



**Active Transportation Advisory Committee  
(ATAC)**

**AGENDA**

**MEETING**

**October 27, 2014**

**5:00 p.m.**

**625 Burnell Street  
Napa CA 94559**

**General Information**

*All materials relating to an agenda item for an open session of a regular meeting of the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the ATAC by ATAC members, staff or the public within 72 hours of but prior to the meeting will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Secretary of the ATAC, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, California 94559, Monday through Friday, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., except for NCTPA holidays. Materials distributed to a majority or all of the members of the ATAC at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the ATAC or staff and after the public meeting if prepared by some other person. Availability of materials related to agenda items for public inspection does not include materials which are exempt from public disclosure under Government Code sections 6253.5, 6254, 6254.3, 6254.7, 6254.15, 6254.16, or 6254.22.*

*Members of the public may speak to the ATAC on any item at the time the ATAC is considering the item. Please complete a Speaker's Slip, which is located on the table near the entryway, and then present the slip to the ATAC Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the ATAC on any issue not on today's agenda under Public Comment. Speakers are limited to three minutes.*

*This Agenda shall be made available upon request in alternate formats to persons with a disability. Persons requesting a disability-related modification or accommodation should contact the Administrative Assistant, at (707) 259-8631 during regular business hours, at least 48 hours prior to the time of the meeting.*

*This Agenda may also be viewed online by visiting the NCTPA website at [www.nctpa.net](http://www.nctpa.net), click on Minutes and Agendas – ATAC or go to [/www.nctpa.net/active-transportation-advisory-committee-atac](http://www.nctpa.net/active-transportation-advisory-committee-atac)*

## **ITEMS**

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Approval of Meeting Minutes
4. Public Comments
5. ATAC Member and Staff Comments

## **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

6.	Lifeline Transportation Program Call for Projects (Diana Meehan) ( <i>Pages 6-42</i> )  ATAC will receive information on the MTC Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Call for Projects.	INFORMATION
7.	Complete Streets Checklist Procedure (Diana Meehan) ( <i>Pages 43-45</i> )  ATAC will review and adopt procedure for Complete Streets checklist review.	INFORMATION/ ACTION
8.	Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign Update (Diana Meehan) ( <i>Pages 46-60</i> )  ATAC will receive and update and review next steps for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign.	INFORMATION/ DISCUSSION
9.	Topics for Next Meeting  Discussion of topics for next meeting by ATAC members.	DISCUSSION
10.	Approval of Meeting Date of November 24, 2014 and Adjournment	APPROVE

**Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA)**

**Active Transportation Advisory Committee**

**MINUTES**

**Monday, September 22, 2014**

**ITEMS**

**1. Call to Order**

Meeting was called to order at 5:02 p.m.

**2. Roll Call**

Members Present:

Barry Christian  
Mike Costanzo (Vice Chair)  
Dieter Deiss  
Gabriella Gonzalez McNamara  
Joel King  
Paul Wagner (Chair)

Members Absent:

Joe Tagliaboschi  
Brett Risley  
Anne Darrow

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

**MSC KING / CHRISTIAN** for **APPROVAL** and unanimously carried

**4. Public Comments**

None

**5. ATAC Members and Staff Comments**

Mike Costanzo announced the commuter bike path between Vallejo Street and Lincoln Ave is closed due to damaged buildings from the August 24<sup>th</sup> earthquake. City of Napa Staff member, Lorien Clark was present and included that the path

is closed due to two adjacent buildings that pose a fall risk. The building owner is working to make the repairs necessary so the path can be reopened as soon as possible. It was noted that this path is a critical link for students and commuters and should be a priority for re-opening.

## **6. ATAC Member Nomination**

The committee was introduced to City of Napa ATAC appointee, Eric Hagyard. Mr. Hagyard is an assistant wine maker and part owner of the Napa Bookmine book store in downtown Napa. He is looking forward to working with the committee on upcoming projects that improve cycling and walking.

Motion to recommend the NCTPA Board approve appointee Eric Hagyard as 5<sup>th</sup> representative on the ATAC for the City of Napa.

**MSC CHRISTIAN / KING** for **APPROVAL** unanimously carried

## **7. SR 29 Corridor Improvement Plan Study**

Kate Miller, NCTPA Executive Director, presented an update on the SR 29 Corridor Improvement Plan Study. The study focuses on improvements along the corridor, between the Trancas Park and Ride lot on the north end down to the City of Vallejo at Hwy. 37. Much of the study focus is in the City of American Canyon where there is significant need for improvement.

The committee discussed advocating for Class II bike lanes through the corridor. The Countywide Bicycle Plan indicates a bike route parallel/adjacent to/or on the SR 29. Class I considerations are in the current draft proposal for a modified boulevard concept which showed the best performance in the modeling sequences.

Also of concern to the committee is the Soscol Flyover project which does not include Class II bicycle lanes. Joel King made a motion that a committee letter be written to Caltrans, the NCTPA Board, and the SR 29 Citizens Advisory Committee suggesting that Caltrans fund the portion of the VINE Trail between Airport and Soscol Ferry Road as mitigation for exclusion of Class II lanes on the flyover.

**MSC KING /CHRISTIAN** for **APPROVAL** unanimously carried

## **8. Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts and Surveys**

The committee discussed methods for conducting bicycle counts and surveys in

order to update data to help determine locations with greatest need for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements. Updated data will provide valuable information describing current use and for making future use projections related to projects and programs. This data is becoming a necessary requirement for grant applications within the Active Transportation Program and other funding sources.

Next steps relating to Bicycle/Pedestrian Counts and Surveys:

- Determine locations based on recommendations within the Countywide Bike plan and previous locations used by MTC
- Create Survey using Survey Monkey: Use same/similar questions as previously used for comparison
- Contact other agencies to assist in determining best practices methodology

#### **9. Complete Streets Checklist Procedures**

The committee reviewed the Complete Streets Checklist Procedure requirements. As the advisory committee tasked to review all bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs, the committee will define a procedure for review using Complete Streets guidelines. It was discussed that having a standing report for the checklist would allow a timely review as required for projects are submitted by jurisdictions for programming. NCTPA staff will work on development of a Complete Streets Checklist Procedure and bring it back to the committee for review.

#### **10. Topics for Next Meeting**

- Methodology for Counts and Surveys
- Complete Streets Checklist Procedure
- Safety Campaign

#### **11. Approval of Meeting Date of October 27, 2014 and Adjournment**

Next meeting date was approved by committee. Meeting adjourned at 7:15 p.m.



October 27, 2014  
ATAC Agenda Item 6  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY ATAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Diana Meehan, Associate Planner  
(707) 259-8327 / Email: dmeehan@nctpa.net  
**SUBJECT:** Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Call for Projects

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) receive the NCTPA Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 program wherein up to \$1,216,842 in federal and state funds are being made available to public transit operators, non-profits and other local government agencies through a competitive application and evaluation process.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) makes funding available to improve mobility of low income communities through the Lifeline Program. The funds are distributed to counties on low income population formula and are administered by each county's congestion management agency. The Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) serves as the congestion management agency (CMA) for Napa County. This memo kicks off the "Call for Projects" for the fourth cycle of the Lifeline Transportation Program for Napa County. All interested non-profit organizations and public agencies are invited to submit applications for funding.

The Lifeline Transportation program is a competitive grant program that funds projects that result in improved mobility and public transit system enhancements for low-income residents.

The program is intended to fund projects included in community-based transportation plans, this includes projects that: 1) Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process; 2) improve transportation choices; 3) address transportation gaps identified in the Community Based Transportation Program (CBTP); and 4) focus on transportation needs specific to elderly and disabled residents of low income communities.

## **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a fiscal impact? Yes – up to \$1,216,842 in new revenues to public agencies and non-profit organizations in Napa County.

Is it Currently Budgeted? No. Projects will be added to NCTPA's respective budgets once the Board approves the final Lifeline program

Future Fiscal Impact: Yes.

Consequences if not approved: Critical Lifeline projects will not be funded.

## **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

### **Program Administrator:**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has issued a Lifeline Transportation Grant Program call for projects. MTC tasks the region's CMAs to administer the program. NCTPA serves as the CMA in Napa County.

### **Eligible Applicants:**

Public agencies, including transit agencies, county social service agencies, cities and counties, and non-profit organizations are eligible applicants. However, since STA, FTA Section 5307, and Proposition 1B PTMISEA funds are all statutorily restricted to eligible public transit agencies, applicants must partner with NCTPA to access the revenues.

### **Available Funding:**

The funds will be distributed over a two year period- (FY 2014-15 and FY 2015-16).  
Fund sources and estimated amounts:

Fund Source	Amount			Total
	2014	2015	2016	
Job Access and Reverse Commute (FTA Section 5307 Funds)	\$144,523	\$72,621	\$73,783	\$290,927
State Transit Assistance (STA)	\$212,406	\$214,336	\$200,103	\$626,845
State Proposition 1B Funds –Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement, and Service Enhancement Account Program (PTMISEA)	\$299,070			\$299,070
Total	\$655,999	\$286,957	\$273,886	\$1,216,842

**Local Matching Fund Requirement:**

Local Match Requirement: 20% for capital projects, 50% for operating projects, 50% for auto-related projects. Depending on projects submitted and availability, State Transit Assistance (STA) may be used to match up to 30% of the project cost providing that a project is eligible for both STA and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC).

**Eligible Projects:**

The program goal is to improve mobility for low income communities in Napa. The program prioritizes:

- Projects developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process that include broad partnerships among a variety of stakeholders such as public agencies, transit operators, community-based organizations, and other community stakeholder, and outreach to underrepresented stakeholders.
- Projects that provide a range of transportation choices by adding a variety of new or expanded services including but not limited to: enhanced fixed route transit services, shuttles, taxi, voucher, programs, improved access to autos, and capital improvement projects.
- Projects that address transportation gaps and /or barriers identified in CBTP or other substantive local planning efforts involving focused outreach to low-income populations.

The program supports both operating and capital projects subject to the eligibility of the fund sources. MTC is also encouraging projects that support or coordinate with county or sub-regional mobility managers and consolidated transportation service agencies. In Napa and Solano, that agency is the Solano Napa Commuter Information (SNCI). Statutory restrictions and eligibility for each of the revenues included in the Lifeline program can be found at the following websites:

FTA Section 5307 (formerly FTA Section 5316) Job Access and Reverse Commute:  
[http://www.fta.dot.gov/legislation\\_law/12349\\_15209.html](http://www.fta.dot.gov/legislation_law/12349_15209.html)

State Transit Assistance: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/State-TDA.html>

Proposition 1B: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Proposition-1B.html>

**Evaluation Criteria and Scoring:**

Projects will be selected based on:

- 1) Project need/goals and objectives (maximum 20 points possible)
- 2) Community-identified priority (maximum 20 points possible)

- 3) Implementation plan and project management capacity (maximum 15 points possible)
- 4) Coordination and program outreach (maximum 15 points possible)
- 5) Cost –effectiveness and performance indicators (maximum 5 points possible)
- 6) Project budget/sustainability (25 points)

**Project Delivery Requirements:**

Project sponsors must have completed the project and expended all funds within 3 years of award.

**Application/Lifeline Program Schedule:**

<b>Lifeline Transportation Program Schedule</b>	
October 27, 2014	NCTPA issues “Call for Projects”
November 21, 2014	Applications due to NCTPA
Nov. 24 to Dec. 12, 2014	Application Committee Review
January 8, 2014	NCTPA Committees Review
January 15, 2015	Draft Projects submitted to MTC
January 21, 2015	NCTPA Board Approval
January 22, 2015	Approved Projects submitted to MTC

(Detailed timeline in grant application; dates are subject to change without notice)

Applications are due to NCTPA no later than November 21, 2014 by 5:00 PM.

The evaluation staff will consist of CMA staff, MTC staff, and local stakeholders. A full program of projects will be recommended to the NCTPA Board of Directors for approval at the January 21, 2015 meeting. The approved project list will be submitted to MTC for commission approval and funding shortly thereafter.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: (1) MTC Lifeline Transportation Program Guidelines  
(2) Lifeline Application

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Programming and Allocations Committee**

October 8, 2014

Item Number 2d

**Resolution No. 4159**

**Subject:** Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines for FY2014-15 through FY2015-16.

**Background:** MTC's Lifeline Transportation Program funds projects that improve mobility for the region's low-income communities. The program is administered by the nine county congestion management agencies (CMAs), and in Santa Clara County via a joint arrangement between the CMA and the County. In the first three funding cycles, approximately \$190 million in Lifeline funding was programmed to 224 projects throughout the region.

**Fund sources**

The target programming amount for Cycle 4 is \$65 million, which includes three years of funding (FY2013-14 through FY2015-16). As in previous cycles, the funding sources include a mix of state and federal funds, to support both operating and capital activities: approximately \$31 million in State Transit Assistance (STA) funds, \$25 million in Proposition 1B – Transit funds, and \$9 million in Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) funds. See Table A for a summary of the funding available in Cycle 4, Table B for the STA and JARC amounts by county, and Table C for the Proposition 1B – Transit amounts by transit operator.

**Issues and changes**

Generally, the Cycle 4 guidelines are similar to the Cycle 3 guidelines; however, key issues in this cycle and proposed changes from the previous cycle include the following:

- **Non-transit sponsors.** Unlike previous cycles of the Lifeline Transportation Program, the funds in the Cycle 4 program are predominantly restricted to transit operators. This is a challenge because many of the Lifeline projects identified in Community Based Transportation Plans (CBTPs) are not traditional transit projects. In previous Lifeline cycles, the JARC funds in particular could more easily be directed to non-profits and local government agencies for non-traditional transit projects. However, in MAP-21, the FTA JARC program was rolled into the FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area program, resulting in additional federal requirements that make it more difficult for non-FTA grantees to receive the funds (e.g., National Transit Database reporting, drug and alcohol testing, fare discount requirements). Non-profits and local government agencies are still eligible subrecipients of STA and Section 5307 (JARC) funds in Cycle 4, but they must partner with an entity that is an eligible direct recipient that is willing to pass-through the funds.
- **Means-Based Fare Project recommendation.** MTC staff is proposing to set aside up to \$700,000 in STA funds toward the potential development and implementation of a regional means-based transit fare program. In Lifeline Cycle 3, MTC set aside \$300,000 for Phase I of this project to develop the regional concept, including identifying who would be eligible, costs, funding, relationship to other discounts, and other policy elements. Depending on the results of the Phase I study, funds from the Cycle 4 \$700,000 set-aside may be used for Phase II implementation activities. If the set-aside is not needed for

Phase II of the Means-Based project, it would be used for other Lifeline projects.

- **Recognition of Mobility Managers/CTSAs.** Mobility management was a key coordination strategy recommended in MTC's 2013 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan) update. The designation of lead mobility managers or Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs) at the county or subregional level was an essential component of that strategy. Consistent with those recommendations, the Lifeline Program Administrators may, at their discretion, choose to award extra points to—or otherwise give priority to—projects sponsored by or coordinated with county or subregional Mobility Managers or CTSAs.
- **Formula updates.** Low-income population factors and transit ridership factors have been updated with 2012 data.
- **Communities of concern (CoCs).** A mapping tool showing both CoCs adopted with Plan Bay Area as well as the most recent socioeconomic data available from the Census Bureau is available at: [http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive\\_Maps/cocs.html](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive_Maps/cocs.html). There is a user's guide available to aid in the use of this tool.

The Cycle 4 program guidelines have been reviewed with MTC's Policy Advisory Council Equity and Access Subcommittee, the Transit Finance Working Group, and CMA staff.

#### Timeline

The anticipated timeline for Cycle 4 is as follows:

Action:	Anticipated Date:
Commission approves Cycle 4 Program Guidelines	October 22, 2014
County Lifeline Program Administrators initiate project selection process	October / November 2014
Transit operators submit draft Prop 1B project lists to County Lifeline Program Administrators	January 15, 2015
Board-approved Section 5307 (JARC) and STA programs, and Prop 1B Allocation Requests due to MTC	March 13, 2015
Commission approval of Program of Projects	April 22, 2015

**Issues:** The FY2014-15 and FY2015-16 JARC (5307) and STA funding amounts are preliminary projections and are subject to revision based on federal appropriations actions in the case of JARC (5307), and actual revenue generation in the case of STA.

**Recommendation:** Refer Resolution No. 4159 to the Commission for approval.

**Attachments:** Table A - Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding  
Table B - Estimated STA and JARC (5307) Funding Targets by County  
Table C - Proposition 1B Transit Funding Targets by Transit Operator and County  
MTC Resolution No. 4159

**Table A – Lifeline Transportation Program**  
**Cycle 4 Funding**  
**FY2013-14 through FY2015-16**

Fund Source	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	Total
STA <sup>1</sup>	\$ 10,446,392	\$ 10,541,289	\$ 10,541,289	\$ 31,528,970
Prop 1B <sup>2</sup>	-	\$ 24,827,359	-	\$ 24,827,359
5307 Lifeline Set-Aside (JARC) <sup>3</sup>	\$ 2,681,772	\$ 2,889,856	\$ 2,936,094	\$ 8,507,722
5307 Lifeline Set-Aside (JARC) Small UA Carryover <sup>4</sup>	\$ 469,974	-	-	\$ 469,974
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 13,598,138</b>	<b>\$ 38,258,504</b>	<b>\$ 13,477,383</b>	<b>\$ 65,334,025</b>

**Notes:**

- (1) FY14 & FY15 total STA revenue generation amounts are consistent with those in the most recent MTC Fund Estimate (MTC Resolution No. 4133). As such, the FY14 STA revenue generation is based on the \$392 million in the enacted FY2013-14 State Budget and the FY15 STA revenue generation is based on the \$373 million estimated in the proposed FY2014-15 State Budget. The FY14 STA amount does not include the \$1.05 million that was used for the Cycle 3 JARC funding restoration. The FY16 STA estimate assumes no growth. These amounts will be updated as the MTC Fund Estimate (Res. 4133) is updated.
- (2) FY15 Prop 1B appropriations will be the only appropriations for Cycle 4 and the final Prop 1B appropriations for the Lifeline Transportation Program.
- (3) FY14 5307 amounts are based on actual apportionments. FY14 amount does not include the \$208K that was used for the Cycle 3 JARC funding restoration. FY15 assumes a 0% growth rate over FY14 (including \$208K that was used for the Cycle 3 JARC funding restoration) and FY16 assumes a 1.6% growth rate over FY15. These growth rates are consistent with projected growth rates for the FY15 & FY16 Transit Capital Priorities program. Preliminary projections subject to revision.
- (4) FY14 5307 Small UA Carryover amount is FY13 actual small UA apportionments that were not programmed in Lifeline Cycle 3.

10/8/2014

Table B – Estimated STA & JARC (5307) Funding Targets by County

County	FY2014			FY2015			FY2016		
	STA	FY13 Small UA Carryover JARC (5307)		STA	JARC (5307)		STA	JARC (5307)	
	Actual	Actual	Actual		Estimate	Estimate		Estimate	Estimate
& Share of Regional Low Income Population <sup>1</sup>									
Alameda	22.6%	2,365,598	31,800	2,387,087	646,829	2,228,571	2,228,571	657,178	8,932,528
Contra Costa	14.3%	1,495,905	-	1,509,494	409,028	1,409,256	1,409,256	415,572	5,628,449
Marin	2.6%	273,857	-	276,345	74,881	257,994	257,994	76,079	1,030,406
Napa	2.0%	212,406	71,632	214,336	72,621	200,103	200,103	73,783	917,502
San Francisco	12.5%	1,309,667	-	1,321,564	358,104	1,233,805	1,233,805	363,834	4,927,714
San Mateo	8.4%	880,699	-	888,700	240,811	829,685	829,685	244,664	3,313,693
Santa Clara	23.1%	2,415,237	61,111	2,437,177	642,383	2,275,335	2,275,335	652,661	9,126,287
Solano	6.4%	668,858	273,831	674,934	277,612	630,115	630,115	282,054	3,085,016
Sonoma	7.9%	824,165	31,600	831,652	167,587	776,425	776,425	170,268	2,845,070
MTC - Means-Based Fare Project		-	-	-	-	700,000	700,000	-	700,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,446,392</b>	<b>469,974</b>	<b>10,541,289</b>	<b>2,889,856</b>	<b>10,541,289</b>	<b>10,541,289</b>	<b>2,936,093</b>	<b>40,506,665</b>

10/8/2014

County	Three-Year Total			95% STA Programming Targets		
	& Share of Regional Low Income Population <sup>1</sup>	STA <sup>1</sup>		FY2014	FY2015	
		Estimate	JARC (5307) Estimate		Estimate	Total Estimate
Alameda	22.6%	6,981,256	1,951,272	2,247,318	2,267,733	6,632,194
Contra Costa	14.3%	4,414,655	1,213,794	1,421,110	1,434,020	4,193,922
Marin	2.6%	808,196	222,210	260,164	262,527	767,786
Napa	2.0%	626,845	290,657	201,786	203,619	595,503
San Francisco	12.5%	3,865,036	1,062,678	1,244,184	1,255,486	3,671,784
San Mateo	8.4%	2,599,084	714,609	836,664	844,265	2,469,130
Santa Clara	23.1%	7,127,749	1,998,538	2,294,475	2,315,318	6,771,361
Solano	6.4%	1,973,907	1,111,109	635,415	641,188	1,875,212
Sonoma	7.9%	2,432,242	412,828	782,957	790,069	2,310,630
MTC - Means-Based Fare Project		700,000	-	-	-	665,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>31,528,970</b>	<b>8,977,695</b>	<b>9,924,072</b>	<b>10,014,225</b>	<b>29,952,522</b>

10/8/2014

(1) Note that the "Share of Regional Low Income Population" percentages reflect the most recent population data from the 2012 American Community Survey, as is proposed in the Lifeline Cycle 4 program guidelines; however, the county STA distribution percentages in the MTC Fund Estimate (Res. 4133) have not been updated to reflect the most recent population data. If updated percentages are approved as part of the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines, the county STA distribution percentages in the FY2015-16 MTC Fund Estimate will be shown accordingly in February 2015.

**Table C – Proposition 1B Transit Funding Targets by Transit Operator and County**

Transit Operator <sup>2</sup> & Hybrid Formula (Share of Regional Low Income Ridership & Share of Regional Low Income 2012 Population)	Prop 1B <sup>1</sup>			
	FY2014	FY2015	FY2016	Total
AC Transit	-	4,299,828	-	4,299,828
BART	-	4,604,653	-	4,604,653
County Connection (CCCTA)	-	255,194	-	255,194
Golden Gate Transit/Marin Transit	-	787,196	-	787,196
Wheels (LAVTA)	-	125,625	-	125,625
Muni (SFMTA)	-	6,189,054	-	6,189,054
SamTrans	-	1,230,533	-	1,230,533
Tri Delta Transit (ECCTA)	-	178,754	-	178,754
VINE (NCTPA)	-	299,070	-	299,070
VTA	-	4,832,062	-	4,832,062
WestCat (WCCTA)	-	81,113	-	81,113
Solano County Operators	-	899,217	-	899,217
Sonoma County Operators	-	1,045,061	-	1,045,061
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,827,359</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>24,827,359</b>

(1) FY15 Prop 1B appropriations are the only appropriations in Cycle 4.

(2) Only transit operators who have previously received Proposition 1B Lifeline funds are included in the formula distribution.

10/8/2014

Date: October 22, 2014  
W.I.: 1311  
Referred by: PAC

**ABSTRACT**

Resolution No. 4159

This Resolution adopts the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines.

The following attachment is provided with this Resolution:

Attachment A —Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines FY2013-14  
through FY2015-16

Further discussion of the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines is provided in the Programming and Allocations Committee Summary sheet dated October 8, 2014.

Date: October 22, 2014  
W.I.: 1311  
Referred by: PAC

RE: Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. 4159

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is the regional transportation agency for the San Francisco Bay Area pursuant to Government Code Section 66500 *et seq.*; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 3814, which directed Proposition 1B funds to the Lifeline Transportation Program; and,

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 3837, which established a consolidated policy for State Transit Assistance (STA) – population-based funds, including a set percentage to the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 4072, which established the process and criteria for programming the FY2012-13 and FY2013-14 FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area funds, including a set-aside for the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution 4140, which established the process and criteria for programming the FY2014-15 and FY2015-16 FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area funds, including a set-aside for the Lifeline Transportation Program; and

WHEREAS, MTC will use the process and criteria set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution to fund a Cycle 4 program of projects for the Lifeline Transportation Program; now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the program guidelines to be used in the administration and selection of the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation projects, as set forth in Attachment A of this Resolution; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director of MTC shall forward a copy of this Resolution, and such other information as may be required, to such other agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

Amy Rein Worth, Chair

The above Resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in Oakland, California on October 22, 2014.

Date: October 22, 2014  
W.I.: 1310  
Referred by: PAC

Attachment A  
MTC Resolution No. 4159  
Page 1 of 19



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

## **Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines**

October 2014

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION**

**LIFELINE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CYCLE 4 GUIDELINES  
FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2016**

October 2014

**Table of Contents**

1.	PROGRAM GOAL.....	3
2.	PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.....	4
3.	FUNDING APPORTIONMENT AND AVAILABILITY.....	4
4.	ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS/SUBRECIPIENTS.....	6
5.	STA AND SECTION 5307 PROGRAMMING PROCESS.....	7
6.	PROPOSITION 1B PROGRAMMING PROCESS.....	7
7.	ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES.....	8
8.	LOCAL MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.....	9
9.	COORDINATED PLANNING.....	9
10.	GRANT APPLICATION.....	10
11.	APPLICATION EVALUATION.....	10
12.	COUNTYWIDE PROGRAM OF PROJECTS.....	11
13.	POLICY BOARD ADOPTION.....	11
14.	PROJECT DELIVERY.....	11
15.	PROJECT OVERSIGHT.....	12
16.	PERFORMANCE MEASURES.....	12
17.	FUND ADMINISTRATION.....	13
18.	COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.....	13
19.	TIMELINE.....	14

Appendix 1. Funding Source Information

Appendix 2. Standard Evaluation Criteria

**METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
LIFELINE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM CYCLE 4 GUIDELINES  
FY 2014 THROUGH FY 2016**

October 2014

1. **PROGRAM GOAL.** The Lifeline Transportation Program is intended to fund projects that result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the nine San Francisco Bay Area counties.

The Lifeline Program supports community-based transportation projects that:

- Are developed through a collaborative and inclusive planning process that includes broad partnerships among a variety of stakeholders such as public agencies, transit operators, community-based organizations and other community stakeholders, and outreach to underrepresented stakeholders.
- Improve a range of transportation choices by adding a variety of new or expanded services including but not limited to: enhanced fixed route transit services, shuttles, taxi voucher programs, improved access to autos, and capital improvement projects.
- Address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified in Community-Based Transportation Plans (CBTP) or other substantive local planning efforts involving focused outreach to low-income populations. While preference will be given to community-based plan priorities, strategies emerging from countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan or other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern will also be considered. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable. A communities of concern (CoC) mapping tool showing both CoCs adopted with Plan Bay Area as well as the most recent socioeconomic data available from the Census Bureau is available at:  
[http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive\\_Maps/cocs.html](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive_Maps/cocs.html).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a user's guide available to aid in the use of this tool.

2. **PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION.** The Lifeline Program will be administered by county congestion management agencies (CMAs) or other designated county-wide agencies as follows:

County	Lifeline Program Administrator
Alameda	Alameda County Transportation Commission
Contra Costa	Contra Costa Transportation Authority
Marin	Transportation Authority of Marin
Napa	Napa County Transportation Planning Agency
San Francisco	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
San Mateo	City/County Association of Governments
Santa Clara	Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority and Santa Clara County
Solano	Solano Transportation Authority
Sonoma	Sonoma County Transportation Authority

3. **FUNDING APPORTIONMENT AND AVAILABILITY.** Fund sources for the Cycle 4 Lifeline Transportation Program include State Transit Assistance (STA), Proposition 1B - Transit, and Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)<sup>2</sup> funds. Cycle 4 will cover a three-year programming cycle, FY2013-14 to FY2015-16.
- a. **STA and Section 5307 (JARC).** Funding for STA and Section 5307 (JARC) will be assigned to counties by each fund source, based on the county's share of the regional low-income population (see Figure 1).<sup>3</sup> Lifeline Program Administrators will assign funds to eligible projects in their counties. See Section 5 for details about the STA and Section 5307 (JARC) programming process and Appendix 1 for detailed eligibility requirements by fund source.

<sup>2</sup> The Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21) federal transportation authorizing legislation eliminated the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program (Section 5316) and combined JARC functions and funding with the Urbanized Area Formula (Section 5307) and the Non-urbanized Area Formula (Section 5311) programs. JARC projects were made eligible for 5307 funding, and, consistent with MTC's Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Process and Criteria (MTC Resolution Nos. 4072 and 4140), in the FY2013-14, FY2014-15 and FY2015-16 Section 5307 programs, a portion of the Bay Area's large urbanized area funds have been set aside for the Lifeline program.

<sup>3</sup> FTA Section 5307 funds are apportioned by urbanized area (UA), so the distribution of 5307 funds will also need to take UA boundaries into consideration.

**Figure 1. County and Share of Regional Poverty Population**

<i>County</i>	<i>Share of Regional Low Income (&lt;200% Poverty) Population</i>
Alameda	22.6%
Contra Costa	14.3%
Marin	2.6%
Napa	2.0%
San Francisco	12.5%
San Mateo	8.4%
Santa Clara	23.1%
Solano	6.4%
Sonoma	7.9%
Total	100%

Source: ACS 2010 and 2012 1-Year Estimates

- b. **Proposition 1B.** Proposition 1B funding will be assigned by MTC directly to transit operators and counties based on a formula that distributes half of the funds according to the transit operators' share of the regional low-income ridership, and half of the funds according to the transit operators' share of the regional low-income population. The formula distribution is shown in Figure 2. See Section 6 for details about the Proposition 1B programming process and Appendix 1 for detailed eligibility requirements by fund source.

**Figure 2. Transit Operator & Hybrid Formula**  
(Share of Regional Low Income Ridership & Share of Regional Low Income Population)

<i>Transit Operator</i>	<i>Hybrid Formula Share</i>
AC Transit	17.3%
BART	18.5%
County Connection (CCCTA)	1.0%
Golden Gate Transit/Marin Transit	3.2%
Wheels (LAVTA)	0.5%
Muni (SFMTA)	24.9%
SamTrans	5.0%
Tri Delta Transit (ECCTA)	0.7%
VINE (NCTPA)	1.2%
VTA	19.5%
WestCat (WCCTA)	0.3%
Solano County Operators	3.6%
Sonoma County Operators	4.2%
Total	100%

Note: Only transit operators who have previously received Proposition 1B Lifeline funds are included in the formula distribution

- c. **Regional Means-Based Transit Fare Program.** MTC will set aside up to \$700,000 in Cycle 4 STA funds toward the potential development and implementation of a regional

means-based transit fare program. In Lifeline Cycle 3, MTC set aside \$300,000 for Phase I of this project. In Phase I, MTC is conducting a study to develop the regional concept, including identifying who would be eligible, costs, funding, relationship to other discounts, and other policy elements. Depending on the results of the Phase I study, funds from the Cycle 4 \$700,000 set-aside may be used for Phase II implementation activities.

- d. Local Fund Exchanges. Consistent with MTC Resolution No. 3331, MTC will allow County Lifeline Program Administrators to use local fund exchanges to fund projects that are not otherwise eligible for the state and federal funds in Cycle 4. Lifeline Program Administrators must notify MTC about their intent to exchange funds, and MTC staff will review and approve the exchanges on a case-by-case basis. MTC staff is supportive of these fund exchanges to the extent that the exchange projects meet the spirit of the Lifeline Transportation Program.

#### 4. ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS/SUBRECIPIENTS

- a. STA. There are three categories of eligible recipients of STA funds: a) transit operators; b) Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs); and c) Cities and Counties that are eligible to claim Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 4, 4.5 or 8 funds.

Non-profit organizations and Cities/Counties that are not eligible TDA Article 4, 4.5 or 8 claimants are only eligible for STA funds if they partner with an eligible STA recipient (e.g., a transit operator) that is willing to serve as the recipient of the funds and pass through the funds to the non-profit or City/County, and if they have a project eligible to use.

- b. Section 5307 (JARC). Transit operators that are FTA grantees are the only eligible recipients of Section 5307 (JARC) funds.

Non-profit organizations and public agencies that are not FTA grantees are only eligible for Section 5307 (JARC) funds if they partner with an FTA grantee (transit operator) that is willing to serve as the direct recipient of the Section 5307 (JARC) funds and pass through the funds to the subrecipient non-profit or public agency.

Section 5307 (JARC) recipients/subrecipients will be required to have a Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and provide it during the application process.<sup>4</sup> A DUNS number may be obtained from D&B by telephone (866-705-5711) or the Internet (<http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>).

- c. Proposition 1B. Transit operators are the only eligible recipients of Proposition 1B funds.

---

<sup>4</sup> A Dun and Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number is a unique, non-indicative 9-digit identifier issued and maintained by D&B that verifies the existence of a business entity. The DUNS number is a universal identifier required for Federal financial assistance applicants, as well as recipients and their direct subrecipients.

5. STA AND SECTION 5307 PROGRAMMING PROCESS. For STA and Section 5307 funds, Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for soliciting applications for the Lifeline Transportation Program.

Consistent with MTC's Public Participation Plan and FTA's Title VI Circular (FTA C 4702.1B), MTC encourages Lifeline Program Administrators to conduct a broad, inclusive public involvement process, and use multiple methods of public outreach. Unlike previous cycles of the Lifeline Transportation Program, the funds in the Cycle 4 program are predominantly restricted to transit operators (see Section 4 for recipient eligibility restrictions). Therefore, MTC also acknowledges that each Lifeline Program Administrator's public outreach strategy will be tailored accordingly.

Methods of public outreach may include, but are not limited to, highlighting the program and application solicitation on the CMA website, and sending targeted postcards and e-mails to all prospective applicants, including those that serve predominantly minority and low-income populations.

Further guidance for public involvement is contained in MTC's Public Participation Plan.

- a. Competitive Process. STA and Section 5307 (JARC) projects must be selected through an open, competitive process with the following exception: In an effort to address the sustainability of fixed-route transit operations, Lifeline Program Administrators may elect to allocate some or all of their STA and/or Section 5307 (JARC) funds directly to transit operators for Lifeline transit operations within the county. Projects must be identified as Lifeline projects before transit operators can claim funds, and will be subject to Lifeline Transportation Program reporting requirements.
  - b. STA Contingency Programming. Due to the uncertainty of forecasting STA revenues, the Lifeline Program Administrators will program 95 percent of their county's estimated STA amount, and develop a contingency plan for the remaining five percent should it be available.
6. PROPOSITION 1B PROGRAMMING PROCESS. In most cases, Proposition 1B Transit funds will be allocated directly to transit operators by MTC, due to the limited eligibility and uses of this fund source. Upon concurrence from the applicable CMA,<sup>5</sup> transit operators may program funds to any capital project that is consistent with the Lifeline Transportation Program and goals, and is eligible for this fund source. Transit operators are encouraged to consider needs throughout their service area. Projects must be identified as Lifeline projects before transit operators can claim funds, and, at the discretion of the Lifeline Program Administrators, may be subject to Lifeline Transportation Program reporting requirements. For Marin, Solano and Sonoma counties, Proposition 1B funds are being directed to the CMA, who should include these funds in the overall Lifeline programming effort (keeping in mind the limited sponsor and project eligibility of Proposition 1B funds).

---

<sup>5</sup> CMA concurrence may be provided via a board resolution or a letter from an authorized representative.

## 7. ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES

- a. Eligible operating projects. Eligible operating projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, may include (but are not limited to) new or enhanced fixed route transit services, restoration of Lifeline-related transit services eliminated due to budget shortfalls, shuttles, taxi voucher programs, auto loan programs, etc. See Appendix 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.
- b. Eligible capital projects. Eligible capital projects, consistent with requirements of funding sources, may include (but are not limited to) purchase of vehicles; bus stop enhancements; rehabilitation, safety or modernization improvements; or other enhancements to improve transportation access for residents of low-income communities. See Appendix 1 for additional details about eligibility by funding source.
- c. Section 5307 restrictions
  - (1) Job Access and Reverse Commute requirement. For the Lifeline Transportation Program, the use of Section 5307 funds is restricted solely to Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) projects. For details regarding eligible JARC projects, see the FTA Section 5307 Circular (FTA C 9030.1E), Chapter IV, Section 5 available at [http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FINAL\\_FTA\\_circular9030.1E.pdf](http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FINAL_FTA_circular9030.1E.pdf). Also see Appendix 1 for detailed eligibility requirements by fund source
  - (2) New and existing services. Consistent with FTA's Section 5307 circular (FTA C 9030.1E), Chapter IV, Section 5.a, eligible job access and reverse commute projects must provide for the development or maintenance of eligible job access and reverse commute services. Recipients may not reclassify existing public transportation services that have not received funding under the former Section 5316 program as job access and reverse commute services in order to qualify for operating assistance. In order to be eligible as a job access and reverse commute project, a proposed project must qualify as either a "development project" or "maintenance project" as follows:
    - i. Development Projects. "Development of transportation services" means new projects that meet the statutory definition and were not in service as of the date MAP-21 became effective October 1, 2012. This includes projects that expand the service area or hours of operation for an existing service.
    - ii. Maintenance Projects. "Maintenance of transportation services" means projects that continue and maintain job access and reverse commute projects and services that received funding under the former Section 5316 Job Access and Reverse Commute program.

8. **LOCAL MATCHING REQUIREMENTS.** The Lifeline Transportation Program requires a minimum local match of 20% of the total project cost. Lifeline Transportation Program funds may cover a maximum of 80% of the total project cost.

a. **Exceptions to 20% requirement.** There are two exceptions to the 20% local match requirement:

(1) FTA Section 5307 (JARC) operating projects require a 50% match. However, consistent with MTC's approach in previous funding cycles, Lifeline Program Administrators may use STA funds to cover the 30% difference for projects that are eligible for *both* JARC and STA funds.

(2) All auto-related projects require a 50% match.

b. **Sources of local match.** Project sponsors may use certain federal, state or local funding sources (Transportation Development Act, operator controlled State Transit Assistance, local sales tax revenue, etc.) to meet the match requirement. In-kind contributions such as the market value of in-kind contributions integral to the project may be counted as a contribution toward local share.

For Section 5307 JARC projects, the local match can be *non*-Department of Transportation (DOT) federal funds. Eligible sources of non-DOT federal funds include: Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Community Services Block Grants (CSBG) and Social Services Block Grants (SSBG) administered by the US Department of Health and Human Services or Community Development Block grants (CDBG) and HOPE VI grants administered by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Grant funds from private foundations may also be used to meet the match requirement.

Transportation Development Credits ("Toll Credits") are not an eligible source of local match for the Lifeline Transportation Program.

9. **COORDINATED PLANNING.** Under MAP-21, projects funded with Section 5307 JARC funds are no longer required by FTA to be derived from a locally developed, coordinated public transit-human services transportation plan ("Coordinated Plan"); however, in the Bay Area's Coordinated Plan, MTC continues to identify the transportation needs of individuals with disabilities, older adults, *and* people with low incomes, and to provide strategies for meeting those local needs. Therefore, projects funded with Lifeline Transportation Program funds should be consistent with the transportation needs, proposed solutions, and enhanced coordination strategies presented in the Coordinated Plan to the extent practicable considering any other funding source restrictions.

The Bay Area's Coordinated Plan was updated in March 2013 and is available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/>.

Mobility management was a key coordination strategy recommended in the 2013 plan update. The designation of lead mobility managers or Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs) at the County or subregional level was an essential component of that strategy. Consistent with those recommendations, the Lifeline Program Administrators may, at their discretion, choose to award extra points to—or otherwise give priority to—projects sponsored by or coordinated with County or subregional Mobility Managers or CTSAs.

Transportation needs specific to senior and disabled residents of low-income communities may also be considered when funding Lifeline projects.

10. GRANT APPLICATION. To ensure a streamlined application process for project sponsors, a universal application form will be used, but, with review and approval from MTC, may be modified as appropriate by the Lifeline Program Administrator for inclusion of county-specific grant requirements.

Applicants with multi-county projects must notify the relevant Lifeline Program Administrators and MTC about their intent to submit a multi-county project, and submit copies of their application to all of the relevant counties. If the counties have different application forms, the applicant can submit the same form to all counties, but should contact the Lifeline Program Administrators to determine the appropriate form. If the counties have different application deadlines, the applicant should adhere to the earliest deadline. The Lifeline Program Administrators will work together to score and rank the multi-county projects, and, if selected, to determine appropriate funding. (Note: Multi-county operators with projects that are located in a single county need only apply to the county where the project is located.)

#### 11. APPLICATION EVALUATION

- a. Evaluation criteria. Standard evaluation criteria will be used to assess and select projects. The six criteria include (1) project need/goals and objectives, (2) community-identified priority, (3) implementation plan and project management capacity, (4) coordination and program outreach, (5) cost-effectiveness and performance indicators, and (6) project budget/sustainability. Lifeline Program Administrators will establish the weight to be assigned for each criterion in the assessment process.

Additional criteria may be added to a county program but should not replace or supplant the regional criteria. MTC staff will review the proposed county program criteria to ensure consistency and to facilitate coordination among county programs.

See Appendix 2 for the detailed standard evaluation criteria.

- b. Evaluation panel. Each county will appoint a local evaluation panel of CMA staff, the local low-income or minority representative from MTC's Policy Advisory Council (if available), and representatives of local stakeholders, such as transit operators, other transportation providers, community-based organizations, social service agencies, and local jurisdictions, to score and select projects. Counties are strongly encouraged to appoint a diverse group of stakeholders for their local evaluation panel. Each county will

assign local priorities for project selection by establishing the weight for each criterion and, at the CMA's discretion, adding local criteria to the standard regional criteria.

12. COUNTYWIDE PROGRAM OF PROJECTS. A full program of projects is due to MTC from each Lifeline Program Administrator on **March 13, 2015**. However, given state and federal funding uncertainties, sponsors with projects selected for FY2015 and FY2016 Section 5307 (JARC) funds and FY2016 STA funds should plan to defer the start of those projects until the funding is appropriated and secured. Lifeline Program Administrators, at their discretion, may opt to allot FY2014 and FY2015 funds to high scoring projects so they can be started quickly. MTC staff will work with Lifeline Program Administrators on this sequencing; MTC staff expects that more will be known about the FY2015 Section 5307 (JARC) funds and the FY2016 STA and Section 5307 (JARC) funds in calendar year 2015.

13. POLICY BOARD ADOPTION

- a. Project sponsor resolution of local support. Prior to MTC's programming of Lifeline Cycle 4 funds (STA, Section 5307 JARC and/or Proposition 1B) to any project, MTC requires that the project sponsor adopt and submit a resolution of local support. The resolution shall state that approved projects not only exemplify Lifeline Program goals, but that the local project sponsors understand and agree to meeting all project delivery, funding match and eligibility requirements, and obligation and reporting deadlines and requirements. MTC will provide a resolution of local support template. The County Lifeline Program Administrators have the option of collecting the resolutions of local support from project sponsors along with the project applications, or after the project is selected by the County for funding.

Caltrans requires that Proposition 1B - Transit projects either be consistent with the project sponsor's most recent short-range transit plan (SRTP), as evidenced by attaching the relevant SRTP page to the allocation request, or be accompanied by a certified Board Resolution from the project sponsor's governing board.

b. Lifeline Program Administrator/CMA Board Resolution and Concurrence

- (1) STA and Section 5307 (JARC). Projects recommended for STA and Section 5307 (JARC) funding must be submitted to and approved by the respective governing board of the Lifeline Program Administrator.
- (2) Proposition 1B. Projects funded with Proposition 1B Transit funds must have concurrence from the applicable Lifeline Program Administrator/CMA. Concurrence may be provided by a board resolution or by a letter from an authorized representative.

14. PROJECT DELIVERY. All projects funded under the county programs are subject to the following MTC project delivery requirements:

- a. Section 5307 (JARC). Project sponsors must expend the Lifeline Transportation Program Section 5307 (JARC) funds within three years of the FTA grant award or execution of agreement with pass-through agency, whichever is applicable. To prevent the Section 5307 (JARC) funds from lapsing on the federal obligation deadline, MTC reserves the right to reprogram funds if direct recipients fail to submit their FTA grant by the following dates:
  - June 30, 2015 for FY2014 and FY2015 funds (the deadline to submit grants for FY15 funds may be extended depending on the availability of FY15 apportionments.)
  - June 30, 2016 for FY2016 funds

Direct recipients are responsible for carrying out the terms of their grants.

- b. STA. Project sponsors must expend the Lifeline Transportation Program STA funds within three years of the date that the funds are programmed by MTC or the date that the agreement with pass-through agency is executed, whichever is applicable.
  - c. Proposition 1B. Project sponsors must expend the Lifeline Transportation Program Proposition 1B funds within three years of the date that funds are available. Disbursement timing depends on the timing of State bond sales.
15. PROJECT OVERSIGHT. For Lifeline projects funded by STA and Section 5307 (JARC), Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for programmatic and fiscal oversight, and for monitoring project sponsors in meeting the MTC obligation deadlines and project delivery requirements. In addition, Lifeline Program Administrators will ensure that projects substantially carry out the scope described in the grant applications for the period of performance. All project budget and scope of work changes must be approved by the MTC Commission; however the Lifeline Program Administrators are responsible for approving budget and scope of work changes prior to MTC's authorization. All scope changes must be fully explained and must demonstrate consistency with Lifeline Transportation Program goals.

For projects funded by Proposition 1B, the Lifeline Program Administrators are encouraged to continue coordination efforts with the project sponsors if they determine that it would be beneficial toward meeting the Lifeline goals; however, this may not be necessary or beneficial for all Proposition 1B projects.

See Appendix 1 for detailed accountability and reporting requirements by funding source.

16. PERFORMANCE MEASURES. As part of the Call for Projects, applicants will be asked to establish project goals, and to identify basic performance indicators to be collected in order to measure the effectiveness of the Lifeline projects. At a minimum, performance measures for service-related projects would include: documentation of new "units" of service provided with the funding (e.g., number of trips, service hours, workshops held, car loans provided), cost per unit of service, and a qualitative summary of service delivery procedures employed for the project. For capital projects, project sponsors are responsible for establishing

milestones and reporting on the status of project delivery. Project sponsors are responsible for satisfying all reporting requirements, as referenced in Appendix 1. Lifeline Program Administrators will forward all reports containing performance measures to MTC for review and overall monitoring of the Lifeline Transportation Program.

#### 17. FUND ADMINISTRATION

- a. Section 5307 (JARC). MTC will enter all Lifeline Section 5307 (JARC) projects into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Transit operators that are FTA grantees are the only eligible recipients of Section 5307 (JARC) funds. FTA grantees will act as direct recipients, and will submit grant applications directly to FTA.

For Section 5307 (JARC) projects sponsored by non-FTA grantees (e.g., nonprofits or other local government entities), the FTA grantee who was identified as the partner agency at the time of the application will submit the grant application to FTA directly and, following FTA approval of the grant, will enter into funding agreements with the subrecipient project sponsor.

FTA recipients are responsible for following all applicable federal requirements and for ensuring that their subrecipients comply with all federal requirements. See Section 18 for federal compliance requirements.

- b. STA. For transit operators receiving STA funds, MTC will allocate funds directly through the annual STA claims process. For other STA eligible projects administered by sponsors who are not STA eligible recipients, the project sponsor is responsible for identifying a local transit operator who will act as a pass-through for the STA funds, and will likely enter into a funding agreement directly with the project sponsor. Project sponsors are responsible for entering their own STA projects into the TIP.
- c. Proposition 1B Transit. Project sponsors receiving Proposition 1B funds must submit a Proposition 1B allocation request to MTC for submittal to Caltrans with prior review by MTC. The state will distribute funds directly to the project sponsor. Note that although the Proposition 1B Transit Program is intended to be an advance-payment program, actual disbursement of funds is dependent on the State budget and State bond sales. Project sponsors are responsible for entering their own Proposition 1B projects into the TIP.

#### 18. COMPLIANCE WITH FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

- a. Lifeline Program Administrator Responsibilities. For the selection of FTA Section 5307 (JARC) projects, in accordance with federal Title VI requirements, Lifeline Program Administrators must distribute the Section 5307 (JARC) funds without regard to race, color, and national origin, and must assure that minority populations are not being denied the benefits of or excluded from participation in the program. Lifeline Program Administrators shall develop the program of projects or competitive selection process to ensure the equitable distribution of FTA Section 5307 (JARC) funds to project sponsors

that serve predominantly minority populations. Equitable distribution can be achieved by engaging in outreach to diverse stakeholders regarding the availability of funds, and ensuring the competitive process is not itself a barrier to selection of applicants that serve predominantly minority populations.

- b. **Project Sponsor Responsibilities.** FTA Section 5307 (JARC) applicants should be prepared to abide by all applicable federal requirements as specified in 49 U.S.C. Section 5307; FTA Circulars C 9030.1E, 4702.1B and 4703.1; the most current FTA Master Agreement; and the most current Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance Programs.

FTA Section 5307 (JARC) direct recipients will be responsible for adhering to FTA requirements through their agreements and grants with FTA directly and for ensuring that all subrecipients and third-party contractors comply with FTA requirements.

19. **TIMELINE.** The anticipated timeline for Cycle 4 is as follows:

Program	Action	Anticipated Date*
All	Commission approves Cycle 4 Program Guidelines	October 22, 2014
All	MTC issues guidelines to counties	October 22, 2014
Prop 1B	Transit operators submit draft project lists to County Lifeline Program Administrators	January 15, 2015
Prop 1B	Allocation requests due to MTC (concurrence** from the CMA is required)	March 13, 2015
5307 (JARC) & STA	Board-approved** programs due to MTC from CMAs	March 13, 2015
All	<b>Commission approval of Program of Projects</b>	<b>April 22, 2015</b>
5307 (JARC)	MTC submits TIP amendment for FY14, FY15 and FY16 projects	End of April – Deadline TBD
Prop 1B & STA	Project sponsors submit TIP amendments	End of April – Deadline TBD
Prop 1B	MTC submits allocation requests to Caltrans	Deadline TBD by Caltrans*
STA	Operators can file claims for FY14 and FY15	After 4/22/15 Commission Approval
5307 (JARC)	Deadline for transit operators (FTA grantees) to submit FTA grants for FY14 and FY15 funds	June 30, 2015
STA	Operators can file claims for FY16	After July 1, 2015
5307 (JARC)	Deadline for transit operators (FTA grantees) to submit FTA grants for FY16 funds	June 30, 2016

\* Dates subject to change depending on State and Federal deadlines and availability of funds.

\*\* CMA Board approval and concurrence may be pending at the time of deadline.

**Appendix 1**  
**Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4**  
**Funding Source Information**

Purpose of Fund Source	State Transit Assistance (STA) To improve existing public transportation services and encourage regional transportation coordination <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA_4-17-2013.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA_4-17-2013.pdf</a>	Proposition 1B – Transit To help advance the State's goals of providing mobility choices for all residents, reducing congestion, and protecting the environment <a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/Prop%201B/PTMISEA-Guidelines_2013.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/Prop%201B/PTMISEA-Guidelines_2013.pdf</a>	Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) To support the continuation and expansion of public transportation services in the United States <a href="http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FINAL_FTA_circular9030.1E.pdf">http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/FINAL_FTA_circular9030.1E.pdf</a>
Detailed Guidelines	<a href="http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA_4-17-2013.pdf">http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/MassTrans/Docs-Pdfs/STIP/TDA_4-17-2013.pdf</a>		
Use of Funds	For public transportation purposes including community transit services	For public transportation purposes	For the Lifeline Transportation Program, the use of Section 5307 funds is restricted solely to Job Access and Reverse Commute projects that support the development and maintenance of transportation services designed to transport welfare recipients and eligible low income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment.
Eligible Recipients	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit operators</li> <li>Consolidated Transportation Service Agencies (CTSAs)</li> <li>Cities and Counties if eligible to claim TDA Article 4, 4.5 or 8 funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit operators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transit operators that are FTA grantees</li> </ul>
Eligible Subrecipients (must partner with an eligible recipient that will serve as a pass-through agency)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities and counties that are not eligible to claim TDA Article 4, 4.5 or 8 funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private non-profit organizations</li> <li>Public agencies that are not FTA grantees (e.g., cities, counties)</li> </ul>

Eligible Projects	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)
	<p><b><u>Transit Capital and Operations, including:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New, continued or expanded fixed-route service</li> <li>▪ Purchase of vehicles</li> <li>▪ Shuttle service if available for use by the general public</li> <li>▪ Purchase of technology (e.g., GPS, other ITS applications)</li> <li>▪ Capital projects such as bus stop improvements, including bus benches, shelters, etc.</li> <li>▪ Various elements of mobility management, if consistent with STA program purpose and allowable use. These may include planning, coordinating, capital or operating activities.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Transit Capital</u></b> (including a minimum operable segment of a project) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rehab, safety, or modernization improvements</li> <li>▪ Capital service enhancements or expansions</li> <li>▪ New capital projects</li> <li>▪ Bus rapid transit improvements</li> <li>▪ Rolling stock procurement, rehab, or replacements</li> </ul> <p>Projects must be consistent with most recently adopted short-range transit plan or other publicly adopted plan that includes transit capital improvements.</p>	<p><b><u>New and existing services.</u></b> Eligible job access and reverse commute projects must provide for the development or maintenance of eligible job access and reverse commute services. Recipients may not reclassify existing public transportation services that have not received funding under the former Section 5316 program as job access and reverse commute services in order to qualify for operating assistance. In order to be eligible as a job access and reverse commute project, a proposed project must qualify as either a “development project” or a “maintenance project” (see Section 7.c(2) of these guidelines for details regarding “development” and “maintenance” projects).</p> <p><b><u>Capital and Operating projects.</u></b> Projects that comply with the requirements above may include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Late-night &amp; weekend service;</li> <li>▪ Guaranteed ride home service;</li> <li>▪ Shuttle service;</li> <li>▪ Expanding fixed route public transit routes, including hours of service or coverage;</li> <li>▪ Demand-responsive van service;</li> <li>▪ Ridesharing and carpooling activities;</li> <li>▪ Transit-related aspects of bicycling;</li> <li>▪ Administration and expenses for voucher programs;</li> <li>▪ Local car loan programs;</li> <li>▪ Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS);</li> <li>▪ Marketing; and</li> <li>▪ Mobility management.</li> </ul> <p>See FTA C 9030.1E, Chapter IV, Section 5 for details regarding eligible JARC projects.</p>

	State Transit Assistance (STA)	Proposition 1B – Transit	Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC)
Lifeline Program Local Match	20%	20%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>50% for operating projects (may use STA funds to cover up to 30% if project is eligible for both JARC and STA)</li> <li>50% for auto projects</li> <li>20% for capital projects</li> </ul>
Estimated timing for availability of funds to project sponsor	<p>Transit operators, CTSAs and eligible cities and counties can initiate claims for FY14 and FY15 funds immediately following MTC approval of program of projects, and can initiate claims for FY16 funds after July 1, 2015.</p> <p>For subrecipients, the eligible recipient acting as fiscal agent will likely initiate a funding agreement following MTC approval of program of projects. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of the agreement.</p>	<p>Project sponsors must submit a Proposition 1B allocation request to MTC for submittal to Caltrans by March 13, 2015. Disbursement timing depends on bond sales.</p>	<p>Following MTC approval of the program of projects, MTC will add projects to the TIP. Following TIP approval, FTA grantees must submit FTA grants for FY14 and FY15 funds by June 30, 2015. (The deadline to submit grants for FY15 funds may be extended depending on the availability of FY15 apportionments.) FTA grantees must submit FTA grants for FY16 funds by June 30, 2016.</p> <p>FTA grantees can begin their projects after the funds are obligated in an FTA grant (estimated Fall 2015 for FY14 &amp; FY15 funds; estimated Fall 2016 for FY16 funds). For subrecipients, the FTA grantee acting as fiscal agent will likely initiate a funding agreement following FTA grant award. Funds will be available on a reimbursement basis after execution of the agreement.</p>
Accountability & Reporting Requirements	<p>Transit operators and eligible cities and counties must submit annual performance (i.e., ridership) statistics for the project, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to MTC along with annual claim.</p> <p>Depending on the arrangement with the pass-through agency, subrecipients will likely submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to the pass-through agency for reimbursement, and then to Lifeline Program Administrators for review.</p>	<p>Using designated Caltrans forms, project sponsors are required to submit project activities and progress reports to the state every six months, as well as a project close-out form. Caltrans will track and publicize progress via their website.</p> <p>Project sponsor will not be required to submit progress reports to the Lifeline Program Administrator unless the LPA believes that county-level project monitoring would be beneficial. MTC and/or the Lifeline Program Administrators may request to be copied on progress reports that are submitted to Caltrans.</p>	<p>FTA grantees are responsible for following all applicable federal requirements for preparing and maintaining their Section 5307 (JARC) grants. MTC and/or the Lifeline Program Administrators may request copies of FTA grantees' quarterly Section 5307 (JARC) grant reports to FTA.</p> <p>Depending on the arrangement with the pass-through agency, subrecipients will likely submit quarterly performance reports with invoices, first to Lifeline Program Administrators for review, and then to the pass-through agency for reimbursement. Subrecipients will also submit Title VI reports annually to the pass-through agency.</p>

**Note:** Information on this chart is accurate as of October 2014. MTC will strive to make Lifeline Program Administrators aware of any changes to fund source guidelines that may be enacted by the appropriating agencies (i.e. State of California, Federal Transit Administration).

## Appendix 2 Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Standard Evaluation Criteria

The following standard evaluation criteria are intended to provide consistent guidance to each county in prioritizing and selecting projects to receive Lifeline Transportation Program funds. Each county, in consultation with other stakeholder representatives on the selection committee, will consider these criteria when selecting projects, and establish the weight to be assigned to each of the criterion. Additional criteria may be added to a county program but should not replace or supplant the regional criteria. MTC staff will review the proposed county program criteria to ensure consistency and to facilitate coordination among county programs.

- a. **Project Need/Goals and Objectives:** Applicants should describe the unmet transportation need or gap that the proposed project seeks to address and the relevant planning effort that documents the need. Describe how project activities will mitigate the transportation need. Project application should clearly state the overall program goals and objectives, and demonstrate how the project is consistent with the goals of the Lifeline Transportation Program.
- b. **Community-Identified Priority:** Priority should be given to projects that directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified through a Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) or other substantive local planning effort involving focused outreach to low-income populations. Applicants should identify the CBTP or other substantive local planning effort, as well as the priority given to the project in the plan.

Other projects may also be considered, such as those that address transportation needs identified in countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan, or other documented assessment of needs within designated communities of concern. Findings emerging from one or more CBTPs or other relevant planning efforts may also be applied to other low-income areas, or otherwise be directed to serve low-income constituencies within the county, as applicable.

A communities of concern (CoC) mapping tool showing both CoCs adopted with Plan Bay Area as well as the most recent socioeconomic data available from the Census Bureau is available at: [http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive\\_Maps/cocs.html](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive_Maps/cocs.html).<sup>1</sup>

- c. **Implementation Plan and Project Management Capacity:** For projects seeking funds to support program operations, applicants must provide a well-defined service operations plan, and describe implementation steps and timelines for carrying out the plan.

For projects seeking funds for capital purposes, applicants must provide an implementation plan, milestones and timelines for completing the project.

Priority should be given to projects that are ready to be implemented in the timeframe that the funding is available.

---

<sup>1</sup> There is a user's guide available to aid in the use of this tool.

Project sponsors should describe and provide evidence of their organization's ability to provide and manage the proposed project, including experience providing services for low-income persons, and experience as a recipient of state or federal transportation funds. For continuation projects that have previously received Lifeline funding, project sponsor should describe project progress and outcomes.

- d. **Coordination and Program Outreach:** Proposed projects will be evaluated based on their ability to coordinate with other community transportation and/or social service resources. Applicants should clearly identify project stakeholders, and how they will keep stakeholders involved and informed throughout the project. Applicants should also describe how the project will be marketed and promoted to the public.
- e. **Cost-Effectiveness and Performance Indicators:** The project will be evaluated based on the applicant's ability to demonstrate that the project is the most appropriate way in which to address the identified transportation need, and is a cost-effective approach. Applicants must also identify clear, measurable outcome-based performance measures to track the effectiveness of the service in meeting the identified goals. A plan should be provided for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, as well as steps to be taken if original goals are not achieved.
- f. **Project Budget/Sustainability:** Applicants must submit a clearly defined project budget, indicating anticipated project expenditures and revenues, including documentation of matching funds. Proposals should address long-term efforts and identify potential funding sources for sustaining the project beyond the grant period.

**A. GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION**

**1. Project Sponsor**

Name of the organization \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone number \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail address \_\_\_\_\_

DUNS Number<sup>1</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Other Partner Agencies**

Agency	Contact Person	Address	Telephone

**3. Project Type:** *Check one.* ☐ Operating ☐ Capital ☐ Both

**For operating projects, please check one of the following:** ☐ New ☐ Continuing

**4. Project Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**5. Brief Description of Project (50 words max.):**

**6. Budget Summary:**

	Amount (\$)	% of Total Project Budget
Amount of Lifeline funding requested:		
Amount of local match proposed:		
Total project budget:		

<sup>1</sup> Provide your organization's nine-digit Dun & Bradstreet (D&B) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number. To search for your agency's DUNS Number or to request a DUNS Number via the Web, visit the D&B website: <http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform>. To request a DUNS Number by phone, contact the D&B Government Customer Response Center at 1-866-705-5711.

## Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding Application

---

### B. PROJECT ELIGIBILITY

#### Lifeline Eligibility

Does the project result in improved mobility for low-income residents of the Bay Area?

☐ Yes. *Continue.*    ☐ No. *Stop. The project is not eligible to receive Lifeline funds.*

Does the project address a transportation gap and/or barrier identified in one of the following planning documents? (Additional details to be provided in question #3)

☐ Yes. *Continue.*    ☐ No. *Stop. The project is not eligible to receive Lifeline funds.*

*Check all that apply:*

- ☐ Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP)
- ☐ Other substantive local planning effort involving focused outreach to low-income populations
- ☐ Countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plan
- ☐ Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan
- ☐ Other documented assessment of need within the designated communities of concern

(Please specify: \_\_\_\_\_)

Is the service open to the general public or open to a segment of the general public defined by age, disability, or low income?

☐ Yes. *Continue.*    ☐ No. *Stop. The project is not eligible to receive Lifeline funds.*

#### Section 5307 Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) Eligibility

Is the project designed to transport welfare recipients and eligible low income individuals to and from jobs and activities related to their employment, including transportation projects that facilitate the provision of public transportation services from urbanized areas and rural areas to suburban employment locations?

☐ Yes. *The project may be eligible to receive Section 5307 JARC funds.*

☐ No. *The project is not eligible to receive Section 5307 JARC funds, but may be eligible to receive STA funds*

**For “transportation services” projects:** Is the project a JARC “development” or “maintenance” project, as defined by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA)? *Check one.*

*If one of the boxes below is checked, the project may be eligible to receive Section 5307 JARC funds.*

- ☐ **Development project** (New project that was not in service as of the date MAP-21 became effective October 1, 2012; includes projects that expand the service area or hours of operation for an existing service.)
- ☐ **Maintenance project** (Projects and services that received funding under the former FTA Section 5316 JARC program.)

**C. CIVIL RIGHTS**

1. **Civil Rights Policy:** The following question is not scored. If the response is satisfactory, the applicant is eligible for Lifeline funds; if the response is not satisfactory, the applicant is not eligible.

Describe the organization's policy regarding Civil Rights (based on Title VI of the Civil Rights Act) and for ensuring that benefits of the project are distributed equitably among low income and minority population groups in the project's service area.

2. **Demographic Information:** The following question is for administrative purposes only and is not a factor in determining which projects are selected to receive an award. (Please contact your Lifeline Program Administrator for assistance if you do not have this demographic information readily available, or visit <http://factfinder2.census.gov>)

Does the proportion of minority people in the project's service area exceed 58 percent (i.e., the regional average minority population)?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

**D. PROJECT NARRATIVE**

Please provide a narrative to describe the project addressing points #1-13 below:

**Project Need/Goals and Objectives**

1. Describe the unmet transportation need that the proposed project seeks to address and the relevant planning effort that documents the need. Describe how project activities will mitigate the transportation need. Describe the specific community this project will serve, and provide pertinent demographic data and/or maps.
2. What are the project's goals and objectives? Estimate the number of service units that will be provided (e.g., one-way trips, vehicle loans, bus shelters, persons trained). Estimate the number of low-income persons that will be served by this project per day, per quarter and/or per year (as applicable).

**Community-Identified Priority**

3. How does the project address a transportation gap and/or barrier identified in Community-Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) and/or other substantive local planning effort involving focused outreach to low-income populations? Indicate the name of the plan(s) and the page number where the relevant gap and/or barrier is identified. If applicable, indicate the priority given to the project in the plan. (For more information about CBTPs, visit <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/cbtp/>.)

How does the project address a gap and/or barrier identified in a countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plan, the Bay Area's 2013 Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan (Coordinated Plan), and/or other documented assessment of needs within designated communities of concern? Indicate the name of the plan(s) and the page number where the relevant need is identified. The Coordinated Plan is available at <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/pths/>.

Per the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines, Appendix 2 Evaluation Criteria, priority should be given to projects that directly address transportation gaps and/or barriers identified through a CBTP or other substantive local planning effort involving focused outreach to low-income populations; however, other projects may also be considered, such as those that address transportation needs identified in countywide or regional welfare-to-work transportation plans, the

## Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding Application

---

Coordinated Plan, or other documented assessment of needs within designated communities of concern.

4. Is the project located in the community in which the CBTP and/or other substantive local planning effort involving focused outreach to low-income populations was completed? If not, please include justification for applying the findings from the CBTP and/or other substantive local planning effort in another low-income area. For more information, visit <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/cbtp/> and <http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/snapshot/>.

A communities of concern (CoC) mapping tool showing both CoCs adopted with Plan Bay Area as well as the most recent socioeconomic data available from the Census Bureau is available at:

[http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive\\_Maps/cocs.html](http://gis.mtc.ca.gov/samples/Interactive_Maps/cocs.html). There is a user's guide available to aid in the use of this tool.

### Implementation Plan and Project Management Capacity

5. ***For operating projects:*** Provide an operational plan for delivering service, including a project schedule. For fixed route projects, include a route map.

***For capital projects:*** Provide an implementation plan for completing a capital project, including a project schedule with key milestones and estimated completion date.

6. Describe any proposed use of innovative approaches that will be employed for this project and their potential impact on project success.
7. Is the project ready to be implemented? What, if any, major issues need to be resolved prior to implementation? When are the outstanding issues expected to be resolved?
8. Describe and provide evidence of your organization's ability to provide and manage the proposed project. Identify previous experience in providing and coordinating transportation or related services for low-income persons. Describe key personnel assigned to this project, and their qualifications.
9. Indicate whether your organization has been or is a current recipient of state or federal transportation funding. If your organization has previously received Lifeline funding, please indicate project name and grant cycle and briefly describe project progress/outcomes including the most recent service utilization rate.

### Coordination and Program Outreach

10. Describe how the project will be coordinated with public and/or private transportation providers, social service agencies, and private non-profit organizations serving low-income populations.
11. Describe how project sponsor will continue to involve key stakeholders throughout the project. Describe plans to market the project, and ways to promote public awareness of the program.

## Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding Application

### Cost-Effectiveness and Performance Indicators

12. Demonstrate how the proposed project is the most appropriate way in which to address the identified transportation need. Identify performance measures to track the effectiveness of the project in meeting the identified goals. At a minimum, performance measures for service-related projects would include: documentation of new “units” of service provided with the funding (e.g., number of trips, service hours, workshops held, car loans provided), cost per unit of service (e.g., cost per trip), and a quantitative summary of service delivery procedures employed for the project. For capital-related projects, milestones and reports on the status of project delivery should be identified.
13. Describe a plan for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of the service, and steps to ensure that original goals are achieved.

### E. BUDGET

#### Project Budget/Sustainability

1. Provide a detailed line-item budget describing each cost item including start-up, administration, operating and capital expenses, and evaluation in the format provided below. If the project is a multi-year project, detailed budget information must be provided for all years. Please show all sources of revenue, including anticipated fare box revenue.

The budget should be in the following format:

REVENUE	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Lifeline Program Funds				\$ -
[Other Source of Funds]				\$ -
[Other Source of Funds]				\$ -
TOTAL REVENUE	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
EXPENDITURES <sup>1</sup>	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	TOTAL
Operating Expenses (list by category)				\$ -
Capital Expenses (list by category)				\$ -
[Other Expense Category]				\$ -
[Other Expense Category]				\$ -
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

<sup>1</sup> If the project includes indirect expenses, the applicant must have a federally approved indirect cost rate.

Clearly specify the source of the required matching funds. Include letter(s) of commitment from all agencies contributing towards the match. If the project is multi-year, please provide letters of commitment for all years.

2. Describe efforts to identify potential funding sources for sustaining the service beyond the grant period if needed.

## Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Funding Application

---

### F. STATE AND FEDERAL COMPLIANCE

By signing the application, the signator affirms that: 1) the statements contained in the application are true and complete to the best of their knowledge; and 2) the applicant is prepared to comply with any and all laws, statutes, ordinances, rules, regulations or requirements of the federal, state, or local government, and any agency thereof, which are related to or in any manner affect the performance of the proposed project, including, but not limited to, Transportation Development Act (TDA) statutes and regulations, 49 U.S.C. Section 5307, FTA Circular C 9030.1E, the most current FTA Master Agreement, and the most current Certifications and Assurances for FTA Assistance Programs.

For further information, see the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Guidelines (MTC Resolution No. 4159), available at [http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/lifeline/LTP4\\_guidelines.pdf](http://www.mtc.ca.gov/planning/lifeline/LTP4_guidelines.pdf)

---

Signature

---

Date

---

Printed Name



October 27, 2014  
NCTPA Agenda Item 7  
Continued From: NEW

**Action Requested: INFORMATION/ACTION**

## **NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY ATAC Agenda Letter**

---

**TO:** Active Transportation Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Diana Meehan, Associate Planner  
(707) 259-8327 / Email: [dmeehan@nctpa.net](mailto:dmeehan@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Complete Streets Checklist Procedure

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) review and approve the draft Complete Streets Checklist procedure.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Agencies applying for regional transportation funds must complete a Routine Accommodations Checklist to document how the needs of bicyclists *and* pedestrians were considered in the process of planning and/or designing the project for which funds are being requested. For projects that do not accommodate bicyclists *and* pedestrians, project sponsors must document a justification as to why it is not feasible to include complete streets elements. According to MTC Resolution 3765, the checklist is intended for use on projects at their earliest conception or design phase.

This guidance pertains to transportation projects that are funded with federal and state revenues administered by NCTPA that could in any way impact bicycle and/or pedestrian use, whether or not the proposed project is designed to accommodate either or both modes.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

MTC Resolution 3765 calls for all projects funded through MTC's programs and fund

---

sources to consider the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians in planning, design and construction. The resolution specifies that project sponsors complete the Routine Accommodations/Complete Streets Checklist when the project is submitted to MTC for funding. The checklist is intended for use on projects at their earliest conception or design phase so that any pedestrian or bicycle consideration is included in the project budget.

When projects are submitted to NCTPA for funding, it is the responsibility of the ATAC to review the submitted Routine Accommodations/Complete Streets Checklist along with the project application in accordance with MTC resolution 3765. Projects that do not include a Routine Accommodations/Complete Streets Checklist cannot be considered for funding.

See Attachment 1 for review procedures.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: (1) Draft Complete Streets Checklist Procedure

## **ROUTINE ACCOMMODATIONS/COMPLETE STREETS**

### Checklist Review Procedure

1. A standing item for review will be included in ATAC regular meetings.
2. NCTPA will ensure that local agencies have submitted completed checklists for projects whose funding is administered by NCTPA.
3. NCTPA will make complete checklists available for review by the Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC).
4. ATAC will provide feedback to project sponsors regarding any questions/concerns in the checklist, which will be relayed to project sponsors by NCTPA.
5. ATAC will ensure a timely review process.



October 27, 2014  
NCTPA Agenda Item 8  
Continued From: NEW

**Action Requested: INFORMATION/DISCUSSION**

## **NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY ATAC Agenda Letter**

---

**TO:** Active Transportation Advisory Committee  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Diana Meehan, Associate Planner  
(707) 259-8327 / Email: dmeehan@nctpa.net  
**SUBJECT:** Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign Update

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The Active Transportation Advisory Committee (ATAC) will receive an update on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Campaign.

### **DISCUSSION**

With increases in bicycle and pedestrian travel modes within the County, there has also been an increase in accidents and incidents involving bicyclists and pedestrians. The Napa Countywide Bicycle Plan identifies a Countywide Traffic Safety Campaign as a high priority project. The plan recommendation is to:

- Implement a coordinated Countywide Traffic Safety Campaign. The campaign should consist of a variety of multi-media activities designed to reach target audiences including motorists, adult bicyclists, recreational bicyclists, students, migrant workers, employers, etc.

NCTPA is currently beginning the process of creating a countywide pedestrian master plan. Much like the countywide bicycle plan, the pedestrian plan will include similar program components so that both plans can be combined to create an active transportation plan in Napa County. Pedestrian safety will also be included as part of a coordinated Countywide Traffic Safety Campaign.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? No

---

## **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

At the February 2014 ATAC meeting, staff presented a preliminary scope of work outline for the Safety Campaign and preliminary budget proposal. Committee members discussed the scope and decided that although the campaign should be inclusive of both bicycle and pedestrians, safety issues surrounding each are unique and the campaign should be put forward in a two-part approach. One designed towards bicycle safety and the other towards pedestrian safety.

One common point in the safety message was that all users, both motor and active have the same rights, same responsibilities and should use the same rules. Having law enforcement involved is considered key in creating an effective enforceable campaign.

Officer Anna Paulson attended the July 2014 ATAC meeting and discussed various safety issues relating to enforcement. She agreed to participate with the ATAC as an advisor on safety and enforcement issues and will periodically attend ATAC meetings beginning in January 2015.

Staff has investigated opportunities for grant funding for the safety campaign. Currently, the primary funding identified for the campaign is through the Office of Traffic Safety (OTS). Grants are typically administered by law enforcement agencies although other agencies are eligible for funding. Approximately \$70 million in funding is available on an annual basis and funds various types of safety programs. NCTPA could potentially partner with local law enforcement agencies for grant funding. See attachment (1) for list of previous grantees and amounts.

The program is on the Federal fiscal cycle, from October 1<sup>st</sup> through September 30<sup>th</sup>. Grants for the 2015 cycle are already funded. A call for 2016 applications will be issued by the end of November 2014, with applications due in January 2015. If selected, funding will be available beginning October 2015.

NCTPA staff will continue to monitor the OTS website for the 2016 call for projects. An initial grant from OTS could fund the launch of the media campaign, but to maintain an effective campaign, ongoing funding would be needed.

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: (1) OTS FY2014 Grants

<b>2014 TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS*</b> <b>By Region</b>		
<b>STATEWIDE &amp; MULTI-REGIONAL</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control	Minor Decoy/Shoulder Tap, TRACE, IMPACT/ROSTF and Trapdoor	\$1,500,000.00
California Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control	CREED/MADD	\$670,331.00
California Department of Motor Vehicles	DUI Hot List Expansion and Monitoring Project	\$87,605.00
California Department of Motor Vehicles	Investigating the relationship between marijuana, alcohol, and other drugs and crash-related risky driving behaviors	\$90,000.00
California Department of Motor Vehicles	Using Identification Card Readers to Identify Drivers Under Suspension/Revocation in Real Time at DUI/License Checkpoints	\$83,000.00
California Department of Motor Vehicles	An Examination of California's Distracted Drivers	\$66,869.00
California Department of Motor Vehicles	Development of Alcohol Intervention Letters Based on the Transtheoretical Model of Behavior Change in California's Negligent Operator Treatment System	\$30,000.00
California Department of Public Health	Vehicle Occupant Safety Program	\$353,000.00
California Department of Public Health	California Pedestrian Safety Program	\$600,000.00
California Department of Public Health	Crash Medical Outcomes Data Project	\$569,857.00
California Emergency Medical Services Authority	California EMS Data System Transformation to National EMS Data System	\$245,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Teen Choices 6	\$1,900,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Warrant Service Team Effort (WaSTE) IV	\$350,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Alcohol Enforcement, Reduction, and Traffic Safety (ALERTS)	\$6,000,000.00

California Highway Patrol	Area-wide Impaired Driving Collision Reduction Effort	\$599,957.00
California Highway Patrol	Teen Distracted Drivers Education and Enforcement (TDDEE) III	\$1,028,987.00
California Highway Patrol	Adult Distracted Drivers IV	\$400,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Drug Recognition Evaluator (DRE) Program 2014	\$1,500,000.00
California Highway Patrol	California Motorcycle Safety Enforcement and Education III	\$1,050,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Yreka Occupant Restraint	\$75,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Vehicle Occupant Restraint Education and Instruction III	\$1,130,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Statewide Pedestrian and Bicyclist Enforcement and Education Project	\$400,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Grant Administration Program (GAP) 2014	\$401,796.00
California Highway Patrol	Start Smart Teen Driver Safety Education Program VI	\$399,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Keeping Everyone Safe (KEYS) V	\$200,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Reduce Aggressive Driving Incidents and Tactically Enforce Speed (RADIATES) II	\$4,000,000.00
California Highway Patrol	Focused High-Collision Reduction	\$600,000.00
California Polytechnic State University, Pomona	Investigation on Causal Factors for Motorcycle-Related Crashes in CA	\$99,999.00
California State University, Fresno	Restraint Usage Surveys 2013-2014	\$272,759.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	Teens in the Driver Seat	\$300,000.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	Comprehensive Motorcycle Safety Project	\$226,970.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	Pedestrian, Bicycling, and Traffic Safety Assessments	\$515,000.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	SafeTREC IX	\$1,297,000.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	Integration, outreach and improvements to TIMS and CATSIP websites	\$276,000.00
University of California, Irvine	California College DUI Awareness Project	\$642,468.00
University of California, San Diego	Worksite Course to Reduce Cell Phone Distracted Driving	\$144,937.00
Regents of the University of California, Berkeley Campus	Sobriety Checkpoint Program - 2014	\$14,528,811.00
University of California, San Diego	Training Professionals to Promote Older Driver Safety	\$339,997.00

## NORTHERN CALIFORNIA

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Butte County	Kids In Safe Seats	\$79,800.00
Davis	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$124,500.00
Dunsmuir	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$200,000.00
Eureka	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$96,600.00
Fortuna Police Department	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$65,000.00
Glenn County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$139,727.00
Lake County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$240,241.00
Marysville	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$67,750.00
Marysville	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$74,000.00
Mendocino County	Walk and Pedal in Fine Fettle Project	\$100,000.00
Orland	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$48,715.00
Paradise	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$89,000.00
Red Bluff	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$131,825.00
Redding	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$101,000.00
Redding	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$220,000.00
Shasta County	Teens Drive Safe in Shasta	\$131,050.00
Shasta County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$258,910.00
Siskiyou County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$40,000.00
West Sacramento	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$106,260.00
Yolo County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$233,295.00
Yuba City	Families Travel Safe Program	\$153,000.00
Yuba City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$47,000.00

## NORTH BAY AREA

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Albany	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$49,160.00

Concord	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$200,000.00
Contra Costa County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$135,500.00
Contra Costa County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$162,000.00
Dublin	Automated GIS-Based Collision Analysis and Tracking System	\$32,380.00
Fairfield	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$125,000.00
Hayward	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$223,100.00
Hayward	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$100,000.00
Marin County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$286,378.00
Napa	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$124,000.00
Napa	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$90,950.00
Napa County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$277,600.00
Oakland	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$300,000.00
Oakland	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$175,000.00
Petaluma	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$350,000.00
Petaluma	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$253,000.00
Pittsburg	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$50,000.00
Rohnert Park	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$249,495.00
San Pablo	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$50,450.00
San Rafael	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$175,500.00
San Rafael	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$73,000.00
San Ramon	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$36,000.00
Santa Rosa	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$290,000.00
Sebastopol	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$48,000.00

Solano County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$122,000.00
Solano County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution and Enhanced Forensic Toxicology Program	\$932,000.00
Sonoma	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$70,000.00
Sonoma County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$403,702.00
Suisun City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$83,793.00
Vallejo	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$220,000.00
Vallejo	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$80,000.00
Windsor	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$150,000.00

## SACRAMENTO VALLEY/HIGH SIERRA

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Auburn	DUI Avoid Campaign	\$110,000.00
Calaveras County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$174,310.00
Citrus Heights	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$163,300.00
El Dorado County	Avoid DUI Program	\$90,000.00
El Dorado County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$306,982.00
Elk Grove	Safety Training and Response for the Disabled	\$127,300.00
Elk Grove	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$120,000.00
Folsom	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$230,000.00
Folsom	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$155,000.00
French Camp McKinley Fire District	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$250,000.00
Lodi	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$89,350.00
Placer County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$69,136.00
Rancho Cordova	Selecting Traffic Enforcement and Multilingual Child Passenger Safety Program	\$280,300.00

Sacramento	Traffic Safety and Education Program	\$169,155.00
Sacramento	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$1,008,680.00
Sacramento County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$400,000.00
Sacramento County	Enhanced Identification of Impairing Substances in DUI Drug Cases for California Law Enforcement	\$736,799.00
Sacramento County	Traffic Safety Resource Prosecutor	\$1,085,339.00
Sacramento County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$1,166,889.00
San Joaquin County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$145,000.00
San Joaquin County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$402,516.00
San Joaquin County Superior Court	San Joaquin County DUI Court Program	\$607,052.00
South Lake Tahoe	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$33,200.00
Stockton	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$300,000.00
Stockton	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$305,165.00
Tracy	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$69,731.00
<b>SOUTH BAY/MONTEREY</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Burlingame	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$258,000.00
Capitola	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$80,000.00
Capitola	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$51,368.00
Daly City	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$200,000.00
Daly City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$59,168.00
Gilroy	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$30,828.00
Hollister	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$39,440.00
Menlo Park	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$52,584.00
Monterey County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$421,000.00

Pacifica	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$49,170.00
Redwood City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$55,000.00
Salinas	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$212,787.00
Salinas	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$100,000.00
San Francisco City	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$100,000.00
San Francisco City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$45,000.00
San Jose	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$245,222.00
San Mateo	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$54,172.00
Santa Clara County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$179,470.00
Santa Clara County	Countywide Traffic Safety Education	\$200,000.00
Santa Cruz County	End Distracted Driving: Traffic Safety Education Project	\$150,000.00
South San Francisco	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$99,215.00
Sunnyvale	BE AWARE - PED & BICYCLIST ROADWAY Safety	\$50,000.00

## CENTRAL CALIFORNIA

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Ceres	Avoid DUI Program	\$157,000.00
Ceres	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$48,425.00
Clovis	Avoid DUI Program	\$257,437.00
Clovis	Traffic Safety and Education Program	\$46,156.00
Clovis	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$45,917.00
Fresno	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$371,919.00
Fresno County	Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$159,108.00
Fresno County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$641,546.00
Kings County	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$95,000.00
Livingston	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$45,000.00
Madera	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$93,000.00

Madera County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$145,340.00
Merced	Avoid DUI Program	\$99,563.00
Merced	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$40,378.00
Merced County	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$100,000.00
Modesto	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$179,515.00
Oakdale	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$20,173.00
Riverbank	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$33,682.00
Riverbank	Traffic Collision Database Analysis and Mapping System	\$4,400.00
Stanislaus County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$346,967.00
Stanislaus County	Traffic Collision Database Analysis and Mapping System	\$45,900.00
Tulare	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$77,882.00
Tulare County	The Big Picture: Reducing Youth Alcohol Access to Increase Traffic Safety	\$270,000.00
Visalia	Avoid DUI Program	\$204,000.00
Visalia	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$164,000.00

## CENTRAL COAST

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Lompoc	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$81,000.00
Oxnard	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$175,000.00
Oxnard	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$177,357.00
San Luis Obispo	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$130,000.00
San Luis Obispo County	Portable Evidential Breath Test Program (PEBT)	\$226,309.00
San Luis Obispo County	Traffic Safety Injury Prevention Program	\$185,790.00
Santa Barbara	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$86,100.00
Santa Barbara County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$120,000.00
Santa Barbara County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$130,000.00

Santa Maria	Regional Collision Response and Extrication Improvement Program	\$200,000.00
Santa Maria	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$140,000.00
Thousand Oaks	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$133,400.00
Ventura	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$66,122.00
Ventura County	Improved Technology for DUID Cases Grant	\$355,500.00
Ventura County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$362,065.00

## LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Agency	Grant Title	Amount
Alhambra	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$85,000.00
Arcadia	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$43,000.00
Azusa	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$47,000.00
Bell	Traffic Collision Database Analysis and Mapping System	\$45,000.00
El Monte	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$80,000.00
Gardena	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$600,000.00
Gardena	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$125,000.00
Glendale	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$228,000.00
Glendora	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$600,000.00
Glendora	Cell Phone Policy Development and Education for Employers	\$100,000.00
Glendora	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$60,000.00
Hawthorne	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$130,000.00
Long Beach	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$203,000.00
Los Angeles	Impaired Driving Vertical Prosecution Grant	\$527,502.00
Los Angeles	Child Passenger Safety Program	\$450,000.00
Los Angeles	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$1,500,000.00

Los Angeles County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$265,872.00
Los Angeles County	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$1,100,000.00
Monrovia	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$55,000.00
Monterey Park	Senior Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety	\$90,000.00
Pasadena	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$175,000.00
Pomona	Protecting Child Passengers in Pomona and California	\$140,135.00
Pomona	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$130,000.00
Redondo Beach	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$90,000.00
Santa Monica	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$140,000.00
Signal Hill	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$75,400.00
Southern California Regional Rail Authority	Public Safety Awareness on Railroad Campaign	\$61,325.00
Whittier	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$93,000.00
<b>ORANGE COUNTY</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Anaheim	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$299,392.00
Anaheim	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$151,950.00
Costa Mesa	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$74,523.00
Fountain Valley	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$55,300.00
Fullerton	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$165,212.00
Garden Grove	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$88,000.00
Huntington Beach	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$270,264.00
Irvine	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$111,956.00
La Habra	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$70,877.00
Laguna Beach	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$51,253.00

Newport Beach	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$282,910.00
Orange	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$124,900.00
Orange County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$215,000.00
Orange County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$521,060.00
Orange County	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$163,000.00
Placentia	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$65,070.00
Santa Ana	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$201,300.00
Tustin	Traffic Collision Database Analysis and Mapping System	\$29,704.00
<b>INLAND EMPIRE</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Bakersfield	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$195,000.00
Bakersfield	A Life Interrupted	\$43,942.00
Bakersfield	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$205,569.00
Corona	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$18,000.00
Fontana	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$165,985.00
Hemet	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$96,337.00
Indian Wells	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$25,000.00
Kern County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$153,092.00
Kern County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$479,272.00
Menifee	Personnel overtime and traffic-related equipment for enforcement and compliance	\$100,000.00
Moreno Valley	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$125,000.00
Murrieta	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$100,000.00
Norco	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$85,000.00

Ontario	Alcohol Multi-Agency Task Force Operation	\$117,500.00
Ontario	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$307,197.00
Ontario	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$300,000.00
Palm Desert	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$67,588.00
Palm Springs	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$92,170.00
Rancho Mirage	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$22,000.00
Redlands	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$71,443.00
Rialto	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$159,804.00
Ridgecrest	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$99,670.00
Riverside	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$439,388.00
Riverside	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$187,000.00
Riverside County	Alcohol Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$375,287.00
Riverside County	Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$762,881.00
Riverside County	Riverside County Car Seat Education and Encouragement Expansion Program	\$214,854.00
San Bernardino	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$256,942.00
San Bernardino County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$481,673.00
San Bernardino County	Alcohol and Drug Impaired Driver Vertical Prosecution Program	\$347,030.00
San Jacinto	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$75,000.00
Upland	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$47,142.00
Wildomar	Traffic Collision Database Analysis and Mapping System	\$45,000.00
<b>SAN DIEGO/BORDER</b>		
<b>Agency</b>	<b>Grant Title</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Chula Vista	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$293,000.00

El Cajon	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$85,570.00
Escondido	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$106,110.00
Imperial Beach	Be Safe, Imperial Beach! A Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Education Project and Awareness Campaign	\$40,000.00
National City	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$128,778.00
Oceanside	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$111,128.00
San Diego	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$401,500.00
San Diego County	Avoid DUI Campaign	\$300,000.00
San Diego County	Intensive Probation Supervision for High-Risk Felony and Repeat DUI Offenders	\$500,000.00
San Diego County	Keep 'Em Safe	\$245,500.00
San Diego County	Selective Traffic Enforcement Program	\$152,910.00
Grants as of 6/24/2013		