth of population is about 18% - meaning that 82% of the population producing trips on local and regional roads already resides in Solano County. New land use development can change the type and volume of traffic growth, but is unlikely to substantially change that patterns that exist.

There are two possible exceptions to this conclusion. First, ABAG's growth projections could lead to a re-ordering of regional transportation investments, with more money going into the inner Bay Area communities projected to take on more residential growth. If the actual growth continues to happen in suburban communities such as Solano County – as has been the pattern for more than 20 years – but the transportation investments change to reflect ABAG's projections, then the impact of actual growth on Solano's transportation system will be worse, because the county and local jurisdictions will lack resources to improve the system.

The other potential change is a significant increase in the rate of employment growth in Solano County. Local residents drive to Bay Area and Sacramento jobs because that is where the major employment centers are located; and, in the case of many inner Bay Area jobs, that is where the high salary jobs are. If Solano County and the seven cities are successful in attracting new, good-paying jobs at a faster rate than ABAG projects, the need for Solano residents to commute on I-80 to the inner Bay or to Sacramento will be reduced. The potential to improve both the local and regional transportation pattern, as well as to provide other economic and sociological benefits to local jurisdictions, is significant.



DATE: March 31, 2011
TO: STA PAC
FROM: Sara Woo, Associate Planner
RE: Funding Opportunities Summary

Discussion:

Below is a list of funding opportunities that will be available to STA member agencies during the next few months. Attachment A provides further details for each program.

	FUND SOURCE	AMOUNT AVAILABLE	APPLICATION DEADLINE
1.	Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)	Approximately \$20 million	Due On First-Come, First Served Basis
2.	Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)	Approximately \$10 million	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
3.	Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)*	Up to \$5,000 rebate per light-duty vehicle	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
4.	Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Hybrid Electric Vehicle Purchase Vouchers (HVIP)*	Approximately \$10,000 to \$45,000 per qualified request	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
5.	Program for Arterial System Synchronization*	Approximately \$1,250,000	Due April 12, 2011

*New funding opportunity

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. Detailed Funding Opportunities Summary

Attachment A

The following funding opportunities will be available to the STA member agencies during the next few months. Please distribute this information to the appropriate departments in your jurisdiction.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)	Anthony Fournier Bay Area Air Quality Management District (415) 749-4961 afournier@baaqmd.gov	Ongoing. Application Due On First-Come, First Served Basis Eligible Project Sponsors: private non-profit organizations, state or local governmental authorities, and operators of public transportation services	Approximately \$20 million	Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program provides incentive grants for cleaner-than-required engines, equipment, and other sources of pollution providing early or extra emission reductions.	Eligible Projects: cleaner on-road, off-road, marine, locomotive and stationary agricultural pump engines http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-Sources/Carl-Moyer-Program.aspx
Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)	Gary A. Bailey Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (916) 874-4893 gbailey@airquality.org	Ongoing. Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis Eligible Project Sponsors: private non-profit organizations, state or local governmental authorities, and operators of public transportation services	Approximately \$10 million , maximum per project is \$4.5 million	The Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (ERP), an extension of the Carl Moyer Program, provides grant funds to replace Tier 0, high-polluting off-road equipment with the cleanest available emission level equipment.	Eligible Projects: install particulate traps, replace older heavy-duty engines with newer and cleaner engines and add a particulate trap, purchase new vehicles or equipment, replace heavy-duty equipment with electric equipment, install electric idling-reduction equipment http://www.airquality.org/mobile/moyererp/index.shtml

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)*	Meri Miles ARB (916) 322-6370 mmiles@arb.ca.gov	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Up to \$5,000 rebate per light-duty vehicle	The Zero-Emission and Plug-In Hybrid Light-Duty Vehicle (Clean Vehicle) Rebate Project is intended to encourage and accelerate zero-emission vehicle deployment and technology innovation. Rebates for clean vehicles are now available through the Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP) funded by the Air Resources Board (ARB) and implemented statewide by the California Center for Sustainable Energy (CCSE).	Eligible Projects: Purchase or lease of zero-emission and plug-in hybrid light-duty vehicles http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/cvrp.htm
Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Hybrid Electric Vehicle Purchase Vouchers (HVIP)*	To learn more about how to request a voucher, contact: info@californiahvip.org	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Approximately \$10,000 to \$45,000 per qualified request	The California Air Resources Board (ARB) created the HVIP to speed the market introduction of low-emitting hybrid trucks and buses. It does this by reducing the cost of these vehicles for truck and bus fleets that purchase and operate the vehicles in the State of California. The HVIP voucher is intended to reduce about half the incremental costs of purchasing hybrid heavy-duty trucks and buses.	Eligible Projects: Purchase of low-emission hybrid trucks and buses http://www.californiahvip.org/

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
Program for Arterial System Synchronization (PASS)	Vamsi Tabjulu MTC (510)817-5936 vtabjulu@mtc.ca.gov	April 12, 2011 Eligible Applicants: Cities and counties in the Bay Area	Approximately \$1,250,000 , with a maximum of \$10,000 per project	Provides funding for technical assistance to Bay Area jurisdictions with retiming traffic signal systems that include signals from multiple jurisdictions, interact with freeways and state highways, operate on corridors with established regional significance, provide transit priority, or have been developed in conjunction with other regional programs.	Eligible Projects: Technical assistance and financial support will be focused on traffic signal system projects that: 1) interact with freeways and state highways; 2) involve traffic signals from multiple jurisdictions; 3) operate on corridors with established regional significance; 4) provide priority for transit vehicles; 5) have been developed in conjunction with other regional programs http://www.mtc.ca.gov/services/arterial_operations/downloads/PASS_Guidelines_2010-11.pdf

*New Funding Opportunity

**STA staff, Sara Woo, can be contacted directly at (707) 399-3214 or swoo@sta-snci.com for assistance with finding more information about any of the funding opportunities listed in this report.