



**Technical Advisory Committee  
(TAC)**

**AGENDA**

**MEETING**

**Thursday, November 6, 2014  
2:00 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 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) which are provided to a majority or all of the members of the TAC by TAC 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 TAC, 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 TAC at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the TAC 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 TAC on any item at the time the TAC 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 TAC Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the TAC 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 – TAC or go to <http://www.nctpa.net/technical-advisory-committee-tac>.*

## ITEMS

1. Call to Order
2. Introductions
3. Public Comments
4. TAC Member and Staff Comments
5. Standing:
  - 5.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report
  - 5.2 Project Monitoring Funding Programs (*Pages 4-18*)
  - 5.3 Transit Report (*VINE Ridership*) (*Page 19*)
  - 5.4 Vine Trail Report
6. Caltrans Report\*

**Note: Where times are indicated for agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.**

<b>7.</b>	<b><u>CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS (7.1)</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u></b>
	7.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes of October 2, 2014 (Renee Kulick) ( <i>Pages 20-24</i> )	APPROVE	2:20 PM

<b>8.</b>	<b><u>REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS (8.1-8.7)</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u></b>
	8.1 Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) Project and Program List (Danielle Schmitz) ( <i>Pages 25-37</i> )	INFORMATION/ ACTION	2:25 PM

TAC will review the Napa Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) Draft Project and Program Lists and discuss creating an ad-hoc committee to review potential revenue sources.

	8.2 Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Call for Projects (Diana Meehan) ( <i>Pages 38-74</i> )	INFORMATION	2:45 PM
--	---	-------------	---------

TAC will review the Lifeline Transportation Program Cycle 4 Call for Projects guidelines.

	8.3 Senate Bill (SB) 743 Draft CEQA Guideline Changes Update (Alberto Esqueda) ( <i>Pages 75-79</i> )	INFORMATION	3:00 PM
--	---	-------------	---------

TAC will review and comment on the draft NCTPA comment letter to be

submitted to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR).

- |     |   |             |         |
|-----|---|-------------|---------|
| 8.4 | Cap and Trade Program Update<br>(Danielle Schmitz) <i>(Pages 80-84)</i> | INFORMATION | 3:15 PM |
|-----|---|-------------|---------|

TAC will receive a Cap and Trade update on the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Draft Program Guidelines.

- |     |   |                            |         |
|-----|---|----------------------------|---------|
| 8.5 | Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix* (Kate Miller) | INFORMATION/<br>DISCUSSION | 3:30 PM |
|-----|---|----------------------------|---------|

Staff will provide TAC with the latest Federal and State legislative update.\*

- |     |   |             |         |
|-----|---|-------------|---------|
| 8.6 | NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for November 19, 2014 (Kate Miller)<br><i>(Pages 85-92)</i> | INFORMATION | 3:45 PM |
|-----|---|-------------|---------|

Preview draft version of the NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for November 19, 2014.

- |     |                        |            |         |
|-----|------------------------|------------|---------|
| 8.7 | Topics of Next Meeting | DISCUSSION | 3:55 PM |
|-----|------------------------|------------|---------|

Discussion of topics for next meeting by TAC members.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

Approval of next Regular Meeting date of December 4, 2014 and Adjournment

<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u></b>
APPROVE	4:00 PM

Inactive Obligations  
Local, State Administered/Locally Funded and Rail Projects

November 6, 2014

TAC Agenda Item 5.2

Continued From: NEW

ACTION REQUESTED: INFORMATION

Updated on  
10/23/2014

Project No (newly added projects highlighted in GREEN)	Status	Agency/District Action Required	State Project No	Prefix	District	County	Agency	RTPA	MPO
5042038	Inactive	Deobligation Process Initiated	'04924015L'	BRLS	4	NAP	Napa	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
5042056	Future	Invoice returned to agency. Resubmit to District by 02/20/2015	'0414000334L'	STPL	4	NAP	Napa	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
5921010	Future	Submit invoice to District by 02/20/2015	'04928133L'	BRLO	4	NAP	Napa County	Metropolitan Transportation Commission	Metropolitan Transportation Commission

Inactive Obligations  
Local, State Administered/Locally Funded and Rail Projects

November 6, 2014

TAC Agenda Item 5.2

Continued From: NEW

Updated on  
10/23/2014

ACTION REQUESTED: INFORMATION

Project No (newly added projects highlighted in GREEN)	Description	Latest Date	Authorization Date	Last Expenditure Date	Last Action Date	Program Codes	Total Cost	Federal Funds	Expenditure Amt	Unexpended Bal
5042038	FIRST ST OVER NAPA RIVER BRIDGE 21C-0095 . , BRDG REPLACEMENT	8/1/2013	12/13/2002	8/1/2013	8/1/2013	Q120,Q100,L1C0,H1C0, H120	15,244,910.00	13,340,362.00	13,026,357.10	314,004.90
5042056	CITY OF NAPA, PDA IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	2/20/2014	2/20/2014		2/20/2014	M240	311,000.00	275,000.00	0	275,000.00
5921010	04-NAP-O-CR, OAKVILLE CROSS RD AT NAPA RIVER, BRIDGE REPLACEMENT, BR.NO. 21C	3/13/2014	7/30/1996	3/13/2014	3/13/2014	Q110,L11E,H110,1170	905,000.00	548,000.00	535,409.61	12,590.39

Federal At Risk Report  
 Federally-Funded Locally-Sponsored Napa County Projects

Status Date: November 2014

**Red Zone Projects**

Index	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title						
	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone
<b>1</b>	<b>NAP110006</b>	<b>American Canyon</b>	<b>American Canyon PDA Development Plan</b>						
	STP	\$318	PE	13/14	Submit invoice to Caltrans	10/7/2014	Y		R
	PDA - STP	\$475	PE	13/14	Submit invoice to Caltrans	10/7/2014	Y		R
<b>2</b>	<b>NAP110014</b>	<b>NCTPA</b>	<b>Napa Vine Trail Design and Construction - various locations</b>						
	TCSP	\$800	PE	11/12	Submit invoice	1/26/14	Y	Field Review signed off and complete	
	Other local	\$228	PE	13/14		9/30/13	Y	Admin modification to existing obligation	
	CMAQ	\$211	PE	11/12	Submit invoice	1/26/14	Y		
	TCSP	\$120	ROW	13/14	Request authorization	6/1/14	Y	Obligate funds by September 2014	G
	Other local	\$211	CON	13/14		2/1/14			
	TCSP	\$1,580	CON	13/14	Request authorization	6/1/14	R	Obligate funds by September 2014	Y
	RTP-LRP	\$2,000	CON	15/16		2/1/16	G	Programming placeholder	
	ATP	\$3,600	CON	15/16	Request authorization	2/1/15	G		
<b>3</b>	<b>NAP130010</b>	<b>Napa County</b>	<b>Silverado Trail Yountville-Napa Safety</b>						
	STP	\$143	CON	14/15	Request authorization	11/1/14	N/A	Re	

Federal At Risk Report  
 Federally-Funded Locally-Sponsored Napa County Projects

Status Date: November 2014

**Yellow Zone Projects Continued**

Index	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone
<b>3</b>	<b>NAP110013</b>	<b>Napa</b>	<b>North/South Bike Connection</b>									
		CMAQ		\$300	CON	13/14	Submit invoice	9/10/14	Y	E76 Obligation received		R
		CMAQ		\$160	CON	13/14	Submit invoice	9/10/14	Y	E76 Obligation received		R
		CMAQ		\$40	PE	11/12	Invoice paid 7/23/12		G	NEPA clearance obtained; finishing up design work		
<b>4</b>	<b>NAP130002</b>	<b>NCTPA</b>	<b>Napa County SRTS Program</b>									
		CMAQ		\$420	PE	13/14	Submit invoice	09/17/14	G	OA received		
<b>5</b>	<b>NAP130001</b>	<b>City of Napa</b>	<b>PDA Planning Program Funds</b>									
		STP		\$275	PE	13/14	Submit invoice	02/20/15	G	Need Supplemental Agreement signed; OA received		
<b>6</b>	<b>NAP110009</b>	<b>Napa County</b>	<b>Silverado Trail Paving Phase F</b>									
		STP		\$526	Con	11/12	Invoice to Caltrans		Y	Closeout in process		
		STP-FAS		\$312	Con	11/12						
<b>7</b>	<b>NAP110007</b>	<b>American Canyon</b>	<b>Theresa Ave Sidewalk Phase III</b>									
		CMAQ		\$200	CON	13/14	Submit invoice	10/14/14	Y	E76 received - going out for bid		R

Page 3 of 4

Yellow Zone Projects									
Index	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title						
		Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Prev Zone
8	NAP110019	Napa County	Napa County Road Rehab - Various						
	STP-FAS		\$1,114	Con	11/12	invoice to Caltrans		Y	closeout in process



## Federally-Funded Locally-Sponsored Napa County Projects

**Green Zone Projects**

Inde	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title						
	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone
<b>9</b>	<b>NAP110028</b>	<b>City of Napa</b>	<b>California Blvd. Roundabouts</b>						
	CMAQ	\$1,740	CON	16/17	request obligation	11/1/16	G	Project also has STIP funds	
	CMAQ	\$723	ROW	14/15	request obligation	02/01/15	Y	project aslo has \$431 in STIP ROW funds	
	RIP-T4-FED	\$431	ROW	14/15	request extension	03/01/15	Y	STIP funds for ROW need an extension if not authorized by 7/1/15	
	RIP-T4-FED	\$1,070	CON	16/17	request obligation	11/01/16	G		
<b>10</b>	<b>NAP110023</b>	<b>County of Napa</b>	<b>Silverado Trail Phase H Rehab</b>						
		\$890	CON	15/16			G		
		\$794	CON	15/16			G		

Notes:

**Appendix A****Federal At Risk Report Zone Criteria****Required Activities per Resolution 3606 (Revised July 23, 2008)**

<b>Required Activities Monitored by CMA<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Criteria Timeframes for Required Activities</b>		
	<b>Red Zone</b>	<b>Yellow Zone</b>	<b>Green Zone</b>
Request Project Field Review	Project in TIP for more than nine (9) months, or obligation deadline for Con funds within 15 months.	Project in TIP for less than nine (9) months, and obligation deadline for Con funds more than 15 months away.	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Submit Environmental Package	NA	NA	NA
Approved DBE Program and Methodology	NA	NA	NA
Submit Request for Authorization (PE)	within three (3) months	within three (3) to six (6) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Submit Request for Authorization (R/W)	within four (4) months	within four (4) to nine (9) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Submit Request for Authorization (Con)	within six (6) months	within six (6) to nine (9) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Obligation/ FTA Transfer	within two (2) months	within two (2) to four (4) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Advertise Construction	within four (4) months	within four (4) to six (6) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Award Contract	within six (6) months	within six (6) to nine (9) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Award into FTA Grant	within two (2) months	within two (2) to four (4) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Submit First Invoice	within two (2) months	within two (2) to four (4) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Liquidate Funds	within four (4) months	within four (4) to nine (9) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones Move to Appendix D
Project Closeout	within four (4) months	within four (4) to nine (9) months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones

**Other Zone Criteria**

<b>Red Zone</b>	Projects with funds programmed in the same FY for both a project development phase (i.e. Env or PSE) and a capital phase (i.e. R/W or Con) without the project development phase(s) obligated.
<b>Yellow Zone</b>	Projects with an Amendment to the TIP pending.

**Notes:** <sup>1</sup> See Appendix B for more information about the Required Activities and Resolution 3606.

**Appendix B**  
**Definitions of the Required Activities per Resolution 3606 (As revised January 22, 2014)**

Index	Definition	Deadline
<b>1</b>	<b>Req Proj Field Rev</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "Implementing agencies are to request a field review from Caltrans Local Assistance within twelve months of approval of the project in the TIP, but no less than twelve months prior to the obligation deadline of construction funds. This policy also applies to federal-aid projects in the STIP. The requirement does not apply to projects for which a field review would not be applicable, such as FTA transfers, regional operations projects and planning activities, or if a field review is otherwise not required by Caltrans. It is expected that Caltrans will conduct the review within 60 calendar days of the request. Failure for an implementing agency to make a good-faith effort in requesting and scheduling a field review from Caltrans Local Assistance within twelve months of programming into the TIP (but no less than twelve months prior to the obligation deadline) could result in the funding being reprogrammed and restrictions on future programming and obligations. Completed field review forms (if required) must be submitted to Caltrans in accordance with Caltrans Local Assistance procedures."	12 months from approval in the TIP <sup>1</sup> , but no less than 12 months prior to the obligation deadline of construction funds.
<b>2</b>	<b>Sub ENV package</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "Implementing agencies are required to submit a complete environmental package to Caltrans for all projects (except those determined Programmatic Categorical Exclusion as determined by Caltrans at the field review), twelve months prior to the obligation deadline for right of way or construction funds. This policy creates a more realistic time frame for projects to progress from the field review through the environmental and design process, to the right of way and construction phase. If the environmental process, as determined at the field review, will take longer than 12 months before obligation, the implementing agency is responsible for delivering the complete environmental submittal in a timely manner. Failure to comply with this provision could result in the funding being reprogrammed. The requirement does not apply to FTA transfers, regional operations projects or planning activities."	12 months prior to the obligation deadline for RW or Con funds. (No change)
<b>3</b>	<b>Sub Req for Auth</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "In order to ensure funds are obligated or transferred to FTA in a timely manner, the implementing agency is required to deliver a complete, funding obligation / FTA Transfer Request for Authorization (RFA) package to Caltrans Local Assistance by November 1 of the fiscal year the funds are listed in the TIP. The RFA package is to include the CTC allocation request documentation for CTC administered funds such as STIP and state-TAP funded projects as applicable. Projects with complete packages delivered by November 1 of the TIP program year will have priority for available OA, after ACA conversions that are included in the Obligation Plan. If the project is delivered after November 1 of the TIP program year, the funds will not be the highest priority for obligation in the event of OA limitations, and will compete for limited OA with projects advanced from future years. Funding for which an obligation/ FTA transfer request is submitted after the November 1 deadline will lose its priority for OA, and be viewed as subject to reprogramming."	November 1 of FY in which funds are programmed in the TIP.
<b>4</b>	<b>Obligate Funds/ Transfer to FTA</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "MTC Regional Discretionary Funding is subject to a regional obligation/ authorization/ FTA transfer deadline of January 31 of the fiscal year the funds are programmed in the TIP. Implementing agencies are required to submit the completed request for obligation/ authorization or FTA transfer to Caltrans Local Assistance by November 1 of the fiscal year the funds are programmed in the TIP, and receive an obligation/authorization/ FTA transfer of the funds by January 31 of the fiscal year programmed in the TIP. For example, projects programmed in FY 2014-15 of the TIP have a request for authorization/ obligation/ FTA transfer submittal deadline (to Caltrans Local Assistance) of November 1, 2014 and an obligation/ authorization/FTA transfer deadline of January 31, 2015. No extensions will be granted to the obligation deadline."	For submittal of request for obligation /authorization or FTA transfer November 1 of FY in which funds are programmed in the TIP. For obligation/ FTA transfer January 31 of FY in which funds are programmed in the TIP.

**Appendix B**  
**Definitions of the Required Activities per Resolution 3606 (As revised January, 2014)**

Index	Definition	Deadline
<b>5</b>	<b>Execute PSA</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606, "The implementing agency must execute and return the Program Supplement Agreement (PSA) to Caltrans in accordance with Caltrans Local Assistance procedures. It is expected that Caltrans will initiate the PSA within 30 days of obligation. The agency should contact Caltrans if the PSA is not received from Caltrans within 30 days of the obligation. This requirement does not apply to FTA transfers. Agencies that do not execute and return the PSA to Caltrans within the required Caltrans deadline will be unable to obtain future approvals for any projects, including obligation and payments, until all PSAs for that agency, regardless of fund source, meet the PSA execution requirement. Funds for projects that do not have an executed PSA within the required Caltrans deadline are subject to de-obligation by Caltrans."	Within 30 days of receipt of the PSA from Caltrans, and within six months from the actual obligation date. <sup>2</sup>
<b>6</b>	<b>Advertise Contract /Award Contract/Award into FTA Grant</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "For the Construction (CON) phase, the construction/equipment purchase contract must be advertised within 3 months and awarded within 6 months of obligation / E-76 Authorization (or awarded within 6 months of allocation by the CTC for funds administered by the CTC). However, regardless of the award deadline, agencies must still meet the invoicing deadline for construction funds. Failure to advertise and award a contract in a timely manner could result in missing the subsequent invoicing and reimbursement deadline, resulting in the loss of funding. Agencies must submit the complete award package immediately after contract award and prior to submitting the first invoice to Caltrans in accordance with Caltrans Local Assistance procedures. Agencies with projects that do not meet these award deadlines will have future programming and OA restricted until their projects are brought into compliance (CTCadministered construction funds lapse if not awarded within 6 months). For FTA projects, funds must be approved/awarded in an FTA Grant within one federal fiscal year following the federal fiscal year in which the funds were transferred to FTA."	Advertised within 3 months of obligation and awarded within 6 months of obligation.  <b>FTA Grant Award:</b> Within 1 year of transfer to FTA.
<b>7</b>	<b>Submit First Invoice / Next Invoice Due</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "Funds for each federally funded (Environmental (ENV/ PA&ED), There is no guarantee that funds will be available to the project once de-obligated. If a project does not have eligible expenses within a 6-month period, the agency must provide a written explanation to Caltrans Local Assistance for that six-month period and submit an invoice as soon as practicable to avoid missing the 12-month invoicing and reimbursement deadline. Agencies with projects that have not been invoiced against and reimbursed within a 12-month period, regardless of federal fund source, will have restrictions placed on future programming and OA until the project is properly invoiced. Funds that are not invoiced and reimbursed against at least once every 12 months are subject to de-obligation by FHWA."	<b>For Con phase:</b> Once <b>For all other phases:</b> Once within 6 months following Obligation and then once every 6 months thereafter, for each phase and federal program code.
<b>7a</b>	<b>Inactive Projects</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "Caltrans requires administering agencies to submit invoices at least once every 6 months from the time of obligation (E-76 authorization). Projects that have not received a reimbursement of federal funds in the previous 12 months are considered inactive with the remaining un-reimbursed funds subject to de-obligation by FHWA with no guarantee the funds are available to the project sponsor. To ensure funds are not lost in the region, regional deadlines have been established in advance of federal deadlines. Project Sponsors must submit a valid invoice to Caltrans Local Assistance at least once every 6 months and receive a reimbursement at least once every 9 months, but should not submit an invoice more than quarterly. Agencies with projects that have not been invoiced against at least once in the previous 6 months or have not received a reimbursement within the previous 9 months have missed the invoicing/reimbursement deadlines and are subject to restrictions placed on future regional discretionary funds and the programming of additional federal funds in the federal TIP until the project receives a reimbursement."	Funds must be invoiced against at least once every 6 months to remain active.

**Appendix B**  
**Definitions of the Required Activities per Resolution 3606 (As revised January 22, 2014)**

Index	Definition	Deadline
<b>8</b>	<b>Liquidate Funds</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "California Government Codes 16304.1 and 16304.3 places additional restrictions on the liquidation of federal funds. Generally, federal funds must be liquidated (fully expended, invoiced and reimbursed) within 4 state fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the funds were appropriated. CTC-administered funds must be expended within 2 state fiscal years following the fiscal year in which the funds were allocated. Funds that miss the state's liquidation/ reimbursement deadline will lose State Budget Authority and will be de-obligated if not re-appropriated by the State Legislature, or extended in a Cooperative Work Agreement (CWA) with the California Department of Finance. CTC-administered funds must also be extended by the CTC. This requirement does not apply to FTA transfers."	Federal funds must be liquidated within four years of obligation. CTC administered funds must be liquidated within 2 year of obligation.
<b>9</b>	<b>Estimated Completion Date/Project Closeout</b>	
	Per MTC Resolution 3606-Revised, "Implementing Agencies must fully expend federal funds on a phase one year prior to the estimated completion date provided to Caltrans. At the time of obligation (E-76 authorization) the implementing agency must provide Caltrans with an estimated completion date for that project phase. Any unreimbursed federal funding remaining on the phase after the estimated completion date has passed, is subject to project funding adjustments by FHWA. Implementing agencies must submit to Caltrans the Final Report of Expenditures within six months of project completion. Projects must proceed to right of way acquisition or construction within 10 years of federal authorization of the initial phase. Federal regulations require that federally funded projects proceed to construction or right of way acquisition within 10 years of initial federal authorization of any phase of the project. Furthermore, if a project is canceled, or fails to proceed to construction or right of way acquisition in 10 years, FHWA will de-obligate any remaining funds, and the agency may be required to repay any reimbursed funds. If a project is canceled as a result of the environmental process, the agency may not be required to repay reimbursed costs for the environmental activities. However, if a project is canceled after the environmental process is complete, or a project does not proceed to right of way acquisition or construction within 10 years, the agency is required to repay all reimbursed federal funds. Agencies with projects that have not been closed out within 6 months of final invoice will have future programming and OA restricted until the project is closed out or brought back to good standing by providing written explanation to Caltrans Local Assistance, the applicable CMA and MTC. Note that funds managed and allocated by the CTC may have different and more stringent funding deadlines. A CTC allocated-project must fully expend those funds within 36 months of the CTC funding allocation."	<p><b>Est. Completion Date:</b>            For each phase, fully expend federal funds 1 year prior to date provided to Caltrans.</p> <p><b>Project Close-out:</b>            Within 6 months of final project invoice.</p>

**Notes:**

- <sup>1</sup> Approval in the TIP: For administrative/ minor TIP Amendments it is the date of Caltrans approval. For formal TIP Amendments, it is the date of FHWA approval.
- <sup>2</sup> Per DOT letter from Caltrans Local Assistance to MPOs, regarding "Procedural Changes in Managing Obligations", dated 9/15/05.

## STIP At Risk Report

Status Date: November 2014

## 2014 STIP Locally-Sponsored Napa County Projects

**2010 STIP -Timely Use of Funds Provisions**

The Timely Use of Funds and At Risk reports monitor the STIP Timely Use of Funds Provisions included in the current STIP Guidelines as adopted by the CTC. The current Timely Use of Funds Provisions are as follows:

<b>Required Activity</b>	<b>Timely Use of Funds Provision</b>
Allocation	For all phases, by the end (June 30th) of the fiscal year identified in the STIP.
Construction Contract Award <sup>1</sup>	Within six (6) months of allocation.
Accept Contract (Construction)	Within 36 months of contract award.
Complete Expenditures	For Env, PSE, & R/W funds, costs must be expended by the end of the second FY following the FY in which the funds were allocated.
Final Invoice/Project Completion (Final Report of Expenditures)	For Env, PSE, & R/W funds, within 180 days (6 months) after the end of the FY in which the final expenditure occurred. For Con funds, within 180 Days (6 months) of contract acceptance.

**Zone Criteria**

The Timely Use of Funds and At Risk reports utilize the deadlines associated with each required activity of the STIP Timely use of Funds Provisions to assign a zone of risk. The following zone criteria was developed for each of these risk zones (Red, Yellow, & Green). For the Final Invoice, this activity is tracked but no zone of risk is assigned.

<b>Required Activity</b>	<b>Criteria Timeframes for Required Activities</b>		
	<b>Red Zone</b>	<b>Yellow Zone</b>	<b>Green Zone</b>
Allocation -Env Phase	within four months	within four to eight months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Allocation -PS&E Phase	within six months	within six to ten months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Allocation -Right of Way Phase	within eight months	within eight to twelve months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Allocation -Construction Phase	within eight months	within eight to twelve months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Construction Contract Award	within six months	within six to eight months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Accept Contract	within six months	within six to twelve months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Complete Expenditures	within eight months	within eight to twelve months	All conditions other than Red or Yellow Zones
Final Invoice/Project Completion (Final Report of Expenditures)	NA	NA	NA

**Other Zone Criteria**

<b>Yellow Zone</b>	STIP /TIP Amendment pending
<b>Red Zone</b>	Extension Request pending

**Notes:**

1. Statute requires encumbrance by award of a contract for construction capital and equipment purchase within twelve months of allocation. CTC Policy is six months.

Green Zone Projects									
Index	PPNO	Sponsor	Project Title	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes
		Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)						Prev Zone
1	FMS 5932	American Canyon	Devlin Road and Vine Trail Extension						
			\$297	PE	15/16	Request obligation	11/1/15	G	state only funds
	RIP - T4 -ST		\$1,665	CON	17/18	Request obligation	11/1/17	G	state only funds
2	FMS 5725	American Canyon	Eucalyptus Drive Extension						
	RIP -T4-FED		\$1,154	CON	18/19	Request obligation	11/1/18	G	
3	2130F	City of Napa	California Roundabouts						
			\$1,070	CON	16/17	Request obligation	11/1/16	G	project also has OBAG funds in CON
	RIP-T4-FED								
4	FMS 6013	Calistoga	Petrified Forest Road and SR 128 Intersection Improvements						
			\$105	PS&E	15/16	Request obligation	11/1/15	G	
	RIP-T4-FED		\$50	ROW	16/17	Request obligation	11/1/16	G	
			\$425	CON	17/18	Request obligation	11/1/17	G	
5	FMS 5942	Yountville	Hopper Creek Pedestrian Path						
			\$100	PS&E	16/17	Request obligation	11/1/16	G	
	RIP-T4-FED		\$400	CON	17/18	Request obligation	11/1/17	G	
6	FMS 5934	County of Napa	Airport Boulevard Rehab						
			\$57	PS&E	17/18	Request obligation	11/1/17	G	
			\$1,275	CON	18/19	Request obligation	11/1/18	G	
7		City of Napa	Silverado Five-Way Intersection Improvements						
			\$1,153	CON	17/18	Request obligation	11/1/17	G	Project likely to become a SHOPP project - not in the TIP yet needs to be amended once PID is complete
8	2130H	Yountville	North Yountville bike lanes & extend sidewalk (ext 6-12)						
	RTIP-TE		\$43	PSE	10/11	complete			
	RTIP-TE		\$86	CON	11/12	complete			closed out
9	2130G	American Canyon	Napa Jct. Elementary School ped improvements (ext 6-12)						
	RTIP-TE		\$24	PSE	10/11	complete			
	RTIP-TE		\$14	CON	11/12	submit invoice to Caltrans or risk deobligation	2/20/15	G	Invoice due on 8/20/14 accepted; next invoice due on 2/20/2015
	RTIP-TE		\$183	CON	11/12	submit invoice to Caltrans or risk deobligation	2/20/15	G	Invoice due on 8/20/14 accepted; next invoice due on 2/20/2015

STIP At Risk Report  
2014 STIP Locally-Sponsored Napa County Projects

Status Date: November 2014

**Yellow Zone Projects**

Index	PP No.	Sponsor	Project Title		Req'd Activity	Date	Zone	Notes	Prev
		Source	Prog'd Amount	Phase	FY	Req'd By			Zone
			(\$x 1,000)						
10	2130F	City of Napa	California Roundabouts						
			\$431	ROW	14/15	Request extension for STIP funds	3/1/15	Decide in Jan 2015 if extension is needed for funds obligated	

Notes:



Status Date: November 2014

Page 3 of 4

## TDA 3 Project List - November 2014

Index	TIP ID	Sponsor	Project Title							
	Source	Prog'd Amount (\$x 1,000)	Phase	FY	Req'd Activity	Date Req'd By	Zone	Notes	Prev Zone	
1	TDA 3	City of Napa \$72	SR29 Undercrossing PE	12/13				20% complete		
2	TDA 3	American Canyon \$190	Broadway Bike/Pedestrian Improvements CON	10/11	close out needed		G	funds invoiced and received		
3	TDA 3	City of Napa \$163	Tulocay Creek Bridge and Trail Completion CON	13/14	recently approved by NCTPA Board			Awaiting MTC approval		
4	TDA 3	American Canyon 47,855	Rio Del Mar/Los Altos/Theresa Ped Project CON	14/15			G	Awaiting MTC approval		
5	TDA 3	St. Helena \$107,278	Mitchell Drive Sidewalk Project CON	14/15			G	Awaitng MTC approval		
6	TDA 3	Calistoga \$106,427	Riverside Ped Project CON	14/15			G	Awaiting MTC approval		
7	TDA 3	Yountville 51,086	Washington St. Sidewalk Project CON	14/15			G	Awaiting MTC approval		

# VINE SERVICE ANALYSIS

July 2014 - September 2014

November 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 5.3  
Continued From: NEW  
ACTION REQUESTED: INFORMATION

SYSTEMWIDE		
July - September		
2013	2014	
196,283	246,608	26%

NOTES
<p>The VINE system continues its streak of 22 months of uninterrupted ridership growth. In addition, the months of July, August and September mark the highest first quarter ridership in a decade. Overall, on-time performance is very good and road calls and preventable accidents are significantly better than benchmarks.</p>

RIDERS BY SERVICE			
	July - September		
	2013	2014	
VINE Routes 1 - 11	156,376	199,969	28%
VINE Route 21	2,321	3,325	43%
VINE Route 25	1,618	1,910	18%
VINE Route 29	8,774	12,849	46%
Am Can Transit	5,392	5,459	1%
Calistoga Shuttle	6,127	6,796	11%
St. Helena Shuttle	2,477	2,993	21%
Yountville Trolley	8,288	7,630	-8%

MILES BETWEEN ROAD CALLS	
YTD	Last YTD
1 per 33,365	1 per 15,972
Standard = 1 per 10,000 mi	

PREVENTABLE ACCIDENTS	
YTD	Last YTD
Act = 0.6	Act = 0.2
Std. = 1.6	Std. = 1.6

	Weekday Passengers Per Revenue Service Hour	
	Goal	Actual
Route 1	12	8.4
Route 2	12	16.6
Route 3	12	15.8
Route 4	12	13.0
Route 5	12	13.0
Route 6	12	10.5
Route 7	12	8.3
Route 8	12	18.9
Route 10	12	11.4
Route 11	12	12.5
Route 21	7	6.7
Route 25	5	17.7
Route 29	7	7.5
Am Can Transit	5	5.1
Calistoga Shuttle	2	4.3
St. Helena Shuttle	2	3.5
Yountville Trolley	2	6.9

On Time Performance	
Goal	Actual
90%	96.7%
90%	89.6%
90%	91.3%
90%	96.9%
90%	89.7%
90%	92.3%
90%	90.5%
90%	83.4%
90%	72.6%
90%	72.8%
90%	87.1%
90%	90.2%
90%	85.4%

**Technical Advisory Committee  
(TAC)**

***MINUTES***

**Thursday, October 2, 2014**

**ITEMS**

**1. Call to Order**

Chair Holley called the meeting to order at 2:07PM (local).

Jason Holley, Chair	City of American Canyon
Mike Kirn	City of Calistoga
Eric Whan, Vice Chair	City of Napa
Rick Tooker	City of Napa
Nathan Steele	Town of Yountville
Rick Marshall	County of Napa
Ursula Vogler	MTC

**2. Introductions**  
None.

**3. Public Comments**  
None.

**4. TAC Member and Staff Comments**

**Town of Yountville** – Member Steele announced that the new Public Works Director for the Town of Yountville should be announced by the end of October 2014.

**City of Napa** – Vice Chair Whan announced that the City's roundabout project is progressing and that a third roundabout (SR 29 and First) is being considered as a cooperative project with the City spearheading the design and Caltrans leading the construction. The project would be a first roundabout in District 4 involving Caltrans owned property.

Member Tooker informed TAC of the Justin Sienna EIR scoping meeting currently followed with large opposition and traffic controversy. He further thanked those agencies that assisted in repairing the fencing along Salvador.

**MTC** - Representative Vogler encouraged members to visit and participate in the EV Ride Event being held today (October 2, 2014) in Napa at Copia. Vogler also reminded members that the application deadline for the Car Share Grant is due to MTC by October 17, 2014.

**City of American Canyon** – Chair Holley announced a federal grant submittal for American Canyon which is currently under review and in the scoring process, with the final application submittal due in a few weeks.

**NCTPA** - Staff provided TAC with the following information and handouts:

- TDA 3 – Two jurisdictions (Yountville and Calistoga) submitted and await further direction and/or approval from MTC.
- TFCA – Funding agreements to be sent out to FYE 2015 project sponsors for signature.
- NACTO Conference, San Francisco, October 22-25, 2014.
- Countywide Pedestrian Plan RFP has closed with an on-call planning contractor recommended to perform the services. Agreement will be placed before the NCTPA Board for approval on October 15, 2014.
- Napa Solano Travel Demand Model – Socioeconomic update approval by Cambridge requested, and await clarification on the discrepancies in the TAZ report for American Canyon.
- SR29 Corridor Improvement Plan - CAC meeting to be held on October 2, 2014, 5:30PM, NCTPA Board Room.; Caltrans to provide a presentation on the Soscol Flyover to the NCTPA Board at November 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- NCTPA – A job vacancy announcement has been released for an Administration Assistant and/or Technician. Application deadline is October 10, 2014.

## **5. Standing**

### **5.1 Congestion Management Agency (CMA) Report**

CTP guidelines were adopted at last meeting.

### **5.2 Project Monitoring Funding Programs**

Staff provided TAC with the latest project reporting data and deadlines.

- NAP130010 - STP - \$143K - Silverado Trail Yountville-Napa due November 1<sup>st</sup>.

**5.3 Transit Report (*VINE Ridership*)**

Ridership report was not available. Executive Director Miller announced the Clipper “soft launch” for October 25, 2014 and the expected implementation of the program is scheduled for November 5, 2014.

**5.4 Vine Trail Report**

No report available.

**6. Caltrans Report.** – NCTPA staff provided TAC with the latest report.

**7. CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS (7.1)**

**7.1 Approval of Meeting Minutes**

*Approve*

Meeting Minutes of September 4, 2014 were approved with Item 4, TAC Member and Staff Comments, County of Napa, as amended to read “A bridge on Partrick has been “partially” closed and speed and weight limits have been imposed.”

**MSC\* MARSHALL / STEELE** for **APPROVAL** and unanimously carried.

**8. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS (8.1-8.8)**

**8.1 2015 Federal and State Legislative Program and Project Priorities**

*Action*

TAC reviewed and provided comment on the 2015 Federal and State Legislative Program and Project Priorities List to be presented to the NCTPA Board at their October 15, 2014 meeting for approval. Edits and/or additions requested

- State Revenues – Support efforts that identify longer term and permanent solutions to address transportation infrastructure funding shortfalls *and system maintenance shortfalls*.
- Revenues that prioritize maintenance and enhancements of existing transportation infrastructure, *as well as needed capacity improvement*.
- *Traffic Operations Center* – A city and countywide corridor management operations.
- *Corridor Adaptive Signal Timing*.

Considering the addition of edits to the priority listing, the TAC concurred with Staff’s recommendation to the Board for approval.

**MSC\* MARSHALL / STEELE** for **APPROVAL** and unanimously carried.

**8.2 Cap and Trade Program Update**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with an overview of the draft guidelines for the Cap and Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program released in September 2014. Staff recommended consolidating JPA/TAC comments in one letter addressing their concerns. Staff will draft a letter and circulate to TAC for review and submit to SGC by the October 31, 2014 deadline.

**8.3 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) and Community Based Transportation Plan (CBTP) Update**

*Information*

Staff presented TAC with an update on the CTP and CBTP. An overview of the issue papers, established goals and objectives, committee and public meeting feedback, as well as TAC's participation in the process were discussed.

**8.4 Senate Bill (SB) 743 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guideline Changes Update**

*Information*

TAC received an update on the Office of Planning and Research's (OPR) draft guidelines requiring the replacement of "level of service" (LOS) with "vehicle miles traveled" (VMT). OPR is seeking comments by Friday, November 21, 2014. TAC members will poll their jurisdictions to see if there is interest in sending a joint letter signed by the NCTPA Board. Staff will draft a letter for TAC's review; if there is not unanimous support to send a letter from the NCTPA Board, NCTPA will send a letter signed by Ms. Miller.

**8.5 Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix**

*Information*

Staff provided TAC with the latest Federal and State legislative update, including review of bills signed into law, vetoed or failed. There was no action on the bill matrix required.

**8.6 NCTPA Board of Directors Agenda for October 15, 2014**

*Information*

Staff Reviewed the NCTPA agenda.

**8.7 Topics of Next Meeting**

*Discussion*

- SB 743 Letter
- CWTP

- Cap and Trade Letter

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

*Approve*

Next regular meeting date of November 6, 2014, was approved and meeting was adjourned at 4:01 PM.

DRAFT





Novmeber 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1  
Continued From: October 2014  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION/ ACTION**

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

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Danielle Schmitz, Planning Manager  
(707) 259-5968 / Email: [dschmitz@nctpa.net](mailto:dschmitz@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Napa Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) – Draft Project and Program Lists

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC review the Napa Countywide Transportation Plan (CWTP) Draft Project and Program Lists, and discuss creating an ad-hoc committee to review potential revenue sources.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As part of NCTPA's responsibilities under the interagency agreement with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), the agency is tasked with developing long-range countywide transportation priorities to support regional planning and programming efforts. This effort informs MTC's Regional Transportation Plan and the Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS) which is updated every four years. NCTPA last updated the countywide transportation plan in 2009.

NCTPA staff and its consulting team developed a new set of goals and objectives based upon the NCTPA Board feedback at its January 15, 2014 CWTP kickoff retreat. The new goals and objectives were approved at the March 19, 2014 Board Meeting. As part of an effort to make a meaningful plan the Board asked staff to create "performance measures" to go along with the goals and objectives and provide an annual progress report to the Board. In an effort to ensure projects and programs included in the plan are consistent with the goals and objectives, project sponsors scored their projects using the evaluation criteria that was approved at the July TAC meeting.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None.

## **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

At the January 15, 2014 Board retreat, the Board asked staff to create “performance measures” to supplement the Plan’s Goals and Objectives. At the July 2014 meeting the TAC approved the evaluation criteria. TAC has used the evaluation criteria to self-evaluate their transportation projects and programs. The scoring process is a simple one (1) point for every objective met – there are 27 objectives in all. NCTPA also used the evaluation criteria to assess transportation projects and programs that the agency administers.

After the initial compilation of projects, staff conducted second round-robin meetings with each jurisdiction in early October to refine their project and program lists. Attached to this report is the most recent list of countywide projects and programs.

Unlike the RTP, the CTP can be used as visionary planning document and include financially unconstrained project and program lists. NCTPA will include a priority project list that will reflect the constrained projects and programs and a visionary list that will provide an unconstrained list of projects and programs. Staff will work with the CTP consultant team and local jurisdictions over the coming months to create a constrained project list for the CTP. Priority projects will be included in the constrained project list. As future funding becomes available projects will be pulled from the unconstrained project list and put on the constrained list.

Based on preliminary fund projections, there will be a significant shortfall in funding available for CTP projects and programs. NCTPA staff recommends that an ad-hoc committee of the TAC be convened to review potential revenue sources that could alleviate this shortfall. The end result, once approved by the TAC and the Board, will form a blue print expenditure plan for future sales tax or other locally generated revenues. The CTP consultant team will work with the ad-hoc committee to come up with a revenue blueprint to better outline future funding opportunities.

### **Summary of Projects:**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b># of projects</b>	<b>Estimated project Cost</b>	<b>Estimated Need</b>
American Canyon	8	\$76,300,000	\$72,884,000
Calistoga	14	\$21,403,000	\$20,853,000
City of Napa	34	\$173,200,000	\$169,453,000
County of Napa	7	\$22,500,000	\$21,000,000
St. Helena	11	\$31,468,000	\$31,950,000
Yountville	10	\$35,950,000	\$35,950,000
NCTPA	19	\$375,446,090	\$315,387,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>\$736,267,090</b>	<b>\$666,973,722</b>

## **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments:   (1) CWTP Project List  
                  (2) CWTP Program List  
                  (3) Draft Timeline/Date of Events

Napa Countywide Transportation Plan  
Project List

No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location			Mode	Project Phase	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
				Location	Start Point	End Point										
1	AC	Devlin Road Extension	Extend Devlin Road from the grade-separated crossing with the California Northern Railroad south to Green Island Road	Devlin Road	Green Island Road	Devlin Road	Vehicle		\$5,300,000	\$1,962,000	STIP	\$3,338,000	2018		Yes	18
2	AC	Newell Drive Extension	Extend Newell Drive from Donaldson Way East to Highway 29	Newell Drive	Donaldson Way East	Highway 29	Vehicle		\$23,000,000	\$0	-	\$23,000,000	2019		No	14
3	AC	Commerce Boulevard Extension	Extend Commerce Boulevard from Eucalyptus Drive to Commerce Boulevard	Commerce Boulevard	Eucalyptus Drive	Commerce Boulevard	Vehicle		\$5,800,000	\$150,000	-	\$5,650,000	2025		No	16
4	AC	Green Island Road Goods Mobility Improvements	Rehabilitate Green Island Road to improve access to industrial park area	Green Island Road	300' east of RR	Commerce Boulevard	Vehicle		\$5,800,000	\$150,000	Local; addtl \$3M grant submitted	\$5,650,000	2016		Yes	20
5	AC	American Canyon Multimodal Transit Center	Construct transit center	TBD			Bus, rail, bicycle, pedestrian, passenger vehicle		\$12,000,000	\$0	-	\$12,000,000	2025		No	19
6	AC	Highway 29 Pedestrian Safety Overcrossings	Construct three more pedestrian crossings over Highway 29	TBD			Bicycle and pedestrian		\$19,000,000	\$0	-	\$19,000,000	2020		Yes	18
7	AC	Highway 29 Intersection Improvements at Napa Junction Road	Widen Napa Junction Road approaches at Highway 29	Napa Junction Road	SR 29	??	Vehicle		\$4,000,000	\$0	-	\$4,000,000	2017		Yes	23
8	AC	Eucalyptus Complete Streets	Extend Eucalyptus 450' to the east, connecting at SR 29.	Eucalyptus Drive	SR29	West of Theresa	Vehicle		\$1,400,000	\$1,154,000	STIP	\$246,000	2018		No	21
9	Calistoga	LSR Rehab	Lake Street Reconstruction and Complete Street Enhancements	Lake Street	Washington Ave	Grant St.	Vehicle	PSE/CON	\$1,950,000	\$0	-	\$1,950,000	2015	2016	No	13
10	Calistoga	Vine Trail Fair Way Extension	Construct Vine Trail	Fairway	Fair Way	Washington St.	Bike	CON	\$1,200,000	\$0	-	\$1,200,000	2015	2016	No	13
11	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 29/128 & Lincoln Ave	Signalization of Intersection at SR 29/128 & Lincoln Ave	SR 29/128 & Lincoln Ave.	SR 29	SR 128	Vehicle	PID/PSE/CON	\$1,900,000	\$0	-	\$1,900,000	2017	2019	No	14
12	Calistoga	Pedestrian Safety Improvements SR 29 & Cedar Street	In Pavement Lighting	SR 29 and Cedar Street	SR 29	Cedar St	Pedestrian	PSR/PSE	\$100,000	\$0	-	\$100,000	2017	2018	No	13
13	Calistoga	Pedestrian Safety Improvements SR 29 & Brannan Street	In Pavement Lighting	SR 29 and Brannan Street	SR 29	Brannan St	Pedestrian	PSR/PSE	\$100,000	\$0	-	\$100,000	2017	2018	No	13
14	Calistoga	Safe Routes to School	Construct foot bridge over the Napa River at Pioneer Park	Pioneer Park and Napa River	Calistoga Community Center	Pioneer Park	Pedestrian	PSR/PSE	\$850,000	\$0	-	\$850,000	2017	2018	No	17
15	Calistoga	Washington Street Reconstruction	Complete Streets Enhancements along Washington Street	Washington Street	Lincoln	Oak	Vehicle	PSE/CON	\$1,200,000	\$0	-	\$1,200,000	2017	2018	No	10
16	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 128 & Berry Street	Widen SR 128 and install left turn lane onto Berry Street	SR 128 & Pet Forest Road	On SR 128 300' south of Berry St.	On SR 128 300' north of Berry St.	Vehicle	PID/PSE/CON	\$650,000	\$0	-	\$650,000	2018	2019	No	14
17	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 29 & Washington Ave	Convert Signal to protected left turn phasing at Intersection of SR 29 & Washington Ave	SR 29 & Washington Ave.	SR 29	Washington	Vehicle	CON	\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000	2020	2022	No	14
18	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 29 & Fair Way	Signalization of intersection at SR 29 & Fair Way	SR 29 and Fair Way	SR 29	Fair Way	Vehicle	CON	\$950,000	\$0	-	\$950,000	2021	2022	No	14
19	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 29 & Silverado Trail	Signalization of intersection at SR 29 & Silverado Trail	SR 29 and Silverado Trail	SR 29	Silverado Trail	Vehicle	CON	\$853,000	\$0	-	\$853,000	2027	2028	No	14

**Napa Countywide Transportation Plan  
Project List**

ATTACHMENT 1  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1  
November 6, 2014

No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location			Mode	Project Phase	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
				Location	Start Point	End Point										
20	Calistoga	Intersection Improvements at SR 128 & Petrified Forest	Signalization of Intersection at SR 128 & Petrified Forest	SR 128 & Pet Forest Road	SR 128	SR 128	Vehicle	CON	\$650,000	\$550,000	STIP/LM	\$100,000	2015	2017	Yes	14
21	Calistoga	SR-29 Bypass	Calistoga SR-29 Bypass Dunaweal Ln/Tubbs Ln	Dunaweal	SR 29	Silverado Trail	Vehicle		\$7,000,000	\$0	-	\$7,000,000	2030		No	
22	Calistoga	Lincoln Corridor Safety Enhancements	Signal modification, bike and ped enhancements,	Lincoln Avenue	SR 128	Silverado Trail	Vehicle		\$3,500,000	\$0	-	\$3,500,000	2020		No	
23	City of Napa	Trower Avenue Extension	Extend Trower Avenue east to connect with Big Ranch Road	Trower Avenue	Eastern terminus of Trower Ave	Big Ranch Road	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$10,500,000	\$0	-	\$10,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	12
24	City of Napa	Linda Vista Bridge and Extension	New bridge at Redwood Creek and extension of Linda Vista Avenue to Robinson Lane over new Linda Vista Bridge	Linda Vista Avenue	Southern terminus of Linda Vista	Robinson lane	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$3,500,000	\$0	-	\$3,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	12
25	City of Napa	South Terrace Bridge and Extension	New bridge at Cayetano Creek and extension of Terrace Drive from the southern terminus of Terrace Drive to the northerly terminus of South Terrace Drive	Terrace Drive	Southern terminus of Terrace Dr	Northern terminus of S Terrace Dr	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$3,500,000	\$0	-	\$3,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	12
26	City of Napa	Solano Bridge and Extension	New bridge at Napa Creek and extension of Solano Avenue south to connect with First Street	Solano Avenue	Southern terminus of Solano Ave	First Street	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$7,000,000	\$0	-	\$7,000,000	2020	2020-2040	No	12
27	City of Napa	Lincoln Avenue at California Blvd & SR29 Off-Ramp	Reconfigure northbound SR 29 off-ramp at Lincoln Avenue and modify Lincoln/California intersection	Lincoln Avenue	SR29 Off-Ramp	California Avenue	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$5,500,000	\$0	-	\$5,500,000	2020	2020-2040	Yes	8
28	City of Napa	Salvador Avenue Widening	Widen Salvador Avenue from SR29 to Jefferson Street	Salvador Avenue	SR29	Jefferson Street	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	12
29	City of Napa	Imola Corridor Sidewalk Improvements	Construct sidewalks along Imola Avenue where none exist or gaps are present from Foster Road to eastern City Limits	Imola Avenue	Foster Road	Eastern City Limits	Ped/Bike	Planning	\$6,500,000	\$20,000	NCTPA	\$6,480,000	2014	2020-2040	No	17
30	City of Napa	SR29 under Pueblo Avenue	Pueblo Avenue Overpass connecting Pueblo Avenue to West Pueblo Avenue	Pueblo Avenue	Pueblo Avenue	West Pueblo Avenue	Vehicle	Planning	\$30,000,000	\$0	-	\$30,000,000	2020	2020-2040	No	10
31	City of Napa	SR29 over Trower	Trower Avenue Underpass	Trower Avenue/ SR29 Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$30,000,000	\$0	-	\$30,000,000	2020	2020-2040	No	10
32	City of Napa	Jefferson/Laurel Signal	New signal at Jefferson Street/Laurel Street Intersection	Jefferson/ Laurel Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	7
33	City of Napa	Jefferson/Old Sonoma Signal	New signal at Jefferson Street/Old Sonoma Road Intersection	Jefferson/ Old Sonoma Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	7
34	City of Napa	Jefferson/Imola Intersection Widening	Jefferson/Imola intersection modification	Jefferson/ Imola Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$3,000,000	\$0	-	\$3,000,000	2020	2020-2040	No	8
35	City of Napa	Solano/Redwood Intersection Widening	Widening and restriping modifications to the Solano Avenue/ Redwood Road Intersection	Solano/ Redwood Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$750,000	\$0	-	\$750,000	2020	2020-2040	No	8
36	City of Napa	Vine Trail Gap Closure (3rd-Vallejo)	Construct Class I multiuse path between 3rd Street and Vallejo Street	Adjacent to Soscol	Third Street	Vallejo	Ped/Bike	Planning	\$3,500,000	\$100,000	TDA-3; NVVT Coalition	\$3,400,000	2016	2020	YES*	17
37	City of Napa	SR29 Bike & Pedestrian Undercrossing	Construct a bicycle and pedestrian undercrossing along the north bank of Napa Creek under SR29 at approximately post mile 11.67	North bank Napa Creek	-	-	Ped/Bike	Design	\$850,000	\$97,000	BTA; TDA-3	\$753,000	2013	2017	Yes	17
38	City of Napa	Soscol Avenue Widening	Widen Soscol Avenue-SR221-SR121 to six lanes from Magnolia Drive to Silverado Trail including median widening	Soscol Avenue	Magnolia Drive	Silverado Trail	Vehicle	Planning	\$22,000,000	\$0	-	\$22,000,000	2020	2020-2040	No	8
39	City of Napa	Lincoln/Jefferson Right Turn Lane(s)	Modify Lincoln/Jefferson intersection with right turn lanes	Jefferson/ Lincoln Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$750,000	\$0	-	\$750,000	2020	2020-2040	No	7
40	City of Napa	Lincoln/Soscol Right turn Lane(s)	Modify Lincoln/Soscol intersection with right turn lanes	Lincoln/Soscol intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$750,000	\$0	-	\$750,000	2020	2020-2040	No	7
41	City of Napa	First Street Roundabouts (west side)	Construct roundabouts on First Street at Freeway Drive and SR29 Southbound ramps	1st/Freeway SR29 Ramp	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Design	\$8,500,000	\$0	-	\$8,500,000	2020	2020-2040	Yes	9

Napa Countywide Transportation Plan  
Project List

No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location			Mode	Project Phase	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
				Location	Start Point	End Point										
42	City of Napa	Soscol/Silverado Trail Modification	Soscol/Silverado intersection modification with Southbound duel left turn lanes on Silverado Trail	Soscol/ Silverado Trail Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$750,000	\$0	-	\$750,000	2020	2020-2040	No	8
43	City of Napa	Jefferson/Sierra Signal	New signal at Jefferson Street/ Sierra Avenue Intersection	Jefferson/ Sierra Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	8
44	City of Napa	Browns Valley Road Widening	Widen Browns Valley Road from Westview Drive to McCormick Lane	Browns Valley Road	Westview Drive	McCormick Lane	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$3,500,000	\$0	-	\$3,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	7
45	City of Napa	Salvador Creek Bike Trail	Construct a Class I multiuse path along Salvador Creek	adjacent to Salvador Creek	Maher Street	Big Ranch Road	Ped/Bike	Planning	\$800,000	\$0	-	\$800,000	2020	2020-2040	YES*	16
46	City of Napa	5-way Intersection Modification	Construct intersection improvements at Silverado Trail/Third Street/Coombsville Road/East Avenue	Silverado/ Coombsville/ 3rd/ East Ave Intersection	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Design	\$8,500,000	\$3,500,000	Caltrans	\$5,000,000	2014	2019	Yes	10
47	City of Napa	Oxbow Preserve Pedestrian Bridge	Construct a pedestrian bridge from the Oxbow Preserve over the Napa River to the River Trail	Napa River	Oxbow Preserve	River Trail	Ped/Bike	Planning	\$1,250,000	\$0	-	\$1,250,000	2020	2020-2040	YES*	16
48	City of Napa	Oxbow District Pedestrian Bridge	Construct a pedestrian bridge from the River Trail over the Napa River to Third Street	Napa River	River Trail	Third Street	Ped/Bike	Planning	\$1,250,000	\$0	-	\$1,250,000	2020	2020-2040	YES*	16
49	City of Napa	Laurel Street Sidewalk	Construct sidewalks along Laurel Street from Laurel Park to Laurel Manor	Laurel Street	Laurel park	Laurel Manor	Ped	Planning	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	14
50	City of Napa	Traffic Operations Center	Citywide signal coordination	-	-	-	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	Planning	\$2,000,000	\$0	-	\$2,000,000	2020	2020-2040	YES**	12
51	City of Napa	Sierra Avenue Sidewalks	Construct sidewalks along Sierra Avenue from Jefferson Street to SR29	Sierra Avenue	Jefferson Street	SR29	Pedestrian	Planning	\$800,000	\$0	-	\$800,000	2020	2020-2040	No	14
52	City of Napa	Foster Road Sidewalk	Construct sidewalks along Foster Road adjacent to Irene M. Snow Elementary School	Foster Road adjacent to Snow School	-	-	Pedestrian	Planning	\$750,000	\$0	-	\$750,000	2020	2020-2040	No	14
53	City of Napa	Terrace Drive Sidewalks	Construct Sidewalks along Terrace Drive where gaps are present	Terrace Drive	Coombsville Road	Southern terminus of Terrace Drive	Pedestrian	Planning	\$1,500,000	\$0	-	\$1,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	14
54	City of Napa	Main Street Sidewalk Widening	Widening the sidewalk on Main Street from First Street to Third Street	Main Street	First Street	Third Street	Pedestrian	Planning	\$2,000,000	\$30,000	Local	\$1,970,000	2016	2020	No	14
55	City of Napa	Vine Trail (Redwood Rd Crossing)	Construct a grade separated crossing across Redwood Road connecting the adjacent sections of the Vine Trail	Redwood Road	-	-	Bike/Ped/ Vehicle	Planning	\$4,500,000	\$0	-	\$4,500,000	2020	2020-2040	YES*	17
56	City of Napa	Railroad Crossing Upgrades	Upgrade all railroad crossings Citywide to concrete panels with flangeway fillers	-	-	-	Bike/Ped/ Vehicle/ Rail	Planning	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2020	2020-2040	No	14
57	Napa County	Devlin Rd Extension	Complete construction of collector road as parallel facility for SR 29 corridor	Airport Industrial Area	Soscol Ferry Rd	Green Island Rd	Vehicle	CON	\$5,500,000	\$1,300,000	TMF	\$4,200,000	2015	2020	Yes	9
58	Napa County	Napa Valley Vine Trail - Calistoga	Construct Class I mixed use path	SR 29	Silverado Trail	Bothe State Park	Bike/Ped	CON	\$6,000,000	\$200,000	Local Donation	\$5,800,000	2016	2018	Yes	11
59	Napa County	Imola Ped Corridor	Construct pedestrian access and safety improvements along and crossing Imola Avenue	Imola Avenue	Skyline Park	Foster Rd	Vehicle	CON	\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000	2018	2020	Yes	10
60	Napa County	Silverado Trail intersections	Improve intersection safety and operations Oak Knoll Avenue, Yountville Crossroad, Oakville Crossroad, Deer Park Rd, Dunaweal Ln	Silverado Trail, various	Napa	Calistoga	Vehicle	CON	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2020	2040	No	5
61	Napa County	Solano Ave flood improvement	Construct improvements to reduce flooding in corridor	Solano Ave	Yountville	Dry Creek	Vehicle	CON	\$300,000	\$0	-	\$300,000	2020	2025	Yes	3
62	Napa County	29 North County intersections	Improve intersection safety and operations Oakville Grade Rd, Oakville Crossroad, Rutherford Rd (SR 128), Deer Park Rd, Dunaweal Ln	SR 29	Napa	Calistoga	Vehicle	CON	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2025	2040	No	5
63	Napa County	Route 221	Improve corridor operations	SR 221 Napa Vallejo Highway	SR 29	SR 121	Vehicle	CON	\$5,200,000	\$0	-	\$5,200,000	2030	2040	No	7
64	NCTPA	Soscol Flyover	Construct SB 221 to SB 29/12 flyover structure	SR 29/12/221			Vehicle	CON	\$50,000,000	\$0	-	\$50,000,000	2015	2035	Yes	9
65	NCTPA	Shop truck w/ hoist & push bar for road calls	State of Good Repair	N/A	N/A	N/A	Bus	N/A	\$65,000	\$0	-	\$65,000	2015		No	11

No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location			Mode	Project Phase	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
				Location	Start Point	End Point										
66	NCTPA	Asset Management Database	State of Good Repair	N/A	N/A	N/A	Bus	N/A	\$50,000	\$0	-	\$50,000	2015		No	13
67	NCTPA	Sales Office Equipment	Transit Enhancements	N/A			Bus		\$60,000	\$0	-	\$60,000	2016		No	15
68	NCTPA	Taxi Scrip Automated Readers	Pedestrian Network				Transit		\$20,000	\$0	-	\$20,000	2016		No	12
69	NCTPA	Support Vehicle for Supervisors	State of Good Repair				Bus		\$50,000	\$0	-	\$50,000	2016	2017	No	5
70	NCTPA	Airport Junction	Construct grade separated interchange	SR 29/12/Airport			Vehicle	CON	\$73,000,000	\$0	-	\$73,000,000	2020	2040	Yes	9
71	NCTPA	29 South County intersections	Improve intersection safety and operations SR 29/12/121 "Carneros Junction," S Kelly Rd, Green Island Rd	SR 29	American Canyon	Napa	Vehicle	CON	\$1,500,000	\$0	-	\$1,500,000	2020	2035	Yes	9
72	NCTPA	Carneros Intersection	SR 29/SR12/SR 121 (Carneros intersection) Improvements	SR29/SR12/SR 121			Vehicle		\$500,000	\$0	-	\$500,000			Yes	
73	NCTPA	SR 29-Urban Highway	Landscape enhancements to Urban Highway from Carneros Intersection to Trancas. SR 29 at Imola, 1st Street, Lincoln, Trancas	SR 29	Carneros Intersection	Trancas Street	Vehicle		\$250,000	\$0	-	\$250,000			Yes	
74	NCTPA	SR 29- Unincorporated Napa County/Carneros	4-Lane Rural Highway, from unincorporated Napa County to Carneros intersections.	SR 32	Jameson	Napa City Limits	Vehicle		\$8,000,000	\$0	-	\$8,000,000			Yes	
75	NCTPA	SR-29 Unincorporated Napa/ AC	4-Lane Rural Highway in unincorporated Napa County from American Canyon to Jameson Canyon	SR 29	Napa Junction Road	Jameson Canyon Road	Vehicle		\$50,000,000	\$0	-	\$50,000,000			Yes	
76	NCTPA	SR 29 Gateway	Highway 29 Fr improvements include adding additional traffic lane in each direction, pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and transit amenities	SR 29	American Canyon Road	Napa Junction Road	Vehicle	CON	\$26,000,000	\$0	-	\$26,000,000	2015	2030	Yes	20
77	NCTPA	Maintenance Facility	Maintenance and Fueling Facility				Bus		\$40,000,000	\$0	-	\$40,000,000				
78	NCTPA	VINE Maintenance Facility (Construction O&M)	Acquisition and construction of new vehicle maintenance facility	TBD	TBD	TBD	Bus	CON	\$38,300,000	\$0	-	\$38,300,000	2017	2040	No	16
79	NCTPA	Fueling Station (Construction and O&M)	Acquisition and construction of new fueling station	TBD	TBD	TBD	Bus	CON	\$3,792,000	\$0	-	\$3,792,000	2017	2040	No	16
80	NCTPA	Rapid Bus Project	Bus Rapid Corridor Improvements				Bus		\$23,250,000	\$0	-	\$23,250,000	2022	2040	No	16
81	NCTPA	Rebranding	New NCTPA Image, Including Bus Stop Signage				Bus	None	\$550,000	\$0	-	\$550,000	2015	2018	No	16
82	NCTPA	Silverado Trail Route	New regional bus route along Silverado Trail				Bus	None	\$60,059,090	\$0	-					
83	St Helena	Downtown Pedestrian Improvements	Install traffic calming devices (eg. bulb outs), upgrade sidewalk, pedestrian lighting, pedestrian furniture, landscaping	Main Street (SR29)	Spring Street	Adams Street	Pedestrian	PE-CON	\$400,000	\$21,278	Local	\$378,722	2011	2018	No	9
84	St Helena	Sulphur Creek Class I Bikeway	Construct Class I Bikeway	Sulphur Creek	Sulphur Springs Avenue	Napa River	Bicycle		\$5,800,000	\$0	-	\$5,800,000	2020	2030	No	11
85	St Helena	Spring Mountain Road Class I Bikeway	Construct Class I Bikeway	Spring Mountain Road	Lower Reservoir	Spring Mountain Court	Bicycle		\$1,700,000	\$0	-	\$1,700,000	2020	2030	No	14
86	St Helena	Oak Avenue Extension	Extend Oak Avenue	Oak Avenue	Charter Oak Avenue	Grayson Avenue	Vehicle		\$1,800,000	\$0	-	\$1,800,000	2020	2025	No	10
87	St Helena	Starr Avenue Extension	Extend Starr Avenue	Starr Avenue	Hunt Avenue	Adams Street	Vehicle		\$617,000	\$0	-	\$617,000	2025	2030	No	10
88	St Helena	Adams Street Extension	Extend Adams Street	Adams Street	end	Starr Avenue	Vehicle		\$851,000	\$0	-	\$851,000	2025	2030	No	10
89	St Helena	New North-South Collector	Extend College Avenue, or Starr Avenue, or Allison Avenue	New	Mills Lane	Pope Street	Vehicle		\$1,900,000	\$0	-	\$1,900,000	2025	2030	No	10
90	St Helena	Mills Lane Safety Improvements	Improve Mills Lane to two lanes with bike/ped access	Mills Lane	Main Street (SR29)	End	Vehicle		\$3,500,000	\$0	-	\$3,500,000	2025	2030	No	12
91	St Helena	Napa River Class I Bikeway	Construct Class I Bikeway (River Trail)	Napa River	South City Limit	North City Limit	Bicycle		\$9,800,000	\$0	-	\$9,800,000	2030	2040	No	14

No.	Sponsor	Project Title	Project Description	Project Location			Mode	Project Phase	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
				Location	Start Point	End Point										
92	St Helena	New East-West Collector	Extend Adams Street or Mills Lane	New	End	Silverado Trail	Vehicle		\$2,900,000	\$0	-	\$2,900,000	2035	2040	No	10
93	St Helena	Fulton Lane Safety Improvements	Improve Fulton Lane to two lanes with bike/ped access	Fulton Lane	Railroad Ave	End	Vehicle		\$2,200,000	\$0	-	\$2,200,000	2035	2040	No	12
94	Yountville	Pedestrian Bridge	Pedestrian overcrossing over SR 29, connecting town core to future Napa Valley Wine Train station	NWT Future Train Station	Train Station	Washington Street	Pedestrian	Planning, Design, Construction	\$5,000,000	\$0	-	\$5,000,000	2024	2025	No	
95	Yountville	Transportation Infrastructure	Transportation infrastructure. Extend Yount Mill Road and Yountville Cross Rd, connecting the new development to the Town.	Northeast of Washington and Yountville Cross Rd	Entire Site	Entire Site	Ped & Bike & Vehicle	Planning, Design, Construction	\$2,500,000	\$0	-	\$2,500,000	2030	2035	No	
96	Yountville	Regrade & Repave Webber West of Washington Street	Webber will need to be repaved to a gentler slope and Washington will need to have its grade raised so that the water can properly drain down Washington St. Extend the storm drain at Vintage Inn to Webber. When the private property north of Webber Ave is developed, the applicant will be conditioned to regrade Webber Ave. This work should be coordinated with the replacement of the sewer O-line (1956) and with the curb and sidewalk replacement at Vintage Inn (ST-6012).	Webber Avenue west of Washington Street	Washginton Street	Dead end of Webber Avenue	Pedestrian & Bike & Vehicle	Planning, Design, Construction	\$150,000	\$0	General Fund	\$150,000	2020	2021		
97	Yountville	Yountville CrossRoads Bicycle Path & Sidewalk	A full lane bicycle path along Yountville Crossroads	Length of Yountville CrossRoads	Yountville Cross Roads and Yonut St	Yountville Cross Roads and Stags View Ln	Bike	Planning, Design, Construction	\$1,500,000	\$0	-	\$1,500,000	2030	2031	No	
98	Yountville	Oak Circle Parking Improvement	Parking improvements to existing infrastructure	Future Oak Circle Park, near Oak Circle and Vitner Ct	N/A	N/A	Vehicle	Planning, Design, Construction	\$75,000	\$0	-	\$75,000	2015	2018	No	
99	Yountville	South Veteran's Park Parking Improvement	Parking improvements to existing infrastructure	At Veteran's Park, Washington St. South of California Dr	N/A	N/A	Vehicle	Planning, Design, Construction	\$175,000	\$0	-	\$175,000	2020	2021	No	



**Napa Countywide Transportation Plan  
Program List**

ATTACHMENT 2  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1

No.	Sponsor	Program Category	Program Description	Mode	Total Cost	Total Committed	Types of funds Committed	Total Need	Start Year	End Year	Included in Plan Bay Area	# of Objectives Met
1	AC	Pedestrian Network	Improve safety and accessibility to local schools by eliminating access barriers and completing unfinished sidewalks; include Safe Route to School network	Pedestrian and Bicycle				\$ -				
2	AC	Pedestrian Network	Implement the American Canyon trail master plan.	Predominantly pedestrian				\$ -				
3	AC	Bicycle Network	Build out American Canyon Bicycle network including Class I, II and III	Predominantly bicycle				\$ -			Yes	
4	AC	Other LS&R Maintenance/Safety	Make safety improvements and perform rehabilitation and preventative maintenance on local bridges	Vehicle	\$ 12,000,000			\$ 12,000,000				
5	AC	LS&R Rehab	Rehabilitate, restore, preserve and rejuvenate local streets, collectors and arterials pavement	Vehicle				\$ -				
6	AC	Bridge and Culvert Rehab	Rehabilitate, restore, preserve and rejuvenate local bridge and culvert pavement	Vehicle				\$ -			No	
7	AC	ITS	ITS/ Synchronization enhancements at intersections	Vehicle				\$ -			No	
8	Calistoga	Bridges and Culverts	Replacement of existing structures	Vehicle	\$ 3,125,000			\$ 3,125,000			No	
9	Calistoga	Bicycle Network	Expansion of Class I Pathway and Class II Routes	Bike	\$ 8,000,000			\$ 8,000,000			Yes	
10	Calistoga	Bicycle Network	Maintenance of existing infrastructure; Class I, II, and III infrastructure as consistent with Countywide and Citywide Bicycle Plans; Bicycle racks and lockers	Bike	\$ 1,250,000			\$ 1,250,000			Yes	
11	Calistoga	Pedestrian	Sidewalk maintenance and rehabilitation; Gaps and missing links; multimodal trails; ADA improvements	Pedestrian	\$ 5,580,000			\$ 5,580,000			No	
12	Calistoga	LS&R Rehab	Maintenance and rehabilitation of existing local streets and roads	Vehicle	\$ 10,650,000			\$ 10,650,000			Yes	
13	Calistoga	LS&R Rehab	Improvements to increase safety and operations on the roadway system (ex. Roadway connections, dedicated turn lanes, widening)	Vehicle	\$ 250,000			\$ 250,000			Yes	
14	Calistoga	Bridges and Culverts	Maintenance and rehabilitation	Vehicle	\$ 1,250,000			\$ 1,250,000				
15	City of Napa	Pedestrian Network	Sidewalk Improvement Program	Ped	\$ 156,000,000	\$1,500,000 FY14/15*	Local; Gas Tax; CDBG	\$ 154,500,000			Yes	20
16	City of Napa	ITS	Signal Upgrade Program	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	\$ 4,500,000	-	-	\$ 4,500,000			Yes	18
17	City of Napa	Bridges and Culverts	Bridge Rehabilitation and Maintenance Program	Vehicle/ Ped/Bike	\$ 40,000,000	-	-	\$ 40,000,000			NO	17
18	City of Napa	LS&R Rehab	Street Resurfacing Program	Vehicle/Bike	\$ 175,000,000	\$3,000,000 FY14/15*	Local; Gas Tax	\$ 172,000,000			Yes	15
19	Napa County	LS&R Rehab	Pavement Preservation + more	Local Roadway System	\$ 225,000,000	\$ 7,840,000	General Fund	\$ 217,160,000			Yes	10
20	Napa County	Bridge and Culvert Rehab	Rehabilitate, restore and preserve local bridge and culver pavement	Vehicle	\$ 40,000,000						No	

**Napa Countywide Transportation Plan  
Program List**

ATTACHMENT 2  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1

21	Napa County	Bridge and Culvert Replacement	Pavement Preservation + more	Vehicle	\$ 95,000,000						No	
22	NCTPA	Park and Ride Lots, (Construction and O&M)	Park and Ride Lots throughout Napa County	Bus	\$ 2,025,000	\$ -	None	\$ 2,025,000	2015	2040	No	16
23	NCTPA	New Transit Vehicles (EXPANSION)	Acquisition of new paratransit vehicles, community shuttle buses and VINE buses for service expansion	Bus	\$ 27,510,000	\$ -		\$ 27,510,000	2017	2040		
24	NCTPA	New Transit Vehicles (REPLACEMENT)	Acquisition of new paratransit vehicles, community shuttle buses and VINE buses for state of good repair	Bus	\$ 62,510,000	\$ -		\$ 62,510,000	2015	2040		
25	NCTPA	New Shelters and Stop Amenities (EXPANSION)	Improved bus stops throughout Napa County	Bus	\$ 4,850,000	\$ -	None	\$ 4,850,000	2020	2040	No	17
26	NCTPA	Bus Shelter Program (REPLACEMENT)		Bus	\$ 3,000,000	\$ -			2015	2040		
27	NCTPA	Transit System Growth (Operating Costs)		Bus	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	None	\$ 2,800,000	2018	2040	No	16
28	NCTPA	Corridor Speed Improvements	IT and Roadway enhancements to improve operating speeds- From Vallejo- Napa	Bus	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -	None	\$ 10,000,000	2016	2020	No	
29	NCTPA	Corridor Speed Improvements	IT and Roadway enhancements to improve operating speeds- From American Canyon- Napa	Bus	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -	None	\$ 10,000,000	2016	2020	No	
30	NCTPA	Equipment Upgrades & Replacement Program	Wi-Fi for all buses, Camera System & Real Time signage	Bus	\$ 350,000	\$ -	None	\$ 350,000	2015	2019		
31	NCTPA	State of Good Repair/ PM	7 low-floor articulated buses, 7 low-floor 35' buses, 14 articulated buses	Bus	\$ 76,125,000	\$ -	None	\$ 76,125,000				
32	NCTPA	Local routes (1-8) - expanded service hours	Expand service hours from 4am-12am, add Sunday service	Bus	\$ 10,281,880	\$ -	None	\$ 10,281,880				
33	NCTPA	Regional routes (10/11)- expanded service hours	Expand service hours from 4am-12am, add Sunday service	Bus	\$ 10,346,000	\$ -	None	\$ 10,346,000				
34	NCTPA	Regional routes (10/11)- Enhanced frequency	Increase frequency from 30 peak, 60 midday and weekends to 15 peak and 30 midday and weekends.	Bus	\$ 39,431,210	\$ -	None	\$ 39,431,210				
35	St Helena	LS&R Rehab	Annual Slurry/Crack Seal, Microsurfacing and sign replacement/upgrade	Vehicle	\$ 18,855,473	\$ -		\$ 18,855,473	2015	2040	No	
36	St Helena	Pedestrian Network	Annual Curb, Gutter, Sidewalk, ADA Ramp Replacement	Pedestrian	\$ 500,000	\$ -		\$ 500,000				
37	St Helena	Pedestrian Network	Expand the pedestrian Network	Pedestrian								
38	St Helena	Bridges and Culverts	Bridge Rehab/maintenance	Vehicle							No	
39	St Helena	Bridges and Culverts	Bridge Replacement	Vehicle							No	
40	Yountville	Pedestrian Network	Tree, Tree Grate, Curb, Gutter, & Sidewalk Replacement Program ;Park Paths Program (Mission Street to Hotel Yountville Path)	Pedestrian	\$ 820,000	\$ 160,000	Gas Tax; Capital Projects Fund	\$ 660,000			No	
41	Yountville	LS&R Rehab	Pavement Management, Slurry Seal and Patching, streetlight replacement.	Vehicle	\$ 8,500,000	\$ 2,525,000	Gas Tax; Capital Projects Fund	\$ 5,975,000			Yes	

42	Yountville	Pedestrian Network	Ped Network includes Town's tree, tree grate, curb, gutter, and sidewalk replacement program (CP-3015) and park paths program (PK-4015)	Pedestrian	\$ 1,920,000	\$ 175,000		\$ 1,745,000			No	
----	------------	--------------------	---	------------	--------------	------------	--	--------------	--	--	----	--

SR-29 Corridor Related Program
Newly Added Program
Deleted Program
Modified Program

**Countywide Transportation Plan Timeline/Meeting Dates**

ATTACHMENT 3  
TAC Agenda Item 8.1  
November 6, 2014

<b>Date/Time</b>	<b>Meeting</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Location</b>
<b>November 19, 2014 at 1:30 PM</b>	NCTPA Board Meeting	Provide a quarterly update to the Board on the CTP/CBTP	NCTPA
<b>November 2014 -January 2015</b>	CBTP follow-up stakeholder meetings	CBTP additional meetings in AC and with others to refine list of CBTP projects	Various locations
<b>December 5, 2014 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	Standing Item – constrained and unconstrained project and program lists and revenue forecasts	NCTPA
<b>December 9, 2014 at 5:30 PM</b>	Community Advisory Committee Meeting	Review draft project and program lists and revenue sources	NCTPA
<b>January 8, 2015 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	Provide Issue papers for review	NCTPA
<b>February 5, 2015 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	Refine Project and Program Lists and Issue Papers	NCTPA
<b>February 18, 2015 at 1:30 PM</b>	NCTPA Board Meeting	Provide a quarterly update to the Board on the CTP/CBTP	NCTPA
<b>March 5, 2015 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	Feedback on Issue Papers and Project and Program Constrained List	NCTPA

## Countywide Transportation Plan Timeline/Meeting Dates

Date/Time	Meeting	Subject	Location
<b>March 24, 2015 at 5:30 PM</b>	Community Advisory Committee Meeting	Review Issue Papers and Project and Program Lists (Draft Plan)	NCTPA
<b>April 2, 2015 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	CTP update/ Draft plan	NCTPA
<b>April 2015</b>	Public Workshops	Public Workshops to review draft plan and projects and program	American Canyon, Napa, St. Helena
<b>May 7, 2015 at 2:00 PM</b>	TAC Meeting	Draft Plan	NCTPA
<b>May 20, 2015 at 1:30 PM</b>	NCTPA Board Meeting	Draft Plan to NCTPA Board	NCTPA
<b>June 17, 2015 at 1:30 PM</b>	NCTPA Board Meeting	Final Plan Approved by NCTPA Board	NCTPA
<b>July 2015</b>	Anticipated RTP call for projects		

\*Dates/Times are subject to change



November 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8.2  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

## NAPA COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND PLANNING AGENCY TAC Agenda Letter

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**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 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) 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 p.m. 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	615,465	2,387,087	646,829	2,228,571	657,178	8,932,528
Contra Costa	14.3%	1,495,905	-	389,194	1,509,494	409,028	1,409,256	415,572	5,628,449
Marin	2.6%	273,857	-	71,250	276,345	74,881	257,994	76,079	1,030,406
Napa	2.0%	212,406	71,632	72,621	214,336	72,621	200,103	73,783	917,502
San Francisco	12.5%	1,309,667	-	340,740	1,321,564	358,104	1,233,805	363,834	4,927,714
San Mateo	8.4%	880,699	-	229,134	888,700	240,811	829,685	244,664	3,313,693
Santa Clara	23.1%	2,415,237	61,111	642,383	2,437,177	642,383	2,275,335	652,661	9,126,287
Solano	6.4%	668,858	273,831	277,612	674,934	277,612	630,115	282,054	3,085,016
Sonoma	7.9%	824,165	31,600	43,373	831,652	167,587	776,425	170,268	2,845,070
MTC - Means-Based Fare Project		-	-	-	-	-	700,000	-	700,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>10,446,392</b>	<b>469,974</b>	<b>2,681,772</b>	<b>10,541,289</b>	<b>2,889,856</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:

<b>Program</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Anticipated Date*</b>
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
<b>All</b>	<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			
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.

**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



November 06, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8.3  
Continued From: October 2014  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

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

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Alberto Esqueda, Assistant Planner  
(707) 259-5976 / Email: [aesqueda@nctpa.net](mailto:aesqueda@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Senate Bill 743 Draft CEQA Guideline Changes - Comment Letter

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Information only.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At the October 2014 TAC meeting NCTPA staff presented an informational item on Senate Bill (SB) 743 Draft CEQA Guideline Changes. At the meeting, some TAC members voiced their desire to submit a letter to the Office of Planning and Research (OPR) signed by the NCTPA Board. As a follow-up to the meeting staff contacted TAC members individually to gauge interest to draft a collaborative comment letter and present the letter before the NCTPA Board for its approval. NCTPA was only going to move forward if there was unanimous consent amongst the jurisdictions. However, unanimous interest was not reached and as such, NCTPA will submit a comment letter on SB 743 from the Executive Director.

OPR seeks public comments on the preliminary discussion draft. Attached is the draft NCTPA comment letter for TAC members' comment and review. NCTPA encourages jurisdictions to make additional comments which are due to OPR by Friday, November 21, 2014.

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

Is there a Fiscal Impact? None

---

## **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

Last year the Legislature passed, and Governor Brown signed into law, Senate Bill 743 (Steinberg, 2013), which requires Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to develop alternative methods of measuring transportation impacts under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). SB 743 creates a process to change the way we analyze transportation impacts under CEQA. Currently, environmental review of transportation impacts focuses on the delay that vehicles experience at intersections and on roadway segments. That delay is often measured using a metric known as “level of service,” or LOS. Mitigation for increased delay often involves increasing capacity (i.e. the width of a roadway or size of an intersection), which may increase auto use and emissions and discourage alternative forms of transportation. Under SB 743, the focus of transportation analysis will shift from driver delay to reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, creation of multimodal networks, and promotion of a mix of land uses.

Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) is the primary new metric that is being considered to evaluate a project’s transportation impacts within a Transit Priority Area (TPA). TPAs are defined as an area within one-half mile of a major transit stop that exists or is planned. A major transit stop is defined as a rail, ferry or bus station or the intersection of two or more major bus routes with service intervals of 15 minutes or less during the morning and afternoon peak commute periods.

There is discussion to devise a regional average VMT threshold that would hold projects to the same standard within the region. Development projects that generate greater VMT than the regional average for similar land use types may result in a significant impact. However, new development projects that result in net decreases in VMT, or are located within one-half mile of either an existing major transit stop, or a stop along an existing high quality transit corridor, may be considered to have a less than significant transportation impact.

Impacts on pedestrians, bicyclists and transit have not typically been considered. Projects to improve conditions for pedestrians, bicyclist and transit have been discouraged because of impacts related to congestion. Requiring “mitigation” for such impacts in the CEQA process imposes increasing financial burdens, not just on project developers that may contribute capital costs for bigger roadways, but also on taxpayers that must pay for maintenance and upkeep of those larger roads. Such impacts have not completely escaped notice, however. For many years, local governments, transportation planners, environmental advocates and others have encouraged the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to revise the CEQA Guidelines to reframe the analysis of transportation impacts away from capacity. LOS impact analysis concentrated mitigation on expanding the external transportation network to accommodate new projects. SB 743 compliant studies that identify potential VMT impacts will likely focus on how to modify the project to minimize VMT.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachments: (1) NCTPA Comment Letter on Senate Bill (SB) 743 Draft CEQA  
Guideline Changes

November 6, 2014

Mr. Calfee  
Senior Counsel  
Governor's Office of Planning and Research  
1400 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Updating Transportation Impacts Analysis in the CEQA Guidelines  
Preliminary Discussion Draft of Updates to the CEQA Guidelines  
Implementing Senate Bill (SB) 743

Dear Mr. Calfee:

The Napa County Transportation & Planning Agency (NCTPA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the guidelines for the implementation of SB 743. While NCTPA accolades the efforts to implement SB 375 and reduce GHG emissions at such a large scale we would like to provide some comments on the proposed guidelines.

On the subject of land use projects and vehicle miles traveled (VMT), while creating a regional average VMT level of impact determination may expedite an element of the CEQA analysis, regions are too diverse to have a single VMT threshold. To illustrate the extensive variety within one (1) single region, consider the city of San Francisco and the town of Yountville, two (2) jurisdictions within the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) region, but substantially different in geography, infrastructure and population. A sub-regional, VMT threshold would be more appropriate for suburban localities without robust transportation infrastructures.

The elimination of the LOS metric and vehicle delay as a finding of environmental impact under CEQA in the impact analysis of a development project may have inadvertent consequences on the on-time performance of transit vehicles with routes in the area potentially undermining the original purpose. It is well-known that slower traffic speeds emit higher levels of CO<sub>2</sub> as outlined by Barth and Boriboonsomsin (2009) in "Traffic Congestion and Greenhouse Gases."

Appendix F identifies two (2) types of models, sketch and travel demand, used to determine the amount of VMT resulting from a project. The complexity and type

of model influence VMT, thus more direction is needed as to which model should be used.

We would like to reiterate there is a vast range of communities and ask you to consider the complex diversity of each region. Also, examine the possibility of a phased implementation of the guidelines by region and establishing a sub-regional VMT threshold methodology that can be implemented in phases over a period of time.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to the opportunity to contribute to further iterations of these draft guidelines.

Sincerely,

Kate Miller  
Executive Director

cc: NCTPA Technical Advisory Committee



November 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8.4  
Continued From: October 2014  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

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

---

**TO:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**FROM:** Kate Miller, Executive Director  
**REPORT BY:** Danielle Schmitz, Planning Manager  
(707) 259-5968 / Email: [dschmitz@nctpa.net](mailto:dschmitz@nctpa.net)  
**SUBJECT:** Cap and Trade Update on the Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities Draft Program Guidelines

---

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Information only.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

At the October 2014 TAC meeting staff provided an overview of the draft guidelines for the Cap and Trade Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities program that were released on September 24, 2014. NCTPA circulated a comment letter on the guidelines to the jurisdictions and on October 28, 2014 submitted to the Strategic Growth Council as comment.

### **FINANCIAL IMPACT**

Is there a fiscal impact? No.

### **BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION**

On September 24, 2014 the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) issued its draft guidelines for the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Cap and Trade Program. TAC members received an email notifying them the guidelines had been released. As a reminder, the guidelines can be viewed at: [http://www.sgc.ca.gov/docs/Draft\\_AHSC\\_Guidelines\\_for\\_posting\\_082314.pdf](http://www.sgc.ca.gov/docs/Draft_AHSC_Guidelines_for_posting_082314.pdf)

Also, Bay Area agencies are concerned about the application of the CalEnviroScreen for defining disadvantaged communities under the Cap and Trade program. Under most scenarios, Napa will have no disadvantaged communities which would limit the funds



---

the county is eligible to receive. However, under the transit program, if no disadvantaged communities are defined, a transit operator may spend its allocation in any area it deploys service. Conversely, if a disadvantaged community is defined, there is potential conflict between Title VI and the Cap and Trade.

Finally, MTC convened the general managers of the transit systems to discuss its original program proposal. This would significantly augment the revenues that NCTPA will receive from \$400,000 to \$2.5 million over the life of the program (which would sunset in 2020 if no legislative action occurs to extend it).

On October 28, 2014 NCTPA submitted a comment letter (attached) to the Strategic Growth Council.

### **SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

Attachment: (1) NCTPA Comment Letter on AHSC



October 28, 2014

Mr. Mike McCoy  
Strategic Growth Council  
1400 10<sup>th</sup> Street  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program Guidelines

Dear Mr. McCoy,

Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities (AHSC) Draft Program Guidelines. NCTPA is a joint powers authority comprised of the cities, town, and county of Napa and serves as the congestion management agency and public transit provider. NCTPA recognizes the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) through projects that impact land use, housing and transportation and acknowledges the Council is taking on a daunting task of creating such a complex program.

NCTPA offers the following comments on the AHSC Draft Guidelines:

**General:**

- Simplify - As written the guidelines are extremely prescriptive and complex and definitions and scoring should be simplified.
- The CARB methodologies for quantifying GHG emissions need to be developed, vetted and revised before the Strategic Growth Council (SGC) issues its first call for projects.
- Projects should be consistent with existing regional Sustainable Communities Strategies (SCSs). The region's roles should include an evaluation and affirm a project's consistency with the SCS.
- Bus service should be an eligible form of transit under the proposed TOD Project Area type as many of California's mostly densely populated cities have highly efficient fixed bus service that operate on 5-10 minute headways in areas where rail and bus rapid transit systems are ½ mile or more away where new, low income housing is being established with more than adequate mixed uses (San Francisco, Oakland, San Jose, Los Angeles, Napa).
- NCTPA suggests that the SGC make further clarification about development requirements. For every TOD project that has to include an Affordable Housing Development, what stage of development does an affordable housing project need to be in to qualify? Built within the scope of the project, built within the last year, fully funded, etc.?

**Specific:**

- Page 10 – Requirement number 5 under TOD project areas requires that every transportation or green infrastructure project must be proposed in conjunction with a *new* affordable housing project. NCTPA recommends that guidelines allow for transportation projects to be eligible if they serve or are adjacent to an affordable housing project that *exists* or is fully funded and under construction. Further, affordable housing projects should be eligible for funding by themselves if they are located in an area with transit service meeting the adopted standards.

- Page 10 - Demonstration of mode shift should be broader than showing an increase in transit ridership. In Napa we are promoting all alternative modes including walking, biking, van pooling, carpooling – a better measure would be reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMTs).
- Page 12 - NCTPA is in support of the Density Requirements shown for areas that are not within a large city downtown or urban center and feel they are appropriate for more rural-suburban areas such as Napa.
- Page 13 - Item 2 - Add Travel Demand Management that reduces VMTs as an eligible expense under the program, these could include: implementation of car sharing, bike sharing, organizing locally sponsored van pool programs, parking pricing programs, casual carpool hubs, etc.
- Page 15 - Operational costs should be considered as a means to jump start viable GHG reduction programs and could be capped so as to incentivize programs towards self-sufficiency – examples of eligible projects could be implementing shuttles, increasing transit headways, expanding transit hours, site mobility management, car share, bike share, electronic bike lockers
  - – a possible approach could be limiting eligibility for operating costs to 3-5 years maximum with a sliding scale to wean projects off subsidies - an example follows:
    - Year 1 80% maximum eligible subsidy
    - Year 2 60% maximum eligible subsidy
    - Year 3 40% maximum eligible subsidy
    - Year 4 20% maximum eligible subsidy
- Page 16-19 - Table 5 should be simplified – it is very prescriptive and may inadvertently result in a good project from being considered eligible. We would recommend that the AHSC guidelines put greater emphasis on the kinds of projects – once built out – that can have a significant impact on reducing GHGs rather than narrowly refining the minute elements that would make a project eligible. The table should therefore be revised to reflect “concepts for eligible elements”.
- Page 21 - Minimum 50 percent non-AHSC match for capital portion of the project budget is too high. Because of limited funding availability at the State and Federal levels, project sponsors currently have trouble meeting a 20 percent match. It should be noted that this level of match requirement could place additional constraints on SGC’s ability to achieve the requirement that 50 percent of AHSC funds benefit disadvantaged communities considering that such communities may be even less likely than others to have matching funds available.
- Page 22 – NCTPA is concerned with the requirement that a “public agency with jurisdiction over the project area is a required applicant”. Specifically, how this requirement relates to transit operators who many times do not have local jurisdiction over a project area but could provide a meaningful project proposal in that area. This requirement puts more responsibility on cities/counties that may have staffing issues and do not want to be the primary project sponsor but support the project moving forward. NCTPA suggests a local letter of support from the local jurisdiction in which the project is located satisfy the requirement for local jurisdiction support.
- Page 30-52 - Scoring seems unnecessarily complicated and should be simplified. The scoring should be weighted towards GHG reduction. (g) Consider collapsing the transit-supportive amenities to mixed use development – the more mix of uses, the higher the points rather than attempting to define how it should look. (h) Reduction in vehicle miles traveled should be the overall objective rather than which mode a particular user ultimately switches to. Expand parking scoring to include points for other travel demand measures.

NCTPA looks forward to working with the Strategic Growth Council as the new AHSC Program is adopted and implemented. An important step will be to include feedback that refines the guidelines to be more simplistic allowing for implementation of real projects that can be meaningful and meet the goals of the program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Kate Miller', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kate Miller  
NCTPA Executive Director

cc: NCTPA Technical Advisory Committee



625 Burnell Street, Napa CA 94559

November 6, 2014  
TAC Agenda Item 8.6  
Continued From: NEW  
**Action Requested: INFORMATION**

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

### **Board of Directors**

### **AGENDA**

**Wednesday, November 19, 2014  
1:30 PM**

**NCTPA/NVTA Conference Room  
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 NCTPA Board of Directors are posted on our website at [www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12](http://www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12) at least 72 hours prior to the meeting and will be available for public inspection, on and after at the time of such distribution, in the office of the Secretary of the NCTPA Board of Directors, 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 the present members of the Board at the meeting will be available for public inspection at the public meeting if prepared by the members of the NCTPA Board 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 Board on any item at the time the Board 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 Board Secretary. Also, members of the public are invited to address the Board 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 Karrie Sanderlin, NCTPA Board Secretary, 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 – NCTPA Board or go to [www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12](http://www.nctpa.net/agendas-minutes/12)*

*Note: Where times are indicated for agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.*

## **ITEMS**

1. Call to Order – Chair John F. Dunbar
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Roll Call

Members:

Joan Bennett	City of American Canyon
Leon Garcia, Mayor	City of American Canyon
Chris Canning, Mayor	City of Calistoga
James Barnes	City of Calistoga
Scott Sedgley	City of Napa
Jill Techel, Mayor	City of Napa
Keith Caldwell	County of Napa
Bill Dodd	County of Napa
Ann Nevero, Mayor	City of St. Helena
Peter White	City of St. Helena
Lewis Chilton	Town of Yountville
John F. Dunbar, Mayor	Town of Yountville
Beth Kahiga	Paratransit Coordinating Council

4. Public Comment
5. Chairperson's, Board Members' and Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Commissioner's Update
6. Director's Update
7. Caltrans' Update

***Note: Where times are indicated for agenda items they are approximate and intended as estimates only, and may be shorter or longer, as needed.***

8.	<b><u>PRESENTATIONS</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u></b>
8.1	Soscol Junction Improvement Project  Caltrans staff will provide a presentation on the Soscol Junction Improvement Project.	INFORMATION	1:45 PM
8.2	Clipper Card Demonstration  Staff from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission will provide a presentation on the Clipper Card Program	INFORMATION	2:00 PM

9.	<b><u>CONSENT ITEMS (9.1 – 9.9)</u></b>	<b><u>RECOMMENDATION</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u></b>
9.1	Approval of Meeting Minutes of October 15, 2014 (Karrie Sanderlin) <i>(Pages 8-12)</i>	APPROVE	2:15 PM
9.2	Resolution No. 14-21 Appendix A to the NCTPA Conflict of Interest Code the (Janice Killion) <i>(Pages 27-29)</i>	APPROVE	
	Board action will approve amending Appendix A to the NCTPA's Conflict of Interest Code.		
9.3	Resolution No. 14-22 Establishing Parking Violation Fees (Antonio Onorato) <i>(Pages 30-32)</i>	APPROVE	
	Board action will approve establishing penalties and fines for parking violations on NCTPA transit facilities per City of Napa's parking enforcement and violation fee structure.		
9.4	Resolution No. 14-23 Authorizing the Executive Director to Execute Fund Transfer Agreements with the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for FY 2014-15 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Program (Antonio Onorato) <i>(Pages 30-32)</i>	APPROVE	
	Board action will authorize Fund Transfer Agreements with the State of California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for FY 2014-15 State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) Planning, Programming and Monitoring (PPM) Program in the amount of \$69,000.		

- 9.5 Resolution No. 14-24 Approving the FY 2014-15 Salary Ranges for Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) Job Classifications (Karrie Sanderlin) *(Pages 30-32)*

APPROVE

Board action will approve the FY 2014-15 Salary Ranges for NCTPA Job Classifications based upon the Bay Area Consumer Price Index (CPI) ending December 2013 of 2.2%.

- 9.6 Resolution No. 14-25 Delegating Authority to Process Compromise and Settle Claims Pursuant to government Code Section 935.4 (Janice Killion) *(Pages 27-29)*

APPROVE

Board action will authorize the Executive Director to allow, compromise or settle individual general liability and workers compensation claims against NCTPA only if the amount to be paid pursuant to such allowance, compromise or settlement is Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$50,000.00) or less.

- 9.7 Amendment No. 3 to Work Authorization 12-29P005 with Riechers & Spence Associates (RSA) for Professional Engineering Services (Herb Fredricksen) *(Pages 27-29)*

APPROVE

Board action will approve Amendment No. 3 to the Work Authorization 12-29P005 with Riechers & Spence Associates (RSA) to amend the scope of work and total compensation in an amount not to exceed \$221,870 and extend the period of performance to June 30, 2015.



- 9.8 Donation from Eagle Cycling Club-  
Bicycle Repair Stand (Diana  
Meehan) (*Pages 27-29*) APPROVE

Board action will accept a donation from the Eagle Cycling Club of a Bicycle Repair Stand valued at \$800 for installation at the Soscot Gateway Transit Center.

- 9.9 Amendment No. 2 to Contract 12-20P002 Work Authorization #2 with the ARUP (Danielle Schmitz) (*Pages 27-29*) APPROVE

Board action will approve an amendment with ARUP in an amount not to exceed \$34,205 and extend the period of performance until September 30, 2015 for work associated with the Napa Countywide Transportation Plan and the Community Based Transportation Plan.

10. **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**TIME**

- 10.1 VINE Automatic Passenger Counters (APC) Presentation (Tom Roberts) (*Pages 44-55*)

INFORMATION

2:20 PM

The Board will receive a presentation on the purpose and functionality of the VINE Automatic Passenger Counters.

- 10.2 Countywide Transportation Plan: VISION 2040 *Moving Napa Forward* Update (Danielle Schmitz) (*Pages 44-55*)

INFORMATION

2:40 PM

The Board will receive an update on the VISION 2040 *Moving Napa Forward* plan.

- 10.3 Approval of Napa County Transportation and Planning Agency (NCTPA) Agreement No. 14-21 with Avail Technologies, Inc. (Antonio Onorato) *(Pages 56-74)*

APPROVE 3:00 PM

Board action will authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and award Agreement No. 14-21 (Attachment 1) with Avail Technologies, Inc., State College, PA, for an Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) with Computer Aided Dispatch and Automatic Vehicle Location (CAD-AVL) for VINE Transit in an amount not-to-exceed \$2,980,200.

- 10.4 Legislative Update and State Bill Matrix (Kate Miller) *(Pages 56-74)*

3:20 PM

The Board will receive the monthly Federal and State Legislative Update.

**11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

**12. CLOSED SESSION**

**TIME**

- 12.1 **CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR**  
(Government Code Section 54956.8)

3:30 PM

Property: APN 046-370-024-000  
Agency Negotiator: Kate Miller,  
Executive Director  
Negotiating Parties: Joe Carter,  
Boca Company  
Under Negotiation: Price and terms  
of payment

**12.2 CONFERENCE WITH REAL  
PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR**  
(Government Code Section 54956.8)

Property: APN 007-082-004  
Agency Negotiator: Kate Miller,  
Executive Director  
Negotiating Parties: Michael D.  
Mario  
Under Negotiation: Price and terms  
of payment

Property: APN 007-082-001 and  
APN 007-082-002  
Agency Negotiator: Kate Miller,  
Executive Director  
Negotiating Parties: New East  
Frontiers, Inc., Daniel Su  
Under Negotiation: Price and terms  
of payment

Property: APN 035-110-028  
Agency Negotiator: Kate Miller,  
Executive Director  
Negotiating Parties: Arthur J. &  
Judith A. Housely  
Under Negotiation: Price and terms  
of payment

Property: APN 034-210-001, APN  
034-200-009 and APN 007-322-005  
Agency Negotiator: Kate Miller,  
Executive Director  
Negotiating Parties: Napa Valley  
Wine Train, Inc., Tony Giaccio  
Under Negotiation: Price and terms  
of payment

**12.3 CONFERENCE WITH LEGAL  
COUNSEL - ANTICIPATED  
LITIGATION** (*Pages 258-259*)

Significant exposure to litigation  
pursuant to Government Code  
Section 54956.9(e)(3):

12.4 **CONFERENCE WITH LABOR  
NEGOTIATOR (Government Code  
Section 54957.6)**

Agency Designated Representative:  
John F. Dunbar, Chairman

Employee: Executive Director

13. **ADJOURNMENT**

**RECOMMENDATION**

4:00 PM

13.1 Approval of Regular Meeting Date of  
December 17, 2014 and  
Adjournment

APPROVE

I hereby certify that the agenda for the above stated meeting was posted at a location freely accessible to members of the public at the NCTPA offices, 625 Burnell Street, Napa, CA, by 5:00 p.m., Friday November 14, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Karalyn E. Sanderlin, NCTPA Board Secretary