



Solano Transportation Authority

One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Area Code 707
424-6075 • Fax 424-6074

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
AGENDA**

Members:

Benicia
Dixon
Fairfield
Rio Vista
Solano County
Suisun City
Vacaville
Vallejo

**March 31, 2004 at 1:30 p.m.
Solano Transportation Authority
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, CA**

ITEM

STAFF PERSON

- I. CALL TO ORDER**
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT (1:30 -1:35 p.m.)**
- IV. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC, STA STAFF AND TRANSIT CONSORTIUM (1:35 -1:40 p.m.)**
- V. CONSENT CALENDAR**
Recommendation: Approve the following consent items in one motion.
(1:40 -1:45 p.m.)

Daryl Halls, Chair

- A. Minutes of the TAC Meeting of February 25, 2004– Pg. 1**
Recommendation: Approve minutes of February 25, 2004.
- B. STA Board Meeting Highlights – Pg. 7**
March 10, 2004
Informational
- C. STIA Board Meeting Highlights – Pg. 11**
March 10, 2004
Informational
- D. Funding Opportunities Summary- Pg. 13**
Informational
- E. Updated STA Meeting Schedule for 2004 - Pg. 17**
Informational

Johanna Masiclat

Kim Cassidy

Kim Cassidy

Sam Shelton

Kim Cassidy

F. Time Extension Request for STIP-APDE Funds and Amended Contract with Wilbur Smith Associates for the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Train Station – Pg. 20
Recommendation:

Dan Christians

Forward the following recommendations to the STA Board:

1. *Authorize the Executive Director to request Caltrans Division of Rail to modify the “Intercity Rail Passenger Facility Agreement” dated December 12, 2001 for the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Train Station by revising the project description, scope of work and project budget and extend the term of the agreement one additional year through June 30, 2005.*
2. *Subject to obtaining the time extension request from Caltrans as stated in Recommendation No. 1 above, authorize the Executive Director to approve a contract amendment, (including a time extension through June 30, 2005), with Wilbur Smith Associates and to modify the scope of work and schedule to complete negotiations and obtain approval from the Union Pacific Railroad, and retain additional sub-consultants (as needed) to complete the environmental, preliminary engineering and station design work and other related project development activities by June 30, 2005.*

VI. ACTION ITEMS

A. Development of Track 1 and Big Tent Projects for Transportation 2030

Dan Christians

Recommendation

Forward the following recommendation to the STA Board:

1. *A Draft List of Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent Projects for consideration and discussion at the Transportation 2030 public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2004.*

(1:45 – 2:00 p.m.) – Pg. 23

B. Legislative Update – March 2004

Janice Sells

Recommendation

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

1. *AB 2847 - Support*
2. *SB 1614 - Support*
3. *ACA 21 - Support*
4. *ACA 24 - Support*
5. *ACA 29 - Support*

(2:00 – 2:10 p.m.) – Pg. 41

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

- A. **County Transportation Expenditure Plan Update** Daryl Halls
Informational: (2:10 – 2:15 p.m.) – Pg. 61
- B. **Federal TEA 21 Reauthorization Update** Daryl Halls
Informational: (2:15 – 2:20 p.m.) – Pg. 69
- C. **State Budget Update** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:20 – 2:25 p.m.) – Pg. 71
- D. **I-80/I-680/I-780 MIS/Corridor Study – Draft Study** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:25 – 2:30 p.m.) – Pg. 73
- E. **Highway Projects Status Report** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:30 – 2:35 p.m.) – Pg. 75
- F. **Use of STP/CMAQ Second Cycle Funding as STIP Backfill** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:35 – 2:40 p.m.) – Pg. 79
- G. **Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study – Update** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:40 – 2:45 p.m.) – Pg. 89
- H. **Local Street and Roads Update** Mike Duncan
Informational: (2:45 – 2:50 p.m.) – Pg. 96
- I. **Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) – Next Steps** Janice Sells
Informational: (2:50 – 2:55 p.m.) – Pg. 106

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The next regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee will be at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, April 28, 2004.

NOTE: At the conclusion of the meeting, a presentation will be made to the TAC members by D.J. Smith, consultant to the STIA, on the results of a public opinion poll pertaining to development of the Countywide Transportation Expenditure Plan and Sales Tax Ordinance.



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the Meeting
February 25, 2004

I. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority's Conference Room.

Present:

TAC Members Present:	Dan Schiada	City of Benicia
	Janet Koster	City of Dixon
	Morrie Barr	City of Fairfield
	Julie Pappa	City of Rio Vista
	Gary Cullen	City of Suisun City
	Dale Pfeiffer	City of Vacaville
	Mark Akaba	City of Vallejo
	Paul Wiese	County of Solano

Others Present	Ed Huestis	City of Vacaville
	Gian Aggarwal	City of Vacaville
	Daryl Halls	STA
	Mike Duncan	STA
	Dan Christians	STA
	Elizabeth Richards	STA
	Sam Shelton	STA
	Jennifer Tongson	STA
	Johanna Masiclat	STA
	Randy Anderson	Landpeople
	Craig Goldblatt	MTC
	Cameron Oakes	Caltrans

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

On a motion by Paul Wiese, and a second by Dan Schiada, the STA TAC unanimously approved the agenda adding the following: V.G, Letter of Support for the City of Fairfield's Application for the Safe Routes To School Program, VI.C, 2004 STIP-Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects, and VI.D, Request to MTC for Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) Funds.

III. OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

None presented.

IV. REPORTS FROM CALTRANS, MTC AND STA STAFF

Caltrans: Cameron Oakes reported on a meeting between the City of Rio Vista and Caltrans Deputy Director Dana Cowell to discuss planning of the Rio Vista Bridge.

MTC: Craig Goldblatt provided a summarized update on regional, statewide, and countywide TDA funding for FY04/05.

STA: Dan Christians announced upcoming deadlines to draft applications for the YSAQMD Clean Air Funds Program, Section 5310 Program, Safe Routes to Schools Program (5th Cycle), TDA Article 3, and TFCA Program.

V. CONSENT CALENDAR

On a motion by Paul Wiese, and a second by Julie Pappa, the STA TAC approved the consent calendar with the exception of Agenda Item V.G “Letter of Support for the City of Fairfield’s Application for the Safe Routes to School Program” which was pulled for separate discussion.

Recommendation:

- A. Minutes of the TAC Meeting of January 28, 2004
- B. STA Board Meeting Highlights – February 11, 2004
- C. STIA Board Meeting Highlights – February 11, 2004
- D. Funding Opportunities Summary
- E. Updated STA Meeting Schedule for 2004
- F. Solano-Napa Countywide Travel Demand Modeling Contract with the City of Fairfield
- G. Letter of Support for the City of Fairfield’s Application for the Safe Routes To School Program

On a motion by Gary Cullen, and a second by Morrie Barr, the STA TAC approved the staff recommendation for agenda item V.G and request for a Letter of Support for the City of Benicia’s Application for the Safe Routes To School Program in the amount of \$264,000.

VI. ACTION ITEMS

- A. **Draft I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study**
Dan Christians reviewed the estimated capital costs, analysis, development, and implementation strategies for the 30-year draft plan. He noted that additional comments due on or before March 9, 2004 will determine the recommendation made for review, discussion, and approval by the STA Board. The STA Board and STA Transit

Committee are expected to receive a presentation on the Draft Plan at their next meeting on March 10, 2004 and April 5, 2004 with final action on the plan scheduled for May 14, 2004.

Recommendation:

Recommend to the STA Board to approve the Draft I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study.

On a motion by Dan Schiada, and a second by Janet Koster, the STA TAC voted to table the item and to agendize for the meeting of March 31, 2004.

B. Status of Unmet Transit Needs Process for FY04/05

Elizabeth Richards provided an update on the Unmet Transit Needs public input process for the FY04/05 Transportation Development Act (TDA) claims for streets and roads purposes. She also provided an updated matrix listing relevant issues raised through the public input process and draft responses recently submitted by the respective transit agencies. She noted that upon completion of all responses listed and others raised by MTC, they will be resubmitted to the TAC and Consortium next month for review and approval.

Recommendation:

Recommend to the STA Board approval of the following:

1. Responses to the Unmet Transit Needs Hearing for FY 04/05 as shown in Attachment B.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to forward the coordinated Unmet Transits Needs response for FY 04/05 to MTC.

On a motion by Janet Koster, and a second by Dan Schiada, the STA TAC voted to table the item and to agendize for the meeting of March 31, 2004.

C. 2004 STIP – Transportation Enhancement (TE) Projects

Mike Duncan outlined funding levels for unrestricted State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for Solano County and the Federal programming guidelines for proposed 2004 STIP with Transportation Enhancement (TE) “Reserve Lump Sum” Programming.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board approve the following: Program Transportation Enhancement (TE) funds in the 2004 STIP as a Reserve Lump Sum by fiscal year as shown in Attachment C.

On a motion by Dale Pfeiffer, and a second by Dan Schiada, the STA TAC approved the recommendation.

D. Request to MTC for Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) Funds for:

1. I-80/Leisure Town Road Overcrossing - \$4.65M (replaces STIP)
2. Completion of I-80/I-680/SR-12 Interchange PA/ED - \$6.8M (replaces TCRP)

Mike Duncan explained delays to projects funded with State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for FY03/04 and the potential elimination of fund for projects with Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) allocations approved by the CTC. He cited the potential availability of Federal cycle funds through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

Based on further discussion, the STA TAC agreed in consensus to require separate votes on recommendation# 1 and recommendation# 2.

Julie Pappa recused herself from discussion and voting on Recommendation Item# 2.

On a motion by Gary Cullen, and a second by Dan Schiada, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendations as amended.

Recommendation:

Recommend the STA Board of Directors authorize the Chair to do the following:

1. Send a letter to MTC immediately requesting \$4.65M in STP/CMAQ funds to replace \$4.65M in FY 2003-04 STIP funds for the I-80/Leisure Town Road Overcrossing project.

On a motion by Morrie Barr, and a second by Gary Cullen, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation.

2. Send a letter to MTC requesting \$6.8M in STP/CMAQ funds to replace TCRP funds to complete the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange PA/ED, if the TCRP program is terminated.

On a motion by Paul Wiese, and a second by Dan Schiada, the STA TAC unanimously approved the recommendation (with Julie Pappa recusing herself).

E. Development of County Transportation Expenditure Plan

Note: On a motion by Morrie Barr and a second by Dale Pfeiffer, this item was moved from Item VII.A to Item VI.E for action with the recommendation added.

Dan Christians discussed the development of the 30-year revenue projections and project costs estimates for the plan. He noted that staff will schedule a special meeting of the TAC and key transit staff to review a summary of the recent public opinion poll and the draft project cost estimates. He urged the TAC to appoint one member to represent in the Citizen's Advisory Committee.

Recommendation:

Forward a recommendation to the STIA Board to appoint Morrie Barr, City of Fairfield, a TAC representative to the Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC).

On a motion Dale Pfeiffer, and a second by Paul Wiese, the STA TAC unanimously approved the appointment of Morrie Barr, City of Fairfield, as the TAC representative to the CAC.

VII. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Development of County Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP)

Moved to Item VI.E for action.

B. Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) Public Information Program

Dan Christians highlighted efforts for public awareness of projects in RM 2 provided by the STA.

C. Status Report on Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Dan Christians announced STA CTP committee meetings during March and April and plans to provide a number of public presentations on the Draft CTP identifying needs and recommendations coming out of recent STA corridor and strategic planning studies. He noted a draft comprehensive CTP will be forwarded for review and comments prior to the next TAC meeting on March 31, 2004 and public input at the April 14, 2004 STA Board meeting. He commented that approval of the CTP update is scheduled for the May 12, 2004 STA Board meeting.

D. Senior and Disabled Transit Study

Dan Christians summarized the current development of estimated costs of low-cost strategies for projects that can be implemented in a 5-year timeframe if funding becomes available. He noted that a presentation on the draft plan is scheduled to be made at the STA Board Meeting on March 10, 2004.

E. Countywide Pedestrian Plan

Randy Anderson, Landpeople, a consultant for the STA, provided an update on the purpose, outline, and process for the development of the County Pedestrian Plan. Randy noted that STA staff and the consultant are scheduled to meet with Solano County's City and County Planning Directors, the new Countywide Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC), and the STA Alternative Modes Committee for discussion.

F. Development of Track 1 Projects for Transportation 2030

Dan Christians provided key dates and the public input process for the final development of Track 1 Projects for Transportation 2030. In addition, he provided the following information for T-2030: Approved Transportation 2030 Regional Investment Option, Project Submittals to MTC for Evaluation in T-2030 (2005 RTP), and Existing STA Track 1 and Track 2 Projects in the 2001 RTP.

G. Freeway System Management Program

Mike Duncan outlined plans from MTC, Caltrans, and CMAs to develop ways to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the regional transportation system. He noted drafts regional policies were provided for Traffic Operations Systems (TOS) and Regional Operations Strategy (ROS).

H. Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study – Update

Mike Duncan identified the technical factors related to the results and conclusions of the three options identified as potential locations for truck scales in Solano County. He noted that Option 2 has been eliminated for further consideration and that the Arterials, Highways and Freeways Committee directed STA staff to work with CHP and Caltrans to provide additional information on several issues surrounding the remaining options.

I STP/CMAQ/TEA Obligation Authority Priorities

Mike Duncan provided a list dated January 15, 2004 from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) outlining projects with Federal STP/CMAQ/TEA Funds.

J. I-80/I-680/I-780 MIS/Corridor Study – Long Term Projects

Mike Duncan discussed the application of operational strategies and performance measures used to develop a systematic analysis of each of the three freeway corridors for “Long Term Projects”. He provided the following information reflecting this study: Draft Potential Long-Term Projects (Priority Order) and Mid-Term Projects (Approved by STA Board on September 10, 2003).

K. State Route 12 Major Investment Study – Operational Strategy

Mike Duncan noted the development of an Operational Strategy for the corridor is being planned and the analysis will identify a recommended implementation plan for improvements and proposed funding strategies for projects.

L. Local Street and Roads Update

Mike Duncan provided an update on potential revenues available to meet the pavement and non-pavement needs at both the County level and jurisdictional level and reported on the Local Streets and Roads Committee recommendation to use Regional funds for MTS streets only for the next cycle of Federal funds.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned in memory of Charlie Jones, the Solano County Director of Transportation, who died on February 14, 2004.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:40 p.m. The next regular meeting of the STA TAC is scheduled for Wednesday, March 31, 2004 at 1:30 p.m.



Solano Transportation Authority
Board Highlights
For March 10, 2004
6:00 p.m.

TO: City Councils and Board of Supervisors
(Attn: City Clerks and County Clerk of the Board)
FROM: Kim Cassidy, STA Clerk of the Board
RE: Summary Actions of the March 10, 2004 STA Board Meeting

Following is a summary of the actions taken by the Solano Transportation Authority at the Board meeting of March 10, 2004. If you have any questions regarding specific items, please give me a call at 424-6008.

ACTION ITEMS: FINANCIAL

A. Consultant Services Contracts for Programmatic EIR and Public Input for Development of CTEP

Recommendation: Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a consultant services contract with Jones & Stokes for development of the Programmatic EIR update for the County Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP) by the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA) for an amount not to exceed \$40,000.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a consultant services contract with Public Affairs Management (PAM).
3. Authorize the Executive Director to purchase the privately funded public opinion poll data conducted by Moore & Associates in November 2003, for an amount not to exceed \$7,500.

On a motion by Member Intintoli, and a second by Member Silva, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Solano-Napa Countywide Travel Demand Modeling Contract with the City of Fairfield

Recommendation: Approve the following:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to enter into a two-year contract with the City of Fairfield to provide on-going travel demand modeling services in an amount not to exceed \$80,000 a year for FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05 plus three additional potential optional years (2005-06, 2006-07, and 2007-08) if determined needed by

the Executive Director and subject to additional budget authority for each optional year.

2. Approve the preliminary Scope of Work as contained in Attachment A.

On a motion by Member Alternate Price, and a second by Member Alternate Segala, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

ACTION ITEMS: NON FINANCIAL

A. 2004 STIP – Transportation Enhancements (TE) Projects

Recommendation: Approve the following:

1. Program Transportation Enhancements (TE) funds in the 2004 STIP as a Reserve Lump Sum by fiscal year as shown in Attachment C.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to submit the 2004 STIP Transportation Enhancement programming for Solano County to MTC.

On a motion by Member Messina, and a second by Member Augustine, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

B. Status Report on Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan

Recommendation: Approve the following:

1. A modified schedule for development and adoption of the CTP update as specified in Attachment B.
2. Request staff provide informational presentation to each city council and the Board of Supervisors during March and April 2004 to provide information on recently completed corridor and transit studies and needs assessments as part of an overview of the Solano Comprehensive Transportation Plan update.

On a motion by Member Alternate Price, and a second by Member Messina, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

C. Request to MTC for Surface Transportation Program/Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (STP/CMAQ) Funds for:

1. **I-80/Leisure Town Road Overcrossing - \$4.65M (replaces STIP)**
2. **Completion of I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange PA/ED - \$6.8M (replaces TCRP)**

Recommendation: Recommend the STA Board of Directors authorize the Chair to do the following:

1. Send a letter to MTC immediately requesting \$4.65M in STP/CMAQ funds to replace \$4.65M in FY 2003-04 STIP funds for the I-80 Leisure Town Road Overcrossing project.
2. Send a letter to MTC requesting \$6.8M in STA/CMAQ funds to replace TCRP funds to complete the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange PA/ED, if the TCRP program is terminated.

On a motion by Member Alternate Segala, and a second by Member Augustine, the STA Board unanimously approved the recommendation.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

On a motion by Member Coglianesi, and a second by Member Silva, the consent items were approved in one motion.

- A. STA Board Minutes of February 11, 2004**
Recommendation: Approve minutes of February 11, 2004.
- B. Approve Draft TAC Minutes of February 25, 2004**
Recommendation: Receive and file.
- C. Authorization for STA to Provide Administrative and Legal Functions for STIA as part of the Development of a CTEP**
Recommendation: Approve the following:
 - 1. Authorize the STA to perform administrative and legal duties and functions on behalf of the STIA until November 10, 2004.
 - 2. Direct STA staff to maintain accounting and fiscal records of administrative and legal services performed by STA on behalf of the STIA.
- D. Appointment of Bicycle Advisory Committee Members (BAC)**
Recommendation: Appoint the following to participate in the STA's Bicycle Advisory Committee for a three-year term ending December 2007:
 - 1. Jim Fisk, Dixon Member
 - 2. Mick Weninger, Vallejo Member
 - 3. Bill Schmidt, Member-at-Large
- E. Appointment of Pedestrian Advisory Committee Members (PAC)**
Recommendation: Appoint Barbara Comfort to the Pedestrian Advisory Committee representing the Solano County Agricultural Advisory Committee for a three-year term ending December 2007.
- F. Letter of Support for the City of Fairfield's and City of Benicia's Application for the Safe Routes to School Program**
Recommendation: Authorize the Executive Director to forward letters of support for the following:
 - 1. The City of Fairfield's Safe Routes to School application for \$59,000.
 - 2. The City of Benicia's Safe Routes to School application for \$264,000.
- G. Resolution for the FY 2004-05 FTA Section 5310 Program to Replace One Solano Paratransit Vehicle**
Recommendation: Adopt a resolution for STA's application for FY 2004-05 FTA Section 5310 funds stating that no nonprofit agencies were able to demonstrate its ability to provide a service similar to Solano Paratransit.

UPDATE FROM STAFF

- A. Caltrans Report – Yader Bermudez**
- B. MTC Report –None provided.**
- C. STA Report**
 - 1. Presentation of Draft I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study.
 - 2. Presentation of Draft Senior and Disabled Transit Study.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS: Information was provided for the following items:

- A. Development of Track 1 Projects for Transportation 2030**
- B. Draft I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study**
- C. Senior and Disabled Transit Study**
- D. Freeway System Management Program**
- E. Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study - Update**
- F. STP/CMAQ/TEA Obligation Authority Priorities**
- G. State Route 12 Major Investment Study – Operational Strategy**
- H. Regional Measure 2 (RM2) Public Informational Program**
- I. FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES:** Information was provided for future funding opportunities for the following:
 - ◆ *Yolo Solano Air Quality Management District (YSAQMD) Clean Air Fund Program.*
 - ◆ *TFCA Program (40% Program Manager Funds).*
 - ◆ *TFCA Program (60% Program Regional Funds)*

The next regular meeting of the STA Board is scheduled for **April 14, 2004, 6:00 p.m.** at Suisun City Hall.



**Solano Transportation Improvement Authority
Board Meeting Highlights
For March 10, 2004
7:15 p.m.**

Notice to the Public:

By action of the Solano County Board of Supervisors and the City Councils of the Cities within Solano County, a new public agency has been established. The new public agency is the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA) and it has been established pursuant to, and for the purposes provided for under, California Public Utilities Code §§180000 et seq.

TO: City Councils and Board of Supervisors
(Attn: City Clerks and County Clerk of the Board)
FROM: Kim Cassidy, STIA Clerk of the Board
RE: Summary Actions of the March 10, 2004 STIA Board Meeting

Following is a summary of the actions taken by the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority at the Board meeting of March 10, 2004. If you have any questions regarding specific items, please give me a call at 424-6008.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mary Ann Courville (Vice Chair)	City of Dixon
Harry Price (Member Alternate)	City of Fairfield
Steve Messina	City of Benicia
Marci Coglianesse	City of Rio Vista
Mike Segala (Member Alternate)	City of Suisun City
Len Augustine	City of Vacaville
Joanne Schivley	City of Vallejo
John Vasquez	County of Solano

ACTION ITEMS: FINANCIAL

None presented.

ACTION ITEMS: NON FINANCIAL

A. Public Input Process and Schedule for CTEP

Recommendation:

Approve the following:

1. The public input process and schedule for the CTEP as outlined in Attachment A.
2. Authorize the Executive Director to coordinate a community input meeting for the CTEP in each of Solano County's seven cities.
3. Authorize the Executive Director to coordinate at least three meetings of the Citizen's Advisory Committee to provide a countywide forum for public input for the CTEP.

On a motion by Member Vasquez, and a second by Member Alternate Price, the STIA Board unanimously approved the staff recommendation.

B. Formation of Citizens Advisory Committee

Recommendation: Approve the creation of a Citizen's Advisory Committee, as specified in Attachment A, to provide public input to the STIA Board and staff pertaining to the transportation projects to be included in the County Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP).

On a motion by Member Messina, and a second by Member Alternate Segala, the STIA Board unanimously approved the recommendation as amended.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS:

On a motion by Member Messina, and a second by Member Vasquez, the consent items were approved in one motion. Member Alternate Price abstained on Agenda Item V.A (*STIA Board Minutes of February 11, 2004*).

A. STIA Board Minutes of February 11, 2004.

Recommendation: 1. Approve minutes of February 11, 2004.

INFORMATIONAL ITEMS: Information was provided for the following items:

A. Review of Draft Revenue Estimates for Sales Tax and Federal and State Revenues

B. Review of Draft County Transportation Plan (CTEP) Project Descriptions

The next regular meeting of the STIA Board is scheduled for **April 14, 2004 at approximately 7:30 p.m.**, following the regular STA Board meeting at Suisun City Hall.



DATE: March 31, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant
RE: Funding Opportunities Summary

The following funding opportunities will be available to STA members during the next few months. Also attached are summary fact sheets for each program. Many grants previously available at this time were discontinued or are waiting for the State Budget or TEA 3 reauthorization. Please distribute this information to appropriate departments within your jurisdiction.

<u>Fund Source</u>	<u>Application Available From</u>	<u>Applications Due</u>
Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance Program (TETAP)	Christina Atienza, MTC, (510) 817-3221	Due 4:00pm April 16, 2004
TFCA Program (60% Program Regional Funds)	Karen Chi, BAAQMD, (415) 749-5121	Workshop on May 18, 2004 Due end of June 2004
Bikes Belong Grant Program	Tim Baldwin, Bikes Belong Coalition, (617) 426-9222	Q2 – May 14, 2004 Q3 – September 3, 2004 Q4 – November 23, 2004



FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:

Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance Program

Applications Due 4:00pm, April 16, 2004

TO: STA TAC

FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Traffic Engineering Technical Assistance Program is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors: Bay Area government agencies involved with traffic or transit operations and safety.

Program Description: This is a grant for technical assistance from consultants hired by MTC for traffic engineering projects defined by local agencies.

Funding Available: Approximately \$225,000 in federal funds for 2004. Maximum grant amount per project is \$30,000 with MTC making the local match.

Eligible Projects: Operations: Traffic calming, crosswalks
Analysis/Evaluations: collision analysis, develop grant apps
Planning: challenging project planning: eg. Traffic signal system upgrades, Smart Corridor operations.

Grant Contact: Christina Atienza, MTC, (510) 817-3221
http://www.mtc.ca.gov/about_mtc/doing_biz/tetap.htm

STA Contact Person: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant, (707) 424-6075



FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:

**Regional Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program
(60% Regional Funds)**

Applications Due end of June 2004

TO: STA TAC

FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Regional Transportation Fund for Clean Air Program is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors: Cities of Benicia, Fairfield, Suisun, and Vallejo, the County of Solano, school districts and universities in the Bay Area Air Basin.

Program Description: This is a regional air quality program to provide grants to local and regional agencies for clean air projects.

Funding Available: Approximately \$10 million was available in 2003. Eligible projects must be between \$10,000 to \$1,000,000.

Eligible Projects: Shuttle/feeder buses, arterial management, bicycle facilities, clean air vehicles, and "Smart Growth" projects.

Further Details: Karen Chi, BAAQMD, (415) 749-5121

STA Contact Person: Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner, 707.424.6014



FUNDING OPPORTUNITY:

Bikes Belong Grant Program

Applications Due: 2nd Quarter - May 14, 2004
3rd Quarter - September 3, 2004, 4th Quarter - November 23, 2004

TO: STA Board

FROM: Sam Shelton, Planning Assistant

This summary of the Bikes Belong Grant Program is intended to assist jurisdictions plan projects that are eligible for the program. STA staff is available to answer questions regarding this funding program and provide feedback on potential project applications.

Eligible Project Sponsors: Cities and the County of Solano are eligible.

Program Description: Bikes Belong is offering grants to address four specific goals:

- Ridership growth
- Leveraging funding
- Building political support
- Promoting cycling

Funding Available: Grants are available up to \$10,000. This program is intended to provide funding for local matches for larger fund sources.

Eligible Projects: Eligible projects include bicycle facility improvements, education, and capacity projects.

Further Information: Applications and grant information are available online at www.bikesbelong.org. Navigate to grant programs.

Bikes Belong Contact: Tim Baldwin, Bikes Belong Coalition, (617) 426-9222

STA Contact Person: Robert Guerrero, STA Associate Planner (707) 424-6014
rguerrero@STA-SNCL.com



DATE: March 23, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Kim Cassidy, Administrative Services Director/Clerk of the Board
RE: Updated STA Meeting Schedule for 2004

Background:

Attached is the revised STA schedule for meetings that may be of interest to the STA TAC. This schedule is an overview of the 2004 calendar year.

Fiscal Impact:

None.

Recommendation:

Informational

Attachment:

A. Meeting Schedule 2004



STA MEETING SCHEDULE (For The Calendar Year 2004)

DATE	TIME	DESCRIPTION	LOCATION	CONFIRMED
April 1	9:00 a.m.	Truck Scales Tour	Fairfield Transit Center	
April 1	9:00 a.m.	Arterials, Highways & Freeways Committee	STA Conference Room	X
April 1	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	X
April 5	9:00 a.m.	Transit Subcommittee	STA Conference Room	X
April 14	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
April 14	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
April 21	6:30 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	X
April 28	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
April 28	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
May 12	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
May 12	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
May 15	9:00 a.m.	Transpo Expo	Westfield Shoppingtown	X
May 21	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Community Center	X
May 26	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
May 26	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
June 3	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	X
June 9	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
June 9	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
June 16	6:30 p.m.	Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC)	STA Conference Room	X
June 30	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
June 30	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X

July 14	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
July 14	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
July 16	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Community Center	X
Aug. 5	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Aug. 25	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Aug. 25	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Sept. 8	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
Sept. 8	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
Sept. 17	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Community Center	X
Sept. 29	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Sept. 29	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Oct. 7	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Oct. 13	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
Oct. 13	7:15 p.m.	STIA Board Meeting (Time Approximate)	Suisun City Hall	X
Oct. 27	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Oct.27	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Nov. 10	5:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
Nov. 10	6:00 p.m.	STA 7 th Annual Awards	Fairfield TBD	X
Nov. 19	12:00 p.m.	Paratransit Coordinating Council (PCC)	Fairfield Community Center	X
Nov. 24	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Nov. 24	1:30 p.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Dec. 2	6:30 p.m.	Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC)	STA Conference Room	X
Dec. 8	6:00 p.m.	STA Board Meeting	Suisun City Hall	X
Dec. 29	10:00 a.m.	Intercity Transit Consortium	STA Conference Room	X
Dec. 29	1:30 a.m.	Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)	STA Conference Room	X



DATE: March 22, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Dan Christians, Assistant Executive Director/ Director of Planning
RE: Time Extension Request for STIP-APDE Funds and Amended Contract with Wilbur Smith Associates for the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Train Station

Background:

On June 13, 2001, the STA Board approved the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Train Station as the next Capitol Corridor Train Station in Solano County. Since 2001, the cities of Fairfield and Vacaville, STA, the Capitol Corridors, and the Project Development Team (PDT) has been actively working on a phased site plan, railroad right-of-way plan and a track improvement and station platform plan that would be acceptable to both the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority and the Union Pacific Railroad.

On December 11, 2001 the STA Board authorized a contract amendment with Wilbur Smith Associates to provide technical assistance for the Project Development Team (PDT) subject to obtaining state-only Advanced Project Development Element (ADPE) funds from the 2001-02 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) in the amount of \$125,000. On December 12, 2001, the California Transportation Commission approved the APDE project development funds for the project. About \$25,428 of these funds has been expended through September 29, 2003. This state funding will expire on June 30, 2004, unless extended one additional year through June 30, 2005.

The primary tasks under this contract include the following activities:

- Schematic site planning and support for environmental document (NEPA)
- Railroad facilities planning
- Access and on-site circulation planning
- Cost estimation
- Development of funding strategies
- Negotiations/coordination with railroads
- Meetings and coordination with agencies
- Development of marketing plans

Major components of this project are proposed to include:

- Phase 1: Approximately 200 parking spaces, passenger platforms, pedestrian shelters, perimeter landscaping and track improvements
- Phase 2: Approximately 300+ parking spaces, interior landscaping, bus shelters, feeder bus service, initial joint development

- Phase 3: An additional 600+ parking structure, station building and additional joint commercial development

On July 2, 2003, a status report was made by STA staff and the City of Fairfield, which indicated that progress continues to be made to refine detailed plans for submittal to Union Pacific.

Various options and alternative plans have been developed to obtain consensus on the required railroad improvements. The Project Development Team expects that agreement will be reached with the Union Pacific by 2004. Once final agreement from the railroad has been reached, it is expected that the project will move into a final three year process to complete environmental documentation, phasing plans, specifications and final cost estimates, right-of way acquisition and construction. It is expected that the track and station plans being developed for this project will serve as a prototype for future new stations along the Union Pacific/Capitol Corridor. Construction of Phase 1 of the project is still expected to be completed in 2007 as described in last year's progress report. If the necessary project funding is obtained, Phase 2 of the project could also be completed within this time frame.

Since July 2003, Phase 1 of the Oakland-Sacramento Commuter Rail Study (the follow-up study to the Dixon – Auburn and Contra Costa-Solano commuter rail studies) has also been completed and Phase 2 feasibility work is underway. This study proposes three additional peak hour commuter-oriented trains to augment and interline with the 12 existing and a total of 16 planned Capitol Corridor trains.

The last preliminary cost estimate prepared for the project in 2003 was approximately \$35 million. On March 2, 2004, primarily as a result of the STA, Capitol Corridor and MTC's concerted efforts, \$25 million of funds were approved in Regional Measure 2 to fund the Fairfield/Vacaville Train Station and Capitol Corridor track improvements along the I-80 and I-680 corridors. These RM 2 funds, along with \$1.3 million of federal appropriations, \$2.25 million of STIP funds (now scheduled for 2005-06) and approx \$2 million of locally committed funds, are expected to be sufficient to fund the full design and construction of Phase 1 and most of Phase 2. Phase 1 is sufficient in order to obtain service from the Capitol Corridor, plus the track work needed to accommodate this new station.

Discussion:

There is still a need for additional technical work funded through this STIP-APDE funded contract to complete the following:

1. Various schematic site plans.
2. Finalize the track improvement plans for approval by the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR).
3. Obtain approvals from the Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Board.
4. Update the cost estimates and project schedule.
5. Complete the funding strategy and other project development activities for the project team to proceed into the final design and construction stage.

The City of Fairfield was previously approved for an additional \$125,000 of 2003-04 STIP funds to complete the project design. Because of the State Budget crisis, those funds have now been delayed until 2005-06 and will probably now be proposed to be amended for construction activities only. Therefore, the remaining STIP- APDE funds that the STA has been awarded are a

key resource to continue the project development and environmental document activities through 2004-05.

The Capitol Corridor JPA has provided substantial guidance and assistance to advance the track improvement plans through the Union Pacific. At the recommendation of the Capitol Corridor's Managing Director, a key meeting with representatives of the UPRR, STA and the PDT will be held in April 2004 to reach consensus on the project and what improvements will be required in the railroad right-of-way. Once the UPRR provides written concurrence, a final schedule of activities will immediately commence to complete the environmental documents and other activities needed to initiate the final plans and specifications to construct the project.

Caltrans Division of Rail staff has advised STA staff that a one-year time extension, through June 30, 2005, would most likely be granted upon a request by the STA. With a final one year time extension, STA will amend the contract with Wilbur Smith Associates to modify the scope of work and allow them to add additional subcontractor firms as needed to their team (i.e. EIP Associates, DKS Associates and Thompson and Associates) to complete the environmental, preliminary engineering, station design and other critical project development activities in a very timely manner. The scope of work in the prior contract amendment will be updated to reflect the remaining activities needed to complete the critical project development work by the PDT over the next year as discussed above.

Fiscal Impact:

There will be no effect on the STA General Fund. The consultant services are paid entirely from State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) - Advanced Project Development Element Funds (ADPE) funds and all the remaining available funds are budgeted in the 2003-04 and 2004-05 STA Budget.

Recommendation:

Forward the following recommendations to the STA Board:

1. Authorize the Executive Director to request Caltrans Division of Rail to modify the "Intercity Rail Passenger Facility Agreement" dated December 12, 2001 for the Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Train Station by revising the project description, scope of work and project budget and extend the term of the agreement one additional year through June 30, 2005.
2. Subject to obtaining the time extension request from Caltrans as stated in Recommendation No. 1 above, authorize the Executive Director to approve a contract amendment, (including a time extension through June 30, 2005), with Wilbur Smith Associates and to modify the scope of work and schedule to complete negotiations and obtain approval from the Union Pacific Railroad, and retain additional sub-consultants (as needed) to complete the environmental, preliminary engineering and station design work and other related project development activities by June 30, 2005.



DATE: March 22, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Dan Christians, Assistant Executive Director/ Director of Planning
RE: Development of Track 1 and Big Tent Projects for Transportation 2030

Background

Every three years Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) are required to develop regional transportation plans (RTP's) based on a variety of planning factors. Two critical requirements that pertain to developing an RTP is to demonstrate air quality conformity and that the plan is fiscally constrained. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the federally designated MPO for the Bay Area and its nine counties. Besides air quality conformity requirements, one of the main purposes of an RTP is to make transportation funding estimates for the next 25 years. This plan sets forth the basic funding categories for each project or program and separate funding cycles are established before funding is actually programmed.

A number of key issues have already been identified for Transportation 2030 (T-2030) including the following:

1. Transit/local roads funding shortfalls.
2. The expanded Transportation for Livable Communities/Housing Incentives Program (TLC/HIP) and transportation-land use-smart growth issues.
3. Goods movement program.
4. Older Americans mobility.
5. Safety and security measures.
6. Regional bicycle and pedestrian projects
7. Air quality issues.
8. Balancing future funding commitments between Regional Customer Service Programs with maintenance of the system and addressing congestion through expansion projects.

MTC previously determined that for T-2030, there would be an estimated \$99.4 billion of already committed transportation funds over the next 25 years (e.g. gas tax, TDA and existing sales tax measures). With the passage of Regional Measure 2, approximately \$3.6 billion additional funds will now be included in the committed category increasing the T-2030 committed funds to about \$103 billion MTC projects. \$8.8 billion of uncommitted discretionary funds remain available for various local, countywide and regional projects that are programmed at the regional level and at the congestion management agency level (e.g. county federal and STIP cycle funds for local streets and roads, roadway capacity projects, Intermodal centers and park and ride lots).

In addition, there is an estimated \$1.3 billion of Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds expected to fund various SHOPP and congestion relief projects on the regional system over 25 years.

On December 17, 2003, MTC adopted a new Regional Investment Scenario for T-2030 that included:

- Transit Shortfalls: \$1.33 billion
- MTS Road Shortfalls: \$990.5 million
- State Highway shortfall: 0 (MTC staff has deemed this the responsibility of the State.)
- Regional Operations Programs: \$ 400.8 million
- Clean Air Program: \$255.5 million
- Lifeline Transportation: \$216 million
- Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program: \$200 million
- TLC/HIP: \$454 million
- CMA Planning: \$95 million
- County Programs: \$4.845 billion (Track 1 and ITIP funds)

T-2030 will be broken down into committed, Track 1 – those projects expected to be funded with state and federal funds and “Big Tent” – those projects that will need additional local or regional funding such as from a countywide transportation sales tax or regional gas tax.

A total of \$266.3 million was approved by STA and MTC for Solano County projects in 2001 for the current RTP (Attachment A). Initial project recommendations for MTC performance evaluation were submitted to MTC in October 2003. STA submitted 40 potential Track 1, ITIP or “Big Tent” candidate projects (Attachment B). From these two lists, STA will develop a new Track 1 list and submit to MTC in May 2004. MTC has completed a preliminary performance evaluation of the 40 projects submitted by the STA (Attachment C) to be used primarily by CMAs to submit new and revised Track 1 projects.

On February 11, 2004, the STA Board approved the schedule and public input process for development of the Track 1 projects for T-2030.

The Bay Area Partnership (made up of the regional CMA’s, transit operators, Caltrans, FHWA and other agencies), MTC and its various committees are now in the process of completing analyses of the projects submitted last fall for evaluation, preparing a Programmatic EIR and convening various task forces to provide further recommendations to MTC on each of the major issues remaining in the development of the plan (i.e. MTS vs. non-MTS streets and road shortfall, transit shortfall, Regional Bicycle/Pedestrian Program and the TLC/HIP program).

Discussion:

Based on MTC’s recently adopted funding option for T-2030, a total of **\$277.8 million** of Track 1 funds is expected to be available to the STA and it’s member agencies for Solano County projects over the next 25 years.

Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) funds are in addition to the basic Track 1 funds provided to each county. The purpose of ITIP is to fund certain high priority

traffic congestion projects such as interregional road or intercity rail projects having regional or statewide significance (e.g. I-80/680/12 interchange, I-80 HOV lanes, other I-80/680/780 corridor projects, S.R. 12 Jameson Canyon and Capitol Corridor track improvements). By placing these projects in the RTP, these projects receive MTC and Caltrans support for future cycles of ITIP funds. In the 2001 RTP, STA projects were pledged to receive \$144.2 million of ITIP and STA is expecting to receive a similar commitment in T-2030.

As part of MTC's T-2030 Phase 1 public outreach program, an early input opportunity on both the T-2030 (as well as the STA's new CTP update) was held at the STA Board meeting on October 8, 2003. STA advertised the meeting in Solano County's major newspapers. Since then, an estimated 73 written comments have been received and were provided to the STA Board on January 14, 2004. As part of their T-2030 Phase 2 public outreach program, MTC is requesting each of the congestion management agencies to hold further public input opportunities before the new Track 1 lists are approved.

Timeline: The remaining key dates as specified by MTC and the STA for the T-2030:

- April 14, 2004– Public input at the STA Board meeting
- May 21, 2004 – Final CMA Track 1 lists submitted to MTC by STA (and other CMA's)
- Fall 2004 – Draft T-2030 released
- January – March 2005 – MTC adopts Final T-2030

Public Input Process

Based on a public input process approved by the STA Board in February, STA staff distributed a special flyer and RTP/CTP comment cards to various cities, libraries, chambers of commerce, citizen groups and other interested parties. The remaining T-2030 Phase 2 public input process now includes:

- April 5-9, 2004 - Publish Ads in three largest Solano County newspapers encouraging public input process at the RTP/CTP public meeting scheduled for the STA Board meeting of April 14, 2004
- April 14, 2004 – STA Boards holds public input opportunity for Track 1 project for T-2030 and CTP 2030

Final Schedule for Submittal of New Track 1 List for T-2030

Based on input received and reviewed, the following schedule is proposed for the final review and approval of a new Track 1 list for T-2030 by the STA Board:

- March 31, 2004 – TAC and Consortium reviews and comments on a preliminary list of proposed options for Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent projects
- April 14, 2004 – STA Board reviews and comments on preliminary list of options for proposed Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent projects (STA Board T-2030 Public Hearing).
- April 28, 2004 - TAC and Consortium review and forward a recommendation on a final list of proposed Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent projects
- May 12, 2004 – STA Board approves a final list of proposed T-2030 Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent projects for submittal to MTC

Preliminary Track 1 and ITIP and “Big Tent” Projects Under Consideration

Staff is preparing two preliminary optional lists of Track 1, ITIP and “Big Tent” projects for consideration by the Consortium and TAC. With the passage of Regional Measure 2, some of the projects that will now be funded by RM2 can now be removed or modified in the Track 1 list to focus more on I-80/680/780 corridor improvements, local streets and roads and other remaining priority projects. In addition, Track 1 funding previously designated for bicycle and pedestrian projects will now be included as “committed” funding under the new Regional Bicycle/Program and will not need to be included in STA’s Track 1 funding. Also, MTS Streets and Roads funding, Vallejo Transit Capital Shortfall, CMA Planning funds and TLC funds are also considered committed and have already been taken “off the top” of the Track 1 estimate for the STA.

In the new Track 1 list for T-2030, a primary policy decision will need to be made if any funding needs to be included for the previously shown I-80 Widening project between Vacaville and Dixon and how much funding should be included for the Solano share of the S.R 12 Jameson Canyon Project. With the completion of the Draft I-80/680/780 Corridor Study, about 39 Mid Term projects (5-20 year projects totaling between \$872- 1,080 million) and about 26 Long Term projects (20 or more year projects totaling \$874 million) have been identified.

The following major 2001 RTP Track 1 and ITIP projects are subject to modifying and updating the 2001 dollar amounts (shown in Attachment A):

1. I-80/680/12 Interchange Improvements Phase 2
 - a. Braiding EB I-80 Ramps – I-680 to Suisun Valley Road
 - b. I-80 EB & WB HOV Lane – SR 12 West to Air Base Parkway (Requires relocation of truck scales)
2. North Connector (formerly part of I-80/680 Interchange)
3. Non MTS Streets and Roads
4. Vallejo Intermodal Terminal
5. Jepson Parkway:
6. I-80 HOV lane: Fairfield to Vacaville (a portion is included in 1b above)
7. SR 12 (east) safety improvements:
8. SR 12 widening: Jameson Canyon (Solano portion)
9. Capitol Corridor Train Stations & Track Improvements
10. Match for Local Interchanges

Most of the other smaller projects and programs (i.e., projects or programs having less than \$5 million designated in the 2001 RTP) are mostly covered by new committed funds (i.e., RM2) or by expanded regional programs (i.e., regional bicycle and pedestrian and TLC/HIP) and may now be removed entirely from the new Track 1 list.

From the project list recently evaluated by MTC, the additional high priority projects identified in the I-80/680/780 Corridor Study are being considered for inclusion in T-2030 from the list of projects recently evaluated by MTC:

The I-80 widening project between Vacaville and Dixon (Project No. 44) is now being recommended as a Long Term corridor project and is therefore proposed to be deleted from the Track 1 list.

Several possible Track 1 options, with a staff recommended option, are being developed and will be provided for preliminary discussion at the TAC and Consortium meetings at the April 14th public meeting at the STA Board.

Big Tent

MTC has also requested congestion management agencies to submit potential T-2030 “Big Tent” projects totaling about \$26 billion for the entire nine-county Bay Area, or about \$1.2 billion for Solano County over 25 years. For Solano County, it is assumed that “Big Tent” projects would primarily cover some of the remaining shortfalls for various categories or programs expected to be included in a potential Transportation Sales Tax Measure.

Some major categories for potential “Big Tent” projects or programs could include:

- Additional phases to complete the I-80/680/12 Interchange
- Additional Mid Term projects identified in I-80/680/780 Corridor Study
- Jepson Parkway
- Additional funding for non-MTS streets and roads
- Additional improvements to SR 12: Fairfield-Rio Vista and Jameson Canyon (Solano portion).
- Additional funding for Capitol Corridor Train Stations & Track Improvements and operating funds to provide additional and commuter-oriented trains
- Napa-Solano Passenger Rail Service
- Senior and Disabled Transit Services
- Additional Express Bus Capital
- Additional Park and Ride facilities
- Additional Baylink Ferry Services
- SR 113 Improvements

Staff will provide the several T-2030 options at the meeting.

Recommendation:

Forward the following recommendation to the STA Board:

1. A Draft List of Track 1, ITIP and Big Tent Projects for consideration and discussion at the Transportation 2030 public hearing scheduled for April 14, 2004.

Attachments: A. Existing STA Track 1 and ITIP Projects in the 2001 RTP
B. Project Submittals to MTC for Evaluation in T-2030 (to be adopted in 2005)
C. MTC Performance Evaluation for Potential T-2030 Projects

Current 2001 RTP STA Track 1 and ITIP Projects

Project	2001 RTP Track 1 (2001 dollars)	2001 RTP ITIP Projects (2001 dollars)
MTS streets and pavement	\$ 8.9M	
Non-MTS streets and roads pavement	\$ 22.6M	
Local Streets and Roads non-pavement	\$ 1.0M	
TLC county program	\$ 9.7M	
Vallejo Transit capital replacement	\$ 40.1M	
Match for improvements to local interchanges	\$ 10.0M	
Non-capacity increasing safety projects to improve congested intersections, local arterials and highways	\$ 3.0M	
Solano County Intercity bus service and transit hubs	\$ 5.0M	
Park and Ride Lots	\$ 3.0M	
Bicycle and pedestrian projects	\$ 5.0M	
I-80/680/780 interchange improvements	\$ 65.0M	\$ 70.0
Additional express bus service on I-680 (capital costs)	\$ 2.1M	
Vallejo Intermodal ferry terminal (Phase 1)	\$ 10.0M	
Vallejo ferry maintenance facility	\$ 0.4M	
Widen I-80 from 6 lanes to 8 lanes part way between Vacaville and Dixon	\$ 12.5M	
Express bus service on I-80 (capital costs for additional services beyond those in Regional express Bus Program)	\$ 3.5M	
Construct rail stations, track improvements, or intermodal centers for Capitol Corridor intercity rail or commuter rail service; potential stations sites are Fairfield/Vacaville, Dixon and Benicia	\$ 10.0M	
Jepson Parkway (Phase 1): Includes I-80/Leisure Town Road interchange improvements	\$ 43.0M	
I-80 HOV lanes part way between I-680 and I-505 through Fairfield and Vacaville	\$22.4M	\$ 30M
Operational and safety improvements on Route 12 from Sacramento River to I-80 (Phase 1)	\$ 2.0M	
Widen Route 12 (Jameson Canyon) from I-80 in Solano County to Route 29 in Napa county from 2 lanes to 4 lanes (Solano County portion of project)	\$14.0M	\$44.2M

2001 Regional Transportation Plan Track 1 projects - Solano County: \$266.3 million
Transportation 2030 Plan Track 1 est. - Solano County: \$277.8 million

**SOLANO COUNTY
REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN (TRANSPORTATION 2030)
Proposed Submittals to MTC for Performance Measures Evaluation
DRAFT 10/16/03**

Existing RTP Track 1 Major Projects 2001

1. I-80/680/12 Interchange Improvements (2001 RTP Ref. # 21807)
 - a) Braiding EB I-80 Ramps – I-680 to Suisun Valley Road
 - b) I-80 EB & WB HOV Lane – SR 12 West to Air Base Parkway
(Requires relocation of truck scales)
2. North Connector (formerly part of I-80/680 Interchange) (2001 RTP Ref. # 21807)
3. Vallejo Intermodal Terminal (2001 RTP # 21817)
4. Jepson Parkway (2001 RTP Ref. # 94151)
5. I-80 HOV lane: Fairfield to Vacaville (a portion is included in 1b above)
(2001 RTP Ref. # 98167)
6. SR 12 (east) safety improvements (2001 RTP Ref. # 21823)
7. SR 12 widening: Jameson Canyon (Solano portion) (2001 RTP Ref. # 94152)
8. Capitol Corridor Train Stations & Track Improvements (2001 RTP Ref. # 94148)
 - a. Fairfield/Vacaville
 - b. Benicia
 - c. Dixon

Proposed Additional RTP Projects (Track 1 & Track 2) for Transportation 2030

1. Extend WB I-80 HOV from east of Carquinez Bridge to Maritime Academy ramp.
2. Install EB I-80 Signage for SR 29 West of Toll Plaza
3. Expand/Relocate/Improve Lemon & Curtola Park & Ride
4. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Travis to Air Base Parkway
5. A/B Relocate / Reconstruct Truck Scales
6. Improve/Expand Fairfield Transportation Center – Phase 3
7. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Magellan to Beck Av merge
8. EB I-80 Aux Lane – SR 12 (E) to Magellan
9. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Redwood to SR 37 with 2 lane off ramp
10. WB I-80 Aux Lane – West Texas to Abernathy
11. WB I-80 Aux Lane – North Texas to Waterman
12. WB I-80 Aux Lane – Merchant to Cherry Glen
13. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Cherry Glen to Alamo
14. Red Top Road Park & Ride- Phase 2
15. WB I-80 Aux Lane – Waterman to Travis

16. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Air Base to North Texas
17. WB & EB I-80 Aux Lane – SR 12 (E) to Suisun Valley (If truck scale of scale of Segment 1)
18. Gold Hill Road Park & Ride
19. Lake Herman / Vista Point Park & Ride
20. WB I-80 Aux Lane – Green Valley Road to SR 12 West
21. Braid I-80 EB Ramps – SR 12 (E) West to Green Valley Road
22. Glen Cove / I-780 Park and Ride -
23. I-80 / I-505 Weave Correction Project
24. Benicia West Military Park & Ride
25. Hiddenbrooke Parkway Park & Ride
26. North Texas Park & Ride
27. Columbus & Rose Park & Ride
28. EB I-80 Aux Lane – Benicia Road to Georgia Street
29. WB I-80 Aux Lane – Georgia Street to Benicia Road
30. I-80 WB Aux Lane – Redwood to Tennessee
31. I-80 EB Aux Lane – Tennessee to Redwood
32. EB / WB I-780 Stripe Aux Lane – 2nd to 5th
33. I-80 / Pitt School Road Interchange Improvement
34. North First Street Park & Ride
35. Complete I-80/680/12 Interchange Improvements
36. WB and EB HOV lane on I-80 from Carquinez Bridge to S.R. 37
37. Commuter Rail (Solano's portion of Oakland / Richmond-Sacramento / Auburn Rail Service)
 - a) Complete new commuter rail stations at Fairfield/Vacaville, Benicia, and Dixon
 - b) Solano County's share of operating funds for 5-county system
 - c) Additional track improvements to accommodate commuter service
38. Complete SR12 (east) corridor improvements
39. Widen State Route 37 to 4 lanes (from Napa River Bridge to Solano County line)
40. Benicia Ferry Service



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bart MetroCenter
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-7700
Tel: 510-464-7700
TDD/TTY: 510-464-7769
Fax: 510-464-7849

Memorandum

TO: Partnership Technical Advisory Committee

DATE: March 15, 2004

FR: Lisa Klein

W.I.:

RE: Transportation 2030 Project Performance Evaluation: Preliminary Results

This report includes the first, and most substantial, set of results from the Transportation 2030 Project Performance Evaluation. Comments, questions and additional information on the preliminary evaluation results are welcome through March 29. Please direct comments and questions to Lisa Klein (lklein@mtc.ca.gov or 510-464-7832). The revised evaluation results will be presented to the Planning and Operations Committee on April 9.

Consistent with the legislative intent and adopted evaluation framework, MTC expects the evaluation results will be transmitted to the CMA boards prior to adoption of the county Transportation 2030 project lists. In addition, CMAs are asked to submit, along with their county lists, a discussion of how the evaluation results were considered in the project selection process. While our ability to revised the methodology for this evaluation is limited due to time constraints, we recognize this effort as the first step in an evolving process and welcome constructive criticism to help us refine the process for the future.

Guide to Preliminary Results

Included here are preliminary evaluation results for 390 projects in the main evaluation – projects considered likely candidates for the financially constrained portion of the plan. These results are for the needs assessment portion of the evaluation. Recall that the needs assessment, reviewed in more detail below, considers the transportation system conditions that a project is intended to address. The results presented here reflect two levels of evaluation:

1. About half the projects underwent a detailed evaluation, receiving a high to low rating based on the adopted measures for each objective evaluated. The following criteria were used to select projects for the detailed evaluation:
 - Major capacity expansion project
 - Gap closure projects on regional facilities or services
 - Interchange improvement that results in a new movement
 - Significant environmental justice issues
 - Significant effect on Smart Growth
 - Significant effect on air quality
2. The remainder, 200 mostly smaller and programmatic projects, were evaluated on a yes/no basis. A “yes” rating indicates the project addresses the objective; a “not applicable” rating indicates it does not. For these projects, system conditions generally were not assessed.

The evaluation results are summarized in the following attachments:

- Attachment A, illustrative of the summary we will provide the Commission, highlights major investment decisions and allows comparison between projects expected to address the same objective. Table A-1 lists all projects in the detailed evaluation with capital cost greater than \$25 million. Projects are listed by county and the primary objective they address. (Because the majority of projects addressing the Operational Efficiency and Reliability objectives cost less than \$25 million, all of these projects are shown.) The assignment of main objectives is based on MTC's interpretation and is a refinement of information provided to PTAC in November in which two main measures were identified for each project. Table A-2 lists the regional and multi-county projects, which are mostly programmatic in nature and are not included in Table A-1.
- Attachment B lists all the projects evaluated to date by County and corridor. This report is formatted so one can easily find the ratings of a particular project and includes notes explaining non-intuitive results for some projects.

Each project was evaluated relative to the objectives it was assumed by the project sponsor to address, as indicated in the project submittal forms. If a submitter did not check an objective as applicable, the project was assumed not to address it and was not evaluated for that objective. (In the summary tables, a blank indicates the project was not evaluated for a given objective.) For the Connectivity and Access objectives, where there was confusion about the definitions used, MTC made a determine on which objective was addressed. In a few other cases, MTC evaluated objectives that clearly applied even if they were not checked. Unfortunately, there was not time for to comprehensively review all objectives for all 390 projects.

The first level of review determined whether the project does, in fact, address the objective as defined for the purposes of this evaluation. If the project does address the objective, it was rated "yes" in the yes/no evaluation or low to high in the detailed evaluation. If the project does not meet the objective, it was rated "not applicable". Detailed descriptions of the bases for these determinations and the rating scales for each objective are provided in Attachment C: Basis for Rating Projects by Objective.

Review of Needs Assessment Concept and Criteria

MTC adopted project performance criteria and associated corridor objectives in MTC Resolution No. 3564. (See Attachment D.) The adopted criteria outline two elements of the evaluation: (1) needs assessment portion of the analysis, which is intended to assess future transportation system conditions relative to the objectives addressed by individual projects; and (2) corridor benefits analysis, which is intended to consider the interactive effects of packages of projects on travel within an entire corridor. The results presented here are for the needs based portion of the assessment only. For the most part, the adopted criteria for this portion of the analysis consider transportation conditions or needs in 2025 as represented in regional travel demand model forecasts using ABAG Projections 2003 land uses and assuming implementation of projects in the 2001 RTP. This scenario is the basis for the needs assessment because the legal performance measures requirement applies to new projects – those not in the 2001 RTP. In a few cases where forecasted data is not up to the task, the adopted measures are based on current conditions or qualitative assessments.

Next Steps

As you are aware, this was the first effort to conduct a project evaluation of this nature. We welcome feedback both to refine the results for this evaluation and to improve the process for future RTP updates. To this end, we have outlined the following next steps:

1. **Comments on Preliminary Results (due March 29)** – Project submitters, CMAs, and other partners should respond to Lisa Klein no later than March 29 with any questions, comments or additional information that may affect the evaluation results. During this time, MTC staff will continue to review and make refinements to the analysis. We encourage you not to wait until the last minute, as it will be difficult to devote adequate time to each response if they are all submitted on March 29.
2. **Revised Evaluation Results to MTC Planning and Operations Committee (April 9)**
3. **Results Transmitted to CMA Boards by CMA staff (April, May)** – prior to adopting county project lists for Transportation 2030. You will recall that the aim of the evaluation is to provide additional information in the decision making process. The results of the evaluation to not themselves mandate or disqualify any projects for inclusion in Transportation 2030
4. **CMAs Submit Discussion of how Evaluation was Used (May 21)** – County project lists are due to MTC on May 21. At that time, the CMAs should also submit a discussion of how the evaluation results were used. MTC will also develop a short response form for CMAs to provide feedback on how useful the evaluation proved to be and how we could improve the evaluation in the future.

A few additional elements of the evaluation will be integrate in March and April as they develop:

- Results from the Corridor Benefits Analysis – Modeling work is underway to calculate measures of corridor benefit: user benefit (value of travel time savings), change in emissions and vehicle miles traveled, and change in average travel time. Projects in the main evaluation have been grouped into two packages, and the benefits will be measured at the corridor level for each package of projects: Alternative 1 includes local access and system operations projects; Alternative 2 includes major capacity expansion projects. Results from this analysis are expected to be complete in March; however, because benefits will not be attributed to individual projects, it may not be critical to finalize it for the April 9 POC meeting. Operating and maintenance cost estimates will be available along with these results.
- Phase 2 of the Evaluation (Big Tent Candidates) – Some of the projects submitted for the evaluation were identified as likely candidates for the Big Tent because they clearly require new revenue for capital or operating. (See Attachment E.) We are aware that this list includes several projects considered fully funded with the passage of RM 2 on March 3. We will prioritize these projects for the Phase 2 evaluation. The results for Phase 2 should be available by the end of April.
- Regional Goods Movement Study – As noted in the attached reports, a number of projects have been identified as having potentially significant benefits to goods movement by virtue of the fact they are located in a priority goods movement corridor or address critical goods movement issues. These projects will be examined in more detail in the Regional Goods Movement Study, with results provided to the CMAs at the end of March. We hope this additional information, which goes beyond the framework of the criteria adopted for the performance evaluation, will be useful to the CMAs in prioritizing projects (particularly those using ITIP funding) for inclusion in Transportation 2030.

SOLANO COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions, 2004\$)	Efficient Operation	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Comm. Viability	Equity	Safety	Submit. Safety	Mainten-ance	Roads Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
Efficient Operations																	
316	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Air Base Parkway to North Texas Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$24.9	H	n.a.	H		M	n.a.			n.a.					
318	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Cherry Glen to Alamo Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$8.0	H	n.a.	H		M	n.a.			n.a.					
319	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Merchant to Cherry Glen Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$16.9	H	n.a.	H		M	n.a.			n.a.					
295	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Magellan to Beck Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$12.5	M/H	n.a.	M/H		M	n.a.			n.a.					
320	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from North Texas to Waterman Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$28.9	M/H	n.a.	M/H		M	n.a.			n.a.					
307	I-80 EB Auxiliary lane from Tennessee to Redwood Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$18.1	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			n.a.					
308	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Redwood to Tennessee Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$11.0	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			n.a.					
309	I-80 WB Auxiliary Lane from Georgia to Benicia Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$14.2	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			ML					
310	I-80 EB Auxiliary lane from Benicia Road to Georgia Street Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$13.4	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			H					
315	I-80 EB and WB Auxiliary Lanes - SR 12 E to Suisun Valley Road Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$11.1	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			n.a.					

*Includes all projects in detailed evaluation with Operations, Reliability and an Equity as a main objective (even those under \$25 million).
 (1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement Study.
 (2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Air Quality rating based only on one of two adopted measures; rating shown here reflects TCM status; final rating will also reflect corridor emissions

Notes on Rating:
 H=High; M=Medium; L=Low; Y=Yes, objective applies but information not sufficient to rate.
 n.a. = not applicable - objective determined not to apply.
 Blank indicates project was not evaluated relative to the objective because it was not checked in the application and is assumed not to apply.
 Inpl indicates information was not sufficient to conduct evaluation.

SOLANO COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Corridor	Capital Cost (Millions 2004\$)	Efficient Operation	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Comm. Viability	Equity	Safety	Seismic Safety	Maintenance	Air Quality Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
323	I-60 EB Auxiliary Lane from the SR 12 EB off-ramp to the Magellan EB off-ramp Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$10.2	M	n.a.	M		M	n.a.			n.a.					
322	EB I-60 Auxiliary Lane from Redwood to SR 37 Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$18.4	L	n.a.	L		M	n.a.			H					
Reliability																	
328	Solano County I-680 Ramp Metering and TOS Project Caltrans	Diablo	\$8.1	H	H		n.a.			n.a.		n.a.				M	
443	Solano County I-780 Ramp Metering, TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project Caltrans	Diablo	TBD	M/H	M/H		n.a.			n.a.		n.a.				M	
525	Solano County I-60 TOS Project Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$14.2	M	M		n.a.	M		n.a.		n.a.				M	
326	Solano County I-60 Ramp Meter Project and TOS fiber optic communications system Caltrans	Eastshore North	\$18.8	M	M		n.a.	M				n.a.				M	
329	Solano County SR-37 TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project Caltrans	North Bay East-West	\$7.3	M	M		n.a.			n.a.		n.a.				M	
New Capacity																	
288	I-60 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Air Base Parkway to I-505 Solano County Transportation Authority 98167	Eastshore North	\$70.2	H		H		M	n.a.							M	
289	Jeppson Parkway, I-60 - SR 12 Solano County Transportation Authority 94151	Eastshore North	\$145.4			H	M	L	M	n.a.		Y		n.a.			

*Includes all projects in detailed evaluation with Operations, Reliability and an Equity as a main objective (even those under \$25 million).
 (1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement Study.
 (2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Air Quality rating based only on one of two adopted measures; rating shown here reflects TCM status; final rating will also reflect corridor emissions
 3/8/2004 2:30:02 PM

Notes on Rating:
 H=High; M=Medium; L=Low; Y=Yes, objective applies but information not sufficient to rate.
 n.a. = not applicable - objective determined not to apply.
 Blank indicates project was not evaluated relative to the objective because it was not checked in the application and is assumed not to apply.
 Inop indicates information was not sufficient to conduct evaluation.

SOLANO COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions 2004\$)	Efficient Operation	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Comm. Vitality	Equity	Safety	Seismic Safety	Mainten- tence	Noise Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
292	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From SR 12 West to Air Base Parkway Solano County Transportation Authority 98167	Eastshore North	\$42.7	M/H		M/H	n.a.	M								M	
303	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Carquinez Bridge to SR 37 Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$31.4	M		M		M								M	

SONOMA COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions 2004\$)	Efficient Operation	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Comm. Vitality	Equity	Safety	Seismic Safety	Mainten- tence	Noise Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
180	Hwy 116/Hwy 121 Intersection Improvements: signalize and channelize Sonoma County	North Bay East- West	\$5.0	H			L	n.a.	L			n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
189	Sonoma County 101 Corridor TOS Project Calltrans	Golden Gate	\$17.3	M/H	M/H					n.a.		n.a.				M	
200	Sonoma County 101 Ramp Metering and fiber optic cable Calltrans	Golden Gate	\$27.7	M/H	M/H					n.a.		L				M	

New Capacity

438	Widen US 101 (add HOV lane in each direction): Rte 37 to Old Redwood Calltrans 98147, 98154	Golden Gate	\$388.8	H		H		n.a.	H	n.a.		n.a.				H	
189	Widen for US 101 HOV lanes: Steele Lane - Windsor River Rd Calltrans 98183	Golden Gate	\$60.3	M/H		M/H			n.a.								

*Includes all projects in detailed evaluation with Operations, Reliability and an Equity as a main objective (even those under \$25 million).
 (1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement Study.
 (2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Air Quality rating based only on one of two adopted measures; rating shown here reflects TOM status; final rating will also reflect corridor emissions
 3/8/2004 2:30:02 PM

Notes on Rating:
 H=High; M=Medium; L=Low; Y=Yes, objective applies but information not sufficient to rate.
 n.a. = not applicable - objective determined not to apply.
 Blank indicates project was not evaluated relative to the objective because it was not checked in the application and is assumed not to apply.
 Incpl indicates information was not sufficient to conduct evaluation.

SOLANO COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Main Objective	Capital Cost (millions 2004\$)	Efficient Operations	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Equity	Comm. Viability	Safety	Seismic Safety	Maintenance	Noise Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
Diablo																	
328	Solano County I-680 Ramp Metering and TOS Project Caltrans	Reliability	\$8.1	H	H	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
443	Solano County I-780 Ramp Metering, TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project Caltrans	Reliability	180	MH	MH	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
Eastshore North																	
288	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Air Base Parkway to I-505 Solano County Transportation Authority 88187	New Capacity	\$70.2	H	H	H	M	M	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
289	Jepson Parkway: I-80 - SR 12 Solano County Transportation Authority 94151	New Capacity	\$145.4	n.a.	n.a.	H	M	L	M	n.a.	n.a.	Y	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		
290	Vallejo Station (enhanced ferry terminal with enhanced bus transfer center) Solano County Transportation Authority 21871	New Capacity	\$64.5	n.a.	n.a.	M	Y	Y	Y	n.a.	Y	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		
292	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From SR 12 West to Air Base Parkway Solano County Transportation Authority 88187	New Capacity	\$47.7	MH	MH	MH	n.a.	M	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
295	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from Magellan to Beck Solano County Transportation Authority	Efficient Operations	\$12.8	MH	n.a.	MH	n.a.	M	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		
303	I-80 EB and WB HOV Lane - From Carquinez Bridge to SR 37 Solano County Transportation Authority	New Capacity	\$31.4	M	M	M	n.a.	M	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	M	
305	I-80/Pitt School Road Interchange Improvement Solano County Transportation Authority	Access	\$7.5	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		
307	I-80 EB Auxiliary lane from Tennessee to Redwood Solano County Transportation Authority	Efficient Operations	\$13.1	M	n.a.	M	n.a.	M	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.		

(1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement
 (2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public
 (3) Air Quality rating based only on one of two adopted measures; rating shown here reflects TCM status; final rating will also reflect corridor emissions

Notes on Rating:
 H=High; M=Medium; L=Low; Y=Yes; N=No
 Incpl. indicates information was not sufficient to conduct evaluation
 Blank indicates project was not evaluated relative to the objective because sponsor did not indicate project addresses that objective, and it was assumed not to apply.

SOLANO COUNTY

ID	Project Title, Submitted by, 2001 RTP ID numbers	Main Objective	Capital Cost (millions 2004\$)	Efficient Operations	Reliability	New Capacity	Passenger Access	Port/ Airport Access	Connectivity	Equity	Comm. Viability	Safety	Seismic Safety	Maintenance	Noise Reduction	Air Quality (3)	Notes
323	I-80 EB Auxiliary Lane from the SR 12 EB off-ramp to the Magellan EB off-ramp Solano County Transportation Authority	Efficient Operations	\$16.2	M	n.a.	M	n.a.	M	n.a.			n.a.					
324	Extend WB I-80 HOV from east of Carquinez Bridge to Maritime Academy Off-Ramp Solano County Transportation Authority	New Capacity	\$52.9	M		M	n.a.	M								M	
325	Solano County I-80 TOS Project Caltrans	Reliability	\$14.2	M	M		n.a.	M			n.a.	n.a.				M	
326	Solano County I-80 Ramp Meter Project and TOS fiber optic communications system Caltrans	Reliability	\$18.8	M	M		n.a.	M				n.a.				M	
North Bay East-West																	
300	SR 12 (east) corridor improvements Solano County Transportation Authority	New Capacity	\$16.5	Y	n.a.	Y	Y		n.a.			Y					Programmatic Presubmitter
329	Solano County SR-37 TOS and Fiber Optic Communication Project Caltrans	Reliability	\$7.3	M	M		n.a.				n.a.	n.a.				M	
Solano County Countywide																	
284	Solano County Transit Centers and Park & Ride Facilities Solano County Transportation Authority	Access	\$53.9	Y			Y			Incl.	n.a.	n.a.			Fit	Y	

(1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement.
 (2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public.
 (3) Air Quality rating based only on one of two adopted measures; rating shown here reflects TCM status; final rating will also reflect corridor emissions.

Notes on Ratings:
 H=High; M=Medium; L=Low; Y=Yes; N=No
 Incl. Indicates information was not sufficient to conduct evaluation
 Blank indicates project was not evaluated relative to the objective because sponsor did not indicate project addresses that objective, and it was assumed not to apply.

Attachment E: Projects to be Evaluated in Phase 2 of the Evaluation
Transportation 2030 Project Evaluation, March 1, 2004

ID	Project Title, 2001 RTP ID Number	Submitted By	Corridor	Capital Cost (millions, 2004\$)
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY				
126	Treasure Island to San Francisco Ferry Service	Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$21.8
253	Downtown Ferry Terminal	Port of San Francisco	Transbay	\$86.4
247	Bayview Transportation Improvements Project (alt access route between Hunters Point Shipyard and US 101)	San Francisco City/County	San Francisco Countywide	\$152.5
414	Geary LRT	San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$1,734.2
419	Trolley Coach Extension/Conversions	San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$624.1
425	19th Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$25.9
427	Potrero Bus Rapid Transit	San Francisco Municipal Railway (MUNI)	San Francisco Countywide	\$60.0
462 (2)	MUNI Rapid/Enhanced Bus on 30-Stockton line	Public: Architecture 21	San Francisco Countywide	TBD
463 (2)	MUNI F Line spur to N-Judah Spur and Golden Gate Park connection	Public: individual	San Francisco Countywide	\$250.0
464 (2)	San Francisco: Grant Avenue Transit Mall and enhanced service	Public: individual	San Francisco Countywide	TBD
535	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II)	Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6
520	BART Seismic Retrofit Program	BART	Regional	\$1199.7
SAN MATEO COUNTY				
120	Redwood City to San Francisco to Alameda Ferry Service	Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$34.8
125	South San Francisco to San Francisco to Alameda Ferry Service	Water Transit Authority	Transbay	\$22.2
528	Dumbarton Rail Corridor 21618	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Transbay	\$277.6
534	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II)	Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6
131	BART Seismic Retrofit Program	BART	Regional	\$1199.7
SANTA CLARA COUNTY				
410	Dumbarton Rail Corridor 21618	San Mateo County Transportation Authority	Transbay	\$277.6
434	Caltrain Rail Capacity Improvements (Baby Bullet Phase II)	Caltrain	Peninsula	\$335.6
470 (2)	Personal Rapid Transit: 3 mile Feeder to Milpitas LRT Station • - multiple projects	Public: Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association	Fremont-South Bay	TBD
471 (2)	Personal Rapid Transit: 10 mile route connection to Montague BART station [proposed] and extensive circulation within Milpitas • - multiple projects	Public: Sunnyhills Neighborhood Association	Fremont-South Bay	TBD
SOLANO COUNTY				
304 (1)	Complete I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange Improvements (Phase 3) 21807	Solano County Transportation Authority	Diablo	\$508.5
381	Capitol Corridor Regional Rail Service (West Contra Costa and Solano counties)	AMTRAK	Eastshore North	\$122.0
445	Martinez-Benicia-San Francisco Ferry Service	Solano County Transportation Authority	Eastshore North	\$35.0
286	SR 37 Widening with environmental mitigation	Solano County Transportation Authority	North Bay East-West	\$154.5
SONOMA COUNTY				

(1) Indicates project may have benefits for goods movement. More information will be forthcoming from the MTC Goods Movement Study

(2) Indicates project was submitted by a member of the public



DATE: March 22, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Janice Sells, Program Manager/Analyst
RE: Legislative Update – March 2004

Background:

Each year, STA staff monitors state and federal legislation that pertains directly to transportation and related issues. In January 2004, the STA Board adopted its Legislative Priorities and Platform for 2004 to provide policy guidance on transportation legislation and the STA's legislative activities.

Discussion:

This month's legislative report includes five bills covering two specific topics, the increasing of the state fee on gas to provide new revenue for transportation and restructuring the state legislatures authority to divert transportation funds to bail out the State General Fund.

Gas Tax Fee:

AB 2847 (Orpeza) – Support Gasoline and motor vehicle fuel fees

This bill would impose a 5-cent per gallon fee on gasoline that would be deposited into a newly created Highway Fee Fund and would be used to fund maintenance, operation, improvement and construction of the state highway system and local streets and roads. It would also finance environmental mitigation.

SB 1614 (Torlakson) – Support Gasoline and motor vehicle diesel fuel

This bill would impose a 10-cent fee on each gallon of gasoline that would be used to finance maintenance, operations, and road systems as well as environmental mitigation programs.

Staff recommends support of these two bills that are in agreement with Item 1 of the STA's Legislative Priorities approved by the Board on January.

Restrict transfer of revenue:

ACA 21 (Bogh and Spitzer) - Support Motor vehicle fuel sales and tax revenue.

This constitutional amendment would change the vote requirement to 4/5 of the membership of each house in order to enact a statute suspending the transfer of sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel deposited into the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund.

ACA 24 (Dutra) – Support Transportation Investment Fund – Loans.

The constitutional amendment would require that money transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund may only be loaned to the General Fund under more restrictive conditions.

ACA 29 (Harman, Lowenthal, and Richman – Coauthors: Bates, Benoit, Berg, Canciamilla, Daucher, Dutra, Shirley, Horton, LaMalfa, Liu, Mathews, Negrete, McLeod, Plesica and Wolk) – Support Transportation Investment Funding

The constitutional amendment would delete the provision authorizing the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of revenues from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency.

Staff recommends support of these three bills that are in agreement with Item 2 of the STA's Legislative Priorities approved by the Board on January.

An updated Legislative Matrix is included as Attachment A.

Recommendation:

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

1. AB 2847 - Support
2. SB 1614 - Support
3. ACA 21 - Support
4. ACA 24 - Support
5. ACA 29 - Support

Attachment: A – 2004 Legislative Matrix

B – Copies of AB 1847, SB 1614, ACA 21, ACA 24, ACA 29

C – 2004 Legislative Priorities and Platform

**Solano Transportation Authority
2004 Legislative Matrix
March**

State Legislation

State Legislation Bill/Author	Subject	Status	Position
AB 1320 (Dutra) Transit Village Plan Design	This bill would require the Transit Village Plan to include any 5 of the demonstrable public benefits that is currently authorized by the Transit Village Development Planning Act of 1994.	SEN Read first time – to committee on rules for assignment	
AB 2847 (Orpeza) Gasoline and motor vehicle diesel fuel fees	This bill would, until January 1, 2008, impose a 5-cent fee on each gallon of gasoline subject to the existing laws and each gallon of motor vehicle diesel fuel subject to the Diesel Fuel Tax Law. The revenues from the fee would be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund created by the bill. The bill would require money from the fee, except for refunds, to be used, upon appropriation by the Legislature, only to finance the maintenance, operation, improvement and construction of the state highway and local street and road system, and to finance environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles.	ASM May be heard in committee on March 23, 2004	Support
ACA 21 (Bough and Spitzer) Motor vehicle fuel sales tax revenue	This bill would change the vote requirement to 4/5 of the membership of each house of the legislature in order to enact a statute suspending in whole or in part the transfer of sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel deposited into the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund.	ASM From printer	Support
ACA 24 (Dutra) Transportation Investment Fund - Loans	This measure would authorize the Legislature to loan funds in the Transportation Investment Fund to the General Fund or any other state fund or account, or to local agencies, under conditions that are similar to conditions applicable to loans of revenues under Article XIX of the California Constitution. This bill would require that any money transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund may be loaned to the General Fund only under one of the following conditions: 1) That any amount loaned is to be repaid in full to the Transportation Investment Fund during the same fiscal year; 2) that any amount loaned is to be repaid in full, with interest at the rate paid on money in the Pooled Money Investment Account, or any successor to that account, during the period of time that the money is loaned within three fiscal years from the date on which the loan was made.	ASM May be heard on March 18, 2004	Support

<p>ACA 29 (Harman, Lowenthal, and Richman – Coauthors: Bates, Benoit, Berg, Canciamilla, Daucher, Dutra, Shirley, Horton, LaMalfa, Liu, Mathews Negrete, McLeod, Plescia, and Volk) Transportation Investment Fund</p>	<p>This measure would delete the provision authorizing the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of revenues from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund for a fiscal year during the fiscal emergency.</p>	<p>ASM To print</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p>SB 1614 (Torlakson) Gasoline and motor vehicle diesel fuel</p>	<p>This bill would impose a 10-cent fee on each gallon of gasoline of subject to existing law on collection of such fees and would require such revenues from the fee to be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund created by the bill. The bill would require the fee to be imposed according to existing law and upon appropriation by the Legislature. This bill would also require that revenues from the fee to be used to finance the maintenance, operation, and road system and that revenue from one cent of the fee be used to finance environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to hold hearings annually in order to derive information to report to the Legislature on the amount of funding needed to maintain, operate, improve and construct the state highway and local street and road system.</p>		<p>Support</p>

BILL NUMBER: AB 2847 INTRODUCED
 BILL TEXT

ATTACHMENT B

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Oropeza

FEBRUARY 20, 2004

An act to add Division 19 (commencing with Section 40000) to the Streets and Highways Code, relating to motor vehicle fuel.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 2847, as introduced, Oropeza. Gasoline and motor vehicle diesel fuel fee.

The Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law imposes a tax of 18 per gallon of fuel, and requires, if the federal fuel tax is reduced below the rate of 9

per gallon and federal financial allocations to this state are reduced or eliminated, that the tax rate be increased so that the combined state and federal tax rate per gallon equals 27

. The Diesel Fuel Tax Law imposes an excise tax for the use of fuel at a rate of 18

per gallon, and requires that, if the federal fuel tax is reduced below the rate of 15

per gallon and specified federal financial allocations to this state are reduced or eliminated, the tax rate be increased by an amount so that the combined state and federal tax rate per gallon equals 33 per gallon. i This bill would also, until January 1, 2008, impose a 5

fee on each gallon of gasoline subject to the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law and each gallon of motor vehicle diesel fuel subject to the Diesel Fuel Tax Law. The revenues from the fee would be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund created by the bill. The bill would require the fee to be imposed on those persons and entities subject to and would be collected pursuant to the same procedures set forth in the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law and the Diesel Fuel Tax Law. The bill would require money from the fee, except for refunds, to be used, upon appropriation by the Legislature, only to finance the maintenance, operation, improvement, and construction of the state highway and local street and road system, and to finance environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles. a Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. Division 19 (commencing with Section 40000) is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

DIVISION 19. GASOLINE AND DIESEL MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL

40000. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a fee of five cents (\$.05) is imposed, until January 1, 2008, on each gallon of gasoline subject to Part 2 (commencing with Section 7301) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and each gallon of motor vehicle

diesel fuel subject to Part 31 (commencing with Section 60001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

40001. Revenues generated from the fee imposed in Section 40000 shall be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund which is hereby created in the State Treasury and, except for refunds of overpayments, may only be used, upon appropriation by the Legislature, to finance the maintenance, operation, improvement, and construction of the state highway and local street and road system, and to finance environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles.

40002. The imposition of the fee in Section 40000 shall be as follows:

(a) The fee on gasoline shall be imposed on those persons and entities subject to, and shall be collected pursuant to the procedures set forth in, Part 2 (commencing with Section 7301) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(b) The fee on motor vehicle diesel fuel shall be imposed on those persons and entities subject to, and shall be collected pursuant to the procedures set forth in, Part 31 (commencing with Section 60001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

BILL NUMBER: SB 1614 INTRODUCED
 BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Senator Torlakson

FEBRUARY 20, 2004

An act to add Division 19 (commencing with Section 40000) to the Streets and Highways Code, relating to motor vehicle fuel.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1614, as introduced, Torlakson. Gasoline and motor vehicle diesel fuel.

The Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law imposes a tax of 18 per gallon of fuel, and requires, if the federal fuel tax is reduced below the rate of 9 per gallon and federal financial allocations to this state are reduced or eliminated, that the tax rate be increased so that the combined state and federal tax rate per gallon equals 27 . The Diesel Fuel Tax Law imposes an excise tax for the use of fuel at a rate of 18 per gallon, and requires that, if the federal fuel tax is reduced below the rate of 15 per gallon and specified federal financial allocations to this state are reduced or eliminated, the tax rate be increased by an amount so that the combined state and federal tax rate per gallon equals 33 per gallon. i This bill would also impose a 10 fee on each gallon of gasoline subject to the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law and each gallon of motor vehicle diesel fuel subject to the Diesel Fuel Tax Law and would require revenues from the fee to be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund created by the bill. The bill would require the fee to be imposed on those persons and entities subject to and would be collected pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Motor Vehicle Fuel License Tax Law and the Diesel Fuel Tax Law. The bill would require, except for refunds of overpayments, that, upon appropriation by the Legislature, revenues from 9 of the fee be used to finance the maintenance, operation, improvement, and construction of the state highway and local street and road system and that revenues from one cent of the fee be used to finance environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles. The bill would require the California Transportation Commission to hold hearings annually in order to derive information to report to the Legislature on the amount of funding needed to maintain, operate, improve, and construct the state highway and local street and road system. , Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) The excise tax on motor vehicle fuel was last increased on January 1, 1994, when the rate was set at eighteen cents (\$0.18) per gallon.

(b) The demand on California's state highways, streets, and local roads has increased at a far greater rate than the revenues available to operate, maintain, and improve the transportation network.

(c) Increased motor vehicle fuel economy results in the consumption of less fuel and the generation of less gas tax revenue per mile driven, while inflation also erodes this revenue.

(d) Because motor vehicles create wear and tear on the highway, street, and road system, users of the system should pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, operating, and improving the system.

(e) A fee on gasoline and diesel sales would help maintain, operate, improve, and construct the state highway, local street, and road system, and the amount of the levy would not exceed the reasonable cost of funding those purposes.

(f) Because emissions from motor vehicles add to air quality problems, a portion of the fee on gasoline and diesel sales should be used for environmental programs that mitigate the air quality impacts of motor vehicles.

SEC. 2. Division 19 (commencing with Section 40000) is added to the Streets and Highways Code, to read:

DIVISION 19. GASOLINE AND DIESEL MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL

40000. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a fee of 10 cents (\$0.10) shall be imposed on each gallon of gasoline subject to Part 2 (commencing with Section 7301) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code and each gallon of motor vehicle diesel fuel subject to Part 31 (commencing with Section 60001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

40001. Revenues generated from the fee imposed in Section 40000 shall be deposited in the Highway Fee Fund which is hereby created in the State Treasury and, except for refunds of nonpayments, may only be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, as follows:

(a) Nine cents (\$0.09) of the 10 cent (\$.0.10) fee revenue shall be allocated to finance the maintenance, operation, improvement, and construction of the state highway and local street and road system.

(b) One cent of the 10 cent (\$0.10) fee revenue shall be allocated towards environmental programs that mitigate the air impacts of motor vehicles.

40002. The imposition of the fee in Section 40000 shall be as follows:

(a) The fee on gasoline shall be imposed on those persons and entities subject to, and shall be collected pursuant to the procedures set forth in, Part 2 (commencing with Section 7301) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

(b) The fee on motor vehicle diesel fuel shall be imposed on those persons and entities subject to, and shall be collected pursuant to the procedures set forth in, Part 31 (commencing with Section 60001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code.

40003. The California Transportation Commission shall annually hold hearings in order to derive information to report to the Legislature on the amount of funding needed to maintain, operate, improve, and construct the state highway and local street and road system.

BILL NUMBER: ACA 21 INTRODUCED
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Members Bogh and Spitzer

JANUARY 7, 2004

Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 21--A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending subdivision (d) of Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, relating to transportation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 21, as introduced, Bogh. Motor vehicle fuel sales tax revenue.

Existing provisions of the California Constitution require that sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel that are deposited into the General Fund be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund and used for transportation purposes, but allow the transfer of these revenues to be suspended in whole or in part for a fiscal year under specified circumstances by a statute enacted by a 2/3 vote of the membership of each house of the Legislature.

This measure would change the vote requirement to 4/5 of the membership of each house of the Legislature in order to enact a statute suspending in whole or in part the transfer of this particular revenue from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.
State-mandated local program: no.

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2003-04 Regular Session commencing on the second day of December 2002, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California that the Constitution of the State be amended by amending subdivision (d) of Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, to read:

(d) The transfer of revenues from the General Fund of the State to the Transportation Investment Fund pursuant to subdivision (a) may be suspended, in whole or in part, for a fiscal year if both of the following conditions are met:

(1) The Governor has issued a proclamation that declares that the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a) will result in a significant negative fiscal impact on the range of functions of government funded by the General Fund of the State.

(2) The Legislature enacts by statute, pursuant to a bill passed in each house of the Legislature by rollcall vote entered in the journal, ~~two-thirds~~ *four-fifths* of the membership of each house concurring, a suspension for that fiscal year of the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a), provided that the bill does not contain any other unrelated provision.

BILL NUMBER: ACA 24 INTRODUCED
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Member Dutra

FEBRUARY 13, 2004

Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 24--A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by adding Section 2 to Article XIX B thereof, relating to transportation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 24, as introduced, Dutra. Transportation Investment Fund: loans.

Article XIX B of the California Constitution requires, commencing with the 2003-04 fiscal year, sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel that are deposited in the General Fund to be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund for allocation to various transportation purposes. Article XIX B authorizes the transfer of these revenues to the Transportation Investment Fund to be suspended in whole or in part for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency pursuant to a proclamation issued by the Governor and the enactment of a statute by a 2/3 vote of both houses of the Legislature if the statute does not contain any unrelated provision.

This measure would authorize the Legislature to loan funds in the Transportation Investment Fund to the General Fund or any other state fund or account, or to local agencies, under conditions that are similar to conditions applicable to loans of revenues under Article XIX of the California Constitution.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes.
State-mandated local program: no.

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2003-04 Regular Session commencing on the second day of December 2002, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California that the Constitution of the State be amended by adding Section 2 to Article XIX B thereof, to read:

SEC. 2. (a) Any money transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund pursuant to Section 1 may be loaned to the General Fund of the state or any other state fund or account only under one of the following conditions:

(1) That any amount loaned is to be repaid in full to the Transportation Investment Fund during the same fiscal year in which the loan was made, except that repayment may be delayed until a date not more than 30 days after the date of enactment of the budget bill for the subsequent fiscal year.

(2) That any amount loaned is to be repaid in full, with interest at the rate paid on money in the Pooled Money Investment Account, or any successor to that account, during the period of time that the money is loaned, to the Transportation Investment Fund, within three

fiscal years from the date on which the loan was made and one of the following has occurred:

(A) The Governor has proclaimed a state of emergency and declares that the emergency will result in a significant negative fiscal impact to the General Fund of the state.

(B) The aggregate amount of General Fund revenues for the current fiscal year, as projected by the Governor in a report to the Legislature in May of the current fiscal year, is less than the aggregate amount of General Fund revenues for the previous fiscal year, adjusted for the change in the cost of living and the change in population, as specified in the budget submitted by the Governor pursuant to Section 12 of Article IV in the current fiscal year.

(b) Nothing in this article prohibits the Legislature from authorizing, by statute, loans to local transportation agencies, cities, counties, or cities and counties from the Transportation Investment Fund for the purposes authorized under this article. Any loan authorized as described by this subdivision shall be repaid, with interest at the rate paid on money in the Pooled Money Investment Account, or any successor to that account, during the period of time that the money is loaned, to the Transportation Investment Fund, within four years after the date on which the loan was made.

BILL NUMBER: ACA 29 INTRODUCED
BILL TEXT

INTRODUCED BY Assembly Members Harman, Lowenthal, and Richman
 (Coauthors: Assembly Members Bates, Benoit, Berg, Canciamilla,
Daucher, Dutra, Shirley Horton, La Malfa, Liu, Matthews, Negrete
McLeod, Plescia, and Wolk)

MARCH 11, 2004

Assembly Constitutional Amendment No. 29--A resolution to propose to the people of the State of California an amendment to the Constitution of the State, by amending Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, relating to transportation.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

ACA 29, as introduced, Harman. Transportation Investment Fund.

Article XIX B of the California Constitution requires, commencing with the 2003-04 fiscal year, that sales taxes on motor vehicle fuel that are deposited in the General Fund be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund for allocation to various transportation purposes. Article XIX B authorizes this transfer to the Transportation Investment Fund to be suspended in whole or in part for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency pursuant to a proclamation issued by the Governor and the enactment of a statute by a 2/3 vote of both houses of the Legislature if the statute does not contain any unrelated provision.

This measure would delete the provision authorizing the Governor and the Legislature to suspend the transfer of revenues from the General Fund to the Transportation Investment Fund for a fiscal year during a fiscal emergency.

Vote: 2/3. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: no.
State-mandated local program: no.

Resolved by the Assembly, the Senate concurring, That the Legislature of the State of California at its 2003-04 Regular Session commencing on the second day of December 2002, two-thirds of the membership of each house concurring, hereby proposes to the people of the State of California that the Constitution of the State be amended by amending Section 1 of Article XIX B thereof, to read:

SECTION 1. (a) For the 2003-04 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, all moneys that are collected during the fiscal year from taxes under the Sales and Use Tax Law (Part 1 (commencing with Section 6001) of Division 2 of the Revenue and Taxation Code), or any successor to that law, upon the sale, storage, use, or other consumption in this State of motor vehicle fuel, and that are deposited in the General Fund of the State pursuant to that law, shall be transferred to the Transportation Investment Fund, which is hereby created in the State Treasury.

(b) (1) For the 2003-04 to 2007-08 fiscal years, inclusive, moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, in accordance with Section 7104 of

the Revenue and Taxation Code as that section read on ~~the operative date of this article~~ March 6, 2002 .

(2) For the 2008-09 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated solely for the following purposes:

(A) Public transit and mass transportation.

(B) Transportation capital improvement projects, subject to the laws governing the State Transportation Improvement Program, or any successor to that program.

(C) Street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by cities, including a city and county.

(D) Street and highway maintenance, rehabilitation, reconstruction, or storm damage repair conducted by counties, including a city and county.

(c) For the 2008-09 fiscal year and each fiscal year thereafter, moneys in the Transportation Investment Fund shall be allocated, upon appropriation by the Legislature, as follows:

(A) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (A) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(B) Forty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(C) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purposes set forth in subparagraph (C) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

(D) Twenty percent of the moneys for the purpose set forth in subparagraph (D) of paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).

~~(d) The transfer of revenues from the General Fund of the State to the Transportation Investment Fund pursuant to subdivision (a) may be suspended, in whole or in part, for a fiscal year if both of the following conditions are met:~~

~~(1) The Governor has issued a proclamation that declares that the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a) will result in a significant negative fiscal impact on the range of functions of government funded by the General Fund of the State.~~

~~(2) The Legislature enacts by statute, pursuant to a bill passed in each house of the Legislature by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, a suspension for that fiscal year of the transfer of revenues pursuant to subdivision (a), provided that the bill does not contain any other unrelated provision.~~

~~(e) The Legislature may enact a statute that modifies the percentage shares set forth in subdivision (c) by a bill passed in each house of the Legislature by rollcall vote entered in the journal, two-thirds of the membership concurring, provided that the bill does not contain any other unrelated provision and that the moneys described in subdivision (a) are expended solely for the purposes set forth in paragraph (2) of subdivision (b).~~

Solano Transportation Authority 2004 Legislative Priorities and Platform

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

1. Monitor and support, as appropriate, legislative proposals to increase funding for transportation infrastructure.
2. Oppose efforts to reduce or divert funding from transportation projects.
3. Pursue project funding for:
 - a. I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange *
 - b. Jepson Parkway Project*
 - c. Vallejo Intermodal Station*
 - d. Vallejo Baylink Ferry Service
 - e. Fairfield/Vacaville Intermodal Station*
 - f. Capitol Corridor Rail Service and track improvements throughout Solano County
 - g. Inter-city transit
4. Support initiatives to pursue the 55% voter threshold for county transportation infrastructure measures.
5. Monitor legislative efforts to merge MTC and ABAG governing boards and their respective responsibilities.
6. Monitor the progress of the \$3 bridge toll and support Measure 2 scheduled for the March 2004 ballot.

** Federal Priority Projects*

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

I. Air Quality

1. Sponsor use of Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA) funds for clean fuel projects.
2. Monitor and review approval of the 2004 Ozone Attainment Plan by EPA.
3. 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.
4. Monitor legislation providing infrastructure for low, ultra-low and zero emission vehicles.
5. Monitor and comment on regulations regarding diesel fuel exhaust particulates and alternative fuels.
6. Support policies that improve the environmental review process to minimize conflicts between transportation and air quality requirements.
7. Monitor energy policies and alternative fuel legislation or regulation that may affect fleet vehicle requirements for mandated use of alternative fuels.
8. Support legislation to provide funding for innovative, intelligent/advanced transportation and air quality programs, which relieve congestion, improve air quality and enhance economic development.
9. Support legislation to finance cost effective conversion of public transit fleets to alternative fuels.
10. Support income tax benefits or incentives that encourage use of alternative fuel vehicles, van pools and public transit without reducing existing transportation or air quality funding levels.

II. Americans with Disabilities Act

1. Encourage new or revised guidelines to provide more flexible ADA access to trails, bike routes and transit.

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

III. Alternative Modes (Bicycles, HOV, Livable Communities, Ridesharing)

1. Support legislation promoting bicycling and bicycle facilities as a commute option.
2. Oppose expanded use of HOV lanes for purposes not related to congestion relief and air quality improvement.
3. Monitor legislation providing land use incentives in connection with rail and multimodal transit stations – transit oriented development.

IV. Congestion Management

1. Support administrative or legislative action to ensure consistency among the Federal congestion management and the State's Congestion Management Program requirements.

V. 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.

VI. 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 state discretionary funding made available for transportation grants or programs.

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

3. Protect State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) from use for purposes other than those covered in SB 140 of 1997 reforming transportation planning and programming.
4. 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. Support transportation initiatives that increase the overall funding levels for transportation priorities in Solano County.
6. Advocate for primacy of general transportation infrastructure funding over high-speed rail project and Bay Area Ferry Authority.
7. Support measures to restore local government's property tax revenues used for general fund purposes, including road rehabilitation and maintenance.
8. Seek a fair share for Solano County of any federal funding made available for transportation programs and projects.
9. Support legislation to secure adequate budget appropriations for highway, bus, rail, air quality and mobility programs in Solano County.
10. Support efforts to pass a new federal transportation reauthorization bill.
11. Support state policies that assure timely allocation of transportation revenue, including allocations of new funds available to the STIP process as soon as they are available.
12. 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
13. Support or seek legislation to assure a dedicated source of funding, other than the State Highway Account for local street and road maintenance and repairs.

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

14. Monitor the distribution of state transportation demand management funding.
15. 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, the Petroleum Violation Escrow Account (PVEA), State Highway Account (SHA), Public Transit Account (PTA), and Transportation Development Act (TDA) and any ballot initiative.

VI. Liability

1. Monitor legislation affecting the liability of public entities, particularly in personal injury or other civil wrong legal actions.

VII. Paratransit

1. In partnership with other affected agencies and local governments seek additional funding for paratransit operations, including service for persons with disabilities and senior citizens.

VIII. Project Delivery

1. Support 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, 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 construction projects.

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

4. Continue to streamline federal application/reporting/monitoring requirements to ensure efficiency and usefulness of data collected and eliminate unnecessary and/or duplicative requirements.

IX Rail

1. In partnership with other affected agencies, sponsor making Capitol Corridor Joint Powers Authority an eligible operator for state transit assistance with funds to be apportioned to member agencies.
2. In partnership with other counties located along Capitol Corridor, seek expanded state commitment for funding passenger rail service, whether state or locally administered.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Seek funds for the development of intercity, regional and commuter rail service connecting Solano County to the Bay Area and Sacramento regions.
6. Continue to monitor and evaluate the proposed \$10 billion High Speed Rail Bond scheduled for the November 2004 ballot.

X. Ferry

1. Protect the existing source of operating support for Vallejo Baylink ferry service, most specifically the Bridge Tolls–Northern Bridge Group “1st and 2nd Dollar” revenues which provide a 5 percent and 2 percent set aside for transit operations and ferry capital, respectively.
2. Advocate for sufficient State operating and capital for Vallejo Baylink ferry and countywide express bus from the proposed “3rd Dollar” Bridge Toll (Measure 2) program in amounts sufficient in order to maintain and expand Vallejo Baylink ferry and express bus operations and fund Intermodal stations in support of this service.

2004 STA LEGISLATIVE PLATFORM

3. In addition to new bridge tolls, work with MTC to generate new regional transit revenues such as gasoline sales taxes, etc., to support the ongoing operating and capital needs of transit services, including bus and ferry and rail.
4. Work with MTC to obtain an increase to the federal Ferryboat Discretionary (FBD) Funds to provide an annual earmark for the Bay Area, similar to Washington State and Alaska, with priority given to existing ferry capital projects.

XI. Safety

1. Support legislation or administrative procedures to streamline the process for local agencies to receive funds for road repair from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

XII. 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 transportation demand management programs and alternative fuel 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. Due to the elimination/reduction of Federal transit operating subsidies, support legislation to also eliminate or ease Federal requirements and regulations regarding transit operations.
6. Support efforts to change Title 23 restrictions on use of toll bridge funds for operations.



DATE: March 23, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Daryl Halls, Executive Director
RE: County Transportation Expenditure Plan Update

Background:

In 2002, the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA) developed a County Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP) that was incorporated into a sales tax ordinance that if approved by 2/3 majority of Solano County's voters would have raised a ½ cent sales tax in Solano County to fund a series of transportation projects and programs to relieve traffic congestion. In November of 2002, 60% of Solano County's voters voted in support of Measure E, but it failed to attain the necessary 2/3 (66.7%) voter threshold for passage.

At their meeting of December 10, 2003, the STA Board provided direction to staff to initiate the process for the development of a Countywide Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP), corresponding to the recommendations outlined in a consultant report prepared by D.J. Smith, Smith Watts and Associates.

On January 14, 2004, the STA Board approved a series of recommendations developed by the Board's Local Funding Subcommittee and STA staff. At the meeting, the Board approved the recommendation of the Local Funding Subcommittee to move forward on the initiation of the development of a County Transportation Expenditure Plan (CTEP) by requesting the Solano County Board of Supervisors form the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA), consistent with the state statutes pertaining to the formation of a Local Transportation Authority (LTA). In addition, the Board approved authorizing staff to retain three separate consultants to assist the STIA Board in the development of the expenditure plan and public information, updating the Programmatic EIR for the CTEP, and providing specialized legal services.

On February 3, 2004, the Solano County Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the formation of the STIA and on February 11th, the new STIA Board members were sworn in and the agency's initial organizational meeting was held.

On March 10, 2004, the STIA Board reviewed draft 30-year revenue projections and project cost estimates for a list of projects that received a positive response from potential likely Solano County voters based on a public opinion poll conducted in November of 2003. At the same meeting, the STIA Board approved the public input process and the composition for a 50 member plus Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC). The public input process includes holding community meetings in each of the seven cities in addition to the countywide meetings at the CAC.

The TAC appointed Morrie Barr, City of Fairfield, as the TAC representative to the Citizen's Advisory Committee. Pam Belchamber, Vallejo Transit, was appointed by the Intercity Transit Consortium to represent the transit operators. A summary of the STIA Board's most recent meeting has been included with the TAC agenda.

Discussion:

This month, staff began to implement the process for development of the expenditure plan as outlined by the STIA Board. Attached for informational purposes is a matrix highlighting the proposed timeline and public input process for development of the transportation expenditure plan. Also attached is the draft list of revenue projections and project cost estimates presented to the STIA Board in March. At a special meeting scheduled immediately after the monthly TAC meeting, D.J. Smith, a consultant to the STIA, will be reviewing with the TAC the results of the privately funded public opinion poll. A particular focus will be on voter receptivity to the local and regional projects contained in the questionnaire. Mike Duncan will be reviewing the draft project cost estimates.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachment:

- A. Proposed timeline and public input process for CTEP
- B. Revenue Projects for Sales Tax and Federal and State Funds
- C. Draft Project Cost Estimates



**CTEP PROCESS
DRAFT 03/03/2004**

COMMITTEE/TASK	FEB.	MARCH	APRIL	MAY	JUNE	JULY	AUG.
Local Funding Subcommittee		03/03/2004	04/07/2004 05/05/2004	Special STIA Mtg. 05/12/2004	06/02/2004	07/07/2004	08/11/2004
STIA Board Legal Steps	2/11/04 Form LTA	3/10/04	4/14/04 EIR Hearing		06/09/2004 Ordinance adopted by STIA-EIR Adopted	07/14/2004 Ordinance adopted by Board of Supervisors	08/11/2004 Aug. 6 to Ballot. Deadline ballot language and impartial analysis
Administration/Consultants		Project Costs and Revenue Estimates Developed	Retain Public Input Consultant				
Public Input Process							
Citizen Advisory Committee		Formed by STIA	04/23/2004	05-07-04, 05/21/04			
7 City Community Groups			7 City Community Mtgs. Held				
Expenditure Plan			Initial Options Developed.	CTEP Adopted by STIA	Adopted by Cities and County		
EIR		Consultant Retained. Start EIR Process	Public Scoping Meeting		Adopt EIR (30 days prior to Board of Sup. Action)		
Oversight Committee			Options Considered	Option Selected	Oversight Committee Formed	Oversight Committee Sworn In	Rebuttal Arguments

03/18/2004 KC

SOLANO COUNTY HALF CENT SALES TAX REVENUE ESTIMATE

30 Year Period beginning in FY 2004-05

(Thousands of FY 2003-04 Dollars)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1/2 Cent Sales Tax Estimate	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Amount	6,955	28,709	29,649	30,589	31,520	32,440	33,527	34,818	36,132	37,458	38,802	40,167	41,550	42,945	44,351	45,777
Annual Percent Change	---	3.19%	3.27%	3.17%	3.05%	2.92%	3.35%	3.85%	3.77%	3.67%	3.59%	3.52%	3.44%	3.36%	3.28%	3.21%

Notes:
Based on MTC estimate provided on January 15, 2004; MTC estimate is for the 2004 RTP and ends in FY 2028-29
MTC estimate based on the Solano County sales tax forecast with low-moderate growth prepared by the Center for the Study of the California Economy.
Annual real growth rate assumed to be 3.21% in FY 2019-20 and beyond
FY 2004-05 sales tax revenue assumed to be available in April 2005, with the end of the 30th year of sales tax availability in March 2034.

2005 RTP FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING PROJECTION FOR SOLANO

30 Year Period beginning in FY 2004-05

(Thousands of FY 2003-04 Dollars)

Sec. 5307	2000 Census UA	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
		FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
UAs in Solano	Fairfield	1,946	1,937	1,927	1,917	1,908	1,898	1,889	1,879	1,870	1,860	1,851	1,842	1,833	1,824	1,814	1,805
	Vacaville	38,202	1,361	1,355	1,348	1,341	1,334	1,328	1,321	1,314	1,308	1,301	1,295	1,288	1,282	1,275	1,269
	Vallejo	80,762	2,892	2,864	2,849	2,835	2,821	2,807	2,793	2,779	2,765	2,751	2,737	2,724	2,710	2,696	2,683
	TOTAL	173,311	6,207	6,145	6,114	6,084	6,053	6,023	5,993	5,963	5,933	5,903	5,874	5,845	5,815	5,786	5,757

Notes:
Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
BAY AREA STP FUNDS	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
SOLANO COUNTY SHARE OF STP	63,216	62,900	62,585	62,272	61,961	61,651	61,343	61,036	60,731	60,427	60,125	59,824	59,525	59,228	58,932	58,637
CMAQ - BAY AREA	3,679	3,661	3,642	3,624	3,606	3,588	3,570	3,552	3,535	3,517	3,499	3,482	3,464	3,447	3,430	3,413
SOLANO COUNTY SHARE OF CMAQ	54,571	54,099	53,828	53,559	53,292	53,025	52,760	52,496	52,234	51,973	51,713	51,454	51,197	50,941	50,686	50,433
TOTAL	111,466	110,660	110,055	109,455	108,859	108,266	107,676	107,088	106,503	105,920	105,340	104,762	104,187	103,614	103,043	102,474

Notes:
Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP.

Bay Area STP and CMAQ - Bay Area funds reported as total discretionary funds for all Bay Area Counties
Solano County share of total Bay Area funds calculated as percentage of Bay Area Population residing in Solano County (5.82%)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Solano STP Base Revenue	FY 2004-05	FY 2005-06	FY 2006-07	FY 2007-08	FY 2008-09	FY 2009-10	FY 2010-11	FY 2011-12	FY 2012-13	FY 2013-14	FY 2014-15	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
Solano STP Base Revenue	199,567	4,296	8,577	11,344	8,914	8,900	8,705	8,512	8,319	8,127	7,937	7,747	7,559	7,371	7,185	6,999
Solano STP Prop. 42 Increment	155,885	-	-	-	4,194	4,285	4,384	4,488	4,603	4,722	4,848	4,993	5,152	5,308	5,465	5,623
TOTAL	355,452	4,296	8,577	11,344	13,108	13,185	13,089	12,999	12,922	12,849	12,785	12,740	12,712	12,679	12,650	12,622

Notes:
Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP.

Date: March 2, 2004

SOLANO COUNTY HALF CENT SALES TAX REVENUE ESTIMATE

30 Year Period beginning in FY 2004-05

(Thousands of FY 2003-04 Dollars)

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31
1/2 Cent Sales Tax Estimate															
Amount	47,249	48,768	50,336	51,954	53,624	55,348	57,128	58,964	60,860	62,814	64,830	66,911	69,059	71,276	55,173
Annual Percent Change	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%	3.21%

Notes:

Based on MTC estimate provided on January 15, 2004; MTC estimate is for the 2004 RTP and ends in FY 2028-29. MTC estimate based on the Solano County sales tax forecast with low-moderate growth prepared by the Center for the Study of the California Economy. Annual real growth rate assumed to be 3.21% in FY 2019-20 and beyond. FY 2004-05 sales tax revenue assumed to be available in April 2005, with the end of the 30th year of sales tax availability in March 2004.

2005 RTP FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDING PROJECTION FOR SOLANO

30 Year Period beginning in FY 2004-05

(Thousands of FY 2003-04 Dollars)

Sec. 5307	2000 Census UA	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Fairfield		1,796	1,787	1,778	1,770	1,761	1,752	1,743	1,734	1,726	1,717	1,708	1,700	1,691	1,682
UAs in Solano		1,263	1,256	1,250	1,244	1,238	1,231	1,225	1,219	1,213	1,207	1,201	1,195	1,189	1,183
Yallico		2,669	2,656	2,643	2,630	2,616	2,603	2,590	2,577	2,565	2,552	2,539	2,526	2,513	2,500
TOTAL		5,729	5,700	5,671	5,643	5,615	5,587	5,559	5,531	5,503	5,476	5,448	5,420	5,393	5,365

Notes:

Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP.

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
BAY AREA STP FUNDS	58,344	58,052	57,762	57,473	57,186	56,900	56,615	56,332	56,050	55,769	55,487	55,205	54,924	54,642
SOLANO COUNTY SHARE OF STP	3,396	3,379	3,362	3,345	3,328	3,312	3,295	3,279	3,262	3,246	3,229	3,213	3,197	3,180
CMAQ - BAY AREA	50,181	49,930	49,680	49,432	49,184	48,938	48,694	48,450	48,208	47,966	47,724	47,481	47,239	46,997
SOLANO COUNTY SHARE OF CMAQ	2,921	2,906	2,891	2,877	2,863	2,848	2,834	2,820	2,806	2,792	2,778	2,763	2,749	2,735

Notes:

Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP. Bay Area STP and CMAQ - Bay Area funds reported as total discretionary funds for all Bay Area Counties. Solano County share of total Bay Area funds calculated as percentage of Bay Area Population residing in Solano County (5.82%).

	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Solano STIP Base Revenue	6,814	6,631	6,448	6,266	6,085	5,905	5,726	5,551	5,377	5,203	5,029	4,854	4,680	4,506
Solano STIP Prop. 42 Increment	5,788	5,961	6,135	6,309	6,485	6,667	6,859	7,056	7,257	7,458	7,660	7,861	8,062	8,264

Notes:

Based on MTC estimate for the 2004 RTP.

Date: March 2, 2004



**Draft 2004 County Transportation Expenditure Plan Project Descriptions
March 10, 2004**

(All estimates provided in 2004 dollars)

I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange

Rebuild the Interchange to relieve congestion by adding travel lanes, improving connections between I-80 and I-680 and I-80 and SR 12, relocating the Cordelia Truck Scales, separating truck traffic from other traffic with braided ramps, and providing alternate routes for local traffic (collector-distributor roads and the North Connector). Project capital costs are estimated to be \$740 million to \$1 billion. Potential funding sources include local funds, Regional Measure 2 (RM 2), the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP), State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) including both Regional Improvement Program (RIP) and Interregional Improvement Program (ITIP) funds, State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP), Surface Transportation Program (STP), and Federal Demonstration funds (earmarks).

I-80/I-680/I-780 Corridor Improvement Projects

Projects to relieve congestion and improve traffic flow through Solano County were identified in the I-80/I-680/I-780 Corridor Study for Solano Counties. These projects include adding travel lanes and auxiliary lanes to some freeway segments, improving major interchanges, constructing new park and ride lots and improving existing lots, and improving connections to the freeways. The projects are identified as Mid-Term projects (within the next 20 years) and Long-Term projects. Capital costs for these projects are estimated to be \$350 million to \$430 million for Mid-Term Projects and \$725 million for Long-Term projects. Potential funding sources include local funds, RM 2 (for park and ride lots), STIP including both RIP and ITIP funds, SHOPP, STP, Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ), and Federal Demonstration funds (earmarks).

State Route (SR) 12 Improvements

Improvements to SR 12 in Solano County include safety and capacity improvements on SR 12 east between I-80 and the Sacramento River in Rio Vista and widening SR 12 west (Jameson Canyon) to four lanes from I-80 to SR 29 in Napa County. Capital costs for these projects are estimated to be \$190 million. Potential funding sources include local funds, STIP including both RIP and ITIP funds, SHOPP, STP, and Federal Demonstration funds (earmarks).

Local Streets and Roads

Maintaining local streets and roads for Solano County and the seven cities of the county is necessary to ensure adequate roadway facilities for Solano County citizens. Roadway maintenance includes projects for slurry seals, chip seals, asphalt overlays, roadway reconstruction, and maintenance of other roadway components (e.g., drainage, traffic signals, curbs and gutters, etc.). The costs over the next 25 years for streets and roads maintenance for Solano County is estimated to be \$960 million. Potential funding sources include local funds, State gas tax, Proposition 42, STIP (very limited), and STP.

Commuter Rail Service – Sacramento to Oakland

Based on the “Contra Costa Solano I-80 Rail Feasibility Study,” this service would provide three commuter trains traveling from Solano County stations to Richmond BART, Oakland and Sacramento, integrated with the four exiting Capitol Corridor trains during the peak commute hours. The cost would be shared with Contra Costa County (and potentially other counties along the corridor – i.e. Yolo, Sacramento and Placer counties). Total capital costs would range from about \$154 to \$243 million (in 2003 \$s) over 25 years depending on the amount of contributions from other counties. Other potential funding sources would include federal Congestion and Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, federal New Starts, STIP funds, federal earmarks, RM2 and fares.

Napa Solano Passenger Rail Service

Based on the “Napa Solano Passenger Rail Study,” this service would operate between Solano and Napa County and funded with local sales tax measure funds from both STA and Napa County Transportation Planning Agency. It would provide service between the Vallejo Intermodal Station, Sereno Park and Ride and downtown Napa and between the Suisun/Fairfield Train Station, Vallejo and Napa. Total Solano County project costs would be about \$134 million over 19 years. Potential funding sources could include, federal CMAQ funds, federal New Starts, STIP funds annual federal earmarks and fares.

Senior and Disabled Transit Services

Based on the “Solano County Senior and Disabled Transit Study,” this program addresses the mobility needs of the large and growing senior and disabled population in Solano County over the next 30 years. The program includes various short, medium and long term implementation strategies for seniors and disabled such as proposed fare discounts, expansion of local, intercity and inter-county senior and disabled transit services, new and expanded evening and weekend subsidized taxi services. Costs would range from \$63 million to \$110 million of capital and operating costs over 30 years depending on the level of service provided. Potential funding sources include TDA, State Transit Assistance Funds (STAF), and federal funds and fares.

Express Bus Services along I-80/680/780 Corridor

The I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study proposes an implementation program to expand express bus services to address growing demand for commute alternatives to Bay Area and Sacramento destinations. The service plan would expand the number of express buses from 29 to 100. A total of eleven bus routes would be established to provide phased, expanded services along the entire corridor. The total project cost would be \$70 million over 25 years. Potential funding sources include RM2, TDA, STIP and federal funds. (RM2 is expected to provide the necessary operating funds – i.e. \$27 million or more over 25 years- for these new and expanded services).

Local Return-to-Source Transportation Projects

Return-to-Source projects selected by local jurisdictions may include a wide range of transportation projects to support vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian modes of transportation. Examples of potential projects may include rehabilitation of neighborhood streets, capacity improvements to local roadways, and pedestrian improvements to downtowns, as well as a wide range of other transportation projects identified by local jurisdictions. Estimated capital costs are determined by the projects identified by local jurisdictions. Potential funding sources include local funds, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 and Article 8, State gas tax, STIP (very

limited), Transportation Enhancement (TE), STP and CMAQ.

Transportation Safety Projects

Transportation safety projects will improve the safety for Solano County citizens using all modes of transportation. Examples of potential transportation safety projects include improvements to dangerous intersections or roadway segments, installation of traffic and pedestrian signals, improved walking and biking routes to schools, separation of pedestrians and bicyclists from vehicular traffic, and enhanced response by public safety personnel. Estimated capital costs are \$80 million to \$100 million over the next 25 years. Potential funding sources include local funds, Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 and Article 8, State gas tax, STIP (very limited), STP, CMAQ, Safe Routes to Schools (SR2S), and Hazard Elimination System (HES) funds.



DATE: March 23, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Daryl Halls, Executive Director
RE: Federal TEA 21 Reauthorization Update

Background:

The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) annually seeks federal funding for its priority transportation projects. In 2000, the STA adopted a list of three projects as priorities for federal earmarks:

1. I-80/680/SR 12 Interchange
2. Jepson Parkway
3. Vallejo Station

In 2002, following the completion of an evaluation and prioritization of future rail stations on the Capitol Corridor, the Fairfield/Vacaville Rail Station was added as a fourth priority for federal funding. In 2000, the STA formally entered into a partnership with the cities of Fairfield, Vacaville and Vallejo to fund and share a federal lobbyist to pursue annual appropriations earmarks for the two transit projects and to obtain reauthorization earmarks for the two highway projects. Through this partnership and thanks to the strong support of Congressman George Miller and Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher, the STA has successfully landed four annual appropriations earmarks for the Vallejo Station totaling \$5.1 million and two annual appropriations earmarks for the Fairfield/Vacaville Rail Station totaling \$1.3 million.

Since 1991, Federal Reauthorization has historically occurred every six years following the passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA). ISTEA was an innovative and historic bill that provided a significant increase in flexible federal funds for transportation. In 1998, the passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21) increased the flexibility and authority for metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to set priorities for the allocation of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Management and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds. In the Bay Area, this task is performed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), as the federally designated MPO, in consultation with the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).

TEA 21 contained a funding level of \$218 billion over the six-year term of its authorization (1998 to 2003). This was a 40% increase over the funding level for ISTEA. The STA and Suisun City was successful in obtaining two separate TEA 21 earmarks, totaling \$14.45 million, for the Jepson Parkway. U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer played a key role in assisting the STA in obtaining the larger of the two earmarks.

Discussion:

In early March (March 8th and 9th), members of the STA Board and staff traveled to Washington D.C. to request federal earmarks as part of the 2004 Appropriations bill and TEA 21 Reauthorization. During the trip, the STA met with Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher and Congressmen George Miller and Mike Thompson, and staff for U.S. Senators Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein. Consistent with the STA Board's adopted priorities, the STA continues to request annual appropriations funding for the Vallejo Station and the Fairfield/Vacaville Rail Station and TEA 21 Reauthorization earmarks for the I-80/680/SR 12 Interchange and Jepson Parkway.

TEA 21 REAUTHORIZATION

There currently exists a gap between the funding levels proposed for TEA 21 Reauthorization by the White House, the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives. President Bush's administration has proposed a small increase for TEA 21 Reauthorization to \$254 billion (\$245 billion in guaranteed funding). The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee originally proposed a funding level of \$375 billion, but lack of political support to index the federal gas tax or to enact a higher federal gas tax has resulted in the House reducing its proposal down to \$275 billion. This week, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee was preparing to mark up the bill. The House Ways and Means Committee was also scheduled to mark up the Revenue Title to pay for the \$275 billion Reauthorization Bill on Wednesday, March 24th. The Ways and Means Revenue Title introduced last week also includes both elements of gasohol taxation "reform" advocated for by California (the transfer to the Federal Highway Trust Account of the 2.5 cents per gallon of the gasohol tax currently deposited in the general fund and the replacement of the gasohol tax exclusion with an equivalent tax credit), but proposes to cut off the gasohol tax credit on September 30, 2007. This is before the scheduled six year term for reauthorization.

The Senate had previously proposed a TEA 21 Reauthorization funding level of \$318 billion (\$295 billion in guaranteed funding) and its bill maintains the gasohol credit until 2010 (the entire term of the Reauthorization Bill). House Speaker Dennis Hastert (R- Illinois) has indicated his intention to move forward the House Reauthorization Bill as quickly as possible.

Recommendation:

Informational.



DATE: March 19, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director of Projects
RE: State Budget Update

Background:

The State of California has faced significant budget challenges since FY 2001-02, although the full magnitude of the problems did not surface until late 2002. The efforts to deal with the budget deficit, reported to be as much as \$38B from FY 2002-03 through FY 2004-05, have had a negative impact on transportation funding throughout California. Solano County has been impacted by deferred funding and project delays and may face more significant impacts in the future.

On January 9, 2004, the Governor released his proposed State budget for FY 2004-05. The Governor's proposed budget reduces many state-funded programs, including funding for transportation.

At the California Transportation Commission (CTC) Meeting on January 22, 2004, CTC staff and Caltrans staff presented the highlights of the Governor's proposed FY 2004-05 budget and the potential impacts on transportation in California. The news was not good. Some of the significant proposals that will impact Solano County include:

- Suspension of Proposition 42 would decrease funding by \$1.1B in support of state and local transportation programs.
- Using State Highway Account (SHA) funds to "pay back" \$406M to the General Fund for \$406M in bond payments previously made from the General Fund for projects that may have been SHA eligible. Additionally, a loan of \$200M from the SHA to the General Fund to be repaid in 2007.
- Elimination of the Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and the revocation of funds previously allocated, but not spent.
- Elimination of 805 positions for Caltrans, including 201 positions in District 4.

Discussion:

On March 2, 2004, California voters approved a \$15 billion bond measure to provide funding for the FY 2003-04 projected deficit in the State budget. This bond will lessen the immediate impact on state programs, including transportation. However, the Legislative Analyst's Office has predicted a \$17 billion deficit next fiscal year unless significant changes are made to bring expenditures in line with projected revenues.

While the Legislature has made some mid-year budget reductions for FY 2003-04, thus far transportation has not been a specific target. The Legislature has not approved the Governor's

proposal to immediately eliminate the TCRP program and rescind existing allocations that have not been expended. However, the CTC has not allocated TCRP or STIP funds since Spring 2003 and has indicated that allocations will not resume in the foreseeable future unless the Legislature provides specific direction to resume allocations and provides funding.

In general, there seems to be agreement that no Legislative action will occur until after the Governor provides the May Revisions to the budget he proposed in January.

Recommendation:
Informational.



DATE: March 18, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects
RE: I-80/I-680/I-780 MIS/Corridor Study – Draft Study

Background:

The Major Investment Study (MIS)/Corridor Study for the interstate highway system in Solano County was awarded to Korve Engineering on October 1, 2002 and is nearing completion. The Draft I-80/I-680/I-780 Major Investment & Corridor Study has been circulated for comments to the members of the Corridor Working Group and members of the Project Development Team (PDT).

Discussion:

The Draft I-80/I-680/I-780 Major Investment & Corridor Study document incorporates the prioritized Mid-Term and Long-Term projects into a project phasing plan for the whole corridor. The Draft document also incorporates the findings/recommendations from the Transit Corridor Study and information from the Truck Scales Relocation Study into recommendations for the corridor.

An Operational Strategy was used to develop the project prioritization by evaluating existing and forecasted deficiencies throughout the corridor. Projects were then identified that corrected deficiencies while balancing the flow through the corridor. In addition to this operational strategy, the following performance measures were also used to prioritize these projects:

1. Traffic Operations
2. Safety
3. HOV Lane Performance
4. Preliminary Right-of-Way Requirements
5. Preliminary Environmental Constraints
6. Order of Magnitude Costs
7. Complements Transit Plan
8. User Benefit.

Whereas the Operational Strategy was the primary criteria for developing the priority of the Mid-Term projects, the performance measures provided a relative indication of mobility, traffic operations characteristics, impacts, benefits and costs of each project, and helped determine the basis for prioritizing the Long-Term Projects. The prioritized Long-Term projects are numbered sequentially after the Mid-Term projects and are anticipated to be completed after the Mid-Term projects.

In addition to the Mid-Term Projects and Long-Term Projects, local interchanges that are not integral to main line traffic improvements were evaluated and proposed improvements identified. Local interchanges were prioritized by jurisdictions and are not integrated into the project lists for the I-80/I-680/I-780 Corridor since they are typically funded with local revenues and do not provide added capacity (or congestion relief) to the corridor.

In September 2003, the STA Board approved the list of prioritized Mid-term Projects. On January 28, 2003, the TAC recommended the following to the STA Board of Directors:

Approve the following:

1. The projects and recommended priority for Long-Term Projects as shown on Attachment A
2. Add the Benicia Intermodal Terminal/Park and Ride to the Mid-Term Projects as project 15B.

At the STA Board meeting on February 11, 2004, the Board voted to table action on the recommendations in order to give Board members more time to evaluate the projects and the potential benefits and impacts for their communities. At the February TAC meeting, members of the TAC were requested to discuss the Mid-Term and Long-Term projects with their respective STA Board members.

STA staff will schedule presentations to the City Councils and the Board of Supervisors in the month of April to ensure there is a greater awareness of the information in the study for the elected officials and the public for each community.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments

- A. Draft I-80/I-680/I-780 Major Investment & Corridor Study (available on the ftp website provided via email from Korve Engineering)
<ftp://209.78.235.11>
User name: sta-mis
Password: corstudy



DATE: March 19, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director of Projects
RE: Highway Projects Status Report:
1) I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange
2) North Connector
3) I-80/I-680/I-780 MIS/Corridor Study, Segments 2-7
4) I-80/I-680/I-780 Transit Corridor Study
5) Caltrans Auxiliary Lanes Project
6) Jepson Parkway
7) Highway 37
8) Highway 12 (Jameson Canyon and 12/29 Interchange)
9) Highway 12 (East)
10) I-80 Widening (Dixon to Vacaville)

Background:

Highway projects in Solano County are funded from a variety of Federal, State and local fund sources. The Governor's proposed State Budget, released on January 9th, will have a significant negative impact on Solano County projects if fully enacted by the Legislature. New STIP and TCRP allocations have been suspended since May 2003 and the Fund Estimate for the 2004 STIP established a Zero STIP. The Governor's proposal will eliminate the TCRP and greatly reduce funding for the STIP. In FY 2003-04, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) voted to continue funding for Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) projects with current allocations. The I-80/I-680/SR 12 environmental studies, the North Connector environmental studies, the Jameson Canyon environmental studies and the purchase of a ferry have continued to receive reimbursements from the state; however, these funds may be in jeopardy for FY 2003-04 and may be deleted for subsequent fiscal years. In order to continue with these projects, STA would be required to identify alternative fund sources.

Discussion:

The following provides an update to major highway projects in Solano County:

1) *I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange PA/ED.* The environmental phase of this project is totally funded by a TCRP grant (\$8.1M) and funds have been allocated by the CTC. However, continued funding is in jeopardy due to the Governor's proposal to eliminate the TCRP. The environmental studies are underway by a joint venture of MTCo/Nolte. The Environmental Scoping Meeting and transportation "open house" were held on May 12, 2003. The technical analysis portion of the study to evaluate the truck scales relocation has been completed and the Draft Study released. The configuration of the Interchange is dependent on the location of the truck scales. Discussions are underway between staff members at Headquarters and District 4 Caltrans, Headquarters California Highway Patrol (CHP) and STA to reevaluate the current

design criteria using emerging technologies in order to lessen the impact of truck scales on highway designs, particularly within the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange. Follow on meetings with senior management of Caltrans, CHP and the Business, Transportation and Housing (BT&H) Agency will be scheduled as soon as practical. STA staff and consultants met with staff from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) and received guidance on how to proceed with evaluating the potential impacts of this project on the Suisun Marsh. The PA/ED phase of this project is scheduled for completion in late 2006.

2) *North Connector PA/ED*. Korve Engineering was selected for the PA/ED phase for the North Connector. This project continues on schedule. Environmental studies are underway and most of the draft technical studies have been released for comments. The North Connector PA/ED is fully funded through the TCRP (\$2.7M) and funding is potentially in jeopardy. The environmental studies have been accelerated to complete as much work as possible prior to the end of FY 2003-04. Additional needed environmental studies have been identified for areas adjacent to the Red Top Road/SR 12 intersection and the consultant has been directed to proceed with these studies. The Environmental Scoping Meeting and transportation open house were held on March 6, 2003 in Fairfield. The final alignment of a portion of the North Connector is dependent on the outcome of the truck scales relocation study and the decision regarding the future location of truck scales. The PA/ED phase of this project is scheduled for completion in December 2004.

3) *I-80/I-680/I-780 MIS/Corridor Study, Segments 2-7*. Korve Engineering was selected to complete this last phase of the I-80/680/780 Corridor Study. This project is funded with a State Planning and Research (SP&R) grant for \$300,000, STIP Planning, Programming and Monitoring (STIP-PPM) funds for \$60,700, and Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds for \$380,000. The Draft I-80/I-680/I-780 Major Investment & Corridor Study has been provided to the Corridor Working Group and Caltrans District 4 staff for comments (see related Agenda item). The study is scheduled for completion in Spring 2004.

4) *I-80/I-680/I-780 Transit Corridor Study*. This project is funded with a State Planning Congestion Relief Program (PCRCP) grant for \$275,000. Wilbur Smith Associates was selected to complete the I-80/680/780 Transit Corridor Study, a complementary study to the highway corridor study. The Transit Corridor Study identified specific locations for park and ride lots that have been incorporated into both the Mid-Term and Long-Term projects lists. The consultant evaluated the intercity and regional transit needs for the entire interstate corridor and developed detailed, multi-modal implementation strategies and cost estimates along the entire corridor. The Draft Final Report has been circulated for comments.

5) *Caltrans Auxiliary Lanes Project*. Caltrans is the project manager for this project. The project was advertised for bids on September 2, 2003 and the contract was awarded to O.C. Jones (the contractor for SR 37 Improvements) on December 2, 2003. Construction started on March 2, 2004. The construction contract was awarded for \$12,121,812, 30% under the engineer's estimate. The project is funded through the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) the State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP). This project adds one lane in each direction between I-680 and SR 12 East and also provides a two-lane ramp between I-80 and I-680 in both directions. The project is currently scheduled to be completed in November 2004, long before the opening of the new span of the Benicia-Martinez Bridge in 2006. **The official Ground Breaking for this project is scheduled for 10:00 a.m., April 16, 2004.**

6) *Jepson Parkway*. The Environmental Impact Study (EIS) is underway for the Jepson Parkway with scheduled completion in 2004. Several segments of the project have been completed, including the Vanden/Peabody intersection realignment in Fairfield, replacement/widening of three bridges in Vacaville, and Leisure Town Road improvements in Solano County. Additionally, the contract for the Walters Road widening segment in Suisun City was awarded on January 6, 2004 to Ghillotti Brothers, Inc (\$5.01M) with construction scheduled to begin in early April 2004. The next segment scheduled for construction, the I-80/Leisure Town Road Interchange, has been delayed by the decision of the CTC to suspend new STIP allocations. This project is currently the number one priority project in Solano County to receive a STIP allocation. The STA has requested Federal (STP) funds to replace STIP funds to allow the project to proceed to construction. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) will consider this request on March 24, 2004 (see related STP/CMAQ Agenda item).

7) *Highway 37*. Phase 2 and Phase 3 are under construction and proceeding on schedule. Phase 2 provides four lanes from the Napa River Bridge to SR 29 and is scheduled to be complete by January 2005. Phase 3 constructs the SR 37/29 interchange and is scheduled to be complete by December 2005. The project is fully funded with \$62M in ITIP and STIP funds that have been allocated by the CTC. The contracts for both Phase 2 and Phase 3 were awarded to O.C. Jones Construction. The projects are on schedule and within budget.

8) *Highway 12 (Jameson Canyon and 12/29 Interchange)*. Caltrans is currently in the PA/ED phase for the project. The environmental and design phases of this project are funded in the TCRP and \$4.1M of the \$7.0M in TCRP funds has been allocated by the CTC; however, Caltrans District IV has suspended the consultant contracts for this project at the direction of Caltrans Headquarters. Other than some engineering work on roadway alignments, no work is being done on this project. The STA, Napa County Transportation Planning Agency (NCTPA), and Caltrans have participated in a value analysis process with the goal of identifying a "fundable" roadway project. Agreement has been reached at the staff level to provide a 4-lane conventional roadway instead of a freeway design, reducing the estimated costs from \$262M to \$120M. Follow-on work has identified a roadway alignment that will bring the total project costs below \$100M. The elimination of the TCRP will stop funding for this project. If this occurs, STA and NCTPA will need to identify an alternate fund source to continue with the project and work with Caltrans to take the lead on the project.

9) *Highway 12 (East)*. Three State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) projects are currently underway between Suisun City and Rio Vista. The Round Hill Creek Bridge project is complete. The other two projects provide profile improvements and shoulder widening to correct safety deficiencies, as well as turning lanes at some intersections. These projects are in the preliminary design phase and the environmental documents and project reports are scheduled for completion in October 2004. The draft Environmental Impact Report was released for review by Caltrans in January 2004 and a Public Meeting was held on March 10, 2004 at the Western Railroad Museum to receive public comments. Construction is scheduled for 2006-2008. The current cost estimate for the Scandia to Denverton project is \$11.5M and the cost estimate for the Denverton to Currie project is \$25M. Both projects are currently funded through the design stage and full funding is anticipated through the SHOPP program in FY 2005-06.

10) *I-80 Widening (Dixon to Vacaville)*. The project is in the PA/ED phase with Caltrans. The environmental and design phases of this project are funded with \$9M in ITIP funds; however,

only funds for the environmental phase have been allocated. A Value Analysis has been completed. Three alternatives recommended in the value analysis are currently being evaluated in the environmental documents.

Recommendation:
Informational.



DATE: March 19, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects
RE: Use of STP/CMAQ Second Cycle Funding as STIP Backfill

Background:

Due to the State budget crisis and its impact on transportation, the California Transportation Commission (CTC) suspended virtually all State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) allocations in June 2003. Since then, numerous projects from throughout the state that are ready for construction have been submitted to the CTC for allocations. Due to the unavailability of funds in the State Highway Account (SHA), these projects were placed in a "Pending" status. The unavailability of STIP funds have resulted in many critical construction projects in the Bay Area being placed on hold, including the Jepson Parkway I-80/Leisure Town Road Overcrossing and Interchange project in Vacaville.

Discussion:

In December 2003, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) adopted initial commitments for Transportation 2030 (T-2030) that would fund a number of regionally significant programs from future STP/CMAQ/TE funding. These proposed commitments would fully use the second cycle federal discretionary programming in the following program areas:

- Clean Air
- Regional Operations
- CMA Planning
- Transit Capital Shortfall
- Local Streets and Roads Shortfall
- Transportation for Livable Communities/Housing Incentives Program (TLC/HIP)
- Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

In an effort to keep construction projects moving forward and thus stimulating the Bay Area economy, the Congestion Management Agencies (CMA's) from all nine counties of the Bay Area presented a proposal to the Partnership Board (an advisory Board to the Commission) on how to modify the programming of Second Cycle STP/CMAQ/TE to "free-up" federal funds to backfill a list of critical STIP projects. Additionally, the CMA's proposal identified specific Traffic Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) projects that may also be eligible for federal funding if the TCRP is eliminated.

The CMA's proposal recommended full funding for the Clean Air Program, Regional Operations Program, CMA Planning, Transit Capital Shortfall and Local Streets and Roads Shortfall programs in the Second Cycle. However, the proposal recommended deferring or suspending, in

full or in part, funding for the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and the TLC/HIP Program in the second Cycle. The deferred funds would be used on STIP projects that have been previously committed, but face funding shortfalls due to the lack of available state funding.

All Second Cycle “loans” to STIP projects would be repaid to the regional programs in the Third Cycle of STP/CMAQ/TE funding, thus making them “whole.” The \$60 million freed up by the deferrals and suspensions would go toward STIP projects that are awaiting funding and would provide a strong economic stimulus to the Bay Area while also providing congestion relief.

The Jepson Parkway I-80/Leisure Town Road Overcrossing and Interchange project in Vacaville, the STA’s highest priority construction project, is included in the list to receive federal funds as a STIP backfill.

MTC staff, in cooperation with the Partnership Board, developed a programming proposal for using STP/CMAQ Second Cycle funding to backfill STIP projects based on the CMA’s proposal that was presented to the Partnership Board. This staff proposal (see attachment) will be considered for adoption by the full Commission on March 24, 2004.

Recommendation:
Informational.

Attachment

- A. MTC Memorandum, March 3, 2004



METROPOLITAN
TRANSPORTATION
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Boni MetroCenter
191 Eighth Street
Oakland, CA 94607-7700
Tel: 510.464.7700
TDD/TTY: 510.464.7769
Fax: 510.464.7818

Memorandum

TO: Programming and Allocations Committee

DATE: March 3, 2004

FR: Executive Director

W.I.:

RE: Use of STP/CMAQ Second Cycle Funding as STIP Backfill

Over the past several weeks, staff has been responding to a January 26th Partnership Board request to look at options for using Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), and Transportation Enhancement (TE) funding as substitute programming for critical STIP projects that have been unable to receive allocations due to the crisis in the State Highway Account. This is a status report on those activities. The STIP schedule will require that you take action at the April committee meeting.

Background

In December 2003, the Commission approved Phase 1 commitments for Transportation 2030 (T-2030). The Commission adopted a number of regionally significant program elements that would be funded from future STP/CMAQ/TE funding. Subsequently, the Partnership Board met on January 26th to discuss the T-2030 Phase 1 commitments in more detail. At this meeting, the congestion management agencies (CMA's) presented a proposal on how to proceed with implementing Phase 1 T-2030 commitments under Second Cycle STP/CMAQ/TE programming in the context of the State of California's fiscal crisis. The Partnership requested MTC consider this proposal.

Programming activity had been scheduled to follow the Commission's December 2003 adopted T-2030 recommendations. The Second Cycle federal discretionary programming would commit anticipated FY 2005-06 and 2006-07 STP/CMAQ/TE revenues. The T-2030 Phase 1 commitments would fully utilize the anticipated appropriated revenues in the second cycle in the following program areas:

- Clean Air
- Regional Operations
- CMA Planning
- Transit Capital Shortfall
- Local Streets and Roads Shortfall
- Transportation for Livable Communities/ Housing Incentives Program (TLC/HIP)
- Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program

The CMA's proposal would permit full funding for the Clean Air Program, Regional Operations Program, CMA Planning, Transit Capital Shortfall, and Local Streets and Roads Shortfall programs in the Second Cycle. However, they recommend that the region consider deferring or suspending, in full or in part, the funding for the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program and TLC/HIP program in the Second Cycle program. The funds being deferred or suspended from the TLC/HIP and the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian program would be used on STIP projects that have been previously committed but face shortfalls due to the lack of available funding at the state level.

Making Room for STIP Projects

We have considered the CMA proposal and in concert with discussions with the Partnership and other stakeholders since January 26th, have developed a strategy for deferral and repayment of some of the STP/CMAQ/TEA funding to the Third Cycle of federal discretionary funding, FY 2007-08 and FY2008-09 (see Attachment 1). In summary, \$60 million in federal discretionary funding would be freed up, as follows:

- The adopted First Cycle programming done by the Commission in June 2003 did not fully program the available revenues in FY 2004-05. The remaining \$11 million in unprogrammed STP/CMAQ funds is being made available for STIP programming now.
- The T-2030 commitment levels for the Regional Operations Program was to ongoing contracts for the various program elements, such as TransLink® and 511. Primarily through the temporary usage of SAFE funds MTC has in reserve, MTC is able to defer \$5 million out of FY 2005-06 with payback in FY 2007-08. This will not affect the availability of funds for any ongoing contract activity.
- The Second Cycle of federal discretionary programming was to have included more than \$27 million annually for the TLC/HIP program, to make up for no TLC/HIP programming in the First Cycle. The recommendation is to suspend the earlier years of TLC/HIP funding, covering FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05. This suspension frees up \$54 million of STP/CMAQ/TE funding. The original Second Cycle TLC/HIP programming level was set at \$72 million. Staff's recommendation is to keep the full \$27 million annual commitment in the first year of Second Cycle of federal discretionary programming, which is FY 2005-06, in order to meet the Transportation Control Measure "C" requirement in the approved 2001 Ozone Attainment Plan for our region. In FY 2006-07, staff recommends up to a \$9 million HIP program. The freed up amount of \$36 million would be made available for backfilling the STIP. As shown in Attachment 1, there would be higher funding levels for TLC/HIP in the Third Cycle so that the average annual programming amount over the four years would be \$27 million.

- The Regional Bike/Pedestrian program received a commitment under Phase 1 T-2030 of \$200 million over 25 years. In lieu of \$8 million annually starting in FY2005-06, this recommendation would halve the program in the first two years to \$8 million instead of \$16 million, making up for it in the outer two years of SAFETEA, FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09. Thus, the average annual commitment over the four-year period would remain \$8 million.

All Second Cycle "loans" to STIP projects would be repaid to the Regional Operations, TLC/HIP, and Regional Bike programs in the Third Cycle. The \$60 million freed up in the earlier years will go towards STIP projects that are awaiting funding, and will provide much needed economic stimulus and congestion relief.

STIP projects proposed for funding

In consultation with the Partnership and individual project sponsors, we have assembled a list of projects that are ready-to-go existing STIP projects that would be moving forward if sufficient STIP funding was available. Only existing STIP projects were considered. In screening the nearly 200 projects in the upcoming 2004 RTIP, staff developed a number of Guiding Principles in making its final recommendation (see Attachment 2). High priority projects were deemed to be safety-related, necessary to meet air quality commitments, and critical rehabilitation of our existing system. As well, there are a number of high profile STIP projects that are relying on future TCRP allocations to make them whole, with the TCRP funds completing complex funding packages for these projects. The \$60 million made available will be committed to backfilling the STIP projects shown in Attachment 3. Note that the possible removal of these projects from the RTIP is mentioned in the Draft 2004 RTIP going out for public comment today. The removal of these projects from the STIP also will enable other much-needed priorities to be advanced in the STIP.

The funding for the projects that may not receive their future TCRP funding allocations will be held in reserve until such time that the outcome of the TCRP program and the likelihood of new allocations to TCRP projects is known. At the earliest, this will be at the conclusion of the FY 2004-05 State Budget deliberations.

Note that the STP/CMAQ funding is only a portion of the larger regional response to the STIP shortfall. Upon the CTC release of the Draft STIP Fund Estimate in November 2003, it became evident that STIP revenues, consisting of the State Highway Account (SHA), the Public Transportation Account (PTA), and the Transportation Congestion Relief Fund (TCRF), would not reach the fund levels originally anticipated. MTC staff began work in earnest with the STIP project sponsors months in advance of this news to see if there were ways to use other local or regional funds to keep projects going. Many sales tax authorities came forward to offer local sales tax funding to be used as a substitute for STIP funding, paid back at a later date in the STIP.

Memo to Programming & Allocations Committee
March 3, 2004
Page 4

As well, Santa Clara County has exercised the use of the GARVEE bonding mechanism to advance critical projects in their County. A comprehensive summary of all these STIP backfill strategies is contained in Attachment 4.

We recommend that the Commission consider in its adoption of the 2004 RTIP in April 2004 the removal of the projects listed in Attachment 3 from the STIP and resultant inclusion of the same projects in the Second Cycle of STP/CMAQ programming. That same action should provide for the repayment of the displaced programmatic funding in the Third Cycle of federal programming.



Steve Heminger

SH:DS/bg

F:\PROJECT\Funding\RTIP\04 RTIP\04 STIP Crisis Management\STP\CMAQ Crisis Management
01-03-04 PAC\Memo to 4MAR04 PAC.doc

Baseline Programming from T-2030 Consensus

First, Second, and Third Cycle STP/CMAQ/TEA

Scheduled Commission adoption October 2004 for Second Cycle

*(figures in millions of dollars)	1 st Cycle		2 nd Cycle		3 rd Cycle	
	FFY 2003-04	FFY 2004-05	FFY 2005-06	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2007-08	FFY 2008-09
Clean Air	\$12	\$28	\$6	\$3	\$2	\$2
Regional Operations	\$25	\$40	\$33	\$27	\$20	\$19
Planning Activities	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$5
TEA-21 OA Carryover	\$95	\$48				
Road & Transit Shortfalls ¹	—	—	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56
TLC/HIP ²	—	—	\$27	\$45	\$36	\$54
Regional Bike/Ped.	—	—	\$8	\$8	\$8	\$8
Possible Additional Funding ³					\$25	\$11
TOTAL	\$136 ⁷	\$120 ⁷	\$134	\$143	\$152	\$155

Deferral Option for Second Cycle Commitments

—Regional Ops & TLC/HIP & Regional Bike/Ped. deferral to Third Cycle—

*(figures in millions of dollars)	1 st Cycle		2 nd Cycle		3 rd Cycle	
	FFY 2003-04	FFY 2004-05	FFY 2005-06	FFY 2006-07	FFY 2007-08	FFY 2008-09
Clean Air	\$12	\$28	\$6	\$3	\$2	\$2
Regional Operations ⁴	\$25	\$40	\$30	\$25	\$25	\$19
Planning Activities	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$4	\$5	\$5
TEA-21 OA Carryover	\$95	\$48				
Road & Transit Shortfalls ¹	—	—	\$56	\$56	\$56	\$56
TLC/HIP ⁵	—	—	\$27	\$9	\$27	\$45
Regional Bike/Ped. ⁶	—	—	\$2	\$6	\$12	\$12
STIP Backfill	—	\$11	\$9	\$40		
Possible Additional Funding ³					\$25	\$16
TOTAL	\$136 ⁷	\$131 ⁷	\$134	\$143	\$152	\$155

Status of STIP Programming in the MTC Region

2002 STIP and upcoming 2004 STIP

(figures in millions of dollars)

(SFY)	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09
Programmed	209.2	170.8	196.7	99.0	190.9	0	0
Allocated	195.2	29.5	0	0	0	0	0
NEW 2004 target	0	0	16.1	155.7	131.7	129.0	195.9

Footnotes:

¹ Transit/local road rehab is 1/25th annually of T-2030 commitment level

² TLC/HIP totals \$162 for the 4 year period, or 6 x \$27 annually under SAFETEA

³ The possible additional funding is based on expectations of increased federal revenues from SAFETEA and represents a midpoint between the Administration's proposal and the Senate's proposal.

⁴ In the Regional Operations Program, \$5 million is deferred to 3rd Cycle and restored in FY 2007-08

⁵ TLC/HIP totals \$108 for the 4 year period, or 4 x \$27 annually under SAFETEA

⁶ Regional Bike/Ped. recovers to \$24 in Third Cycle, or 4 x \$8 annually under SAFETEA

⁷ Amended on March 3, 2004 to reflect actual programming

Memo to PAC - March 3, 2004

Attachment 1

Guiding Principles

For the development of the STP-CMAQ/STIP backfill proposal
February 24th, 2004

1. Only those projects and those phases that are already in the 2002 STIP are being considered for backfill funding, with the exception of the TCRP Reserve category.
2. The STP/CMAQ funding will be programmed as a grant to the project. The project list will be adopted as part of STP/CMAQ Second Cycle policy adoption by the MTC Commission in April 2004.
3. The funding available is Federal Fiscal Year's 2005-06 and 2006-07 appropriated STP and CMAQ funding, what MTC is considering as "Second Cycle" federal discretionary programming. The revenue assumptions are consistent with revenue assumptions developed for First Cycle programming of these funds.
4. The revenues available as STIP backfill are being deferred out of Second Cycle from the T-2030 Phase 1 Consensus elements adopted by the Commission in December 2003. These deferrals will be made up for in Third Cycle.
5. The funds freed up from T-2030 Phase 1 Consensus deferrals are pooled to address the highest priority STIP needs regionally. Funds will not be returned to the Counties in accordance with any formula share or crediting scenario.
6. The TCRP Reserve is money that will be held pending the outcome of the Governor's proposal to eliminate the TCRP program, or the outlook on further deferral of Prop 42 revenues in FY 2005-06. MTC will not act to program these funds until after this legislative session, and perhaps until after there is additional clarity on the potential for further Prop 42 deferral in the FY 2005-06 State Budget.

The TCRP project funding levels listed are those dollar levels representing Unallocated TCRP funding. Projects with a discrete funding amount necessary to match other committed funding and enable a crucial project to go forward were included in this grouping. Allocated TCRP funding in danger of being unreimbursed was considered but was recommended to not be included on the list.

Should TCRP funds be available for the project then the STP/CMAQ will return to MTC for T-2030 commitments as determined by the Commission.

7. Projects have been selected in an attempt to address geographical equity, while respecting those categories that the MTC Commission should consider as very high priorities in this current environment of fiscal decline.

Critical categories selected include the following:

- safety projects that would otherwise be delayed due to the unavailability of STIP funds
- air quality projects included in a current conformity finding not scheduled for revisiting. NOTE: the Bay Area Air Basin projects will be part of the upcoming conformity finding made in conjunction with the adoption of the 2005 TIP
- Critical funding as a backfill to unallocated TCRP necessary to complete complex funding packages on STIP/TCRP projects
- rehab projects that are critical to the local agency and do not otherwise fit into the Transit and Local roads rehab element of the Second Cycle STP/CMAQ T-2030 consensus elements

8. Projects are primarily ready-to-go construction projects that will provide needed safety improvements, address air quality needs, cover necessary rehab, and provide needed TCRP funds to high priority STIP projects

9. It is not recommended that any regional federal funds be utilized to backfill delayed STIP funding. There is no guarantee STIP funding will return to the region.

J:\PROJECT\Funding\RTIP\04 RTIP\04 STIP Crisis Management\STP-CMAQ Crisis Management 03-03-04 PAC\STP-CMAQ for STIP Guiding Principles.doc

Memo to PAC
March 3, 2004
Attachment 2

Proposed STIP Crisis Backfill

March 3, 2004

(amounts in thousands)

County	PPNO	TIP ID	RTP ID	Deliverable Phase	Mode	Implementing Agency	Project Title	STP-CMAQ Amount
Safety Enhancements								
Alameda	2011C	ALA030012	98198	CON (Phase 1)	Local Road	County of Alameda	Vasco Road Safety Imps - Phase 1	\$3,900
San Francisco	2014R	SF-010029	21507	ENV	Urban Rail	BART	BART - Downtown Stations Seismic Analysis	\$500
San Francisco	2014N	SF-010033	94635	CON	Urban Rail	BART	BART - San Francisco Stations Platform Edge Tiles Replacement	\$2,000
San Francisco	2014H	SF-010024	94080	CON	Bus	SF Muni	SF Muni - 1401 Bryant Overhead Lines Building Seismic Rehab	\$9,200
San Mateo	0225G	SM-010002	21893	CON	State Hwy	Caltrans	SR 92 - Shoulder Widening and Curve Correction - Pilarcitos Crk	\$2,619
Santa Clara	0070	SCL010040	21715	CON	State Hwy	VTA	SR 152/SR 156 - Improvements	\$11,700
Total:								\$29,919
CUM.TOTAL								\$29,919
Air Quality								
Solano	5301	SOL990004	94151	CON (Phase 2)	Local Road	Solano TA	Jepson Parkway - between SR 12 and I-80 on Walters, Vanden and Leisure Town Roads - Phase 2	\$4,650
Total:								\$4,650
CUM.TOTAL								\$34,569
Transit Rehab								
Alameda	2113A	ALA990020	94526	CON	Bus	AC Transit	AC Transit - Engine Transmission Rehabilitation	\$628
Alameda	2009D	ALA030001	94526	CON	Bus	AC Transit	AC Transit - Bus Component Rehabilitation	\$4,000
San Francisco	2014P	SF-010026	94572	CON	Ferry	GGBHTD	GGBHTD - San Francisco Ferry Terminal Facilities Rehab	\$2,250
Total:								\$6,878
CUM.TOTAL								\$41,447
TCRP Backfill (Reserve) *								
Contra Costa	2011G	CC-030030	98197	CON	Urban Rail	BART	BART - Richmond Station Additional Parking	TBD
Marin	0342L	MRN990001	94563	CON	State Hwy	Caltrans	US 101 - HOV Lane Gap Closure - Cal Park to N. San Pedro	TBD
Napa	0367D	NAP010008	94074	ENV	State Hwy	Caltrans	SR 12 - Jamieson Canyon Widening	TBD
Sonoma	0789A	SON990001	94165	CON	State Hwy	Caltrans	US 101 - HOV Lanes - SR 12 to Steele Lane	TBD
Total:								\$19,620
CUM.TOTAL								\$61,067
GRAND Total:								\$61,067

* Note: Reserve amounts dependent upon TCRP Availability and Caltrans cost savings.

**STIP Shortfall
Regional Response
March 3, 2004**

(amounts in thousands)

	1 STP/CMAQ Grant	2 STP/CMAQ Reserve	3 AB3090	4 GARVEE
ALAMEDA				
AC Transmission Rehab	\$628			
AC Bus Component Rehab	\$4,000			
Vasco Road Safety Improvements	\$1,400			
680 Sunol Grade Southbound			\$36,837	
880/ Mission Interchange / HOV extrn.				
TOTAL	\$6,028		\$36,837	
CONTRA COSTA				
BART Richmond Station Parking Structure		\$4,320	\$2,000	PENDING
Vasco Road Safety Improvements	\$2,500			
Richmond Amtrak Station Improvements			\$2,100	PENDING
Lafayette Reliez Valley Road Regional Trail			\$109	
Martinez Bay Trail			\$300	
Hillcrest Avenue Offramp - Antioch			\$250	
TOTAL	\$2,500	\$4,320	\$4,759	
MARIN				
101 HOV Gap Closure		\$10,000		
TOTAL		\$10,000		
NAPA				
Route 12 Jamieson Canyon		\$1,500		
TOTAL		\$1,500		
SAN FRANCISCO				
MUNI 3rd SL LRT extension			\$22,570	PENDING
101 Doyle Drive			\$3,000	PENDING
BART Downtown Stations Sismic Analysis	\$500			
BART Tile Edge Replacement	\$2,000			
GGBHTD Ferry Terminal Rehab	\$2,250			
MUNI 1401 Bryant St. Seismic Retrofit	\$9,200			
Department of Parking and Traffic PT Ped Improvements			\$4,056	PENDING
SF Public Work 3rd Street/Bayshore Pavement Rehab			\$4,768	PENDING
TOTAL	\$13,950		\$34,394	
SAN MATEO				
92 Curve Corr/ Shoulder Wdng	\$2,619			
TOTAL	\$2,619			
SANTA CLARA				
880/Coleman				\$81,136
87 HOV, Julian to 280				\$44,018
87 HOV 280 to 85				\$50,645
152/156 Safety Enhancements	\$11,700			
680 Sunol Southbound HOV			\$1,700	
SR 25 Improvements				
TOTAL	\$11,700		\$1,700	\$175,799
SOLANO				
Jepson Parkway/leisuretown IC	\$4,650			
80/680/12 interchange				
Vallejo Ferry Terminal facility				
TOTAL	\$4,650			
SONOMA				
101 12 to Steele HOV lane		\$3,800		
101 Steele Lane interchange				
TOTAL		\$3,800		
Regional TOTAL	\$41,447	\$19,620	\$77,690	\$175,799



DATE: March 19, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director of Projects
RE: Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study – Update

Background:

The Draft Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study was initially presented to the STA Board of Directors on October 8, 2003. The study was conducted as part of the preparation of the Environmental Documents and Project Report for the I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange. The goal of the study is to identify the “best” location, or locations, for truck scales in Solano County based upon the technical factors used in the study. Korve Engineering, as a subconsultant to MTCO/Nolte Joint Venture, and Nolte Engineering conducted the Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study.

Three options were identified as potential locations for truck scales in Solano County. These options are:

- Option 1 – Relocate the scales within the I-80/I-680/SR12 Interchange area
- Option 2 – Locate a set of scales on I-80 between Fairfield and Vacaville and locate a set of scales on SR 12 between Suisun City and SR 113
- Option 3 - Locate a set of scales on I-80 between Vacaville and Dixon, locate a set of scales on SR 12 between Suisun City and SR 113, and locate a set of scales on I-505 between Vacaville and the county line.

STA scheduled meetings in order to facilitate public input and to provide affected agencies and interest groups with detailed information. The following meetings have occurred or are currently scheduled:

- Highway 12 Association – October 16, 2003
- Supervisor Forney – October 22, 2003
- Dixon City Council – October 28, 2003
- Caltrans District 4 Director Bijan Sartipi – November 3, 2003
- Vacaville City Council – November 11, 2003
- Rio Vista City Council – November 20, 2003
- Suisun City Council – December 2, 2003
- Fairfield City Council – January 6th
- BCDC – February 4th
- Headquarters Caltrans, Director of SHOPP Program – Feb 26th
- Arterials, Highways and Freeways Committee Tour of the Cordelia Truck Scales Facility – April 2nd

Discussion:

The STA received letters concerning the Truck Scales from the Cities of Dixon, Rio Vista and Vacaville, and the Resolution adopted by the City of Fairfield. Additionally, a letter from the Commissioner of the California Highway Patrol to the Director of Caltrans was also provided to STA. Attachment A provides a summary of the correspondence received by STA.

Based upon comments received during the public meetings, STA staff and project consultants further evaluated the potential benefits/disbenefits of the proposed site on I-80 between Fairfield and Vacaville (Lagoon Valley) and the proposed site on eastbound SR 12 near Olsen Road versus an eastbound SR 12 site near Branscome Road (opposite the proposed westbound site).

Although the I-80 site at Lagoon Valley in Option 2 provides some operational and constructibility improvements over the site within the I-80/680/12 Interchange, the site would still require significant complex braided ramp structures similar to Option 1. Additionally, as the Lagoon Valley and the North Texas Street areas “build-out”, traffic operations on I-80 would lessen the benefits in operational improvements over Option 1. These factors, combined with the additional scales required on SR 12 for Option 2, provided justification for staff to recommend eliminating Option 2 from further consideration.

A westbound site on SR 12 near Branscome Road (a level, straight section of SR 12) was initially eliminated due to an environmental “fatal flaw.” The Suisun Marsh Protection Area is adjacent to the south side of SR 12 in this area, the potential location for a westbound truck scale site. The Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) has said that construction of this type of facility within the Suisun Marsh Protection Area would be extremely difficult, if not impossible. However, additional engineering analysis of this area indicated that SR 12 could be relocated slightly north in the area of potential truck scales, thus negating the need to build in the Suisun Marsh Protection Area. The “flat” topography near Branscome Road and the ability to relocate the roadway slightly north provided justification for staff to recommend eliminating the SR 12 site near Olsen Road and including both eastbound and westbound sites on SR 12 near Branscome Road as the only proposed sites on SR 12.

The Arterials, Highways and Freeways Committee met on February 5, 2004 to review comments and letters received during the public input process, responses to these comments, and potential recommendations to the Board of Directors. The Committee directed staff to work with CHP and Caltrans to provide additional information on the following issues:

1. Can the truck scales be closed completely, or at least until improvements are made to the I-80/680/12 Interchange if they stay in the Interchange?
2. Will one set of scales on I-80, east of Dixon, be sufficient instead of scales at three locations? Or possibly a set on I-80 and a set on I-505, but none on SR 12?
3. Can a viable location on I-80 be located east of the sites proposed in Option 3 without the need for another set of scales on SR 113?
4. Can the design criteria (including technology improvements) be reevaluated to decrease the need for such long ramps and the related bridge structures for the locations in the I-80/680/12 Interchange?

The Committee forwarded the following four recommendations to the STA Board of Directors to be considered at the February 12, 2004 meeting:

1. Delete Option 2 from further consideration.
2. Determine the viability of relocating SR 12 to the north near Branscome Road to allow eastbound and westbound scales near Branscome Road, including a 4-lane roadway in this area. Delete the location near Olsen Road on SR 12 if this scenario is viable.
3. For Option 3 on I-80, reevaluate for locations outside of the Vaca-Dixon Greenbelt to a location, or locations, to the east.
4. Authorize the Executive Director to allocate up to \$10,000 in TCRP funds to complete recommendations 2 and 3.

In addition to approving the recommendations from the Committee, the Board added emphasis to the issues raised by the Committee by adding the following item:

5. Direct staff to fully investigate the following issues:
 - A. Can the truck scales be closed completely, or at least until improvements are made to the I-80/680/12 Interchange if they stay in the Interchange?
 - B. Will one set of scales on I-80, east of Dixon, be sufficient instead of scales at three locations? Or possibly a set on I-80 and a set on I-505, but none on SR 12?
 - C. Can a viable location on I-80 be located east of the sites proposed in Option 3 without the need for another set of scales on SR 113?
 - D. Can the design criteria (including technology improvements) be reevaluated to decrease the need for such long ramps and the related bridge structures for the locations in the I-80/680/12 Interchange?

STA staff recently consulted with CHP about potentially closing the Cordelia Truck Scales. CHP staff was not in favor of closing the scales for two specific reasons. In locations without truck scales, as many as 75% of all trucks have been shown to be overweight creating significant potential damage to both freeway and local roadway infrastructure. In locations with truck scales, less than 10% of trucks are overweight due to the deterrent factor of all trucks being weighed. Additionally, CHP staff at truck scales provides a visual “screening” of all vehicles and drivers for safety violations (e.g., uneven loads, “hot” brakes, damaged tires, tired or impaired drives, etc.) to help ensure freeway safety.

CHP staff agreed to work with Caltrans and STA staff to reevaluate whether truck scales would be needed on I-505 and SR 12 if the Cordelia Truck Scales are moved outside the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange to a location east of the Vacaville-Dixon Greenbelt, including whether a set of scales would also be needed on SR 113 if the scales were moved east of Dixon.

STA staff will direct the consultant to further evaluate the location on SR 12 near Branscome Road and to investigate viable locations on I-80 east of Dixon.

On February 26th, STA staff met with Randy Iwasaki, Headquarters (HQ) Caltrans Deputy Director for Maintenance and Operations (State Highway Operations Protection Program – SHOPP), and Caltrans staff from the Traffic Operations Division and the Research and Innovations Division. The senior Caltrans personnel are very familiar with the Cordelia Truck Scales and are committed to improving these scales; however, the costs identified for any of the options in the Draft Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study are a major concern for HQ Caltrans. Renovated and new truck scales are funded through the SHOPP program. The most

recent program for improving Truck Scales throughout the state shows \$24.1M for improvements to the Cordelia Truck Scales, well below the \$178M - \$415M in capital costs for replacing the Cordelia Truck Scales as shown in the Draft Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study. In fact, the total SHOPP program for the construction and upgrade of 11 Truck Scales throughout California, as shown in the 2001 Weigh Station Inventory of Needs, is only \$148.9M (including the \$24.1M for the Cordelia Truck Scales). Mr. Iwasaki and staff proposed that Caltrans, the California Highway Patrol (CHP) and Solano County will need to work together to develop innovative solutions for replacing the Cordelia Truck Scales that will include technology improvements, enhanced enforcement standards, cooperation from the trucking industry and possibly changes to state and federal laws.

A follow-up meeting was also held on February 26th with Caltrans and CHP operational and research staff to begin investigating how new technology may be used to improve truck scales, possibly reducing the size of truck scales and the need for the majority of trucks to enter the scales facility. The goal of the meeting was to evaluate the existing criteria for designing truck scales and to determine if new technologies could be used to significantly alter these criteria. The following topics were initially discussed:

- Virtual scales that weigh all trucks on the mainline freeway
- Measuring devices to determine oversized trucks (height and width)
- Camera systems to record trucks with violations
- Transponders on all commercial trucks to record ownership, safety inspections, weight records, cargo origin/destination, etc.
- The need for visual inspections to detect potential safety and security problems
- The need for visual inspections for driver screening
- Incentives for trucking companies to use the PrePass system or a similar system

The staff from all agencies agreed that the design criteria used to design new scales within the I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange (Option 1) must be thoroughly reviewed and significant efforts must be made to reduce/eliminate the extremely long truck ramps needed for these scales or similar scales throughout the state. New design criteria for “future” truck scales may include a combination of virtual scales that weigh all trucks on the mainline, camera systems to record violations, incentives for using the PrePass system that ensure safe trucks on the roadway, random inspections for a specified number of trucks to provide a deterrent for non-compliance with weight and safety standards, mobile enforcements units and specific locations for inspecting trucks for safety and security compliance.

Staff agreed to work toward developing a “Conceptual Design Criteria” for future truck scales that relies on reducing the number of trucks entering Truck Scales Facilities, thus reducing the size of the facility and the ramps serving the facility, while maintaining a specific level of “hands-on” inspections for safety and security.

In order to develop new criteria using advanced technology, such as virtual scales and camera enforcement, the trucking industry, unions serving the trucking industry, and state and federal legislators must be consulted. As such, the development of new criteria is well beyond the original scope of the Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study. Caltrans and CHP staff recommended completing the Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study and sending

recommendations to Caltrans and CHP that includes the need for a follow-on study to develop the new criteria.

Staff from Caltrans District 4 and Caltrans Headquarters were scheduled to meet with CHP staff the third week of March to further discuss how to move forward with evaluating the role of emerging technologies in the design of truck scales facilities. STA staff will meet with Caltrans and CHP staff on March 29, 2004 to discuss their conclusions and the next steps for completing the Cordelia Truck Scales Relocation Study.

The Arterials, Highways and Freeways Committee will meet on April 2, 2004 (note revised date) to tour the Cordelia Truck Scales facilities and the other potential sites identified in Option 1 and Option 3 of the Draft Study, and to evaluate additional information on the truck scales.

Recommendation:
Informational.

Attachment

A: Summary of Agency Correspondence

Summary of Agency Correspondence

City of Dixon

- Opposition to Truck Scales in the Vaca-Dixon Greenbelt.
- Infringement on rural/agricultural buffer between Vacaville and Dixon.
- Trucks bypassing scales and using routes through and around the City.
- Close proximity of Option 3 scales to the planned National Veterans' Cemetery.
- Traffic conflicts between truck scales and local interchanges.
- Increase in air pollution from decelerating, accelerating and idling trucks.
- Questions regarding the capital cost analysis for the various locations.
- Substantial increases in operations and maintenance costs in an era of shrinking state budgets.

City of Rio Vista

- The proposed location on SR 12 near Olsen Road is dangerous.
- Truck scales should not be located on a two-lane roadway like SR 12.
- The study does not accurately address traffic operational impacts of scales near Olsen Road.
- Public safety is compromised by Option 3.
- The study underestimates the cost of Option 3.
- Option 3 trades one truck scales problem for three new ones and reduces operational efficiency and effectiveness.

City of Vacaville

- Opposition to Option 3 for the following reasons:
 - Location within the Vaca-Dixon Greenbelt.
 - Negative air quality impacts of the proposed locations on I-80.
 - Increase in operating and maintenance costs for Option 3 over Option 1.
- Opposition to Option 2 for the following reasons:
 - The location in Lagoon Valley is incompatible with the proposed development of Lagoon Valley.
 - Air quality would be significantly impacted in Lagoon Valley.
 - Added freeway congestion for the AM peak for Vacaville and PM peak for Fairfield.
 - Increase in operating and maintenance costs for Option 2 over Option 1 with no guarantee for additional funding for CHP.
- Support of Option 1 for the following reasons:
 - Operating and maintenance costs for Option 1 are far less than the other two options.
 - Option 1 appears to be the optimum location for minimizing trucks diverting the scales.
- Recommended reopening the study of other potential sites.

City of Fairfield (Resolution 2004-20)

- Opposition to Option 1 because of existing and future traffic impacts on the freeway and local interchanges.
- Between Options 2 and 3, support Option 3 because it is located in less urbanized areas without braided ramps or bridge structures.
- Support modifying Option 3 to address the concerns of the cities of Vacaville, Dixon and Rio Vista, such as installing scales only on I-80 east of Dixon.
- Support eliminating and closing the truck scales until the difficulties with Option 1 are addressed.
- If Option 1 is chosen for the location of the truck scales, require the following improvements before any improvements and expansions are made to the truck scales:
 - Construct all needed braided ramps and bridge structures.
 - Reconstruct the Green Valley and Suisun Valley interchanges to accommodate the eastbound truck scale braided ramps.
 - Construct a new I-680/Red Top Road interchange and reconstruct the I-80/Red Top Road interchange if the eastbound I-80 off-ramp to southbound I-680 is eliminated.
 - Ensure the Abernathy/I-80 westbound on-ramp and eastbound off-ramp are not eliminated.
 - Ensure the westbound I-80 truck scales off-ramp accommodates future improvements to the I-80/West Texas Street interchange.
 - Require an MOU between the City, STA and other involved agencies committing to the above conditions and to funding these improvements.

CHP Letter to Caltrans

- Cannot support replacing the Codelia Inspection Facility with six facilities at three locations.
- Challenging fiscal times do not allow for the purchase of additional equipment and hiring of additional staff.
- Option 3 requires a 40% increase in operating costs over Option 1.



DATE: March 19, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Mike Duncan, Director for Projects
RE: Local Streets and Roads Update

Background:

The Bay Area Partnership established a task force in Fall 2002 to develop a methodology to identify the actual capital shortfall for both local streets and roads and transit for the Bay Area. As a result of the work of the Task Force, the MTC Pavement Management Program section established a committee of Public Works Directors and other Public Works personnel to help them identify the estimated pavement and non-pavement needs throughout the Bay Area for the next 25 years. Additionally, this committee (called the Local Streets and Roads Committee) assisted MTC in determining the potential revenues that may be available to meet the pavement and non-pavement needs (see Attachment A for estimated needs and revenues).

A subcommittee of the TAC met several times last year to develop more accurate costs for both pavement and non-pavement preventive maintenance over the next 25 years for Solano County. Similar groups were meeting in each of the nine counties of the Bay Area to assist MTC with determining reasonably accurate estimates of pavement and non-pavement needs and the expected revenues over the next 25 years that may be reasonably available to meet these needs. MTC used the information gathered from the nine counties to identify the projected revenue shortfall for streets and roads over the next 25 years.

Discussion:

The information developed by MTC and the Local Streets and Roads Committee helped the Directors of the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs) to develop a proposed investment strategy for the 2005 Regional Transportation Plan (called Transportation 2030 or T-2030) with a strong emphasis on Local Streets and Roads funding. The \$990.5M proposed by the CMAs for local streets and roads was almost seven times the amount programmed in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. Additionally, the CMA proposed investment strategy also protected the ability of counties to locally program the Counties' Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds and a portion of Federal Cycle funds. On December 19, 2003, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission adopted a regional program investment scenario for T-2030 that mirrored the option developed by the CMA Directors with the exception of higher funding levels for the Regional Bicycle Program and the Lifeline Transit Program. Additionally, the Commission directed that options be evaluated for allocating the Local Streets and Roads funding at both the County level and jurisdictional level.

On February 6, 2004 the Local Streets and Roads Committee met to discuss in general how the \$990.5M should be allocated over the 25-years of T-2030, and more specifically over the next

cycle of Federal funding. The goal of the discussion was to develop a recommendation to present to the Partnership Board for their consideration that would guide the allocation of the regional funding for local streets and roads. After much discussion on how these funds may potentially be allocated, the Local Streets and Roads Committee developed the following recommendations:

1. Recognizing we are in a serious financial situation throughout the Bay Area and the State, for this cycle of federal funds streets and roads dollars will be spent only on Metropolitan Transportation System (MTS) roadways as identified in the MTC resolution (distribution based on MTS shortfall).
2. The Committee will continue to evaluate how streets and roads funds may be used more flexibly in the future for arterials and collectors.
3. The Committee will make a strong effort over the next year to work with MTC to evaluate the MTS, how streets are included on the MTS, and how the system may be modified to include additional streets that are of "regional significance."
4. The Committee will continue to refine how the needs and shortfall are identified for both MTS and non-MTS streets and roads.

The overriding reason for the recommendation from the Committee to confine the Local Streets and Roads funding to the MTS for the next Federal cycle was the comparison of the MTS to the "Score 16" criteria used to justify the need for regional Transit funding. As stated in the adopted MTC Investment Scenario, the Local Streets and Roads funding rationale was a "Regional investment priority given to maintaining defined regionally significant routes – MTS pavement and non-pavement."

At the March 12, 2004 meeting of the Local Streets and Roads Committee, the Committee reversed itself and voted to recommend a more flexible programming policy for the \$990.5M in Local Streets and Roads funds that would allow Counties to program funds for non-MTS streets if all MTS needs were met in the County. If a more flexible programming policy is adopted, each County would be required to determine how available funds would be programmed for MTS versus non-MTS streets and roads, assuming the MTS needs can be met with the available funding. In September 2001, the STA Board adopted a policy for the allocation of future countywide local funds for road rehabilitation (see attachment B). A similar policy for allocating federal funds would be needed if non-MTS streets and roads are eligible for these federal funds.

In addition to the above action, the Committee reiterated the need to reevaluate the criteria for determining which streets should be included in the MTS, possibly including all arterials and major collectors. The Committee will assist MTC staff in reviewing the current MTS criteria and potentially developing new criteria.

Recommendation:

Informational.

Attachments

- A. Streets and Roads Pavement and Non-pavement Needs
- B. Adopted Solano County "Formula" for the Distribution of Countywide Local Funds for Local Streets and Roads

Solano County
Pavement and Non-Pavement Needs and Revenues

	Pavement	Non-Pavement	Total Need	Estimated Revenue (Pave)	Estimated Rev (Non-pave)	Total Revenue	Estimated Shortfall
Benicia	37,158,819	21,858,129	59,016,948	19,331,439	1,930,431	21,261,870	37,755,078
Dixon	27,556,319	16,209,600	43,765,919	6,141,448	3,628,666	9,770,114	33,995,805
Fairfield	94,752,972	55,737,043	150,490,015	71,276,090	35,173,627	106,449,717	44,040,298
Rio Vista	16,753,578	9,855,222	26,608,800	1,738,613	2,265,161	4,003,774	22,605,026
Suisun	47,989,971	28,229,395	76,219,366	9,190,451	0	9,190,451	67,028,915
Vacaville	73,621,572	43,306,807	116,928,379	40,624,232	7,130,154	47,754,386	69,173,993
Vallejo	180,406,173	106,121,278	286,527,451	9,938,682	26,570,259	36,508,941	250,018,510
County	127,781,025	75,165,309	202,946,334	98,901,589	33,915,764	132,817,353	70,128,981
	606,020,429	356,482,783	962,503,212	257,142,544	110,614,062	367,756,606	594,746,606

DRAFT

25-YEAR LOCAL STREETS AND ROADS SHORTFALLS BY "REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE" OPTIONS

PAVEMENT:

	NEED	REVENUE	SHORTFALL	MTS	NON-MTS	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES (15 MIN. SERVICE)	NON-MTS BIKE ROUTES	ARTERIALS & COLLECTORS
Alameda	\$ 1,689,785,238	\$ 1,351,624,591	\$ 338,160,647	\$ 50,334,350	\$ 287,826,298	\$ 46,005,964	\$ 21,527,846	\$ 3,620,431	\$ 109,724,226
Contra Costa	\$ 1,385,001,335	\$ 827,806,543	\$ 557,194,791	\$ 60,898,255	\$ 496,296,537	\$ 65,186,475	\$ 3,622,880	\$ 5,080,906	\$ 167,003,400
Marin	\$ 387,186,766	\$ 177,106,302	\$ 210,080,465	\$ 44,994,469	\$ 165,085,995	\$ 11,347,546	\$ 2,191,684	\$ 54,556	\$ 91,630,612
Napa	\$ 430,048,374	\$ 146,456,758	\$ 283,591,616	\$ 40,596,538	\$ 242,995,079	\$ 12,863,266	\$ -	\$ 762,513	\$ 42,233,284
San Francisco	\$ 1,278,125,136	\$ 398,158,904	\$ 879,966,232	\$ 62,976,659	\$ 816,989,573	\$ 60,080,869	\$ 64,844,150	\$ 5,971,186	\$ 193,592,571
San Mateo	\$ 893,116,540	\$ 537,396,949	\$ 355,719,592	\$ 52,744,341	\$ 302,975,250	\$ 26,451,232	\$ 4,151,841	\$ 700,828	\$ 104,491,178
Santa Clara	\$ 1,995,138,225	\$ 863,158,871	\$ 1,131,979,354	\$ 196,170,878	\$ 935,808,476	\$ 144,074,236	\$ 49,089,056	\$ 16,287,149	\$ 334,907,422
Solano	\$ 606,020,730	\$ 257,142,544	\$ 348,878,186	\$ 20,012,570	\$ 328,865,617	\$ 42,081,788	\$ 412,572	\$ 2,836,324	\$ 151,072,461
Sonoma	\$ 1,111,485,954	\$ 349,401,470	\$ 762,084,484	\$ 151,576,730	\$ 610,507,754	\$ 59,805,629	\$ -	\$ 482,581	\$ 184,932,103
TOTAL	\$ 9,775,908,299	\$ 4,908,252,930	\$ 4,867,655,368	\$ 680,304,790	\$ 4,187,350,578	\$ 467,897,005	\$ 145,640,029	\$ 35,796,474	\$ 1,379,587,266

NON-PAVEMENT:

	NEED	REVENUE	SHORTFALL	MTS	NON-MTS	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES (15 MIN. SERVICE)	NON-MTS BIKE ROUTES	ARTERIALS & COLLECTORS
Alameda	\$ 1,250,120,347	\$ 756,655,598	\$ 493,464,749	\$ 61,479,169	\$ 431,985,581	\$ 67,134,724	\$ 31,414,752	\$ 5,283,155	\$ 160,116,316
Contra Costa	\$ 804,416,971	\$ 403,484,980	\$ 400,931,991	\$ 57,246,028	\$ 343,685,963	\$ 46,905,218	\$ 2,606,859	\$ 3,655,989	\$ 120,168,039
Marin	\$ 261,045,391	\$ 152,481,315	\$ 108,564,076	\$ 20,977,425	\$ 87,586,651	\$ 5,864,114	\$ 1,132,605	\$ 28,193	\$ 47,352,298
Napa	\$ 252,969,632	\$ 71,634,145	\$ 181,335,487	\$ 25,306,519	\$ 156,028,969	\$ 8,225,090	\$ -	\$ 487,570	\$ 27,005,006
San Francisco	\$ 1,177,472,594	\$ 599,345,995	\$ 578,126,599	\$ 41,374,862	\$ 536,751,736	\$ 39,472,365	\$ 42,470,383	\$ 3,922,993	\$ 127,187,852
San Mateo	\$ 668,423,998	\$ 529,160,782	\$ 139,263,216	\$ 20,227,920	\$ 119,035,696	\$ 10,365,583	\$ 1,625,434	\$ 274,372	\$ 40,908,001
Santa Clara	\$ 1,553,097,976	\$ 960,001,683	\$ 593,096,294	\$ 117,737,715	\$ 475,358,579	\$ 75,487,150	\$ 25,720,025	\$ 8,533,590	\$ 175,473,475
Solano	\$ 356,482,783	\$ 110,614,063	\$ 245,868,720	\$ 16,818,222	\$ 229,050,498	\$ 29,656,756	\$ 290,757	\$ 1,998,874	\$ 106,466,939
Sonoma	\$ 653,615,287	\$ 238,156,647	\$ 415,458,620	\$ 75,883,464	\$ 339,775,156	\$ 32,619,382	\$ -	\$ 263,211	\$ 100,866,274
TOTAL	\$ 6,977,844,959	\$ 3,821,535,208	\$ 3,156,309,751	\$ 437,050,924	\$ 2,719,258,827	\$ 315,720,382	\$ 105,260,815	\$ 24,447,946	\$ 905,544,200

	NEED	REVENUE	SHORTFALL	MTS	NON-MTS	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES	NON-MTS TRANSIT ROUTES (15 MIN. SERVICE)	NON-MTS BIKE ROUTES	ARTERIALS & COLLECTORS
Alameda	\$ 2,939,905,585	\$ 2,108,280,189	\$ 831,625,397	\$ 111,813,518	\$ 719,811,878	\$ 113,140,688	\$ 52,942,598	\$ 8,903,586	\$ 269,840,541
Contra Costa	\$ 2,189,418,306	\$ 1,231,281,524	\$ 958,126,782	\$ 118,144,283	\$ 839,982,499	\$ 112,091,693	\$ 6,229,739	\$ 8,736,895	\$ 287,171,439
Marin	\$ 648,232,157	\$ 329,587,616	\$ 318,644,541	\$ 65,971,895	\$ 252,672,646	\$ 17,211,660	\$ 3,324,259	\$ 32,748	\$ 138,982,610
Napa	\$ 683,018,006	\$ 218,090,902	\$ 464,927,104	\$ 65,903,056	\$ 399,024,047	\$ 21,068,356	\$ -	\$ 1,250,083	\$ 69,238,290
San Francisco	\$ 2,455,597,730	\$ 997,504,899	\$ 1,458,092,831	\$ 104,351,522	\$ 1,353,741,309	\$ 99,553,234	\$ 107,114,533	\$ 9,894,180	\$ 320,780,423
San Mateo	\$ 1,561,540,539	\$ 1,066,557,731	\$ 494,982,808	\$ 72,971,862	\$ 422,010,946	\$ 36,806,815	\$ 5,777,275	\$ 975,199	\$ 145,399,180
Santa Clara	\$ 3,548,236,201	\$ 1,823,160,553	\$ 1,725,075,648	\$ 313,908,594	\$ 1,411,167,054	\$ 219,561,386	\$ 74,809,080	\$ 24,820,739	\$ 510,380,997
Solano	\$ 962,503,513	\$ 367,756,607	\$ 594,746,906	\$ 36,830,791	\$ 557,916,115	\$ 71,738,544	\$ 703,329	\$ 4,835,198	\$ 257,539,400
Sonoma	\$ 1,765,301,221	\$ 587,558,117	\$ 1,177,743,103	\$ 227,460,194	\$ 950,282,909	\$ 92,425,011	\$ -	\$ 745,793	\$ 285,798,977
TOTAL	\$ 16,753,753,258	\$ 8,729,788,138	\$ 8,023,965,119	\$ 1,117,355,714	\$ 6,906,609,405	\$ 783,617,387	\$ 250,900,843	\$ 60,244,420	\$ 2,285,131,457

Millbrae	\$ 21,575,612	\$ 1,694,927	\$ 19,880,685	\$ 356,175	\$ 4,212,959	\$ 4,572,134
Pacifica	\$ 18,758,130	\$ 259,615	\$ 18,498,515	\$ 239,319	\$ 17,065,337	\$ 17,291,656
Portola Valley	\$ 8,982,890	\$ -	\$ 8,982,890	\$ -	\$ 3,434,665	\$ 3,434,665
Redwood City	\$ 47,102,489	\$ 7,444,563	\$ 39,657,926	\$ 4,489,981	\$ 23,918,576	\$ 28,408,558
San Bruno	\$ 26,400,994	\$ 3,932,989	\$ 22,468,005	\$ 2,789,907	\$ 15,937,911	\$ 18,727,817
San Carlos	\$ 23,234,629	\$ 2,548,262	\$ 20,686,367	\$ 1,505,514	\$ 13,221,524	\$ 13,727,028
San Mateo	\$ 57,090,742	\$ 9,000,504	\$ 48,090,238	\$ 12,043,346	\$ 84,348,325	\$ 76,381,671
S. San Francisco	\$ 69,416,215	\$ 10,043,823	\$ 59,372,392	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Woodside	\$ 12,497,940	\$ 1,110,762	\$ 11,387,177	\$ 794,098	\$ 7,730,779	\$ 8,494,878
TOTAL	\$ 537,366,949	\$ 72,495,129	\$ 464,901,820	\$ 52,744,341	\$ 302,975,250	\$ 355,719,592

Millbrae	\$ 26,147,746	\$ 2,054,102	\$ 24,093,644	\$ 24,093,644
Pacifica	\$ 36,049,785	\$ 498,934	\$ 35,550,851	\$ 35,550,851
Portola Valley	\$ 12,397,656	\$ -	\$ 12,397,656	\$ 12,397,656
Redwood City	\$ 75,511,046	\$ 11,934,544	\$ 63,576,502	\$ 63,576,502
San Bruno	\$ 45,128,811	\$ 6,722,896	\$ 38,405,915	\$ 38,405,915
San Carlos	\$ 36,961,657	\$ 4,053,776	\$ 32,907,881	\$ 32,907,881
San Mateo	\$ 133,482,413	\$ 21,043,850	\$ 112,438,563	\$ 112,438,563
S. San Francisco	\$ 69,416,215	\$ 10,043,823	\$ 59,372,392	\$ 59,372,392
Woodside	\$ 20,982,817	\$ 1,864,861	\$ 19,117,956	\$ 19,117,956
TOTAL	\$ 893,116,540	\$ 125,239,470	\$ 767,877,070	\$ 767,877,070

	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
\$ 83,995,984	\$ 2,011,662	\$ 81,984,322	\$ 4,670,620	\$ 190,348,822	\$ 195,019,441	
\$ 41,489,904	\$ 1,528,515	\$ 39,961,389	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ 35,888,286	\$ 4,525,207	\$ 31,363,080	\$ 2,287,775	\$ 15,856,001	\$ 18,143,776	
\$ 20,934,834	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,248,114	\$ 26,248,114	
\$ 13,955,413	\$ 26,865	\$ 13,928,547	\$ 6,701	\$ 3,473,910	\$ 3,490,611	
\$ 14,056,246	\$ 657,602	\$ 13,398,643	\$ 344,406	\$ 7,017,260	\$ 7,361,665	
\$ 33,196,665	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ 77,316,034	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ 3,887,898	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ 17,232,001	\$ 2,236,998	\$ 14,995,003	\$ 3,747,582	\$ 25,120,712	\$ 28,868,294	
\$ 50,218,881	\$ 1,628,641	\$ 48,590,240	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	
\$ 36,406,410	\$ 3,484,242	\$ 32,922,168	\$ 5,215,258	\$ 49,278,331	\$ 54,493,589	
\$ 242,278,914	\$ 64,182,659	\$ 178,096,254	\$ 174,748,365	\$ 484,897,781	\$ 659,646,148	
\$ 67,290,537	\$ 668,971	\$ 66,621,567	\$ 223,403	\$ 22,249,348	\$ 22,471,749	
\$ 35,290,148	\$ 2,472,023	\$ 32,818,126	\$ 1,799,898	\$ 23,895,121	\$ 25,695,019	
\$ 89,720,716	\$ 3,861,694	\$ 85,859,023	\$ 3,126,871	\$ 69,521,343	\$ 72,648,214	
\$ 863,156,871	\$ 87,285,080	\$ 775,871,791	\$ 196,170,878	\$ 935,809,476	\$ 1,131,979,354	

	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
\$ 98,901,589	\$ 12,378,053	\$ 86,523,536	\$ 3,614,413	\$ 25,265,023	\$ 28,879,436	
\$ 19,331,439	\$ 766,425	\$ 18,565,015	\$ 706,794	\$ 17,120,586	\$ 17,827,380	
\$ 6,141,448	\$ 18,580	\$ 6,122,868	\$ 64,787	\$ 21,350,085	\$ 21,414,872	
\$ 71,276,090	\$ 5,994,909	\$ 65,281,181	\$ 1,974,800	\$ 21,502,282	\$ 23,476,882	
\$ 1,738,613	\$ -	\$ 1,738,613	\$ -	\$ 15,015,265	\$ 15,015,265	
\$ 9,190,451	\$ 510,820	\$ 8,679,630	\$ 2,156,542	\$ 36,642,979	\$ 38,799,620	
\$ 40,624,232	\$ 4,231,752	\$ 36,392,480	\$ 3,437,273	\$ 29,560,087	\$ 32,997,340	
\$ 9,938,682	\$ 469,811	\$ 9,468,871	\$ 8,088,161	\$ 162,409,330	\$ 170,467,491	
\$ 257,142,544	\$ 24,370,350	\$ 232,772,194	\$ 20,012,570	\$ 328,865,617	\$ 348,878,186	

	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
\$ 104,343,522	\$ 23,482,377	\$ 80,861,144	\$ 105,071,395	\$ 361,811,458	\$ 466,882,853	
\$ 10,324,029	\$ 1,622,240	\$ 8,701,789	\$ 547,226	\$ 2,935,349	\$ 3,482,575	

	Revenue	MTS	Non-MTS
\$ 127,781,025	\$ 15,992,466	\$ 111,788,559	
\$ 37,158,819	\$ 1,473,219	\$ 35,685,600	
\$ 27,556,319	\$ 83,367	\$ 27,472,952	
\$ 94,752,972	\$ 7,969,509	\$ 86,783,463	
\$ 16,753,878	\$ -	\$ 16,753,878	
\$ 47,989,971	\$ 2,667,362	\$ 45,322,609	
\$ 73,621,572	\$ 7,689,025	\$ 65,952,547	
\$ 180,406,173	\$ 8,527,972	\$ 171,878,201	
\$ 606,020,730	\$ 44,382,920	\$ 561,637,810	

	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
\$ 571,226,375	\$ 128,553,772	\$ 442,672,603				
\$ 13,806,604	\$ 2,189,466	\$ 11,617,138				

	Revenue	MTS	Non-MTS
\$ 127,781,025	\$ 15,992,466	\$ 111,788,559	
\$ 37,158,819	\$ 1,473,219	\$ 35,685,600	
\$ 27,556,319	\$ 83,367	\$ 27,472,952	
\$ 94,752,972	\$ 7,969,509	\$ 86,783,463	
\$ 16,753,878	\$ -	\$ 16,753,878	
\$ 47,989,971	\$ 2,667,362	\$ 45,322,609	
\$ 73,621,572	\$ 7,689,025	\$ 65,952,547	
\$ 180,406,173	\$ 8,527,972	\$ 171,878,201	
\$ 606,020,730	\$ 44,382,920	\$ 561,637,810	

	\$	8,635,833	\$	53,911	\$	8,581,922	\$
	\$	19,774,757	\$	3,424,179	\$	16,350,578	\$
	\$	30,684,478	\$	4,077,149	\$	26,607,330	\$
	\$	21,922,654	\$	2,300,366	\$	19,622,288	\$
	\$	109,228,040	\$	21,920,330	\$	87,307,710	\$
	\$	2,368,366	\$	127,583	\$	2,240,783	\$
	\$	14,180,956	\$	1,836,243	\$	12,344,713	\$
	\$	27,937,834	\$	1,320,506	\$	26,617,328	\$
	\$	349,401,470	\$	60,164,885	\$	289,236,585	\$
	\$		\$		\$	151,576,730	\$
	\$		\$		\$	610,507,754	\$
	\$		\$		\$	762,084,484	\$

	\$	8,635,833	\$	53,911	\$	8,581,922
	\$	21,019,051	\$	3,639,640	\$	17,379,411
	\$	153,529,299	\$	20,399,948	\$	133,129,351
	\$	50,272,360	\$	5,275,129	\$	44,997,231
	\$	238,251,401	\$	47,812,829	\$	190,438,572
	\$	12,626,240	\$	680,171	\$	11,946,069
	\$	14,180,956	\$	1,836,243	\$	12,344,713
	\$	27,937,834	\$	1,320,506	\$	26,617,328
	\$	1,111,485,954	\$	211,741,615	\$	899,744,339

REGION	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
Alameda County	\$ 1,351,624,591	\$ 201,975,792	\$ 1,149,648,799	\$ 50,334,350	\$ 267,826,298	\$ 338,160,647
Contra Costa County	\$ 927,806,543	\$ 109,288,251	\$ 718,518,292	\$ 80,898,255	\$ 496,296,537	\$ 557,194,791
Marin County	\$ 177,106,302	\$ 29,887,129	\$ 147,219,173	\$ 44,994,469	\$ 165,085,995	\$ 210,080,465
Napa County	\$ 146,486,758	\$ 20,317,469	\$ 126,169,288	\$ 40,596,538	\$ 242,985,079	\$ 283,591,616
San Francisco	\$ 398,158,904	\$ 28,495,091	\$ 369,663,813	\$ 62,976,659	\$ 816,989,673	\$ 879,966,232
San Mateo County	\$ 537,396,949	\$ 72,495,129	\$ 464,901,820	\$ 52,744,341	\$ 302,975,250	\$ 355,719,592
Santa Clara County	\$ 863,158,871	\$ 87,285,080	\$ 775,873,791	\$ 196,170,878	\$ 955,808,476	\$ 1,131,979,354
Solano County	\$ 257,142,544	\$ 24,370,350	\$ 232,772,194	\$ 20,012,570	\$ 328,865,617	\$ 348,878,186
Sonoma County	\$ 349,401,470	\$ 60,164,885	\$ 289,236,585	\$ 151,576,730	\$ 610,507,754	\$ 762,084,484
TOTAL	\$ 4,908,252,930	\$ 634,279,175	\$ 4,273,973,755	\$ 680,304,790	\$ 4,187,350,578	\$ 4,867,655,368

REGION	Pavement Need	MTS	Non-MTS
Alameda County	\$ 1,689,785,238	\$ 252,310,142	\$ 1,437,475,096
Contra Costa County	\$ 1,385,001,335	\$ 182,849,936	\$ 1,202,151,399
Marin County	\$ 387,186,766	\$ 74,881,598	\$ 312,305,168
Napa County	\$ 430,048,374	\$ 60,914,007	\$ 369,134,367
San Francisco	\$ 1,278,125,136	\$ 91,471,750	\$ 1,186,653,386
San Mateo County	\$ 893,116,540	\$ 125,239,470	\$ 767,877,070
Santa Clara County	\$ 1,995,138,225	\$ 283,455,958	\$ 1,711,682,267
Solano County	\$ 606,020,730	\$ 44,382,920	\$ 561,637,810
Sonoma County	\$ 1,111,485,954	\$ 211,741,615	\$ 899,744,339
TOTAL	\$ 9,775,908,299	\$ 1,327,247,396	\$ 8,448,660,903

Notes:

- The shortfall estimates were prepared for the purposes of MTC's 2005 Regional Transportation Plan, and were intended to be displayed in aggregate at the county level--not at the jurisdictional level.
- The 25-Year Pavement Need was calculated using the MTC Pavement Management Program--a pavement management system software that calculates need based on the individual jurisdiction's pavement condition, treatment costs, and maintenance strategy. 104 out of 109 Bay Area jurisdictions utilize the MTC PMP software. For those jurisdictions that do not, estimates of need were provided by the jurisdiction, or were estimated using the jurisdiction's proportion of centerline miles to total county centerline miles.
- The 25-Year pavement need was estimated using regional average maintenance treatment costs. Actual treatment costs will vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction due to selected treatments and / or environmental factors (condition of sub-grade, terrain, drainage conditions, etc.).
- Need was estimated using a uniform "best practices" decision tree across all of the jurisdictions in the region. Therefore, the need estimates assume that the most cost effective maintenance treatment will be applied, at the recommended time, and does not give any consideration to individual constraints that may exist from jurisdiction to jurisdiction (political, policy, financial, physical road conditions, etc.).
- Need estimates do not include the cost of deferred maintenance--the financial consequence of eliminating or postponing needed repairs due to lack of funding. As a recommended road repairs are "deferred" from one year to the next, the cost of repairing the roadway increases--The cost of deferred maintenance has been estimated to be an additional \$3 billion dollars region wide.
- Revenue projections were based on individual responses to a revenue survey that was circulated by MTC. Where a jurisdiction did not respond, their revenue estimates were calculated by using the county (and jurisdictions) average revenue per centerline mile. Where jurisdictions provided incomplete information on revenue sources, we again used the county averages to determine the proportion of total Local Street & Road revenues contributed by a particular revenue source (i.e., sales tax measures, gas tax, other local sources). It was also assumed that Proposition 42 revenues would be available in full.
- In certain cases, estimated revenue amounts began to out-pace estimates of need towards the end of the 25-year period. Where revenue estimates were greater than need, the revenue amount was changed to equal the need, creating a \$0 shortfall. It is assumed that any surplus revenues will be diverted to other areas.

Cloverdale	\$ 8,121,531.74	\$ 1,276,156	\$ 6,845,375
Cotati	\$ 5,079,901.63	\$ 31,712	\$ 5,048,189
Healdsburg	\$ 12,384,147.38	\$ 2,140,965	\$ 10,223,183
Petaluma	\$ 90,311,352.36	\$ 11,939,969	\$ 78,311,383
Rohnert Park	\$ 29,571,976.74	\$ 3,103,017	\$ 26,468,960
Santa Rosa	\$ 140,147,882.86	\$ 28,125,194	\$ 112,022,689
Sebastopol	\$ 7,427,200.12	\$ 400,101	\$ 7,027,100
Sonoma	\$ 8,341,739.10	\$ 1,080,143	\$ 7,261,596
Windsor	\$ 16,434,020.18	\$ 776,768	\$ 15,657,252
TOTAL	\$ 653,815,267	\$ 124,553,891	\$ 529,261,376

REGION	Non-Pavement Need	MTS	Non-MTS
Alameda County	\$ 1,250,120,347	\$ 182,585,185	\$ 1,067,535,162
Contra Costa County	\$ 804,416,971	\$ 117,820,347	\$ 686,596,624
Marin County	\$ 261,045,391	\$ 48,292,907	\$ 212,752,483
Napa County	\$ 252,969,632	\$ 35,831,769	\$ 217,137,863
San Francisco	\$ 1,177,472,594	\$ 84,268,336	\$ 1,093,204,258
San Mateo County	\$ 688,423,998	\$ 94,795,741	\$ 593,628,257
Santa Clara County	\$ 1,553,097,976	\$ 242,884,854	\$ 1,310,213,123
Solano County	\$ 356,482,783	\$ 26,107,600	\$ 330,375,183
Sonoma County	\$ 653,815,267	\$ 124,553,891	\$ 529,261,376
TOTAL	\$ 6,977,844,959	\$ 957,140,632	\$ 6,020,704,327

	Revenue	MTS Revenue	Non-MTS Revenue	MTS Shortfall	Non-MTS Shortfall	Total Shortfall
	\$ 756,655,598	\$ 121,106,017	\$ 635,549,581	\$ 61,479,189	\$ 431,965,581	\$ 493,464,749
	\$ 403,484,980	\$ 60,574,319	\$ 342,910,661	\$ 57,246,028	\$ 343,665,963	\$ 400,931,991
	\$ 152,481,315	\$ 27,315,482	\$ 125,165,833	\$ 20,977,425	\$ 87,586,651	\$ 108,564,076
	\$ 71,634,145	\$ 10,525,250	\$ 61,108,894	\$ 26,306,619	\$ 186,028,969	\$ 181,335,487
	\$ 599,345,995	\$ 42,893,474	\$ 556,452,522	\$ 41,374,862	\$ 536,751,736	\$ 578,126,599
	\$ 529,160,782	\$ 74,568,221	\$ 454,592,561	\$ 20,227,520	\$ 119,035,696	\$ 139,263,216
	\$ 960,001,683	\$ 125,147,139	\$ 834,854,544	\$ 117,737,715	\$ 475,356,579	\$ 593,096,294
	\$ 110,614,063	\$ 9,289,378	\$ 101,324,684	\$ 16,818,222	\$ 229,050,498	\$ 245,868,720
	\$ 238,156,647	\$ 45,369,600	\$ 192,787,047	\$ 75,863,464	\$ 339,775,156	\$ 415,658,620
	\$ 3,821,535,208	\$ 516,788,881	\$ 3,304,746,327	\$ 437,050,924	\$ 2,719,266,827	\$ 3,156,308,751

Notes:

The shortfall estimates were prepared for the purposes of MTC's 2005 Regional Transportation Plan, and were intended to be displayed in aggregate at the county level--not at the jurisdictional level.

- Estimates of the 25-Year Nonpavement Need were calculated using an average ratio of pavement to non-pavement need. A different ratio was used for rural vs. urban jurisdictions. The ratio method was used due to the absence of a systematic way for estimating actual non-pavement need for each jurisdiction. Since the non-pavement need category encompasses many different segments of public infrastructure--sidewalks, traffic lights, storm drains, etc.--few jurisdictions have a way to inventory and calculate their total non-pavement need. The ratios that we ultimately used were calculated using estimates of non-pavement need from select jurisdictions. The ratio method is adequate for estimating non-pavement need on a regional basis, but is not reliable at the jurisdictional level.
- Revenue projections were based on individual responses to a revenue survey that was circulated by MTC. Where a jurisdiction did not respond, their revenue estimates were calculated by using the county (and jurisdictions) average revenue per centerline mile. Where jurisdictions provided incomplete information on revenue sources, we again used the county averages to determine the proportion of total Local Street & Road revenues contributed by a particular revenue source (i.e., sales tax measures, gas tax, other local sources). It was also assumed that Proposition 42 revenues would be available in full.
- In certain cases, estimated revenue amounts began to out-pace estimates of need towards the end of the 25-year period. Where revenue estimates were greater than need, the revenue amount was changed to equal the need, creating a \$0 shortfall. It is assumed that any surplus revenues will be diverted to other areas.

ATTACHMENT B

Allocation for Road Rehab Projects for Local Funding Measure

*Population and Centerline Miles for Each Jurisdiction **

	<u>Population</u>		<u>Centerline Miles</u>		<u>Pop : Cent.Miles</u>
	Population	% Pop	Miles	% Miles	1.5:1
Benicia	29000	7.27%	92.3	5.73%	6.65%
Dixon	15550	3.90%	47.5	2.95%	3.52%
Fairfield	95300	23.88%	247.1	15.34%	20.47%
Rio Vista	4850	1.22%	28	1.74%	1.42%
Solano Co.	20850	5.23%	605.7	37.61%	18.18%
Suisun City	27250	6.83%	73	4.53%	5.91%
Vacaville	91500	22.93%	218.3	13.56%	19.18%
Vallejo	114700	28.75%	298.4	18.53%	24.66%
TOTAL	399000	100%	1610.3	100%	100%

Road Rehab Allocation for Local Funding Measure

	<u>Allocation of:</u>	
	\$75,000,000	\$100,000,000
Benicia	\$4,990,232	\$6,653,643
Dixon	\$2,638,688	\$3,518,250
Fairfield	\$15,351,610	\$20,468,814
Rio Vista	\$1,068,634	\$1,424,846
Solano Co.	\$13,635,737	\$18,180,982
Suisun City	\$4,433,303	\$5,911,071
Vacaville	\$14,386,493	\$19,181,991
Vallejo	\$18,495,303	\$24,660,404
TOTAL	\$75,000,000	\$100,000,000

* Population: State Dept. of Finance Jan. 2001. Centerline Miles: 2001 Solano CMP.

COMPARISON OF SALES TAX & PROP 42 ALLOCATIONS

AGENCY	POPULATION	% POP	CENTERLINE MILES	% C/L MILES	% POP/CL MILES (1.5:1)	SALES TAX ALLOCATION (\$100M)	PROP 42 ALLOCATION (FY08/09 to 2025/26)	TOTAL	% of TOTAL
Benevia	29000	7.27%	92.3	5.73%	6.65%	\$6,650,000	\$5,397,000	\$12,047,000	4.26%
Dixon	15550	3.90%	47.5	2.95%	3.52%	\$3,520,000	\$2,839,000	\$6,359,000	2.25%
Fairfield	95300	23.88%	247.1	15.34%	20.47%	\$20,470,000	\$17,375,000	\$37,845,000	13.40%
Rio Vista	4850	1.22%	28	1.74%	1.42%	\$1,420,000	\$818,000	\$2,238,000	0.79%
Solano Co.	20850	5.23%	605.7	37.61%	18.18%	\$18,180,000	\$113,037,000	\$131,217,000	46.45%
Suisun City	27250	6.83%	73	4.53%	5.91%	\$5,910,000	\$5,030,000	\$10,940,000	3.87%
Vacaville	91500	22.93%	218.3	13.56%	19.18%	\$19,180,000	\$16,811,000	\$35,991,000	12.74%
Vallejo	114700	28.75%	298.4	18.53%	24.66%	\$24,660,000	\$21,211,000	\$45,871,000	16.24%
TOTAL	399000	100.00%	1610.3	100.00%	99.99%	\$99,990,000	\$182,518,000	\$282,508,000	100.00%



DATE: March 22, 2004
TO: STA TAC
FROM: Janice Sells, Program Manager/Analyst
RE: Regional Measure 2 (RM 2) – Next Steps

Background:

Regional Measure 2 (RM 2), funded through a \$1 toll increase on the Bay Area's seven state-owned bridges, was approved by regional voters on March 2nd. The toll increase is expected to raise approximately \$125 million annually to address congestion relief and enhance convenience and reliability of the Bay Area's public transit system by funding a specific list of regional transportation projects in each of the seven counties.

Election results show that RM2 was approved by 57% of the Bay Area voters. However, only 41% of Solano County voters voted in favor of the measure. At the special TAC meeting D.J. Smith will discuss the disconnect between the ballot summary and highlight the Solano County projects.

The passage of RM2 resulted in funding for the following Solano County projects:

I-80/I-680/SR 12 Interchange	\$100.0 million
Vallejo Station	\$ 28.0 million
Solano County Express Bus Facilities	\$ 20.0 million
Fairfield/Vacaville Train Station and Capitol Corridor Track Improvements	\$ 25.0 million
Competitive Transit Capital Grant Program (North Bay transit and/or park and ride projects)	\$ 20.0 million
Annual Operating Programs	
Vallejo Ferry	\$ 2.7 million per year
Regional Express Bus North Pool	\$ 3.4 million per year

Discussion:

A more detailed application process will now be developed by MTC during the next few months. The next steps to occur before such a funding process can be finalized include the following:

1. MTC's Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA) will adopt the new toll schedule on April 28, 2004
2. Toll collection will begin on July 1, 2004.
3. Initial project reports are due to BATA, by project sponsors, on July 1, 2004 (a template will be provided for reporting on those projects)

The process for securing funding for operational purposes will be slightly different from the capital projects:

1. Performance measures are being developed by BATA (no deadline as yet, but funding cannot be allocated until measures are adopted)
2. First year funding (FY 2004-05) will go to the Water Transit Authority and TransLink
3. Remaining operational funding will begin in FY 2005-06
4. Allocation of bill revenue for transit operation will not occur until federal restrictions prohibiting the use of Bridge Toll funds for transit operation are modified.

STA staff will work with Solano County project sponsors as the funding/application process is further defined for both capital and operating funds.

Recommendation:
Informational.