



**STA BOARD MEETING AGENDA**

**6:00 p.m., Regular Meeting  
 Wednesday, October 12, 2011  
 Suisun City Hall Council Chambers  
 701 Civic Center Drive  
 Suisun City, CA 94585**

**Mission Statement:** To improve the quality of life in Solano County by delivering transportation system projects to ensure mobility, travel safety, and economic vitality.

**Public Comment:** Pursuant to the Brown Act, the public has an opportunity to speak on any matter on the agenda or, for matters not on the agenda, issues within the subject matter jurisdiction of the agency. Comments are limited to no more than 2 minutes per speaker unless modified by the Board Chair, Gov't Code § 54954.3(a). By law, no action may be taken on any item raised during the public comment period (Agenda Item IV) although informational answers to questions may be given and matters may be referred to staff for placement on a future agenda of the agency. **Speaker cards are required in order to provide public comment. Speaker cards are on the table at the entry in the meeting room and should be handed to the STA Clerk of the Board. Public comments are limited to 2 minutes or less.**

**Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA):** This agenda is available upon request in alternative formats to persons with a disability, as required by the ADA of 1990 (42 U.S.C. §12132) and the Ralph M. Brown Act (Cal. Govt. Code §54954.2). Persons requesting a disability related modification or accommodation should contact Johanna Masiclat, Clerk of the Board, at (707) 424-6008 during regular business hours at least 24 hours prior to the time of the meeting.

**Staff Reports:** Staff reports are available for inspection at the STA Offices, One Harbor Center, Suite 130, Suisun City during regular business hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday-Friday. You may also contact the Clerk of the Board via email at [jmasiclat@sta-snci.com](mailto:jmasiclat@sta-snci.com). **Supplemental Reports:** Any reports or other materials that are issued after the agenda has been distributed may be reviewed by contacting the STA Clerk of the Board and copies of any such supplemental materials will be available on the table at the entry to the meeting room.

**Agenda Times:** Times set forth on the agenda are estimates. Items may be heard before or after the times shown.

**ITEM**

**BOARD/STAFF PERSON**

- |   |                    |
|---|--------------------|
| <p><b>I. CALL TO ORDER/PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE</b><br/>(6:00 – 6:05 p.m.)</p>  | <p>Chair Price</p> |
| <p><b>II. CONFIRM QUORUM/ STATEMENT OF CONFLICT</b><br/><i>An official who has a conflict must, prior to consideration of the decision; (1) publicly identify in detail the financial interest that causes the conflict; (2) recuse himself/herself from discussing and voting on the matter; (3) leave the room until after the decision has been made. Cal. Gov't Code § 87200.</i></p> | <p>Chair Price</p> |

**STA BOARD MEMBERS**

Harry Price Chair City of Fairfield	Jack Batchelor, Jr. Vice-Chair City of Dixon	Elizabeth Patterson City of Benicia	Jan Vick City of Rio Vista	Pete Sanchez City of Suisun City	Steve Hardy City of Vacaville	Osby Davis City of Vallejo	Jim Sperring County of Solano
---	--	--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------------------

**STA BOARD ALTERNATES**

Rick Fuller	Chuck Timm	Mike Ioakimedes	Janith Norman	Mike Hudson	Ron Rowlett	Erin Hannigan	John Vasquez
-------------	------------	-----------------	---------------	-------------	-------------	---------------	--------------

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**IV. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

(6:05 – 6:10 p.m.)

**V. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT – Pg. 1**

Daryl Halls

(6:10 – 6:15 p.m.)

**VI. COMMENTS FROM CALTRANS, THE METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), AND STA**

(6:15 – 6:25 p.m.)

**A. 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Awards Nominations**

Jayne Bauer

**B. Directors Report:**

**1. Planning**

Robert Macaulay

**2. Projects**

Janet Adams

**3. Transit/Rideshare**

Judy Leaks

**VII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Recommendation:

*Approve the following consent items in one motion.*

*(Note: Items under consent calendar may be removed for separate discussion.)*

(6:25 - 6:30 p.m.)

**A. STA Board Meeting Minutes of September 14, 2011**

Johanna Masiclat

Recommendation:

*Approve STA Board Meeting Minutes of September 14, 2011.*

**Pg. 7**

**B. Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of September 28, 2011**

Johanna Masiclat

Recommendation:

*Approve Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of September 28, 2011.*

**Pg. 17**

**C. Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Matrix – October 2011 – Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista**

Liz Niedziela

Recommendation:

*Approve the FY 2011-12 Solano TDA Matrix – October 2011 - Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista as shown in Attachment A.*

**Pg. 23**

**D. State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) Regional Paratransit Funding Request for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program**

Liz Niedziela

Recommendation:

*Allocate \$25,000 of STAF Regional Paratransit funds for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program.*

**Pg. 25**

- E. Solano County Transit (SolTrans) Transitional Costs Funding Request** Liz Niedziela  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve allocation of SolTrans funding request in the amount of \$395,800 of STAF to cover transitional costs through Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12.*  
**Pg. 51**
- F. Contract Amendment for SolTrans Project Management Consultant** Liz Niedziela  
*Recommendation:*  
*Authorize the Executive Director to extend the consultant contract with John Harris for SolTrans Project Management services until June 30, 2012 for an amount not-to-exceed \$85,000.*  
**Pg. 59**
- G. Contract Amendment for SolTrans Financial Consultant** Liz Niedziela  
*Recommendation:*  
*Authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract with Nancy Whelan Consulting for SolTrans Financial and Technical Services for an amount not-to-exceed \$130,000.*  
**Pg. 61**
- H. Solano County Transit Operators' Coordinated Short Range Transit Plan** Liz Niedziela  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the following:*  
  - 1. Authorize the Executive Director to submit a County Level Coordination funding request to MTC for individual SRTP analysis and a coordinated SRTP of Solano County transit operators; and*
  - 2. A coordinated analysis in cost effectively addressing Mobility Needs of People with Disabilities in Solano County.***Pg. 63**
- I. Project Managers for Transit Projects, Plans and Studies** Liz Niedziela  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the following:*  
  - 1. Authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Qualifications for Transit Project Management Services; and*
  - 2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements with two to three consultants for Project Management Services for an amount not-to-exceed \$120,000 for the five projects specified.***Pg. 93**

**J. Employer of Record for the Solano County Transit (SolTrans) Employees as Specified**

Daryl Halls  
Joy Apilado

Recommendation:

*Authorize the Executive Director to develop and enter in to an agreement with SolTrans designating STA as the 'Employer of Record' for the SolTrans Administrative Assistant position and other agreed upon SolTrans staff positions as identified in the SolTrans JPA's Transition Plan.*

**Pg. 95**

**VIII. ACTION FINANCIAL ITEMS**

**A. 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

Jessica McCabe

Recommendation:

*Approve the following:*

1. *Approve the 2011 10-Year Investment Plan for Highways and Major Transit Capital Projects as shown in Attachment D;*
2. *Program \$8.3M in available non-Transportation Enhancement (TE) STIP funds to the Jepson Parkway project;*
3. *Program \$649,000 in unprogrammed STIP TE reserve to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project;*
4. *Program \$672,000 in available new STIP TE funds to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project; and*
5. *Adopt Resolution No. 2011-17 (Attachment E)- A resolution of the Solano Transportation Authority authorizing the application for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Transportation Enhancements (TE) funding to Deliver the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing Project; and*
6. *Program \$98,000 in FY 2015-16 and \$274,000 in FY 2016-17 available for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) activities.*

(6:30 – 6:40 p.m.)

**Pg. 97**

**IX. ACTION NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS**

**A. Public Hearing on Proposed SolanoExpress Route 30 Service Changes**

Mona Babauta,  
FAST and  
Liz Niedziela

Recommendation:

1. *Conduct Public Hearing on Proposed SolanoExpress Route 30 Service Changes; and*
2. *Approve service changes to SolanoExpress Route 30 to improve time efficiency and cost effectiveness.*

(6:40 – 6:50 p.m.)

**Pg. 121**

- B. Proposed Revisions to the STA’s Local Preference Policy and Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 STA’s Local Preference Analysis** Bernadette Curry  
Daryl Halls  
*Recommendation:*  
*Adopt the attached revisions to the STA’s Local Purchasing Policy and receive the initial amended report for STA’s FY 2010-11 Local Preference Policy.*  
(6:50 – 7:00 p.m.)  
**Pg. 127**
- C. 2011 Solano Congestion Management Plan (CMP)** Robert Macaulay  
*Recommendation:*  
*Authorize the Executive Director to submit the Draft 2011 Solano CMP to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for conformity review.*  
(7:00 – 7:10 p.m.)  
**Pg. 135**
- D. STA’s Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform** Jayne Bauer  
*Recommendation:*  
*Approve the following:*
- 1. Authorize the Executive Director to distribute the STA’s Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform for a 30-day review and comment period; and*
  - 2. Oppose funding cuts to California Amtrak operations as proposed in the Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Subcommittee 2012 appropriations bill.*
- (7:10 – 7:20 p.m.)  
**Pg. 137**

## X. INFORMATIONAL

- A. Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Program Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Year-End Report** Judy Leaks  
*Informational*  
(7:20 – 7:25 p.m.)  
**Pg. 179**
- B. Safe Routes to Transit Plan (SR2T) Update** Robert Guerrero  
*Informational*  
(7:25 – 7:30 p.m.)  
**Pg. 189**

## NO DISCUSSION

- C. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program Fourth Quarter and Annual Report** Susan Furtado  
*Informational*  
**Pg. 201**

- D. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update/One Bay Area Block Grant Update** Robert Macaulay  
*Informational*  
**Pg. 205**
- E. Funding Opportunities Summary** Sara Woo  
*Informational*  
**Pg. 245**
- F. STA Board Meeting Schedule for Calendar Year 2011** Johanna Masiclat  
*Informational*  
**Pg. 249**

**XI. BOARD MEMBERS COMMENTS**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

The next regular meeting of the STA Board is scheduled at **6:00 p.m., Wednesday, December 14, 2011, Suisun City Hall Council Chambers.**



## MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 4, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Daryl K. Halls  
RE: Executive Director's Report –October 2011

---

The following is a brief status report on some of the major issues and projects currently being advanced by the STA. An asterisk (\*) notes items included in this month's Board agenda.

### **2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) \***

The STA staff has prepared the recommendation for programming Solano County's share of the 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) based on the July 2011 STIP Fund Estimate prepared by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). This recommendation includes programming \$8.3 million in new programming capacity for the Jepson Parkway, \$1.32 million in unprogrammed and new STIP Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds for the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project, and \$372,000 in STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring funds to the STA for project development activities. Both of the projects recommended for funding are priority projects of the STA and these funds will leverage other funding sources.

### **Updated Solano Congestion Management Plan (CMP) \***

Staff has updated the Solano Congestion Management Plan (CMP) in accordance with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) updated regional CMP guidelines. Most of the changes identified in this CMP update are minor in anticipation of the new Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)/Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) being developed by the MTC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). A more substantive CMP update is expected in 2013 once the new RTP is adopted.

### **STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform \***

Staff has reviewed and updated STA's Legislative Priorities and Platform in early preparation for the 2012 legislative sessions in Sacramento and Washington, DC. This specifically includes an updated list of priorities for federal and state funds. The STA Board is being requested to release the document for public and agency review and comment prior to adoption by the Board at the meeting in December.

**Modifications to SolanoExpress Route 30 \***

Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST) staff has recommended modifications to Route 30 to improve on-time performance and to better serve the current and potential riders. STA staff is also recommending an additional modification to better serve westbound Vacaville and Dixon riders of Route 30 in the morning. Route 30 provides seven daily express bus trips from the Solano cities of Fairfield, Vacaville and Dixon to UC Davis and Sacramento. The Board is being asked to conduct a public hearing to hear any public comments prior to Board action on the proposed service changes.

**Request to Help Address Transitional Costs for SolTrans \***

The STA has received a request from Solano County Transit (SolTrans) for transit funds to help cover some of the transitional costs for SolTrans, for the remainder of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12, associated with the new formation of the agency. Staff is recommending the STA Board approve allocating these State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) for this year to assist SolTrans in this effort during their first year of transition and until their Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) can be completed.

**Status of Implementation of Regional CLIPPER Card**

CLIPPER is the name of the regional transit card designed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) to be used for all of the transit systems in the Bay Area. The implementation of the CLIPPER card began initially with several of the larger operators (covering over 90% of the region's transit riders). The funding and initiation of the next phase (dubbed phase 3) implementation is being finalized to expand the CLIPPER card to more of the 25 plus transit operators in the region. Solano County's transit operators were originally scheduled to be included in a later roll out of phase 3 which would occur in the future when funding is available. The new Water Emergency Transit Agency (WETA) is funding the CLIPPER implementation for the regional ferry system and is being included as part of phase 2. Solano's larger transit operators with fixed route service (SolTrans, FAST, and Vacaville City Coach) are interested in and ready to be included as part of the earlier roll out and our MTC Commissioner, Supervisor Jim Spering, has made this request to MTC. MTC staff is looking at grouping the next rollout by East Bay operators (smaller operators located in Contra Costa and Alameda), the 101 Corridor (Marin and Sonoma) and Solano-Napa. According to MTC staff, once the decision is made, the roll out of CLIPPER to the next group of operators will happen in 2013 with rollout to the remaining operators likely to occur one year later.

**STA's 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Awards Nominees Announced \***

The nominees for the STA's 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Awards Program have been submitted and will be released at the Board meeting. There are a total of nine categories being recognized and 27 total nominees this year. The event is scheduled for the evening of November 9, 2011 at the Fairfield Community Center and provides an opportunity to highlight the top projects, agencies and individuals that are making a difference in transportation in Solano County.

**5<sup>th</sup> Annual Commute Challenge Raises Bar for Participation**

The fifth annual Solano Commute Challenge is entering into the home stretch and the record number of Solano employers participating (51) has been matched by the record number of employees registered to participate with 685.

Attachment:

- A. STA Acronyms List of Transportation Terms (Updated March 2011)

This page intentionally left blank.

<b>A</b>		<b>J</b>	
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments	JARC	Jobs Access Reverse Commute Program
ACTC	Alameda County Transportation Commission	JPA	Joint Powers Agreement
ADA	American Disabilities Act	<b>L</b>	
AVA	Abandoned Vehicle Abatement	LATIP	Local Area Transportation Improvement Program
APDE	Advanced Project Development Element (STIP)	LEV	Low Emission Vehicle
AQMD	Air Quality Management District	LIFT	Low Income Flexible Transportation Program
ARRA	American Recovery and Reinvestment Act	LOS	Level of Service
<b>B</b>		LS&R	Local Streets & Roads
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District	<b>M</b>	
BABC	Bay Area Bicycle Coalition	MIS	Major Investment Study
BAC	Bicycle Advisory Committee	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit	MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
BATA	Bay Area Toll Authority	MTC	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
BCDC	Bay Conservation & Development Commission	MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
BT&H	Business, Transportation & Housing Agency	<b>N</b>	
<b>C</b>		NCTPA	Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency
CAF	Clean Air Funds	NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
CALTRANS	California Department of Transportation	NHS	National Highway System
CARB	California Air Resources Board	NOP	Notice of Preparation
CCCC (4'Cs)	City County Coordinating Council	<b>O</b>	
CCCTA (3CTA)	Central Contra Costa Transit Authority	OTS	Office of Traffic Safety
CCJPA	Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority	<b>P</b>	
CCTA	Contra Costa Transportation Authority	PAC	Pedestrian Advisory Committee
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act	PCC	Paratransit Coordinating Council
CHP	California Highway Patrol	PCRPP	Planning & Congestion Relief Program
CIP	Capital Improvement Program	PSR	Project Study Report
CMA	Congestion Management Agency	PDS	Project Development Support
CMAQ	Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Program	PDT	Project Delivery Team
CMP	Congestion Management Plan	PDWG	Project Delivery Working Group
CNG	Compressed Natural Gas	PMP	Pavement Management Program
CTC	California Transportation Commission	PMS	Pavement Management System
<b>D</b>		PNR	Park & Ride
DBE	Disadvantaged Business Enterprise	PPM	Planning, Programming & Monitoring
DOT	Department of Transportation	PPP (P3)	Public Private Partnership
<b>E</b>		PS&E	Plans, Specifications & Estimate
ECMAQ	Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Program	PSR	Project Study Report
EIR	Environmental Impact Report	PTA	Public Transportation Account
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement	PTAC	Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (MTC)
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	<b>R</b>	
EV	Electric Vehicle	RABA	Revenue Alignment Budget Authority
<b>F</b>		RBWG	Regional Bicycle Working Group
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report	RFP	Request for Proposal
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration	RFQ	Request for Qualification
FPI	Freeway Performance Initiative	RM 2	Regional Measure 2 (Bridge Toll)
FTA	Federal Transit Administration	RPC	Regional Pedestrian Committee
<b>G</b>		RRP	Regional Rideshare Program
GHG	Greenhouse Gas	RTEP	Regional Transit Expansion Policy
GIS	Geographic Information System	RTIF	Regional Transportation Impact Fee
<b>H</b>		RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
HIP	Housing Incentive Program	RTIP	Regional Transportation Improvement Program
HOT	High Occupancy Toll	RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
HOV	High Occupancy Vehicle	<b>S</b>	
<b>I</b>		SACOG	Sacramento Area Council of Governments
ISTEA	Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act	SAFETEA-LU	Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equality Act-a Legacy for Users
ITIP	Interregional Transportation Improvement Program	SCS	Sustainable Community Strategy
ITS	Intelligent Transportation System	SCTA	Sonoma County Transportation Authority

SFCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
SJCOG	San Joaquin Council of Governments
SHOPP	State Highway Operations & Protection Program
SMAQMD	Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District
SMCCAG	San Mateo City-County Association of Governments
SNCI	Solano Napa Commuter Information
SoHip	Solano Highway Improvement Plan
SOV	Single Occupant Vehicle
SP&R	State Planning & Research
SR	State Route
SR2S	Safe Routes to School
SR2T	Safe Routes to Transit
STAF	State Transit Assistance Fund
STIP	State Transportation Improvement Program
STP	Federal Surface Transportation Program

**T**

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 <sup>st</sup> 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**  
**Board Minutes for Meeting of**  
**September 14, 2011**

**I. CLOSED SESSION**

There were no matters to report.

**II. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Price called the regular meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. A quorum was confirmed.

**MEMBERS**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Harry Price, Chair	City of Fairfield
	Jack Batchelor, Vice Chair	City of Dixon
	Mike Ioakimedes (Alternate Board Member)	City of Benicia
	Jan Vick	City of Rio Vista
	Pete Sanchez	City of Suisun City
	Steve Hardy	City of Vacaville
	Osby Davis	City of Vallejo
	Jim Spering	County of Solano

**MEMBERS**

<b>ABSENT:</b>	Elizabeth Patterson	City of Benicia
----------------	---------------------	-----------------

**STAFF**

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Daryl K. Halls	Executive Director
	Bernadette Curry	Legal Counsel
	Janet Adams	Deputy Executive Director/ Director of Projects
	Robert Macaulay	Director of Planning
	Johanna Masiclat	Clerk of the Board
	Susan Furtado	Accountant and Administrative Services Manager
	Jayne Bauer	Marketing and Legislative Program Manager
	Liz Niedziela	Transit Analyst
	Judy Leaks	Program Manager
	Robert Guerrero	Senior Planner
	Sam Shelton	Project Manager
	Jessica McCabe	Assistant Project Manager
	Sara Woo	Associate Planner
	Samantha Sipin	Summer Intern

**ALSO**

**PRESENT:**

*In Alphabetical Order by Last Name:*

Jim Ducoing	Resident, City of Fairfield
Bill Emlen	County of Solano
Mike Hudson	City of Suisun City Councilmember and STA Board Alternate Member
Dan Kaspersen	City of Suisun City
David Kleinschmidt	City of Vallejo
Wayne Lewis	City of Fairfield
Rod Moresco	City of Vacaville
Elizabeth Richards	Recipient, Proclamation of Appreciation and Resident, City of Vacaville
Mike Roberts	City of Benicia
Matt Tuggle	County of Solano

**III. CONFIRM QUORUM/STATEMENT OF CONFLICT**

A quorum was confirmed by the Clerk of the Board. There was no Statement of Conflict declared at this time.

**IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

By consensus, the STA Board unanimously approved the agenda with the exception of

**V. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

George Gwynn, Jr. commented on various issues regarding transit and improvement programs.

**VI. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Daryl Halls provided an update on the following topics:

- CTC Approves Funding for SR 12 Jameson Canyon and Jepson Parkway Projects
- Recommendation from June STA Board Workshop
- STA Support for MTC's Regional Express Lanes Application to the CTC
- Proposed Agricultural and Open Space Access Pilot Program Highlights New One Bay Area Block Grant Proposal by ABAG and MTC
- ECMAQ Funds for Vacaville Dixon Bike Project
- STA Tribute to Elizabeth Richards
- Development of Alternative Fuels and Infrastructure Plan for Solano County
- Employers and Employees Make 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Commute Challenge a Success
- STA's SNCI Program Sets Monthly Record for New Vanpool Starts
- Solano's Abandon Vehicle Abatement Program Hits Ten Years Renewal Mark

**VII. COMMENTS FROM METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION (MTC), CALTRANS, AND STAFF:**

**A. MTC Report:**

None presented.

**B. Caltrans Report:**

None presented.

**C. STA Reports:**

**A. Proclamation of Appreciation for Elizabeth Richards**

**B. Directors Report:**

**1. Planning**

Robert Macaulay provided an update on Wayfinding Signage.

**2. Projects**

Janet Adams provided an update on SR 12 Jameson Canyon Widening and Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Projects.

**3. Transit/Rideshare**

Judy Leaks provided an update on the 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Solano Commute Challenge.

**VIII. CONSENT CALENDAR**

On a motion by Board Member Spring, and a second by Vice Chair Batchelor, the STA Board approved Consent Calendar Items A through O with the exception to pull for comment Item VIII.C and a separate vote at the request of Board Member Sanchez.

**A. STA Board Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2011**

Recommendation:

Approve STA Board Meeting Minutes of July 13, 2011.

**B. Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of August 31, 2011**

Recommendation:

Approve Draft TAC Meeting Minutes of August 31, 2011.

**C. Amendment to Executive Director's Employment Agreement and Adjustment of Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director's Salary Ranges**

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Adjust the Salary Ranges for the Executive Director and the Deputy Executive Director/Director of Projects as specified, including a travel allowance modification for the Deputy Executive Director/Director of Projects; and
2. Approve the First Amendment to the Executive Director Employment Agreement.

**Board Member Comment:**

At the request of Board Member Sanchez, this item was pulled for comment and separate vote. Board Member Sanchez commended the work of the Executive Director and Deputy Executive Director/Director of Projects, however, he noted he is opposed to the recommendation for salary adjustments and stated that he would rather adjust the amount of leave time off.

On a motion by Board Member Spring, and a second by Vice Chair Batchelor, the STA Board approved the recommendation with a 7 to 1 vote. Board Member Sanchez voted no.

**D. Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Matrix – September 2011 – City of Dixon Claim and County of Solano Modification**

Recommendation:

Approve the FY 2011-12 Solano TDA Matrix – September 2011 - City of Dixon and the County of Solano Modification as shown in Attachment A.

- E. Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Indirect Cost Allocation Plan (ICAP) Rate Application**  
Recommendation:  
Approve the following:
1. STA's ICAP Rate Application for FY 2011-12; and
  2. Authorize the Executive Director to submit the ICAP Rate Application to Caltrans.
- F. Redesignation of STA as Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program Service Authority for Solano County**  
Recommendation:  
Approve the following:
1. Resolution No. 2011-16 as specified in Attachment D.
  2. Authorize the Executive Director to:
    - a) Notify the Department of Motor Vehicles of the intent for STA to extend the Solano Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program for another 10-year period;
    - b) Submit a new resolution to formally request the extension of the AVA Program in Solano County; and
    - c) Notify member agencies of the continuation of the Solano AVA Program and ask that each agency issue resolutions approving the STA as the AVA Service Authority for Solano County.
- G. City of Dixon West B Street Pedestrian Undercrossing Project**  
Recommendation:  
Authorize the Executive Director to:
1. Enter into an agreement with the City of Dixon to deliver the West B Street Pedestrian Undercrossing Project;
  2. Negotiate and execute a contract with HDR to complete the design services for the project for an amount not to exceed \$250,000;
  3. Negotiate and execute a contract amendment for up to \$100,000 with Quincy Engineering to provide Project Management Services for the project; and
  4. Request for Proposals for construction management services and enter into an agreement not-to-exceed \$600,000.
- H. Regional Express Lanes Network Letter of Support**  
Recommendation:  
Authorize the STA Chair to forward a Letter of Support to the California Transportation Commission in support of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission application for authorizing a Bay Area Regional Express Lanes Network that includes the I-80 and I-680 Corridors in Solano County.
- I. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Scenario Modeling Priority Projects for Solano County**  
Recommendation:  
That the STA Board to approve the RTP scenario modeling priority project list for Solano County as specified in Attachment A.

**J. Local Street and Roads (LS&R) Proposed Solano County Annual Report**

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Scope of Work for the STA's Local Streets and Roads Annual Report, including MTC's Streetsaver GIS and Program services as specified in Attachment D; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into an agreement with MTC for Streetsaver Program services for an amount not-to-exceed \$12,250 for FY 2012-13 and an annual license of \$2,250 per year.

**K. I-80/I-680/State Route (SR) 12 Interchange Project**

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Resolution No. 2011-13 and Funding Allocation Request from Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for \$5.0 million in Regional Measure 2 or Assembly Bill (AB) 1171 Bridge Toll funds for the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Project for the relocation of the PG&E valve lot (Right-of-Way Phase); and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to circulate the Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the PG&E Valve Lot Relocation.

**L. North Connector Mitigation Planting and Irrigation Project - Contract Amendment**

Recommendation:

Approve a contract amendment for HT Harvey and Associates to cover additional Mitigation Site related services for the North Connector Project for an amount not-to-exceed \$12,600.

**M. North Connector Project - Contract Amendment**

Recommendation:

Approve a contract amendment for BKF Engineers to cover the preparation of Record Drawings, continued assistance with Right of Way acquisition and acquisition of agricultural easements for the North Connector Project for an amount not-to-exceed \$51,900.

**N. Redwood Parkway – Fairgrounds Drive Improvement Project**

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to amend the funding agreement between the Solano Transportation Authority, the City of Vallejo, and the County of Solano for the environmental document and project technical report for the Redwood Parkway – Fairgrounds Drive Improvement Project; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract with HQE Inc for an amount not-to-exceed \$109,000 for the environmental document and project approval for the Redwood Parkway – Fairgrounds Drive Improvement Project.

**O. Regional Transportation Fund for Clean Air (TFCA) Program Application Co-Sponsorship**

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Co-sponsor an application with NCTPA for shuttle service along SR 12 Jameson Canyon with stops identified in the staff report; and
2. Approve a local match of \$51,850 from STAF funding for the proposed shuttle service.

## **IX. ACTION – NON-FINANCIAL ITEMS**

### **A. Recommendations Derived From the STA Board Workshop of June 27, 2011**

Daryl Halls summarized the follow-up to the Board member comments and discussion provided at the STA Board Workshop held on June 27, 2011. He stated that staff has developed a series of specific recommendations to the seven topic areas covered at the Board Workshop. The topic areas include improvements to the SR 12 and I-80 corridors, Public Private Partnerships for Solano County's major transit centers, development of a Long Range Sustainability Plan for Transit, development of an Alternative Fuels Strategy for Transit, and funding of local priorities such as Safe Routes to School, Local Streets and Roads, and Mobility for Seniors and Persons with Disabilities.

#### **Public Comments:**

None presented

#### **Board Comments**

Board Member Vick raised concerns regarding the locations of the ramp metering on SR 12 and I-80. She requested that the STA Board be included in any discussion related to the installations and operations of ramp metering. She wanted assurance that the Board will be given an opportunity to be heard.

Daryl Halls responded that staff plans to provide the Board with updates on installations and operations of ramp metering at future meetings.

#### **Recommendation:**

Approve follow-up recommendations from the STA Board Work Shop of June 27, 2011 as specified in Attachment C.

On a motion by Vice Chair Batchelor, and a second by Board Member Hardy, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

### **B. One Bay Area Block Grant Proposal**

Robert Macaulay reviewed MTC and ABAG's proposals to combine the allocation of federal cycle funds that MTC currently allocates for various transportation programs into a new grant proposal, called the "One Bay Area Grant." He described the proposal that will combine a number of previously separate programs: Local Streets and Roads maintenance, regional Safe Routes Schools, regional Bicycle Network development, and Transportation for Livable Communities. He also listed the four areas of concern for STA and the member agencies regarding the guidelines: Restrictions on federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds, restricted use of funds in PDAs, the Supportive Local Transportation and Land Use Policies and ensuring no net revenue loss from Cycle 1 funding levels.

#### **Public Comments:**

None presented

### **Board Comments**

Board Member Vick requested clarification on the Performance and Accountability section of the proposed One Bay Area Block Grant Guidelines (Pg. 4/Sec. 2 - Approved Housing Element RHNA) regarding the timing on the RHNA numbers. Robert Macaulay responded that MTC and ABAG have received a number of questions regarding the same concerns. He noted that if a City or County have a currently valid housing element that meets the new RHNA, jurisdictions have 18 months after the adoption of the SCS to meet the new RHNA.

Supervisor Spering added that the proposed program is performance based and mainly it is accountability that is being built in. He stated that there will be tremendous debate from environmental and advocacy groups. Daryl Halls noted that by the Board providing directions on the following recommendations, it will keep Solano County engaged in the regional policy discussions.

### Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to request MTC and ABAG modify the One Bay Area Block Grant criteria as follows:

1. Allow STP funds to be spent on any eligible roadway, without consideration of whether or not the roadway is in a designated PDA;
2. Change the language of Supportive Local Transportation and Land-Use Policy a) to read “Parking/pricing policies (e.g. cash out, peak pricing, on-street/off street pricing differentials, eliminate parking minimums, unbundled parking) **or** adopted city and/or countywide employer trip reduction ordinances or programs”;
3. A ‘no net loss of revenue’ for each CMA, based upon actual Cycle 1 funding, and adjust the County Grant Amount for Solano of the One Bay Area Block Grant guidelines to \$15.2 million; and
4. Allow non-STP funds to be spent on projects within or in direct support of PDAs.

On a motion by Board Member Vick, and a second by Board Member Sanchez, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

*Board Member Davis left the meeting.*

### **C. Agricultural and Open Space Pilot Program**

Robert Macaulay reviewed the development of a pilot plan to address transportation issues related to the preservation of viable agricultural and open space lands. He cited that the recommended approach to development of the agricultural and open space plan would be to assemble a working group to guide work done by a consultant. He added that STA would act as the lead agency and would administer the consultant contract in coordination with the County of Solano and interested cities..

### **Public Comments:**

None presented

### **Board Comments**

None presented.

### Recommendation:

Authorize STA staff to develop a Scope of Work for the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC)’s proposed agricultural and open space pilot plan and program for Solano County.

On a motion by Board Member Vick, and a second by Board Member Hardy, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

**X. ACTION FINANCIAL ITEMS**

**A. Programming of Remaining Cycle 1 Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (ECMAQ) Funds**

Sam Shelton reviewed staff's recommendation to allocate \$305,000 in remaining ECMAQ funds from federal cycle one funds for the Vacaville-Dixon Bike Project, the last remaining and unfunded priority bike project. He added that as part of this recommendation, it is recommended that the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program be prioritized for forthcoming federal cycle 2 funds to ensure some level of SR2S funds are available for the balance of the next three years covered by the federal cycle 2.

**Public Comments:**

None presented

**Board Comments**

None presented.

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. Reprogram \$305,000 of Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (ECMAQ) funds from the STA's Safe Routes to School Program to the County of Solano's Vacaville-Dixon Bicycle Route (Phase 5 - Hawkins Road) project for construction; and
2. Prioritize \$1.1 M of Cycle 2 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the STA's Safe Routes to School Program.

On a motion by Vice Chair Batchelor, and a second by Board Member Hardy, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

**B. Solano County Alternative Fuels and Infrastructure Plan**

Robert Guerrero provided an overview of the development of an Alternative Fuels and Infrastructure Plan for Solano County that will focus on opportunities for converting Solano County's transit fleet and public vehicle fleets to alternative fuels.

**Public Comments:**

None presented

**Board Comments**

None presented.

Recommendation:

Authorize the Executive Director to develop an Alternative Fuels and Infrastructure Plan for Solano County with a budget not to exceed \$75,000.

On a motion by Vice Chair Batchelor, and a second by Board Member Sanchez, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.



This page intentionally left blank.



**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes for the meeting of**  
**September 28, 2011**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was called to order at approximately 1:35 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority's Conference Room 1.

**Present:**

<b>TAC Members Present:</b>	Mike Roberts	City of Benicia
	George Hicks	City of Fairfield
	Dave Mellili	City of Rio Vista
	Dan Kasperson	City of Suisun City
	Rod Moresco	City of Vacaville
	David Kleinschmidt	City of Vallejo
	Matt Tuggle	County of Solano

**STA Staff Present:**

*(In Alphabetical Order by Last Name)*

Janet Adams	STA
Jayne Bauer	STA
Robert Guerrero	STA
Daryl Halls	STA
Judy Leaks	STA
Robert Macaulay	STA
Johanna Masielat	STA
Jessica McCabe	STA
Liz Niedziela	STA
Sam Shelton	STA

**Others Present:**

*(In Alphabetical Order by Last Name)*

Amanda Dum	City of Suisun City
Steve Hartwig	City of Fairfield
MJ Lanni	City of Vallejo
Wayne Lewis	City of Fairfield

**II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On a motion by George Hicks, and a second by Mike Roberts, the STA TAC unanimously approved the agenda.

**III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT**

None presented.

#### IV. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC AND STA STAFF

**Caltrans:** None presented.

**MTC:** None presented.

**STA:** Jayne Bauer cited that the nominees for the 14<sup>th</sup> Annual Awards ceremony will be announced at the October Board meeting.

**Other:** Steve Hartwig, City of Fairfield provided an update on the Fairfield – Vacaville Train Station Project.

#### V. CONSENT CALENDAR

On a motion by George Hicks, and a second by Rod Moresco, the STA TAC approved Consent Calendar Items A through F.

**A. Minutes of the TAC Meeting of August 31, 2011**

Recommendation:

Approve TAC Meeting Minutes of August 31, 2011.

**B. Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Matrix – October 2011 – Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista**

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to STA Board to approve the FY 2011-12 Solano TDA Matrix – October 2011 - Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista as shown in Attachment A.

**C. State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) Regional Paratransit Funding Request for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program**

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to allocate \$25,000 of STAF Regional Paratransit funds for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program.

**D. Seniors and People with Disabilities Transportation Study**

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the Solano Transportation Study for Seniors and People with Disabilities.

**E. Proposed SolanoExpress Route 30 Service Changes**

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve service changes to Route 30 in order to improve time efficiency and cost effectiveness.

**F. Comprehensive Transportation Plan – Land Use Chapter**

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the Draft Land Use Chapter of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan included as Attachment A.

## VI. ACTION FINANCIAL ITEMS

### A. **2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)**

Jessica McCabe reviewed MTC's 2012 STIP Fund Estimate County Targets and the updated 10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects. She also reviewed the 2012 development schedule including STA TAC, STA Board, MTC, and CTC meetings.

#### Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the following:

1. Approve the 2011 10-Year Investment Plan for Highways and Major Transit Capital Projects;
2. Program \$8.3M in available non-Transportation Enhancement (TE) STIP funds to the Jepson Parkway project;
3. Program \$649,000 in unprogrammed STIP TE reserve to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project;
4. Program \$672,000 in available new STIP TE funds to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project; and
5. Program \$98,000 in FY 2015-16 and \$274,000 in FY 2016-17 available for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) activities.

On a motion by Dave Mellili, and a second by David Kleinschmidt, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

### B. **South County Transit (SolTrans) Funding Request to Cover Transitional Costs**

Liz Niedziela provided an overview and identified transition costs of \$395,800 for the remainder of FY 2011-12. He listed the activities that STA has funded to date and SolTrans' proposal for additional funding. He added that a separate request to MTC for other one-time costs is under development by SolTrans and STA staff.

#### Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve allocation of SolTrans funding request in the amount of \$395,800 of STAF to cover transitional costs.

On a motion by Mike Roberts, and a second by David Kleinschmidt, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

## VII. ACTION FINANCIAL ITEMS

### A. **Update of Solano Congestion Management Plan (CMP)**

Robert Macaulay provided update to the development of the 2011 CMP which requires draft CMPs submitted to MTC by October 14, 2011. He noted that because MTC is preparing a substantial update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) at this time, including development of the first-ever Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). He added that when the 2013 CMP update occurs, the new RTP and SCS will be in place, and a major CMP update will be appropriate.

#### Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the 2011 Update of the Solano CMP.

On a motion by Dan Kasperson, and a second by Dave Mellili, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

**B. STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform**

Jayne Bauer reviewed the 2012 appropriations bill that would end federal subsidies for Amtrak operations that receive state operating assistance, the House Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD). In addition, she requested to forward a recommendation to the STA Board distribution of the draft 2012 Legislative Platform and Priorities for a 30-day review and comment period.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STA Board to approve the following:

1. Distribute the STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities Platform for a 30-day review and comment period; and
2. Oppose funding cuts to California Amtrak operations as proposed in the Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Subcommittee 2012 appropriations bill.

On a motion by George Hicks, and a second by Matt Tuggle the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

**VIII. INFORMATIONAL**

**A. Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program Fourth Quarter and Annual Report**

Robert Macaulay reviewed the annual fiscal year-end report submitted to the State Controller's Office before the required due date of October 31, 2011.

**B. Safe Routes to Transit Plan (SR2T) Update**

Robert Guerrero provided an update on the development of a SR2T Plan. He reported that staff is currently working with the SR2T Task Forces to complete the walking audits. He added that three of five surveys have been completed at the time of this report.

**C. Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Program Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Year-End Report**

Judy Leaks provided a year-end wrap-up of the ten major elements listed in the SNCI Program Annual Report in Solano County.

**D. Benicia Climate Action Plan (CAP) Implementation**

Robert Macaulay noted that the City of Benicia and STA staff are already working together to integrate Solano-Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) rideshare and vanpool activities with both the city and major employers. He added that STA staff reports on fund programming will identify those projects that could help implement the City of Benicia CAP and Benicia projects may be given higher ranking if they are part of the CAP.

**E. Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update/One Bay Area Block Grant Update**

Robert Macaulay noted that Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has released the population and employment projections for three of the land use scenarios that will be analyzed to help develop the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). He cited that MTC will release the scenario results in December 2011 and have the draft SCS available in February 2012.

**NO DISCUSSION**

**F. Funding Opportunities Summary**

**G. STA Board Meeting Highlights of September 14, 2011**

**H. STA Board and Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule for Remainder of Calendar Year 2011**

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 p.m. The next meeting of the STA TAC is scheduled at **1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 30, 2011.**

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Matrix –  
October 2011 – Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista

---

**Background:**

The Transportation Development Act (TDA) of 1971 established two sources of funds that provide support for public transportation services statewide – the Local Transportation Fund (LTF) and the Public Transportation Account (PTA). Solano County receives TDA funds through the LTF and State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) through the PTA. State law specifies that STAF funds be used to provide financial assistance for public transportation, including funding for transit planning, operations and capital acquisition projects.

For a number of years, TDA funds had been modestly increasing. TDA is generated from a percentage of countywide sales tax. After several years of growth, Solano TDA revenue began to decline after Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07. At its peak in FY 2006-07, the TDA available countywide was \$15.9 million and then gradually declined for two years. In FY 2008-09 it made its first significant drop of nearly 5% to \$14.7 million and in FY 2009-10 Solano TDA decreased by even a larger percentage (10.7%) to \$13.1 million. For FY 2011-12, the current projection is that TDA will remain flat and result in \$12.9 million for Solano transit operators. The Solano FY 2011-12 TDA fund estimates by jurisdiction are shown on the attached TDA matrix (Attachment A).

The new TDA and STAF FY 2011-12 revenue projections were approved by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) in February 2011. The fund estimates include projected carryover from FY 2010-11. It should be noted that the carryover amounts appear to be significant for most Solano jurisdictions. These figures were calculated at the end of December 2010. Due to the timing of several jurisdictions' submittal of their FY 2010-11 TDA claims, the FY 2010-11 TDA funds were not shown as allocated and the carryovers are artificially high. The FY 2010-11 estimated obligations were added to the TDA matrix in the initial column after the estimates and reviewed with the STA Consortium in March 2011.

**Discussion:**

The October version of the TDA matrix reflects the cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista's TDA claims. The City of Fairfield has prepared their FY 2011-12 TDA claim and it has been added to the TDA matrix as shown on Attachment A. The City of Fairfield will be claiming TDA funds for the operation of Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST) and capital funding for preventative maintenance. The City of Fairfield contributes TDA to the countywide intercity American with Disabilities Act (ADA) taxi program, countywide transit planning, and the intercity transit funding agreement.

The City of Rio Vista has prepared their FY 2011-12 TDA claim and it has been added to the TDA matrix as shown on Attachment A. The City of Rio Vista will be claiming TDA funds for the operation of Rio Vista Delta Breeze and miscellaneous capital projects. The City of Rio Vista contributes TDA to the countywide intercity ADA taxi program and countywide transit planning. The City of Rio Vista does not contribute to the intercity transit funding agreement.

The TDA matrix also reflects three other modifications and was approved by the STA Board September 14, 2011. The Intercity Funding Agreement amounts approved by the STA Board in July 2011 were added to the TDA matrix. The Intercity Taxi Scrip Program claimed by the City of Vacaville was added to the matrix and MTC's July 2011 fund estimate on the TDA projected carryover that was also updated on the TDA matrix.

MTC is required to use County Auditor estimates for TDA revenues. TDA is generated from a percentage of countywide sales tax and distributed to local jurisdictions based on population share. Given the economic downturn, sales tax and TDA have decreased and will remain suppressed until the economy improves. Staff reemphasizes that these TDA figures are revenue *estimates*. Especially with all the existing uncertainty, the amounts are not guaranteed and staff advises against claiming 100% of the TDA fund to avoid fiscal difficulties if the actual revenues are lower than the projections.

The Consortium and STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None to the STA Budget. Approval of the TDA Matrix-October 2011 is important for the timely processing of the Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista TDA claims.

**Recommendation:**

Approve the FY 2011-12 Solano TDA Matrix – October 2011 - Cities of Fairfield and Rio Vista as shown in Attachment A.

Attachment:

- A. FY 2011-12 Solano TDA Matrix – October 2011 (This attachment has been provided to the STA Board members under separate enclosure. To obtain a copy, please contact the STA at (707) 424-6075.)



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Manager/Analyst  
SUBJECT: State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) Regional Paratransit Funding  
Request for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program

---

**Background:**

An important transit service provided in Solano County is mobility services for people with disabilities. For an estimated 15 years, Solano Paratransit was a transportation program that provided transit services between the Cities of Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun City, Vacaville, Rio Vista, and the County of Solano for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) certified individuals. In July 2009, at the request of the City of Fairfield, Solano Paratransit service was dissolved by the Solano Transportation Authority and the individual transit agencies took on this responsibility separately.

Two Seniors and People with Disabilities Transportation Summits were held in 2009 to discuss service and people with disabilities mobility issues and challenges. An estimated 150 attendees representing seniors and people with disabilities, senior centers, non-profits, transit providers, and medical facilities attended and actively participated in identifying their mobility challenges at Summit I on June 26, 2009. At the first summit, mobility issues and concerns were heard loud and clear from seniors, people with disabilities, non-profits and others. The second countywide Seniors and People with Disabilities Transportation Summit was held October 30, 2009 at the Joseph Nelson Community Center in Suisun City. Summit II presented several solutions to the challenges facing transportation services and programs for seniors and people with disabilities in Solano County. One of the solutions was an Intercity Taxi Scrip Program. In an effort to continue to sustain Intercity transportation for people with disabilities, the transit agencies of Solano County (Dixon, Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, Vallejo, Benicia, Rio Vista and Solano County) devised a system of transferring individuals from one agencies' Paratransit service to another allowing individuals to continue to make intercity trips within Solano County. Another solution was the development of a countywide user guide.

Through the coordinated efforts of the transit operators and Solano County, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program was formed. On February 1, 2010, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program was launched across the County providing a flexible option for qualified ambulatory ADA Paratransit certified riders. Scrip books may be purchased for \$15 and each book contains \$100 worth of scrip. The Intercity Taxi Scrip may be used for taxi trips between cities and rural areas within Solano County.

**Discussion:**

Based on the success of the first year of operation, the transit partners propose to continue the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program through Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 while research and planning continues for the ultimate move to the much more complex Phase Two which could provide accessible taxis for non-ambulatory ADA certified passengers.

The continuation of Phase One of the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program will provide Solano County residents who are ADA qualified and ambulatory a viable, flexible transportation alternative that is a better fit than Paratransit service as it exists today. This intercity taxi service program provides curb-to-curb service, offering substantially more convenience than Paratransit service provides to passengers.

The transit partners of Solano County, consisting of the transit agencies of each jurisdiction and Solano County, is requesting \$25,000 in Regional Paratransit operating funds for the continued operation of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program for Fiscal Year 2011-12. The transit partners of Solano County were successful in securing a federal New Freedom grant of \$144,372 for this project. The \$25,000 combined with countywide Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds of \$119,373 will provide for the local match. The total estimated cost of the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program for FY 2011-12 is \$339,700.

The Consortium and STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**Fiscal Impact:**

STA staff proposes to budget \$25,000 in State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) regional Paratransit funds for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program.

**Recommendation:**

Allocate \$25,000 of STAF Regional Paratransit funds for the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program.

Attachment:

- A. Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Funding Request



ESTABLISHED 1850

# CITY OF VACAVILLE

650 MERCHANT STREET  
VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 95688-6908  
www.cityofvacaville.com

ATTACHMENT A

**STEVE HARDY** Mayor  
**DILENNA HARRIS** Councilmember

**RON ROWLETT** Vice Mayor  
**CURTIS HUNT** Councilmember

**MITCH MASHBURN** Councilmember

September 19, 2011

Department of Public Works  
Maintenance Division

Solano Transportation Authority Board  
c/o Elizabeth Niedziela  
Solano Transportation Authority  
One Harbor Center, Suite 130  
Suisun City, CA 94585

Dear STA Board Members:

The City of Vacaville, on behalf of the transit partners of Solano County, is submitting a request for Regional Paratransit funding to continue operating the Intercity Taxi Scrip program. Attached you will find our funding request application which details the specifics of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program.

Over the last 12 months, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program has seen tremendous ridership growth and has become a valued transportation alternative for individuals and provides a level of mobility freedom that did not exist prior to the implementation of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program in Solano County.

The transit partners are respectfully requesting \$25,000 in Regional Paratransit funds to continue the Intercity Taxi Scrip program through fiscal year 2012. If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact my office at (707) 469-6504.

Sincerely,

**BRIAN MCLEAN**  
Fleet & Transit Manager  
*On behalf of the Transit Partners of Solano County*

Enc.: Intercity Taxi Scrip Program FY2012 Funding Request

This page intentionally left blank.

# **Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Fiscal Year 2012 Funding Request**



**Presented to:**  
Solano Transportation Authority Board

**By:**  
The Transit Partners of Solano County  
Dixon  
Vacaville  
Fairfield  
Suisun  
Vallejo  
Benicia  
Rio Vista  
Solano County

September 19, 2011

## Table of Contents

Funding Request and Background .....	3
Brief Description of Project.....	5
Year-One Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Statistics.....	5
Estimated Number of Passenger Trips Serviced by this Project .....	6
Program Goals and Objectives.....	6
How does this Program Address Gaps and or Transportation Barriers Identified through the MTC Coordinated Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan (CTP).....	6
Project Implementation Plan .....	7
Program Performance Indicators.....	7
Program Promotion and Public Outreach.....	8
Proposed Project Budget – Operating Assistance Project .....	9
Attachments.....	11

## **Funding Request**

The transit partners of Solano County, consisting of the transit agencies of each jurisdiction, formally request \$25,000 in Regional Paratransit operating funds for the continued operation of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program for Fiscal Year 2011-12.

## **Background**

Solano Paratransit was a transportation program designed to provide transit services between the cities of Solano County for ADA certified individuals. In July 2009 Solano Paratransit discontinued operations due to the overall cost of the program exceeding the ability of the contributing program members to justify and financially afford further contribution. Costs had continued to soar each successive year until 2009 when the program cost topped \$700,000.

In an effort to continue to sustain Intercity transportation for disabled individuals, the transit agencies of Solano County (Dixon, Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, Vallejo, Benicia, Rio Vista and Solano County) stepped in and devised a system of transferring individuals from one agencies' Paratransit service to another allowing individuals to continue to make intercity trips within Solano County. This quick fix however was recognized by all as simply a stop-gap until a more user friendly and cost effective transportation solution was established.

Beginning in July 2009 the public transit operators of Solano County and non-profit organization such as Faith In Action worked together with the taxi companies of Solano County in the development of a Countywide Intercity Taxi Reduced Fare Scrip program.

As the challenge of Intercity transportation for disabled individuals within Solano County was such that no one all encompassing program could resolve it in a single implementation, the transit partners focused on a phased approach.

Developed over the course of seven months, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program was formed. Phase One of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program was designed to provide taxi based transportation for ADA qualified ambulatory Solano County residents.

Phase Two of the Intercity Taxi Scrip would complete the program by providing taxi based transportation for both ambulatory and non-ambulatory ADA qualified residents of Solano County.

On February 1, 2010 Phase One of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program was launched across the County.

After a full year of operation (February 2010 through February 2011), operating statistics and costs for the Intercity Taxi Scrip program have been gathered. The partner agencies are proud to announce that the Intercity Taxi Scrip program is an astounding success.

Based on the success of the first year of operation, the transit partners propose to continue Phase One of the program through Fiscal Year 2012 while research and planning continues for the ultimate move to the much more complex Phase Two.

The transit agencies of Solano County, all contributing to the Intercity Taxi Scrip program, respectfully request the County of Solano's financial assistance to continue operating the Intercity Taxi Scrip program.

## **Brief Description of Project**

The Intercity Taxi Scrip program establishes an alternative to ADA Dial-A-Ride service beyond existing reduced fare programs currently in place in Solano County. The continuation of Phase One of this program as outlined within this grant application will allow Solano County residents who are ADA qualified and ambulatory a viable, flexible transportation alternative that can offer the passenger a transportation mode that is a better fit than Paratransit service as it exists today.

The Intercity Taxi Scrip program offers passengers the following benefits:

- 24-hour operation, 7 days a week
- flexible, on-call, same day service
- No advanced scheduling necessary
- Can accommodate "subscription" type service
- Not a shared-ride system

Persons interested in this Intercity Taxi Scrip program must first complete an ADA application; available by contacting the local transit agency, by downloading from the local agencies website, or by calling the local transit agency and requesting an application be mailed.

Qualified individuals to the program are provided with a free color photo ID card. The photo ID card allows participants of the program to purchase a \$100 booklet of Intercity Taxi Scrip for only \$15. The purchase of the Intercity Taxi Scrip can be made at designated sale locations within each city; information on the program can be easily obtained by contacting the cities local transit agency. Additionally, an Intercity Taxi Scrip program guide can be obtained from the local transit agency explaining the program in detail.

For those individuals who choose to use this transportation mode, this taxi service program provides a premium level of curb-to-curb service, offering substantially more convenience than Paratransit service provides to passengers.

## **Year-One Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Statistics**

Based on the first year of operating the Intercity Taxi Scrip program, the following program statistics were developed.

Total Operating Cost:	\$117,137.50
Total Passenger Trips:	3,671
Total Revenue Miles:	42,560
Total Cost per Mile:	\$2.75
Cost per Passenger Trip:	\$31.91

In comparison, during the final year of Solano Paratransit operation, the cost per mile was \$5.09 and cost per passenger trip was \$81.05. The cost savings derived from the Intercity Taxi Scrip program is substantial and the program benefits to the passenger are great.

### **Estimated Number of Passenger Trips Serviced by this Project**

Participation in the Intercity Taxi Scrip program steadily grew month by month over the course of the first year of operation. During this first year of operation 3,671 passenger trips were provided. It is expected that this program will continue to grow and the number of passenger trips will increase as passenger word of mouth and public outreach continue. Based on the rate of use, it is possible that 4,500-5,000 passenger trips could be provided by the end of fiscal year 2012.

### **Program Goals and Objectives**

Phase One of the Intercity Taxi Reduced Fare Scrip program provides service above and beyond that required by the American with Disabilities Act, providing ADA-Plus type service. The Intercity Taxi Scrip program allows those persons who are disabled and ambulatory to access intercity transportation services via same day transportation, without the need for ride reservations to be made days or weeks in advance.

Taxi service operates with longer hours and requires less notice to provide same day or same hour services. For this factor alone the convenience gained through the use of this transportation mode provides a level of freedom not previously available to disabled persons within Solano County.

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Coordinated Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan (CTP) outlines gaps in ADA service within the Bay Area, including Solano County. The Intercity Taxi Scrip program fills this transportation gap and provides much needed Intercity transit services for disabled ambulatory individuals that they would otherwise not have.

### **How does this Program Address Gaps and or Transportation Barriers Identified through the MTC Coordinated Transit/Human Services Transportation Plan (CTP)?**

Listed below are the transportation gaps identified by the 2007 MTC CTP report.

- Trips to health care, page D-18
- Same day urgent trips, page D-18
- Access to shopping, page D-19
- Lack of transit operating hours, page D-19
- Frequency on weekday and weekends, page D-19
- Number of transfers required, page D-19

These transportation gaps are such that Paratransit is unable to fill, without involving a serious level of inconvenience to the passenger. On the other hand, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program fulfills all these transportation gaps while providing door to door, same day service at a deeply discounted fare.

For example, same day service is highly unlikely with Paratransit as the Paratransit passenger manifest for the current day is based on reservations made at least 24 hours in advance.

Access to shopping and trips to health care providers is again constrained by the limitations of Paratransit and shared-ride passenger scheduling.

Lack of operating hours, frequency of service and required transfers are again all constraints of a Paratransit transportation mode that does not adequately meet the needs of a disabled person. If the goal is to provide mobility freedom to disabled persons seeking to fully integrate into the workforce and equally participate in society as a non-disabled person, then Paratransit is not the answer.

The Intercity Taxi Scrip program has proven through the first year of operation, that taxi based service is the way forward, offering many benefits to the passenger.

- Taxi service operates 24 hours a day;
- Taxi service can accommodate advance reservations and subscription type service requests;
- Taxi service can traverse Solano County from Vacaville to Vallejo at a lower cost than Paratransit service could accomplish;
- Taxi service is a more “on-demand” type transportation mode, not hindered by a shared-ride, multiple pickup/drop-off passenger manifest;
- Taxi service can free the rider from the restraints of scheduling their lives around transportation.

In addition, the Intercity Taxi Scrip program provides a substantially reduced taxi fare to the passenger making it a viable alternative to a less convenient ADA Paratransit service.

The Intercity Taxi Scrip program provides an 85% subsidy to disabled ambulatory persons showing a County-wide ADA Disability Card. The passenger is required to pay only 15% of the total cost of the ride.

### **Project Implementation Plan**

There are no defined routes as this is an on-demand intercity taxi reduced fare scrip service for eligible ADA disabled ambulatory residents of Solano County. The geographic area covered will be the whole of Solano County.

The partnering cities (Dixon, Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, Vallejo, Benicia, Rio Vista and Solano County) and taxi companies have developed joint marketing materials including an Intercity Taxi Scrip program brochure (see attachment).

Phase One of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program is currently in service. No further implementation is required beyond maintaining operation of Phase One through fiscal year 2012.

### **Program Performance Indicators**

Performance will be measured monthly via Intercity taxi ridership logs provided to the partner cities and compiled monthly into a running ridership total (see attachment – FY2011 Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Operations Matrix). The data collected during fiscal year 2012 will be used to compare against data collected during 2011 operation.

In addition to Intercity Taxi Scrip ridership figures, the partner cities will be closely monitoring the ridership on our respective Paratransit systems. As we saw during the first year of operation, we anticipate the Intercity Taxi Scrip program to continue to alleviate existing service demand pressure on Intercity Paratransit services within the County for persons who are non-ambulatory.

As disabled ambulatory individuals have begun to utilize the Intercity Taxi Scrip program, it has alleviated capacity issues on the existing Intercity Paratransit system and thereby allows for more service availability to disabled non-ambulatory individuals on the existing Intercity Paratransit service.

### **Program Stakeholders**

The Stakeholders for the Intercity Taxi Scrip program are comprised of the following agencies:

- City of Fairfield
- City of Vacaville
- City of Vallejo
- City of Dixon
- City of Rio Vista
- City of Benicia
- County of Solano
- Solano Transportation Authority

### **Program Promotion and Public Outreach**

The transit agencies of each city participate in various committees focused on the transportation needs of disabled persons, for example; Commission on Aging, Senior Round Table, ADA Advisory Committee and Solano Paratransit Coordinating Council.

Marketing of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program will continue to be directed towards these committees and various sub-groups where Stakeholder and community members can expand the scope of our message by distributing the availability of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program to their particular groups and organizations.

Additionally, bi-monthly meetings such as with the Paratransit Coordination Council (PCC) and with the various community commissions and committees outlined above will be conducted to keep these groups apprised of the status of this project.

Finally, and more importantly, each of the partner transit managers noted within this grant proposal will conduct presentations at community meetings to directly “get the word out” regarding the availability of the Intercity Taxi Scrip program.

<b>Proposed Project Budget – Operating Assistance Project</b>
---

<b>Applicant:</b>	City of Vacaville, on behalf of the transit partners of Solano County
<b>Project Period:</b>	July 1, 2011 to June 30, 2012
<b>Program Type:</b>	Countywide, Intercity ADA Transportation

**OPERATING BUDGET**

**(1) Total Operating Expenses (Itemize)**

Solano County Intercity Taxi Scrip Program	\$ 339,700	
	\$	
	\$	
	\$	
<b>TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$ 339,700</b>	<b>\$ 339,700</b>

**(2) Less Fare box and Other Revenue**

15% passenger responsible fares	\$ 50,955	
<b>Regional Paratransit Funding Request</b>	<b>\$ 25,000</b>	
	\$	
	\$	
<b>TOTAL FAREBOX AND OTHER REVENUE</b>	<b>\$ 75,955</b>	
<b>APPLIED AGAINST ELIGIBLE EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$ 75,955</b>	<b>\$ 75,955</b>

<b>(3) NET PROJECT COST (Line 1 – Line 2 – Line 3)</b>	<b>\$ 263,745</b>
--	-------------------

**(4) Local Share (Itemized by Source Type & Amount)**

Transportation Development Act (TDA)	\$ 119,373	
	\$	
<b>TOTAL LOCAL SHARE</b>	<b>\$ 119,373</b>	<b>\$ 119,373</b>

(5) FEDERAL SHARE (New Freedom Grant) \$ 144,372

---

**(6) BUDGET SUMMARY: Local Share + Federal Share = Net Project Cost**

LOCAL SHARE:	\$ 119,373
<hr/>	
FEDERAL SHARE:	+ \$ 144,372
<hr/>	
<b>NET PROJECT COST:</b>	<b>= \$ 263,745</b>
<hr/> <hr/>	

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Brochure

FY 2011 Intercity Taxi Scrip Program Operations Matrix

This page intentionally left blank.



SOLANO COUNTY INTERCITY

# TAXI SCRIP PROGRAM

February 2010 Riders' Guide



## CUSTOMER SERVICE

The public transit providers of Solano County are committed to ensuring quality customer service is offered within the Intercity Taxi Scrip program. Your comments are welcome as they are an important tool to improve service.

All taxis operating in Solano County carry pre-stamped, no postage necessary, Taxi Comment Cards available for your use.

If you have an immediate concern, please contact the taxi company's dispatcher or manager.

*For program concerns or suggestions, or if you are unable to resolve an issue with a taxi company, contact your local public transit provider listed below:*

**Dixon Redit-Ride**  
(707) 678-5020

**Vallejo Transit**  
(707) 648-4315

**Vacaville City Coach**  
(707) 449-5170

**Benicia Breeze**  
(707) 746-4300

**Fairfield and  
Suisun Transit**  
(707) 428-7535

**Rio Vista Delta Breeze**  
(707) 374-5337

**County of Solano**  
(707) 784-6765





## THE SOLANO COUNTY INTERCITY TAXI SCRIP PROGRAM

is a flexible option for qualified ADA

(Americans with Disabilities Act) paratransit-certified riders. This service provides premium ADA plus, curb-to-curb, same day transportation. The Intercity Taxi Scrip program is in addition to paratransit services available by public transit providers throughout Solano County.

## BENEFITS OF THE INTERCITY TAXI SCRIP PROGRAM

- » Service between cities and rural areas in Solano County
- » 24 hour access, 7 days a week
- » Same day service
- » No transfers required
- » Low-cost



## ELIGIBILITY

- » You must be an ADA paratransit certified resident of Solano County.
- » You must be ambulatory or able to enter and exit a taxi without the help of another person.
- » Your mobility device must be able to be folded for transport in the trunk of the taxi.
- » If you are a wheelchair user and cannot independently transfer from the wheelchair to the back seat of a taxi, you should continue to use paratransit for your travel needs.

*If you are not currently ADA paratransit certified and would like an application, please call your local public transit provider:*

**Dixon Read-Ride**  
(707) 678-7442

**Benicia Breeze**  
(707) 746-4300

**Vacaville City Coach**  
(707) 449-5170

**Rio Vista  
Delta Breeze**  
(707) 374-5337

**Fairfield &  
Suisun DART**  
(707) 428-7535

**Unincorporated  
Solano County**  
(707) 784-2797

**Vallejo RunAbout**  
(707) 649-1999

“ Intercity Taxi Scrip may be a travel solution if you do not require an accessible vehicle and can travel with minimal assistance. ”

## ADA PHOTO ID CARD



To purchase and use the new Intercity Taxi Scrip you will need an ADA photo ID card. This card will allow you to use both Intercity Taxi Scrip as well as paratransit services throughout Solano County. This new ADA photo ID card will replace your current paratransit card, if your local public transit provider issued one to you. Contact your local public transit program for information on how to obtain your new identification card.

- » There is no charge for your new ADA photo ID card. You will be required to show your ID each time you purchase or use Intercity Taxi Scrip.



Sample ADA Picture ID Card

## LOST OR STOLEN ADA PHOTO ID CARD

Please contact your local public transit provider. A replacement card will be issued for a \$5 charge. Please allow up to three weeks for processing.

## SCHEDULING A RIDE

When calling for a taxi, please tell the dispatcher:

- » Your name
- » Your ADA number
- » That you will be using Intercity Taxi Scrip
- » The date and time you want to be picked up
- » Your exact pick up and destination addresses
- » Where you will be waiting, the exact pick up location (for example: "Solano Mall in front of Red Robin")
- » Special instructions such as gate codes
- » The number of persons traveling with you
- » If you use a mobility device such as a collapsible wheelchair or walker



- » If you are traveling with a service animal or pet
- » If traveling to an appointment, both your desired pick-up time and your scheduled appointment time

*The following taxi companies have agreed to participate in the Intercity Taxi Scrip program. Simply call the taxi within your city to request a ride.*

### BENICIA

**City Cab**  
(707) 745-3399

**Yellow Cab**  
(707) 745-4040

### FAIRFIELD/SUISUN

**Fairfield Cab**  
(707) 422-5555

**Veteran's Cab**  
(707) 421-9999

**Yellow Cab**  
(707) 428-4400

### RIO VISTA

**Vista Cab**  
(707) 374-6572

### VACAVILLE/DIXON

**AA Taxi**  
(707) 449-8294

**Yellow Cab**  
(707) 446-1144

### VALLEJO

**California Taxicab**  
(707) 645-1000

**City Cab**  
(707) 643-3333

**Yellow Cab**  
(707) 644-1234



## SERVICE AREAS & HOURS OF OPERATION

Taxi service operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It takes approximately 15 to 30 minutes from the time you place your phone call for the taxi to arrive. While taxi service does not require an advance reservation, one to two hours notice is appreciated.

Intercity Taxi Scrip is valid for taxi trips originating and ending within Solano County. For instance, you can use Intercity Taxi Scrip from Benicia to Dixon (both within Solano County), but not to Davis, Sacramento or Richmond which are located in other counties.

Taxis may only provide service within the jurisdiction in which they are licensed. For example, Vallejo taxis may take a passenger TO another city, but may not be allowed to pick up a passenger FROM another city. For your return trip, you must call a taxi from your current city (point of pick-up).

## PURCHASING INTERCITY TAXI SCRIP

Scrip books may be purchased for \$15.00. Each book contains \$100.00 worth of scrip.

**Intercity Taxi Scrip may be used for taxi trips between cities and rural areas within Solano County and is not valid for trips within your local city.**

**Intercity Taxi Scrip is non-refundable and will expire.** The expiration date is printed on the front of the scrip booklet. Only purchase the amount of scrip you intend to use. Limitations may apply to the number of scrip books you may purchase in any given month and vary from city to city. Please check with your local public transit provider for details.



**Benicia: City Hall Finance Department**  
250 East "L" Street  
(707) 746-4300

**Dixon: City Hall**  
600 East "A" Street  
(707) 678-7000

**Fairfield: Fairfield Transportation Center**  
2000 Cadenasso Drive  
(707) 428-7635

**Rio Vista: City Hall Finance Department**  
One Main Street  
(707) 374-6451

**Suisun City: Amtrak Station**  
177 Main Street  
(707) 374-2878

**Vacaville: City Hall Public Works Dept.**  
650 Merchant Street  
(707) 449-5170

**Vallejo: City Hall 1st Floor Cashier's Office**  
555 Santa Clara Street  
(707) 648-4315

**Vallejo: Florence Douglas Senior Center**  
333 Amador Street  
(707) 643-1044

## SERVICE RESTRICTIONS

The Intercity Taxi Scrip program offers curb-to-curb transportation service. Please note, taxi drivers are not required to assist passengers. If you require assistance, please travel with an attendant.



### Drivers are NOT Permitted To:

- » Enter the residence of a rider.
- » Perform any personal care assistance for any rider, such as lifting or carrying a passenger.
- » Perform errands for riders, such as picking up prescriptions or groceries.

## SCHEDULING RECURRING TRIPS (SUBSCRIPTION TRIPS)

Taxi availability is dependent upon overall demand for service in your community. When demand is high, wait times may be longer. You are encouraged to schedule recurring trips in advance.

Subscription service may be available for recurring trips on the same day(s) and time(s) each week. To request information about subscription service, contact the taxi dispatcher.

## CANCELING A TRIP

Early trip cancellations provide more service opportunities for other customers. Please make every effort to cancel your trip as early as possible. Persons who repeatedly refuse taxi trips at the door when the taxi has arrived within 10 minutes of the requested pick up time, may be denied future service or charged a fee by the taxi company. For rules and policies regarding cancellation and refused trips, please call the taxi company.

## TAXI FARES

Taxi fares are set by local City Councils. Rates are posted within each taxi and vary throughout the county. Taxis accept cash in addition to Intercity Taxi Scrip. No change is given for scrip. Taxi drivers may not have exact change for cash fare.

**At the time of your trip, you must show your ADA photo ID card to the driver. If you do not have your ADA photo ID card, you must pay the full taxi fare.**

## TAXI WAIT-TIME & TIPS

Drivers are not allowed to accept Intercity Taxi Scrip as payment for wait time or tips. You may use cash to have a taxi cab wait for you or to pay a tip.

## ATTENDANT AND/OR COMPANION

Fares are charged by trip, not per person. There is no additional charge for extra passengers; however, taxi capacity is limited to the number of persons who can be safely transported while each is wearing a seat belt.

## TRANSPORTING PACKAGES

The amount of space in a taxi is limited. You are responsible for loading and unloading your packages or other carry on items. Drivers are not required to assist riders with their carry on items. If you require assistance, please travel with a companion.

## SEAT BELTS

All passengers must wear lap and shoulder belts as required by California Motor Vehicle law.



## TRAVELING WITH CHILDREN

When traveling with a child under the age of six who weighs less than 60 pounds, you must provide the child's safety seat and properly secure the child in it.



## SERVICE ANIMALS AND PETS

Both service animals and well behaved pets are allowed and travel free. Service animals must be under your direct physical control at all times. Small pets must be fully enclosed in a secure container you can manage.

A driver may refuse to transport an animal if it is not under your control, is disruptive or behaves in an aggressive or threatening manner. Please tell the taxi dispatcher you will be traveling with a service animal or pet when scheduling your trip.



## SUSPENSION OF SERVICE

Suspension from our program can result when a rider obtains or uses service under false pretenses; for example, provides false information on the eligibility application, allows others to ride in their place, or misuses taxi scrip.

“ For rules and policies regarding cancellation and refused trips, please call the taxi company. ”



This page intentionally left blank.



THE INTERCITY TAXI SCRIP PROGRAM  
IS PROVIDED BY:



This page intentionally left blank.

**INVOICES**

	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	TOTALS
FF Yellow Cab	\$421.50	\$1,090.50	\$1,312.00	\$1,426.75	\$1,516.25	\$2,090.75	\$2,103.00	\$1,072.50	\$927.00	\$803.00	\$727.00	\$1,333.00	\$14,823.25
Vallejo/Benicia City Cab	\$52.50	\$69.25	\$942.00	\$409.00	\$1,667.25	\$913.00	\$1,289.75	\$1,939.50	\$2,599.00	\$3,839.00	\$4,327.75	\$3,711.75	\$21,759.75
Vets Cab Fairfield - AA Taxi	\$353.25	\$756.25	\$32.00	\$551.75	\$0.00	\$967.50	\$138.50	\$1,294.75	\$1,277.00	\$2,163.25	\$1,916.50	\$1,033.00	\$10,483.75
Vallejo Yellow Cab	\$0.00	\$50.00	\$474.75	\$220.50	\$423.50	\$1,108.00	\$1,705.75	\$626.25	\$216.50	\$235.00	\$529.25	\$829.50	\$6,419.00
Yellow Cab Vacaville	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,187.50	\$1,279.00	\$1,053.75	\$1,234.75	\$643.25	\$5,398.25
AA Taxi Vacaville	\$743.25	\$1,315.00	\$1,067.25	\$1,388.00	\$0.00	\$1,671.75	\$2,254.00	\$1,548.75	\$1,307.75	\$1,024.75	\$1,171.25	\$984.75	\$14,476.50
Vaca Checker Cab	\$0.00	\$630.75	\$1,095.75	\$515.75	\$1,260.50	\$1,672.00	\$2,056.75	\$2,493.00	\$2,759.00	\$2,945.75	\$5,153.50	\$5,271.50	\$25,854.25
Checker Cab - Fairfield	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$1,405.25	\$1,759.25	\$1,887.50	\$2,770.00	\$2,987.00	\$10,809.00
Fairfield Cab Co.	\$110.00	\$194.00	\$296.50	\$392.50	\$0.00	\$317.00	\$503.00	\$524.00	\$1,257.25	\$1,312.50	\$1,352.50	\$854.50	\$7,113.75
													<b>\$117,137.50</b>

**PASSENGER TRIPS**

	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	TOTALS
FF Yellow Cab	12	38	33	49	56	71	65	21	28	26	26	42	467
Vallejo/Benicia City Cab	1	3	51	47	63	24	31	63	57	74	86	73	573
Vets Cab Fairfield - AA Taxi	10	23	1	18	35	34	40	52	49	65	48	30	405
Vallejo Yellow Cab	0	1	11	6	10	19	29	13	7	6	10	20	132
Yellow Cab Vacaville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	40	34	34	18	166
AA Taxi Vacaville	22	65	55	33	0	54	69	48	43	36	35	32	492
Vaca Checker Cab	0	20	30	9	43	40	68	87	95	108	160	158	818
Checker Cab - Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	69	79	100	109	414
Fairfield Cab Co.	3	6	10	10	0	8	14	15	36	38	37	27	204
	<b>48</b>	<b>156</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>316</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>424</b>	<b>466</b>	<b>536</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>3671</b>

**TOTAL REV. MILES**

	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	TOTALS
FF Yellow Cab	177	456	398	595	629	875	889	447	387	334	300	555	6042
Vallejo/Benicia City Cab	18	27	301	278	541	118	166	583	848	1274	1404	1193	6751
Vets Cab Fairfield - AA Taxi	120	256	11	185	339	320	381	428	424	772	668	432	4336
Vallejo Yellow Cab	0	17	141	75	146	387	590	209	76	71	177	273	2162
Yellow Cab Vacaville	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399	355	432	423	243	1852
AA Taxi Vacaville	252	799	671	333	0	561	748	489	409	314	355	332	5263
Vaca Checker Cab	0	226	408	177	468	626	763	514	1028	1092	1933	1982	9217
Checker Cab - Fairfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517	649	692	1028	1108	3994
Fairfield Cab Co.	20	57	96	145	0	185	212	222	531	550	568	357	2943
													<b>42560</b>

Cost Per Mile	\$2.75
---------------	--------

Cost Per Passenger Trip	\$31.91
-------------------------	---------

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Manager/Analyst  
SUBJECT: Solano County Transit (SolTrans) Transitional Costs Funding Request

---

**Background:**

The October 2010, SolTrans Transition Plan included a discussion of one-time transit service consolidation costs. Estimates were provided for office relocation, re-branding, professional services, and debt retirement. As the transition progresses, these specific transitional tasks have become clearer. Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has provided \$300,000 in State Transit Assistance Funding (STAF) to address transition costs incurred in FY 2010-11 and early FY 2011-12. Specifically, STA has funded and contracted for branding services resulting in the approval of the new agency's logo and a plan for its use. STA has funded the interim executive director, legal counsel, and finance, administration and human resources consulting services for the past several months.

**Discussion:**

The SolTrans transition is well underway. SolTrans has been approved by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) as a grant recipient, adopted its first year budget, taken over managerial of the three service contracts, and consolidated the three contracts into one resulting in over \$1 million in annual savings. Concurrently, there have been some unanticipated challenges. Continuing to serve SolTrans passengers and operate the system well while addressing transition needs requires an ongoing supplement to SolTrans existing staff until permanent staff can be retained. Additional professional services and interim staff support are essential to finalizing legal agreements related to the consolidation, coordinating federal and state capital grant responsibilities, managing the implementation of the branding plan, managing the Short Range Transit Plan for SolTrans, establishing the employee benefits program, and establishing policies and procedures for the new agency. These tasks are making progress, but in some cases are taking longer than expected.

In addition, the financial outlook is not as favorable for SolTrans as projected in 2010 when the Transition Plan was developed. Projected operating deficits inherited from the two merged city transit systems will require significant efforts by staff, consultants, and the SolTrans Board to resolve over the next several months. Although the financial situation is not unique among Bay Area transit operators, the added responsibilities for managing the transition have stretched SolTrans capabilities.

SolTrans have identified transition costs of \$395,800 for the remainder of FY 2011-12. The table included in this staff report below shows the activities that STA has funded to date and SolTrans' proposal for additional funding. A separate request to MTC for other one-time costs is under development by SolTrans and STA staff.

<b>SolTrans Professional Services and Interim Staff Activities through FY 2011-12</b>	<b>Initial STA Contribution (Estimated)</b>	<b>Proposed Additional STA Contribution Request</b>
Logo and Re-Branding Consulting Services	\$38,500	\$0
Legal Services	\$50,000	\$46,400
Human Resources Transition Services	\$25,000	\$0
Financial and Administrative Consulting Services	\$100,000	\$215,000
Vacaville Financial Services Contract Start Up	\$47,000	\$0
Interim Executive Director and Board Clerk	\$36,500	\$134,400
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$297,000</b>	<b>\$395,800</b>

At the September 15, 2011 SolTrans Board meeting, the SolTrans Board unanimously voted to authorize SolTrans staff to submit a request to STA for additional funding in the amount of \$395,800 for the transition costs.

The Consortium and STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**Fiscal Impact:**

The \$395,800 in State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) to cover the request from SolTrans can be funded with Northern County Population-Based STAF.

**Recommendation:**

Approve allocation of SolTrans funding request in the amount of \$395,800 of STAF to cover transitional costs through Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12.

Attachments:

- A. SolTrans Funding Request Letter
- B. SolTrans Start-up Team Monthly Status Report (September 2011)



---

311 Sacramento Street, Suite A • Vallejo, CA 94590 • (707) 648-4046 • (707) 648-4260 Fax

September 16, 2011

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

**RE: Funding Request for Transition Costs**

Dear Mr. Halls:

With the strong support of Solano Transportation Authority, SolTrans has recently completed two months of independent transit operations resulting from the consolidation of City of Benicia and City of Vallejo transit services. We have successfully transitioned transit services of the two cities into a single operations contract between SolTrans and MV Transportation. Further progress has been made in the areas of finance, human resources, and planning. SolTrans' application for grantee status was accepted by the Federal Transit Administration, TDA, STA and bridge toll allocations are flowing to SolTrans, and we have established finance and banking services. A staffing plan and benefits package has been approved by the Board and interim staff positions have been filled. The new logo was adopted and our service is being branded in a consistent and recognizable manner. The Short Range Transit Plan is under way and will provide us with affordable, cost effective service options for the coming years.

Our progress would not have been possible without STA's guidance and support. STA's commitment of nearly \$300,000 has helped us achieve the transition milestones mentioned above. However, the transition is not complete and we need to address several outstanding issues related to hiring employees and establishing interim and permanent benefits programs, finalizing legal agreements with the member Cities to transfer assets and contracts, and transitioning existing grants, while maintaining interim staffing of critical agency functions.

We are looking to STA for continued financial assistance to help cover these transition costs. Last night the SolTrans Board authorized us to make a request of \$395,800 for professional services and interim staff for FY 2011-12. A copy of the staff report is attached.

*SolTrans Ltr. to Daryl Halls, STA Executive Director dated: September 16, 2011  
RE: Funding Request for Transition Costs*

Thank you for your ongoing partnership in the transit consolidation effort and for your consideration of this request. Please let me know if you need any additional information about SolTrans' progress or transition needs.

Sincerely,

  
James McElroy  
Interim Executive Director

Attachment: Staff Report, Funding Request for Transition Costs



DATE: September 7, 2011  
TO: SolTrans Board  
FROM: Nancy Whelan, Interim Chief Financial Officer  
RE: Funding Request for Transition Costs

---

**Discussion:**

The October 2010 SolTrans Transition Plan included a discussion of one-time transit service consolidation costs. Estimates were provided for office relocation, re-branding, professional services, and debt retirement. As the transition progresses, these needs have become clearer.

Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has provided \$300,000 in State Transit Assistance Funding to address transition needs incurred in FY 2010-11 and early FY 2011-12. Specifically, STA has funded and contracted for branding services resulting in the approval of the new agency's logo and a plan for its use. STA has funded the interim executive director, legal counsel, and finance, administration and human resources consulting services for the past several months.

The transition is well under way and as reported to the Board at the monthly meetings, there have been some unanticipated challenges. Continuing to serve our riders and operate the system well while addressing transition needs requires an ongoing supplement to our existing staff. Additional professional services and interim staff support are essential to finalizing legal agreements related to the consolidation, coordinating federal and state capital grant responsibilities, managing the implementation of the branding plan, managing the Short Range Transit Plan, establishing the employee benefits program, and establishing policies and procedures for the new agency. Some of these tasks have taken longer than expected.

In addition, as we discussed in the August Board Workshop, the financial outlook is not as favorable as we had projected in 2010 when the Transition Plan was developed. Projected deficits in FY 2012-13 and beyond will require significant efforts by staff, consultants, and the Board to resolve over the next several months. Although the financial situation is not unique among Bay Area transit operators, the added responsibilities for managing the transition have stretched our capabilities.

STA staff and management have indicated that they will consider a request for additional funding for the transition. We have identified transition costs of \$395,800 for the remainder of FY 2011-12.

The chart below shows the activities that STA has funded to date and our proposal for additional funding. A separate request to MTC for other one-time costs is under development.

<b>Professional Services and Interim Staff Activities</b>	<b>Initial STA Contribution (Estimated)</b>	<b>Proposed Additional STA Contribution Request</b>
Logo and Re-Branding Consulting Services	\$38,500	\$0
Legal Services	\$50,000	\$46,400
Human Resources Transition Services	\$25,000	\$0
Financial and Administrative Consulting Services	\$100,000	\$215,000
Vacaville Financial Services Contract Start Up	\$47,000	\$0
Interim Executive Director and Board Clerk	\$36,500	\$134,400
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$297,000</b>	<b>\$395,800</b>

**Recommendation:**

Authorize SolTrans to submit a request for funding to STA in the amount of \$395,800 for professional services and interim staff for FY 2011-12.



Start-up Team Monthly Status Report  
**September 2011**  
 Prepared by John Harris,  
 Special Projects Manager

---

## A. BACKGROUND

With the opening of the new transit center for service operations on July 1 and the successful staffing of several key SolTrans' staff positions and functions shortly thereafter, the organization is transitioning from a transition team headed by the STA's consultant team and staff into a fully operational staff capable of handling day-to-day operations and completing the remaining critical start-up/transition tasks in a timely manner. This transition is expected to be completed by the end of FY 2011/12.

## B. WORK THIS MONTH

### SolTrans Staffing

Although several positions are temporarily filled, SolTrans now has enough dedicated staff to cover all operational functions. John Harris has been contracted through the STA as a special projects consultant and is responsible for the SRTP, research and analysis, and coordinative duties as assigned through the balance of the year. Nancy Whelan has been contracted to serve in the capacity of Finance Director. Jeanine Wooley is on loan from the City of Vallejo to manage SolTrans' operational contract. Greg Anderson is on loan from the City of Vallejo to manage the agency's procurement and grants. Suzanne Fredriksen has been retained as the Interim Clerk of the Board/Administrative Assistant. Jim McElroy was designated by the SolTrans Board to serve as Interim Executive Director during the transition period.

### SolTrans Marketing, Logo and Brand RFP

Last month, the SolTrans Board approved the new SolTrans logo and marketing plan. The SolTrans' marketing consultant, Page Design, is currently working on the development of a SolTrans website, designing graphics/decals for new and existing fleet vehicles (as specified in Attachment A) and designing items in coordination with MTC's Transit Connectivity Wayfinding project (i.e. maps/schedules/fare media).

### Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) Status

The SolTrans staff in coordination with the lead consultant from Moore & Associates, Michael Eshleman, conducted a SRTP Workshop with the SolTrans Board on Thursday August 18. The workshop focused on the purpose and goals of the SRTP process and gave the Board an opportunity to offer the SRTP team direction on pending SRTP operational plan scenarios and input on corresponding SRTP public outreach activities. Public input meetings will be scheduled for October/November 2011.

### Financial Services/Human Resources Services Status

SolTrans' FY12 budget was loaded into the accounting system by the City of Vacaville on July 5th. TDA and RM2 funds were deposited into the SolTrans' account on July 15th. The initial checks to pay invoices were issued on August 22nd.

Securing SolTrans FTA Grantee Status

SolTrans submitted a package of information to FTA requesting grantee status in early May 2011. In May and early June, FTA staff indicated that the request would be processed prior to July 1, 2011. On June 28, FTA indicated that the staff leads assigned to the matter were away from the office on leave and were scheduled to return after the July Fourth holiday. FTA expected to “expeditiously bring closure to this matter and issue the letter addressing SolTrans status as a new grantee.” Since then, FTA staff has asked for further clarification on the status of assets owned by the City of Vallejo and grants currently administered by the City of Vallejo. SolTrans staff has provided additional information on these topics and have requested to meet with FTA. A meeting is scheduled for the week of September 12th.

MTC Meeting to Discuss Transitional Costs

SolTrans Board Member Jim Spering, SolTrans’ Jim McElroy, and STA’s Executive Director Daryl Halls are coordinating a meeting with MTC management staff to discuss funding one time transitional/start up costs. A follow up meeting is being scheduled for late September or early October.

Coordinating with Benicia and Vallejo

Both the City of Benicia and the City of Vallejo are working on asset transfer agreements and are scheduled to approve the actual transfers by September 30th.

**A. STANDING CRITICAL PATH GOALS**

<b>July through December 2011</b>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Complete transfer of grants/ agreements/contracts/liability policies and capital assets by 9/30</li><li>2. Complete SRTP by 12/31</li><li>3. Continue PERS actuarial process</li><li>4. Begin selection process of permanent CEO</li><li>5. Continue and implement efforts to permanently hire Staff (4.5.FTE)</li></ol>

Attachment:

- A. Photo of Demo SolTrans Logo on Bus



DATE: September 30, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Contract Amendment for SolTrans Project Management Consultant

---

**Background:**

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, John Harris was retained by the STA to serve as the project manager for the Transit Consolidation study that was initiated in early 2007. The contract was subsequently amended several times to continue services through June 2010. The CBTP for East Fairfield was postponed until the CBTP for Vacaville was completed. This occurred last fiscal year.

Phase II of the Transit Consolidation Study was completed in June 2009. In June 2009, the STA Board approved a series of recommendations with one being to pursue consolidation of Benicia and Vallejo Transit systems.

Since June 2009, STA has been working with Benicia and Vallejo to consolidate their transit operations. A Joint Powers Authority (JPA) was approved among the member agencies of the Cities of Benicia, Vallejo and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) creating Solano County Transit, or SolTrans. In December 2010, SolTrans held its first Board meeting. Along with the approval of the JPA, a SolTrans Transition Plan was created. Mr. Harris has assisted in the development of these key documents.

Since December 2010, a Transition Team has been working toward transitioning transit operations from the Cities. Mr. Harris has been involved with numerous aspects of this process. He has been a key player in re-negotiating the service contracts to ensure SolTrans begins on as strong a fiscal foundation. On July 1, 2011, Vallejo Transit and Benicia Breeze services merged together and began operations. The Short Range Transit Plan is currently underway analyzing the two transit systems. John Harris is the project manager for SolTrans Short Range Transit Plan. SolTrans Interim Executive Director, Jim McElory, has requested John Harris be retained to continue to assist SolTrans during the transition period. John Harris has extensive experience in the field of transit. He worked for many years at the Bay Area transit agencies and offers hands-on transit management knowledge.

**Discussion:**

Some tangible progress has been accomplished to date to establish SolTrans and a substantial amount of work still remains to be done. There will be further work to be done into Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 to further stabilize SolTrans. The project manager will continue to manage the transition team, serve as the project manager for the SolTrans Short Range Transit Plan and to assist SolTrans staff. Staff is recommending this contract be amended to extend until June 30, 2012 for a not-to-exceed amount of \$85,000.

**Fiscal Impact:**

The fiscal impact for the contract is \$85,000. The \$85,000 and will be covered by State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) as part of the \$395,800 SolTrans transitional costs if approved by STA Board (subject of separate staff report).

**Recommendation:**

Authorize the Executive Director to extend the consultant contract with John Harris for SolTrans Project Management services until June 30, 2012 for an amount not-to-exceed \$85,000.



DATE: September 30, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Contract Amendment for SolTrans Financial Consultant

---

**Background:**

In July 2001, the STA Board selected Nancy Whelan, of Nancy Whelan Consulting (NWC), to serve as a Transit and Funding Consultant. Recent contract amendments have extended NWC's contract through June 30, 2012. NWC has continued to provide a high level of expertise and has successfully assisted the STA in completing several transit projects. Specifically, in the past few years NWC has provided invaluable expertise and support for the successful intercity transit funding agreement effort and substantial support in terms of financial expertise for the Solano County Transit consolidation effort with Benicia and Vallejo.

**Discussion:**

NWC is currently providing technical financial support to SolTrans. Neither transit operator had full-time dedicated finance staff to devote to manage tasks such as preparing budgets, establishing a new financial management system for SolTrans, transferring of assets, and preparing documents to secure operating funds. NWC is filling this role, and will continue to do so, until finance staff can be secured by SolTrans.

SolTrans Board has appointed Nancy Whelan as Interim Finance Director and Jim McElroy, SolTrans Interim Executive Director and has requested STA extend the contract with NWC through the remainder of the fiscal year. Staff is recommending this contract be amended for a not-to-exceed amount of \$130,000 for technical financial support to SolTrans. Currently, the NWC contract term is June 30, 2012 and does not require a time extension.

**Fiscal Impact:**

The fiscal impact for the contract is \$130,000 and will be provided by State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF) as part of the \$395,800 SolTrans transition cost if approved by STA Board (subject of separate staff report).

**Recommendation:**

Authorize the Executive Director to amend the contract with Nancy Whelan Consulting for SolTrans Financial and Technical Services for an amount not-to-exceed \$130,000.

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Program Manager/Analyst  
SUBJECT: Solano County Transit Operators' Coordinated Short Range Transit Plan

---

**Background:**

Federal statutes require that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in partnership with the state and with local agencies, develop and periodically update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which implements the RTP by programming federal funds to transportation projects contained in the RTP. In order to effectively execute these planning and fund programming responsibilities, MTC, in cooperation with Region IX of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), requires each transit operator receiving federal funding through the TIP (federal grantees within the MTC region) to prepare, adopt, and submit an Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) to MTC.

SRTPs are funded in part by FTA Section 5303 funds for which MTC is the grantee. MTC in turn makes these funds available to eligible transit operators through a funding agreement between MTC and the individual operator. These guidelines describe the purpose, planning horizon and frequency of updates for the SRTP, and provide detail relative to the tasks and subtasks outlined in the funding agreement.

MTC staff suspended the SRTP policy for Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 and did not require operators submit their scheduled SRTP for last year. Instead of funding the SRTPs, FTA Section 5303 planning funds were used to support the Regional Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) and the Regional Transit Origin-Destination (O-D) and Demographic Survey.

**Discussion:**

In April 2011, MTC adopted Resolution 3532, revised SRTP guidelines for FY 2011-12, based on earlier input from the Transit Financial Working Group (TFWG). The guidelines focus FY 2011-12 SRTP development on small and medium size operators that are not the immediate focus of the Transit Sustainability Project.

Attachment A is a memo prepared by MTC staff for the October Transit Fund Working Group (TFWG) about the SRTP Program for FY 2011-12. This item was sent out in advance of the packet to allow eligible operators more time to prepare letters of intent to request SRTP funding. The attached memo includes program information, instructions for applying for SRTP funding, and a draft schedule. Small- and medium-sized operators that are not part of the Transit Sustainability Project, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA), and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) are invited to submit a one-page letter of intent listing the amount of funds requested

### Proposed Funding

As part of the application process, eligible small and medium operators may request to use a consultant hired by MTC or to receive non-federal funds to cover SRTP costs. MTC encourages agencies to focus SRTP efforts on enhanced coordination and planning, especially between agencies with overlapping service areas, contiguous transit corridors and mutual customers.

### County/Corridor Level Coordination

Based on the recent interest in transit, improved transit coordination focus and interest from Solano and Sonoma Counties, some Section 5303 funding will be reserved for the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in these counties to encourage enhanced countywide transit coordination and planning. MTC will work with the CMAs and local transit operators to develop a scope similar to certain TSP subregional analysis work.

### Program Administration

The small- and medium-sized operators not part of the Transit Sustainability Project, SCTA and STA are invited to submit a one-page letter of intent listing the amount of funds requested.

Based on a recent meeting with Solano's three largest transit operators and last month's transit Consortium meeting that included all Solano transit operators, STA staff is recommending STA submit a County Level SRTP Coordination funding request to MTC to include individual SRTP analysis of each transit operator in Solano County, coordination with the update to the Solano Intercity Transit Plan, and an enhanced coordinated analysis in addressing Mobility Needs for People with Disabilities in Solano County. Some of the areas of interest could include the Intercity Taxi Scrip Program, non-profit partnerships, and a program that assist paratransit users that are able to transfer to fixed route. This specific analysis is consistent with the recommendations contained in the draft Seniors and People with Disabilities Plan Update.

The following schedule is proposed for funding and developing SRTPs in FY 2011-12:

MTC releases call for SRTP applications and instructions	September 20, 2011
SRTP and County Level Coordination funding requests due to MTC	October 7, 2011
MTC reviews list of recommended funding with TFWG	November 2, 2011
MTC adopts FY 2011-12 SRTP and County Level Coordination funding; SRTP guidelines revised to include deliverable dates	December 2011/ January 2012
SRTP/County Level Coordination Plan funding contracts executed	January 2012
Review of Draft SRTP by STA Board	May 2012
Draft SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans for FYs 2012-22 due to MTC	June 1, 2012
Coordinate SRTP for Solano County by STA Board	July 2012
Final SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans for FYs 2012-22 due to MTC	September 1, 2012

### Future SRTP Policy

The interim funding program for FY 2011-12 cycle funding and the administration of the SRTP program may be revised based on TSP recommendations. Policies addressing the administration of TDA audits and the Productivity Improvement Project program may also be revised to include TSP recommendations. A new proposal incorporating those recommendations into the SRTP process will be proposed once TSP recommendations are adopted.

STA staff will work with the transit operators to discuss what scope of work to be included in Addressing Mobility Needs of People with Disabilities request for proposal if MTC awards this funding to STA.

The Consortium recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Recommendation:**

Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to submit a County Level Coordination funding request to MTC for individual SRTP analysis and a coordinated SRTP of Solano County transit operators; and
2. A coordinated analysis in cost effectively addressing Mobility Needs of People with Disabilities in Solano County.

Attachment:

- A. MTC's Memorandum on the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) Call for Applications

This page intentionally left blank.



**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: Transit Finance Working Group  
FR: Christina Verdin  
RE: Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) Update

DATE: August 3, 2011

In April 2011, MTC adopted Resolution 3532, Revised, SRTP guidelines for FY2011-12, based on earlier input from the TFWG. The guidelines focus FY2011-12 SRTP development on small and medium size operators that are not the immediate focus of the Transit Sustainability Project. Proposed funding, county/corridor level coordination, and schedule information are included below. Staff seeks comments from the TFWG before commencing the program.

### *Proposed Funding*

As part of the application process, eligible small and medium operators may request to use a consultant hired by MTC or to receive non-federal funds to cover SRTP costs. MTC encourages agencies to focus SRTP efforts on enhanced coordination and planning, especially between agencies with overlapping service areas, contiguous transit corridors and mutual customers.

### *County/Corridor Level Coordination*

Based on the TSP improved coordination focus and interest from Solano and Sonoma counties, some Section 5303 funding will be reserved for Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in these counties to promote enhanced coordination and planning. These funds would be allocated directly to the congestion management agencies that would in turn work with operators. Based on proposals from the CMAs in Sonoma and Solano counties and the operators in those counties, staff will recommend specific areas for focus modeled after the TSP subregional analysis.

### *Proposed Schedule*

The following schedule is proposed for funding and developing SRTPs in FY2011-12:

MTC releases call for SRTP applications and instructions	September 2011
SRTP and County Level Coordination funding requests due to MTC	October 2011
MTC adopts FY2011-12 SRTP and County Level Coordination funding; SRTP guidelines revised to include deliverable dates	December 2011/ January 2012
SRTP/County Level Coordination Plan funding contracts executed	January 2012
Draft SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans for FYs 2012-22 due to MTC	June 1, 2012
Final SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans for FYs 2012-22 due to MTC	September 1, 2012

***Future SRTP Policy***

The interim funding program for FY2011-12 cycle funding and the administration of the SRTP program may be revised based on TSP recommendations. Policies addressing the administration of TDA audits and the Productivity Improvement Project program may also be revised to include TSP recommendations. A new proposal incorporating those recommendations into the SRTP process will be proposed once TSP recommendations are adopted.

MTC welcomes continued feedback on crafting an approach to this process. Please contact me at [cverdin@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:cverdin@mtc.ca.gov) or Kenneth Folan at [kfolan@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:kfolan@mtc.ca.gov) if you have any questions.

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership TFWG\Transit Finance WG\2011\11 Memos\08\_August\05\_SRTP Update.doc



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](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: Transit Finance Working Group

DATE: September 21, 2011

FR: Christina Verdin

RE: Short-Range Transit Plan (SRTP) – Call for Applications

In August 2011, MTC staff sought comment from the TFWG on the SRTP Program for FY2011-12. This memo includes program information, instructions for applying for SRTP funding and draft schedule. Please find MTC adopted Resolution 3532, Revised, SRTP guidelines for FY2011-12, in Attachment A to this memorandum.

### *Proposed Funding*

As part of the application process, eligible small and medium operators may request to use a consultant hired by MTC or to receive non-federal funds to cover SRTP costs. MTC encourages agencies to focus SRTP efforts on enhanced coordination and planning, especially between agencies with overlapping service areas, contiguous transit corridors and mutual customers.

### *County/Corridor Level Coordination*

Based on the TSP improved coordination focus and interest from Solano and Sonoma counties, some Section 5303 funding will be reserved for Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) in these counties to promote enhanced coordination and planning. Using the TSP consultant pool, MTC will work with the CMAs and local agencies to develop a scope similar to certain TSP subregional analysis work.

### *Program Administration*

Small- and medium-sized operators not part of the Transit Sustainability Project, the Sonoma County Transportation Authority, and the Solano Transportation Authority are invited to submit a one-page letter of intent listing the amount of funds requested. Note that staff does not intend to recommend funding levels above prior year awards. **Requests should be submitted by Friday, October 7, 2011.** Requests should include the following:

For Operators:

- Statement describing if the SRTP will pertain only to the agency submitting the request or if it will pertain to two or more agencies that share overlapping service areas, contiguous transit corridors and/or mutual customers.
- Is the request to use a consultant hired by MTC or to directly receive non-federal funds to cover SRTP costs? If the SRTP is for one agency, include a description of any corridor service delivery coordination with other agencies and a listing of those agencies, if applicable.
- The amount of funding requested.

For CMAs:

- Statement describing the agencies that will be included in the County/Corridor Level Coordination document
- A brief description of the service areas/corridors where coordination is planned to take place within the county.
- The amount of funding requested.

Once all requests are received, MTC will recommend Section 5303 or non-federal funding. Based on proposals from the CMAs in Sonoma and Solano counties and the operators in those counties, staff will recommend specific areas for focus modeled after the TSP subregional analysis.

This list of recommended funding will be reviewed with the Transit Finance Working Group at the November 2, 2011 meeting.

***Proposed Schedule***

The following schedule is proposed for funding and developing SRTPs in FY2011-12:

MTC releases call for SRTP applications and instructions	September 20, 2011
SRTP and County Level Coordination funding requests due to MTC	October 7, 2011
MTC reviews list of recommended funding with TFWG	November 2, 2011
MTC adopts FY2011-12 SRTP and County Level Coordination funding; SRTP guidelines revised to include deliverable dates	December 2011/ January 2012
SRTP/County Level Coordination Plan funding contracts executed	January 2012
Draft SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans due to MTC	June 1, 2012
Final SRTP/County Level Coordination Plans due to MTC	September 1, 2012

***Future SRTP Policy***

The interim funding program for FY2011-12 cycle funding and the administration of the SRTP program may be revised based on TSP recommendations. Policies addressing the administration of TDA audits and the Productivity Improvement Project program may also be revised to include TSP recommendations. A new proposal incorporating those recommendations into the SRTP process will be proposed once TSP recommendations are adopted.

All requests should be submitted to Christina Verdin in Programming and Allocations. If you have questions, please call (510) 817-5869 or send an email to [cverdina@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:cverdina@mtc.ca.gov). Please contact me at [cverdina@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:cverdina@mtc.ca.gov) or Kenneth Folan at [kfolan@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:kfolan@mtc.ca.gov) if you have any questions.

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Programming and Allocations Committee**

April 13, 2011

Item Number 2d

**Resolution No. 3532, Revised**

**Subject:** Revision to the Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) Guidelines for FY 2011-12

**Summary:** Staff recommends updating the SRTP guidelines for FY 2011-12. The proposal focuses FY 2011-12 SRTP development on small and medium sized operators that are not the immediate focus of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP). For other operators, the SRTP requirements would be suspended in FY 2011-12 based on the regional TSP effort. Future SRTP policy and funding will be subject to recommendations included in the TSP, scheduled for adoption in early 2012.

**Background:** Historically, MTC has required each transit operator receiving federal funding to submit an SRTP to MTC at least biennially to meet federal planning requirements related to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

For FY 2010-11 staff focused the available FTA Section 5303 planning funds to support the TSP Project and an upcoming Transit Origin-Destination and Demographic Survey. MTC formerly provided FTA funding to each operator to support the development of the SRTP. However based on the increased difficulty of administering Federal Funds used for this purpose, staff proposes an interim approach that would give operators a choice either to use a consultant hired by MTC to assist with SRTP development or to receive non-federal funds to cover in-house SRTP costs.

This staff proposal takes into account other planning efforts for the interim year as listed below:

<b>Planning Element</b>	<b>Related or Proposed FY 2011-12 Planning Efforts</b>
Description of the existing system	Statistical Summary
System performance assessment	Statistical Summary TSP
Service Plan	SRTP for small to medium operators TSP for large operators
Capital improvement plans	Regional Transit Capital Inventory, needs calculations for Plan Bay Area
Financial plan identifying revenue	SRTP for small to medium operators TSP for large operators

Staff proposes to implement this policy on an interim bases for FY 2011-12. Following Commission adoption of the TSP, staff will return to this Committee with a revised SRTP framework.

**Issues:** None.

**Recommendation:** Refer MTC Resolution No. 3532, Revised to the Commission for approval.

**Attachments:** MTC Resolution No. 3532, Revised  
Attachment A -SRTP Guidelines

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership TFWG\\_Transit Finance WG\\_2011\11 Memos\10\_October\02\_SRTP Update\_1.doc

Date: March 26, 2003  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: PAC  
Revised: 03/22/06-C  
04/23/08-C  
04/27/11-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3532, Revised

This resolution adopts the Short Range Transit Plan Guidelines.

Attachment A to this resolution was amended on March 22, 2006 and April 23, 2008.

Attachment A was revised on April 27, 2011 to clarify that the SRTP guidelines will focus on small and medium sized operators that are not the subject of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) in FY 2011-12. For other transit operators, the requirements are suspended based on the TSP and other planning efforts in FY 2011-12.

Further discussion of these actions is contained in the MTC “Executive Director’s Memoranda” to the Programming and Allocations Committee dated March 5, 2003, March 1, 2006, and April 13, 2011; and in the Programming and Allocations Committee summary sheet dated April 9, 2008 and April 13, 2011.

Date: March 26, 2003  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: PAC

RE: Short Range Transit Plan Guidelines

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. 3532

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation planning agency 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 San Francisco Bay Area, charged with carrying out the metropolitan transportation planning and fund programming processes required to maintain the region's eligibility for federal funds for transportation planning, capital improvements, and operations; and

WHEREAS, MTC the federal Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) requires MPOs to work cooperatively with the state and public transit operators to develop regional transportation plans and Transportation Improvement Programs (TIP) for urbanized areas of the state; and

WHEREAS, MTC has developed, in cooperation with the State, and with public transit operators in the region, a work program for carrying out continuing, comprehensive, and cooperative transportation planning; and

WHEREAS, an Overall Work Program (OWP) for planning activities in the Bay Area is annually prepared by MTC, the Association of Bay Area Governments, and the California Department of Transportation; and

WHEREAS, the OWP describes MTC's annual unified work program to achieve the goals and objectives of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP); and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the goals and objectives of the RTP, MTC's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) includes funds programmed for projects sponsored by public transit operators in the MTC region; and

WHEREAS, MTC, in cooperation with the FTA Region IX office requires that public transit operators in the MTC region which are FTA grantees prepare and regularly update a Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) as inputs to regional transportation planning programming activities; and

WHEREAS, Appendix A of the Overall Work Program (OWP) lists the public transit operators in the region required to prepare and update an SRTP, and provides for the financial support of the operators' development of SRTPs through the use of FTA Section 5303 funds, and also includes an outline scope of work for the SRTP; and

WHEREAS, MTC biennially enters into a funding agreement with each public transit operator required to prepare and update an SRTP, which passes through to the operator FTA Section 5303 funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC desires to promulgate detailed SRTP guidelines that more precisely explain the outline scope or work included in the SRTP funding agreement, and which are in accord with and supportive of the planning, fund programming and policy requirements of MTC's Transit Capital Priorities Process and Criteria, the TIP and the RTP; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC does hereby adopt the "Short Range Transit Plan Guidelines," attached hereto as Attachment A to this Resolution and incorporated herein as though set forth at length.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

Steve Kinsey, Chair

The above resolution was adopted by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California on March 26, 2003

Date: March 26, 2003  
W.I.: 1512  
Referred by: PAC  
Revised: 03/22/06-C  
04/23/08-C  
04/27/11-C

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3532, Revised  
Page 1 of 16

## **METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION SHORT RANGE TRANSIT PLAN GUIDELINES**

### **BASIS OF THE SRTP REQUIREMENT**

Federal statutes require that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in partnership with the state and with local agencies, develop and periodically update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which implements the RTP by programming federal funds to transportation projects contained in the RTP. In order to effectively execute these planning and fund programming responsibilities, MTC, in cooperation with Region IX of the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), requires each transit operator receiving federal funding through the TIP (federal grantees within the MTC region) to prepare, adopt, and submit an SRTP to MTC.

In FY 2011-12, MTC will focus SRTP development on small and medium sized operators that are not the subject of the Transit Sustainability Project (TSP) in FY 2011-12. For other transit operators, the requirements are suspended based on the TSP and other planning efforts in FY 2011-12.

These guidelines describe the purpose, planning horizon and frequency of updates for the SRTP, and provide detail relative to the tasks and subtasks outlined in the funding agreement.

### **SRTP PURPOSE**

- A. To serve as a management and policy document for the transit operator, as well as a means of annually providing FTA and MTC with information necessary to meet regional fund programming and planning requirements.
- B. To clearly and concisely describe and justify the transit operator's capital and operating budgets.
- C. To submit requests for federal, state, and regional funds for capital and operating purposes through MTC's Transit Capital Priorities, and in the MTC TIP.
- D. To assess an operator's financial capacity to carry out proposed levels of operations and the associated capital improvement plan. This assists FTA in making its own assessment of an operator's financial capacity.
- E. To regularly provide MTC with information on projects and programs of regional significance, which include: funding and scheduling of expansion projects included in MTC Resolution No. 3434, provision of paratransit service to persons with disabilities, older

adults and others; compliance with federal Title VI reporting requirements; Environmental Justice outreach and public participation, and related service planning; results of the most recent FTA Triennial Review and related corrective actions.

- F. To provide the basis for inclusion of an operator’s capital and operating programs in the RTP.
- G. The goals, objectives, and standards specified in an operator’s SRTP serve as a basis for the assessment of the operator’s performance conducted as part of the MTC Triennial Performance Audit of the operator.

### **THE SRTP AND THE OPERATOR’S GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND STANDARDS**

Goals should reflect the major areas of concern for public transit operators, for example:

- scheduling and route planning
- service reliability
- system effectiveness
- system efficiency
- safety and security
- funding and reserve policies
- customer service
- statutory and regulatory compliance

Objectives should be comprehensive (there can be several objectives under each goal). Service standards should be specific, measurable and quantified where feasible. Goals, objectives and standards should reflect the basis under which new service would be deployed and existing service increased or reduced.

### **PLANNING HORIZON**

The planning horizon is a minimum of ten years. However, a longer planning horizon may be required if necessary to reflect significant capital replacement and/or rehabilitation that would not fall within the ten year period (e.g., railcars, ferryboats, bus subfleet). A longer planning horizon may also be required if necessary to capture the capital or operating budget implications of significant changes in service (e.g., rail extension coming on line, Regional Express Bus deployment).

### **FREQUENCY OF UPDATES**

“Full SRTPs” must be completely updated every four years, in the year preceding a Regional Transportation Plan update. In the interim years, MTC requires at a minimum that an operator develop and update a “Mini-SRTP”. The scope of both the Full and Mini-SRTPs is explained below.

### **REFERENCES TO MTC RESOLUTIONS**

These guidelines make reference in certain sections to the following MTC Resolutions:

- MTC Resolution No. 3434, “Regional Transit Expansion Policy.”
- MTC Resolution No. 3176, “Procedures for Evaluating Transit Efficiency Improvements.”
- MTC Resolution No. 3515: “Transit Capital Priorities, Economic Recovery Principles, Policy Governing the Use of FY 2003-04 FTA Section 5307 Funds.”

- MTC Resolution No. 3427, revised, Attachment C3: Regional Transportation Plan 100% “Transit Capital Shortfall” policy.
- MTC Resolution No.3866: “MTC Transit Connectivity Plan.”

MTC staff will e-mail electronic copies of these resolutions to interested parties upon request.

### **ONBOARD SURVEY**

MTC regularly conducts a regional "on-board" transit survey. The first survey was completed in FY 2006-2007 and is available here:

[http://www.mtc.ca.gov/maps\\_and\\_data/datamart/survey/2006\\_transit.htm](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/maps_and_data/datamart/survey/2006_transit.htm). The next survey is scheduled to begin in FY 2010-2011. The purpose of the survey is threefold: (1) to inform MTC and interested stakeholders of the demographic profile of transit riders throughout the Bay Area; (2) to provide information to transit providers on the travel patterns and characteristics of their customers; and, (3) to provide MTC and interested stakeholders with robust estimates of transit origin/destination patterns, which are important to analytical planning efforts. MTC and operators will coordinate to develop survey instruments that meet these three goals and to provide survey takers access to their transit systems.

### **SCOPE OF THE FULL SRTP**

The Full SRTP must contain at least the information described in this section. Where applicable, sub-sections that are required to be included in the Mini-SRTPs are labeled as such.

#### **1. Title Page**

The title page must include the words “Short Range Transit Plan,” the fiscal years covered by the plan, the official name of the transit operator, the date approved by the governing board, and the following statements:

Federal transportation statutes require that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in partnership with state and local agencies, develop and periodically update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which implements the RTP by programming federal funds to transportation projects contained in the RTP. In order to effectively execute these planning and programming responsibilities, MTC requires that each transit operator in its region which receives federal funding through the TIP, prepare, adopt, and submit to MTC a Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP).

*(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

#### **2. Overview of Transit System**

- A. Brief History (e.g., year of formation, facilities and fleet development, changes in service focus areas, key milestones and events).
- B. Governance.
  1. Type of unit of government (e.g., city, joint powers authority, transit district).

2. Composition and nature of representation of governing body:
  - a. Number of members;
  - b. Elected or appointed (if appointed, how, and what agencies and/or groups do members represent (e.g., cities, county, general public);
  - c. Current members and terms.
- C. Organizational Structure (use graphic format).
  1. Management and staff positions.
  2. Reporting relationships.
  3. Contracted transportation services (name of contractor(s), length of current contract(s)).
  4. Labor unions representing agency employees and length of current contract(s).
- D. Transit Services Provided and Areas Served —Describe fixed route, demand responsive, and connecting services and areas served, and the number of vehicles required for each type of service.
  1. Fixed Route (includes bus and rail):
    - a. Local;
    - b. Express;
    - c. Other commuter service (e.g., subscription service);
    - d. Services provided in partnership with others (funding contributions or policy oversight);
    - e. Accommodation of bicycles.
  2. Demand responsive (includes operator-provided services and services provided under partnership agreements):
    - a. General public;
    - b. Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA);
    - c. Persons with disabilities (non-ADA);
    - d. Older adults.
  3. Connecting services provided by others.
- E. Fare Structure — Describe fare structure for fixed route and demand responsive services, and for interoperator transfers.
  1. Fixed Route Fares:
    - a. Single fare (adults, seniors, student/youth);
    - b. Discounted and/or multi-ride fares (adults, seniors, student/youth);
    - c. Recent changes in fares;
  2. Demand Responsive Fares:
    - a. Single fare;
    - b. Discounted and/or multi-ride fares;
    - c. Recent changes in fares (include the year(s) in which the change(s) took place);

3. Interoperator Transfer Arrangements and Fares
  - a. Clipper<sup>SM</sup> (if currently deployed);
  - b. Other proof of transfer;
- F. Revenue Fleet — Provide a general description of the revenue vehicle/vessel fleet. Identify MTC Regional Express Buses separately. The description can be in narrative or graphic format, or a combination of both. (This description differs from the detailed inventory required under Section 6 of these guidelines.) Include the following information:
  1. Types of vehicles/vessels operated (e.g., standard bus (any length), trolley bus, articulated bus, over-the-road coach, cutaway van, standard van, minivan, cable car, passenger ferryboat, heavy rail, light rail);
  2. Number of each type of vehicle/vessel;
  3. Recognizing that each type of vehicle might be used in multiple types of service, type(s) of service in which each type of vehicle is used (e.g., local, express, commuter, demand responsive).
- G. Existing Facilities — Describe individual or grouped facilities, according to the categories listed below.
  1. Administrative (locations, age, functions located within);
  2. Maintenance and Fueling (type, locations, age);
  3. Vehicle/Vessel Storage/Staging (locations, age, capacity);
  4. Park-and-Ride (locations, age, capacity);
  5. Stations and Stops (type, locations, age, basic amenities);
  6. Right-of-Way, Track or Guideway;
  7. Bicycle Facilities.

### **3. Goals, Objectives and Standards**

- A. Describe the process for establishing, reviewing, and updating goals, objectives, and standards. Goals and objectives should be comprehensive and address all major areas of operator activities, including principles and guidelines under which new service would be implemented. Performance standards should address both the efficiency and effectiveness of the services provided by the operator.
- B. Portray and discuss new or revised goals and related objectives and standards; and identify changes from prior SRTP.

### **4. Service and System Evaluation**

- A. Evaluate route-level and systemwide performance against current service standards (if illustrative, portray local, express or commuter service, or other intercity service separately). Describe the evaluation process. Evaluate the most recent year for which complete data is available. At a minimum, evaluate performance measures relating to effectiveness and efficiency. Key performance measures could include passengers per revenue vehicle hour, passengers per revenue vehicle mile, percent of capacity used, revenue to total vehicle hours, operating cost per revenue vehicle hour, operating cost per passenger, and on-time

performance. A retrospective portrayal of performance (e.g., prior five to ten years) may be warranted to exemplify trends. Identify and evaluate MTC Regional Express Bus service separately. Where the evaluation identifies deviations from service standards, describe proposed remedies, including service expansion and/or contraction. Use narrative, tables and other graphic formats as warranted. *(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs, but is reduced in scope. See section on Scope of Mini-SRTPs.)*

- B. Provide a three-year retrospective of revenue service hours, revenue service miles, and patronage. Evaluate and discuss significant changes. *(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*
- C. Describe and discuss equipment and facility deficiencies, and describe proposed remedies.
- D. Describe any involvement in MTC's "Community-based Transportation Planning Program" ("CBTP"). Describe any specific fixed-route solutions to transit gaps recommended through the CBTP process and the status of their implementation. Describe any services funded specifically to address welfare-to-work and/or low-income transportation needs and the source(s) of funding (e.g., Lifeline).
- E. Identify paratransit services provided in compliance with the paratransit provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Reference planned new activities, major service changes, or procurement of capital equipment to support ADA or other paratransit, dial-a-ride or demand responsive services. Identify other paratransit services with which services are coordinated, and any proposed revisions or improvements to fixed route services intended to enhance their usage by seniors and/or by persons with disabilities.
- F. Provide the date of the agency's most recent federal Title VI analysis and report, and discuss any service deficiencies identified in the report. Generally describe the process used for complying with FTA Circular C4702.1. Attach the most recent triennial Title VI report, plus any subsequent Title VI reports, to the SRTP in an appendix.
- G. Provide the date of the agency's most recent FTA Triennial Review, and describe related remedial actions undertaken or currently underway in response to the review.

## **5. Operations Plan and Budget**

### **A. Operations Plan**

The operations plan sets forth the intentions to provide fixed route and paratransit services over the SRTP period. Document the ongoing evaluation of services and systems with respect to adopted goals, objectives and standards, and legal and regulatory requirements, subject to financial constraints.

- 1. Describe the modes and types of transit services to be operated over the plan period. Separately identify service provided in partnership with others:
  - a. For the continuation of existing service, refer to or summarize the descriptions provided under Section 2, Subsection "D", Transit Services Provided and Areas Served;
  - b. For the deployment of new service, identify the mode, and describe the service characteristics using the format used in Section 2, Subsection "D," above. Separately identify new service(s) contained in MTC Resolution No. 3434.

2. Separately describe planned new activities or service changes relative to paratransit services provided in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA service).
3. Separately describe any proposed revisions or improvements to fixed route services intended to enhance their usage by persons with disabilities and older adults.
4. Where reductions in service levels are required in order to achieve a balanced operating budget, describe the reductions and assess their impact on the affected service areas and communities.
5. Portray the levels of service planned — Use a table (or other graphic format) to portray planned levels of service hours and service miles. Separately identify the following:
  - a. Fixed route modes by type (e.g. local, express/commuter);
  - b. Demand responsive modes by type (e.g., ADA, non-ADA older adult);
  - c. Expansion service included in MTC Resolution No. 3434.

The table (or other graphic format) shall clearly identify service expansion and/or reduction by the year of planned deployment (expansion) and/or elimination (reduction). There shall be a rational relationship between the information portrayed and the “Service and System Evaluation” section of the SRTP. *(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

6. Describe and discuss planned (not yet implemented or underway) service changes in response to the most recent federal Title VI report and/or FTA Triennial Review.

## **B. Operations Budget**

Demonstrate that planned level of transit service over the planning period, including rehabilitation and replacement of capital assets, is sustainable. Take into consideration expense forecasts, regional and local revenue projections, fare policies, labor or service agreements, competitive demands on funding, regional priorities and policies. The budget should reflect a “baseline” level of service, taking into consideration the existing level of service at the time of publication of the SRTP. Committed service changes must also be defined, with their expenses and revenue separately identified in the operating and capital financial plan tables. Provide sufficient detail to allow a reviewer of the SRTP to evaluate costs of implementing the operating and capital plans, and compare the total with anticipated revenues available during the study period.

The narrative must specifically explain, and the spreadsheet clearly isolate in the appropriate year, by mode, any major change in service hours and miles due to deployment of new service or major service reductions.

The narrative must specifically explain, and the spreadsheet clearly isolate by year (e.g., through individual line items) the following:

- Change in fare revenue due to a fare increase or decrease.
- Change in fare revenue due to a change in the level of service.
- Change in expenses due to a change in the level of service.
- Change in expenses due to a labor or service contract change.

All operations expenses and revenues are to be stated in year of expenditure dollars, with the assumed escalation factors stated. All sources of revenue shown in the operations and in the capital financial plan should be identified individually. All assumptions that relate to expenditure and revenue estimates must also be documented, including specification of ridership or sales growth (if appropriate) separately from inflation forecasts.

1. The operations budget must be sustainable and generally balanced each year over the period of the SRTP, using currently available or reasonably projected revenues.
2. Where increases in local revenues (e.g., fares, sales taxes, general fund revenues) are required in order to sustain existing service levels, describe and discuss the steps and timelines needed to achieve the revenue increases, and the contingent policies and actions that will be taken if the proposed revenue increases do not materialize.
3. Fixed route and demand responsive services may be portrayed separately or in a single budget; however, the expenses and revenue for each must be separately identifiable if portrayed in a single budget.
4. Describe planned fare increases and/or decreases, and/or changes in fare policies, including the year(s) these changes are planned to take effect. Describe planned changes in interoperator transfer arrangements and/or fares (this pertains to interoperator fares themselves, not to the means of fare collection; i.e., Clipper<sup>SM</sup>) Note: as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3176, fare and local discretionary revenue contributions are expected to keep pace with inflation, and fare structure shall comply with regional policy on fare coordination (Resolution No.3866).
5. Separately identify funding sources and amounts to support operating budgets for ADA service, and any other paratransit or demand responsive services available to older adults and/or persons with disabilities.
6. If applicable, discuss strategies to address elimination of FTA Section 5307 Preventive Maintenance funding for operations as prescribed in MTC Resolution No. 3515.
7. Separately identify and describe funding contributions (expended or received) for services provided in partnership with others.
8. The multi-year operating budget shall utilize MTC projections of regional operating revenues. Local funding sources (e.g., transportation sales tax) that will expire during the period covered by the plan shall not be assumed to continue beyond their expiration dates, unless specific renewals have been approved. In order to portray the operating budget:
  - a. Forecast operating costs shall be portrayed in a manner that distinguishes significant expansion and/or contraction of existing service, and the introduction of new service;
  - b. The basis for the operating cost forecasts shall be clearly portrayed (e.g., cost per service hour and service hours);
  - c. The forecast escalation rates (revenue and expenses) must be clearly portrayed;

- d. Indicate reserves available for operations and changes to reserves over the period of the SRTP, including anticipated unallocated TDA reserves;
  - e. Budget levels must correlate with the changes in service identified in the “Operations Plan.”
  - f. Identify sources of operating revenue:
    - i. Fares;
    - ii. Property taxes (directly levied, levied by others);
    - iii. Bridge tolls (directly levied (e.g., GGT), MTC 2% toll revenues, MTC 5% unrestricted general fund, MTC Regional Measure 2);
    - iv. Sales tax (AB 1107, directly levied (e.g., transit district), levied by others (e.g., county sales tax measure (identify Measure)));
    - v. Contributions from JPA partner funding agencies;
    - vi. Federal (FTA section 5307 Operating Assistance, FTA section 5307 Preventive Maintenance, FTA section 5311, STP Preventive Maintenance, CMAQ Operating Assistance (new service), Jobs Access Reverse Commute, New Freedom);
    - vii. Regional (MTC Lifeline, Air District);
    - viii. Advertising;
    - ix. Earned interest;
    - x. BART coordination funds (TDA, STA, BART district funds);
    - xi. TDA (directly apportioned, contributed by others);
    - xii. State Transit Assistance [(directly apportioned, contributed by others) – Revenue-Based, Population-Based (Small Operators, Northern Counties, Regional Paratransit, MTC Regional Express Bus)].
- C. In addition to future year forecasts, the SRTP should include a three-year retrospective of audited (if available) operating expenses and revenue.

*(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

## **6. Capital Improvement Program**

Describe and discuss the capital programs (vehicles, facilities and equipment) required to carry out the operations and services set forth in the operating plan and budget. The Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) should provide the basis for requests for federal, state and regional funding for capital replacements, rehabilitation, and expansion projects. While the CIP does not have to be financially constrained to the extent that the operations budget does, it should reflect the operator’s reasonable expectation of funding, particularly as outlined in MTC’s Regional Transportation Plan. MTC has reaffirmed its prior RTP commitment to fund 100% of the transit capital shortfall, subject to certain conditions as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3427, revised.

Note: the replacement schedules for vehicles and other capital items shall reflect agreements that resulted in the temporary diversion of FTA Section 5307 funds to “preventive maintenance”.

- A. Basis for Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Projects and/or Proposals, for Replacement, Rehabilitation, and Expansion.
1. Describe and discuss policies (or basis), and justification for vehicle replacement:
    - a. Life cycle considerations (current vehicles/vessels);
    - b. Passenger amenity considerations (vehicles to be acquired);
    - c. Mode of power and/or emissions considerations (vehicles/vessels to be acquired);
    - d. Other considerations (e.g., safety, lack of availability of service parts for current vehicles/vessels)
  2. Describe and discuss policies (or basis), and justification for rehabilitation/retrofit:
    - a. Life cycle considerations;
    - b. Passenger amenity considerations;
    - c. Emissions considerations;
    - d. Other considerations.
  3. Describe and discuss policies (or basis), and justification for proposed fleet expansion (or contraction):
    - a. Relationship to fixed route or demand responsive operations plan;
    - b. Basis for type(s) of vehicles/vessels desired (expansion).
    - c. Number and type(s) of vehicles to be removed from service (contraction), including intended disposition (e.g., sale, placed for lease, salvaged).
  4. Current Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Fleet Inventory: Identify items “a” through “k” below individually or by subfleet. Identify MTC Regional Express Buses separately.
    - a. Manufacturer;
    - b. Year of manufacture;
    - c. Identification number (individual VIN or VIN sequence for subfleets);
    - d. Length of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
    - e. Seating capacity of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
    - f. Wheelchair capacity of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
    - g. Vehicle/Vessel type (e.g., mini van, standard van, cutaway van, standard motorbus, articulated motorbus, trolley bus, articulated trolleybus, over-the-road coach, light rail, heavy rail, passenger ferryboat, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car);
    - h. In fixed route service or demand responsive service;
    - i. Mode of power (e.g., diesel, CNG, LPG, gasoline, electric, hydrogen fuel cell, hybrid gasoline-electric, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car not powered).
    - j. Has major rehabilitation of the vehicle(s)/vessel(s) been performed; if yes, how many years of service life were added;
    - k. Year the vehicle(s)/vessel(s) will be retired from service (even if this is beyond the time horizon of the SRTP);

5. Vehicle/Vessel Replacement: Identify items “a” through “k” below individually or by subfleet, showing the number of replacement vehicles/ vessels to be placed in service per year over the planning horizon.
- a. Number of vehicles/ vessels to be replaced;
  - b. Anticipated year of manufacture of replacement vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - c. Year vehicle(s)/ vessel(s) will be placed in service;
  - d. Length of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - e. Seating capacity of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - f. Wheelchair capacity of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - g. Vehicle/Vessel type (e.g., mini van, large van, small bus, suburban bus, trolley bus, over-the-road coach, articulated bus, light rail, heavy rail, passenger ferryboat, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car);
  - h. Placement of the vehicle(s) in fixed route service or demand responsive service;
  - i. Mode of power (e.g., diesel, CNG, LPG, gasoline, electric, hydrogen fuel cell, hybrid gasoline-electric, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car not powered).
  - j. Estimated cost of replacement vehicle(s)/ vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - k. Sources and amounts of funding for replacement vehicle(s)/ vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet – same as portrayed in “j” above), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed.

*(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

6. Vehicle/Vessel Rehabilitation (if applicable): Identify items “a” through “m” below individually or by subfleet, showing the number of vehicles/ vessels to be rehabilitated per year over the planning horizon.
- a. Manufacturer;
  - b. Year of manufacture;
  - c. Identification number, (individual VIN or VIN sequence for subfleets);
  - d. Length of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - e. Seating capacity of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - f. Wheelchair capacity of vehicle(s)/ vessel(s);
  - g. Vehicle/Vessel type (e.g., mini van, large van, small bus, suburban bus, trolley bus, over-the-road coach, articulated bus, light rail, heavy rail, passenger ferryboat, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car);
  - h. Mode of power (e.g., diesel, CNG, LPG, gasoline, electric, hydrogen fuel cell, hybrid gasoline-electric, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car not powered).
  - i. Year of planned rehabilitation (even if this falls outside the time horizon of the SRTP);
  - j. Years of service life to be added;
  - k. Rehabilitation to be performed in-house or contracted, if known;

- l. Estimated cost of rehabilitation of vehicle(s)/vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
- m. Sources and amounts of funding for rehabilitation of vehicle(s)/vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet – same as portrayed in “j” above), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed.

*(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

- 7. Vehicle/Vessel Expansion (if applicable): Identify items “a” through “k” below individually or by subfleet.
  - a. the number of expansion vehicle(s)/vessel(s) to be placed in service per year over the planning horizon of the SRTP.
  - b. Anticipated year of manufacture;
  - c. Year vehicle(s)/vessel(s) will be placed in service;
  - d. Length of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
  - e. Seating capacity of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
  - f. Wheelchair capacity of vehicle(s)/vessel(s);
  - g. Vehicle/Vessel type (e.g., mini van, large van, small bus, suburban bus, trolley bus, over-the-road coach, articulated bus, light rail, heavy rail, passenger ferryboat, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car);
  - h. Placement of the vehicle(s) in fixed route service or demand responsive service;
  - i. Mode of power (e.g., diesel, CNG, LPG, gasoline, electric, hydrogen fuel cell, hybrid gasoline-electric, diesel-electric locomotive, trailer car not powered).
  - j. Estimated cost of expansion vehicle(s)/vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - k. Sources and amounts of funding for expansion vehicle(s)/vessel(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet – same as portrayed in “j” above), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed.

*(This is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs.)*

- 8. Summary of Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Fleet Inventory:
  - a. Total number of fixed route vehicles in active fleet (identified by type; e.g., see item 7.g. above);
  - b. Total number of fixed route vehicles in reserve fleet;
  - c. Spare ratio of fixed route vehicles (at maximum pullout);
  - d. Total number of vessels in active fleet;
  - e. Total number of vessels in reserve fleet;
  - f. Spare ratio of vessels (at maximum pullout);
  - g. Total number of demand responsive vehicles in active fleet (identified by type; e.g., see item 7. g. above);
  - h. Total number of demand responsive vehicles in reserve fleet;
  - i. Spare ratio of demand responsive vehicles (at maximum pullout)
  - j. Useful life of revenue vehicles;

k. Next rehabilitation or replacement of vehicles and vessels, even if beyond the SRTP horizon.

B. Non-Revenue Vehicle Projects and/or Proposals: Replacement, Rehabilitation, and Expansion or Contraction.

1. Discuss replacement, and/or expansion or contraction of non-revenue vehicle fleet:
  - a. Briefly, describe uses of non-revenue vehicles;
  - b. Briefly, discuss policies or basis, and justification for replacement (e.g., life cycle, obsolescence, safety considerations);
  - c. Briefly discuss policies or basis, and justification for expansion and/or contraction.
2. Non-Revenue Vehicle Fleet Inventory: Identify items "a" through "n" below, showing the number of vehicles per year over the planning horizon.
  - a. Manufacturer (current vehicles);
  - b. The year of manufacture (or anticipated year of manufacture for replacement and expansion vehicles);
  - c. The years the vehicle(s) will remain in service;
  - d. Year vehicle(s) will be retired from service;
  - e. The year replacement vehicle(s) will be placed in service;
  - f. Estimated cost of replacement vehicle(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - g. Replacement vehicle(s): source(s) and amount of funding, identifying funds that have been secured (programmed, allocated or received) and funds that have not been secured, with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - h. The year expansion vehicle(s) will be placed in service;
  - i. Estimated cost of expansion vehicle(s) (unit cost or total by subfleet), with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - j. Expansion vehicle(s): source(s) and amount of funding, identifying funds that have been secured (programmed, allocated or received) and funds that have not been secured, with annual escalation rates clearly portrayed;
  - k. Vehicle type;
  - l. Mode of power;
  - m. Has rehabilitation of the vehicle(s) been performed or is it planned;
  - n. Total number of vehicles in non-revenue fleet.

Operators with non-revenue vehicles which are not proposed for replacement with regionally programmed funds may choose to provide less detailed information.

*(Item "g" is also a requirement for Mini-SRTPs, but is reduced in scope. See section on Scope of Mini-SRTPs.)*

C. Major Facilities Replacement, Rehabilitation, Upgrade, and Expansion projects of the types listed below. Identify the locations of new or expanded facilities. Provide project budget, including costs, sources of funds and amounts from each source, identifying funds that have

been programmed, allocated or received, and funds that have not been secured. Separately describe security projects. Specify if replacement and rehabilitation of facilities and equipment results in an asset that differs from the existing asset, and how it differs.

1. Administrative;
2. Maintenance and Fueling;
3. Vehicle/Vessel Storage/Staging;
4. Park-and-Ride;
5. Stations and Stops;
6. Right-of-Way, Track, or Guideway;
7. Bicycle Facilities (e.g., lockers).

D. Tools and Equipment: Replacement and/or Upgrade. Discuss current and/or proposed projects. Combine projects into a lump sum and indicate costs, sources of funds and amounts.

## **7. Other Requirements**

A. Provide the following information on expansion projects included in MTC Resolution No. 3434:

1. Portray the project's current capital cost, providing explanation where costs differ from the portrayal in MTC Resolution No. 3434.
2. Capital Funding:
  - a. Discuss and describe secured funding, including fund programming and/or allocation actions, conditions imposed on the use of funds, fund sources and amounts;
  - b. Explain any changes in secured or anticipated funding, providing explanation where funding differs from the portrayal in MTC Resolution No. 3434;
  - c. Portray and discuss the project's cash flow needs, including any anticipated difficulties, and approved or anticipated decisions on bond financing.
3. Project Schedule. Provide the most current schedule for the project, showing key milestones completed, and anticipated milestone completion dates.
4. Operating Costs. Provide operating expense and revenue projections (including sources of funds).
5. Discuss any activities related to changes in land use planned or anticipated in association with the project, including:
  - a. Participation in the development of local land use policies;
  - b. Policies and/or planning pertaining to, and/or development adjacent to transit stations;

- c. Descriptions of land that the transit agency currently owns or controls adjacent to transit stop/stations (use a map if desired to show locations).
  6. Discuss any current or anticipated policy, planning, funding or operating issues associated with the project, not reflected in responses to items 1 through 5, above.
- B. Describe the agency's public outreach and involvement process relative to environmental justice goals. Describe the most recent outcomes from this process.
- C. In the event the operator intends to use FTA section 5303 funds to contract out for the authoring of the SRTP, the MTC SRTP Program Manager must review the description or scope of work before publication of the RFP. In addition, the SRTP Program Manager is to be invited to participate in or at least observe the consultant selection for work to be performed under contract. MTC may or may not be able to actually participate in the consultant selection process, depending upon scheduling and other commitments, but transit operators are to extend the invitation in a timely manner.

### **SCOPE OF MINI-SRTPs**

The Mini-SRTP is an abbreviated version of the Full SRTP, and shall be a series of spreadsheets, supported as necessary by brief narratives. The Mini-SRTP shall include at least the following information:

1. **Title Page** – same as Scope of Full SRTP, item 1, Title Page
2. **Evaluation of Key Performance Measures, Service Factors, and Patronage**
  - A. Evaluate key systemwide performance measures against current service standards. At a minimum, evaluate performance measures relating to effectiveness and efficiency. Key performance measures could include passengers per revenue vehicle hour, passengers per revenue vehicle miles, percent of capacity used, revenue to total vehicle hours, operating cost per revenue vehicle hour, operating cost per passenger, and on-time performance. Where the evaluation identifies deviations from service standards, describe proposed remedies, including service expansion and/or contraction. Use narrative, tables and other graphic formats as warranted. (Similar to Scope of Full SRTP, Service and System Evaluation section, item 4.A.)
  - B. Provide a three-year retrospective of revenue service hours, revenue service miles, and patronage. Evaluate and discuss significant changes. (Same as Scope of Full SRTP, Service and System Evaluation, item 4.B.)
3. **Service Plan** – same as Scope of Full SRTP, Operations Plan, item 5.A.5
4. **Operations Budget** – same as Scope of Full SRTP, Operations Budget, item 5.B
5. **Fleet Inventory Update**
  - A. Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Replacement – same as Scope of Full SRTP, Capital Improvement Program, item A.5

- B. Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Rehabilitation – same as Scope of Full SRTP, Capital Improvement Program, item A.6
- C. Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Expansion – same as Scope of Full SRTP, Capital Improvement Program, item A.7
- D. Non-Revenue Vehicle/Vessel Replacement – Use tabular or other graphic format to show the number of vehicles per year that are proposed for replacement with regionally programmed funds. (Similar to Scope of Full SRTP, Capital Improvement Program, item B.2.g.)

**SCHEDULE AND TRANSMITTAL**

- 1. Submit two hard copies and an electronic copy of draft Full or Mini-SRTPs to MTC staff for review according to the schedule below. Electronic copies may be provided in PDF format, but all spreadsheets must also be provided in MS Excel.
- 2. Submit eight (8) hard copies and an electronic copy of final Full or Mini-SRTPs to MTC according to the schedule below. Electronic copies may be provided in PDF format, but all spreadsheets must also be provided in MS Excel.

**Deliverable**

**Delivery Dates**

Draft FY 2013-2022 Full SRTP  
Final FY 2013-2022 Full SRTP

TBD  
TBD

MTC staff and the transit operators will agree to a schedule once counties and operators have been selected.

An operator at its discretion may choose to submit a Full SRTP for any year when a Mini-SRTP is due.

**REQUIRED APPROVALS**

The operator’s governing body must adopt Full SRTP and any Mini-SRTP containing policy changes from the latest board-approved SRTP. Mini-SRTPs with no policy changes may be adopted or approved by the operator’s General Manager.

**REVISIONS TO THESE GUIDELINES**

Minor modifications to these guidelines may be approved by the Programming and Allocations Committee.

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 4, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Project Managers for Transit Projects, Plans and Studies

---

**Background:**

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has received STA Board approval to follow up and/or develop several transit related projects and plans. The STA Board authorized the Executive Director to release the Request for Proposal (RFP) and enter into an agreement with a consultant for the Community Based Transportation Plan for East Fairfield on October 2008 and for the I-80/I-680/I-780/State Route (SR) 12 Transit Corridor Study on January 2011. The CBTP for East Fairfield was postponed until the CBTP for Vacaville was completed. This occurred last fiscal year.

At the last STA Board meeting in September 2011, the STA Board Workshop summary was presented to the follow-up on the Board member comments and discussion provided at the STA Board Workshop. STA staff developed a series of specific recommendations to the seven topic areas covered at the Board Workshop on July 27, 2011. The development of a Long Range Sustainability Plan for Transit and Mobility for Seniors and People with Disabilities were two of the seven topic area the Board approved follow-up recommendations.

As a separate staff report (Agenda Item No. VIII.H), STA staff is recommending the Board approve the submittal of a County Level Coordination funding request to MTC. The request is to fund a coordinated Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) of Solano County transit operators and to coordinate analysis in cost effectively addressing Mobility Needs of People with Disabilities in Solano County. If funding is approved, the STA staff will come back to the Board with a scope of work and request to authorize the Executive Director to release a request for proposal for the Solano County Coordinated SRTP.

Concurrently, STA has contracted with consultants since 2002 to provide staff support for a variety of transit financial related projects. This has included the Intercity Funding Agreement Calculations and Reconciliation and transit funding calculations. At this time, staff recommends including these services with a new consultant project management selection process.

**Discussion:**

To help STA manage this range of transit studies and analysis, staff recommends contracting with qualified consultants Project Manager (PM) to work jointly with the STA staff and the Solano transit operators to develop plans, programs, and/or studies. The PMs will be responsible to insure the timely delivery of the tasks identified in the scope of work are met. This contract is not subject to the adopted Local Preference Policy because this contract will be funded with State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF),

however, STA staff will ensure local contractors are encouraged to apply. The STA is seeking to contract with between two to three Project Managers to oversee and manage the following projects and provide assistance to STA staff.

- Community Based Transportation Plan – East Fairfield
- I-80/I-680/I-780/State Route (SR) 12 Transit Corridor Study
- Mobility Management Program
- Solano County Coordinated S RTP
- STA Staff Assistance for Transit Finance and Management

The estimated cost for these Project Management services is \$120,000. The amount of \$60,000 will be funded by the individual project dedicated funds. The remaining \$60,000 is to be funded with State Transit Assistance Funds.

**Fiscal Impact:**

The estimated cost for the Project Management contracts is \$60,000/year to be funded with STAF by the individual project dedicated funds. The estimated cost of the STA Staff Assistance for Transit Finance and Management is \$60,000 to be funded from STAF.

**Recommendation:**

Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to release a Request for Qualifications for Transit Project Management Services; and
2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into agreements with two to three consultants for Project Management Services for an amount not-to-exceed \$120,000 for the five projects specified.



DATE: October 4, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Daryl Halls, Executive Director  
Joy Apilado, STA/SolTrans HR Consultant  
SUBJECT: Employer of Record for the Solano County Transit (SolTrans)  
Employees as Specified

---

**Background:**

Solano County Transit (SolTrans) was formed by the cities of Benicia and Vallejo and the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) through the establishment of a Joint Powers Authority (JPA). This JPA was formed to merge the two city transit systems serving Benicia and Vallejo.

As part of this merger and the transition plan for the new agency, it was recommended that a dedicated staff of 5 full-time and one part-time staff be retained through a combination of transfer of transit staff from Vallejo Transit and the recruitment and hiring of new staff. During the initial transition period, consultants and temporary employees have been retained to manage the new agency and facilitate its formation and transition of assets and operational responsibilities from the two cities to the new JPA.

The SolTrans Board has adopted an initial salary schedule and benefits plan in preparation for the recruitment of new staff and transfer of two existing staff from the City of Vallejo to SolTrans. This transfer and recruitment of staff has been delayed due to the long timeframe for the establishment of SolTrans retirement plan with California Public Employees Retirement System (CalPERS). This is estimated at between 9 to 12 months.

**Discussion:**

The SolTrans agency currently needs to recruit for the position of Administrative Assistant. In addition, SolTrans would like to begin the recruitment of the other vacant staff positions (Executive Director, Finance Officer, etc) in a more expedited manner. SolTrans staff presented several options to their Board to fill the position on an interim basis until SolTrans contracts with CalPERS for retirement benefits and establishes policies and procedures for the agency. One of the options is to recruit and hire the Administrative Assistant position, and potentially additional SolTrans employees, through STA as a limited-term contract employee. STA would become the 'employer of record' for SolTrans and the contract would limit the term of the appointment to "not to exceed one year". Upon contracting with CalPERS, the contract through STA would terminate and the position would transition directly to SolTrans. STA would contract to bill SolTrans directly for the cost of the position, which would include all salary, benefits and an overhead charge on a monthly basis. This arrangement would remain in place for up to one year or until SolTrans can contract with CalPERS and the contract staff can be transferred from STA's plan to SolTrans.

**Fiscal Impact:**

There is no fiscal impact to STA. The cost for any SolTrans staff retained by STA through this process would be funded by SolTrans as specified in an agreement proposed to be developed between the two agencies.

**Recommendation:**

Authorize the Executive Director to develop and enter in to an agreement with SolTrans designating STA as the 'Employer of Record' for the SolTrans Administrative Assistant position and other agreed upon SolTrans staff positions as identified in the SolTrans JPA's Transition Plan.



DATE: September 29, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Jessica McCabe, Project Assistant  
RE: 2012 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

---

### **Background**

The State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) is a multi-year capital improvement program of transportation projects on and off the State Highway System, funded with revenues from the State Highway Account and other funding sources. The STIP is composed of two sub-elements: 75% to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), with projects decided by regional agencies, and 25% to the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP). The STIP cycle is programmed every two years and covers a five-year period. STA's 2010 STIP programmed projects are shown in Attachment A. Historically, Solano County averages about \$10M per year in population shares of STIP funds (the RTIP) share for Solano. STA is responsible for programming the RTIP and the California Transportation Commission (CTC) programs the ITIP.

In December 2007, the STA Board approved the "10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects," which was intended to be a guide for future programming actions by the STA Board of STIP funds. The plan prioritized projects by their delivery timeframe: Tier 1 for projects that can begin construction in 5 years, Tier 2 projects that can begin construction in 10 years, and Tier 3 for future planned projects. This plan would be updated every two years during the STIP programming process.

On July 18, 2011 MTC released its draft STIP Development Policies and Guidelines for recommending the programming of new 2012 STIP funds (Attachment B). These Policies and Guidelines are scheduled to be adopted by the MTC Commission on September 28, 2011.

### **Discussion**

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) established draft funding estimates for the 2012 STIP on July 28, 2011 and MTC released the County Targets based on the CTC's funding estimates (Attachment C). The tables show County Share targets, Transportation Enhancement (TE) targets, and Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) amounts. Due to the economic downturn, statewide STIP estimates are significantly reduced. After deducting PPM funding (CMA Share) and TE funding from the "New County Share Total" funding estimate for Solano County of \$10M, \$8.3M remains available for non-TE projects.

#### *Investment Plan Update and Prior Commitments*

STA staff has recently drafted an update to the "10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects," to reflect the current status and priority of each of these projects (Attachment D). This list of prioritized projects is intended to be used as guide for programming actions by the STA Board, such as the 2012 STIP programming process. As shown on the updated 10-Year Investment Plan, the Jepson Parkway and Dixon West B Street

Undercrossing projects are both listed as Tier 1 projects, and continue to be priorities for the STA. The STA Board has committed its support to both projects, with the approval of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for Jepson Parkway at the May 2011 Board meeting, and the approval of the funding strategy for Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing, at the April 2011 Board meeting. The Jepson Parkway MOU defines the roles and responsibilities of the Jepson Parkway Working Group and each agency in the delivery of the Jepson Parkway Corridor, and establishes the Guiding Principals from which to select and prioritize project phases. The approved funding strategy for Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing committed \$4.949 million in current and future discretionary funding for the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing Project.

#### *2012 STIP Programming Recommendations*

As a priority project, \$36.7 million of State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) was programmed to the Jepson Parkway project as part of the STA's regional commitment. \$2.4 million was allocated for Plans, Specifications & Estimate (PS&E) last year. \$3.8 million was allocated for Right-of-Way funds in Fiscal Year (FY) 2011-12 and \$30.5 million in construction funding is programmed for FY 2014-15. In continuing STA's commitment to the Jepson Parkway Project, which is already programmed in the STIP, STA staff recommends programming the \$8.3M available in non-TE STIP funds to the project, which would go towards construction of either the Cement Hill Road or Leisure Town Road portion of the project.

In April 2011, the STA Board approved a funding plan for West B Street Undercrossing project, and as part of the \$4.949M committed in the funding plan, \$649,000 in STIP TE reserve was committed to the project. Also included in the funding plan was a commitment of future Cycle 2 STP/CMAQ funds; however MTC's proposed new policy emphasizes that the block grants funds be used in Priority Development Areas (PDAs). If block grant funds are restricted to PDAs, Dixon would not be eligible for these funds, because there are no PDAs within its boundaries. Since Dixon does not have any PDAs, the commitment of STIP funds becomes even more crucial to the funding of the West B Street project. Given that the West B Street project has been identified as a priority project by the STA, the funding plan has received support from the STA Board, and it may not be eligible for or only eligible for a small percentage of Cycle 2 block grant funds, STA staff recommends programming the \$649,000 available in STIP TE reserve and \$672,000 in new STIP TE funds to the project. This would program a total of \$1.3M in STIP TE to the project.

Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) funds traditionally fund STA project development activities and Project Study Reports (PSR) for future STIP funded projects, as required by the CTC prior to being programmed into the STIP. These reports conduct a preliminary analysis of a project's purpose, need, scope, and feasibility. Based on the final 2012 STIP Fund estimate, \$98,000 in FY 2016-17 and \$274,000 in FY 2016-17 is available for PPM activities.

#### *2012 STIP Development Schedule*

The following is a 2012 STIP development schedule including STA TAC, STA Board, MTC, and CTC meetings:

August 31, 2011	TAC STIP 2012 info (update on STIP)
September 14, 2011	STA Board STIP 2012 info

September 28, 2011	TAC recommends 2012 STIP project recommendations to STA Board
October 12, 2011	STA Board approves 2012 STIP Solano project recommendations to MTC
October 14, 2011	Deadline for CMAs to submit project listings to MTC
November 16, 2011	MTC approves 2012 Bay Area RTIP recommendations to CTC
March 28, 2012	CTC adopts 2012 STIP

The STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

### **Fiscal Impact**

The STA is committed to its local partners and to the completion of both the Jepson Parkway and the West B Street Undercrossing projects. By programming funds to these projects, STA will be fulfilling that commitment. In committing PPM funds, STA is also fulfilling its commitment to facilitating planning, programming, and project monitoring activities in Solano County.

### **Recommendation**

Approve the following:

1. Approve the 2011 10-Year Investment Plan for Highways and Major Transit Capital Projects as shown in Attachment D;
2. Program \$8.3M in available non-Transportation Enhancement (TE) STIP funds to the Jepson Parkway project;
3. Program \$649,000 in unprogrammed STIP TE reserve to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project;
4. Program \$672,000 in available new STIP TE funds to the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project;
5. Adopt Resolution No. 2011-17 - A resolution of the Solano Transportation Authority authorizing the application for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Transportation Enhancements (TE) funding to Deliver the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing Project; and
6. Program \$98,000 in FY 2015-16 and \$274,000 in FY 2016-17 available for Planning, Programming, and Monitoring (PPM) activities.

Attachments:

- A. STA's 2010 STIP Programmed Projects
- B. MTC's draft STIP Development Policies & Guidelines and Development Schedule, 7-18-2011
- C. MTC's 2012 STIP Fund Estimate County Targets, 9-02-2011
- D. Updated 10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects, 10-12-2011
- E. Resolution No. 2011-17 - A resolution of the Solano Transportation Authority Applying for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Transportation Enhancements (TE) funding to Deliver the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing Project.

This page intentionally left blank.

## 2011 SUMMARY OF STIP COUNTY SHARES

Does Not Include ITIP Interregional Share Funding (See Separate Listing)

(\$1,000's)

Total County Share, June 30, 2010 (from 2010 Report)	83,461
Less 2009-10 Allocations and closed projects	(13,752)
Less Projects Lapsed, July 1, 2010-June 30, 2011	0
<b>Total County Share, June 30, 2011 (includes TE)</b>	<b>69,709</b>

### Solano

Agency	Rte	PPNO	Project	Ext	Del.	Voted	Total	Project Totals by Fiscal Year					Project Totals by Component							
								Prior	10-11	11-12	12-13	13-14	14-15	R/W	Const	E & P	PS&E	R/W Sup	Con Sup	
<b>Highway Projects:</b>																				
Solano TA	loc	5301	Jepson Parkway			Jul-10	2,400	0	2,400	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,400	0	0
MTC		2152	Planning, programming, and monitoring	SB 184	Jul-10	Jul-10	35	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0
STA		2263	Planning, programming, and monitoring	SB 184	Jul-10	Jul-10	589	0	589	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	589	0	0	0
MTC		2152	Planning, programming, and monitoring	SB 184	Jun-11	Jun-11	35	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0
Caltrans	12	367D	Jameson Cyn Rd widen Seg 1 (RIP)(TCRP)(CMIA)(08S-57)			May-11	4,550	0	4,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,550	0	0	0
Caltrans	12	367I	Jameson Cyn Rd widen Seg 2 (RIP)(TCRP)(CMIA)(08S-57)			Mar-11	2,450	0	2,450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2,450	0	0	0
Solano TA	loc	5301	Jepson Parkway			Jun-11	3,800	0	3,800	0	0	0	0	0	3,800	0	0	0	0	0
Solano TA	loc	5301	Jepson Parkway				30,457	0	0	0	0	0	30,457	0	0	30,457	0	0	0	0
Caltrans	loc	5301L	Rt 80/680/12 Interchange (TCRP #25.3)(08S-29)				11,412	0	0	11,412	0	0	0	0	0	11,412	0	0	0	0
MTC		2152	Planning, programming, and monitoring				108	0	0	0	35	36	37	0	0	108	0	0	0	0
STA		2263	Planning, programming, and monitoring				841	0	0	229	229	192	191	0	0	841	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal, Highway Projects</b>							56,677	0	13,824	11,676	264	228	30,685	3,800	50,477	0	2,400	0	0	
<b>Rail and Transit Projects:</b>																				
Vallejo	ferry	2261	Vallejo Baylink ferry maintenance facility			Jun-11	4,300	0	4,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	4,300	0	0	0	0
Fairfield	rail	6045K	Capitol Corridor rail station, Fairfield				4,000	0	0	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	4,000	0	0	0	0
<b>Subtotal, Rail &amp; Transit Projects</b>							8,300	0	4,300	4,000	0	0	0	0	0	8,300	0	0	0	0
<b>Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects:</b>																				
San Bruno	te	648E	San Bruno medians: various aesthetic/safety improv.			Mar-11	630	0	630	0	0	0	0	0	0	630	0	0	0	0
Vacaville	te	5152E	Jepson Parkway Gateway enhancement (ext 5-10)	Mar-11	Mar-11	230	230	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	230	0	0	0	0
Vallejo	te	5152J	Downtown Vallejo Square pedestrian enhancements		Mar-11	412	0	412	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412	0	0	0	0
Marin Co	te	2127Q	Marin, Sir Francis Drake Blvd bike lane				294	0	0	0	294	0	0	0	0	294	0	0	0	0
American Cyn	te	2130G	Napa Jct Elementary School ped improvements				183	0	0	183	0	0	0	0	0	183	0	0	0	0
Rohnert Park	te	5156J	Sonoma, Copeland Creek bike path reconstruction				176	0	0	176	0	0	0	0	0	176	0	0	0	0
Fairfield	te	6045K	Capitol Corridor rail station, Fairfield, TE elements				400	0	0	0	400	0	0	0	0	400	0	0	0	0
MTC	res	5152A	TE reserve (MTC Share)				1,413	0	0	0	601	406	406	0	1,413	0	0	0	0	
STA	res	5152K	TE reserve (County Share) (10S-039)				649	0	0	0	649	0	0	0	649	0	0	0	0	
<b>Subtotal TE Projects</b>							4,387	230	1,042	359	1,944	406	406	0	4,387	0	0	0	0	
<b>Total Programmed or Voted since July 1, 2010</b>							69,364													

<b>Balance of STIP County Share, Solano</b>	
Total County Share, June 30, 2011	69,709
Total Now Programmed or Voted Since July 1, 2010	69,364
Unprogrammed Share Balance	345
Share Balance Advanced or Overdrawn	0

This page intentionally left blank.



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](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: Programming and Delivery Working Group

DATE: July 18, 2011

FR: Kenneth Kao

RE: 2012 STIP Development Policies and Guidelines

### **Background**

As the Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the nine-county Bay Area, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for developing and submitting the region's proposed projects for the upcoming 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program. In cooperation with the Congestion Management Agencies, MTC will develop the schedule and Policies and Procedures for the 2012 RTIP in the coming months.

The following policy and programming issues regarding the 2012 RTIP will be discussed at the Programming and Delivery Working Group and the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee.

### **New Transportation Enhancement Policies**

- **Transportation Enhancement Project Priority versus TE Reserve**  
In an effort to increase delivery of Transportation Enhancement projects, the California Transportation Commission will give priority to programming actual projects over TE reserve. This means that if a county wishes to program TE reserve, and another county wishes to program TE funds to an identified project, the CTC will program the identified project if there is not enough capacity to program both. In this example, the TE reserve will either not be programmed, or be programmed in a later year where there is capacity. Accordingly, MTC strongly recommends identifying actual projects for programming, rather than programming to TE reserve.
- **Front Loading of Transportation Enhancement Funds**  
The California Transportation Commission will allow for the front loading of Transportation Enhancement funds in the 2012 STIP. Therefore, counties are able to request programming of new TE projects in the first three years of the STIP. Previously, new projects were only allowed in the last two years of the STIP. MTC cautions, however, that projects programmed in the early years of the STIP must be ready to allocate the funds in the year of programming.
- **Transportation Enhancement Project Pre-Review by Caltrans Local Assistance**  
In many instances, projects proposed for the Transportation Enhancement program of the STIP encounter a number of unanticipated environmental and schedule issues that delay the project, causing a need for STIP time extensions. In order to minimize these unanticipated obstacles to project delivery, the MTC requires Caltrans pre-review of all proposed TE projects in the 2012 RTIP. After the Congestion Management Agencies submit their projects to MTC for inclusion into the RTIP, MTC will transmit all TE Project Programming Request (PPR) forms and approved TE Applications to Caltrans District 4 Local Assistance for an

additional cursory review. Local Assistance Engineers and Environmental staff may recommend changes to the project schedule and cost, based on known project conditions and environmental considerations. These recommendations will be reviewed with MTC and the CMA before being updated in the final 2012 RTIP submittal or subsequent updates through the California Transportation Commission prior to final 2012 STIP adoption.

- **Transportation Enhancement Project Delivery Deadlines**

In order to more closely align Transportation Enhancement project delivery dates with the summer construction season, MTC will enforce new allocation deadlines for TE projects. All TE projects must submit a full and complete CTC allocation and federal obligation package to Caltrans District 4 by December 1 of the fiscal year in which the project is programmed. This will give sufficient time for Caltrans and CTC to allocate the funds by the following February in order to meet obligation by March 31. Exceptions to the TE delivery deadlines may be granted for extraordinary circumstances, such as for instances where the project has a target award later than the six month award deadline after allocation prescribed by CTC STIP guidelines. Any exceptions will be reviewed by CMA and MTC, and granted on a case-by-case basis.

- **MTC's Share of Transportation Enhancement Reserves**

MTC has held half of the region's Transportation Enhancement funds in reserve for regional priorities to be identified through future policy decisions. At this time, staff proposes continuing to hold half of the region's TE funds in reserve in the 2012 RTIP for future identified project(s). The project(s) would be programmed in the last two years of the 2012 RTIP.

### **Other New Policies**

- **MTC Resolution No. 3866 Compliance – Transit Coordination Implementation Plan**

On February 24, 2010, MTC approved Resolution No. 3866, which documents coordination requirements for Bay Area transit operators to improve the transit customer experience when transferring between transit operators and in support of regional transit projects. *If a transit operator fails to comply with Res. 3866 requirements, MTC may withhold, restrict or reprogram funds or allocations.* Res. 3866 supersedes MTC's earlier coordination plan, Res. 3055.

One goal of MTC staff in organizing Res. 3866 was to incorporate some detailed project information through reference rather than directly in the resolution in order to facilitate future updates of project-specific requirements and minimize the need for official Commission action. For this reason, some documents are referenced in Res. 3866 and available for download at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/tcip>. MTC may periodically update these documents after soliciting feedback from its TACs. Transit operators must comply with these more detailed documents in order to comply with Res. 3866.

- **Project Study Report Requirement Update**

Over the past few years, Caltrans, in cooperation with the regional agencies, has re-examined the Project Study Report process. Through the years, the PSR document has become too detailed, and duplicates much of the effort that will be done during the environmental document phase. As a result of this re-examination, Caltrans has approved the lighter Project Study Report (Project Development Support) (PSR/PDS) document for use to program new STIP projects. However, the CTC will only allow preconstruction phases to be programmed in the STIP with the PSR/PDS document. Construction can be programmed once a draft

environmental document has been circulated. Additionally, if a project has already substantially completed an environmental document (such as a circulating draft or a final environmental document), the PSR requirement is waived, and a project sponsor may request programming of STIP funds to the project.

### **Carryover Policies from 2010 RTIP**

- **ARRA RTIP Backfill Programming**

In order to expedite obligation and expenditure of American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) funds, and to address the State's lack of funding, MTC programmed \$31 million in ARRA funds to backfill unavailable STIP funds for the Caldecott Tunnel Fourth Bore project. Of the \$31 million, \$29 million came from Contra Costa's county share, and \$2 million from Alameda's county share. These amounts were not programmed in the 2010 RTIP, therefore, in the 2012 RTIP, MTC will have discretion to program the \$31 million in freed up RTIP capacity from these two counties. Therefore, Contra Costa's available programming capacity will be reduced by \$29 million, and Alameda's available programming capacity will be reduced by \$2 million in FY 2012-13.

- **Highlights of Changes in the 2010 RTIP**

A number of changes that were first implemented in the 2010 RTIP are carried forward to the 2012 RTIP. These changes include the following:

- Complete Streets Checklist – Required for all projects
- SB 286 Conservation Corps Involvement – Required for all TE projects
- Prohibition of Multiple Phases in Same Year – Required for all projects
- Project Size Minimums - \$500,000 minimum project size for large counties, \$250,000 minimum project size for counties under 1 million population.

- **2012 STIP Schedule**

Currently, the 2012 STIP is proceeding as scheduled, and as identified in Attachment A. In previous years, the STIP process had been delayed due to the lack of a state budget. This cycle, a state budget is now in place. Therefore, a delay in the STIP schedule is not expected.

CTC is still scheduled to adopt the final STIP Fund Estimate and Guidelines at the August CTC meeting. Currently, the MTC Commission will approve the RTIP on November 16, 2011. The deadline for CMAs to submit the draft list of RTIP projects is October 14, 2011. Please refer to Attachment A for the current 2012 RTIP Schedule.

Additionally, CMAs and Caltrans are reminded of two important policies for the development of the 2012 RTIP:

- **CMAs Notification of All Eligible Project Sponsors**

The CMAs are reminded that they must notify all eligible project sponsors within the county of the availability of RTIP funds. Eligible project sponsors include cities, counties, transit operators, and tribal governments. Notification can be in the form of a call for projects to all eligible project sponsors. Prior board action committing RTIP funds to a specific set of projects may also be sufficient to meet this requirement.

- **Caltrans Notification of Cost Increases**

Caltrans shall notify the CMAs and MTC of any anticipated cost increases to currently-programmed RTIP projects by September 1, 2011. This will allow sufficient time to ensure these cost increases are programmed in the RTIP or addressed another way in consultation

with Caltrans and the CMA. Ideally, Caltrans should notify the CMAs and MTC of cost increases prior to the call for projects.

Any questions regarding these policy and programming issues should be directed to Kenneth Kao at (510) 817-5768, or [kkao@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:kkao@mtc.ca.gov).

Attachments

A – Tentative 2012 RTIP Schedule

J:\COMMITTEE\Partnership\Partnership PDWG\2011 PDWG\11 PDWG Memos\05\_July 18 11\04b\_0\_2012\_STIP\_Development.doc

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**  
**2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program**  
**Draft Development Schedule**  
**July 11, 2011**

March 23, 2011	Caltrans presentation of draft STIP Fund Estimate Assumptions (CTC Meeting – San Diego)
May 11, 2011	CTC adoption of STIP Fund Estimate Assumptions (CTC Meeting – Los Angeles)
June 20, 2011	Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC) / Programming and Delivery Working Group (PDWG) discussion and review of initial issues and schedule for 2012 RTIP
June 22, 2011	Caltrans presentation of the draft STIP Fund Estimate and draft STIP Guidelines (CTC Meeting – Long Beach)
June 30, 2011	Governor signs State Budget
July 18, 2011	PTAC and PDWG review of proposed RTIP Policies and Procedures
July 27, 2011	CTC holds 2012 Fund Estimate Workshop and STIP Guidelines Hearing (Sacramento)
August 10, 2011	CTC adopts STIP Fund Estimate and STIP Guidelines (CTC Meeting – Sacramento)
September 7, 2011	Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG) review of proposed RTIP Policies and Procedures
September 8, 2011	Local Streets and Roads Working Group (LS&RWG) review of proposed RTIP Policies and Procedures
September 14, 2011	MTC Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) scheduled review and recommendation of final proposed RTIP Policies and Procedures
September 19, 2011	PTAC and PDWG scheduled review of final proposed RTIP Policies and Procedures
September 28, 2011	MTC Commission scheduled adoption of RTIP Policies and Procedures
October 14, 2011	CMAAs submit to MTC, RTIP projects summary listings and identification of projects requiring project-level performance measure analysis. Deadline to submit Routine Accommodations Checklist for new projects.
October 17, 2011	PTAC scheduled review of draft RTIP
October 24, 2011	Final Project Programming Request (PPR) forms due to MTC. Final RTIP project listing and performance measure analysis due to MTC. Final PSR (or PSR Equivalent), Transportation Enhancement Application (approved by Caltrans), Resolution of Local Support, and Certification of Assurances due to MTC ( <b>Final Complete Applications due</b> )
October 28, 2011	MTC submits Transportation Enhancement projects and applications to Caltrans District 4 for Local Assistance review
November 7, 2011	Draft RTIP scheduled to be available for public review
November 9, 2011	PAC scheduled review of RTIP and referral to Commission for approval
November 16, 2011	MTC Commission scheduled approval of 2012 RTIP
December 15, 2011	2012 RTIP due to CTC
February 1, 2012	CTC 2012 STIP Hearing – Southern California (Los Angeles)
February 8, 2012	CTC 2012 STIP Hearing – Northern California (CTC Meeting - Sacramento)
March 8, 2012	CTC Staff Recommendations on 2012 STIP released
March 28, 2012	CTC adopts 2012 STIP (CTC Meeting – Sacramento)

Shaded Area – Actions by Caltrans or CTC

This page intentionally left blank.

MTC Resolution No. 4028

Attachment 1-B

**Final 2012 STIP Fund Estimate County Targets**

9/1/2011

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

All numbers in thousands

Table 1: County Share Targets

	a	b	a+b=c	d	e	c+d+e=f	g	f+g
	FY 2015-16 New Distrib.	FY 2016-17 New Distrib.	2012 STIP New Distrib.	2010 STIP Carryover Balance	Lapses*	2012 STIP Net Capacity	ARRA Backfill (Caldecott)	2012 STIP CMA Program Capacity
Alameda	8,910	20,348	29,258	5,414	700	35,372	(2,000)	33,372
Contra Costa	6,079	13,881	19,960	43,493	13,475	76,928	(29,000)	47,928
Marin	1,661	3,792	5,453	(35,192)	100	(29,639)		0
Napa	1,093	2,497	3,590	445	667	4,702		4,702
San Francisco	4,504	10,283	14,787	(1,673)	0	13,114		13,114
San Mateo	4,649	10,617	15,266	6,524	887	22,677		22,677
Santa Clara	10,560	24,115	34,675	(42,409)	0	(7,734)		0
Solano	2,749	6,277	9,026	345	721	10,092		10,092
Sonoma	3,424	7,819	11,243	(21,696)	985	(9,468)		0
<b>Bay Area Totals</b>	<b>43,629</b>	<b>99,629</b>	<b>143,258</b>	<b>(44,749)</b>	<b>17,535</b>	<b>116,044</b>	<b>(31,000)</b>	<b>131,885</b>

Note: New County Share Total is the sum of unprogrammed balances, lapses, and new capacity for FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17. Counties with negatives have a "\$0" new share.

\* Prior year lapsed funds returned to county share.

Table 2: Transportation Enhancement Targets

	New TE Share	MTC 50% Share	CMA 50% Discretion	FY 2015-16 New Distrib.	FY 2016-17 New Distrib.
Alameda	4,358	2,179	2,179	2,196	2,162
Contra Costa	2,973	1,487	1,486	1,498	1,475
Marin	813	406	407	410	403
Napa	534	267	267	269	265
San Francisco	2,202	1,101	1,101	1,110	1,092
San Mateo	2,274	1,137	1,137	1,146	1,128
Santa Clara	5,164	2,582	2,582	2,602	2,562
Solano	1,345	673	672	678	667
Sonoma	1,675	837	838	844	831
<b>Bay Area Totals</b>	<b>21,338</b>	<b>10,669</b>	<b>10,669</b>	<b>10,753</b>	<b>10,585</b>

Note: New TE funds are split 50-50 between the Counties and MTC. TE Targets are a subset of Table 1.

Table 3: Planning, Programming, and Monitoring Amounts  
FY 12-13 through FY 15-16 and FY 16-17

	PPM Limit FY13 - FY16	Currently Programmed	MTC Share FY 16 PPM	CMA Share FY 16 PPM	PPM Limit FY 17	MTC Share FY 17 PPM	CMA Share FY 17 PPM
Alameda	2,793	2,347	126	320	1,017	131	886
Contra Costa	1,825	1,521	82	222	694	85	609
Marin	528	445	23	60	190	24	166
Napa	330	112	14	204	125	15	110
San Francisco	1,426	1,201	64	161	514	67	447
San Mateo	1,479	1,247	67	165	531	69	462
Santa Clara	3,277	2,502	147	628	1,206	153	1,053
Solano	857	720	39	98	314	40	274
Sonoma	1,049	877	47	125	391	48	343
<b>Bay Area Totals</b>	<b>13,564</b>	<b>10,972</b>	<b>609</b>	<b>1,983</b>	<b>4,982</b>	<b>632</b>	<b>4,350</b>

J:\PROJECT\Funding\RTIP\12 RTIP\Final 2012 STIP FE Targets 2011-09-01.xls]Sheet1

This page intentionally left blank.

## 10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects

List of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 projects (10-12-11)

Tier 1 Highway Projects "Projects that can begin construction in the next 5 years"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
STA	Jepson Parkway	Leisure Town (Elmira to Alamo)	\$35.4 M	\$35.4 M
		Cement Hill/Walters Road Extension and Widening	\$69.9 M	\$69.9 M
		Red Top Road to I-505	\$120 M	\$104 M
Caltrans	EB I-80 Aux Lane – Fairfield	Travis to Air Base Parkway	\$5.0 M (by 2012)	\$5.0 M
STA	I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange	Package 1, 2, & 3	\$309 M	\$191 M

Tier 2 Highway Projects "Projects that can begin construction in the next 10 years"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
Caltrans	WB I-80 Aux Lane	W. Texas to Abernathy	\$5-8 M	\$5-8 M
Caltrans	WB I-80 Aux Lane	Waterman to Travis Blvd	\$5-8 M	\$5-8 M
STA	I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange*	Package 4, 5, 6 & 7	\$381 M	\$381 M
Caltrans	SR12 East Safety/Operational Improvements	From Suisun City to Rio Vista	(est.) \$100 M	(est.) \$100 M
STA	Truck Scales Relocation	(WB Scales)	\$140 M	\$140 M
STA	I-80 Express Lanes	Carquinez Bridge to SR37	\$100 M	\$100 M

\* West End section of North Connector is included as part of I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange project

Tier 3 Highway Projects "Projects that are in the planning phase and are priorities to the STA Board"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
Caltrans	I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange	Remaining Phases	\$1.2 Billion	\$1.2 Billion
Caltrans	Rio Vista Bridge Realignment/Replacement	Currently being studied.	\$1.5 Billion	\$1.5 Billion
Caltrans	SR 12 East Widening Improvements	Currently being studied	pending	pending
Caltrans	SR113 Improvements	Currently being studied.	Pending	pending

## 10-Year Investment Plan for Highway and Major Transit Capital Projects

List of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 projects (10-12-11)

Tier 1 Transit Projects "Projects that can begin construction in the next 5 years"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
Fairfield	Fairfield/Vacaville Rail Station (Ph 2)	Phase 1 fully funded	\$4.8 M	\$4.8 M
Vacaville	Vacaville Intermodal Station (Ph 2)	Phase 1 built	\$14 M	\$12 M
Vallejo	Vallejo Ferry Maintenance Facility (Ph 2) (Ph 2 & 3)	Move operations to Mare Island	Pending	Pending
Vallejo	Curtola Transit Center (Ph 1)	Lemon Street	\$15 M	\$3 M
Fairfield	Fairfield Transportation Center		\$20 M	\$16 M
Dixon	West B Street Undercrossing		\$6.1 M	\$500 K

Tier 2 Transit Projects "Projects that can begin construction in the next 10 years"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
Dixon	Dixon Transportation Center (Parkway Blvd., A Street Undercrossing)		Pending	Pending
Benicia	I-680 Industrial Park-n-Ride	Phase 2, RM 2 Funding	\$1.25 M	0
Rio Vista	Church Rd/SR12 Park and Ride	CON in FY 09-10	\$8 M	\$8 M
Vallejo	Curtola Park and Ride (Ph 2)		Pending	Pending
Vallejo	Vallejo Station (Phase B)	Pending updated schedule.	\$27 M	\$15.5 M

Tier 3 Transit Projects "Projects that are in the planning phase and are future priorities for the STA Board"				
Sponsor	Project	Details	Cost	Shortfall
Rio Vista	Downtown Park and Ride		\$0.3 M	\$0.3 M
Vallejo	Curtola Transit Center (Ph 3)		Pending	Pending

**RESOLUTION NO. 2011-17****A RESOLUTION OF THE SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (STA) AUTHORIZING THE APPLICATION FOR STATE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (STIP) TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENTS (TE) FUNDING TO DELIVER THE CITY OF DIXON'S WEST B STREET UNDERCROSSING PROJECT.**

**WHEREAS**, SOLANO TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY (herein referred to as "APPLICANT") is submitting an application to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for \$1,321,000 in funding from the 2012 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) for the City of Dixon's West B Street Undercrossing project (herein referred to as "PROJECT" or "PROJECTS") for the MTC 2012 RTIP, as authorized by MTC by Resolution No. 4028 (herein referred to as "PROGRAM"); and

**WHEREAS**, SB 45 (Chapter 622, Statutes 1997) substantially revised the process for estimating the amount of state and federal funds available for transportation projects in the state and for appropriating and allocating the available funds to these projects; and

**WHEREAS**, as part of that process, MTC is responsible for programming projects eligible for Regional Improvement Program funds, pursuant to California Government Code Section 14527(b), for inclusion in the RTIP, and submission to the California Transportation Commission, for inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program; and

**WHEREAS**, MTC will review and include, if approved, 2012 RTIP projects in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

**WHEREAS**, MTC has requested eligible transportation project sponsors to submit applications nominating projects to be programmed for Regional Improvement Program funds in the RTIP; and

**WHEREAS**, applications to MTC must be submitted consistent with procedures, conditions, and forms it provides transportation project sponsors; and

**WHEREAS**, APPLICANT is a sponsor of transportation projects eligible for Regional Improvement Program funds; and

**WHEREAS**, the RTIP Project Programming Request (PPR) form of the project application, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, lists the project, purpose, schedule and budget for which APPLICANT is requesting that MTC program Regional Improvement Program funds for inclusion in the RTIP; and

**WHEREAS**, Part 2 of the project application, attached and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, includes the certification by APPLICANT of assurances required by SB 45 in order to qualify the project listed in the RTIP project nomination sheet of the project application for programming by MTC; and

**WHEREAS**, as part of the application for 2012 RTIP funding, MTC requires any resolution adopted by the responsible implementing agency to state that the project will comply with the procedures specified in the "Timely Use of Funds Provisions and Deadlines" (MTC Resolution No. 4028, Attachment 1, Page 14, and as may be further amended).

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT approves the assurances set forth in Part 2 of the project application, attached to this resolution; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT will comply with the provisions and requirements of the “Timely Use of Funds Provisions and Deadlines” (MTC Resolution No. 4028, Attachment 1, Page 14, and as may be further amended), that PROJECT will be implemented as described in the complete application and in this resolution and, if approved, for the amount programmed in the MTC federal TIP, and that APPLICANT and PROJECT will comply with the requirements as set forth in the 2012 RTIP Policies and Procedures (MTC Resolution No. 4028); and therefore be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT will comply with the provisions and requirements of the Transit Coordination Implementation Plan, as set forth in MTC Resolution No. 3866; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT has reviewed the project and has adequate staffing resources to deliver and complete the project within the schedule set forth in the RTIP Project Programming Request (PPR) form of the project application, attached to this resolution; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT is an eligible sponsor of projects in the State Transportation Improvement Program; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT is authorized to submit an application for State Transportation Improvement Program funds for PROJECT; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT has and will retain the expertise and knowledge necessary to deliver STIP and federally-funded projects, and has assigned a single point of contact for all STIP and FHWA-funded projects to work with the CMA, MTC, and Caltrans on any questions or issues that may arise during the STIP and/or federal programming and delivery process; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that there is no legal impediment to APPLICANT making applications for Regional Improvement Program funds; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed PROJECT, or the ability of APPLICANT to deliver such PROJECT; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that APPLICANT authorizes its Executive Director or designee to execute and file an application with MTC to program Regional Improvement Program funds into the RTIP, for the projects, purposes and amounts included in the project application attached to this resolution; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to MTC in conjunction with the filing of the APPLICANT application referenced herein, along with the name and contact information for the APPLICANT's single point of contact.

---

Harry Price, Chair  
Solano Transportation Authority

Passed by the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) Board on this **12<sup>th</sup> Day of October, 2011** by the following vote:

Ayes: \_\_\_\_\_

Nos: \_\_\_\_\_

Absent: \_\_\_\_\_

Abstain: \_\_\_\_\_

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_

Johanna Masiclat  
Clerk of the Board

I, Daryl K. Halls, the Solano Transportation Authority Executive Director, certify that the above and foregoing resolution was introduced, passed and adopted by said Authority at the regular meeting held this **12<sup>th</sup> Day of October, 2011**.

This page intentionally left blank.

**RTIP Project Application**  
**Part 2: Certification of Assurances**

The implementing agency certifies that the project for which Regional Improvement Program funding is requested meets the following project screening Criteria. **Please initial each.**

1. The project is eligible for consideration in the RTIP. Pursuant to Streets and Highways Code Section 164 (e), eligible projects include improving state highways, local roads, public transit, intercity rail, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities, and grade separation, transportation system management, transportation demand management, soundwall projects, intermodal facilities, and safety. \_\_\_\_\_
2. For the funds requested, no costs have/will be incurred prior to adoption into the STIP by the CTC. \_\_\_\_\_ [bsc1]
3. A Project Study Report (PSR) or PSR equivalent has been prepared for the project. \_\_\_\_\_
4. The project budget included in Part 2 of the project application reflects current costs updated as of the date of application and escalated to the appropriate year. \_\_\_\_\_
5. The project is included in a local congestion management program (CMP). (Note: For those counties that have opted out of preparing a CMP in accordance with Government Code Section 65088.3, the project must be consistent with the capital improvement program adopted pursuant to MTC's funding agreement with the countywide transportation planning agency.) \_\_\_\_\_
6. The year of funding for any design, right-of-way and/or construction phases has taken into consideration the time necessary to obtain environmental clearance and permitting approval for the project. \_\_\_\_\_
7. The project is fully funded. \_\_\_\_\_
8. For projects with STIP federal funds, the implementing agency agrees to contact Caltrans and schedule and complete a field review within six months of the project being adopted or amended into the TIP. \_\_\_\_\_
9. For STIP construction funds, the implementing agency agrees to send a copy of the Caltrans LPP 01-06 "Award Information for STIP Projects – Attachment A" to MTC and the CMA, upon award. \_\_\_\_\_
10. The implementing agency agrees to be available for an audit of STIP funds, if requested. \_\_\_\_\_

The implementing agency also agrees to abide by all statutes, rules and regulations applying to the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), and to follow all requirements associated with the funds programmed to the project in the STIP. \_\_\_\_\_

These include, but are not limited to:

1. Environmental requirements: NEPA standards and procedures for all projects with Federal funds; CEQA standards and procedures for all projects programmed with State funds.
2. California Transportation Commission (CTC) requirements for transit projects, formerly associated with the Transit Capital Improvement (TCI) program. These include rules governing right-of-way acquisition, hazardous materials testing, and timely use of funds.
3. Federal Transit Administration (FTA) requirements for transit projects as outlined in FTA regulations and circulars.

4. Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Caltrans requirements for highway and other roadway projects as outlined in the Caltrans Local Programs Manual.
5. Federal air quality conformity requirements, and local project review requirements, as outlined in the adopted Bay Area Conformity Revision of the State Implementation Plan (SIP).

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (REV. 2/10)

Date: 09/07/11

County	CT District	PPNO	TCRP Project No.	EA
SOL	04			
<b>Project Title:</b> West B Street Bike/Pedestrian Undercrossing				

Proposed Total Project Cost									Notes
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E	60		375					435	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)				450				450	
R/W			170					170	
CON				5,045				5,045	
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>		<b>545</b>	<b>5,495</b>				<b>6,100</b>	

Fund No. 1:	Proposed Funding								Program Code
									RIP-TE-T4-10-F/ST-SOL
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON				649				649	
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>649</b>				<b>649</b>	

Fund No. 2:	Proposed Funding								Program Code
									RIP-T3-06A-PTA-SOL
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E	60							60	
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>60</b>							<b>60</b>	

Fund No. 3:	Proposed Funding								Program Code
									OTHER LOCAL
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E			375					375	UPRR C&M Agreement Costs \$100K
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)				450				450	
R/W			170					170	
CON				4,396				4,396	
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>545</b>	<b>4,846</b>				<b>5,391</b>	

**PROJECT PROGRAMMING REQUEST**

DTP-0001 (REV. 2/10)

Date: 09/07/11

County	CT District	PPNO	TCRP Project No.	EA
SOL	04			
<b>Project Title:</b> West B Street Bike/Pedestrian Undercrossing				

<b>Fund No. 4:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

<b>Fund No. 5:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

<b>Fund No. 6:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									

<b>Fund No. 7:</b>									<b>Program Code</b>
<b>Proposed Funding</b>									
Component	Prior	10/11	11/12	12/13	13/14	14/15	15/16+	Total	Funding Agency
E&P (PA&ED)									
PS&E									
R/W SUP (CT)									
CON SUP (CT)									
R/W									
CON									
<b>TOTAL</b>									



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Liz Niedziela, Transit Manager/Analyst  
Mona Babauta, Transit Manager for Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST)  
SUBJECT: Public Hearing - Proposed SolanoExpress Route 30 Service Changes

---

**Background:**

Prior to 2000, STA contracted with Yolobus to operate Route 30. Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST) has operated Route 30 on behalf of the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) since 2000. Route 30 is included in the Intercity Transit Funding Agreement which coordinates the funding of intercity routes by pooling Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds from all local jurisdictions except Rio Vista.

Over the years, the STA has partnered with FAST to secure other funds for this route. These include Transportation Funds for Clean Air (TFCA) from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Clean Air Funds from the Yolo Solano Air Quality District and Federal Section 5311 operating assistance was allocated for Route 30.

In the fall 2007, Route 30 started experiencing full capacity at the morning stop in Dixon on the Sacramento express trip. FAST started supplementing the service by providing a back-up shuttle so no riders would be left behind. Ridership on this route had continued to steadily increase. FAST surveyed Route 30 riders asking what additional time they would prefer to arrive and depart Sacramento. Using this information, a schedule was drafted and approved by the STA Board in 2008 with additional service in the morning to Sacramento and a later service for the return trip. Saturday service was also included in this service expansion to address the transportation gaps identified in the Dixon Community Based Transportation Plan. Lifeline funding was awarded to assist in the operation cost of the new Saturday service. New expanded service began July 1, 2008.

In the summer of 2009, FAST received requests from passengers wishing to travel from Sacramento to connect with Route 90 in the morning. FAST staff developed an easy and cost neutral fix to facilitate better connectivity among intercity routes. FAST turned the 6:08 AM bus, which used to deadhead back to the garage from Sacramento, into revenue service. This now allows Sacramento passengers to reach the Fairfield Transportation Center (FTC) by 8:25 AM and connect, even with traffic, to the 8:42 AM Route 90 bound for El Cerrito Del Norte BART. To maintain neutral cost, FAST terminated the westbound revenue service on the 6:52 AM bus.

**Discussion:**

Currently, Route 30 operates seven roundtrips, Monday-Friday, between Fairfield and Sacramento with stops in Vacaville, Dixon, and Davis. On Saturday, Route 30 serves Fairfield, Vacaville, Dixon and Davis with three round trips.

FAST has received concerns from passengers about consistent on-time performance problems on the Thursday and Friday afternoon westbound trips from Sacramento to Fairfield. Traffic was identified as the primary cause of the late trips. Recognizing the importance of on-time performance and reliable transit service, FAST staff is proposing a new Route 30 schedule to address the performance issues (Attachment A).

More specifically, FAST staff will be soliciting passenger feedback on changes to the Route 30 schedule to provide more efficient and cost effective service as follows:

- Changing the stop at Davis Street Park and Ride to the new Vacaville Transportation Center. This change will provide passengers the convenience to transfer to local fixed route or intercity routes.
- Possible elimination of two bus stop time points in Sacramento to streamline service.
- Expanded cycle time for the first two inbound (westbound) trips from Sacramento to Fairfield on Friday afternoons to allow for the longer travel time from the Fairfield Transportation Center (FTC) to Sacramento due to traffic.
- Elimination of the 5:47 pm inbound trip from Sacramento to Fairfield on Fridays to allow for the extra time added to the two prior inbound trips to improve on-time performance.
- Possible elimination of the Memorial Union Stop at University of California in Davis on Friday afternoons primarily. The Unitrans Silo Terminal opened in October 2008 and connects to all routes and few Route 30 utilize this stop.
- Adjusting the Saturday schedule to shorten layover time in Davis.

Furthermore, STA staff is proposing another change to the Route 30 to better serve Dixon and Vacaville westbound commuters in the morning. Currently, the first westbound trip leaves Dixon after 9:00 am, making it difficult to commute to employment destinations in Fairfield, Vacaville or in other areas in the Bay Area that are served by the intercity routes. STA staff is recommending the morning trip that serves UC Davis return westbound to serve Dixon and Vacaville instead of proceeding to Sacramento. This should not negatively impact eastbound commuters to Sacramento in the morning since they are better served by two other trips that do not stop at UC Davis and involve less travel time. This proposed trip would then depart Dixon before 8:00 am and deliver passengers to Vacaville and the FTC before well before 9:00 am. With the cost savings achieved by eliminating the leg of the trip between Davis and Sacramento and making the other, proposed service changes, the addition of a late return trip in the evening for Dixon and Vacaville eastbound commuters is also being proposed.

Finalizing the new schedule is ongoing. FAST staff is soliciting passenger feedback and will consider all public comments before making any final changes. The STA Board is requested to hold a public hearing to receive any public comments prior to approving the proposed service changes to Route 30.

The Consortium and STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None. This service change is proposed to be within the current fiscal costs of Route 30, but the service change is anticipated to improve the route's on time performance and ridership.

**Recommendation:**

1. Conduct Public Hearing on Proposed SolanoExpress Route 30 Service Changes; and
2. Approve service changes to SolanoExpress Route 30 to improve time efficiency and cost effectiveness.

Attachment:

- A. Route 30 Rider Alert

This page intentionally left blank.

**PROPOSED FINAL** (Effective November 5, 2011 upon approval by the STA Board).

**Route 30 :: Monday - Friday**

Route 30 :: Eastbound (Fairfield to Davis/Sacramento)										Route 30 :: Westbound (Sacramento/Davis to Fairfield)								
Fairfield		Vacaville	Dixon	UC Davis			Sacramento			UC Davis				Dixon	Vacaville	Fairfield		
Fairfield Transp Center	Westfield Mall	Vacaville Transp Center	Market Ln Park & Ride	Health Science	Silo	Memorial Union	Capitol Mall	9th St & L St	9th St & O St	Capitol Mall	Memorial Union	Silo	Health Science	Market Ln Park & Ride	Vacaville Transp Center	Westfield Mall	Fairfield Transp Center	
268	324	391	392	404	393	403	395	406	407	395	403	393	404	392	391	324	268	
M-F	6:08 AM	--:--	6:22 AM	6:36 AM	--:--	--:--	--:--	7:00 AM	7:06 AM	7:08 AM	7:13 AM	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	7:55 AM G	
M-F	6:48 AM	6:53 AM	7:09 AM	7:22 AM	7:32 AM	7:37 AM	7:45 AM	>>>> Direct Express to Dixon >>>>							8:21 AM	8:35 AM	8:51 AM	8:59 AM G
M-F	6:52 AM	--:--	7:06 AM	7:20 AM	--:--	--:--	--:--	7:44 AM	7:50 AM	7:52 AM G								
M-F	11:56 AM	12:02 PM	12:19 PM	12:31 PM	--:--	--:--	12:56 PM	1:19 PM	1:25 PM	1:27 PM	1:32 PM	1:57 PM	--:--	--:--	2:15 PM	2:29 PM	2:45 PM	2:53 PM G
M-TH	3:29 PM	>>>> Direct Express to Sacramento >>>>						4:29 PM	4:35 PM	4:37 PM	4:42 PM	5:07 PM	5:15 PM	5:20 PM	5:31 PM	5:46 PM	6:02 PM	6:10 PM
F	3:17 PM	>>>> Direct Express to Sacramento >>>>						4:41 PM	4:47 PM	4:49 PM	4:54 PM	--:--	5:17 PM	5:22 PM	5:33 PM	5:48 PM	6:04 PM	6:12 PM
M-TH	3:50 PM	4:01 PM	4:17 PM	4:30 PM	--:--	--:--	--:--	5:05 PM	5:11 PM	5:13 PM	5:18 PM	--:--	--:--	--:--	5:43 PM	5:58 PM	--:--	6:14 PM G
F	3:37 PM	3:48 PM	4:09 PM	4:22 PM	--:--	--:--	--:--	5:17 PM	5:23 PM	5:25 PM	5:30 PM	--:--	--:--	--:--	6:05 PM	6:20 PM	--:--	6:36 PM G
M-TH	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	--:--	5:47 PM	5:53 PM	5:55 PM	6:00 PM	--:--	--:--	--:--	6:25 PM	6:40 PM	--:--	6:56 PM G
M-F	6:12 PM	6:20 PM	6:36 PM	6:49 PM G														
Mon-Friday Service			Mon-Thurs Service		Friday Service		G :: Service ends; bus returns to garage			Mon-Friday Service		Mon-Thurs Service		Friday Service				

**Route 30 :: Saturday**

Route 30 :: Saturday Service to Davis and YoloBus Connections										
Fairfield		Vacaville	Dixon	UC Davis		Dixon	Vacaville	Fairfield		
Fairfield Transp Center	Westfield Mall	Vacaville Transp Center	Market Ln Park & Ride	Arrive Memorial Union	Depart Memorial Union	Market Ln Park & Ride	Vacaville Transp Center	Westfield Mall	Fairfield Transp Center	
268	324	391	392	403	403	392	391	324	268	
Sat	8:13 AM	8:19 AM	8:36 AM	8:48 AM	9:10 AM	9:20 AM	9:42 AM	9:54 AM	10:12 AM	10:17 AM
Sat	10:22 AM	10:28 AM	10:45 AM	10:57 AM	11:19 AM	11:29 AM	11:51 AM	12:03 PM	12:21 PM	12:26 PM
Sat	12:31 PM	12:37 PM	12:54 PM	1:06 PM	1:28 PM	1:38 PM	2:00 PM	2:12 PM	2:30 PM	2:35 PM
Saturday Service										

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 4, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Bernadette Curry, STA Legal Counsel  
Daryl Halls, STA Executive Director  
RE: Proposed Revisions to the UVC Local Preference Policy and  
H 4232/33 UVC Local Preference Analysis

---

**Background:**

In December 2010, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) Board adopted the Local Preference Policy, which applies to the purchase of goods, services and the solicitation of professional services. The policy does not apply to any contract which is required by law to be awarded to the “lowest, responsible bidder”, such as public work projects or other projects to the extent the application would be prohibited by state or federal law. The policy does give an opportunity for local businesses to bid on products and services necessary in the delivery of STA’s projects and programs. Local business firms will be given preference based on their knowledge of the community and proximity to project locations.

The policy supports the public interest of local residents throughout Solano County who are likely to be employed by local businesses. These local businesses generate revenue for the county jurisdictions, and contribute to the social and economic vitality of the local community.

After its initial implementation, questions regarding the Policy were raised and at the Board’s March 9, 2011 meeting, the Executive Committee was tasked with working with staff and local firms to review the policy and recommend modifications as necessary.

**Discussion:**

*Proposed Revisions to the Policy*

Staff and the Executive Committee met twice with the local business community to receive suggestions and feedback on the adopted Policy. The attached proposed revised Policy (Attachment A) includes recommendations from those meetings and subsequent direction from the Executive Committee. The substantive recommended changes are summarized below. Proposed additions to the Policy are indicated in the attached by the underlines and deletions are shown as strikeouts.

*Definition of Local Business*

In an attempt to encourage local businesses to relocate to Solano County, the definition of local business has been refined to include a time period for how long an office must have been established in order to qualify as a local business. The Executive Committee is recommending that the business be located within the County for at least 6 months prior to the date of contract award in order to receive preferential points as a local business. A recommendation was made that this time period be extended to 12 months. This change is not recommended by the Executive Committee for that length of duration because the extra 6 months could end up penalizing those businesses that have relocated to Solano County since the adoption of the Policy.

Concerns were raised that the Policy would allow businesses attempting to qualify as a local business to open up mere shells of an office in Solano County without employing any full time employees in the office. To address this, the Executive Committee is recommending that the local satellite office have at least one full-time employee who will serve as the “responsible in charge”. “Responsible in charge” is defined as the person designated by the contract as the lead contact for all services to be performed under the contract. An additional proposed revision was to establish a requirement that a minimum percentage of a business’ full time employees be located at the satellite office. The Executive Committee is not recommending an establishment of a minimum percentage of the overall business be located in the satellite office.

#### *Establishment of Local Preference Goal*

Additional feedback provided included suggestions regarding the development and/or establishment of a specific participation goal. The Executive Committee is recommending that for solicitations for professional services, the STA staff person responsible for the contract will analyze the availability of local businesses in relationship to the work to be performed and recommend a local business participation goal to be included with each authorization to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP). Preference points will be awarded on a sliding scale based on a local business’s level of services in the proposed scope of services. Each solicitation will have an established goal developed based on the specific services requested and the availability of local businesses to compete for those services as opposed to the adoption of a uniform but otherwise arbitrary percent level of participation.

#### *Revised Invoicing Procedures*

In order to ensure that businesses that are awarded contracts as a result of the utilization of local businesses retain those businesses throughout the duration of the contract term, vendors will be required to certify the on-going participation with each invoice submitted for payment.

#### *Annual Report*

To provide information on the utilization of the Policy, it is recommended that the Policy include an annual report to the Board at the close of each fiscal year. An additional comment was received that recommended that a semi-annual report be added as well. This is not being recommended by the Executive Committee since it is standard practice with the STA that unless otherwise necessary, reporting is done on an annual basis. The analysis for Fiscal Year 2010-11 is summarized below.

#### *Other proposed revisions not recommended*

Staff received additional suggested language that would create a mandatory participation requirement for each solicitation and a penalty for non-compliance. This is not recommended by Legal Counsel and the Executive Committee due to the possibility for legal challenges and the lack of flexibility provided to both the Board and staff to administer the policy in a fair and efficient manner.

#### *Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Local Preference Analysis*

With the adoption of the Local Preference Policy, STA staff has enhanced its tracking system for all account purchase activities to include the following criteria when considering a local business. A local business is defined as follows:

- Has a valid business license issued in Solano County or a political subdivision within Solano County; and
- Principal business office or a satellite office with at least one full-time employee, located in Solano County.

For purchases or services, any local business whose bid is within 5% of the low bid is given the opportunity to match the lower price. In the situation where the local business and the non-local business submit equivalent, lowest responsible bids, preference shall be given to the local business.

The tables in Attachment B show the account purchase activities for the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11. The data is in 6-month increments for the fiscal year. Table 1 is a summary for all purchase activity before the adoption of the policy, Table 2 shows totals for consultant/professional services subject to the policy from January 1, 2011-June 30, 2011 and Table 3 is a summary for all purchase activity upon adoption of the policy.

The categories are based on STA's FY 2010-11 unaudited financial reports. There was some exclusion made to the analysis, such as phone and insurance charges, since there is limited flexibility in terms of vendor choices.

The Consultants/Professional Services category includes the engineering, auditing, and legal consulting services. Twenty (20%) percent of total vendors utilized from June 1, 2010 to December 30, 2010 were local. With the implementation of the Local Preference Policy in December 2010, this percentage increased by four (4%) percent. Although overall expenditures were less for the second half of the fiscal year for this category, local preference expenditures were increased by \$305,909.

Table 2 shows the contracts that were subject to the local preference policy. Of the six (6) total contracts that were initiated during January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011, two (2) were awarded to local vendors.

The General Office Supplies/Purchases category includes cost in the general operations and administration in the delivery of STA's program and projects, such as paper and printing products, postage, and computer software and maintenance. This category shows a three (3%) percent decline in the number of local vendors in January 1, 2011 to June 30, 2011 due to STA not requiring the same overall level of services. However, there was an increase of \$537 in local dollars spent during this same period.

The STA staff continues to be proactive in using the guiding principles of the Local Preference Policy to solicit work from local vendors while being fiscally responsible. STA has initiated future projects and program consultant services Request for Proposal's (RFP's) to include a Local Preference Policy component to ensure that the local business community is provided every opportunity in the bid process. Analysis on this policy will be conducted annually, with data compiled from July to June of the FY.

**Fiscal Impact:**

While the Local Preference Policy does not impact the STA budget, it does contribute to the economic vitality of the local economy.

**Recommendation:**

Adopt the attached revisions to the STA's Local Purchasing Policy and receive the initial amended report for STA's FY 2010-11 Local Preference Policy.

Attachments:

- A. Proposed revisions to STA Local Preference Policy
- B. Purchase activities for Fiscal year (FY) 2010-11
  - Table 1: Pre-Local Preference Policy Adoption (July1, 2010-December 31, 2010)

Table 2: Consultants/Professional Services subject to Local Preference Policy  
(January 1, 2011-June 30, 2011)

Table 3: Post Local Preference Policy Adoption (January 1, 2011-June 30, 2011)

**LOCAL PREFERENCE POLICY**

Inception Date: 12-8-10  
Last Revision Date: 10-12-11  
Page 1 of 4

**1. Local Preference**

In order to address the competitive disadvantage faced by local businesses that seek to enter into contracts with the Solano Transportation Authority ("STA") because of the higher costs of doing business in Solano County, and to encourage businesses to locate and remain in Solano County, the STA has implemented a local preference policy.

**1.1. Definition of Local Business**

For purposes of this section, a "local business" means a business enterprise, including but not limited to a sole proprietorship, partnership, or corporation, which has the following:

- a valid business license issued from Solano County or a political subdivision within Solano County; and
- its principal business office, or a satellite office with at least one full-time employee who will serve as the "responsible in charge" for any contract, located in Solano County for at least six (6) months prior to the award of a contract with the STA.

For purposes of this section, a "responsible in charge" means the person designated by contract as the lead contact for all services to be performed under the contract.

**1.2. Preference****1.2.1. Contracts for purchases of Goods or Supplies**

When competitive bidding is utilized to purchase goods or supplies, the STA representative conducting the solicitation shall perform as follows:

- Where the lowest responsible bidder is not a local business, the STA representative shall provide the lowest responsible local business bidder, should one exist and its bid is within five percent (5%) of the lowest responsible bidder, with notice and an opportunity to reduce its bid to match that of the lowest responsible bidder. Notice shall be by telephone and either facsimile or electronic mail. The local business shall have five (5) business days after the date of such notice to match the lowest bid, in writing. Should the local business so match, it shall be deemed the lowest responsible bidder and receive the award.
- Should the lowest responsible local business bidder decline to match as set forth above, the STA representative shall provide the next lowest responsible local business bidder, should one exist and its bid is within five percent (5%) of the lowest responsible bidder, with the same notice and opportunity to match the bid of the lowest responsible bidder as above. This process shall

continue as necessary, until an award is made either to a responsible local business bidder within five percent (5%) of the lowest responsible bidder, or the lowest responsible bidder itself.

- In instances where a local business and a non-local business submit equivalent, lowest responsible bids, the STA representative shall give preference to the local business.
- No contract awarded to a local business under this section shall be assigned or subcontracted in any manner that permits more than fifty (50) percent or more of the dollar value of the contract to be performed by an entity that is not a local business.

### **1.2.2. Contracts for Professional Service**

When awarding contracts for professional services, the STA representative conducting the solicitation shall give special consideration to local businesses for knowledge of the communities and proximity to project locations. The STA representative will analyze the availability of registered local businesses in relationship to the work to be performed and recommend a local business participation goal to be included with each authorization to issue a Request for Proposal (RFP). Preference points will be awarded based on sliding scale in accordance with a local business's level of participation in the proposed scope of services.

## **1.3. Declaration of Compliance**

### **1.3.1. Bids**

In submitting a bid subject to this section, a local business shall affirm its compliance with subsection 1.1 on a form to be provided by the STA representative.

### **1.3.2. Invoices**

Vendors awarded contracts based on a local preference must certify the on-going participation of the local business throughout the contract term to be submitted with each invoice for payment.

## **1.4. Notice and Outreach**

The STA will maintain a registry of local businesses who are interested in conducting business with the STA. The Each STA representative shall provide adequate notice of the provisions of this section to prospective bidders when conducting a solicitation.

## **1.5. Annual Reporting**

An annual report of the utilization of local preference will be presented to the STA Board of Directors upon the close of each fiscal year at its September meeting, or as soon thereafter as may be heard.

## **1.6. Exceptions**

This ~~Policy section~~ is expressly inapplicable to public works or other projects to the extent the application would be prohibited by state or federal law. The STA Board expressly reserves the right to waive the application of this Policy in

bidding situations involving single bids or other situations in which the application of the Policy is impractical or otherwise not warranted given the circumstances.

## Purchase Activities for FY 2010-11

**Table 1: Pre-Local Preference Policy Adoption (July 1, 2010-December 31, 2010)**

Description	Total Vendor Activities		Local Preference Activities			
	# of Vendors	Amount	# of Local Vendors	Amount	% Local Vendor Used	% Local Dollars
Consultants/Professional Services	51	\$12,902,661	10	\$203,890	20%	2%
Office Space	1	\$123,763	1	\$123,763	100%	100%
General Office Supplies/Purchases	68	\$98,991	31	\$28,252	46%	29%

**Table 2: Consultants/Professional Services Subject to Local Preference Policy\*  
(January 1, 2011-June 30, 2011)**

Description	Total Vendor Activities		Local Preference Activities			
	# of Vendors	Amount	# of Local Vendors	Amount	% Local Vendor Used	% Local Dollars
Consultants/Professional Services	6	\$179,393	2	\$10,617	33%	6%

\*New contracts or amendments subject to policy

**Table 3: Post Local Preference Policy Adoption (January 1, 2011-June 30, 2011)**

Description	Total Vendor Activities		Local Preference Activities			
	# of Vendors	Amount	# of Local Vendors	Amount	% Local Vendor Used	% Local Dollars
Consultants/Professional Services	55	\$9,591,481	13	\$509,799	24%	5%
Office Space	1	\$ 75,167	1	\$75,167	100%	100%
General Office Supplies/Purchases	87	\$ 82,243	37	\$28,789	43%	36%



DATE: October 6, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning  
RE: 2011 Solano Congestion Management Plan (CMP)

---

**Background:**

California law requires urban areas to develop a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The CMP plans strategies for addressing congestion problems by holding jurisdictions to a variety of mobility standards in order to obtain state gas tax subventions. These mobility standards include Level of Service (LOS) standards on the CMP network and transit standards. To help jurisdictions maintain these mobility standards, the CMP lists improvement projects in a seven-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Jurisdictions that are projected to exceed the CMP standards, based on the Napa-Solano Travel Demand Model, are required to create a deficiency plan to meet the CMP standards within the seven-year time frame of the CIP.

The 2009 CMP was approved by the STA Board on September 9, 2009. In order for projects in the CMP's CIP to be placed in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), state law requires that the CMP be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) found the 2009 Solano CMP to be consistent with the RTP.

Subsequent to STA approval and MTC acceptance of the 2009 Solano CMP, several items relevant to the CMP were updated. These updates impact the content of the CMP, as well as the CMP's CIP. The updated items were the Napa-Solano Travel Demand Model (modified as a part of the Regional Traffic Impact Fee study), implementation of the Safe Routes to Schools Program and its addition to the CIP, and changes to the CIP for Senior and Disabled Transit programs. The STA Board adopted the 2010 updates to the CMP in August 2010.

CMPs are prepared in draft form and submitted to the regional Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for review. The Bay Area MPO is the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

**Discussion:**

MTC released updated modeling guidance for the CMP in June 2011 and overall CMP guidance on July 16, 2011. The CMP update schedule requires draft CMPs be submitted to MTC by October 14, 2011. Because MTC is preparing a substantial update to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) at this time, including development of the first-ever Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), MTC has advised STA to only make minor updates to the information in the CMP. When the 2013 CMP update occurs, the new RTP and SCS will be in place, and a major CMP update will be required.

The 2011 CMP identifies changes to facilities, programs and transit ridership that have occurred since 2009. Major changes include opening of the North Connector (Suisun Valley Parkway/Business Center) and McGary Road, Central County bikeway segments in Suisun City and the Rose Drive pedestrian overcrossing of I-780 in Benicia, and completion of the Vacaville Transit Center and Vallejo Transit Center. Transit changes include the merger of Benicia and Vallejo's transit system into Solano County Transit (SolTrans) and the pending transfer of the Vallejo Ferry to the Water Emergency Transportation Agency.

CMP traffic counts are normally taken in the spring, while school is in session. For 2011, the new modeling guidance, which influences traffic counts, was not released until the summer. After consultation with MTC staff, STA has only included existing traffic counts in the 2011 CMP update, and has not conducted new traffic counts for the remaining CMP roadways and intersections. For the 2013 CMP update, STA intends to undertake a comprehensive count of traffic on these roadways.

The CMP CIP consists of locally-identified projects and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) State Highway Operation and Preservation Program (SHOPP) projects. The CIP has been amended to identify those projects that have been completed or that have revised descriptions or cost estimates. MTC has requested that the CMP CIP not include all projects that have been submitted for the RTP. Instead, MTC will complete the RTP update, and the 2013 CMP will include those projects in Solano County or for portions of the Bay Area that include Solano County.

The SHOPP project list has been updated based on action taken by the California Transportation Commission on August 15, 2011. Because of the completion of numerous projects in the 2009 to 2011 as of time frame and the reduction in available SHOPP funds, the Solano County SHOPP list has been reduced by about half.

At its meeting of September 28, 2011, the STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the Draft 2011 Solano CMP. Comments were received from the City of Rio Vista, and have been incorporated into the Draft 2011 Solano CMP. The STA TAC recommended that the STA Board send the Draft 2011 Solano CMP to MTC for conformity review. MTC's review will be completed in time for the TAC and Board to review any comments and for the Board to take final action at its December 2011 meeting.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Authorize the Executive Director to submit the Draft 2011 Solano CMP to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for conformity review.

**Attachment:**

- A. 2011 Congestion Management Program (This attachment has been provided to the STA Board members under separate enclosure. To obtain a copy, please contact the STA at (707) 424-6075.)



DATE: September 30, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Jayne Bauer, Marketing and Legislative Program Manager  
RE: STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform

---

**Background:**

Each year, STA staff monitors state and federal legislation that pertains directly to transportation and related issues. On December 8, 2010, the STA Board adopted its 2011 Legislative Priorities and Platform to provide policy guidance on transportation legislation and the STA's legislative activities during 2011. A matrix listing legislative bills of interest is included as Attachment A. Legislative Updates for September are provided as Attachments B (State) and C (Federal).

**Discussion:**

To help ensure the STA's transportation policies and priorities are consensus-based, the STA's Legislative Platform and Priorities is first developed in draft form by staff with input from the STA's state (Shaw/Yoder/Antwih, Inc.) and federal legislative consultants (Akin Gump). The Draft 2012 Legislative Platform and Priorities (Attachment D) is reviewed by the STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and Transit Consortium for comment. The draft is distributed to STA member agencies and members of our federal and state legislative delegations for review and comment prior to adoption by the STA Board. Proposed additions to the Platform have been highlighted in green and deletions by red strikethrough (Attachment D.1). The Platform with the accepted proposed changes has been provided for your review (Attachment D.2).

The TAC and Consortium reviewed the Draft 2012 Legislative Platform and Priorities at their meetings on September 28<sup>th</sup>, and approved forwarding the document to the Board, with a recommendation to distribute the draft document for a 30-day review and comment period. The Final Draft 2012 Legislative Platform and Priorities will be placed on the December 2011 STA Board agenda for consideration of adoption.

In addition to some minor language cleanup, the primary proposed changes in this year's priorities are as follows:

Priority 1: Restructured the priority projects and programs list for which the STA will seek federal funding instead of listing specific authorization and appropriations funding requests.

Priority 4: Added public private partnerships as legislation the STA specifically supports.

Priority 5: Added sponsorship of legislation to make technical corrections to STA's 2009 sponsored bill to directly claim Transportation Development Act funds, and to claim State Transit Assistance funds.

Priority 13: Added opposition to elimination of federal Transportation Enhancement funding.

Platform IX. Rail #7: Added opposition to Amtrak funding cuts to state-supported Intercity Passenger Rail services.

On September 8<sup>th</sup>, the House Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Subcommittee approved a Fiscal Year 2012 appropriations bill that would end federal subsidies for Amtrak operations that receive state operating assistance. Amtrak reported that it used \$188 million for these services in Fiscal Year 2010. California is one of the fifteen states that would lose their federal operating subsidy. The House bill does not fund the TIGER grant or High Speed Rail grant programs. Nine Senators from the targeted states sit on the Senate Committee. Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority (CCJPA) Chair Franklin sent a letter to the House THUD Appropriations Subcommittee counterpart in the Senate stating the CCJPA's strong opposition to the House's language (Attachment E). On September 20<sup>th</sup> the Senate Appropriations Committee approved their version of the bill, which preserves current funding levels for highways, transit, and Amtrak. As a partner agency to CCJPA, STA staff recommends opposition to proposed funding cuts to California Amtrak operations.

The Consortium and STA Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) recommended approval of this item at their September 28<sup>th</sup> meetings.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to distribute the STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform for a 30-day review and comment period; and
2. Oppose funding cuts to California Amtrak operations as proposed in the Transportation Housing and Urban Development (THUD) Subcommittee 2012 appropriations bill.

Attachments:

- A. STA Legislative Matrix
- B. State Legislative Update – September
- C. Federal Legislative Update - September
- D. STA's Draft 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform
  1. Version with Tracked Changes (Redline)
  2. Version with Accepted Proposed Changes (without Redline)
- E. CCJPA Letter re Amtrak Funding

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 57</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Beall D</u></a></p> <p>Metropolitan Transportation Commission.</p>	<p>SENATE TRANS &amp; HOUSING 2-YEAR BILL</p>	<p>The Metropolitan Transportation Commission Act creates the Metropolitan Transportation Commission as a regional agency in the 9-county San Francisco Bay Area with comprehensive regional transportation planning and other related responsibilities. Existing law requires the commission to consist of 19 members, including 2 members each from the Counties of Alameda and Santa Clara, and establishes a 4-year term of office for members of the commission. This bill would, instead, require the commission to consist of 21 members, including one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of Oakland and one member appointed by the Mayor of the City of San Jose. The bill would require the initial term of those 2 members to end in February 2015. The bill would, effective with the commission term commencing February 2015, prohibit more than 3 members of the commission from being residents of the same county, as specified<b>Last Amended on 5/19/2011</b></p>	<p><b>Support</b> <b>5/11/11</b></p>
<p><a href="#"><u>AB 105</u></a> <b>Committee on Budget</b></p> <p>Transportation.</p>	<p>CHAPTERED 3/24/2011 – Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 6, Statutes of 2011</p>	<p>Existing law provides for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account and revenue in the Public Transportation Account, and requires the Controller to make specified transfers of revenues in that regard to the Transportation Debt Service Fund. Existing law, pursuant to the Budget Act of 2010, provides for a loan of \$761,639,000 from gasoline excise tax revenue in the Highway Users Tax Account to the General Fund, to be repaid with interest by June 30, 2013. This bill, in fiscal years 2010-11 and 2011-12, would require the Controller to transfer specified amounts of revenues deposited in the State Highway Account from vehicle weight fees to the Transportation Debt Service Fund to be used for reimbursement of the General Fund for payment of current general obligation bond debt service for specified voter-approved transportation bonds, in lieu of the previously authorized gasoline excise tax revenues and Public Transportation Account revenues. In subsequent years, the bill would require all vehicle weight fee revenues to be transferred for this purpose. The bill would make appropriations in this regard. The bill would require the Department of Finance to notify the Controller of the amount of debt service relating to expenditures for eligible mass transit guideway projects that may be paid from revenues restricted by Article XIX of the California Constitution. <b>Last Amended on 3/16/2011</b></p>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#">AB 147</a> <a href="#">Dickinson D</a>  Subdivisions.	CHAPTERED 9/6/2011 - Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 228, Statutes of 2011	The Subdivision Map Act authorizes a local agency to require the payment of fees, to be used for various purposes, as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit, including, among others, for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing bridges or major thoroughfares if specified conditions are met. The Mitigation Fee Act authorizes a local agency to charge a variety of fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions in connection with the approval of a development project, as defined. This bill would authorize a local ordinance to require payment of a fee subject to the Mitigation Fee Act, as a condition of approval of a final map or as a condition of issuing a building permit for purposes of defraying the actual or estimated cost of constructing transportation facilities, as defined. <b>Last Amended on 5/31/2011</b>	
<a href="#">AB 516</a> <a href="#">V. Manuel Pérez D</a>  Safe routes to school.	CHAPTERED Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 277, Statutes of 2011	Existing law requires the Department of Transportation, in consultation with the California Highway Patrol, to establish and administer a "Safe Routes to School" program for construction of bicycle and pedestrian safety and traffic calming projects, and to award grants to local agencies in that regard from available federal and state funds, based on the results of a statewide competition. Existing law requires the department to rate proposals submitted by applicants using specified factors. One of the factors relates to consultation and support for projects by school-based organizations, local traffic engineers, local elected officials, law enforcement agencies, school officials, and other relevant community stakeholders. This bill would delete that factor and instead substitute a factor relating to use of a specified public participation process, with involvement by the public, schools, parents, teachers, local agencies, the business community, key professionals, and others, which process identifies community priorities, ensures those priorities are reflected in the proposal, and secures support for the proposal by relevant community stakeholders. The bill would add another factor relating to benefit of a proposal to a low-income school, as defined, and would make other related changes. <b>Last Amended on 7/14/2011</b>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">AB 650</a> <a href="#">Blumenfield D</a></p> <p>Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century.</p>	<p>VETOED 9/26/2011 - Vetoed by the Governor</p>	<p>Existing law establishes various boards and commissions within state government. Existing law establishes various transit districts and other local entities for development of public transit on a regional basis and makes various state revenues available to those entities for those purposes. Existing law declares that the fostering, continuance, and development of public transportation systems are a matter of statewide concern. The Public Transportation Account is designated as a trust fund and funds in the account shall be available only for specified transportation planning and mass transportation purposes. This bill would establish, until March 30, 2013, the Blue Ribbon Task Force on Public Transportation for the 21st Century. The bill would require the task force to be comprised of 12 members and would require the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly to each appoint 6 specified members, by January 31, 2012. The bill would require the task force to elect one of its nonlegislative members as chair. The bill would require the task force to issue a written report that contains specified findings and recommendations relating to, among other things, the current state of California's transit system, the estimated cost of creating the needed system over various terms, and potential sources of funding to sustain the transit system's needs, and to submit the report by September 30, 2012, to the Governor, the Legislature, the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, the Senate Committee on Rules, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the transportation committees of the Legislature. The bill would require the task force, for purposes of collecting information for the written report, to consult with appropriate state agencies and departments and would require the task force to contract with consultants for preparation of the report. The bill would require the Department of Transportation to provide administrative staffing to the task force. The bill would appropriate \$750,000 from the Public Transportation Account to the department, as specified, to accomplish the purposes of these provisions. <b>Last Amended on 8/15/2011</b></p>	
<p><a href="#">AB 710</a> <a href="#">Skinner D</a></p> <p>Local planning: infill and transit-oriented development.</p>	<p>SENATE THIRD READING 9/9/2011 - Read third time. Refused passage. (Ayes 18. Noes 19. Page 2474.).</p>	<p>The Planning and Zoning Law requires specified regional transportation planning agencies to prepare and adopt a regional transportation plan directed at achieving a coordinated and balanced regional transportation system, and requires the regional transportation plan to include, among other things, a sustainable communities strategy, for the purpose of using local planning to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. This bill would state the findings and declarations of the Legislature with respect to parking requirements and infill and transit-oriented development, and would state the intent of the Legislature to reduce unnecessary government regulation and to reduce the cost of development by eliminating excessive minimum parking requirements for infill and transit-oriented development. This bill would also express a legislative finding and declaration that its provisions shall apply to all cities, including charter cities. <b>Last Amended on 8/18/2011</b></p>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">AB 845</a> <a href="#">Ma D</a></p> <p>Transportation: bond funds.</p>	<p>SENATE INACTIVE FILE</p>	<p>Existing law, the Safe, Reliable High-Speed Passenger Train Bond Act for the 21st Century, provides for the issuance of \$9.95 billion in general obligation bonds for high-speed rail and related purposes, including \$950 million to be allocated by the California Transportation Commission to eligible recipients for capital improvements to intercity and commuter rail lines and urban rail transit systems in connection with or otherwise related to the high-speed train system. Of this amount, 80% is to be allocated to eligible commuter and urban rail recipients based on track miles, vehicle miles, and passenger trips pursuant to guidelines to be adopted by the commission. A dollar-for-dollar match is to be provided by a commuter and urban rail recipient for bond funds received. This bill would require the guidelines adopted by the commission to determine the funding share for each eligible commuter and urban rail recipient to use the distribution factors gathered from the 2007 Data Tables of the National Transit Database of the Federal Transit Administration. The bill would require the commission to accept from each eligible recipient a priority list of projects up to the target amount expected to be available for the recipient and would require matching funds provided by the recipient to be from nonstate funds. The bill would define "nonstate matching funds" for purposes of these bond fund allocations to mean local, federal, and private funds, as well as state funds available to an eligible recipient that are not subject to allocation by the commission. <b>Last Amended on 5/10/2011</b></p>	
<p><a href="#">AB 892</a> <a href="#">Carter D</a></p> <p>Department of Transportation: environmental review process: federal pilot program.</p>	<p>GOVERNOR'S DESK</p>	<p>Existing law gives the Department of Transportation full possession and control of the state highway system. Existing federal law requires the United States Secretary of Transportation to carry out a surface transportation project delivery pilot program, under which the participating states assume certain responsibilities for environmental review and clearance of transportation projects that would otherwise be the responsibility of the federal government. Existing law requires the department to submit a report to the Legislature regarding state and federal environmental review. Existing law requires the report to be submitted no later than January 1, 2009, and again, no later than January 1, 2011. This bill would, instead, require the report to be submitted no later than January 1, 2016. The bill would provide that the state shall remain liable for any decisions made or responsibilities assumed prior to repeal of these provisions under applicable federal statutes of limitation for filing citizens' suits in federal courts. <b>Last Amended on 7/13/2011</b></p>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<a href="#"><u>AB 1097</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Skinner D</u></a>  Transit projects: domestic content.	GOVERNOR'S DESK.	Existing law provides various sources of funding for transit projects. This bill would specifically authorize the state or a local agency, relative to the use of federal funds for transit purposes, to provide a bidding preference to a bidder if the bidder exceeds Buy America requirements applicable to federally funded transit projects, as specified. <b>Last Amended on 8/29/2011</b>	
<a href="#"><u>AB 1164</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Gordon D</u></a>  Federal transportation funds.	GOVERNOR'S DESK	This bill authorizes, until September 30, 2015, the Department of Transportation to make loans of federal funds deposited in the State Highway Account to advance projects funded by Proposition 1B. The bill will also allow Caltrans at the end of the federal fiscal year, to commit any unobligated federal funds that the state would be at risk of losing to unfunded, but read-to-go, bond projects. In addition, if other states forfeit federal funds, California will be in a position to claim them, under the provisions of federal law. <b>Last amended on 8/15/11</b>	
<a href="#"><u>AB 1229</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Feuer D</u></a>  Transportation: financing: federal highway grant anticipation notes.	SENATE APPROPS- 2 YEAR BILL	Existing law continuously appropriates the amounts specified in the annual Budget Act as having been deposited in the State Highway Account from federal transportation funds, and pledged by the California Transportation Commission, to the Treasurer for the purposes of issuing federal highway grant anticipation notes, commonly known as GARVEE bonds, to fund transportation projects selected by the commission. Existing law prohibits the Treasurer from authorizing the issuance of the notes if the annual repayment obligations of all outstanding notes in any fiscal year would exceed 15% of the total amount of federal transportation funds deposited in the account for any consecutive 12-month period within the preceding 24 months. This bill authorizes a transportation planning agency to use federal regional surface transportation program (RSTP) funds and congestion mitigation and air quality (CMAQ) funds, to pay the debt service on federal grant anticipation revenue vehicles (GARVEEs). <b>Last amended on 6/21/2011</b>	
<a href="#"><u>AJR 5</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Lowenthal, D</u></a>  Transportation revenues.	CHAPTERED 6/8/2011 - Chaptered by the Secretary of State, Chapter Number 29, Statutes of 2011	This measure would request the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and enact legislation to conduct a study regarding the feasibility of the collection process for a transportation revenue source based on vehicle miles traveled, in order to facilitate the creation of a reliable and steady transportation funding mechanism for the maintenance and improvement of surface transportation infrastructure. <b>Last Amended on 3/29/2011</b>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#">SB 211</a> <a href="#">Emmerson R</a></p> <p>California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: tire inflation regulation.</p>	VETOED	<p>The California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 designates the State Air Resources Board as the state agency charged with monitoring and regulating sources of emissions of greenhouse gases. The state board is required to adopt a statewide greenhouse gas emissions limit equivalent to the statewide greenhouse gas emissions level in 1990 to be achieved by 2020, and to adopt rules and regulations in an open public process to achieve the maximum technologically feasible and cost-effective greenhouse gas emission reductions. A violation of a regulation adopted by the state board pursuant to the act is subject to specified civil and criminal penalties. Pursuant to the act, the state board adopted a regulation requiring automobile service providers, by September 1, 2010, among other things, to check and inflate vehicle tires to the recommended pressure rating when performing automobile maintenance or repair services. This bill, until January 1, 2017, would require a tire pressure gauge used to meet the requirements of this regulation to be accurate within a range of plus or minus 2 pounds per square inch of pressure (2 psi). The bill, until January 1, 2017, would authorize automotive service providers to meet the requirements of the regulation without checking and inflating a vehicle's tire if that tire is determined to be an unsafe tire, as defined. <b>Last Amended on 8/16/2011</b></p>	
<p><a href="#">SB 582</a> <a href="#">Yee D</a></p> <p>Commute benefit policies.</p>	VETOED	<p>Existing law requires transportation planning agencies to undertake various transportation planning activities, including preparation of a regional transportation plan. Existing law requires transportation planning agencies that are designated under federal law as metropolitan planning organizations to include a sustainable communities strategy as part of the regional transportation plan for their region. Existing law creates air quality management districts and air pollution control districts with various responsibilities relative to reduction of air pollution. This bill, beginning on January 1, 2013, subject to certain exceptions, would authorize a metropolitan planning organization jointly with the local air quality management district or air pollution control district to adopt a commute benefit ordinance that requires covered employers operating within the common area of the organization and district with a specified number of covered employees to offer those employees certain commute benefits. The bill would require that the ordinance specify certain matters, including any consequences for noncompliance, and would impose a specified reporting requirement. The bill would provide for the 8 metropolitan planning organizations within the region served by a specified air district to adopt the ordinance only after the district first acts to adopt the ordinance. The bill would exclude from its provisions an air district with a trip reduction regulation initially adopted prior to the federal Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 as long as it continues to have a regulation that allows trip reduction as a method of compliance. The bill would make its provisions inoperative on January 1, 2017. <b>Last Amended on 7/7/2011</b></p>	

Bill ID/Topic	Location	Summary	Position
<p><a href="#"><u>SB 867</u></a> <a href="#"><u>Padilla D</u></a></p> <p>Build California Bonds.</p>	<p>SENATE TRANS. &amp; HOUSING. 2 YEAR BILL</p>	<p>Existing law creates the California Transportation Financing Authority with specified powers and duties relative to the issuance of bonds to fund transportation projects to be backed, in whole or in part, by various revenue streams of transportation funds and toll revenues in order to increase the construction of new capacity or improvements for the state transportation system. This bill would, in addition, provide for the authority to issue Build California Bonds, the proceeds of which would be used for specified transportation capital improvements. Bondholders would be entitled to nonrefundable tax credits against their personal income tax or corporate tax liability. The bonds would not be a debt or liability of the state or a political subdivision of the state, except for the authority. The bill would provide for the authority to enter into financing agreements with participating local transportation authorities for the purpose of financing or refinancing transportation projects. Each series of bonds issued by the authority would be secured by a financing agreement between the authority and the local transportation authority. The bill would limit the principal amount of bonds to be issued by the authority under these provisions to \$5 billion over a 5-year period commencing January 1, 2012.</p>	

This page intentionally left blank.



**SHAW/YODER/ANTWIH, inc.**  
 LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY • ASSOCIATION MANAGEMENT

September 28, 2011

TO: Board Members, Solano Transportation Authority  
 FROM: Gus Khouri, Legislative Advocate  
 Shaw / Yoder / Antwih, Inc.

**RE: STATE LEGISLATIVE UPDATE- SEPTEMBER**

The legislature completed its business and adjourned Session for the year on September 9<sup>th</sup>. Governor Brown had until October 10<sup>th</sup> to sign or veto legislation. Barring a Special Session, the legislature will not reconvene until January. The following is a list of issues of interest to the Authority that we have been monitoring over the course of the final weeks.

**Regional Fee Proposal**

In 2010, the Senate's original version of a "gas tax swap" bill included a set of provisions authorizing regional transportation planning entities to conduct an election, to raise a fee on gasoline (by majority vote), for purposes of implementing SB 375 (Steinberg). At the time, the STA board debated that specific proposal, and ultimately decided that it would be supportive if the funding was intended to supplement rather than supplant state funding. The proposal was however an attempt to devolve responsibility for transit funding to the regional level and essentially abdicate the state's role in provide funding directly to transit operators. In essence, the proposal did attempt to supplant rather than supplement funding for public transportation and would have been perilous considering the voter requirement to retain funding.

The final "gas tax swap" package (AB 6 and 9, 8<sup>th</sup> Extraordinary Session) however, did *not* contain the regional fee idea, and although it ultimately eliminated three of the four major tax revenue streams historically flowing to the Public Transportation Account (PTA) in order to create capacity to pay for transportation bond debt service, it retained and enhanced the sales tax on diesel fuel – which supports a State Transit Assistance (STA) program at historic funding levels.

We were recently notified by the Senate pro Tempore's office about an effort to revisit the regional fee issue through SB 791 (Steinberg) in order to provide supplemental funding to both highway and transit programs. The concept of the bill would authorize a Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), subject to receiving majority voter approval from the voters within its jurisdiction, to impose a regional congestion reduction charge on vehicle fuel to fund transportation improvements necessary to reduce vehicular traffic congestion within the MPO's region.

The legislation requires that projects adopted in the regional transportation plan be funded and directly provide a benefit to the motorist within the region. Local streets and roads, transit operations, bicycle and pedestrian programs and SHOPP projects would be among the list of eligible expenditures. It is apparently written to comply with the provisions of Proposition 26 in order to tab the proceeds as a fee rather than a tax. Due to a lack of consensus with the Assembly, Senator Steinberg stopped his pursuit of the regional fee proposal and subsequently amended SB 791 to address a non-transportation related issue.

### **Federal Gas Tax Expiration/Extension**

Congressional leaders struck a deal on September 10<sup>th</sup> to extend temporarily the expiring laws governing the nation's highways and airways at roughly their current funding levels.

H.R. 2887 will authorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration through January and surface transportation laws through March. Highway programs would be funded at the fiscal 2011 rate — \$41.7 billion — far above the \$27 billion approved in their budget earlier this year. Because the extension is for six months and not a full year, the actual amount authorized is half of the fiscal 2011 level. The FAA would get about \$5.4 billion for the four-month period beginning in October and ending Jan. 31.

Without action, authorization for both highway and aviation programs would have expired at the end September, and both President Barack Obama and members of Congress warned that scenario could cost hundreds of thousands of jobs.

House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-Fla.) secured an agreement from GOP leaders to find revenue later to ensure that the money spent from the highway trust fund on the short-term extension does not leave him without the funds necessary to win approval of a long-term reauthorization of surface transportation laws next year.

The bill includes the following:

- \$27 billion for highway refurbishment, passenger and freight rail, distributed through formula
- \$6 billion in capital projects to modernize fixed guideway systems and to replace and rehabilitate bus and bus facilities
- \$5 billion in competitive grants across all modes with significant national or regional impact
- \$4 billion to improve intercity passenger rail and to develop new high-speed passenger rail corridors
- \$3 billion for transit capital projects, with a particular emphasis on new buses and existing bus and rail rehabilitation
- \$2 billion for Amtrak capital improvements
- \$2 billion for airport improvement grants
- \$1 billion for the transition to a satellite air traffic control system

The enactment of the legislation averted a major crisis for transportation funding for California. Currently, the federal gas tax is 18.4 cents per gallon, of which 4.3 cents is permanent, but 14.1 cents is tied to reauthorization of the program.

Had Congress not taken action, California has statute under Rev & Tax Code Section 7360 which authorizes an immediate backfill in the event that the federal gas tax is reduced or eliminated, but, it was enacted in 1989, prior to later increases in the federal tax rate. Therefore, the state backfill is limited to 9 cents per gallon, rather than the additional 9 cents that was realized as a result of the passage of Proposition 111 (1990).

A similar issue exists with the federal diesel tax, which is 24.4 cents per gallon, of which 4.3 cents is permanent; 20.1 cents is at risk in the face of failure to reauthorize. State law authorizes a backfill of 20.1 cents per gallon of the federal diesel tax.

Caltrans however believes that current law (Section 7360 of the Rev and Tax Code) contains a trigger that is too narrowly drafted. As a result, it would not protect the state from a loss of federal revenue unless the precise conditions in that statute are met (i.e., federal excise tax is reduced below nine cents and federal transportation funding to the state is reduced or eliminated). State legislation by a 2/3 vote would have been necessary had the federal transportation bill not been approved.

Caltrans also pointed out that it would probably take six months for the state to receive any replacement revenue from the increased state excise tax that BOE would put into place. There are similar sections in the Rev and Tax Code that apply to the federal excise tax on diesel.

This page intentionally left blank.

## M E M O R A N D U M

September 29, 2011

To: Solano Transportation Authority  
From: Akin Gump Strauss Hauer and Feld LLP  
Re: September Report

During the month of September we have monitored transportation developments of interest to the Solano Transportation Authority. We also updated the list of potential grant opportunities.

**Continuing Resolution**

On September 29, 2011, the House of Representatives approved a continuing resolution (CR) that will fund the government until October 4, averting a government shutdown on October 1. The Senate passed the bill on September 26. At the same time the Senate passed the short term CR, it passed a longer term CR through November 18. The longer term CR would fund the government at the level reflected in the budget ceiling agreement (\$1.043 trillion in fiscal year 2012 spending).

The House will consider a longer term CR next week. Some conservative House Republicans oppose the spending levels in the Senate bill even though the funding is consistent with the budget ceiling agreement because it exceeds the spending caps adopted in the fiscal year 2012 House budget resolution.

**Fiscal Year 2012 Appropriations**

On September 22, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved a bill to provide \$109.5 billion in spending for fiscal year 2012 transportation and housing programs. The bill funds the highway and transit program in line with current spending (\$49.4 billion - \$41.1 billion for highways and \$8.3 billion for transit). The transportation bill approved by the House Appropriations Committee in contrast provides only \$34.5 billion for highway and transit programs (\$27.7 billion for highways and \$6.8 for mass transit).

The Senate bill included \$550 million for the TIGER grant program for projects of national and regional significance. It also includes \$25 million for transit energy efficiency grants (TIGGER) and \$100 million for high speed rail grants. The House transportation appropriations bill did not include funding for the TIGER, TIGGER, or high speed rail.

The Senate bill would provide \$90 million under HUD's Community Development fund for sustainable community planning grants. No funding was provided in the House or Senate for DOT's livable communities grants.

The Senate bill does not include the language proposed by the House to end federal subsidies for Amtrak operations that receive state operating assistance. The Senate transportation appropriations bill would fund Amtrak operating subsidies at \$544 million, down from \$562 million in fiscal year 2011. The House bill would provide \$227 million for operating grants.

### **Surface Transportation Reauthorization**

The House Republican leadership recently advised House Transportation and Infrastructure Chair John Mica (R-FL) that they would work with him to identify offsets to support a six-year transportation reauthorization bill at current funding levels. The leadership has ruled out a gas tax increase and, therefore, must identify an additional \$15 billion annually to supplement estimated gas tax revenue. An agreement on the offsets would be necessary to support the higher funding levels. In a September 15 speech before the Washington Economic Club, House Speaker John Boehner (R-OH) suggested that expanded offshore oil and gas leasing could be tied to infrastructure spending. He did not elaborate on the plan, which would be met with opposition in the Senate.

Assuming the House can identify the offsets to support additional transportation spending, the House and Senate will be closer to agreement on reauthorization. Senate Environment and Public Works Committee Chair Barbara Boxer (D-CA) has proposed a two-year bill with \$109 billion in spending, which would equal current spending levels adjusted for inflation. Under the latest extension, legislators have until March 30, 2012 to pass a reauthorization of the bill.

### **Bills Introduced**

Members of Congress continue to introduce bills to make reforms to transportation programs that may be offered as amendments to the reauthorization bill.

On September 22, Sen. Robert Menendez introduced *The Livable Communities Act* (S 1621), which would formally authorize the Office of Sustainable Housing and Communities at HUD and its Regional Planning and Community Challenge grant programs. The bill would also create a loan program for infrastructure improvements (streetscape, utilities) in preparation for transit oriented development.

On September 13, Sen. Sherrod Brown (D-OH) introduced his proposal to create an infrastructure bank (*The National Infrastructure Bank Act*, S. 1550). The bank would provide loans and loan guarantees while leveraging private sources for projects of regional and national

importance, such as the overhaul of the Brent Spence Bridge, which carries interstate highway traffic over the Ohio River.

On September 14, Rep. Randy Forbes (R-VA) introduced *The 414 Plan Act* (H.R. 2924), named for the 414 days that it took to construct a bridge to replace the I-35W bridge in Minneapolis, Minnesota, that collapsed resulting in the deaths of 13 motorists. The bill would suspend federal regulations for five years that do not pertain to the safety or durability of highway facilities, or public and workplace safety. Along with the five year suspension, the bill would repeal the Protection of Nonmotorized Transportation Traffic Requirement [23 USC 109(m)], the Transportation Enhancement Allocation [23 USC 133(d)(2)] and the Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways Authorizations and Requirements (23 USC 217) and planning requirements related to pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities.

On September 7, Rep. Gregory Meeks (D-NY) introduced *The Putting America Back to Work Act* (H.R. 2862). The bill would offer a tax cut to corporations to repatriate overseas profits to the United States at a reduced tax rate (fifteen percent) and re-invest the new tax revenue in a Jobs Fund to finance infrastructure projects, including roads, bridges, tunnels, and transit.

On September 22, Rep. Ande Carson (D-IN) introduced three bills to improve transit services. *The Modernizing Public Transit Act* (H.R. 3019) would require that DOT consider population density, land use, proposed land use, and local development goals along the project corridor and connecting corridors and estimated reductions in transit times for passengers of the existing transit system in approving grant agreements for new starts and small starts projects. *The Community Transit Promotion Act* (H.R. 3021) would amend authorizing legislation for the Job Access and Reverse Commute Formula Grants and the New Freedom Program to increase the percentage of funds allowable for operating costs from 50 to 80 percent. *The Protecting Transit Through Increased Flexibility Act* (H.R. 3022) would allow transit agencies to use a greater portion of formula grants for operating costs.

This page intentionally left blank.

Updated 9/30/2011 7:18 AM



# Solano Transportation Authority

## 2011 DRAFT 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform

(Adopted by STA Board For Review by STA Board 12/8/10 10/12/11)

### LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

- ~~1.~~ 1. Pursue federal funding for the following priority projects and ~~transit~~ ~~services~~ programs:

#### Roadway/Highway:

##### Tier 1:

I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange

Jepson Parkway

##### Tier 2:

I-80 Westbound Truck Scales

I-80 Express Lanes

#### Transit Centers:

##### Tier 1:

Fairfield Transportation Center Expansion

Vallejo Transit Center at Curtola and Lemon, Phase 1

Vacaville Transit Center, Phase 2

##### Tier 2:

Fairfield/Vacaville Multimodal Train Station, Phase 2

Vallejo Transit Center (Downtown) Parking Structure

Dixon Intermodal Station

#### Climate Change/Alternative Fuels

#### Safe Routes to School

#### Mobility Management

2. Monitor and support, as appropriate, legislative proposals to increase funding for transportation infrastructure, operations and maintenance in Solano County.

~~New Authorization in surface transportation legislation~~

~~I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange (Phase 2)~~

~~Jepson Parkway Project~~

~~Vacaville Intermodal Station (Phase 2)~~

~~Appropriations as proposed for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2012~~

~~Dixon Intermodal/B Street Pedestrian Undercrossing (SR2S)~~

~~Curtola Transit Center (Phase 1)~~

~~Fairfield/Vacaville Multimodal Train Station~~

- ~~2. Monitor and support, as appropriate, legislative proposals to increase funding for transportation infrastructure, operations and maintenance in Solano County.~~

3. 3. Seek/sponsor legislation in support of initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County.

4. Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides low cost financing for transportation projects.
5. Sponsor legislation that makes needed technical corrections to the statute enacted pursuant to the Solano Transportation Authority's (STA) 2009 sponsored bill providing eligibility for the STA to directly claim the share of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds available to cities in the county and the county, and authorizing the STA to claim State Transit Assistance program funds directly from MTC.

~~3.~~

~~4.~~ Oppose efforts to reduce or divert funding from transportation projects.

~~6.~~

~~5.~~

~~6.~~ Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures.

~~7.~~

~~7.~~

~~8.~~ Support establishment of regional Express Lanes network (~~High Occupancy Toll~~) with assurance that revenues collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate.

~~8.~~

~~9.~~

~~10.~~ Support or sponsor Express Lanes on the I-80 Corridor in coordination with the regional express lanes network, or as a demo project if the regional express lanes network legislation is unsuccessful or does not provide the flexibility of the I-80 corridor working group to determine the expenditure plans for the corridor.

~~11.~~

9. Monitor and participate in the implementation of state climate change legislation, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act and SB 375. Participate in the development of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and ensure that locally-beneficial projects and programs are contained in the SCS. Support the funding and development of a program to support transportation needs for agricultural and open space lands as part of the SCS.

~~12.~~ Monitor the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, including the development and issuance of implementing rules by the California Air Resources Board and the State Office of Planning and Research.

~~13.~~

~~14.~~ Monitor implementation of SB 375 (Steinberg), including establishment of regional emission reduction targets. Participate in the development of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and ensure that local initiatives are included as part of the development of regional SCS.

~~15.~~

~~16.~~10. Monitor proposals and, where appropriate, support efforts to exempt projects funded by local voter-approved funding mechanisms from the provisions of SB 375 (Steinberg).

~~17.~~ Support legislation to finance cost effective conversion of public transit fleets to alternative fuels and/or to retrofit existing fleets with latest emission technologies.

~~18.~~

~~19.~~ 11. Support efforts to protect and preserve funding in the Public Transportation Account (PTA) ~~base, Prop. 42 and secure spillover funds to transit.~~

~~Monitor any new bridge toll proposals, support the implementation of projects funded by bridge tolls in and/or benefitting Solano County.~~

~~Support federal and state legislation framed by California Consensus Principles (Item XIII, Attachment A).~~

12. Support federal and state legislation framed by California Consensus Principles (Item XIII, Attachment A), and that provides funding for movement of goods along corridors (i.e. I-80, SR 12, Capitol Corridor) and facilities (i.e., Cordelia Truck Scales).

~~20.~~ 13. Oppose efforts to eliminate the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funding program and support maintaining current levels of TE funding for transportation projects in Solano County.

## LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

### I. Alternative Modes (Bicycles, HOV, Livable Communities, Ridesharing)

1. Support legislation promoting bicycling and bicycle facilities as a commuter option.
2. Support legislation providing land use incentives in connection with rail and multimodal transit stations – Transit Oriented Development.
3. Support legislation and regional policy that provide qualified Commuter Carpools and Vanpools with reduced tolls on toll facilities as an incentive to encourage and promote ridesharing.
4. Support legislation that increases employers' opportunities to offer commuter incentives.
5. Support legislative and regulatory efforts to ensure that projects from Solano County cities are eligible for federal, state and regional funding of Transportation Oriented Development (Transit Oriented Development) projects, ~~including Proposition 1C funds~~. Ensure that development and transit standards for TOD projects can be reasonably met by developing suburban communities.
6. Support establishment of regional Express Lanes network ~~(High Occupancy Toll)~~ with assurance that revenues collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate. (Priority #68)
  - ~~1.~~ Support or sponsor Express Lanes on the I-80 Corridor in coordination with the regional express lane network, or as a demo project if the regional express lane network legislation is unsuccessful or does not provide the flexibility of the I-80 corridor working group to determine the expenditure plans for the corridor. (Priority #7)

~~Support federal legislation that authorizes funding for livable communities projects and programs.~~

## II. Climate Change/Air Quality

- ~~1. Monitor the implementation of the 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).~~
1. Monitor implementation of federal attainment plans for pollutants in the Bay Area and Sacramento air basins, including ozone and particulate matter attainment plans. Work with MTC and SACOG to ensure consistent review of projects in the two air basins.
- ~~2. Monitor the implementation of the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, including the development and issuance of implementing rules by the California Air Resources Board and the State Office of Planning and Research. (Priority #8)~~
- ~~3.~~
2. Monitor and participate in the implementation of state climate change legislation, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act and SB 375. Participate in the development of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and ensure that locally-beneficial projects and programs are contained in the SCS. Support the funding and development of a program to support transportation needs for agricultural and open space lands as part of the SCS. (Priority #9)

~~Monitor implementation of SB 375 (Steinberg), including establishment of regional emission reduction targets. Ensure that local Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCS) are included as part of the development of regional SCS. (Priority #9)~~

~~Monitor proposals and, where appropriate, support efforts to exempt projects funded by local voter-approved funding mechanisms from the provisions of SB 375 (Steinberg). (Priority #10)~~
3. Monitor proposals and, where appropriate, support efforts to exempt projects funded by local voter-approved funding mechanisms from the provisions of SB 375 (Steinberg). (Priority #10)
4. Support legislation, which ensures that any fees imposed to reduce vehicle miles traveled, or to control mobile source emissions, are used to support transportation programs that provide congestion relief or benefit air quality.
5. Support legislation providing infrastructure for low, ultra-low and zero emission vehicles.
- ~~6. Monitor and comment on regulations regarding diesel fuel exhaust particulates and alternative fuels.~~
- ~~7.~~
- ~~8.6.~~ Support policies that improve and streamline the environmental review process to minimize conflicts between transportation and air quality requirements.

~~9.7.~~ Support legislation that allows for air emission standards appropriate for infill development linked to transit centers and/or in designated Priority Development Areas. Allow standards that tolerate higher levels of particulates and other air pollutants in exchange for allowing development supported by transit that reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

~~40.8.~~ Monitor energy policies and alternative fuel legislation or regulation that may affect fleet vehicle requirements for mandated use of alternative fuels.

~~44.9.~~ Support legislation to provide funding for innovative, intelligent/advanced transportation and air quality programs, which relieve congestion, improve air quality and enhance economic development.

~~42.10.~~ Support legislation to finance cost effective conversion of public transit fleets to alternative fuels and/or to retrofit existing fleets with latest emission technologies.  
(Priority #11)

~~43.11.~~ Support income tax benefits or incentives that encourage use of alternative fuel vehicles, vanpools and public transit without reducing existing transportation or air quality funding levels.

~~44.12.~~ Support federal climate change legislation that provides funding from, and any revenue generated by, emission dis-incentives or fuel tax increases (e.g. cap and trade programs) to local transportation agencies for transportation purposes.

#### IV. Employee Relations

1. Monitor legislation and regulations affecting labor relations, employee rights, benefits, and working conditions. Preserve a balance between the needs of the employees and the resources of public employers that have a legal fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers.
2. Monitor any legislation affecting workers compensation that impacts employee benefits, control of costs, and, in particular, changes that affect self-insured employers.
3. Monitor legislation affecting the liability of public entities, particularly in personal injury or other civil wrong legal actions.

#### V. Environmental

1. Monitor legislation and regulatory proposals related to management of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, including those that would impact existing and proposed transportation facilities such as State Route 12 and State Route 113.
2. Monitor sea-level rise and climate change in relation to existing and proposed transportation facilities in Solano County.
3. Monitor proposals to designate new species as threatened or endangered under either the federal or state Endangered Species Acts. Monitor proposals to

designate new “critical habitat” in areas that will impact existing and proposed transportation facilities.

4. Monitor the establishment of environmental impact mitigation banks to ensure that they do not restrict reasonably-foreseeable transportation improvements.
5. Monitor legislation and regulations that would impose requirements on highway construction to contain stormwater runoff.

VI. Ferry

1. Protect the existing source of operating and capital support for Vallejo Baylink ferry service, most specifically the Bridge Tolls-Northern Bridge Group “1st and 2nd dollar” revenues which do not jeopardize transit operating funds for Vallejo Transit bus operations.

2. ~~Monitor~~ Support efforts to ensure appropriate levels of service directly between Vallejo and San Francisco.

~~implementation of SB 1093 (Vallejo Baylink Ferry transition to the San Francisco Bay Area Water Emergency Transportation Authority, or WETA) and support efforts to ensure appropriate level of service directly between Vallejo and San Francisco.~~

- 2.3. Monitor surface transportation authorization legislation to ensure adequate funding for ferry capital projects.

VII. Funding

1. Protect Solano County's statutory portions of the state highway and transit funding programs.
2. Seek a fair share for Solano County of any federal and state discretionary funding made available for transportation grants, programs and projects.
3. Sponsor legislation that makes needed technical corrections to the statute enacted pursuant to the Solano Transportation Authority's (STA) 2009 sponsored bill providing eligibility for the STA to directly claim the share of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds available to cities in the county and the county, and authorizing the STA to claim State Transit Assistance program funds directly from MTC. (Priority #5)
- ~~3.4.~~ Protect State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds from use for purposes other than those covered in SB 45 of 1997 (Chapter 622) reforming transportation planning and programming, and support timely allocation of new STIP funds.
- ~~4.5.~~ Support state budget and California Transportation Commission allocation to fully fund projects for Solano County included in the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Comprehensive Transportation Plans of the county.
- ~~5.6.~~ Support efforts to protect and preserve funding in the Public Transportation Account (PTA) ~~base, Prop. 42 and secure spillover funds to transit.~~ (Priority #~~12~~11)
7. Seek/sponsor legislation in support of initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County. (Priority #3)
- ~~6.8.~~ Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides low cost financing for transportation projects in Solano County. (Priority #4)
- ~~7.9.~~ Support measures to restore local government's property tax revenues used for general fund purposes, including road rehabilitation and maintenance.
- ~~8.10.~~ Support legislation to secure adequate budget appropriations for highway, bus, rail, air quality and mobility programs in Solano County.
- ~~9.11.~~ Support initiatives to pursue the 55% or lower voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures. (Priority #~~7~~5)
- ~~10.12.~~ Ensure that fees collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate. (Priority #~~8~~6)
- ~~11.13.~~ Support federal and state legislation framed by California Consensus Principles (Item #XIII, Attachment A) that provides funding for movement of goods along corridors (i.e. I-80, SR 12, Capitol Corridor) and facilities (i.e., Cordelia Truck Scales). (Priority #~~12~~5)

- ~~12.~~14. Support efforts to quickly enact legislation that reauthorizes the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and provides a fair share return of funding to California.
- 15. Support efforts to reauthorize federal transportation policy and funding as framed by California Consensus Principles (Item XIII, Attachment A), focusing efforts on securing funding for high priority regional transportation projects.
- 16. Oppose efforts to eliminate the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funding program and support maintaining current levels of TE funding for transportation projects in Solano County. (Priority # 13)
- ~~13.~~17. Support legislation or the development of administrative policies to allow a program credit for local funds spent on accelerating STIP projects through right-of-way purchases, or environmental and engineering consultant efforts.
- ~~14.~~18. Support or seek legislation to assure a dedicated source of funding, other than the State Highway Account for local streets and roads maintenance and repairs, and for transit operations.
- 19. Monitor the distribution of State and regional transportation demand management funding.
- ~~15.~~20. Monitor any new bridge toll proposals, support the implementation of projects funded by bridge tolls in and/or benefitting Solano County.
- ~~16.~~21. Oppose any proposal that could reduce Solano County's opportunity to receive transportation funds, including diversion of state transportation revenues for other purposes. Fund sources include, but are not limited to, State Highway Account (SHA), Public Transportation Account (PTA), and Transportation Development Act (TDA) and any local ballot initiative raising transportation revenues. (Priority #46)
- ~~17.~~22. Support legislation that encourages multiple stakeholders from multiple disciplines to collaborate with regard to the application for and the awarding of Safe Routes to School grants.

#### VIII. Project Delivery

1. Monitor legislation to encourage the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency to reform administrative procedures to expedite federal review and reduce delays in payments to local agencies and their contractors for transportation project development, right-of-way and construction activities.
2. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms to enhance Caltrans project delivery, such as simultaneous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and engineering studies, design-build authority, and a reasonable level of contracting out of appropriate activities to the private sector.

3. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms that result in cost and/or time savings to environmental clearance processes for transportation projects.
- ~~4.~~ Continue to streamline federal application/reporting/monitoring requirements to ensure efficiency and usefulness of data collected and eliminate unnecessary and/or duplicative requirements.
- ~~4.5.~~ Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides streamlined and economical delivery of transportation projects in Solano County. (Priority #4)

~~IX.~~

~~X.~~

~~XI.~~ Rail

~~2.~~ In partnership with other affected agencies, sponsor making Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority an eligible operator for state transit assistance funds.

~~3.~~

~~4.1.~~ In partnership with other counties located along Capitol Corridor, seek expanded state commitment for funding passenger rail service, whether state or locally administered.

~~5.2.~~ Support legislation and/or budgetary actions to assure a fair share of State revenues of intercity rail (provided by Capitol Corridor) funding for Northern California and Solano County.

~~6.3.~~ Seek legislation to assure that dedicated state intercity rail funding is allocated to the regions administering each portion of the system and assure that funding is distributed on an equitable basis.

~~7.4.~~ Seek funds for the expansion of intercity, and development of regional and commuter rail service connecting Solano County to the Bay Area and Sacramento regions.

~~8.5.~~ Monitor the implementation of the High Speed Rail project.

~~6.~~ Support efforts to fully connect Capitol Corridor trains to the California High Speed Rail system, and ensure access to state and federal high speed rail funds for the Capitol Corridor.

~~9.7.~~ Oppose legislation that would prohibit Amtrak from providing federal funds for any state-supported Intercity Passenger Rail corridor services.

X. Safety

1. Monitor legislation or administrative procedures to streamline the process for local agencies to receive funds for road and levee repair and other flood protection.

2. Monitor implementation of the Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone designation on SR 12 from I-80 in Solano County to I-5 in San Joaquin County, as authorized by AB 112 (Wolk).
3. Support legislation to ~~further~~ adequately fund replacement of at-grade railroad crossings with grade-separated crossings.
4. Support legislation to further fund Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit programs in Solano County.

XI. Transit

1. Protect funding levels for transit by opposing state funding source reduction without substitution of comparable revenue.
2. Support ~~an~~ income tax credit to employers for subsidizing employee transit passes.
3. Support tax benefits and/or incentives for programs to promote the use of public transit.
4. In partnership with other transit agencies, seek strategies to assure public transit receives a fair share of funding for welfare-to-work social services care, and other community-based programs.
5. Monitor efforts to change Federal requirements and regulations regarding the use of federal transit funds for transit operations for rural, small and large Urbanized Areas (UZAs).
6. Support efforts that would minimize the impact of any consolidations of UZAs on Solano County transit agencies.
7. In addition to new bridge tolls, work with MTC to generate new regional transit revenues to support the ongoing operating and capital needs of transit services, including bus, ferry and rail. **(Priority # 13)**
8. In partnership with other affected agencies and local governments seek additional funding for paratransit operations, including service for persons with disabilities and senior citizens.

XII. Movement of Goods

1. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via maritime-related transportation, including the dredging of channels, port locations and freight shipment.
2. Support efforts to mitigate the impacts of additional maritime goods movement on surface transportation facilities.
3. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via rail involvement.

4. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via aviation.
5. Monitor proposals to co-locate freight and/or passenger air facilities at Travis Air Force Base (TAFB), and to ensure that adequate highway and surface street access is provided if such facilities are located at TAFB.
6. Monitor legislation to establish a national freight policy and fund freight-related projects.

### *XIII. Federal New Authorization Policy*

The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission presented a report outlining a new long-term strategic transportation vision to guide transportation policymaking at the national level. The Solano Transportation Authority supports the principles contained in the Commission's "Transportation for Tomorrow," released in January 2008, specifically as summarized below:

#### Recommended Objectives for Reform:

- Increased Public and Private Investment
- Federal Government a Full Partner
- A New Beginning

#### Major Changes Necessary to Accomplish Objectives:

1. The federal program should be performance-driven, outcome-based, generally mode-neutral, and refocused to pursue objective of genuine national interest. The 108 existing surface transportation programs in SAFETEA-LU and related laws should be replaced with the following 10 new federal programs:
  - Rebuilding America – state of good repair
  - Global Competitiveness – gateways and goods movement
  - Metropolitan Mobility – regions greater than 1 million population
  - Connecting America – connections to smaller cities and towns
  - Intercity Passenger Rail and Water Transit – new regional networks in high-growth corridors
  - Highway Safety – incentives to save lives
  - Environmental Stewardship – both human and natural environments
  - Energy Security – development of alternative transportation fuels
  - Federal Lands – providing public access on federal property
  - Research and Development – a coherent national research program

National, state and regional officials and other stakeholders would establish performance standards, develop detailed plans for achievement, and develop detailed cost estimates to create a national surface transportation strategic plan. Only projects called for in the plan would be eligible for federal funding.

2. Congress should establish an independent National Surface Transportation Commission (NASTRAC), modeled after aspects of the Postal Regulatory Commission, the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and state public utility commissions to perform two principal planning and financial functions:
  - a. Oversee various aspects of the development of the outcome-based performance standards.
  - b. Establish a federal share to finance the plan and recommend an increase in the federal fuel tax to fund that share.
3. Project delivery must be reformed by retaining all current environmental safeguards, but significantly shortening the time it takes to complete reviews and obtain permits.

4. Major revenue reform is necessary:
  - a. All levels of government and the private sector must contribute their appropriate shares.
  - b. User financing must be implemented.
  - c. Budgetary protections for the Highway Trust Fund must be put in place.
  - d. Legislation must be passed to keep the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund solvent and prevent highway investment from falling below the levels guaranteed in SAFETEA-LU.

Between 2010 and 2025:

- a. Federal fuel tax should be raised and indexed to the construction cost index.
- b. Federal user-based fees (such as freight fees for goods movement, dedication of a portion of existing customs duties, ticket taxes for passenger rail improvements) should be implemented to help address the funding shortfall.
- c. Congress needs to remove certain barriers to tolling and congestion pricing by modifying the current federal prohibition against tolling on the Interstate System to allow:
  - i. Tolling to fund new capacity, with pricing flexibility to manage its performance.
  - ii. Congestion pricing in metropolitan areas with populations greater than 1 million.
- d. Congress should encourage the use of public-private partnerships to attract additional private investment to the surface transportation system.
- e. State and local governments need to raise motor fuel, motor vehicle, and other related user fees.

Post-2025:

- a. A vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee should be implemented.

Updated 9/30/2011 7:24 AM



## Solano Transportation Authority DRAFT 2012 Legislative Priorities and Platform

*(For Review by STA Board 10/12/11)*

### LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

1. Pursue federal funding for the following priority projects and programs:
  - Roadway/Highway:
    - Tier 1:
      - I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange
      - Jepson Parkway
    - Tier 2:
      - I-80 Westbound Truck Scales
      - I-80 Express Lanes
  - Transit Centers:
    - Tier 1:
      - Fairfield Transportation Center Expansion
      - Vallejo Transit Center at Curtola and Lemon, Phase 1
      - Vacaville Transit Center, Phase 2
    - Tier 2:
      - Fairfield/Vacaville Multimodal Train Station, Phase 2
      - Vallejo Transit Center (Downtown) Parking Structure
      - Dixon Intermodal Station
  - Climate Change/Alternative Fuels
  - Safe Routes to School
  - Mobility Management
2. Monitor and support, as appropriate, legislative proposals to increase funding for transportation infrastructure, operations and maintenance in Solano County.
3. Seek/sponsor legislation in support of initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County.
4. Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides low cost financing for transportation projects.
5. Sponsor legislation that makes needed technical corrections to the statute enacted pursuant to the Solano Transportation Authority's (STA) 2009 sponsored bill providing eligibility for the STA to directly claim the share of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds available to cities in the county and the county, and authorizing the STA to claim State Transit Assistance program funds directly from MTC.
6. Oppose efforts to reduce or divert funding from transportation projects.
7. Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures.

8. Support establishment of regional Express Lanes network with assurance that revenues collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate.
9. Monitor and participate in the implementation of state climate change legislation, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act and SB 375. Participate in the development of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and ensure that locally-beneficial projects and programs are contained in the SCS. Support the funding and development of a program to support transportation needs for agricultural and open space lands as part of the SCS.
10. Monitor proposals and, where appropriate, support efforts to exempt projects funded by local voter-approved funding mechanisms from the provisions of SB 375 (Steinberg).
11. Support efforts to protect and preserve funding in the Public Transportation Account (PTA).
12. Support federal and state legislation framed by California Consensus Principles (Item XIII, Attachment A), and that provides funding for movement of goods along corridors (i.e. I-80, SR 12, Capitol Corridor) and facilities (i.e., Cordelia Truck Scales).
13. Oppose efforts to eliminate the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funding program and support maintaining current levels of TE funding for transportation projects in Solano County.

## LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

### *I. Alternative Modes (Bicycles, HOV, Livable Communities, Ridesharing)*

1. Support legislation promoting bicycling and bicycle facilities as a commuter option.
2. Support legislation providing land use incentives in connection with rail and multimodal transit stations – Transit Oriented Development.
3. Support legislation and regional policy that provide qualified Commuter Carpools and Vanpools with reduced tolls on toll facilities as an incentive to encourage and promote ridesharing.
4. Support legislation that increases employers' opportunities to offer commuter incentives.
5. Support legislative and regulatory efforts to ensure that projects from Solano County cities are eligible for federal, state and regional funding of Transportation Oriented Development (Transit Oriented Development) projects. Ensure that development and transit standards for TOD projects can be reasonably met by developing suburban communities.
6. Support establishment of regional Express Lanes network with assurance that revenues collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate. (*Priority #8*)

## **II. Climate Change/Air Quality**

1. Monitor implementation of federal attainment plans for pollutants in the Bay Area and Sacramento air basins, including ozone and particulate matter attainment plans. Work with MTC and SACOG to ensure consistent review of projects in the two air basins.
2. Monitor and participate in the implementation of state climate change legislation, including the California Global Warming Solutions Act and SB 375. Participate in the development of the Bay Area Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), and ensure that locally-beneficial projects and programs are contained in the SCS. Support the funding and development of a program to support transportation needs for agricultural and open space lands as part of the SCS. (*Priority #9*)
3. Monitor proposals and, where appropriate, support efforts to exempt projects funded by local voter-approved funding mechanisms from the provisions of SB 375 (Steinberg). (*Priority #10*)
4. Support legislation, which ensures that any fees imposed to reduce vehicle miles traveled, or to control mobile source emissions, are used to support transportation programs that provide congestion relief or benefit air quality.
5. Support legislation providing infrastructure for low, ultra-low and zero emission vehicles.
6. Support policies that improve and streamline the environmental review process.
7. Support legislation that allows for air emission standards appropriate for infill development linked to transit centers and/or in designated Priority Development Areas. Allow standards that tolerate higher levels of particulates and other air pollutants in exchange for allowing development supported by transit that reduces greenhouse gas emissions.
8. Monitor energy policies and alternative fuel legislation or regulation that may affect fleet vehicle requirements for mandated use of alternative fuels.
9. Support legislation to provide funding for innovative, intelligent/advanced transportation and air quality programs, which relieve congestion, improve air quality and enhance economic development.
10. Support legislation to finance cost effective conversion of public transit fleets to alternative fuels and/or to retrofit existing fleets with latest emission technologies.
11. Support income tax benefits or incentives that encourage use of alternative fuel vehicles, vanpools and public transit without reducing existing transportation or air quality funding levels.
12. Support federal climate change legislation that provides funding from, and any revenue generated by, emission dis-incentives or fuel tax increases (e.g. cap and trade programs) to local transportation agencies for transportation purposes.

IV. Employee Relations

1. Monitor legislation and regulations affecting labor relations, employee rights, benefits, and working conditions. Preserve a balance between the needs of the employees and the resources of public employers that have a legal fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers.
2. Monitor any legislation affecting workers compensation that impacts employee benefits, control of costs, and, in particular, changes that affect self-insured employers.
3. Monitor legislation affecting the liability of public entities, particularly in personal injury or other civil wrong legal actions.

V. Environmental

1. Monitor legislation and regulatory proposals related to management of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, including those that would impact existing and proposed transportation facilities such as State Route 12 and State Route 113.
2. Monitor sea-level rise and climate change in relation to existing and proposed transportation facilities in Solano County.
3. Monitor proposals to designate new species as threatened or endangered under either the federal or state Endangered Species Acts. Monitor proposals to designate new "critical habitat" in areas that will impact existing and proposed transportation facilities.
4. Monitor the establishment of environmental impact mitigation banks to ensure that they do not restrict reasonably-foreseeable transportation improvements.
5. Monitor legislation and regulations that would impose requirements on highway construction to contain stormwater runoff.

VI. Ferry

1. Protect the existing source of operating and capital support for Vallejo Baylink ferry service, most specifically the Bridge Tolls-Northern Bridge Group "1st and 2nd dollar" revenues which do not jeopardize transit operating funds for Vallejo Transit bus operations.
2. Support efforts to ensure appropriate levels of service directly between Vallejo and San Francisco.
3. Monitor surface transportation authorization legislation to ensure adequate funding for ferry capital projects.

VII. Funding

1. Protect Solano County's statutory portions of the state highway and transit funding programs.
2. Seek a fair share for Solano County of any federal and state discretionary funding made available for transportation grants, programs and projects.
3. Sponsor legislation that makes needed technical corrections to the statute enacted pursuant to the Solano Transportation Authority's (STA) 2009 sponsored bill providing eligibility for the STA to directly claim the share of Transportation Development Act (TDA) funds available to cities in the county and the county, and authorizing the STA to claim State Transit Assistance program funds directly from MTC. *(Priority #5)*
4. Protect State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds from use for purposes other than those covered in SB 45 of 1997 (Chapter 622) reforming transportation planning and programming, and support timely allocation of new STIP funds.
5. Support state budget and California Transportation Commission allocation to fully fund projects for Solano County included in the State Transportation Improvement Program and the Comprehensive Transportation Plans of the county.
6. Support efforts to protect and preserve funding in the Public Transportation Account (PTA). *(Priority #11)*
7. Seek/sponsor legislation in support of initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County. *(Priority #3)*
8. Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides low cost financing for transportation projects in Solano County. *(Priority #4)*
9. Support measures to restore local government's property tax revenues used for general fund purposes, including road rehabilitation and maintenance.
10. Support legislation to secure adequate budget appropriations for highway, bus, rail, air quality and mobility programs in Solano County.
11. Support initiatives to pursue the 55% or lower voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures. *(Priority #7)*
12. Ensure that fees collected for the use of Express Lanes are spent to improve operations and mobility for the corridor in which they originate. *(Priority #8)*
13. Support federal and state legislation framed by California Consensus Principles (Item #XIII, Attachment A) that provides funding for movement of goods along corridors (i.e. I-80, SR 12, Capitol Corridor) and facilities (i.e., Cordelia Truck Scales). *(Priority #12)*

14. Support efforts to quickly enact legislation that reauthorizes the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act – a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), and provides a fair share return of funding to California.
15. Support efforts to reauthorize federal transportation policy and funding as framed by California Consensus Principles (Item XIII, Attachment A), focusing efforts on securing funding for high priority regional transportation projects.
16. Oppose efforts to eliminate the federal Transportation Enhancement (TE) Funding program and support maintaining current levels of TE funding for transportation projects in Solano County. (*Priority # 13*)
17. Support legislation or the development of administrative policies to allow a program credit for local funds spent on accelerating STIP projects through right-of-way purchases, or environmental and engineering consultant efforts.
18. Support or seek legislation to assure a dedicated source of funding, other than the State Highway Account for local streets and roads maintenance and repairs, and for transit operations.
19. Monitor the distribution of State and regional transportation demand management funding.
20. Monitor any new bridge toll proposals, support the implementation of projects funded by bridge tolls in and/or benefitting Solano County.
21. Oppose any proposal that could reduce Solano County's opportunity to receive transportation funds, including diversion of state transportation revenues for other purposes. Fund sources include, but are not limited to, State Highway Account (SHA), Public Transportation Account (PTA), and Transportation Development Act (TDA) and any local ballot initiative raising transportation revenues. (*Priority #6*)
22. Support legislation that encourages multiple stakeholders from multiple disciplines to collaborate with regard to the application for and the awarding of Safe Routes to School grants.

*VIII. Project Delivery*

1. Monitor legislation to encourage the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency to reform administrative procedures to expedite federal review and reduce delays in payments to local agencies and their contractors for transportation project development, right-of-way and construction activities.
2. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms to enhance Caltrans project delivery, such as simultaneous Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and engineering studies, design-build authority, and a reasonable level of contracting out of appropriate activities to the private sector.
3. Support legislation and/or administrative reforms that result in cost and/or time savings to environmental clearance processes for transportation projects.

4. Continue to streamline federal application/reporting/monitoring requirements to ensure efficiency and usefulness of data collected and eliminate unnecessary and/or duplicative requirements.
5. Support legislation that encourages public private partnerships and provides streamlined and economical delivery of transportation projects in Solano County. (*Priority #4*)

IX. Rail

1. In partnership with other counties located along Capitol Corridor, seek expanded state commitment for funding passenger rail service, whether state or locally administered.
2. Support legislation and/or budgetary actions to assure a fair share of State revenues of intercity rail (provided by Capitol Corridor) funding for Northern California and Solano County.
3. Seek legislation to assure that dedicated state intercity rail funding is allocated to the regions administering each portion of the system and assure that funding is distributed on an equitable basis.
4. Seek funds for the expansion of intercity, and development of regional and commuter rail service connecting Solano County to the Bay Area and Sacramento regions.
5. Monitor the implementation of the High Speed Rail project.
6. Support efforts to fully connect Capitol Corridor trains to the California High Speed Rail system, and ensure access to state and federal high speed rail funds for the Capitol Corridor.
7. Oppose legislation that would prohibit Amtrak from providing federal funds for any state-supported Intercity Passenger Rail corridor services.

X. Safety

1. Monitor legislation or administrative procedures to streamline the process for local agencies to receive funds for road and levee repair and other flood protection.
2. Monitor implementation of the Safety Enhancement-Double Fine Zone designation on SR 12 from I-80 in Solano County to I-5 in San Joaquin County, as authorized by AB 112 (Wolk).
3. Support legislation to adequately fund replacement of at-grade railroad crossings with grade-separated crossings.
4. Support legislation to further fund Safe Routes to School and Safe Routes to Transit programs in Solano County.

XI. Transit

1. Protect funding levels for transit by opposing state funding source reduction without substitution of comparable revenue.
2. Support income tax credit to employers for subsidizing employee transit passes.
3. Support tax benefits and/or incentives for programs to promote the use of public transit.
4. In partnership with other transit agencies, seek strategies to assure public transit receives a fair share of funding for welfare-to-work social services care, and other community-based programs.
5. Monitor efforts to change Federal requirements and regulations regarding the use of federal transit funds for transit operations for rural, small and large Urbanized Areas (UZAs).
6. Support efforts that would minimize the impact of any consolidations of UZAs on Solano County transit agencies.
7. In addition to new bridge tolls, work with MTC to generate new regional transit revenues to support the ongoing operating and capital needs of transit services, including bus, ferry and rail.
8. In partnership with other affected agencies and local governments seek additional funding for paratransit operations, including service for persons with disabilities and senior citizens.

XII. Movement of Goods

1. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via maritime-related transportation, including the dredging of channels, port locations and freight shipment.
2. Support efforts to mitigate the impacts of additional maritime goods movement on surface transportation facilities.
3. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via rail involvement.
4. Monitor and support initiatives that augment planning and funding for movement of goods via aviation.
5. Monitor proposals to co-locate freight and/or passenger air facilities at Travis Air Force Base (TAFB), and to ensure that adequate highway and surface street access is provided if such facilities are located at TAFB.
6. Monitor legislation to establish a national freight policy and fund freight-related projects.

### *XIII. Federal New Authorization Policy*

The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission presented a report outlining a new long-term strategic transportation vision to guide transportation policymaking at the national level. The Solano Transportation Authority supports the principles contained in the Commission's "Transportation for Tomorrow," released in January 2008, specifically as summarized below:

#### Recommended Objectives for Reform:

- Increased Public and Private Investment
- Federal Government a Full Partner
- A New Beginning

#### Major Changes Necessary to Accomplish Objectives:

1. The federal program should be performance-driven, outcome-based, generally mode-neutral, and refocused to pursue objective of genuine national interest. The 108 existing surface transportation programs in SAFETEA-LU and related laws should be replaced with the following 10 new federal programs:
  - Rebuilding America – state of good repair
  - Global Competitiveness – gateways and goods movement
  - Metropolitan Mobility – regions greater than 1 million population
  - Connecting America – connections to smaller cities and towns
  - Intercity Passenger Rail and Water Transit – new regional networks in high-growth corridors
  - Highway Safety – incentives to save lives
  - Environmental Stewardship – both human and natural environments
  - Energy Security – development of alternative transportation fuels
  - Federal Lands – providing public access on federal property
  - Research and Development – a coherent national research program

National, state and regional officials and other stakeholders would establish performance standards, develop detailed plans for achievement, and develop detailed cost estimates to create a national surface transportation strategic plan. Only projects called for in the plan would be eligible for federal funding.

2. Congress should establish an independent National Surface Transportation Commission (NASTRAC), modeled after aspects of the Postal Regulatory Commission, the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, and state public utility commissions to perform two principal planning and financial functions:
  - a. Oversee various aspects of the development of the outcome-based performance standards.
  - b. Establish a federal share to finance the plan and recommend an increase in the federal fuel tax to fund that share.
3. Project delivery must be reformed by retaining all current environmental safeguards, but significantly shortening the time it takes to complete reviews and obtain permits.

4. Major revenue reform is necessary:
  - a. All levels of government and the private sector must contribute their appropriate shares.
  - b. User financing must be implemented.
  - c. Budgetary protections for the Highway Trust Fund must be put in place.
  - d. Legislation must be passed to keep the Highway Account of the Highway Trust Fund solvent and prevent highway investment from falling below the levels guaranteed in SAFETEA-LU.

Between 2010 and 2025:

- a. Federal fuel tax should be raised and indexed to the construction cost index.
- b. Federal user-based fees (such as freight fees for goods movement, dedication of a portion of existing customs duties, ticket taxes for passenger rail improvements) should be implemented to help address the funding shortfall.
- c. Congress needs to remove certain barriers to tolling and congestion pricing by modifying the current federal prohibition against tolling on the Interstate System to allow:
  - i. Tolling to fund new capacity, with pricing flexibility to manage its performance.
  - ii. Congestion pricing in metropolitan areas with populations greater than 1 million.
- d. Congress should encourage the use of public-private partnerships to attract additional private investment to the surface transportation system.
- e. State and local governments need to raise motor fuel, motor vehicle, and other related user fees.

Post-2025:

- a. A vehicle miles traveled (VMT) fee should be implemented.



DATE: September 30, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Judy Leaks, Program Manager/Analyst  
RE: Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) Program  
Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Year-End Report

---

**Background:**

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA)'s Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program is funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the purpose of managing countywide and regional rideshare programs in Napa and Solano Counties and providing air quality improvements through trip reduction. Through its programs and promotions with employers and employees, and assistance to commuters and travelers, SNCI addresses Goal 5a of the STA's Comprehensive Transportation Plan, "The Solano CTP will seek to maintain regional mobility while improving local mobility; mobility will be maintained or improved by reducing congestion, whether through more efficient use or expansion of existing systems," and Goal 6b "Promote the maintenance and improvement of a healthy natural environment, with special emphasis on air quality and climate change issues."

The STA Board approved the Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Work Program for the SNCI Program on September 8, 2010 (Attachment A). The Work Program included ten major elements.

1. Customer Service
2. Employer Program
3. Vanpool Program
4. Incentives
5. Emergency Ride Home
6. SNCI Awareness Campaign
7. Bike to Work Campaign
8. Solano Commute Challenge
9. General Marketing
10. Partnerships

**Discussion:**

With the completion of the Fiscal Year, STA staff has prepared the SNCI Program's FY 2010-11 Annual Report for Solano County (Attachment B). A separate report will be prepared for Napa County. The SNCI Program has had an active and productive year in spite of the effects of the regional economic condition. The SNCI Program continues to provide comprehensive personalized customer service to individuals requesting ridesharing services, transit, or bicycle information by phone, internet, or in person.

Events, which included health fairs, business expos, job fairs, farmers markets and community events were staffed by SNCI. Staff stocked display racks with current rideshare and transit information, which included transit information for Vallejo Transit, Baylink Ferry, Benicia Breeze, FAST (Fairfield and Suisun Transit), Vacaville City Coach, Dixon Redit-Ride, Rio Vista Delta Breeze, and Amtrak Capitol Corridor. Staff also coordinated with the Solano Bicycle Advisory Committee to update and reprint the Solano Yolo BikeLinks Map.

Employers throughout Solano and Napa Counties have received a range of employer services. Staff has provided presentations and attended events at employer sites to increase awareness of SNCI services. Staff administered Transportation Surveys and provided density maps that were used to determine the commuting needs at many employer sites. SNCI staff is working with two major employers, State Compensation Insurance Fund and Travis Air Force Base to increase the participation of their employers.

The Emergency Ride Home (ERH) Program has been in operation since January 2006. The objective of this program is to encourage the use of commute alternatives such as carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, walking or bicycling, by providing a free ride home to program participants in cases of emergency. Seven new employers registered for this program this past year. A total of 60 Solano employers are now participating and 350 of their employees are registered.

The 4<sup>th</sup> Annual Solano Commute Challenge was a targeted outreach campaign for Solano County employers to encourage employees to use transit, carpool, vanpool, bike, or walk to work at least 30 times from August to October. 46 Solano employers and 620 of their employees participated.

The Vanpool Program continued to provide quality customer service and support to new and existing vanpools, including the responsibility of any vanpool that has an origin or destination in Solano, Napa, Yolo, or Sacramento counties. Staff also performed van assists which include processing Motor Vehicle Reports, issuing Sworn Statement Cards, processing medical reimbursements and FasTrak requests, distributing van signs, researching information for vanpools, and other assistance as needed. The Vanpool Incentive Program is designed to support the formation of new vanpools and to keep active vans on the road. Current Vanpool Incentives are: 1) new vanpool driver incentives, 2) vanpool seat subsidy for new vans, and 3) back-up driver incentives. Seven new vanpools were formed increasing the total number of Solano vanpools serviced to 332.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. Solano Napa Commuter Information FY 2010-11 Work Program
- B. Solano Napa Commuter Information 2010-11 Annual Report

**Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI)  
Work Program  
FY 2010-11**

(Adopted on September 8, 2010)

---

1. **Customer Service**: Provide the general public with high quality, personalized rideshare, transit, and other non-drive alone trip planning through teleservices, internet and through other means. Continue to incorporate regional customer service tools such as 511 and 511.org.
2. **Employer Program**: Outreach can be a resource for Solano and Napa employers for commuter alternative information including setting up internal rideshare programs. SNCI will maximize these key channels of reaching local employees. Develop an online communication package for employers that can be used to inform employees about commute alternatives via the internet/intranet. SNCI will continue to concentrate efforts with large employers through distribution of materials, events, major promotions, surveying, and other means. Coordination with Solano Economic Development Corporation (EDC), chambers of commerce, and other business organizations.
3. **Vanpool Program**: Form 20 vanpools and handle the support for all vanpools coming to or leaving Solano and Napa counties. Increase marketing to recruit vanpool drivers.
4. **Incentives**: Evaluate, update and promote SNCI's commuter incentives. Continue to develop, administer, and broaden the outreach of carpool, vanpool, bicycle, and transit through employee incentive programs.
5. **Emergency Ride Home**: Broaden outreach and marketing of the emergency ride home program to Solano County and Napa County employers.
6. **SNCI Awareness Campaign**: Develop and implement a campaign that includes messages in print, radio, on-line and other mediums to increase general awareness of SNCI and SNCI's non-drive alone services in Solano and Napa counties. Revise SNCI's portion of the STA's website to be more interactive and include helpful information to commuters, travelers, vanpool drivers and employers. Leverage the current concern for climate change to direct commuters to SNCI's web site or 800 phone number.
7. **California Bike to Work/Bike to School Campaign**: Take the lead in coordinating the regional 2011 Bike to Work campaign in Solano and Napa counties. Coordinate with State, regional, and local organizers to promote bicycling locally. Include working with school districts to promote safety and bicycling to school.
8. **Solano Commute Challenge**: Conduct an employer campaign that encourages Solano County employers and employees to compete against one another in the use of commute alternatives to driving alone. This campaign includes an incentive element and enlists the support of local Chambers of Commerce.

9. **General Marketing**: Maintain a presence in Solano and Napa on an on-going basis through a variety of general marketing activities for rideshare, bicycling, and targeted transit services. These include distribution of a Commuter Guide, offering services at community events, managing transportation displays, producing information materials, print ads, radio ads, direct mail, public and media relations, cross-promotions with other agencies, and more.
  
10. **Partnerships**: Coordinate with outside agencies to support and advance the use of non-drive alone modes of travel in all segments of the community. This would include assisting local jurisdictions and non-profits implementing projects identified through Community Based Transportation Plans, Children's Network and other efforts.

## Solano Napa Commuter Information Year-End Report – FY 2010-2011

### What is the SNCI Program?

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA)'s Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI) program offers free services and information for alternative transportation in Solano and Napa counties and surrounding regions. Information and services for carpool, vanpool, bus, ferry, rail, bicycling, and more are delivered to the general public and through employers. Through the provision of these services and programs SNCI assists the STA to "promote the maintenance and improvement of a healthy natural environment, with special emphasis on air quality and climate change issues." The focus of the SNCI program is to encourage the use of non-drive alone travel modes to maximize roadway efficiencies, improve air quality, present mobility options and help address climate change goals.

The STA Board of Directors approved the FY 2010-2011 Work Program for the SNCI Program in September 2010. The Work Program included nine major elements: Customer Service, Employer Program, Vanpool Program, Incentives, Emergency Ride Home, SNCI Awareness Campaign (Solano Commute Challenge), Bike to Work Campaign, General Marketing, and Partnerships.

In 2010-2011, the SNCI program was funded by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD), and Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (CMAQ) funds for the purpose of managing countywide and regional rideshare programs in Napa and Solano counties and providing air quality improvements through trip reduction.

#### SNCI 2010-11 Funding

MTC	\$240,000
BAAQMD	\$205,000
YSAQMD	\$12,000
ECMAQ	\$145,000

2010-11 marked the final year of a six-year contract with MTC. In June 2011, a one-year extension of that contract secured funding for FY 2011-12.

### General Public Services and Outreach

#### Customer Service

SNCI provides a high level of customer service via internet, telephone, and community events. During 2010-11, staff responded to an estimated 2900 information calls, providing ridematching services, local and regional transit trip planning, and Baylink Ferry and Capitol Corridor schedules. SNCI uses the Bay Area's Regional Ridematch System and has a customized interface featuring SNCI's logo and information. Over 1,114 carpool/vanpool matchlists were processed; 814 were for newly interested commuters and 300 were updates. There has been a significant increase in internet transit trip planning requests with 225 requests during the year.

#### Service requests per year

	Info Calls	Matchlists	Internet Requests
2010-11	2,890	1,114	225
2009-10	2,781	725	<i>Did not track</i>
2008-09	3,473	1,050	<i>Did not track</i>

Thousands of materials were distributed in response to phone calls, through numerous displays, at events, and through other means. Nearly 48,000 pieces of transit and transportation alternative information were distributed. SNCI staff supplies 129 display racks throughout Napa and Solano counties at employer sites, public libraries, senior and community centers and other locations.

#### Materials Distributed

30,271	Public Transit Schedules
7,638	Commuter Guides
5,618	Solano Express brochures
4,200	Solano Yolo BikeLinks Maps

#### Events

SNCI staffed 46 events in Napa and Solano counties, providing in-person ridematching and transit-trip planning services. These events included:

- Farmers Markets
- Health Fairs
- Benefit Fairs
- Employer Events
- Earth Day Events
- Community Events

#### Marketing

SNCI launched its revised, user-friendly website, [www.commuterinfo.net](http://www.commuterinfo.net), in March 2011. Helpful links from pages that determine your commute options, direct you to ridematching, explain vanpooling and transit, and inform employers allow users to find useful information. This information is kept up-to-date to increase value.

SNCI regularly places advertisements in local newspapers and on local radio stations as part of regional rideshare campaigns and throughout the year to increase general program awareness. Other advertising avenues are also used, such as city and county Visitors Guides.

### Employer Programs

#### Employers

The SNCI Programs works with employers in Solano and Napa counties to help them improve their employees' commutes and reduce the number of drive alone commute trips. A database of nearly 500 employers in the two counties is maintained and kept current. This database is used to promote SNCI services and programs through periodic mailings and e-mails.

Employers receive a range of employer services. Presentations detailing the benefits of alternative commute programs have been made to 30 employers. Nineteen (19) employer events were staffed.

#### Services for Employers

- Presentations/Consultations
- Events
- ERH Program
- Vanpool Support
- Bike to Work Campaign
- Solano Commute Challenge
- Display Rack
- Commuter Tax Benefits Info
- Density Maps
- Transportation Surveys

SNCI provided relocation assistance to State Compensation Insurance Fund (State Fund) during the Spring and Summer of 2011. State Fund reduced the size of their San Francisco office and began relocating over 700 employees from San Francisco to their Vacaville and Pleasanton campuses. In addition to transferring from San Francisco, State Fund also moved staff from Vacaville to Pleasanton. The actual relocation is taking place in phases beginning in July and continuing through September. After several consultations with the State Fund relocation team, SNCI staff designed and administered an on-line Transportation Survey to determine what commute modes employees would consider. Over 450 State Fund employees completed the survey. Staff worked with local transit agencies, Fairfield and Suisun Transit (FAST) and Vacaville City Coach, to discuss transit coordination plans. Vacaville City Coach considered the needs of State Fund as well as other employers who are in that business park section of Vacaville when route changes were made. SNCI staffed two events where relocating employees were invited to find out their commute options to their new work locations. 75 employees who were transferring from Vacaville to Pleasanton attended the Vacaville event and 450 who were going to Vacaville from San Francisco attended a similar event in San Francisco. At these events, information about transit options, carpools and vanpools was provided. Employees interested in vanpooling were introduced to the SNCI vanpool coordinator who began to work with them to start vanpools. This assistance made it possible for one new vanpool to be on the road for the first relocation phase with between 6 to 10 additional new vanpools anticipated to form in FY 2011-12.

Travis Air Force Base is the largest employer in Solano County with 14,000 employees. For several years it was difficult to find the appropriate contact to discuss SNCI's services, who would disseminate the information to all their employees. Only a few Travis AFB employees knew about SNCI's services and took advantage of the promotions and incentives available to them. Eight (8) vanpools had been formed several years ago, but there was potential for more. Federal employees who take transit or ride in vanpools are eligible for a Commuter Incentive of up to \$230 each month. This is the implementation of the Federal Commuter Tax Benefit Program. As result of meeting with Col. James Vechery at the Solano Economic Development Council (Solano EDC) meeting in June, staff made a presentation and had discussion with a group from Travis AFB who expressed interest and willingness to implement the SNCI Program. This is anticipated to occur as part of the Solano Commute Challenge in FY 2011-12.

#### Solano Emergency Ride Home Program

The Solano Emergency Ride Home (ERH) Program was established by the STA Board in July 2005 and is designed to encourage the use of commute alternatives such as carpooling, vanpooling, public transit, walking or bicycling, by providing a free ride home to program participants in cases of emergency. By alleviating workers' concerns about their ability to return home in the event of unexpected circumstances, the ERH program can help maximize the use of alternative transportation in Solano and Napa counties. This past year, seven (7) new employers registered for the Solano's ERH program bringing the total of participating employers to 60 in Solano County and 22 in Napa County. A total of 250 employees are registered in the ERH program. During the year there were four (4) requests to use the ERH program.

#### **Solano Commute Challenge**

The Solano Commute Challenge is a targeted outreach campaign for Solano County employers to encourage employees to use transit, carpool, vanpool, bike, or walk to work at least 30 times from August to October. This employer outreach strategy incorporates strengthening partnerships with business organizations and the Solano Chambers of Commerce.

Forty-six (46) major employers totaling 620 employees participated in the fourth annual countywide Solano Commute Challenge during FY 2010-11. 350 participants met the goal and earned the title "Commuter Champion." Solano County became the Most Outstanding Workplace for the third year in a row. State Fund, Genentech, AAA Northern California, Nevada & Utah (NCNU), and California Vegetables Specialties (CVS) earned the title Commuter Champion Workplace.

### Solano Commute Challenge Commute Champion Workplaces

Company Name	City	Total Registrants	Commute Champs	Commute Contenders
Solano County	Countywide	101	53	16
State Fund	Vacaville	59	43	8
Genentech	Vacaville	61	33	6
AAA NCNU	Fairfield	38	28	5
CVS	Rio Vista	29	27	1

Recognition events were conducted at each of the Commute Champion Workplaces. Supervisor Spring, Mayor Augustine, Mayor Price and Mayor Vick attended events in their cities where they joined with their local chamber of commerce to recognize the Commute Champions at each work location.

### Vanpool Program

Vanpool formation and support are the cornerstones of the vanpool program. SNCI works with individuals and employers to illustrate the significant benefits of vanpooling and encourage vanpool formation. Staff changes during FY 2010-11 impacted the number of vans formed. However, the training and orientation of staff has laid the groundwork for a more successful FY 2011-12. Fifteen (15) new vanpools traveling to, through, or from Solano, Napa, Yolo or Sacramento counties were formed last year, with 7 vanpools coming to employers in Solano County. Vanpool support and assistance are integral to keeping vanpools on the road. SNCI is presently responsible for providing the support for 232 vans. These 232 vanpools average 2,552 van riders; 5,104 trips per day; 1,224,960 trips annually. Staff performed 203 van assists which include processing Motor Vehicle Reports, issuing Sworn Statement Cards, processing medical reimbursements and FasTrak requests, distributing van signs, researching information for vanpools and other assistance as needed.

	Vanpools formed	Vanpools Supported	VPs To/From/ Through
FY 2010-2011	7	232	15
FY 2009-2010	11	221	32
FY 2008-2009	8	170	26

### Vanpool Incentives

The Vanpool Incentive Program is designed to support the formation of new vanpools and to keep active pools on the road. SNCI currently provides 3 incentives for vanpools, the New Driver Incentive, the Vanpool Start-up Incentive, and the Back-up Driver Incentive. During the fiscal year, 15 drivers received the new driver incentive; 10 vans received the vanpool start-up incentive; and 13 commuters received the back-up driver incentive.

	New Driver Incentive	Vanpool Start-up Incentive	Back-up Driver Incentive
FY 2010-2011	15	10	13
FY 2009-2010	16	10	14
FY 2008-2009	n/a	7	17

### Bicycle Program

SNCI encourages the use of bicycling as a commute alternative by distributing the Solano Yolo BikeLinks maps, coordinating the annual region-wide Bike to Work Week activities in Solano and Napa counties, and providing a bicycle incentive.

### Bike to Work Week

Bike to Work Week is held each year in May. This region-wide event is designed to persuade drive-alone commuters to try bicycling to work, at least one day a week. On the 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Bike to Work Day, over 1,100 Solano and Napa residents rode their bicycle on May 12, 2011. SNCI supported 26 strategically placed Energizer Stations throughout Solano and Napa counties handing out water, energy bars, and messenger/tote bags stuffed with bike-related information.

A Bike to Work Week campaign packet was distributed to over 300 employers in the two counties to encourage employee participation. Local print and radio advertising was used to promote the campaign.

Two “contests” with winners from each county – the Bicycle Commuter of the Year and the Team Bike Challenge – were held. Jamie Simmons of Solano County and Jim Wilson of Napa County received the 2011 Bike Commuter of the Year Awards. Both were employees of Anheuser-Busch in Fairfield. The county winners of the Team Bike Challenge were the Vaca 5 (Solano County) and the Chevrolegs (Napa County).

### Bicycle Incentive

Solano County residents and employees are offered an incentive to cover 60% of the cost of a new bicycle, up to \$100, for commuting to work. This program is designed to encourage commuters who work within biking distance from home to bicycle as an alternative commute mode. During the fiscal year 7 individuals received the bicycle incentive.

### **FY 2011-2012**

Here are some of the exciting endeavors SNCI has planned for FY 2011-12:

- Assisting the City of Benicia implement their Climate Action Plan as part of a pilot for STA’s Climate Action Plan Strategy
- Conduct 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Solano Commute Challenge
- Conduct First Napa Commute Challenge
- Napa Bike Incentive
- Partnership with 3 Solano college campuses and three primary transit operators to improve mobility and access to students and faculty
- Partnership with Safe Routes to School Program and County Public Health to improve mobility needs at schools
- Coordination with SolTrans, new transit JPA, to provide rideshare assistance as part of their first Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: September 30, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Senior Planner  
RE: Safe Routes to Transit Plan (SR2T) Update

---

**Background:**

On March 9, 2011, the STA Board approved a scope of work for the development of a Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) Plan consistent with STA's approved Overall Work Plan. The Board approved Scope of Work is included as Attachment A for reference.

The purpose of the SR2T Plan is to identify existing barriers and solutions to safe access to transit centers. In addition, the Plan would include walking audit surveys to describe overall pedestrian and bicycle user experience. The walking audits and general process for developing the SR2T Plan is modeled after the development of the Solano Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Plan completed in 2008. The goal is to complete the SR2T Plan by December 2011. This would allow the SR2T Plan to assist in guiding the 2012 funding decisions related to the One Bay Area Block Grant Program.

**Discussion:**

Staff kicked off the SR2T Plan's development in May 2011 by selecting Fehr and Peers consultants to assist in developing the plan. In the past, Fehr and Peers assisted STA with planning and mapping related services for the Solano SR2S Plan.

In June and July, STA staff provided presentations to STA staff committees and STA citizen advisory committees to recruit volunteers to participate in the Plan's development. Attachment B identifies participants on the SR2T Steering Committee and SR2T Task Forces. The SR2T Steering Committee includes participants from the STA Bicycle Advisory Committee, Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Paratransit Coordinating Council, as well as staff from the STA's Technical Advisory Committee and SolanoLinks Transit Consortium. The SR2T Steering Committee is responsible for providing STA staff with guidance regarding the overall development of the plan's development. The SR2T Task Forces have a similar representation of participants; however, their responsibility is to conduct the walking audit surveys at selected transit locations.

The SR2T Steering Committee met on August 11, 2011 and identified the following five Solano Transit Facilities of Regional Significance for conducting the walking audit surveys:

1. Vacaville Transportation Center
2. Fairfield Transportation Center
3. Suisun City Capitol Corridor Train Station
4. Vallejo Transit Center/Downtown Parking Structure
5. Vallejo Transportation Center at Curtola and Lemon Street

The Steering Committee also provided feedback on the walking audit survey forms before it used by the SR2T Task Force. Attachment C is a sample walking audit survey form.

STA staff is currently working with the SR2T Task Forces to complete the walking audits. Three surveys were completed at the time of this report. All five walking audits are anticipated to be completed by the beginning of October. Information collected will be presented to the Steering Committee for discussion and inclusion into the draft Plan. The final Solano Safe Routes to Transit Plan is scheduled to be presented to the STA Board for adoption at their December Board meeting.

**Fiscal Impact:**

Funding for the SR2T Plan was approved by the STA Board as part of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan budget. No new funds are required to complete the plan at this time.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachments:

- A. Safe Routes to Transit Scope of Work
- B. SR2T Steering Committee and SR2T Task Forces Participants
- C. Sample Walking Audit Survey Form

**Safe Routes to Transit**  
**Consultant Scope of Work**

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) wishes to hire a consultant to assist in the development of a Safe Routes to Transit (SR2T) plan. The consultant will primarily be responsible for gathering and organizing data related to safety in the area of Transit Facilities of Regional Significance (TFORS) identified by the STA.

**A. The STA will provide the selected Consultant with the following:**

1. List of all TFORS, including both existing and proposed facilities
2. A list of all streets and paths within a ½ mile radius of each TFORS
3. A contact name, phone number and e-mail for each jurisdiction having identified TFORS

**B. The Consultant will perform the following tasks:**

1. Gather all available accident and safety data for the streets and paths identified in A.2. This will include:
  - a. Traffic accidents, with a special emphasis on identifying incidents involving pedestrians and bicyclists
  - b. Crimes against persons
2. STA staff is working with SR2T task force committees in for each TFORS to collaborate in developing recommendations for improvements at each TFORS. Task force participants will include but not be limited to transit riders, pedestrians, bicyclists, city planners, engineers, police and transit staff. Responsibilities will include conducting a planning and walking audits of each existing TFORS with the SR2T Task Force. Special emphasis will be placed on how pedestrian and bicycle users access each Center. Including a survey of the number of users and how and when users arrive at and depart from each Center.
3. STA staff is working with a SR2T Steering Committee with members representing the task force committees. The Steering Committee will be responsible for providing review and recommendations regarding the development of the planning document.
4. Identify barriers to safe access to or use of identified TFORS with the aid of each SR2T Task Force Committee input, including:
  - a. High incidents of accidents involving pedestrians or cyclists
  - b. High incidents or clusters of criminal activity
  - c. Physical barriers or deteriorated infrastructure that restrict access to TFORS
5. Take digital photos of each TFORS, covering the items listed below. The photos shall be stored in a database designed so that it can be searchable, can be expanded to include future-year photos, and can be incorporated into STA's Geographic Information System (GIS):
  - a. General site photos
  - b. All direct access ways
  - c. Parking lots
  - d. Bicycle parking and storage facilities
6. A list of all incidents or barriers identified in B 1 and 2 above, including a unique identification number. The list shall be designed so that it can be stored in a searchable database, can be expanded to include future-year incidents and/or barriers, and can be incorporated into the STA's GIS.

7. Recommendations for improvements to each TFORS in order to improve bicycle, pedestrian and ADA accessibility and safety, including the following:
  - a. Standard design elements that can be incorporated into both existing and future TFORS.
  - b. Signage consistent with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission's Transit Connectivity Study findings, showing safe access to local and regional destinations.
  - c. A prioritization plan, both county-wide and for each facility examined.

## Safe Routes to Transit Participants

### Steering Committee

Name	Representation
Lindsay Sanford	Police/Safety Officer
Nancy Lund	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)
Allan Deal	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)
Phillip Kamhi	SolanoLinks Consortium
Brian Miller	Planning Staff Representative
Dan Kasperson	Technical Advisory Committee
Shannon Nelson	Paratransit Coordinating Council
Alicia Roundtree	Paratransit Coordinating Council

## Safe Routes to Transit Task Force

### Task Force #1: Vacaville Transportation Center

Name	Representation
Brian Mclean	Transit Consortium
Jeff Knowles	TAC
Ray Posey	BAC
Joel Brick	PAC
Shannon Nelson	PCC-ADA Coordinator
Rod Neal	Enforcement
Kyrre Helmerse (Independent Living Resources Volunteer - wheelchair user)	

### Task Force #2: Fairfield Transportation Center

Name	Representation
Philip Kamhi	Transit Consortium
Wayne Lewis	TAC
David Pyle	BAC
Betty Livingston	PAC
Alicia Roundtree	PCC
Lindsay Sanford	Enforcement
Jim Burnett (wheelchair user)	Adaptive Technology Specialist
Kyrre Helmerse (Independent Living Resources Volunteer - wheelchair user)	

### Task Force #3: Suisun Amtrak Station

Name	Representation
Philip Kaimi	Transit Consortium
Dan Kasperson	TAC
Jane Day	BAC
Mike Hudson	PAC
Alicia Roundtree	PCC-Independent Living Resource
Lindsay Sanford	Enforcement

**Task Force #4: Vallejo Transit Center/Downtown Parking Structure**

Name	Representation
Jeanine Wooley	Transit Consortium
Ed Alberto	TAC
Mick Weninger	BAC
Lynne Williams	PAC
Shannon Nelson	PCC-ADA Coordinator
Mike Nichelini	Vallejo PD

**Task Force #5: Curtola Park and Ride**

Name	Representation
Jeanine Wooley	Transit Consortium
Ed Alberto	TAC
Mick Weninger	BAC
Lynne Williams	PAC
Shannon Nelson	PCC-ADA Coordinator
Mike Nichelini	Vallejo PD

## Safe Routes to Transit

<b>Transit Facility of Regional Significance Walking Audit Form</b>
---

**Transit Facility Name:**

---

**Jurisdiction:**

---

### Instructions

This audit form should be used to assess the conditions of the transit facility site and surrounding roadway network for pedestrians and bicyclists. The findings of these forms will be used to identify potential problems and develop candidate improvement options. Where possible, complete the walking audits during times of peak transit and roadway network usage. Bring maps or aerial photos to mark location-specific issues.

**Audit Date:**

---

**Day of the Week:**

---

**Time of Day:**

---

**Weather Conditions:**

---

**Number of Users Observed (10, 100, etc.):**

---

## On-Site

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Is there a defined drop-off / pick-up area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Does it provide a safe path of travel to transit loading areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does congestion cause unsafe drop-off / pick-up behavior?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there sufficient passenger amenities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Shelters?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Benches?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Trash bins?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Restrooms?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Vending machines?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Is the transit facility well-maintained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Is trash picked up?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Is there graffiti?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is there adequate transit rider information?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are there maps, brochures, and/or schedules available for passengers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Is real-time information available to passengers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are there adequate security features?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are there security cameras?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Do signs indicate that security cameras are present?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is there sufficient lighting of passenger waiting areas?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Are there emergency phones available?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Do you perceive the transit facility as safe?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is attractive and secure bike parking available?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are there enough short-term bike racks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are short-term bike racks secure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Is there long-term bike parking?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Is long-term bike parking easy to use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Were bicyclists observed using the transit facility? How many?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is the site conveniently accessible to pedestrians and bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are there worn paths from bicycle or pedestrian use through surrounding landscaping?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Is there a safe, defined pathway from the roadway to the transit facility?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Is there wayfinding signage to nearby destinations available for transit users?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Other:** Please describe additional on-site observations or problems:

## Roadways

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Are there large roadways (4+ lanes) near the transit center?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are they congested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are they high-speed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Could the number of vehicle lanes be reduced?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Are the lanes wider than necessary (12 feet)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there bike lanes near the transit center?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Do they have sufficient width (≥5 feet)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are they well-marked with lines, bike stencils, and signs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Are they well-maintained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there signed bike routes near the transit center?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are there continuous sidewalks near the transit center?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are they on both sides of the street?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Do they need maintenance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Do they have sufficient width (≥4 feet)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are there marked crosswalks to cross the street?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are they controlled?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Is there adequate lighting for pedestrians and bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Is it “pedestrian-scale”?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Is there sufficient wayfinding signage to the transit facility for pedestrians and bicyclists?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Is it “pedestrian-scale”?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Is it well-maintained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Are there bus stops?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are they conveniently located near destinations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are they near safe pedestrian crossings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Do they have amenities such as benches, shelters, transit information, and bike racks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Other:** Please describe additional roadway observations or problems:

# Intersections

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Are there crosswalks across each intersection leg?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Is there enough crossing time?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Are there countdown timers?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Are the push buttons easy to find?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there free right-turns?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there large curb radii?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are there median pedestrian islands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Are they wide enough?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Do they have “thumbnails”?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Are there push buttons on the islands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Are there curb ramps?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Do they feature truncated domes?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are there bicycle detectors?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Are there advanced stop bars?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Are there permissive left-turns that conflict with crosswalks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. Is the cycle length long (>120 seconds)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Other:** Please describe additional intersection observations or problems:

## Other

	Yes	No	N/A
1. Are there opportunities for a Class I shared-use path?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Are there opportunities for a cul-de-sac pedestrian cut-through?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Are there opportunities for a street extension or connection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Are there any significant barriers (freeways, railroad tracks, etc.) to walking and bicyclists nearby?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Other:** Please describe additional intersection observations or problems:

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Susan Furtado, Accounting & Administrative Services Manager  
RE: Fiscal Year (FY) 2010-11 Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program  
Fourth Quarter and Annual Report

---

**Background:**

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) administers the Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program for Solano County. These administration duties include disbursing funds collected by the State Controller's Office from the Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) vehicle registration fee of \$1 per registered vehicle, using the funding formula of 50% based on population and 50% on vehicles abated.

California Vehicle Code (VC) Section 22710(f) defines qualified abandoned vehicle abatement, as those vehicles marked as abandoned by an AVA Member Agency. AVA Program qualifying vehicles are registered vehicles with California License Plate.

STA's administration duty is in accordance with the VC Section 22710, which requires AVA Member Agencies to adopt an ordinance establishing procedures for the abatement and for recovery of cost. The money received from the DMV shall be used only for the abatement, removal, and disposal of a public nuisance of any abandoned, wrecked, dismantled, or inoperative vehicle or parts from private or public property.

**Discussion:**

STA had unallocated AVA, not claimed by the local agencies, funds carried over from FY 2009-10 in the amount of \$91,808.27. In FY 2010-11, STA was allocated \$343,752.05 in AVA Program Funds resulting in a total amount of \$435,560.32 available to the AVA Program for FY 2010-11. Subsequently, STA disbursed only \$303,752.05 of these funds plus interest earned of \$1,479.81, throughout the fiscal year based on the state funding formula and AVA Program expenditure reimbursement requests submitted by the member agencies. STA deducted \$10,312.56 (3%) of the funding received in FY 2010-11 to cover administrative costs. As of June 30, 2011, the program has remaining unallocated funds of \$123,019.83 due to reduced activities and expenditure reimbursement requests from member agencies. In accordance with Section 9250.7 VC, this unexpended amount is carried forward to FY 2011-12 for continuation of the program. STA has submitted its annual fiscal year-end report to the State Controller's Office before the required due date of October 31<sup>st</sup>.

The AVA Member Agencies for Solano County are the City of Benicia, City of Dixon, City of Fairfield, City of Suisun City, City of Vacaville, City of Vallejo, City of Suisun City, and the County of Solano. The City of Rio Vista has opted not to participate in this program, but has expressed interest for FY 2011-12.

Attached is a matrix summarizing FY 2010-11 and comparing FY 2009-10 numbers of abated vehicles, notices issued, and cost reimbursements submitted by the members of the Solano County's AVA Program.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. Summary of Solano Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program for FY 2010-11 and FY 2009-10

**Summary of Solano Abandoned Vehicle Abatement (AVA) Program for  
FY 2010-11 and FY 2009-10**

Member Agency	FY 2010-11				FY 2009-10			
	# of Abated Vehicles	# of Issued Notices	Reimbursed Amount	Cost per Abatement	# of Abated Vehicles	# of Issued Notices	Reimbursed Amount	Cost per Abatement
City of Benicia	33	5	\$7,673	\$232	327	17	\$9,255	\$28
City of Dixon	90	38	\$3,782	\$42	16	18	\$1,513	\$95
City of Fairfield	391	265	\$39,417	\$101	359	0	\$36,106	\$101
City of Suisun	147	564	\$51,040	\$347	149	287	\$31,080	\$209
City of Vacaville	129	1,052	\$55,358	\$429	141	1,296	\$56,122	\$398
City of Vallejo	1,766	1,723	\$133,811	\$76	2,151	1,757	\$107,494	\$50
Solano County Unincorporated area	154	12	\$12,627	\$82	14	10	\$9,898	\$707
<b>Total</b>	<b>2,710</b>	<b>3,670</b>	<b>\$303,708</b>	<b>\$112</b>	3,157	3,385	\$251,468	\$80

This page intentionally left blank.



DATE: October 6, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Robert Macaulay, Director of Planning  
RE: Regional Transportation Plan Update/One Bay Area Block Grant Update

---

**Background:**

Senate Bill (SB) 375 requires the development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as a part of the development/update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). In the Bay Area, the SCS is the responsibility of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), while the RTP is the responsibility of the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). The two regional planning agencies are working to coordinate the development of the two plans.

The two agencies are developing land use and transportation scenarios to test using MTC's traffic model. The results of these tests will help guide MTC and ABAG as they develop the SCS and RTP. There are 5 land use and 2 transportation scenarios. Four of the 5 land use scenarios look at increasing development in the core Bay Area, especially in the major urban areas of San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland and Fremont. The fifth scenario assumes a larger percentage of growth, both residential and employment, in the suburban counties, including Solano County. The transportation scenarios are designed to provide transportation resources that are consistent with the overall nature of the land use scenarios.

**Discussion:**

ABAG has released the population and employment projections for three of the land use scenarios that will be analyzed to help develop the Bay Area SCS. Those scenarios are included as Attachment A. MTC will use the land use scenarios, two transportation networks and the MTC traffic model to develop reports on traffic flow and air emissions (with an emphasis on greenhouse gas emissions). Additional analysis will be done on economic activity, housing equity and safety. MTC originally intended to will release the scenario results in December 2011 and have the Draft SCS available in February 2012, but has recently stated it will push back those dates. The One Bay Area Block Grant proposed is still under development by MTC and ABAG. Staff will provide a more detailed presentation regarding the proposed grant program at a future meeting.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. One Bay Area SCS Alternative Land Use Scenarios (Revised September 1, 2011)

This page intentionally left blank.



## Sustainable Communities Strategy

### ALTERNATIVE LAND USE SCENARIOS Core Concentration, Focused Growth, and Outer Bay Area Growth

REVISED: September 1, 2011

In July, ABAG's Executive Board and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission approved a framework for Five Alternative Scenarios, which will be used to inform the development of the Preferred Scenario of the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS). Scenario 1 and 2 are based on unconstrained growth, assume very strong employment growth, and unprecedented funding to support housing affordability. Scenario 1, the Initial Vision Scenario was released in March 2011. Scenario 2, Core Concentration Unconstrained will be developed to provide a more concentrated development pattern along transit corridors. These two scenarios are essential to identify the challenges and policies for an ideal sustainable development path.

This report presents the land use patterns for scenarios 3, 4, and 5 based on an assessment of economic growth, financial feasibility, and reasonable planning strategies. They provide a range of housing and employment distribution patterns across places and cities that support equitable and sustainable development. The three scenarios are as follows:

- *Core Concentration Growth Scenario:* Concentrates housing and job growth at selected Priority Development Areas in the Inner Bay Area along the region's core transit network.
- *Focused Growth Scenario:* Recognizes the potential of Priority Development Areas and Growth Opportunity Areas across the region with an emphasis on housing and job growth along major transit corridors.
- *Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario:* Addresses higher levels of growth in the Outer Bay Area and is closer to previous development trends than the other two scenarios.

These three scenarios assume a strong economy supported by the appropriate affordable housing production. They also assume targeted local and regional strategies and additional funding to support sustainable and equitable growth. They are designed primarily around Priority Development Areas and Growth Opportunity Areas, as places for growth identified by local jurisdictions. (PDAs will refer to both areas in this report) The level of PDA growth is defined based on the Place Type established by the local jurisdiction (i.e., regional center, transit neighborhood, rural town), which provides a regional language to recognize the character, scale, density and expected growth for the wide range of places in the Bay Area. Beyond the PDAs, household growth is distributed based on employment, transit access, household formation, and housing production. Employment distribution is based upon the existing employment pattern, reversing the previous dispersal trends throughout the region.

## ***Regional dialogue on land use scenarios***

The purpose of the land use alternative scenarios is to expand the regional dialogue on the type of development, planning strategies, and investments to define the SCS. We are seeking input from local jurisdictions, community organizations, business organizations, and general public on the following themes:

### *Distribution of growth*

- Shifting from previous trends of dispersed growth, do these three land use scenarios provide an appropriate spectrum for sustainable and equitable development trends? Is growth concentrated at the appropriate places?

### *Development of vital and healthy places*

- Are housing and jobs converging at the appropriate places? Can this convergence support greater access to jobs and housing, particularly for the low and moderate income populations?
- What elements of the scenarios would support the development of complete communities?
- Do the scenarios address the local expectations and necessary adjustments for regional equity and sustainability?

### *Planning strategies and investments*

- How can local jurisdictions, community organizations, and business organizations converge into a coherent regional strategy?
- What policies and investments should be prioritized to support the SCS?

This report includes five sections and two appendices. The first section is a brief summary of the input received from local jurisdictions and stakeholders on local development and equity. The second section is an overview of regional employment and household growth between 2010 and 2040. The third section describes employment trends and distribution, including some details of the recent regional employment analysis undertaken by ABAG and MTC to inform the land use patterns. The fourth section provides an overview of the housing distribution, which relies on the housing analysis presented in previous reports. The fifth section covers the next steps towards the development of the Preferred Scenario. The appendices include, first, details on the methodology for growth distribution; and, second, tables of growth by PDA and local jurisdiction. Scenarios maps are compiled in a separate packet.

## **1. INPUT ON SCS SCENARIOS**

The development of the SCS Core, Focused, and Outer Bay Area Growth Scenarios are informed by a wealth of input we received on the Initial Vision Scenario (IVS) from local elected officials, planning directors, and Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) as well as from the Regional Advisory Working Group, Equity Group, and stakeholders groups. County-level Basecamp sites have been well noticed and public workshops were held throughout our nine-county region.

As indicated in previous reports, land use decisions are a local responsibility governed by local jurisdictions. The land use scenarios presented here are based upon local input and strong

coordination among local and regional agencies. Regional agencies have incorporated local input into three coherent land use development patterns.

### ***Input on local development***

The input received reflects the unique characteristics of the region's communities. Some communities described the level of housing growth depicted in the IVS as too high, while other jurisdictions responded that IVS housing growth levels would be appropriate if funding for redevelopment, public schools, transit and other community infrastructure were available. Still, a number of common themes have emerged.

- *Addressing the Bay Area economic challenges:* The Bay Area's first Sustainable Communities Strategy should advance a vibrant economy and strong growth for the region. Employment growth should be aligned with existing and planned transit. Employment totals are too high given past performance and the depth of the recession.
- *Sustainable and equitable housing production:* Growth levels in the Initial Vision Scenario are not feasible given current market constraints and funding availability. Infill development challenges require capital investments and supportive policies. The SCS should reward communities that advance sustainable growth at transit nodes.
- *Transit service:* Cuts in transit service will impede sustainable growth. Transit-served, infill areas that have not been nominated by local communities as PDAs should take on comparable levels of growth.
- *Coordination of regional efforts:* Loss of redevelopment agencies will limit infill development. The SCS should provide CEQA benefits for projects in PDAs. Air District and BCDC requirements should be aligned with the SCS.

### ***Input on equity***

Regional agency staff has worked with the Regional Equity Working Group and MTC's Policy Advisory Council to develop inputs to the Alternative Scenarios that will increase access to opportunities and an improved quality of life for residents from all income categories in communities throughout the region. Social equity as well as economic growth and environmental sustainability are promoted through the emphasis on encouraging growth in complete communities served by transit. In addition, each of the alternative scenarios will also distribute growth in a way that ensures each jurisdiction is planning to accommodate a minimum percent of its expected household growth. Factors related to transit service, employment, and net low-income commuters to a jurisdiction will also inform the alternative scenario housing distributions.

## **2. REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSEHOLD GROWTH 2010 – 2040**

The recent national economic recession triggered a major employment decline. Recent data and research indicates that the nation is facing a slower recovery than expected over the next few years, which will in turn impact the recovery of the Bay Area. Beyond this short term recovery, the rates of employment growth for the Bay Area and California have become closer to or lower than the national rates since the 1980s. They were higher than the nation from the 1960s to the 1980s, but as the region and the state matured in its economic composition, growth rates became closer to the national average.

Due to lowered forecasts of national economic and job growth, along with dramatic decreases in state and national immigration levels (even prior to the recession), the Bay Area job forecast for 2040 would be revised downward by an estimated 100,000 jobs than the forecast employment for the Initial Vision Scenario. The total jobs for 2040 would drop by another 200,000 jobs by switching to a forecast where the Bay Area maintains its current share of national employment.

Even under those considerations, the SCS can reasonably assume a healthy economy for the Bay Area by 2040. High expectations are based on the strength of our knowledge-based economy, the development of new high technology sectors as well as the diverse economy to support these leading sectors. In addition, the Bay Area has a highly qualified labor force when compared to other regions and a high quality of life based on access to urban amenities, natural resources, and a Mediterranean climate. The region also provides businesses with a wealth of research and development resources and a strong network of international exchange.

Given these resources, regional and economic experts working with ABAG and MTC suggest the Bay Area could add almost a million jobs up to 4.26 million jobs by 2040. This is an average of 33,000 per year over the next 30 years, which assumes a healthy and strong economy. This is more than three times the 10,000 average annual job growth of the previous two decades. It is close to the 40,000 average annual job growth of the last 50 years when the region experienced the development of the high technology industry and the finance sector.

This employment growth will be supported by strong housing production of about 770,000 units by 2040. This would represent an annual production of 27,000 units per year. The slow recovery of job growth and housing prices are expected to limit housing production in the near-term. This period should be addressed independently from the housing production of the later years. Assuming a suppressed housing production rate of 15,000 units from 2010-2015, this level of growth would increase to almost 30,000 units per year over the 2015-2040 timeframe. In comparison, historical rates were 20,000 per year from 1990-2010 and 36,000 averaging 1970, 1975, 1980, and 1985 rates, periods of much greenfield housing production.

The expected growth of 770,000 housing units by 2040 in the scenarios under discussion is lower than the equivalent one million units in Initial Vision Scenario. The former is the expected housing production while the latter reflects the housing need. The expected housing production addresses lower 2010 household and population counts (Census 2010), lower employment growth than previous forecasts, and reasonable assumptions on market trends, local and regional policies, and infrastructure.

This level of housing reflects a reasonable job to household ratio for the Bay Area and would consider a reasonable pace of recovery of the housing market. For these scenarios we are assuming a job to household ratio of 1.3 by 2040. This ratio is based on the regional average over the past six decades and is also similar to the present-day ratio. It could be expected that demographic shifts would lower this ratio over the next fifteen years as the baby boomer generation retires, but that it would rise again in the later years of the planning horizon.

**Regional Growth: Households, Population, Employed Residents, Jobs, 2010 - 2040**

	Core, Focused, and Outer Bay Area Growth Scenarios			Initial Vision Scenario
	2010	2040	Growth 2010-40	Growth 2010-40
<i>Households</i>	2,608,000	3,378,000	770,000	1,031,000
<i>Population</i>	7,151,000	9,236,000	2,085,000	2,432,000
<i>Employed residents</i>	3,153,000	3,974,000	821,000	1,338,000
<i>Jobs</i>	3,271,000	4,266,000	995,000	1,463,000

These scenario land development patterns will be supported by transportation scenarios that will vary the level of funding for “fix-it-first” maintenance, transit capacity improvements, roadway improvements, and bike/pedestrian funding.

**3. REGIONAL EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION**

The region is experiencing a transformation in its economic activities and in its population composition, both of which have major land use implications. The very strong growth of knowledge-based activities at the intersection with urban amenities brings new strength to employment centers. These economic trends are parallel to some key emerging demographic changes: young professionals’ preferences for vital urban places instead of office parks, an increase in the ethnic diversity of the labor force and residents, and a major wave of retirement and increase in the senior population. Providing that the region can develop and implement a solid SCS, these changes provide an opportunity to strengthen the economic health, social equity, and sustainability of the Bay Area.

SCS tasks to support a healthy economy include:

- Provide the appropriate transit, affordable housing, and urban amenities to support the new wave of industries at urban locations and densified office parks.
- Support a diverse economy through public investments that support strategic sectors, and the retention and expansion of affordable housing close to major employment centers.
- Regain the economic vitality of regional centers, which lost employment over the past decades. Support increased densities and a mix of uses at suburban office parks, which have been major employment growth areas.
- Concentrate urban amenities and affordable housing in downtown areas and along transit corridors across the region.
- Maintain and increase the viability and productivity of industrial lands and agricultural resource areas.

For the purpose of the SCS Alternative Scenarios we have revised the total employment growth by 2040, the growth by industry, and the distribution by PDA and city. The rationale for this healthy economic growth in relation to population and housing growth will be discussed in a

separate memo. This report primarily focuses on growth by industry and distribution patterns based on the employment analysis developed by ABAG and MTC in collaboration with Strategic Economics.

### **Changes in the regional industrial composition**

Starting in the 1970s the region experienced major employment growth in San Francisco's financial district and the emergence of Silicon Valley as the global center of high technology. In contrast to many other metropolitan regions for subsequent decades, the Bay Area's economic sectors developed through very distinct specialized clusters. In the years following the turn of the millennium the region has a more mature economic base with an economic sector composition that is closer to the national average.

Professional and business services and information jobs have become the major leading sectors in the regional economy. Over the last decades they have experienced sharp growth but they have also been the most impacted during periods of economic decline. These regional leading sectors have increased the demand for highly educated labor and provided high wage jobs. Educational and health services have displayed steady growth, but a more moderate level than professional services. These sectors have surpassed manufacturing, government administration, and retail employment. Over the next 30 years, educational and health services sectors are expected to continue their rate of growth. Professional and business services are expected to generate more than one third of the total regional growth by 2040.

Since the 1980s, these growing sectors have more than compensated the loss in manufacturing and finance jobs. During this period, much of the region's traditional manufacturing employment has relocated to low cost labor regions in Asia and Latin America. More recently despite steady growth in professional and business service jobs related to emerging technology industries, high tech manufacturing has also relocated out of Silicon Valley to lower cost locations. Changes in technology have also reduced labor requirements and increased productivity for the remaining manufacturing businesses. On the opposite spectrum of the economic sector location patterns, while the region continues to be an important financial center, finance employment jobs have been eliminated or relocated out of the Bay Area. The decline of these two sectors has resulted in a loss of middle-income jobs for the region. Looking forward to 2040, manufacturing and finance are not expected to significantly expand. However, they will remain essential and stable sectors in the regional economy and are expected to retain approximately the same employment size over the next 30 years.

The Bay Area is a major international destination for business and leisure travel. Leisure, hospitality and retail are growing employment sectors. In particular, leisure and hospitality employment has grown at a faster pace than retail, following the pattern of professional and business services. Both industry groups are expected to retain a steady growth over the next 30 years.

## Changes in the regional spatial patterns

Over the past decades the Bay Area experienced a decline of employment at its major regional economic centers while suburban employment centers and office parks emerged and grew throughout the region. These spatial patterns were conditioned by the decline of the finance sector in San Francisco, the growth of the high technology sectors in Silicon Valley, the formation of the Tri-Valley business cluster supported by labor from lower housing cost communities in the eastern part of the Bay Area and the central valley, and the strengthening of medium size downtowns such as Walnut Creek, Santa Rosa and Berkeley.

The growth of professional services in close proximity to urban amenities, point toward a new wave of growth that could be accommodated at major economic centers and a demand for urban amenities, mixed-uses and higher densities at suburban employment locations. Analysis of employment and demographic trends indicates that the SCS can serve to support these emerging trends by increasing access to transit, affordable housing, and urban amenities at employment centers. The SCS would recognize the economic function of each place in the region and the potential they offer for the growth of selected industry groups, jobs and businesses. This recognition is also informed by the community choices on the function and qualities of their places. Some of the expected trends are described below.

### ▪ **Renewed regional centers**

Regional centers have reduced their office jobs as a share of the region from 49 percent in 1990 to 41 percent in 2010. Downtown San Francisco and Downtown Oakland also reduced their absolute employment levels. Downtown San Jose had a small increase. In the SCS Scenarios we expect a reversal of this trend. This is based on the rate and scale of growth of professional services urban entertainment, which brings a new economic vitality to the regional centers. Similar to the growth of the financial district in the 1970s, the Bay Area is attracting new businesses and workers that want to locate in close proximity to related firms, services and amenities. The new wave of businesses and young professionals' demand for building space prioritizes flexibility to adjust spaces to multiple functions and requires less office space per worker relative to the early growth of traditional downtown office space. The growth of health and educational services would also support the growth of regional centers.

### ▪ **Office parks:**

Office parks have been a dominant building pattern in the two suburban areas that experienced major growth in the Bay Area over the past several decades: Silicon Valley and the Tri-Valley. In the SCS Alternative Scenarios office park employment will continue to grow but at a slower pace than in recent decades. The emerging private shuttle services run by businesses, particularly in San Mateo and Santa Clara County are expected to grow and improve transit access while lessening, but not fully mitigating increased freeway traffic congestion related to employment growth. Growth in office park employment is limited in part by the capacity of the region's congested freeway network. Office parks in the Tri-Valley area would house more workers within their own jurisdictions, but will continue to draw from lower cost labor in the Central Valley. Some office parks would be transformed with additional office buildings and a mix of uses including housing.

- **Downtown areas and transit corridors**

The increasing need and desire for local services in close proximity to residential locations has led to a clustering of services along corridors and in small downtown areas over the past decades. The increasing size of the region's senior population will likely reinforce this trend over the next decades. The SCS Alternative Scenarios assume an increase in local serving jobs in Priority Development Areas proportional to housing growth in PDAs.

- **Industrial land**

The decline of the manufacturing and wholesale employment due to business relocation and changes in technology has resulted in a major contraction of those businesses in industrial areas. In many areas this has not resulted in vacant industrial land, but a different mix of businesses that are necessary to support the local and regional economies. In addition to basic services such as refuse collection or supply distribution, industrial lands are now occupied by a wide range of businesses from food processing to green industry manufacturing, and auto repair to high tech product development drawing employment from many sectors into traditional industrial lands. The SCS Alternative Scenarios assume limited but stable job growth in manufacturing, given retention of industrial land at core locations and an expanding array of production, distribution and repair activities.

- **Agricultural land**

The Bay Area has a wealth of agricultural land unparalleled among our nation's largest metropolitan regions that provides high quality agricultural products including diverse high-value crop production and its world-renowned wine industry. For the most part the region's remaining farmland is policy-protected from urban expansion. All of the counties outside of San Francisco have a growth management framework (e.g. urban growth boundaries, agricultural zoning, etc.) in place. The SCS Alternative Scenarios assume the retention of most agricultural land with some increase in productivity yielding modest employment growth.

### **Core Concentration, Focused Growth, and Outer Bay Area Growth Scenarios**

Given the expected levels of regional growth, changes in the economic sector composition, and changes in the spatial patterns of employment location, the three alternative scenarios provide alternative land use development patterns based on various degrees of employment concentration. All scenarios assume nearly one million additional jobs in the region through 2040. They also assume the same growth rates by industry. The three scenarios assume slowing or reversal in the declining share of employment in Priority Development Areas experienced in previous decades. The three scenarios also assume some growth in local serving jobs proportional to the housing growth by PDAs.

The three employment scenarios are CONCEPTUAL scenarios to understand and assess distinct land use patterns in relation to housing and transit. Starting from the current distribution of employment and growth trends over previous decades, the scenarios add three factors: the concentration of jobs in PDAs, the concentration of knowledge-based jobs (Information, Finance, Professional & Business Services), and the link of local serving jobs (primarily Retail, some Health, Educational, and Recreational Services) to housing growth. They do not yet include input from local jurisdictions or analysis of land constraints, industrial cluster support, or

public and private investments. This input and analysis will be essential to develop the employment distribution for the Preferred Scenario.

**Overview of job growth by scenario**

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<b>Land use trends</b>	Higher growth in major employment centers close to transit	Higher concentration of employment in PDAs than 2010	Continued trends of more growth in Outer Bay Area and more growth outside of PDAs
<b>PDA job growth</b>	Small increase of PDAs share of regional jobs over Focused Growth Scenario	Small increase of PDAs share of regional jobs over 2010	Decline of PDAs share of regional jobs over 2010
<b>Knowledge-based jobs</b>	Additional 15% in inner bay PDAs	Additional 10% across all PDAs	Decline in share of PDAs following previous trends
<b>Local serving jobs</b>	Follows housing growth, more jobs in inner bay area PDAs	Follows housing growth, distributed across all PDAs and jurisdictions	Follows housing growth, more jobs in outer bay area

*Core Concentration Growth Scenario:* This scenario assumes that the concentration of employment in PDAs across most economic sectors will remain as in 2010. Knowledge-based jobs will be more concentrated in regional centers, city centers, urban neighborhoods, and mixed-use neighborhoods in the Inner Bay Area places where jobs are concentrated today. Local serving jobs will follow housing in PDAs, which will be more concentrated in the Inner Bay Area.

*Focused Growth Scenario:* This scenario assumes that the concentration of employment in PDAs across most economic sectors will remain as in 2010. Knowledge-based and local serving jobs will be more concentrated in PDAs by 2040 than in 2010.

*Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario:* This scenario follows the growth trends from the previous 30 years but with lower rates of job dispersal. Regional Centers and large City Centers grow but slower than other Place Types, while Suburban Centers and office parks outside of PDAs continue to grow at higher rates than the regional average.

**Employment by economic sector**

The employment growth by economic sector is based on the forecast prepared by Caltrans and adjusted to the total regional growth established by ABAG and MTC. While the same level of growth by industry is assumed in the three scenarios, the distribution by city and PDA varies across scenarios.

***Employment growth by economic sector 2010 - 2040***

	<b>Jobs 2010</b>	<b>Jobs 2040</b>	<b>Job growth 2010 – 2040</b>	<b>Annual Growth Rate 2010- 2040</b>
<b><i>Total Jobs</i></b>	3,270,906	4,265,736	994,831	1.01%
<b><i>Agriculture and Natural Resources</i></b>	22,142	22,286	144	0.02%
<b><i>Manufacturing Wholesale and Transportation</i></b>	543,974	659,580	115,606	0.71%
<b><i>Retail</i></b>	325,168	402,036	76,868	0.79%
<b><i>Professional and Business Services / Finance</i></b>	774,502	1,153,879	379,378	1.63%
<b><i>Health, Education, Recreation Services</i></b>	853,755	1,106,095	252,340	0.99%
<b><i>Other: Information, Government, Construction</i></b>	751,365	921,860	170,495	0.76%

***Distribution of Employment***

The employment distribution for 2010 is based on NETS data (See appendix for description of data sources). This data provides employment information by location of a business establishment. This is a high level of geographical resolution, which allows us to capture the employment by PDA more accurately than previous zip code data.

In 2010, it was estimated that PDAs encompassed an estimated 1,586,000 or 48 percent of jobs regionwide. This is 5 percent lower than the PDA share in 1990 according to ABAG analysis of the NETS data. The three scenarios assume different shares of jobs in PDAs as indicated below. Following previous trends but at a slower pace, the Outer Bay Area Scenario assumes a lower PDA share of total jobs in 2040 than in 2010. The Focused Growth and Core Concentration Growth Scenarios both assume a higher concentration of jobs in PDAs in 2040 than in 2010.

***Job Share in PDAs by Scenario: Past and Future Trends 1990 – 2010 – 2040***

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<i>PDA Job Share 1990</i>	53%	53%	53%
<i>PDA Job Share 2010</i>	48%	48%	48%
<i>PDA Job Share 2040</i>	51%	50%	48%
<i>PDA Job Growth Share 2010-2040</i>	58 %	55 %	47 %

Within PDAs, the distribution of jobs varies according to sector and Place Type. The Outer Bay Area Scenario retains a similar distribution in 2010 and 2040 except for the local serving jobs, which shifts according to housing growth. The Focused Growth Scenario increases knowledge-based jobs across all PDAs. The Core Concentration Growth Scenario increases knowledge-based jobs in regional centers, city centers, urban neighborhoods, and mixed-use corridors in the inner Bay Area.

***Share of Regional Job Growth in PDA by Industry Group by Scenario 2010 – 2040***

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<i>Total region</i>	58%	55%	47%
<i>Agriculture and Natural Resources</i>	27%	27%	27%
<i>Manufacturing Wholesale and Transportation</i>	43%	43%	39%
<i>Retail</i>	61%	58%	55%
<i>Professional services/Finance</i>	65%	60%	45%
<i>Health, Education, Recreation Services</i>	48%	48%	47%
<i>Other: Information, Government, Construction</i>	67%	63%	51%

*Share of Regional Job Growth in PDA by Place Type by Scenario 2010 – 2040*

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
Total PDA/GOA Jobs	58.3%	55.3%	46.9%
<b>Inner Bay</b>			
Regional Center	21.4%	19.0%	12.5%
City Center	4.4%	3.9%	4.0%
Suburban Center	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%
Transit Town Center	2.6%	2.7%	2.9%
Urban Neighborhood	5.1%	4.6%	3.5%
Transit Neighborhood	2.3%	2.5%	1.8%
Mixed-Use Corridor	13.3%	12.1%	11.1%
Employment Center	1.4%	1.5%	1.2%
<b>Outer Bay</b>			
Regional Center	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
City Center	0.7%	0.8%	0.8%
Suburban Center	2.0%	2.2%	2.5%
Transit Town Center	1.7%	1.9%	1.8%
Transit Neighborhood	0.8%	0.9%	1.3%
Mixed-Use Corridor	1.4%	1.6%	1.9%
Employment Center	0.2%	0.2%	0.3%
Rural Town Center	0.1%	0.2%	0.1%
Rural Mixed-Use Corridor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

*Share of Regional Professional and Business Services / Finance Job Growth in PDA by Place Type by Scenario 2010 – 2040*

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
Total PDA/GOA Jobs	65.1%	60.0%	45.4%
<b><u>Inner Bay</u></b>			
Regional Center	29.5%	25.3%	12.8%
City Center	4.7%	4.0%	5.1%
Suburban Center	0.7%	0.9%	1.4%
Transit Town Center	2.0%	2.4%	2.9%
Urban Neighborhood	4.7%	4.0%	2.8%
Transit Neighborhood	1.9%	2.3%	0.7%
Mixed-Use Corridor	14.3%	12.3%	11.5%
Employment Center	1.2%	1.5%	0.9%
<b><u>Outer Bay</u></b>			
Regional Center	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
City Center	0.7%	0.8%	0.9%
Suburban Center	1.9%	2.2%	1.9%
Transit Town Center	1.5%	1.8%	1.1%
Transit Neighborhood	0.6%	0.7%	1.4%
Mixed-Use Corridor	1.1%	1.4%	1.5%
Employment Center	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%
Rural Town Center	0.1%	0.2%	0.2%
Rural Mixed-Use Corridor	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

**Share of Regional Retail Job Growth in PDA by Place Type by Scenario 2010 – 2040**

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
Total PDA/GOA Jobs	61.3%	57.9%	55.0%
<b>Inner Bay</b>			
Regional Center	10.2%	9.2%	9.5%
City Center	4.7%	4.4%	4.2%
Suburban Center	3.2%	3.0%	3.2%
Transit Town Center	5.3%	4.8%	3.6%
Urban Neighborhood	5.1%	4.4%	3.6%
Transit Neighborhood	4.5%	4.0%	3.3%
Mixed-Use Corridor	16.2%	14.7%	12.1%
Employment Center	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
<b>Outer Bay</b>			
Regional Center	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%
City Center	0.9%	1.2%	1.2%
Suburban Center	4.1%	4.3%	6.3%
Transit Town Center	2.2%	2.2%	1.9%
Transit Neighborhood	1.7%	1.9%	2.0%
Mixed-Use Corridor	2.3%	2.7%	2.8%
Employment Center	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rural Town Center	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rural Mixed-Use Corridor	0.0%	0.0%	0.1%

**Job Growth by County and PDA by Scenario 2010 – 2040**

	<b>PDA Jobs</b>			<b>County Jobs</b>		
	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
Alameda	106,300	104,000	93,500	203,800	203,700	216,300
Contra Costa	38,000	41,300	46,500	96,400	104,900	126,300
Marin	6,000	6,800	7,900	31,700	34,600	35,900
Napa	300	300	300	14,600	15,600	22,000
San Francisco	206,500	178,000	127,000	206,900	179,100	127,000
San Mateo	41,900	40,300	35,200	99,600	104,000	112,700
Santa Clara	159,300	154,000	129,300	254,200	257,400	247,400
<b>Solano</b>	<b>6,600</b>	<b>7,300</b>	<b>7,500</b>	<b>42,000</b>	<b>46,200</b>	<b>50,200</b>
Sonoma	15,600	17,600	19,700	45,500	49,200	57,100
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>580,400</b>	<b>549,700</b>	<b>467,000</b>	<b>994,800</b>	<b>994,800</b>	<b>994,800</b>

#### 4. REGIONAL HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

The three scenarios, Core Concentration, Focused Growth and Outer Bay Area Growth, address the distribution of 771,000 households by 2040 through alternative land use patterns. Each of these scenarios relates to the employment growth and the three distribution patterns described in the previous section. Levels of household growth are specifically linked to the concentration of knowledge-based and local serving jobs. The three scenarios support healthy economic growth by 2040.

Shifting from the dominant development trend of single-family homes in greenfield areas over the last three decades, the three scenarios assume a higher concentration of households within multi-family housing at transit nodes and corridors with appropriate services and stores. Most of the growth is expected to be accommodated through 3 to 6 story wood-frame buildings, with the exception of major downtown areas where steel-frame buildings of more than 10 stories would be constructed.

The scenarios vary in the overall share of households in PDAs as well as by Place Type and city. The distribution of household growth is based on local input and regional criteria established through the densities and scale of Place Types, transit service, employment, and net low-income commuters. In addition, in the three scenarios each city is expected to reach a minimum household growth equivalent to 40 percent of its household formation. This last factor comes from the Regional Housing Need Allocation methodology for 2014-2022, which identifies the housing needs by city to be addressed through local plans and zoning controls.

Local plans and their proposed housing growth are an important component in the distribution of household growth. Local input on household growth from each jurisdiction was utilized in at least one of the three scenarios.

The PDAs and the growth factors directly addressed equity in the SCS. This final approach to the alternative scenarios is the result of in-depth interactions with equity groups. PDAs cover a wide range of neighborhoods with diverse income levels, infrastructure needs, and transit service. Regional staff worked closely with local jurisdictions to identify neighborhoods appropriate for PDA designation that need public investment for current and future populations as well as areas that are ready to accommodate additional housing. Two growth factors are directly linked to equity. The low-income net in-commuters' factor recognizes the potential of cities with high employment and limited affordable housing to accommodate future household growth. Similarly, the minimum growth floor of 40 percent of jurisdictions' household formation level allows cities with good services to accommodate a portion of their own population growth.

In order to appropriately address equity in the SCS, ABAG and MTC will conduct a thorough assessment of regional income levels and distribution. This report only includes some minor revisions to the income distribution factors used in Projections 2009. Current regional economic changes in the type of businesses, jobs, and labor indicate some regional income polarization. This task requires detailed attention and will be a priority over the next several weeks in preparation for the draft Preferred Scenario.

**Overview of household growth by scenario**

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<b>Land use trends</b>	More growth in PDAs, particularly in Inner Bay Area's major employment centers and transit nodes	Growth throughout regional transit corridors and job centers	Less growth in PDAs, more growth in Outer Bay Area along transit corridors.
<b>Growth factors</b>	Transit service Employment Net low-income commuters		
<b>Minimum level of growth</b>	40% of the expected household formation rate for each jurisdiction		
<b>PDA household growth</b>	Based on Focused Growth Scenario, increase household growth by 20% in Inner Bay Area, plus or minus housing value factor	Growth within PDAs based on minimum level of growth by Place Type.	Based on Focused Growth Scenario, increase household growth by 5 to 30% in Outer Bay Area depending on job growth

*Core Concentration Growth Scenario:* This scenario assumes a concentration of households in PDAs and jurisdictions in the Inner Bay Area to take advantage of the core transit network.

*Focused Growth Scenario:* This scenario assumes focused household growth in PDAs throughout the region's transit corridors.

*Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario:* Closer to recent development trends than the other two scenarios, this scenario assumes more growth of households in the Outer Bay Area in relation to the employment growth by jurisdiction.

The three scenarios vary in their share of PDA household growth from 67 to 79 percent of all regional growth. PDAs currently account for 24 percent of all households in the region. The PDA share of households increases to between 34 and 37 percent of all households in the three scenarios.

***Households in PDAs by Scenario: Current and Future Trends 2010 – 2040***

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<b><i>PDA households 2010</i></b>	634,730	634,730	634,730
<b><i>PDA households 2040</i></b>	1,239,900	1,187,740	1,154,970
<b><i>PDA households growth 2010-2040</i></b>	605,170	553,010	520,270
<b><i>PDA share of total households 2040</i></b>	37%	35%	34%
<b><i>PDA household growth share 2010-2040</i></b>	79%	72%	67%

In the Core Concentration Growth Scenario, Inner Bay Area jurisdictions for the most part experience a greater concentration of growth within their PDAs than in the Focused Growth Scenario, whereas in the Outer Bay Area Scenario growth is less concentrated in the PDAs. In each of the scenarios, the 40 percent housing growth threshold has a considerable affect on some of the smaller residential communities throughout the region.

The concentration of households varies by Place Type. In each scenario, the greatest share of regional growth is within the Mixed-Use Corridors, followed by Regional Centers. The Core Concentration Growth Scenario brings a higher concentration of households at Regional Centers, City Centers, Urban Neighborhoods, and Mixed-Use Corridors. This includes downtown areas in Oakland, San Francisco and San Jose and the San Pablo, Mission, and El Camino transit corridors. The Transit Town Centers and Transit Neighborhoods also play an important role in the Core Concentration Growth Scenario, as many of the PDAs along the core transit network in the Inner Bay Area have these Place Types. In the Focused Growth and Outer Bay Area scenarios, growth is more evenly distributed across all Place Types. The Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario shows higher growth in suburban centers such as the Dublin, Livermore, and San Ramon PDAs

**Share of Regional Household Growth in PDA by Place Type by Scenario 2010 – 2040**

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<b>Total PDA/GOA Share of Households</b>	37%	35%	34%
Regional Center	12.6%	11.2%	10.3%
City Center	8.4%	8.3%	7.7%
Suburban Center	8.3%	8.3%	8.5%
Urban Neighborhood	7.3%	6.1%	5.1%
Transit Town Center	11.2%	9.9%	9.8%
Transit Neighborhood	10.2%	9.3%	9.2%
Mixed-Use Corridor	20.2%	18.3%	16.6%
Employment Center	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Rural Town Center	0.1%	0.1%	0.1%
Rural Mixed-Use Corridor	0.2%	0.2%	0.2%

The distribution of growth by county varies according to their transit access and the relationship of the county to the Inner and Outer Bay Area. Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara, counties have high levels of existing transit service and are primarily within the Inner Bay Area. As a result these counties have more growth in the Core Concentration Growth Scenario. North Bay Counties—Marin, Napa, Solano and Sonoma— and much of Contra Costa County are identified as part of the Outer Bay Area and many of their cities have limited transit access. Thus they display higher growth in the Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario.

**Household Growth by County and PDA by Scenario 2010 – 2040**

	<b>PDA Households</b>			<b>County Households</b>		
	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
Alameda	132,610	121,050	111,740	167,750	172,990	164,300
Contra Costa	66,790	67,510	72,650	96,880	110,930	136,550
Marin	4,100	6,380	6,690	10,100	11,260	13,250
Napa	1,660	1,660	1,740	5,520	6,290	7,170
San Francisco	105,110	85,940	71,900	110,640	90,470	76,430
San Mateo	54,820	44,130	40,810	72,110	68,570	61,700
Santa Clara	205,960	182,220	167,280	245,990	242,060	227,120
<b>Solano</b>	<b>15,440</b>	<b>16,390</b>	<b>17,230</b>	<b>28,740</b>	<b>30,860</b>	<b>38,690</b>
Sonoma	18,680	27,730	30,230	33,080	37,380	45,620
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>605,170</b>	<b>553,010</b>	<b>520,270</b>	<b>770,810</b>	<b>770,810</b>	<b>770,830</b>

## 5. NEXT STEPS

The three land use scenarios presented in this report provide the preliminary analysis for the development of the SCS Preferred Scenario. The following additional tasks are pending to inform the Preferred Scenario and will be developed this fall 2011.

1. Land use analysis
  - Further analysis of regional employment and population growth
  - Further analysis of income forecast and distribution
2. Policy Development to support the Preferred Scenario
  - Housing production
  - Infill development investments
  - Transit access
  - Complete Communities
3. Transportation network analysis
4. Performance targets results for the three Alternative Land Use Scenarios
5. Gather input from local jurisdictions and stakeholders to inform development of the Preferred Scenario

## APPENDIX I

### 1. EMPLOYMENT DISTRIBUTION DATA AND METHODOLOGY

#### *Data Sources*

##### **California Department of Transportation Sector Forecast (Caltrans)**

Caltrans uses an econometric model to project employment by industry out to 2040 for each county in California. The agency's model uses variables and assumptions taken from the UCLA Anderson Forecast and historic employment data from EDD. The most recent projections were released in March 2010. In comparison, the most recent EDD and BLS projections available date from 2008 and 2009. A complete description of the 2010 Caltrans projection methodology and data out to 2035 (2040 data was provided upon request) is available at:

[http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ote/socio\\_economic.html](http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ote/socio_economic.html).

##### **Walls & Associates / Dun and Bradstreet (NETS)**

Walls & Associates converts Dun and Bradstreet archival establishment data into a time-series database of establishment information called the National Establishment Times-Series (NETS) Database. ABAG has analyzed the NETS data to provide information on the spatial distribution of jobs at the jurisdiction and PDA level by employment sector, as well as changes in spatial distribution at these geographies from 1989-2009. More information on the NETS data is available at: <http://www.youreconomy.org/nets/?region=Walls>

#### *Methodology*

##### **2010 Employment**

Current employment is based on total jobs established for the Current Regional Plans and Initial Vision Scenario and the Caltrans breakdown by employment sector for the region for 2010. NETS 2009 data is used to distribute jobs by geography for each sector.

##### **Scenario Employment Distribution**

The Caltrans forecast – scaled to match the regional constrained employment total established for the three alternative scenarios – was used for the regional growth by employment sector for all three scenarios. Each scenario follows two basic steps for then distributing employment growth by geography for each sector.

1. As a baseline, Focused Growth and Core Concentration Growth Scenarios maintain 2010 employment distribution by Place Type and county into the future and Outer Bay Area Growth Scenarios slows down the 1989-2009 trends in distribution of jobs by Place Type and county.
2. A portion of local-serving jobs and knowledge-based jobs are then distributed to follow the investments and growth pattern for each scenario.

### **Core Concentration Growth Scenario**

The Core Concentration Growth Scenario starts with a baseline of maintaining 2010 employment distribution by sector by geography. 50% of new Retail jobs and 10% of new Health, Educational, and Recreational Services jobs were then allocated by PDA and by jurisdiction in conjunction with the housing growth distribution, reflecting a share of local-serving jobs that follows the housing growth in the Core Concentration scenario. An additional 15% of new Information, Professional & Business Services, and Government jobs were located in Inner Bay PDA locations that were Regional Center, Mixed-Use Corridor, City Center, and Urban Neighborhood Place Types. This reflects a further concentration in these sectors into the transit-served locations where they are already concentrated, corresponding to a stronger agglomeration of the knowledge-based and other vertical-office-user jobs into these core areas. These additional office jobs were also allocated to the corresponding jurisdiction.

### **Focused Growth Scenario**

The Focused Growth Scenario also starts with a baseline of maintaining 2010 employment distribution by sector by geography. 50% of new Retail jobs and 10% of new Health, Educational, and Recreational Services jobs were again allocated by PDA and by jurisdiction in conjunction with the housing growth distribution in the Focused Growth Scenario. The Focused Growth Scenario also includes an additional 10% of new Information, Professional & Business Services, and Government jobs locating in PDA locations, reflecting a further consolidation of office uses in PDAs. These additional office jobs were distributed to PDAs throughout the region in proportion to their existing share of these sectors.

### **Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario**

The Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario starts with a baseline that slows the 1989-2009 trend in job distribution by PDA Place Type (for the PDA distribution) and by County (for the jurisdiction distribution). In general this exhibits higher growth in the outer bay counties and slower growth in PDAs overall and a shift in share from inner bay PDAs to outer bay PDAs. As in the other two scenarios, 50% of new Retail jobs and 10% of new Health, Education, and Recreation jobs were allocated by PDA and by jurisdiction to match the housing growth distribution in the Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario. In this scenario, no additional office jobs were added to PDA locations. However, for the counties with both inner and outer bay designations (Alameda, Contra Costa, and Santa Clara counties), a share of Professional & Business Services jobs were reallocated from the inner bay to outer bay jurisdictions to reflect the trend in greater dispersal of jobs within these counties.

## 2. HOUSING DISTRIBUTION METHODOLOGY AND DATA

### *Data Sources*

U. S. Census Bureau – 2010 Census

U. S. Census Bureau – Longitudinal Employment and Household Dynamics (LEHD)

MTC Transit Coverage and Frequency by City

### *Methodology*

#### **Scenario Housing Distribution**

Each scenario was developed based on the three key components.

1. ***Growth in Priority Development Areas:*** PDAs define a sustainable and equitable development framework for the SCS. Local and regional efforts support the development of PDAs as complete communities with the appropriate level of services and urban amenities for the current and future residents and workers. The minimum level of growth for each Place Type and local input were used as a basis for the level of growth in the PDAs.
2. ***Growth by local jurisdiction:*** At the city level, jurisdictions' housing levels were based on Projections 2009, with adjustments based on the 2010 Census and local feedback. Household growth by city was determined based on job concentration, transit service, and existing population and jobs. In addition, a factor based on low-wage commuters was applied to the distribution of housing in order to improve access to employment centers served by transit for low-wage workers.
3. ***Growth pattern informed by the Regional Housing Need Allocation (RHNA):*** The scenarios utilized the proposed RHNA approach<sup>1</sup> for setting a minimum level of growth in the jurisdictions to ensure each jurisdiction is doing a reasonable amount of fair share housing to meet the region's housing need. A minimum housing growth threshold for each jurisdiction was set at 40 percent of its household formation growth. The scenarios assume that RHNA, as a short term housing strategy through local general plans, will shape the long term development pattern through a minimum housing floor (jurisdictions would accommodate at least 40 percent of their future household formation). The income distribution component of the proposed RHNA methodology, which is intended to address housing affordability (whereby jurisdictions would move towards the regional distribution of income groups), was not applied for the scenarios. Analysis of regional income levels and distribution is pending.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) is a state mandated process for determining how many housing units, including affordable units, each community must plan to accommodate. See [http://www.onebayarea.org/plan\\_bay\\_area/housing.htm](http://www.onebayarea.org/plan_bay_area/housing.htm) for more information on RHNA.

***Transit and Employment Criteria for Housing Distribution***

<b>TRANSIT TYPE</b>	<b>EXISTING JOB CENTER (10,000+ JOBS)</b>	<b>FOCUSED GROWTH 2035 HOUSING</b>
BART, Muni Metro, VTA Light Rail	Yes	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 25%
BART, Muni Metro, VTA Light Rail	No	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 20%
Caltrain	Yes	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 25%
Caltrain	No	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 20%
ACE, Capitol Corridor, SMART, eBART, Dumbarton Rail	Yes	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 10%
ACE, Capitol Corridor, SMART, eBART, Dumbarton Rail	No	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 5%
BRT Corridors: El Camino Real, San Pablo Avenue, E.14th Street/Mission Bvd	Yes	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 5%
BRT Corridors: El Camino Real, San Pablo Avenue, E.14th Street/Mission Bvd	No	Increase to low-range Place Type density
PDA's not on major corridors	Yes	Increase to low-range Place Type density plus 10%
PDA's not on major corridors	No	Increase to min Place Type density minus 10%

**Focused Growth Scenario**

For the Focused Growth Scenario, the level of growth in a PDA was taken as the higher of:

- a. the planned level of growth in the PDA, based on jurisdictional feedback on the Initial Vision Scenario, and
- b. the minimum level of growth based on the PDA's Place Type.

The minimum level of growth for a PDA was calculated by multiplying the minimum density for the PDA's Place Type by the redevelopable acreage in the PDA, which was assumed to be 10% of net acreage. The minimum density for each PDA was scaled up or down based on transit tiers and whether the PDA is an existing job center containing 10,000+ jobs. The table below shows the distribution rules for each transit tier/job center combination. If the planned level of growth

in a PDA was lower than the minimum calculated for its Place Type, the growth for that PDA was increased to the calculated minimum.

At the city level, the share of growth within each jurisdictions' PDAs was capped at 95 percent of the jurisdiction's total growth.

### **Core Concentration Growth Scenario**

For the Core Concentration Growth Scenario, growth was shifted to PDAs in the Inner Bay Area. First, housing growth was increased by 20 percent above Focused Growth Scenario levels for these PDAs. Next, housing levels were adjusted up or down based on a housing value factor for each jurisdiction. The housing value adjustment ranged from +15 to -15 percent, based on median home value. ABAG reduced growth in Outer Bay Area PDAs to the desired levels stated by local jurisdictions in their Initial Vision Scenario feedback.

At the city level, housing growth within the Outer Bay Area jurisdictions was reduced to account for the re-distribution of housing to Inner Bay Area PDAs. Housing levels in Inner Bay Area jurisdictions were kept at their Focused Growth Scenario levels or were increased slightly to account for an increase in their PDAs' housing levels, with the share of growth within each jurisdictions' PDAs capped at 95 percent of the jurisdiction's total growth.

### **Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario**

To create the Outer Bay Area Growth Scenario, ABAG first estimated the potential job increase to each jurisdiction. ABAG continued the region's trend in recent decades of jobs shifting from inner to outer counties and from PDAs to outer areas. Within Alameda, Santa Clara and Contra Costa Counties, a share of professional and business growth was also shifted from the Inner Bay Area to Outer Bay Area jurisdictions.

ABAG increased housing growth in those Outer Bay Area jurisdictions that saw significant job growth. Outer Bay Area jurisdictions that had more than 3,000 new jobs received a 30% increase in housing growth in their PDAs over the Focused Growth Scenario, those that grew by 1,000 to 3,000 jobs received a 10% increase in their PDAs, and those that grew by less than 1,000 jobs received a 5% increase.

ABAG reduced growth in Inner Bay Area PDAs to the desired levels stated by local jurisdictions in their Initial Vision Scenario feedback. However, since the City and County of San Francisco did not request a reduction from the Initial Vision Scenario, ABAG reduced each San Francisco PDA's housing growth by 20%.

At the city level, Inner Bay Area jurisdictions' housing units were reduced to desired levels. These housing units were re-distributed to the Outer Bay Area jurisdictions based on each jurisdiction's share of regional growth. Outer Bay Area jurisdiction growth levels may also have increased to account for an increase in units within their PDAs. The share of jurisdictional growth in PDAs within the Outer Bay Area jurisdictions was capped at 85 percent.

## Transportation Assumptions

The following transportation network assumptions, based in part on local jurisdictional feedback on the Initial Vision Scenario, were used to develop the three scenarios:

	<b>Core Concentration</b>	<b>Focused Growth</b>	<b>Outer Bay Area</b>
<i>Bus service</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased frequency and capacity within Inner Bay and along main corridors</li> <li>▪ Bus Rapid Transit service on El Camino Real and E.14th Street/ Mission Blvd.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased frequency and capacity within Inner Bay and along main corridors</li> <li>▪ Bus Rapid Transit service on El Camino Real, San Pablo Ave, and E.14th Street/ Mission Blvd.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased frequency and capacity along main corridors and improved local bus service.</li> </ul>
<i>Rail</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased frequency and capacity along core network</li> <li>▪ Expansion of commuter rail systems in Inner Bay</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased frequency and capacity along core network</li> <li>▪ Expansion of commuter rail systems</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion of commuter rail systems in Outer Bay</li> </ul>
<i>Commute patterns</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase transit trips within and between West Bay and East Bay.</li> <li>▪ Reduce number of auto trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase transit trips within and between West Bay and East Bay.</li> <li>▪ Reduce number of auto trips</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduce length of auto trips</li> </ul>

## **APPENDIX II: TABLES**

- Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction
- Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

<b>KEY</b>
<i>Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)</i>
Priority Development Area
<i>Growth Opportunity Area (Italics)</i>

**Alameda County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Jobs	Core Concentration 2010-2040 Job Growth	Focused 2010-2040 Job Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Alameda</b>		<b>26,480</b>	<b>7,570</b>	<b>8,220</b>	<b>7,870</b>
Naval Air Station	Transit Town Center	1,310	770	770	830
<i>Northern Waterfront</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	1,290	460	470	260
<b>Albany</b>		<b>5,070</b>	<b>1,410</b>	<b>1,350</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<i>San Pablo Avenue &amp; Solano Avenue</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	2,880	920	830	560
<b>Berkeley</b>		<b>73,780</b>	<b>22,300</b>	<b>22,100</b>	<b>21,430</b>
Adeline Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	940	310	280	250
Downtown	City Center	14,220	6,750	5,970	6,240
San Pablo Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,430	730	690	670
South Shattuck	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,000	280	250	160
Telegraph Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,700	570	530	500
University Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,680	520	480	450
<b>Dublin</b>		<b>17,490</b>	<b>4,950</b>	<b>5,520</b>	<b>9,890</b>
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Suburban Center	4,620	1,030	1,130	1,400
Town Center	Suburban Center	320	220	220	270
Transit Center	Suburban Center	0	160	170	200
<b>Emeryville</b>		<b>16,350</b>	<b>6,010</b>	<b>5,660</b>	<b>5,290</b>
Mixed-Use Core	City Center	11,490	4,630	4,190	4,650
<b>Fremont</b>		<b>89,280</b>	<b>26,360</b>	<b>26,320</b>	<b>27,770</b>
Centerville	Transit Neighborhood	2,980	1,140	1,230	670
City Center	City Center	16,300	7,070	6,330	6,630
Irvington District	Transit Town Center	2,670	890	930	1,020
<i>Ardenwood Business Park</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	1,970	610	680	530
<i>Fremont Boulevard &amp; Warm Springs Boulevard Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	9,710	3,350	3,050	2,910
<i>Fremont Boulevard Decoto Road Crossing</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	270	90	90	80
<i>South Fremont/Warm Springs</i>	<i>Suburban Center</i>	7,940	1,990	2,060	1,940
<b>Hayward</b>		<b>63,960</b>	<b>16,050</b>	<b>16,650</b>	<b>17,440</b>
Downtown	City Center	6,200	1,950	1,790	1,820
South Hayward BART	Mixed-Use Corridor	330	140	140	120
South Hayward BART	Urban Neighborhood	480	320	300	280
The Cannery	Transit Neighborhood	1,190	360	400	320
<i>Carlos Bee Quarry</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	0	40	40	40
<i>Mission Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,450	470	440	410
<b>Livermore</b>		<b>47,200</b>	<b>13,540</b>	<b>15,090</b>	<b>20,130</b>
Downtown	Suburban Center	2,870	910	960	1,180
Vasco Road TOD	Suburban Center	5,910	1,220	1,410	1,790
<b>Newark</b>		<b>16,820</b>	<b>4,170</b>	<b>4,440</b>	<b>4,420</b>
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Transit Town Center	1,200	370	370	380
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Transit Neighborhood	180	70	70	50
<i>Cedar Boulevard Transit</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	170	100	90	70
<i>Civic Center Re-Use Transit</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	510	150	160	200
<b>Oakland</b>		<b>196,600</b>	<b>64,390</b>	<b>58,930</b>	<b>57,160</b>
Coliseum BART Station Area	Transit Town Center	5,450	1,520	1,610	1,680
Downtown & Jack London Square	Regional Center	92,180	34,070	35,210	26,080
Eastmont Town Center	Urban Neighborhood	3,570	1,270	1,130	790
Fruitvale & Diamond Areas	Urban Neighborhood	8,490	2,920	2,690	2,190
MacArthur Transit Village	Urban Neighborhood	10,460	3,270	3,110	2,570
Transit Oriented Development Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	33,650	12,620	11,540	10,960
West Oakland	Transit Town Center	7,570	2,370	2,390	2,660
<b>Piedmont</b>		<b>2,100</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>330</b>
<b>Pleasanton</b>		<b>52,510</b>	<b>14,580</b>	<b>16,150</b>	<b>21,510</b>
Hacienda	Suburban Center	9,870	3,720	4,290	4,400
<b>San Leandro</b>		<b>39,350</b>	<b>10,750</b>	<b>10,800</b>	<b>11,300</b>
Bay Fair BART Transit Village	Transit Town Center	1,470	340	360	350
Downtown Transit Oriented Development	City Center	7,910	3,220	2,890	2,960
East 14th Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,500	2,660	2,390	2,300
<b>Union City</b>		<b>19,260</b>	<b>4,650</b>	<b>4,790</b>	<b>4,620</b>
Intermodal Station District	City Center	340	160	150	160
<i>Mission Boulevard</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	20	20	20	20
<i>Old Alvarado</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	470	210	190	180
<b>Alameda County Unincorporated</b>		<b>23,480</b>	<b>6,420</b>	<b>6,960</b>	<b>6,170</b>
<i>Castro Valley BART</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	2,030	530	560	330
<i>East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard Mixed Use Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	2,390	770	710	670

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

**Contra Costa County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Jobs	Core Concentration 2010-2040 Job Growth	Focused 2010-2040 Job Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Antioch</b>		<b>19,910</b>	<b>5,140</b>	<b>5,560</b>	<b>6,900</b>
Hillcrest eBART Station	Suburban Center	20	150	170	170
Rivertown Waterfront	Transit Town Center	3,910	1,060	1,190	1,200
<b>Brentwood</b>		<b>8,370</b>	<b>2,470</b>	<b>2,750</b>	<b>3,480</b>
<b>Clayton</b>		<b>2,280</b>	<b>610</b>	<b>670</b>	<b>1,000</b>
<b>Concord</b>		<b>50,570</b>	<b>13,890</b>	<b>15,070</b>	<b>18,900</b>
Community Reuse Area	Regional Center	170	220	230	300
Community Reuse Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	550	600	710
Downtown BART Station Planning Area	City Center	6,910	2,160	2,400	2,550
North Concord BART Adjacent Employment Center	Employment Center	5,940	1,590	1,770	2,680
West Downtown Planning Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,300	1,010	1,140	1,380
<b>Danville</b>		<b>12,750</b>	<b>3,490</b>	<b>3,780</b>	<b>4,850</b>
<b>El Cerrito</b>		<b>6,550</b>	<b>1,880</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>1,680</b>
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,480	920	850	680
<b>Hercules</b>		<b>4,390</b>	<b>1,400</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,970</b>
Central Hercules	Transit Neighborhood	900	400	450	590
Waterfront District	Transit Town Center	1,280	400	430	450
<b>Lafayette</b>		<b>10,330</b>	<b>2,990</b>	<b>3,280</b>	<b>4,200</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	6,180	1,770	1,930	1,740
<b>Martinez</b>		<b>32,020</b>	<b>6,960</b>	<b>7,860</b>	<b>8,860</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	6,820	1,660	1,910	2,730
<b>Moraga</b>		<b>4,180</b>	<b>1,270</b>	<b>1,380</b>	<b>1,890</b>
Moraga Center	Transit Town Center	1,200	460	520	400
<b>Oakley</b>		<b>3,760</b>	<b>1,130</b>	<b>1,210</b>	<b>2,110</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	580	210	230	210
Employment Area	Suburban Center	730	220	230	270
Potential Planning Area	Transit Neighborhood	300	180	190	250
<b>Orinda</b>		<b>5,200</b>	<b>1,560</b>	<b>1,730</b>	<b>2,350</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,750	840	950	790
<b>Pinole</b>		<b>6,600</b>	<b>1,740</b>	<b>1,870</b>	<b>2,490</b>
Appian Way Corridor	Suburban Center	2,460	660	690	840
Old Town	Transit Town Center	1,410	360	390	400
<b>Pittsburg</b>		<b>16,710</b>	<b>4,510</b>	<b>4,820</b>	<b>5,960</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	1,560	620	650	1,010
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Town Center	150	200	220	200
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Transit Town Center	6,500	1,670	1,820	1,860
<b>Pleasant Hill</b>		<b>19,490</b>	<b>6,080</b>	<b>6,760</b>	<b>8,440</b>
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,510	1,170	1,360	1,680
Diablo Valley College	Transit Neighborhood	2,950	1,610	1,910	3,550
<b>Richmond</b>		<b>34,290</b>	<b>10,130</b>	<b>10,220</b>	<b>8,720</b>
Central Richmond	City Center	6,250	2,540	2,310	2,280
South Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	6,600	1,880	2,060	1,420
23rd Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	320	140	140	130
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,910	900	810	780
<b>San Pablo</b>		<b>8,000</b>	<b>2,050</b>	<b>2,150</b>	<b>2,700</b>
<b>San Ramon</b>		<b>42,110</b>	<b>10,930</b>	<b>12,130</b>	<b>14,820</b>
City Center	Suburban Center	11,290	1,980	2,190	2,830
North Camino Ramon	Transit Town Center	10,720	3,490	3,870	3,670
<b>Walnut Creek</b>		<b>50,600</b>	<b>13,690</b>	<b>15,290</b>	<b>18,610</b>
West Downtown	Suburban Center	7,410	2,670	3,060	3,050
<b>Contra Costa County Unincorporated</b>		<b>14,740</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>4,930</b>	<b>6,380</b>
Contra Costa Centre	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,470	890	1,050	1,200
Downtown El Sobrante	Mixed-Use Corridor	970	280	290	370
North Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	1,850	520	540	760
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Neighborhood	400	340	360	420
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee: San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	9,490	2,660	2,770	3,320

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

**Marin County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<i>Belvedere</i>		460	130	140	150
<i>Corte Madera</i>		6,840	1,760	1,880	2,000
<i>Fairfax</i>		2,430	650	700	760
<i>Larkspur</i>		8,250	2,270	2,460	2,590
<i>Mill Valley</i>		6,330	1,900	2,080	2,180
<i>Novato</i>		22,600	5,820	6,370	6,640
<i>Ross</i>		510	150	160	160
<i>San Anselmo</i>		4,160	1,210	1,320	1,380
<i>San Rafael</i>		42,000	11,040	12,030	12,310
Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center	Transit Town Center	5,800	1,730	1,940	1,770
Downtown	City Center	8,830	2,590	2,930	3,060
<i>Sausalito</i>		7,460	2,520	2,820	2,860
<i>Tiburon</i>		2,960	930	1,030	1,090
<i>Marin County Unincorporated</i>		10,860	3,320	3,620	3,740
Urbanized 101 Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	2,630	820	1,010	1,560
<i>San Quentin</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	3,100	870	940	1,520

**Napa County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<i>American Canyon</i>		2,480	610	630	920
Highway 29 Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,040	280	290	340
<i>Calistoga</i>		2,300	570	600	790
<i>Napa</i>		28,740	7,270	7,730	10,950
<i>St. Helena</i>		4,390	970	1,040	1,570
<i>Yountville</i>		1,440	400	430	610
<i>Napa County Unincorporated</i>		22,390	4,830	5,170	7,130

**San Francisco County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<i>San Francisco</i>		550,340	206,920	179,140	126,990
19th Avenue	Transit Town Center	10,490	2,850	2,880	3,350
Balboa Park	Transit Neighborhood	2,540	810	870	910
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Urban Neighborhood	20,270	7,970	7,170	5,900
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Regional Center	300,220	114,920	94,080	57,350
Eastern Neighborhoods	Urban Neighborhood	60,230	22,950	20,680	16,040
Market & Octavia	Urban Neighborhood	29,780	8,760	7,900	4,810
Mission Bay	Urban Neighborhood	2,900	1,380	1,230	980
Mission-San Jose Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	12,030	4,740	4,300	4,050
Port of San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,280	2,010	1,850	1,710
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with City of Brisba	Transit Neighborhood	1,830	1,230	1,240	460
Transbay Terminal	Regional Center	7,680	4,480	3,870	2,340
Treasure Island	Transit Town Center	250	650	570	450
<i>Citywide</i>		96,840	33,720	31,390	28,630

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

**San Mateo County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Jobs	Core Concentration 2010-2040 Job Growth	Focused 2010-2040 Job Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Atherton</b>		2,280		710	780
<b>Belmont</b>		7,400		2,520	2,470
<b>Brisbane</b>		6,270		1,780	1,910
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco Suburban Center)		440		190	190
<b>Burlingame</b>		25,880		7,440	8,060
Burlingame El Camino Real	Transit Town Center	10,520		2,940	3,090
<b>Colma</b>		2,540		510	490
<b>Daly City</b>		19,370		5,840	5,930
Bayshore	Transit Town Center	980		430	440
Mission Boulevard	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,520		1,110	1,030
<i>Citywide</i>		12,670		3,430	3,730
<b>East Palo Alto</b>		2,670		880	920
Ravenswood	Transit Town Center	900		290	310
<i>Woodland/Willow Neighborhood</i>	<i>Urban Neighborhood</i>	170		130	100
<b>Foster City</b>		13,380		3,900	4,360
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>		4,940		1,260	1,370
<b>Hillsborough</b>		2,110		660	740
<b>Menlo Park</b>		41,320		11,090	12,080
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Transit Town Center	5,200		1,520	1,650
<b>Millbrae</b>		6,910		2,140	2,000
Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,280		450	410
<b>Pacifica</b>		5,690		1,550	1,680
<b>Portola Valley</b>		1,780		500	560
<b>Redwood City</b>		58,370		17,820	18,250
Downtown	City Center	7,920		3,100	2,740
<i>Broadway</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	5,010		1,490	1,380
<i>Middlefield</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	2,380		830	760
<i>Mixed Use Waterfront</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	610		360	320
<i>Veterans Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	3,880		1,220	1,120
<b>San Bruno</b>		12,110		3,960	3,720
Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,390		2,170	1,990
<b>San Carlos</b>		16,050		4,990	4,890
Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center	1,820		420	450
<b>San Mateo</b>		50,640		16,320	17,210
Downtown	City Center	3,900		1,420	1,310
El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,110		580	540
Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	8,780		2,060	2,210
<b>South San Francisco</b>		38,490		11,410	12,030
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,200		880	900
<i>Lindenville Transit Neighborhood</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	2,530		1,180	1,330
<b>Woodside</b>		2,630		570	640
<b>San Mateo County Unincorporated</b>		11,110		3,810	3,950
City County Association of Governments of San Mateo Count Mixed-Use Corridor		68,720		22,870	21,200

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

**Santa Clara County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Campbell</b>		<b>23,950</b>	<b>6,300</b>	<b>6,700</b>	<b>6,590</b>
Central Redevelopment Area	Transit Neighborhood	5,850	1,640	1,820	1,380
Winchester Boulevard Master Plan	Transit Neighborhood	1,110	280	310	200
<b>Cupertino</b>		<b>20,990</b>	<b>6,660</b>	<b>6,630</b>	<b>6,360</b>
<b>Gilroy</b>		<b>17,730</b>	<b>4,200</b>	<b>4,490</b>	<b>8,420</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,030	640	700	660
<b>Los Altos</b>		<b>13,290</b>	<b>4,870</b>	<b>4,810</b>	<b>4,810</b>
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,710	1,200	1,080	1,020
<b>Los Altos Hills</b>		<b>2,960</b>	<b>1,140</b>	<b>1,220</b>	<b>1,400</b>
<b>Los Gatos</b>		<b>18,900</b>	<b>5,250</b>	<b>5,570</b>	<b>5,370</b>
<b>Milpitas</b>		<b>38,820</b>	<b>10,610</b>	<b>11,360</b>	<b>10,720</b>
Transit Area	Suburban Center	3,760	1,790	1,920	2,370
Hammond Transit Neighborhood	Transit Neighborhood	710	160	160	40
McCandless Transit Neighborhood	Transit Neighborhood	920	400	460	150
McCarthy Ranch Employment Center	Employment Center	1,440	340	370	270
Midtown Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	720	310	290	270
Serra Center Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	570	130	130	120
Tasman Employment Center	Employment Center	7,560	1,740	1,870	1,050
Town Center Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	530	170	160	150
Yosemite Employment Center	Employment Center	7,000	1,730	1,890	1,340
<b>Monte Sereno</b>		<b>530</b>	<b>200</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>220</b>
<b>Morgan Hill</b>		<b>16,370</b>	<b>4,090</b>	<b>4,450</b>	<b>7,160</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,370	480	530	530
<b>Mountain View</b>		<b>45,690</b>	<b>14,180</b>	<b>15,280</b>	<b>14,630</b>
Whisman Station	Transit Neighborhood	710	310	340	310
Downtown	Transit Town Center	5,810	2,170	2,470	2,670
East Whisman	Employment Center	4,220	1,670	1,920	1,670
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,950	1,460	1,330	1,240
Moffett Field/NASA Ames	Suburban Center	410	270	260	360
North Bayshore	Suburban Center	6,420	2,080	2,270	230
San Antonio Center	Transit Town Center	2,530	850	890	880
<b>Palo Alto</b>		<b>75,380</b>	<b>26,630</b>	<b>27,820</b>	<b>19,360</b>
California Avenue	Transit Neighborhood	2,770	1,260	1,390	680
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,230	5,990	5,190	4,990
University Avenue/Downtown	Transit Town Center	12,830	4,080	4,530	4,840
<b>San Jose</b>		<b>363,730</b>	<b>116,760</b>	<b>112,610</b>	<b>109,040</b>
Berryessa Station	Transit Neighborhood	5,910	1,530	1,630	1,060
Communications Hill	Transit Town Center	3,440	1,010	1,050	1,060
Cottle Transit Village	Suburban Center	2,110	610	610	820
Downtown "Frame"	City Center	25,780	10,390	9,420	9,560
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,970	2,910	3,250	3,930
Greater Downtown	Regional Center	27,820	21,250	23,630	13,650
North San Jose	Regional Center	78,840	37,840	31,970	24,660
West San Carlos and Southwest Expressway Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	8,260	3,860	3,250	3,390
Bascom TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,220	480	450	390
Bascom Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,830	710	640	590
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	910	350	330	300
Camden Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,120	1,500	1,480	1,420
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,600	1,170	1,120	1,000
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Suburban Center	3,150	1,240	1,400	1,890
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Suburban Center	4,860	1,380	1,400	1,650
Saratoga TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,700	1,490	1,360	1,290
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,550	1,500	1,410	1,280
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Suburban Center	3,010	800	840	1,030
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,350	2,000	1,800	1,680
<b>Santa Clara</b>		<b>96,340</b>	<b>30,080</b>	<b>31,370</b>	<b>29,820</b>
Central Expressway Focus Area	City Center	2,550	1,030	930	950
El Camino Real Focus Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,060	1,150	1,080	1,020
Great America Parkway Focus Area	Urban Neighborhood	2,030	1,300	1,150	880
Lawrence Station Focus Area	Transit Neighborhood	3,200	1,260	1,300	520
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	City Center	3,430	1,040	960	830
Tasman East Focus Area	Transit Neighborhood	560	310	320	180
<b>Saratoga</b>		<b>9,850</b>	<b>3,580</b>	<b>3,920</b>	<b>3,890</b>

**Employment Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction**

**Santa Clara County (continued)**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Sunnyvale</b>		<b>63,860</b>	<b>18,270</b>	<b>19,330</b>	<b>17,930</b>
Downtown & Caltrain Station	Transit Town Center	3,310	1,550	1,380	1,320
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	9,910	2,680	2,870	2,790
Lawrence Station Transit Village	Transit Neighborhood	3,800	1,410	1,540	1,700
<i>East Sunnyvale ITR</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	2,510	760	710	690
<i>Moffett Park</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	9,610	2,550	2,870	2,310
<i>Peery Park</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	5,180	1,510	1,680	1,250
<i>Reamwood Light Rail Station</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	960	230	250	190
<i>Tasman Station ITR</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,290	510	470	440
<b>Santa Clara County Unincorporated</b>		<b>3,510</b>	<b>1,360</b>	<b>1,640</b>	<b>1,720</b>
Valley Transportation Authority: Cores, Corridors, and Station	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	172,750	77,640	74,000	60,440

**Solano County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Benicia</b>		<b>14,160</b>	<b>3,630</b>	<b>3,950</b>	<b>4,990</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	2,570	720	800	900
<i>Northern Gateway</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	1,830	490	540	600
<b>Dixon</b>		<b>4,490</b>	<b>1,070</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>1,310</b>
<b>Fairfield</b>		<b>82,840</b>	<b>18,060</b>	<b>20,310</b>	<b>21,420</b>
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Suburban Center	4,100	1,270	1,450	1,410
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Transit Town Center	330	460	470	490
North Texas Street Core	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,410	440	450	530
West Texas Street Gateway	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,640	490	530	640
<b>Rio Vista</b>		<b>2,010</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>540</b>	<b>610</b>
<b>Suisun City</b>		<b>3,510</b>	<b>1,010</b>	<b>1,110</b>	<b>1,280</b>
Downtown & Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,670	500	560	520
<b>Vacaville</b>		<b>32,290</b>	<b>7,600</b>	<b>8,230</b>	<b>8,740</b>
Allison Area	Suburban Center	1,040	150	180	240
Downtown	Transit Town Center	2,860	700	750	880
<b>Vallejo</b>		<b>34,790</b>	<b>8,810</b>	<b>9,530</b>	<b>10,190</b>
Waterfront & Downtown	Suburban Center	4,660	1,350	1,540	1,340
<b>Solano County Unincorporated</b>		<b>5,840</b>	<b>1,320</b>	<b>1,420</b>	<b>1,640</b>

**Sonoma County**

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
		Total Jobs	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth	2010-2040 Job Growth
<b>Cloverdale</b>		<b>1,840</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>510</b>	<b>560</b>
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Transit Town Center	980	300	330	330
<b>Cotati</b>		<b>3,170</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>710</b>	<b>830</b>
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Transit Town Center	560	170	180	190
<b>Healdsburg</b>		<b>6,330</b>	<b>1,660</b>	<b>1,790</b>	<b>2,070</b>
<b>Petaluma</b>		<b>27,880</b>	<b>7,920</b>	<b>8,660</b>	<b>10,300</b>
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Suburban Center	2,710	750	810	970
<b>Rohnert Park</b>		<b>12,600</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>3,770</b>
Sonoma Mountain Village	Suburban Center	130	160	170	160
<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>70,670</b>	<b>18,160</b>	<b>19,640</b>	<b>22,740</b>
Downtown Station Area	City Center	8,390	2,370	3,160	3,390
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	27,500	7,070	8,050	9,700
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	7,990	2,270	2,680	3,070
<i>North Santa Rosa Station</i>	<i>Suburban Center</i>	6,150	1,830	2,000	2,280
<b>Sebastopol</b>		<b>4,980</b>	<b>1,270</b>	<b>1,340</b>	<b>1,470</b>
Nexus Area	Transit Town Center	3,830	1,000	1,090	1,130
<b>Sonoma</b>		<b>6,090</b>	<b>1,590</b>	<b>1,700</b>	<b>1,880</b>
<b>Windsor</b>		<b>5,630</b>	<b>1,410</b>	<b>1,530</b>	<b>1,920</b>
Redevelopment Area	Suburban Center	1,180	450	500	530
<b>Sonoma County Unincorporated</b>		<b>38,430</b>	<b>9,180</b>	<b>9,950</b>	<b>11,530</b>
<i>8th Street East Industrial Area</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	660	150	160	220
<i>Airport/Larkfield Urban Service Area</i>	<i>Suburban Center</i>	5,480	1,440	1,580	1,030
<i>Penngrove Urban Service Area</i>	<i>Rural Town Center</i>	320	120	120	170
<i>The Springs</i>	<i>Rural Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	3,220	1,020	1,090	1,260

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

KEY
<i>Jurisdiction (Bold Italic)</i>
Priority Development Area
<i>Growth Opportunity Area (Italics)</i>

### Alameda County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Alameda</b>		<b>30,120</b>	<b>6,800</b>	<b>5,810</b>	<b>5,720</b>
Naval Air Station	Transit Town Center	1,090	5,250	4,420	4,420
<i>Northern Waterfront</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	390	1,210	1,010	1,010
<b>Albany</b>		<b>7,400</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>960</b>
<i>San Pablo Avenue &amp; Solano Avenue</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,600	820	700	700
<b>Berkeley</b>		<b>46,030</b>	<b>8,370</b>	<b>8,370</b>	<b>8,370</b>
Adeline Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	620	310	260	260
Downtown	City Center	2,570	4,900	3,980	3,980
San Pablo Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,440	1,150	960	960
South Shattuck	Mixed-Use Corridor	310	130	110	110
Telegraph Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	990	510	430	430
University Avenue	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,560	710	580	580
<b>Dublin</b>		<b>14,910</b>	<b>10,900</b>	<b>13,810</b>	<b>15,780</b>
Downtown Specific Plan Area	Suburban Center	790	470	1,030	1,330
Town Center	Suburban Center	3,750	2,150	2,150	2,710
Transit Center	Suburban Center	620	2,580	2,580	3,350
<b>Emeryville</b>		<b>5,690</b>	<b>5,660</b>	<b>5,230</b>	<b>5,240</b>
Mixed-Use Core	City Center	3,530	5,370	5,010	5,010
<b>Fremont</b>		<b>71,000</b>	<b>19,090</b>	<b>17,380</b>	<b>15,500</b>
Centerville	Transit Neighborhood	5,570	1,880	1,600	1,030
City Center	City Center	6,870	6,580	5,540	2,490
Irvington District	Transit Town Center	4,390	2,380	2,020	2,020
<i>Ardenwood Business Park</i>	<i>Employment Center</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Fremont Boulevard &amp; Warm Springs Boulevard Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	8,540	2,640	2,230	2,180
<i>Fremont Boulevard Decoto Road Crossing</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	650	510	430	430
<i>South Fremont/Warm Springs</i>	<i>Suburban Center</i>	20	4,140	3,460	3,000
<b>Hayward</b>		<b>45,370</b>	<b>15,480</b>	<b>15,480</b>	<b>15,480</b>
Downtown	City Center	2,540	3,390	3,070	3,070
South Hayward BART	Mixed-Use Corridor	170	1,300	1,170	1,170
South Hayward BART	Urban Neighborhood	1,660	2,670	2,420	2,420
The Cannery	Transit Neighborhood	410	830	750	750
<i>Carlos Bee Quarry</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	30	610	550	550
<i>Mission Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	910	2,410	2,200	2,200
<b>Livermore</b>		<b>29,130</b>	<b>9,120</b>	<b>11,210</b>	<b>12,550</b>
Downtown	Suburban Center	920	2,860	2,860	3,700
Vasco Road TOD	Suburban Center	330	670	2,500	3,250
<b>Newark</b>		<b>12,970</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>5,800</b>	<b>5,800</b>
Dumbarton Transit Oriented Development	Transit Town Center	140	2,800	2,430	2,430
Old Town Mixed Use Area	Transit Neighborhood	580	440	380	380
<i>Cedar Boulevard Transit</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	0	980	850	850
<i>Civic Center Re-Use Transit</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	200	400	340	340
<b>Oakland</b>		<b>153,790</b>	<b>58,720</b>	<b>57,720</b>	<b>46,210</b>
Coliseum BART Station Area	Transit Town Center	3,440	2,510	2,250	2,130
Downtown & Jack London Square	Regional Center	10,630	10,650	9,490	9,490
Eastmont Town Center	Urban Neighborhood	5,960	2,460	2,250	1,100
Fruitvale & Diamond Areas	Urban Neighborhood	12,840	7,080	6,350	4,930
MacArthur Transit Village	Urban Neighborhood	8,030	4,140	3,710	3,370
Transit Oriented Development Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	60,970	22,640	20,470	14,620
West Oakland	Transit Town Center	9,030	6,300	5,720	5,720
<b>Piedmont</b>		<b>3,800</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>630</b>	<b>630</b>
<b>Pleasanton</b>		<b>25,250</b>	<b>6,300</b>	<b>7,380</b>	<b>8,340</b>
Hacienda	Suburban Center	1,270	2,820	3,120	4,050
<b>San Leandro</b>		<b>30,720</b>	<b>7,120</b>	<b>7,120</b>	<b>7,120</b>
Bay Fair BART Transit Village	Transit Town Center	630	820	730	730
Downtown Transit Oriented Development	City Center	3,930	3,930	3,490	3,490
East 14th Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,490	1,510	1,370	1,370
<b>Union City</b>		<b>20,430</b>	<b>4,550</b>	<b>4,550</b>	<b>4,160</b>
Intermodal Station District	City Center	1,030	880	750	650
<i>Mission Boulevard</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	0	180	150	150
<i>Old Alvarado</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	290	180	160	160
<b>Alameda County Unincorporated</b>		<b>48,520</b>	<b>8,270</b>	<b>11,540</b>	<b>12,440</b>
<i>Castro Valley BART</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	1,400	570	500	160
<i>East 14th Street and Mission Boulevard Mixed Use Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	6,740	2,060	1,820	1,790

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

### Contra Costa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Antioch</b>		<b>32,250</b>	<b>6,350</b>	<b>6,890</b>	<b>9,740</b>
Hillcrest eBART Station	Suburban Center	150	2,430	2,430	2,680
Rivertown Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,430	2,060	2,060	2,250
<b>Brentwood</b>		<b>16,490</b>	<b>6,500</b>	<b>8,160</b>	<b>9,620</b>
<b>Clayton</b>		<b>4,010</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>530</b>
<b>Concord</b>		<b>44,280</b>	<b>16,740</b>	<b>17,280</b>	<b>24,620</b>
Community Reuse Area	Regional Center	70	2,890	2,890	3,730
Community Reuse Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	9,030	9,030	11,740
Downtown BART Station Planning Area	City Center	2,080	3,910	3,910	5,030
North Concord BART Adjacent Employment Center	Employment Center	10	0	0	0
West Downtown Planning Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	0	600	600	770
<b>Danville</b>		<b>15,420</b>	<b>2,630</b>	<b>2,880</b>	<b>3,100</b>
<b>El Cerrito</b>		<b>10,140</b>	<b>2,130</b>	<b>1,840</b>	<b>1,840</b>
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,200	1,680	1,460	1,460
<b>Hercules</b>		<b>8,120</b>	<b>4,650</b>	<b>4,650</b>	<b>4,880</b>
Central Hercules	Transit Neighborhood	400	2,570	2,570	2,700
Waterfront District	Transit Town Center	640	1,090	1,090	1,150
<b>Lafayette</b>		<b>9,220</b>	<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,650</b>	<b>1,780</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,890	810	810	850
<b>Martinez</b>		<b>14,290</b>	<b>2,300</b>	<b>2,550</b>	<b>2,760</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	750	1,310	1,310	1,370
<b>Moraga</b>		<b>5,570</b>	<b>1,010</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>1,190</b>
Moraga Center	Transit Town Center	430	630	630	660
<b>Oakley</b>		<b>10,730</b>	<b>3,750</b>	<b>3,870</b>	<b>11,980</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	520	1,290	1,290	1,360
Employment Area	Suburban Center	560	980	980	1,030
Potential Planning Area	Transit Neighborhood	980	1,400	1,400	1,470
<b>Orinda</b>		<b>6,550</b>	<b>940</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1,010</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	330	370	370	390
<b>Pinole</b>		<b>6,780</b>	<b>2,130</b>	<b>2,630</b>	<b>3,760</b>
Appian Way Corridor	Suburban Center	510	630	630	700
Old Town	Transit Town Center	680	230	390	430
<b>Pittsburg</b>		<b>19,530</b>	<b>9,340</b>	<b>10,200</b>	<b>10,850</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	1,600	2,180	2,180	2,270
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Town Center	0	2,430	2,430	2,560
Railroad Avenue eBART Station	Transit Town Center	3,600	3,370	3,370	3,530
<b>Pleasant Hill</b>		<b>13,710</b>	<b>4,490</b>	<b>5,770</b>	<b>6,900</b>
Buskirk Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,670	170	700	760
Diablo Valley College	Transit Neighborhood	730	320	320	350
<b>Richmond</b>		<b>36,090</b>	<b>12,250</b>	<b>12,250</b>	<b>12,140</b>
Central Richmond	City Center	4,700	4,050	3,780	880
South Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	3,250	2,310	2,150	1,690
23rd Street	Mixed-Use Corridor	640	970	900	900
San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,710	1,620	1,510	1,510
<b>San Pablo</b>		<b>8,760</b>	<b>2,350</b>	<b>2,350</b>	<b>1,860</b>
<b>San Ramon</b>		<b>25,280</b>	<b>4,190</b>	<b>8,090</b>	<b>9,080</b>
City Center	Suburban Center	480	630	1,410	1,830
North Camino Ramon	Transit Town Center	40	2,400	2,400	3,090
<b>Walnut Creek</b>		<b>30,440</b>	<b>3,760</b>	<b>7,330</b>	<b>8,460</b>
West Downtown	Suburban Center	1,270	1,960	1,960	2,480
<b>Contra Costa County Unincorporated</b>		<b>57,710</b>	<b>9,320</b>	<b>9,920</b>	<b>10,450</b>
Contra Costa Centre	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,780	450	450	470
Downtown El Sobrante	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,670	560	560	580
North Richmond	Transit Neighborhood	1,030	2,460	2,460	2,570
Pittsburg/Bay Point BART Station	Transit Neighborhood	1,020	3,940	3,940	4,130
West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee: San Pablo Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	5,950	3,070	3,180	3,320

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

### Marin County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<i>Belvedere</i>		930	60	60	60
<i>Corte Madera</i>		3,790	370	560	640
<i>Fairfax</i>		3,380	240	240	240
<i>Larkspur</i>		5,910	530	530	610
<i>Mill Valley</i>		6,080	500	500	500
<i>Novato</i>		20,280	1,570	1,600	1,610
<i>Ross</i>		800	70	70	70
<i>San Anselmo</i>		5,240	410	410	410
<i>San Rafael</i>		22,760	2,500	2,790	4,000
Civic Center/North Rafael Town Center	Transit Town Center	1,900	820	820	860
Downtown	City Center	2,420	1,170	1,840	1,930
<i>Sausalito</i>		4,110	260	280	300
<i>Tiburon</i>		3,730	300	300	300
<i>Marin County Unincorporated</i>		26,190	3,290	3,920	4,510
Urbanized 101 Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	4,290	580	2,190	2,290
<i>San Quentin</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	110	1,530	1,530	1,610

### Napa County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<i>American Canyon</i>		5,660	1,690	1,750	2,010
Highway 29 Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	400	1,660	1,660	1,740
<i>Calistoga</i>		2,020	120	120	130
<i>Napa</i>		28,170	2,660	3,160	3,600
<i>St. Helena</i>		2,400	120	120	120
<i>Yountville</i>		1,050	100	150	170
<i>Napa County Unincorporated</i>		9,580	830	990	1,140

### San Francisco County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<i>San Francisco</i>		345,810	110,640	90,470	76,430
19th Avenue	Transit Town Center	4,790	3,080	2,490	2,490
Balboa Park	Transit Neighborhood	1,190	2,350	1,870	1,500
Bayview/Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point	Urban Neighborhood	10,470	15,000	12,030	9,790
Downtown-Van Ness-Geary	Regional Center	89,850	32,810	27,770	23,950
Eastern Neighborhoods	Urban Neighborhood	31,650	8,720	7,230	6,110
Market & Octavia	Urban Neighborhood	11,130	7,650	6,150	5,010
Mission Bay	Urban Neighborhood	3,200	3,280	2,630	2,140
Mission-San Jose Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	29,360	6,220	5,120	4,290
Port of San Francisco	Mixed-Use Corridor	110	2,900	2,300	1,840
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with City of Brisba	Transit Neighborhood	1,510	8,370	6,630	5,320
Transbay Terminal	Regional Center	190	5,500	4,410	3,580
Treasure Island	Transit Town Center	590	9,240	7,320	5,880
<i>Citywide</i>		161,770	5,520	4,520	4,530

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

### San Mateo County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Atherton</b>		2,330		400	400
<b>Belmont</b>		10,580	1,390	1,390	1,390
<b>Brisbane</b>		1,820	1,580	1,580	300
San Francisco/San Mateo Bi-County Area (with San Francisco Suburban Center)		0	1,420	1,160	20
<b>Burlingame</b>		12,360	3,930	3,930	3,930
Burlingame El Camino Real	Transit Town Center	7,170	3,540	2,630	2,630
<b>Colma</b>		560	610	520	210
<b>Daly City</b>		31,090	7,470	7,470	5,700
Bayshore	Transit Town Center	1,550	2,420	2,060	2,060
Mission Boulevard	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,070	1,360	1,180	1,180
<i>Citywide</i>		27,470	3,690	4,230	2,460
<b>East Palo Alto</b>		6,940	3,050	3,050	3,050
Ravenswood	Transit Town Center	970	1,070	930	930
<i>Woodland/Willow Neighborhood</i>	<i>Urban Neighborhood</i>	1,290	1,230	1,110	1,110
<b>Foster City</b>		12,020	1,670	1,670	1,670
<b>Half Moon Bay</b>		4,150	700	700	700
<b>Hillsborough</b>		3,690	820	820	600
<b>Menlo Park</b>		12,350	3,050	3,050	2,450
El Camino Real Corridor and Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,010	1,030	770	770
<b>Millbrae</b>		7,990	2,890	2,180	2,180
Transit Station Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	270	1,960	1,460	1,460
<b>Pacifica</b>		13,970	1,110	1,110	1,110
<b>Portola Valley</b>		1,750	240	240	240
<b>Redwood City</b>		27,960	10,510	9,070	8,280
Downtown	City Center	990	5,320	4,150	4,150
<i>Broadway</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	1,710	770	600	380
<i>Middlefield</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	2,170	640	500	410
<i>Mixed Use Waterfront</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	210	1,350	1,050	1,050
<i>Veterans Corridor</i>	<i>Mixed-Use Corridor</i>	150	990	770	770
<b>San Bruno</b>		14,700	4,670	4,670	4,220
Transit Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,140	3,330	2,800	2,800
<b>San Carlos</b>		11,520	2,400	2,400	2,340
Railroad Corridor	Transit Town Center	440	0	0	0
<b>San Mateo</b>		38,230	11,810	11,810	10,130
Downtown	City Center	500	650	520	520
El Camino Real	Mixed-Use Corridor	840	1,210	970	970
Rail Corridor	Transit Neighborhood	140	6,580	5,310	5,310
<b>South San Francisco</b>		20,940	7,610	6,300	7,430
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,510	3,640	3,030	3,030
<i>Lindenville Transit Neighborhood</i>	<i>Transit Neighborhood</i>	0	860	710	710
<b>Woodside</b>		1,980	310	310	310
<b>San Mateo County Unincorporated</b>		20,910	5,910	5,910	5,090
City County Association of Governments of San Mateo Count Mixed-Use Corridor		38,460	15,470	12,420	10,560

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

### Santa Clara County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration	Focused	Outer Bay Area
			2010-2040 HH Growth	2010-2040 HH Growth	2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Campbell</b>		<b>16,160</b>	<b>2,940</b>	<b>2,940</b>	<b>2,880</b>
Central Redevelopment Area	Transit Neighborhood	1,140	1,430	1,180	1,180
Winchester Boulevard Master Plan	Transit Neighborhood	580	160	130	130
<b>Cupertino</b>		<b>20,180</b>	<b>3,960</b>	<b>3,960</b>	<b>3,960</b>
<b>Gilroy</b>		<b>14,180</b>	<b>5,710</b>	<b>6,440</b>	<b>7,090</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	880	1,600	1,600	2,060
<b>Los Altos</b>		<b>10,750</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>2,160</b>	<b>2,160</b>
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	610	470	350	350
<b>Los Altos Hills</b>		<b>2,830</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>730</b>	<b>730</b>
<b>Los Gatos</b>		<b>12,360</b>	<b>2,330</b>	<b>2,330</b>	<b>2,330</b>
<b>Milpitas</b>		<b>19,180</b>	<b>12,810</b>	<b>12,810</b>	<b>12,810</b>
Transit Area	Suburban Center	750	8,140	6,910	6,910
Hammond Transit Neighborhood	Transit Neighborhood	300	690	580	580
McCandless Transit Neighborhood	Transit Neighborhood	0	410	340	340
McCarthy Ranch Employment Center	Employment Center	0	0	0	0
Midtown Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	340	770	660	660
Serra Center Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	210	40	40	10
Tasman Employment Center	Employment Center	0	0	0	0
Town Center Mixed-Use Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	0	860	730	730
Yosemite Employment Center	Employment Center	30	0	0	0
<b>Monte Sereno</b>		<b>1,210</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>300</b>
<b>Morgan Hill</b>		<b>12,330</b>	<b>3,820</b>	<b>4,150</b>	<b>8,760</b>
Downtown	Transit Town Center	510	1,200	1,200	1,550
<b>Mountain View</b>		<b>31,960</b>	<b>15,120</b>	<b>12,460</b>	<b>11,020</b>
Whisman Station	Transit Neighborhood	650	1,200	950	950
Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,170	1,200	960	960
East Whisman	Employment Center	250	290	230	230
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	3,330	2,690	2,170	2,170
Moffett Field/NASA Ames	Suburban Center	180	2,770	2,210	1,940
North Bayshore	Suburban Center	350	2,640	2,110	1,330
San Antonio Center	Transit Town Center	1,480	3,580	2,870	2,870
<b>Palo Alto</b>		<b>26,490</b>	<b>12,250</b>	<b>12,250</b>	<b>6,110</b>
California Avenue	Transit Neighborhood	750	2,360	1,720	800
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,090	5,380	3,930	1,570
University Avenue/Downtown	Transit Town Center	1,820	3,590	2,630	1,250
<b>San Jose</b>		<b>301,370</b>	<b>133,030</b>	<b>130,890</b>	<b>116,500</b>
Berryessa Station	Transit Neighborhood	1,850	5,540	5,100	4,640
Communications Hill	Transit Town Center	6,540	3,670	3,390	2,780
Cottle Transit Village	Suburban Center	0	3,390	3,120	2,840
Downtown "Frame"	City Center	16,980	12,660	11,710	10,720
East Santa Clara/Alum Rock Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,750	4,850	4,480	4,100
Greater Downtown	Regional Center	3,670	8,320	7,720	7,100
North San Jose	Regional Center	10,420	37,200	34,260	31,220
West San Carlos and Southwest Expressway Corridors	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,730	15,820	15,040	14,230
Bascom TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	260	1,630	1,500	1,360
Bascom Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,810	990	910	840
Blossom Hill/Snell Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	700	1,280	1,180	1,070
Camden Urban Village	Mixed-Use Corridor	920	1,150	1,060	960
Capitol Corridor Urban Villages	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,210	7,270	6,700	6,110
Capitol/Tully/King Urban Villages	Suburban Center	1,410	2,610	2,400	2,190
Oakridge/Almaden Plaza Urban Village	Suburban Center	2,650	8,760	8,070	7,360
Saratoga TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,710	1,310	1,200	1,100
Stevens Creek TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,210	4,580	4,230	3,850
Westgate/El Paseo Urban Village	Suburban Center	1,010	2,920	2,690	2,450
Winchester Boulevard TOD Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	4,150	2,430	2,250	2,060
<b>Santa Clara</b>		<b>43,020</b>	<b>24,260</b>	<b>21,130</b>	<b>20,350</b>
Central Expressway Focus Area	City Center	0	4,640	3,880	3,880
El Camino Real Focus Area	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,650	1,300	1,110	1,110
Great America Parkway Focus Area	Urban Neighborhood	0	3,940	3,300	3,300
Lawrence Station Focus Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	7,190	6,020	6,020
Santa Clara Station Focus Area	City Center	450	3,890	3,260	3,260
Tasman East Focus Area	Transit Neighborhood	0	2,090	1,750	1,750
<b>Saratoga</b>		<b>10,730</b>	<b>2,250</b>	<b>2,250</b>	<b>2,250</b>

## Household Growth by PDA and Jurisdiction

### Santa Clara County (continued)

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Sunnyvale</b>		<b>53,380</b>	<b>16,780</b>	<b>16,780</b>	<b>16,780</b>
Downtown & Caltrain Station	Transit Town Center	1,730	1,840	1,510	1,510
El Camino Real Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	10,350	5,310	4,400	4,400
Lawrence Station Transit Village	Transit Neighborhood	1,560	2,900	2,380	2,380
East Sunnyvale ITR	Mixed-Use Corridor	0	3,340	2,730	2,730
Moffett Park	Employment Center	20	0	0	0
Peery Park	Employment Center	110	10	10	10
Reamwood Light Rail Station	Employment Center	0	0	0	0
Tasman Station ITR	Mixed-Use Corridor	850	1,660	1,350	1,350
<b>Santa Clara County Unincorporated</b>		<b>28,080</b>	<b>7,540</b>	<b>10,480</b>	<b>13,090</b>
Valley Transportation Authority: Cores, Corridors, and Station	Mixed-Use Corridor	68,650	43,880	42,860	38,920

### Solano County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Benicia</b>		<b>10,690</b>	<b>1,190</b>	<b>1,190</b>	<b>1,440</b>
Downtown	Transit Neighborhood	530	1,010	1,010	1,100
Northern Gateway	Employment Center	0	120	120	140
<b>Dixon</b>		<b>5,860</b>	<b>1,390</b>	<b>1,680</b>	<b>1,940</b>
<b>Fairfield</b>		<b>34,480</b>	<b>11,960</b>	<b>12,520</b>	<b>14,420</b>
Downtown South (Jefferson Street)	Suburban Center	600	380	910	950
Fairfield-Vacaville Train Station	Transit Town Center	90	6,510	6,510	6,820
North Texas Street Core	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,600	1,880	1,880	1,970
West Texas Street Gateway	Mixed-Use Corridor	1,020	2,590	2,590	2,720
<b>Rio Vista</b>		<b>3,450</b>	<b>1,420</b>	<b>1,900</b>	<b>2,330</b>
<b>Suisun City</b>		<b>8,920</b>	<b>1,360</b>	<b>1,430</b>	<b>1,500</b>
Downtown & Waterfront	Transit Town Center	1,090	1,190	1,190	1,240
<b>Vacaville</b>		<b>31,090</b>	<b>4,940</b>	<b>5,320</b>	<b>9,950</b>
Allison Area	Suburban Center	550	140	570	590
Downtown	Transit Town Center	220	750	750	780
<b>Vallejo</b>		<b>40,560</b>	<b>5,490</b>	<b>5,640</b>	<b>5,780</b>
Waterfront & Downtown	Suburban Center	980	870	870	910
<b>Solano County Unincorporated</b>		<b>6,710</b>	<b>990</b>	<b>1,180</b>	<b>1,340</b>

### Sonoma County

Jurisdiction or Area Name	Place Type	2010 Total Households	Core Concentration 2010-2040 HH Growth	Focused 2010-2040 HH Growth	Outer Bay Area 2010-2040 HH Growth
<b>Cloverdale</b>		<b>3,180</b>	<b>960</b>	<b>1,040</b>	<b>1,090</b>
Downtown/SMART Transit Area	Transit Town Center	1,040	810	900	940
<b>Cotati</b>		<b>2,980</b>	<b>460</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>540</b>
Downtown and Cotati Depot	Transit Town Center	830	450	450	470
<b>Healdsburg</b>		<b>4,380</b>	<b>860</b>	<b>980</b>	<b>1,080</b>
<b>Petaluma</b>		<b>21,740</b>	<b>2,800</b>	<b>2,800</b>	<b>2,800</b>
Central, Turning Basin/Lower Reach	Suburban Center	750	1,610	1,610	1,760
<b>Rohnert Park</b>		<b>15,810</b>	<b>2,870</b>	<b>3,210</b>	<b>3,490</b>
Sonoma Mountain Village	Suburban Center	200	2,140	2,140	2,350
<b>Santa Rosa</b>		<b>63,590</b>	<b>15,170</b>	<b>18,150</b>	<b>22,620</b>
Downtown Station Area	City Center	2,080	1,220	6,860	7,540
Mendocino Avenue/Santa Rosa Avenue Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	6,910	1,590	4,280	4,670
Sebastopol Road Corridor	Mixed-Use Corridor	2,750	3,250	3,250	3,560
North Santa Rosa Station	Suburban Center	3,940	3,350	3,350	3,660
<b>Sebastopol</b>		<b>3,280</b>	<b>480</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>600</b>
Nexus Area	Transit Town Center	1,150	200	500	520
<b>Sonoma</b>		<b>4,960</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>520</b>	<b>520</b>
<b>Windsor</b>		<b>8,970</b>	<b>1,330</b>	<b>1,360</b>	<b>3,930</b>
Redevelopment Area	Suburban Center	2,040	1,290	1,290	1,350
<b>Sonoma County Unincorporated</b>		<b>56,950</b>	<b>7,640</b>	<b>8,330</b>	<b>8,940</b>
8th Street East Industrial Area	Employment Center	80	20	20	20
Airport/Larkfield Urban Service Area	Suburban Center	2,850	1,110	1,250	1,380
Penngrove Urban Service Area	Rural Town Center	630	670	670	730
The Springs	Rural Mixed-Use Corridor	6,580	1,680	1,680	1,810



DATE: October 3, 2011  
 TO: STA Board  
 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.

	<b>FUND SOURCE</b>	<b>AMOUNT AVAILABLE</b>	<b>APPLICATION DEADLINE</b>
1.	Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)	Approximately <b>\$20 million</b>	Due On First-Come, First Served Basis
2.	Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)	Approximately <b>\$10 million</b>	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis
3.	Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)	Up to <b>\$5,000</b> 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 <b>\$10,000 to \$45,000</b> per qualified request	Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis

\*New funding opportunity

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. Detailed Funding Opportunities Summary

This page intentionally left blank.

**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.

<b>Fund Source</b>	<b>Application/Program Contact Person**</b>	<b>Application Deadline/Eligibility</b>	<b>Amount Available</b>	<b>Program Description</b>	<b>Additional Information</b>
<b>Carl Moyer Memorial Air Quality Standards Attainment Program (for San Francisco Bay Area)</b>	Anthony Fournier Bay Area Air Quality Management District (415) 749-4961 <a href="mailto:afournier@baaqmd.gov">afournier@baaqmd.gov</a>	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 <b>\$20 million</b>	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 <a href="http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-Sources/Carl-Moyer-Program.aspx">http://www.baaqmd.gov/Divisions/Strategic-Incentives/Funding-Sources/Carl-Moyer-Program.aspx</a>
<b>Carl Moyer Off-Road Equipment Replacement Program (for Sacramento Metropolitan Area)</b>	Gary A. Bailey Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (916) 874-4893 <a href="mailto:gbailey@airquality.org">gbailey@airquality.org</a>	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 <b>\$10 million</b> , 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 <a href="http://www.airquality.org/mobile/moyererp/index.shtml">http://www.airquality.org/mobile/moyererp/index.shtml</a>

Fund Source	Application/Program Contact Person**	Application Deadline/Eligibility	Amount Available	Program Description	Additional Information
<b>Air Resources Board (ARB) Clean Vehicle Rebate Project (CVRP)*</b>	Meri Miles ARB (916) 322-6370 <a href="mailto:mmiles@arb.ca.gov">mmiles@arb.ca.gov</a>	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Up to <b>\$5,000</b> 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 <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/cvrp.htm">http://www.arb.ca.gov/msprog/aqip/cvrp.htm</a>
<b>Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Hybrid Electric Vehicle Purchase Vouchers (HVIP)*</b>	To learn more about how to request a voucher, contact: <a href="mailto:info@californiahvip.org">info@californiahvip.org</a>	Application Due On First-Come, First-Served Basis	Approximately <b>\$10,000 to \$45,000</b> 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 <a href="http://www.californiahvip.org/">http://www.californiahvip.org/</a>



DATE: October 3, 2011  
TO: STA Board  
FROM: Johanna Masiolat, Clerk of the Board  
RE: STA Board and Advisory Meeting Schedule for the Remainder of  
Calendar Year 2011

---

**Discussion:**

Attached is the STA Board and Advisory meeting schedule for the remainder of Calendar Year 2011.

**Fiscal Impact:**

None.

**Recommendation:**

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. STA Board and Advisory Meeting Schedule for Remainder of Calendar Year 2011



**STA BOARD AND ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE MEETING SCHEDULE  
CALENDAR YEAR 2011**  
(Last Updated: February 2011)

<b>SUMMARY:</b>	
STA Board:	Meets 2 <sup>nd</sup> Wednesday of Every Month
Consortium/TAC:	Meets <i>Last</i> Wednesday of Every Month
BAC:	Meets 1 <sup>st</sup> Thursday of every <i>Odd</i> Month
PAC:	Meets 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thursday of every <i>Odd</i> Month
PCC:	Meets 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thursdays of every <i>Odd</i> Month

DATE	TIME	DESCRIPTION	LOCATION	STATUS
Thurs., November 3	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., November 9	6:00 p.m.	STA's 14 <sup>th</sup> Annual Awards	Fairfield Community Center	Confirmed
Thurs., November 17	1:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Thurs., November 17	6:00 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., November 30	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Confirmed
Wed., December 14	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	Confirmed
Wed., December 28	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	Tentative
	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	Tentative