AGENDA

1. Call to Order / Introductions / Roll Call

2. Minutes: February 13, 2020

3. Public Presentation
   At this time, the public may address the Technical Advisory Committee on any non-agendized item that is within the subject matter of this agency. If a member of the public wishes to speak on an agenda item he or she is invited to address the Technical Advisory Committee at the time the item is up for consideration. A five-minute maximum time limit for a speaker will apply to all “items from the audience”. The determination of whether an item is within the subject matter of the Committee is a discretionary decision to be made by the chair of the Technical Advisory Committee.

4. Technical Items: B through E are available for action by the committee. The left hand column identifies only recommendations from staff.

   Action
   A. Consent Calendar Items: F through J

   Action
   B. San Joaquin One Voice® Project Submissions & Regional Priority Selection (Chesley/Haruta)
Action C. 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program Draft Guidelines and Application (Ripperda)

Action D. Final Congested Corridor Plan (Ripperda)

Discussion E. Federal Fiscal Year 2019/20 Delivery of Federal Funding (Niblock)

CONSENT CALENDAR

Information F. San Joaquin Regional Climate Summit Re-Cap (Corrales)

Information G. Update on Activities with Institute for Local Government on Homelessness and Affordable Housing (Lang)

Information H. SJCOG Public Participation Plan Appendix A Update (Prince)

Action I. Fiscal Year 2020/21 State Transit Assistance Revenue Estimate & Apportionment Schedule (Dial)

Action J. Proposed Final Fiscal Year 2020/21 Overall Work Program (OWP) (Dial)

5. Other Matters of Business

6. Meeting Adjourned to Thursday, April 9, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)
San Joaquin Council of Governments • 555 E. Weber Avenue • Stockton, CA 95202

Thursday, February 13, 2020

MINUTES

Present | Member Name | Jurisdiction | Present | Member Name | Jurisdiction
---|---|---|---|---|---
Alex Chetley | SJC | X | John Andoh | City of Escalon |
Dave Mendoza | SJC | X | George Lorente | SJRTD |
Eric Alvarez | City of Stockton | X | Juan G. Villanueva | Port of Stockton |
X | Wes Johnson | City of Stockton | Steven Martinez | Caltrans D-10 |
X | Miguel Mendoza | City of Stockton | Josh Swearingen | Caltrans D-10 |
X | Georgia Graham | City of Lodi | Nicholas Fung | Caltrans D-10 |
Charles Swimley | City of Lodi | X | Jordan Peterson | SJRRC |
Juan Portillo | City of Manteca | | John Cadrett | SJVAPCD |
X | Koosun Kim | City of Manteca | Russell Stark | Stk. Metro Airport |
X | Zabih Zaca | City of Tracy | | |
Ed Lovell | City of Tracy | | | |
X | Elizabeth Quilici | City of Ripon | | |
Michael King | City of Lathrop | | | |

Alternates/Others: Lyman Chang, City of Lodi; Alejandro Gomez, SJRTD; Jay Davidson, City of Ripon; Dodgie Vidad, City of Stockton; Elizabeth Blanchard, City of Stockton; Najee Zarif, San Joaquin County; Kim Anderson, Regional Government Services.

SJC OG Staff: Andrew Chesley, Executive Director; Steve Dial, CFO/Deputy Executive Director; Diane Nguyen, Deputy Director; Yvette Davis, Senior Program Specialist; Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner; Timothy Kohay, Senior Regional Planner; Chris Haruta, Associate Program Specialist; David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner; Travis Yokoyama, Associate Regional Planner; Joel Campos, Associate Regional Planner; Christine Corrales, Associate Regional Planner; Hailey Lang, Associate Regional Planner; Isaiah Anderson, Assistant Regional Planner; Michelle Prince, Assistant Regional Planner; Ashley Goldlist, Assistant Regional Planner; Katy Castro, Administrative Clerk II.

1. **Call Meeting to Order/Introductions:**
   John Andoh called the meeting to order at 10:01 a.m. and introductions were made.

2. **Meeting Minutes from January 9, 2020:**
   It was moved/seconded (Graham/Johnson) to approve the meeting minutes from January 9, 2020. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

3. **Public Presentation:**
   None.

4. **Technical Items for Discussion and Action: F through G**

   A. **Consent Calendar:**

   F. 2019 Measure K Strategic Plan Schedule
G. FY 2020/21 Local Transportation Fund Revenue Estimate and Apportionment Schedule

It was moved/seconded (Graham/Peterson) to approve the consent calendar. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

B. Regional Transportation Plan Amendment for Valley Link:
Ryan Niblock reported in response to the request from the Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority, SJCOG staff is proposing the 2018 Regional Transportation Plan Amendment 3 to add elements of the Valley-Link project into the RTP project list. The description of what would enter includes; improvement of the Union Pacific Railroad right-of-way; construction of a station and platform to accommodate the new passenger rail services with parking and access onto Patterson Pass Road. Construction of operations and a maintenance facility at Hanson Road in Tracy along the alignment. Estimate cost is $164 million, $80 million will come from the Bay Area sales tax, and the remainder coming from state discretionary funding programs.

Andrew Chesley commented on the background of the Valley Link project.

Zabih Zaca commented that there is no at-grade railroad crossing in City of Tracy.

David Ripperda stated the Union Pacific Railroad and the California Public Utility Commission oppose any new at-grade railroad crossing.

This item is for discussion only.

C. One Voice® Regional Projects Criteria:
Andrew Chesley stated a small group of board members convened and laid out several principles that they would like to see implemented in the 2020 process. Mr. Chesley discussed the four principles.

Najee Zarif commented on future county projects.

Jordan Peterson commented on project readiness.

Mr. Chesley stated it would be a good argument that two years would be too limiting.

It was moved/seconded (Zaca/Quilici) Motion to recommend the policy language to the SJCOG Board of Directors. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

D. FY 2019/20 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program Call for Projects Funding Recommendations:
Ryan Niblock announced the recommended list of projects is for the CMAQ funding cycle covering FY 2020/21, FY 2020/22, and FY 2022/23 and includes $20.5 million to be programmed in CMAQ funds for new projects.
Georgia Graham stated the City of Lodi had a demonstration project and it needed the infrastructure which was a component of it to provide the cost-effectiveness. Mr. Graham continued to state it was fortunate because Lodi couldn’t do one without the other.

Najee Zarif stated the county held back some projects because they weren’t ready based on the criteria that were given. Ryan Niblock stated that is the big reason why staff had the Technical Sub-Committee work with the applicants. SJCOG staff asks some applicants to tighten up their calculations.

Koosun Kim commented that he joins the review committee to be aware of what is going on. Mr. Kim continued to state the review committee has transparency and tries to be reasonable.

It was moved/seconded (Peterson/Zarif) Motion to (1) recommend that the SJCOG Board approve the CMAQ programming recommendations (2) recommend that two unfunded projects be placed on a CMAQ contingency List, which would expire upon the start of the next CMAQ call for projects. Motion passed unanimously by voice vote.

E. 2022 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy Briefing:
Scenario Planning Defined:
Christine Corrales presented this item. She stated, for the 2018 RTP/SCS, SJCOG staff presented planning scenarios that varied on transportation investment strategies, as well as broadly defined assumptions on development patterns, housing options, growth location, and intensity. Each of the scenarios was evaluated with metrics such as infill development, housing mix, regional density, agricultural land lost, building energy use, and water consumption and others. In April, staff will present a briefing about housing and jobs and in the summer of 2020 staff will have scenario framework to adopt and use towards public outreach process and in 2021 staff is looking at an RTP scenario draft and action with final adoption in July 2022.

This item is for discussion only.

5. Other Matters of Business:

6. Adjournment:
There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m. to Thursday, March 12, 2020, at 10:00 a.m.
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: San Joaquin One Voice® Project Submissions & Regional Priority Selection

RECOMMENDED ACTION: (1) Approve the One Voice® Project Submissions as identified in Attachment 2 (2) Approve the Selection of Regional Priorities for the 2020 San Joaquin One Voice® Program

SUMMARY:

The annual San Joaquin One Voice® trip to Washington D.C. for elected officials, business leaders, and community partners is scheduled for May 10-14, 2020. Delegates have just begun registering to participate in the trip and staff continues to request sponsorship support for the effort.

The One Voice® Request for Regional Projects was closed on February 28th. At the time writing of this staff report, the project submittals have been summarized in Attachment 2 of this staff report.

SJCOG staff is recommending all 20 projects, be included for consideration and approval in the 2020 One Voice® platform of projects.

In accordance with the regional policies adopted by SJCOG Board, SJCOG staff is recommending the following three projects as “regional priorities” (in alphabetical order).

1. International Park of Commerce Interchanges (Tracy)
2. SR 99/120 Interchange Improvements (Manteca)
3. Stockton Diamond Grade Separation (SJRRC)

RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommends approving the 2020 Regional Project Submissions as identified in Attachment 2 and approving the selection of three projects as regional priorities.
FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no impact to the SJCOG OWP. Approving the applications submitted and creating a priority list does not commit funds. Potential funding allocations for the projects identified may be possible through competitive grants. Funding for San Joaquin One Voice® is included in the adopted FY 2019-20 SJCOG OWP. SJCOG also receives donations for some costs pertaining to the trip.

BACKGROUND:

In 2019, the SJCOG Board adopted seven projects as regional priorities for the One Voice® effort in Washington D.C. The effort was not easy, and the board expressed before and after the trip dissatisfaction with the results. The seven projects that were adopted for the 2019 One Voice® trip were (in random order):

1. Stockton Metro Airport Terminal Modernization/Expansion (County)
2. Stockton Diamond Grade Separation (SJRRC)
3. Valley Link Commuter Rail Project (Tracy)
4. Shared Autonomous Vehicle (SAV) Demonstration Project (RTD) Roadway:
5. Central Valley Gateway Project (now known as the International Park of Commerce Interchanges (Tracy)
6. SR 99/120 Interchange Improvements (Manteca)
7. Grant Line Road Improvements (County)

After refining the regional priority process over the last few months, the SJCOG Board (at its February 2020 meeting) adopted the following criteria for this process:

1. Limit the number of regional projects to no more than three.
2. Projects should be regional in that their impact extends beyond the immediate location of the project to other jurisdictions within the region.
3. Project readiness should be key to selection in that any request should be able to utilize funding or whatever authority is granted within the length of the time specified in the grant being requested.
4. A project must be eligible to receive federal funding at the time of request.

(Note this is only the criteria for identifying the regional projects. Local projects will not be affected and will be brought back to the One Voice trip as they have in previous years.)

In review of all the submittals, SJCOG is recommending that all projects move forward as part of the package of projects. Furthermore, SJCOG staff is recommending three projects in Attachment 2 that are the best fit for the regional priorities criteria. All three projects were identified as regional priorities on the trip last year. Summary information for each of the three projects is attached to this staff report to provide further detail on the projects.

1. International Park of Commerce Interchanges (Tracy)
2. SR 99/120 Interchange Improvements (Manteca)
3. Stockton Diamond Grade Separation (SJRRC)

NEXT STEPS:

Following the SJCOG Board adoption of the projects and priorities, SJCOG staff will develop project sheets and any policy position papers with a goal of having the drafts available for review and discussion at the April Board.

SJCOG will continue to partner with legislators, their staff, and members of the Administration to receive counsel about the various federal programs available and how we can successfully compete in the grant process.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Three Project Requests for the three SJCOG staff proposed Regional Priorities (as submitted by project sponsor)
2. 2020 Project Summary List

Prepared By: Christine Haruta, Associate Program Specialist, and Diane Nguyen, Deputy Director
The proposed Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project would construct a grade separation at the intersection of the BNSF Stockton Subdivision and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Fresno Subdivision, in south Stockton. The Stockton Diamond is the busiest at-grade railway junction in California. This distinction was previously held by the Colton Crossing, in southern California, which had a grade separation completed in 2013 and serves as the perfect model for the Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project. The current, at-grade configuration of the Stockton Diamond results in significant delays to UPPR trains serving the Port of Stockton, as well as other freight and passenger trains in the area. These delays ultimately limit the capacity of the Port of Stockton for growth and inhibit the expansion of ACE and San Joaquins services through the region.

The construction of the grade separation will reduce congestion and allow for an uninterrupted flow of rail traffic through the crossing, improving freight mobility and leading to lower costs for freight shipping, reduced delays, and a decrease in fuel consumption for idling locomotives. This increase in throughput and velocity of freight trains translates to cost savings for freight movement, allowing for continued growth and improved efficiency throughout the region. Reducing the current operational challenges between BNSF and UPRR at the Stockton Diamond will decrease the total freight and switch train delay time by 248,818 and 8,338 hours, respectively, through the 30-year analysis period.

In addition to improving freight movement, the Project will also benefit the ACE and San Joaquins passenger rail services’ on-time performance. The current configuration of the Stockton Diamond causes delays to both the ACE and Amtrak San Joaquins services, as a direct result of conflicts with freight trains at the Stockton Diamond. The Project will not only help reduce an estimated 4,783,804 passenger hours of delay, it will also facilitate the expansion of ACE and San Joaquins services and enable more freight and passenger trains to pass through the Diamond at faster speeds.

Federal Request $237.2M
Total Project Cost $237.2M
State Route 120 provides a critical connection for the movement of people and goods into and out of the San Joaquin valley. However, the 99/120 freeway to freeway interchange is subject to significant congestion, delays, and high accident rates. The purpose of this project is to improve safety, and reliability for the traveling public and timely reliable movement of commercial goods. This will be accomplished through modification and expansion of the existing 99/120 interchange and associated facilities.

The Stockton Office of the California Highway Patrol reports that from January 1, 2010, through September 30, 2016, there have been 1261 collisions, 815 injuries, and 11 fatalities on State Route 120 between Interstate 5 and Highway 99. In December 2015, the Manteca City Council contacted State officials in an effort to bring awareness to this dangerous section of highway and garner support for improvements along the bypass connecting State Route (SR) 120 to Highway (HWY) 99, and particularly, the SR 120 east to HWY 99 south Interchange. This area continues to be of great concern to Manteca leaders and residents due to the excessive number of automobile accidents, injuries, and deaths within this six-mile stretch of highway. In addition to the accident rate, the delays associated with this interchange are a significant impediment to the economic growth in the region.

The project will expand and reconstruct the existing State Route 99/120 interchange. The project also includes adding new auxiliary lanes, upgrading existing bridges, constructing additional lanes, ramp upgrades, new signals and lighting at ramps, and significant revision of the Austin Road / SR99 interchange.

Overall, the purpose of this project is to improve the capacity and recurring traffic congestion of the eastbound to southbound and northbound to westbound connector ramps and eliminate weaving and merging between SR-99/120 and SR-99/Austin Road interchanges, and reduce the accidents significantly.

**Federal Request**

| |
|--------|---------|
| CITY OF MANTECA |
| State Route 99/120 Interchange Project |

**LOCATION MAP**

State Route 99/120 Interchange Project
City of Manteca

**Total Project Cost**

| |
|--------|---------|
| Federal Request |
| Total Project Cost | $145M |
CITY OF TRACY

International Park of Commerce (IPC): Interchange Improvements and Parkway Improvements connecting the two Interchanges

The proposed Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project would construct a grade separation at the intersection of the BNSF Stockton Subdivision and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Fresno Subdivision, in south Stockton. The Stockton Diamond is the busiest at-grade railway junction in California. This distinction was previously held by the Colton Crossing, in southern California, which had a grade separation completed in 2013 and serves as the perfect model for the Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project. The current, at-grade configuration of the Stockton Diamond results in significant delays to UPRR trains serving the Port of Stockton, as well as other freight and passenger trains in the area. These delays ultimately limit the capacity of the Port of Stockton for growth and inhibit the expansion of ACE and San Joaquins services through the region.

The construction of the grade separation will reduce congestion and allow for an uninterrupted flow of rail traffic through the crossing, improving freight mobility and leading to lower costs for freight shipping, reduced delays, and a decrease in fuel consumption for idling locomotives. This increase in throughput and velocity of freight trains translates to cost savings for freight movement, allowing for continued growth and improved efficiency throughout the region. Reducing the current operational challenges between BNSF and UPRR at the Stockton Diamond will decrease the total freight and switch train delay time by 248,818 and 8,338 hours, respectively, through the 30-year analysis period.

In addition to improving freight movement, the Project will also benefit the ACE and San Joaquins passenger rail services’ on-time performance. The current configuration of the Stockton Diamond causes delays to both the ACE and Amtrak San Joaquins services, as a direct result of conflicts with freight trains at the Stockton Diamond. The Project will not only help reduce an estimated 4,783,804 passenger hours of delay, it will also facilitate the expansion of ACE and San Joaquins services and enable more freight and passenger trains to pass through the Diamond at faster speeds.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Request</th>
<th>$17.12M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$122M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Federal Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Lathrop</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Avenue/I-5 Interchange Improvement Project</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project would widen Louise Avenue to three through lanes in each direction,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodating a new left turn onto the northbound on ramp and a new loop onramp</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to southbound I-5. All on and off ramps would be widened with new signalized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intersections. Retaining walls would be constructed to accommodate the roadway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widening. Auxiliary lanes would be constructed on I-5 in both directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathrop Road/I-5 Interchange Improvement Project</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The project would widen Lathrop Road to three through lanes in each direction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New loop onramps to I-5 would be constructed, for both northbound and southbound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traffic. Off ramps would be widened, with new signalized intersections. Retaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>walls would be constructed to accommodate the roadway widening. Auxiliary lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would be constructed on I-5 in both directions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Lodi</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Reconstruction at State Route 99/Harney Lane</td>
<td>$5,440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruction of the interchange at State Route (SR) 99 and Harney Lane is a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needed improvement to the SR 99 trade corridor and the regional circulation plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build-out of the Reynolds Ranch Subdivision is expected by 2023 and the recent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion of the Harney Lane Grade Separation has improved Harney Lane access to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 99. Residential development in the Westside and Southwest Gateway areas is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving forward and potential annexation of land planned for residential development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is being considered on the south of Harney Lane, between Lower Sacramento Road and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchins Street. All of these factors are expected to generate more traffic along</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Harney Lane corridor and drive the need for the ultimate interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City of Manteca</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Route 120/Airport Way Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI) Project</td>
<td>$19,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the State Route (SR) 120 / Airport Way Diverging Diamond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange (DDI) project is to provide operational and safety improvements to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address the anticipated traffic generated from ongoing local development and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth and enhance circulation and mobility for vehicular traffic, bicycles, and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedestrians including a grade-separated Class I bikeway and pedestrian path. The</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Manteca has identified within their General Plan the need for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvements to the SR 120 / Airport Way Interchange in order to service the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>projected growth in employment, residential units, retail and commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development on the north side of the SR 120 corridor including Family Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zone (FEZ). The interim signal project at the ramp intersections has temporarily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improved the operations of the interchange; however, the interchange will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating at unacceptable levels of service in the AM and PM peak hours with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drivers experiencing long delays on a daily basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2020 One Voice® Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Federal Request</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Route 99/120 Interchange Project</td>
<td>$80,000,000</td>
<td>$145,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Route 120 provides a critical connection for the movement of people and goods into and out of the San Joaquin valley. However, the 99/120 freeway to freeway interchange is subject to significant congestion, delays, and high accident rates. The purpose of this project is to improve safety, and reliability for the traveling public and timely reliable movement of commercial goods. This will be accomplished through modification and expansion of the existing 99/120 interchange and associated facilities. The project will expand and reconstruct the existing State Route 99/120 interchange. The project also includes adding new auxiliary lanes, upgrading existing bridges, constructing additional lanes, ramp upgrades, new signals and lighting at ramps, and significant revision of the Austin Road / SR99 interchange.

## City of Ripon

### Ripon Multi-Modal Station

$7,236,000 $11,141,000

The City of Ripon is proposing to construct a 7,000 square foot multi-modal station near downtown Ripon. On and off-site improvements for the 3.25 acre project area include: 150 off-street parking spaces, a bus loading and staging area, and a future rail platform for the ACE Train. The Ripon bikeway network will also be incorporated into the project. This multi-modal station would provide a number of benefits, not only to the residents of Ripon, but the region.

### Ripon Surface Water Supply

$4,500,000 $6,800,000

The City of Ripon serves water to 15,000 residents along with businesses and industries located within the city limits. The purpose of this project is to supplement the City of Ripon’s municipal water supply with treated surface water from the South San Joaquin Irrigation District (SSJID) by constructing a 5-mile pipeline from the SSJID existing surface water transmission pipeline to Ripon’s water distribution system, along with a booster pump station. This project will conserve groundwater through in-lieu recharge and provide safe drinking water to Ripon’s community.

## County of San Joaquin

### Stockton Metropolitan Airport Terminal Modernization and Expansion

$30,000,000 $16 to $50 million

The existing terminal building at the Stockton Metropolitan Airport (SCK) was constructed in 1960. The facility houses a number of Airport functions, including airline operations, a public lobby, restroom facilities, a Transportation Security Agency (TSA) checkpoint, checked baggage inspection, airline ticket, vehicle rental offices, Airport Administration offices, two restaurants, various business offices, and a passenger hold room. Due to the age of the facility and the latest growth forecast, the Airport has completed a terminal needs assessment that found the current terminal building has outlived its useful life and recommends construction of a new terminal facility to meet anticipated growth and demand.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Federal Request</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Joaquin Regional Transit District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Solar Energy and Battery Storage Project (Phase 2)</td>
<td>$6,625,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RTD Solar Energy and Battery Storage Project (Phase 2) combines two zero-emission technologies, photo-voltaic (PV) solar energy generation, and zero-emission buses, in a synergistic package that will make a significant impact to local air-quality and will support the sustainability of the transit system by way of operational cost savings and continuity of operations for zero-emission buses. RTD is seeking $6.625 million for the second phase of this project. Phase 2 will include land acquisition, additional solar installations at RTD facilities, and battery storage that will specifically support RTD’s current and expanding zero-emission bus fleet by reducing the costs associated with charging these vehicles as well as ensuring the sustainability of the zero-emission bus fleet by providing a back-up energy source during utility power outages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Port of Stockton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Stockton Rail Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$24,901,000</td>
<td>$24,901,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This project will include the replacement of the existing wooden, through truss single rail swing bridge built in 1932 connecting the Port’s east and west complexes. The single rail bridge will be replaced by two single rail bridges with removable center spans. The new bridges will address future rail demands based on the Port’s growth projections, and regional and interregional growth. The proposed bridges would remove height and width restrictions of the existing steel truss bridge, and provide access for barge traffic in the event of an upstream flood or levee emergency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Street Widening</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds requested are for preliminary/final design, environmental documentation, and construction. The project consists of widening Washington Street from 2-4 lanes from 200 feet east of the Navy Drive/Washington Street intersection to 200 feet east of Port Road 13, for a distance of approximately 4,000 feet. The project would improve operations between the Port’s east and west complexes, between the east complex and the regional transportation network, and would accommodate future growth at the Port’s east complex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockton Diamond Grade Separation</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$237,200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proposed Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project would construct a grade separation at the intersection of the BNSF Stockton Subdivision and the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) Fresno Subdivision, in south Stockton. The Stockton Diamond is the busiest at-grade railway junction in California. This distinction was previously held by the Colton Crossing, in southern California, which had a grade separation completed in 2013 and serves as the perfect model for the Stockton Diamond Grade Separation Project. The current, at-grade configuration of the Stockton Diamond results in significant delays to UPRR trains serving the Port of Stockton, as well as other freight and passenger trains in the area. These delays ultimately limit the capacity of the Port of Stockton for growth and inhibit the expansion of ACE and San Joaquin services through the region. Figure 4 depicts the existing condition of the Stockton Diamond crossing.

### Mountain House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mountain House Community-Wide Security Monitoring System</th>
<th>$1,500,000</th>
<th>$1,878,525</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed project will add a combination of License Plate Reader (LPR) cameras at the entry points to the community, multi-sensor cameras, and Pan-Tilt-Zoom (PTZ) cameras at major intersections, near parks and schools and future commercial sites. The system will use a combination of wireless and hardwired fiber optics communication systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mountain House Express Rapid Transit Service</th>
<th>$4,900,000</th>
<th>$6,115,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This project will procure and operate express, clean-fuel buses for direct service between Mountain House and Pleasanton/Dublin BART station and from Mountain House to Downtown San Jose. In addition, the project will procure four Autonomous Transit (AV) Vehicles to pick-up and drop-off passengers for the first/last-mile connectivity from the proposed main transit station in Mountain House and the Express BRT service. The AV system will be functional with a Level-4 Society of Automotive Engineers (SAE) driverless technology. This will provide near door-to-door service and encourage ridership and mode shift. The initial service plan will include one trip daily to and from each of the two destinations from Mountain House. The service can be expanded based on ridership in the future, with additional procurement of vehicles. The initial procurement will include one bus for each route, plus one spare unit.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stockton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Stockton I-5 Interchanges and Widening</th>
<th>$3,000,000</th>
<th>$430,055,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City of Stockton is seeking $3.0 million to complete engineering design work for Phase 2 of the North Stockton I-5 Interchanges and Widening project to relieve congestion, create jobs and support economic development. The project will improve the I-5 freeway and interchanges to provide intermodal connections and serve increased traffic resulting from population growth and an improving regional economy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2020 One Voice® Project List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Federal Request</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Sacramento Corridor</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$35,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arch Road Widening</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$46,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Link Commuter Rail Project</td>
<td>$25,000,000</td>
<td>$334 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City of Stockton is seeking $35 million to complete the widening of the Lower Sacramento Road Corridor, an important regional arterial. The project will widen approximately 1.8 miles of the Lower Sacramento Road Corridor from the existing two-lanes to six lanes. The project limits include Lower Sacramento Road from Royal Oaks Drive to Pixley Slough. Other improvements along this corridor include the replacement of bridges located at Bear Creek and Pixley Slough. These improvements will tie into the new Lower Sacramento Road Grade Separation Underpass project and San Joaquin County’s Lower Sacramento Road Widening project (recently completed). These improvements will upgrade the roadway design, capacity and operations to achieve vehicular safety as well as reduce congestion issues.

The Arch Road Widening project is an important east-west connection serving Stockton’s south industrial developments, BNSF Intermodal Facility, Stockton Metropolitan Airport, and the Port of Stockton via I-5. The project includes widening Arch-Airport Road between Austin Road and Performance Drive to a four-lane roadway. Improvements include installation of concrete curb, gutter, sidewalks and driveways on both sides, widening narrow sections to a four-lane roadway with a middle turn pocket lane, installing ADA wheelchair ramps, new street lights, new storm drain facilities, striping and signing, and traffic signal modifications. The City requests $6,000,000 to provide for project development including design, environmental clearance, and right-of-way acquisition.

This important project will initially connect San Joaquin Valley communities to the Tri-Valley and the Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) through frequent and fast hybrid multiple unit trains that will utilize the Union Pacific right of way from the planned ACE N Lathrop Station to 2 2020 Project Request Form stations in River Islands, Downtown Tracy, and Mountain House. The Valley Link hybrid trains will then travel in the Altamont Corridor on the former Southern Pacific Railroad right of way now owned by the County of Alameda to the Greenville station in Livermore where the trains will enter the I-580 median and travel to the Isabel station before entering into the BART Dublin/Pleasanton station for an easy transfer onto the BART trains for continued trips into all areas of the Bay Area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Federal Request</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Park of Commerce (IPC): Interchange Improvements and Parkway Improvements</td>
<td>$17,120,000</td>
<td>$85,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The International Park of Commerce (IPC) is an office, retail and industrial park comprised of approximately 1,700 acres and is generally located on the west side of Tracy bounded by I-205, the former Mountain House Parkway, Schulte Road and just east of Hansen Road. The Project is expected to create over 30,000 jobs at build-out and will include over 28 million square feet of building. The IPC Project is of national significance as it directly accesses 2 routes on the National Freight System. It is also within 50 miles of the Port of Oakland, the third largest port in California, and a Port with known rail congestion issues, making truck transport a necessary option for national goods movement. In order to facilitate efficient goods movement in the region and nationally, two interchanges and a key access parkway between the interchanges are necessary for construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lammers Road/I-205 Interchange Project</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$63,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents in San Joaquin County have one of the longest commute times in the nation. The construction of a new interchange at Lammers Road and I-205 is necessary to relieve traffic congestion from the I-205 corridor to the City of Tracy and Mountain House areas. The Project will provide connectivity to both east and westbound ramps from Eleventh Street and Byron Road. It will also provide access to the International Park of Commerce, the County’s largest planned industrial park. The requested federal appropriations is $5 million (Phase 1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program Draft Guidelines and Application

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend to the SJCOG Board that they Approve the Draft Guidelines and Application

SUMMARY:

The California Transportation Commission (CTC) has released the Final Draft 2021 Active Transportation Program (ATP) Cycle 5 Guidelines. The CTC is scheduled to adopt the final guidelines on March 25-26, 2020 and announce a Call for Projects, with applications due June 15, 2020.

Senate Bill 1 directs $100 million annually from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the ATP. When combined with other state and federal funds in the ATP, approximately $446 million will be available in ATP Cycle 5, with $223 million available in the statewide component of the program, and $3,546,000 available to the SJCOG region in the separate Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) component of the program. This funding will be available in Fiscal Years 2021/22, 2022/23, 2023/24, and 2024/25.

This cycle will provide an excellent opportunity to undertake a combined Call for Projects for ATP Cycle 5 funds, Measure K funds, and funding set aside from the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) for active transportation. Combining the Calls for Projects would streamline the process and make a much larger amount of funding available for projects.

Accordingly, SJCOG staff have prepared draft guidelines and a draft supplemental application to accommodate a combined Call for Projects. These guidelines must be adopted by the SJCOG Board no later than March 26, 2020. SJCOG is required to submit our separate regional ATP guidelines to the CTC for their review and approval no later than April 17, 2020.

RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommends the TAC recommend to the SJCOG Board that they approve the Draft Guidelines and Application.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time.
DISCUSSION:

Beginning in November 2019, multiple workshops have been held throughout the state to discuss possible revisions to the ATP guidelines, application, and scoring rubrics. CTC staff have proposed no significant revisions to the program in the draft guidelines and they remain highly similar to those adopted in the previous 2019 ATP Cycle 4.

Application Types

As in the 2019 ATP Cycle 4, there will be a different application for each project type and size. Instead of applicants completing the same application regardless of project type and size, they will choose one from the five different applications described below:

A. **Large Project, Infrastructure only or Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure**: Projects with a total project cost of greater than $7 million must use the Large Project application.

B. **Medium Project, Infrastructure only or Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure**: Projects with a total project cost between $2 million to $7 million must use the Medium Project application.

C. **Small Project, Infrastructure only or Infrastructure/Non-infrastructure**: Projects with a total project cost equal to or less than $2 million must use the Small Project application. This is an increase from the previous threshold of $1.5 million in the last ATP cycle.

D. **Non-infrastructure Only**: Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of the ATP.

E. **Plan**: The development of a community-wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan.

The five applications have been created to align the level of effort to prepare the application with the project size. This allows applications to be streamlined in length and complexity for smaller projects while more information will be requested for larger projects.

MPO Call for Projects

In the previous 2019 ATP Cycle 4, for the MPO competitive program specific call for projects, all applications considered by an MPO, must have been submitted through the statewide competitive program using the electronic application. This change was to reduce the administrative burden for Caltrans and the CTC by avoiding having applications in different formats that were never submitted to the state be submitted by the MPOs.

CTC has now reversed their decision and is allowing MPOs to have separate Calls for Projects again. An MPO may elect to have a supplemental application that applicants must submit to be considered for their MPO competitive program specific call for projects. An MPO may also, with CTC approval, use a different project selection criteria or weighting, minimum project size, match requirement, and/or definition of disadvantaged communities for its competitive selection process.
SJCOG staff have prepared draft guidelines and a draft supplemental application to accommodate a combined Call for Projects utilizing ATP, Measure K, and CMAQ funding. These guidelines adapt the latest ATP Guidelines and the guidelines developed for the previous 2017-2021 Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School and Smart Growth Incentive Program to suit SJCOG’s needs and the requirements of the different funding programs.

**Funding Amount**

This 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program includes approximately $18.5 million of various state, local, and federal funding sources:

- $3.546 million from the regional portion of the ATP
- $3.798 million from the Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Competitive Program
- $7.578 million from the Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program
- $3.6 million from the federal CMAQ Program

**Scoring Criteria**

Proposed projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria. These criteria were adapted from the current ATP guidelines and the previous 2017-2021 Measure K guidelines. Table 1 below shows the maximum number of points allowed for each type of application. If a scoring criterion is left blank, it is not applicable to that application type.

### Table 1: 2021 SJCOG Regional ATP Question Scoring Matrix by Application Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>NI Only</th>
<th>Infrastructure or Infrastructure with Non-Infrastructure (NI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Plan Layout Consistency and Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Sensitive &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation &amp; Plan Development</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging of Other Funding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Land Uses and Development Intensity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Diversity and Affordability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compared to the state 2021 ATP Cycle 5 guidelines, the Leveraging of Other Funding question has been increased in the Large and Medium Applications from 5 points to 15, while 10 points have been added to the Small, Non-Infrastructure Only, and Plan Applications. In addition, the Project Readiness, Project Location, Transit Access, Mixed Land Uses and Development Intensity, and Housing Diversity and Affordability questions have been added from the previous 2017-2021 Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School and Smart Growth Incentive Program Guidelines that were adopted by the SJCOG Board in September 2017.

**BACKGROUND:**

*Previous 2019 ATP Cycle 4*

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) was created in 2013 by Senate Bill 99 and Assembly Bill 101 to promote the increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking & walking. The ATP distributes the total annual funding capacity between three separate programs with 10% going to small urban/rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less, 40% going to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 and 50% going to a statewide program. All funding must be competitively awarded, the requirement that 25% of the funds in each program benefit disadvantaged communities. The ATP has two separate grant processes—one led by the State and the other led by the nine large MPOs including SJCOG.

In the previous 2019 ATP Cycle 4, 23 applications were submitted from the Cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton, Tracy, and San Joaquin County. A total of 552 applications were submitted statewide, competing for approximately $223 million in statewide ATP funds. These 552 applications requested a total of over $2.2 billion. The California Transportation Commission (CTC) announced their staff recommendations for the statewide portion of the 2019 ATP on December 28, 2018. These recommendations included $4,390,000 for the City of Stockton’s California Street Separated Bikeway Project and $2,838,000 for the Stockton Safe Routes to Schools Safety and Connectivity Improvements Project. These recommendations were adopted by the CTC at the January 30, 2019, CTC Meeting.

The other 21 applications from San Joaquin County remained eligible for funding under the MPO Competitive Project Selection Process. Those applications were reviewed by a multidisciplinary advisory committee, made up of volunteers from the region. After scoring the applications, the top scoring application San Joaquin County’s Oro Avenue and Section Avenue Sidewalk Improvements project was recommended for full funding ($1,439,000). The remaining $2,105,000 of funding was recommended to partially fund the next highest ranked project, the City of Stockton’s Safe Routes to School Sidewalk Gap Closure Project. These recommendations were adopted by the SJCOG Board in February 2019 and approved by the CTC in May 2019.

*Previous 2017-2021 Measure K Cycle 1 Call for Projects*

The Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Program provides funding to help expand and enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety and facilities within San Joaquin County. The Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program provides funding for infrastructure enhancements that will assist local agencies to better integrate transportation and land use. These funds are used to support infill development, neighborhood revitalization, and downtown improvements.
In September 2017, SJCOG announced a combined Call for Projects for funding from the Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Competitive Program and the Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program. A total of 40 applications were received requesting more than $39 million in funding. In February 2018, the SJCOG Board awarded a total of $19.63 million of competitive funding from the Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Program and the Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program to 21 projects and plans. SJCOG received far more applications than it was able to fund.

**Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program**

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) was reauthorized under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century in 1998, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users in 2005, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act in 2012, and most recently, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act in 2015 (FAST Act). The purpose of the CMAQ program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. SJCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the San Joaquin County region, is responsible for establishing a process to select and program CMAQ projects.

In April 2019, the SJCOG Board adopting a policy to set aside 15% of available CMAQ funding for bicycle, pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Projects, with the intent to hold a combined call for projects with Measure K and ATP funding at a future date.

**SCHEDULE:**

### 2021 ATP Cycle 5 Statewide Call for Projects Schedule

- CTC adopts ATP Guidelines: March 25-26, 2020
- Statewide ATP Call for Projects begins: March 25-26, 2020
- Project applications due to Caltrans (postmark date): June 15, 2020
- CTC staff recommendations for statewide ATP projects: November 16, 2020
- CTC adopts statewide ATP projects: December 2-3, 2020

### 2021 SJCOG Regional Active Transportation Program Call for Projects Schedule

- MPOs submit optional guidelines to CTC: April 24, 2020
- CTC action on MPO guidelines: May 13-14, 2020
- MPO Call for Projects: May 29, 2020
- Supplemental Applications due to SJCOG: August 28, 2020
- Scoring Committee Review of Applications: November 2020 – January 2021
- CTC distributes projects that were not awarded Statewide funds to MPOs for consideration: December 3, 2020
- SJCOG Staff programming recommendations: January 18, 2021
- SJCOG Board adopts programming recommendations: February 25, 2021
- CTC adopts MPO programming recommendations: May 2021
NEXT STEPS:

If approved by the SJCOG Board, SJCOG staff will submit the adopted 2021 SJCOG Regional ATP Guidelines to the CTC for approval. This approval is expected on May 13-14, 2020, and subsequently SJCOG would announce a Call for Project on May 29, 2020, with applications due on August 28, 2020.

SJCOG staff recommends that project sponsors begin the application process as soon as possible for potential new project grant applications, or for improving unsuccessful applications from the previous ATP and Measure K cycles.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Draft 2021 SJCOG Regional Active Transportation Program Guidelines
2. Draft 2021 SJCOG Regional ATP Supplemental Application

Prepared By: David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner
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I. Introduction

1. Background

The Active Transportation Program (ATP) is a competitive statewide program created to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. Senate Bill 99 (Chapter 359, Statutes of 2013) and Assembly Bill 101 (Chapter 354, Statutes of 2013) created the ATP, and Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) (Chapter 2031, statutes of 2017) directs additional funding from the Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Account to the ATP. The ATP distributes the total annual funding capacity between three programs with 10% going to small urban/rural areas with populations of 200,000 or less, 40% going to Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) in urban areas with populations greater than 200,000 and 50% going to a statewide program. All funding must be competitively awarded, the requirement that 25% of the funds in each program benefit disadvantaged communities. The ATP has two separate grant processes, one led by the California Transportation Commission (CTC) and the other led by the nine large MPOs including the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG). The 2021 ATP Guidelines were adopted by the CTC on March 26, 2020.

The Measure K Renewal Ordinance and Expenditure Plan as passed by the voters of San Joaquin County in 2006 includes a Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Funding Program. The Measure K Expenditure Plan specifies that 60% of the funds will be allocated according to a competitive process. The Expenditure Plan specifies a minimum of $65 million in federal transportation funding or Measure K funding will be made available during the Measure K Renewal program for smart growth incentives to local jurisdictions in San Joaquin County. These funds will be available for infrastructure improvements that will assist local agencies in integrating transportation and land use, such as street calming, walkable community projects, transit amenities and alternative modes of transportation. These funds will be available to enhance infill development, neighborhood revitalization and downtown improvements.

The Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) was reauthorized under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century in 1998, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users in 2005, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act in 2012, and most recently, the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation Act in 2015 (FAST Act). The purpose of the CMAQ program is to fund transportation projects or programs that will contribute to attainment or maintenance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. SJCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the San Joaquin County region, is responsible for establishing a process to select and program CMAQ projects. In April 2019, the SJCOG Board adopting a policy to reserve 15% of CMAQ funding for bicycle, pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School projects.

To reduce administrative burden and streamline the process for applicants, SJCOG has combined these funding sources into one Call for Projects in the 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program. These guidelines describe the policy, standards, criteria, and procedures for the development, adoption and management of the 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program. Where silent, these guidelines will defer to the CTC’s 2021 ATP Guidelines.
2. Program Goals

Pursuant to statute, the purpose of the ATP is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation, such as biking and walking. The goals of the ATP are to:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking.
- Increase the safety and mobility of non-motorized users.
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals as established pursuant to Senate Bill 375 (Chapter 728, Statutes of 2008) and Senate Bill 391 (Chapter 585, Statutes of 2009).
- Enhance public health, including reduction of childhood obesity through the use of programs including, but not limited to, projects eligible for Safe Routes to School Program funding.
- Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program.
- Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

Pursuant to the Measure K Strategic Plan, the goals of the Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Program and the Smart Growth Incentive Program are to:

- Meet the mobility needs for people of all ages and abilities in San Joaquin County by improving and enhancing the existing bicycle and pedestrian network
- Providing better connectivity, accessibility, and safety measures between specific origins and destinations referred to as Community Activity Centers (CACs)
- Assist local agencies in better integrating transportation and land use
- Support infill development, neighborhood revitalization, and downtown improvements

3. Program Schedule and Funding Years

The guidelines for this program of projects must be adopted by March 26, 2020. Programming capacity for the 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program will be for state fiscal years 2021/22 through 2024/25. The following schedule lists the major milestones for the development and adoption of the 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Guidelines and Application Released for Public Review</th>
<th>March 5, 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG Board adoption of Guidelines</td>
<td>March 26, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG Submits Guidelines to CTC</td>
<td>April 17, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTC Action on SJCOG Guidelines</td>
<td>May 13-14, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call for Projects</td>
<td>May 29, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic project applications due to SJCOG (postmark date)</td>
<td>August 28, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff funding recommendations for program</td>
<td>January 18, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG Board adopts funding recommendations</td>
<td>February 25, 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. Funding

4. Sources

The 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program is funded from various state, local, and federal funding sources:

- Approximately $3.546 million from the regional portion of the Active Transportation Program (ATP)
- Approximately $3.798 million from the Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Competitive Program
- Approximately $7.578 million from the Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program
- Approximately $3.6 million from the federal Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

All projects must meet eligibility requirements specific to at least one of these four funding sources.

5. Distribution

The 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program will be distributed as follows:

- Approximately $3.546 million of Active Transportation funds will be programmed on a competitive basis to Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School projects
- Approximately $3.798 million of Measure K funds will be programmed on a competitive basis to Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School projects
- Approximately $7.578 million of Measure K funds will be programmed on a competitive basis to Smart Growth Incentive Program projects
  - For projects requesting funds from the Smart Growth Incentive Program, the maximum Measure K contribution is $2 million per project
    - For project planning, the Measure K contribution is capped at $250,000 per project
    - For environmental analysis, design, and engineering, the Measure K contribution is capped at $250,000 per project
    - For project construction, the Measure K contribution is capped at the difference between the funds spent for other phases and an allocation limitation not to exceed $2 million.
- Approximately $3.6 million of CMAQ funds will be programmed on a competitive basis to Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School projects

6. Matching Requirements

SJCOG does not require a funding match for the 2021 Regional Active Transportation Program.
7. Leveraging Funds

SJCOG encourages the leveraging of additional funds for a project by considering leveraging in the evaluation criteria for all projects, however, applicants are not required to leverage funds. SJCOG will only consider cash funds for leveraging. In-kind contributions are not permitted. Pre-construction phases funded by the applicant will be considered for leveraging even if the funds were expended before the application deadline.

Except for State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding, SJCOG will only consider funds that are not allocated by the CTC on a project specific bases as eligible funds for leveraging points. Leveraging funds may include Non-competitive Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School funds, other Measure K funds derived by formula, or other federal or local funds.

Applicants must provide a complete (phase-by-phase) project funding plan through construction that demonstrates that any competitive funding and leveraged funding in the plan (local, federal, state, private sources) are reasonably expected to be available and sufficient to complete the project.

8. Funding for Plans

Funding from the ATP and the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School Program may be used to fund the development of community-wide active transportation plans, including bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to schools, or comprehensive active transportation plans. ATP funds may only be used to fund plans within or encompassing disadvantaged communities. A list of the components that must be included in an active transportation plan can be found Appendix A of the 2021 ATP Guidelines as adopted by the CTC on March 26, 2020.

Funding from the Smart Growth Incentive Program will be available for planning studies. During the initial years of the program, a larger percentage of Smart Growth Incentive Program funds shall be used to support planning activities. Measure K competitive funds used for Smart Growth Incentive Program planning may only be allocated based on a 50 percent match. Applications for plans may not be combined with applications for infrastructure or other non-infrastructure projects.

9. Reimbursement

The ATP and CMAQ are reimbursement programs for eligible costs incurred. In order for an item to be eligible for reimbursement through Caltrans, that item’s primary use or function must meet the program purpose and at least one of the program goals. Reimbursement is requested through the invoice process detailed in the Caltrans Local Assistance Procedures Manual, Chapter 5, Invoicing. Costs incurred prior to CTC allocation and, for federally funded projects, Federal Highway Administration project approval (i.e. Authorization to Proceed), are not eligible for reimbursement.

The Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School and Smart Growth Incentive Programs are reimbursement programs for eligible costs incurred. A cooperative agreement must be signed by SJCOG and the project sponsor before funds are available for the project.
Once a cooperative agreement has been signed by both parties, the project sponsor is required to submit monthly progress reports to the SJCOG. Also, monthly invoices may be submitted. Expenses are reimbursed in arrears, with the exception of a one-month advance for construction projects (upon request of the sponsor). Expenses incurred prior to the execution of a Measure K Renewal contract are not reimbursable. By the last day of each month, the SJCOG will pay all invoices received by the 10th of that month. The following items are not eligible for Measure K Renewal reimbursement under a cooperative agreement:

- Activities relating to obtaining matching funds for a project.
- Activities related to general Measure K Renewal administration (not specific to the project), education or preparation performed by the project sponsor or contractor.
- Activities relating to another project not covered in the cooperative agreement, even if it is a Measure K Renewal project.
- Activities conducted prior to executing a Measure K Renewal cooperative agreement

### III. Eligibility

#### 10. Eligible Applicants

**Active Transportation Program**

Eligible applicants for the Active Transportation Program are specified in Section 11 of the 2021 ATP Guidelines as adopted by the CTC on March 26, 2020.

**Measure K**

The applicant and/or implementing agency for Measure K funds assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of program funds. Applicants and/or implementing agencies must be able to comply with all the federal, state, and local laws, regulations, policies and procedures required to complete the project. The following entities, are eligible to apply for Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School and Smart Growth Incentive Program funds:

- The cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Manteca, Ripon, Stockton, and Tracy
- The County of San Joaquin
- The San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
- The San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Any other public agency in San Joaquin County that is eligible to receive federal transportation funds may apply for funding only from the Smart Growth Incentive Program
- School districts and private nonprofit 501(c)(3) organizations may only apply for ancillary support need projects through the Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School program. These are individualized community-based needs that are not part of a larger project and include:
  - Bicycle racks and enclosed bicycle storage facilities
  - Lighting & signage
  - Bicycle and pedestrian education and promotion efforts
  - School site specific safe routes to school assessments
Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program

Applicants for CMAQ funding must have a master agreement with Caltrans to receive federal transportation funding.

11. Partnering With Implementing Agencies

Applicants are encouraged to partner with other agencies/groups, including private and non-profit organizations, in applying for funds.

12. Eligible Projects

All projects must be selected through a competitive process and must meet one or more of the program goals:

a. Infrastructure Projects: Capital improvements that will further the goals of this program. This typically includes the environmental, design, right-of-way, and construction phases of a capital (facilities) project.

b. Plans: The development of a community wide bicycle, pedestrian, safe routes to school, or active transportation plan, or planning studies for a project through the Smart Growth Incentive Program or the Active Transportation Program.

c. Non-infrastructure Projects: Education, encouragement, and enforcement activities that further the goals of this program. SJCOG intends to focus funding for non-infrastructure on start-up projects. A project is considered to be a start-up when no program currently exists. Start-up projects must demonstrate how the program is sustainable after funding is exhausted. The program cannot fund ongoing program operations. Non-infrastructure projects are not limited to those benefiting school students. Program expansions or new components of existing programs are eligible for funding as long as the applicant can demonstrate that the existing program will be continued with other funds.

d. Infrastructure projects with non-infrastructure components.

e. Quick-Build Pilot Projects: Quick build projects are interim capital improvement projects that further the goals of the program. These projects do require construction, but are built with durable, low to moderate cost materials and last from one year to five years. See Appendix D of the CTC’s 2021 ATP Guidelines for details.

13. Minimum Request for Funds

To maximize the effectiveness of program funds and to encourage the aggregation of small projects into one larger comprehensive project, the minimum request for funding that will be considered is $250,000. This minimum does not apply to non-infrastructure projects, safe routes to school projects, plans, and quick-build pilot projects.
14. Project Type Requirements

As discussed in the Funding Distribution section (above), the program includes multiple, overlapping components. Below is an explanation of the requirements specific to these components.

A. Disadvantaged Communities

For a project to be considered a Disadvantaged Community, the project must clearly demonstrate, with verifiable information, a direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to a disadvantaged community. To count as providing a benefit, a project must fulfill an important need of low-income people in a way that provides a significant benefit and targets its benefits primarily to low-income people while avoiding substantial burdens on a disadvantaged community. It is incumbent upon the applicant to clearly articulate how the project benefits the disadvantaged community; there is no presumption of benefit, even for projects located within a disadvantaged community. For a project to qualify as directly benefiting a disadvantaged community, the project must:

- Be located within or be within reasonable proximity to, the disadvantaged community served by the project,
- Have a direct connection to the disadvantaged community, or
- Be an extension or a segment of a larger project that connects to or is directly adjacent to the disadvantaged community.

To qualify as a disadvantaged community the community served by the project must meet at least one of the following criteria:

- Median Household Income: (Table ID B19013) is less than 80% of the statewide median based on the most current Census Tract (ID 140) level data from the 2014-2018 American Community Survey (<$56,982). Communities with a population less than 15,000 may use data at the Census Block Group (ID 150) level. Unincorporated communities may use data at the Census Place (ID 160) level. Data is available at the United States Census Bureau Website at: https://data.census.gov/cedsci/?intcmp=aff_cedsci_banner

- CalEnviroScreen: An area identified as among the most disadvantaged 25% in the state according to the CalEPA and based on the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool 3.0 (CalEnviroScreen 3.0) scores (score must be greater than or equal to 39.34). The mapping tool can be found here and the list can be found at: http://www.calepa.ca.gov/EnvJustice/GHGInvest/

- National School Lunch Program: At least 75% of public-school students in the project area are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals under the National School Lunch Program. Data is available at the California Department of Education website at http://www.cde.ca.gov/ds/sd/sd/filessp.asp. Applicants using this measure must indicate how the project benefits the school students in the project area. Project must be located within two miles of the school(s) represented by this criteria.
Healthy Places Index: The Healthy Places Index includes a composite score for each census tract in the State. The higher the score, the healthier the community conditions based on 25 community characteristics. The scores are then converted to a percentile to compare it to other tracts in the State. A census tract must be in the 25th percentile or less to qualify as a disadvantaged community. The live map and the direct data can both be found on the California Healthy Places Index website.

Other: If an applicant believes that the project benefits a disadvantaged community, but the project does not meet the aforementioned criteria due to a lack of accurate information, the applicant may submit another means of qualifying for consideration. SJCOG staff will assess and score this question for applicants using the “Other” category to qualify as a disadvantaged community. Suggested alternatives that can be submitted under this category include:

- Census data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area. The applicant must submit for consideration a quantitative assessment, such as a survey, to demonstrate that the community’s median household income is at or below 80% of the state median household income.

- CalEnviroScreen data that represents a small neighborhood or unincorporated area. The applicant must submit for consideration an assessment to demonstrate that the community’s CalEnviroScreen score is at or above 39.34.

B. Safe Routes to School Projects

For a project to qualify for Safe Routes to School designation, the project must directly increase safety and convenience for public school students to walk and/or bike to school. Safe Routes to Schools infrastructure projects must be located within two miles of a public school or within the vicinity of a public school bus stop and the students must be the intended beneficiaries of the project. Other than traffic education and enforcement activities, non-infrastructure projects do not have a location restriction.

IV. Project Application

All applications will must use the latest state 2021 ATP Cycle 5 Electronic Applications available at the Caltrans Local Assistance Website located at: https://dot.ca.gov/programs/local-assistance/fed-and-state-programs/active-transportation-program/general-and-technical-information. In addition, the 2021 SJCOG Regional ATP Supplemental Application must be submitted as described below.

There are five different applications available for applicants to complete depending on the project type and size. It is incumbent on the applicant to complete the application appropriate for their project. Applicants applying for infrastructure projects must utilize the application type based on the entire project cost, not the ATP request amount. All eligible projects must apply with one of the following application types. Applications for plans may not be combined with applications for infrastructure or non-infrastructure projects.

The five application types are:
A. Large Project, Infrastructure Only or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure
   • Projects with a total project cost of greater than $7 million will be considered a large project and must use the Large Project application. SJCOG, Caltrans, and CTC staff may conduct onsite field reviews on a selection of projects that qualify as large projects. Field reviews are not indicative of the project’s likelihood of funding.
   • Projects that qualify for the large application may choose to apply for only pre-construction phases.

B. Medium Project, Infrastructure Only or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure
   • Projects with a total project cost of more than $2 million and up to $7 million will be considered a medium project and must use the Medium Project application.

C. Small Project, Infrastructure Only or Infrastructure/Non-Infrastructure
   • Projects with a total project cost of $2 million or less will be considered a small project and must use the Small Project application.

D. Non-Infrastructure Only

E. Plan
   • Applicants can only apply for a plan with the Plan application. This application cannot be combined with any other type of project.

15. Application Submittal Requirements

   • All project applications must include the signature of the Chief Executive Officer or other officer authorized by the applicant’s governing board.
   • Where the project is to be implemented by an agency other than the applicant, documentation of the agreement between the project applicant and implementing agency must be submitted with the project application.
   • A project application must also include documentation of all other funds committed to the projects.

The following contents are required to be submitted:

   • Signed cover letter (electronic signature is accepted)
   • Completed Supplemental Application
     o Project Information – Section I
     o Supplemental Questions – Section II
       ▪ Leveraging of Other Funding
       ▪ Project Readiness
       ▪ Project Location
       ▪ Transit Access
       ▪ Mixed Land Uses and Development Intensity
       ▪ Housing Diversity and Affordability
     o Supplemental Application Checklist – Section III
   • Complete Appendix – in order
     o State ATP Application
     o Any additional exhibits not included in your State ATP Application
     o Miscellaneous – Any other information not included in your State ATP Application
One (1) signed color hardcopy and (1) electronic copy must be submitted via thumb drive, CD, or email/file sharing site of the complete grant application no later than 4:00 p.m. on August 28, 2020 to:

David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner
San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 E. Weber Avenue
Stockton, CA 95203
ripperda@sjcog.org

V. Project Selection Process

16. Scoring Criteria

Proposed projects will be scored and ranked on the basis of applicant responses to the below criteria. See the chart below to reference the scoring criteria and points allotted to the different types of applications. The chart below shows the maximum number of points allowed for each scoring criteria for each type of application. If a scoring criterion is left blank, it is not applicable to that application type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>NI Only</th>
<th>Infrastructure or Non-Infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits to Disadvantaged Communities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope and Plan Layout Consistency and Cost Effectiveness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context Sensitive &amp; Innovation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative Projects</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Sustainability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation &amp; Plan Development</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leveraging of Other Funding</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Readiness</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Access</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Land Uses and Development Intensity</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Diversity and Affordability</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project programming recommendations may not be based strictly on the rating criteria given the requirements of the various funding sources.

17. Project Selection between Project Applications with the Same Score

If two or more projects applications receive the same score that is at the funding cut-off score, the following criteria will be used to determine which project(s) will be funded in the following priority order:
a. Infrastructure projects  
b. Project readiness including, but not limited to, completed environmental documents  
c. Highest score on the highest point value question (questions with the highest point value may vary by application type).

18. Project Evaluation Committee

SJCOG staff will form a multidisciplinary Project Evaluation Committee to assist in evaluating project applications. In forming the Project Evaluation Committee, staff will seek participants with expertise in bicycling and pedestrian transportation and land use, including Safe Routes to Schools type projects, and in projects benefiting disadvantaged communities, and will seek geographically balanced representation from local jurisdictions and non-governmental organizations.

19. Project Programming

SJCOG staff will program funding to projects based upon the project scores and input from the Project Evaluation Committee. SJCOG staff will attempt to fund projects from only one of the funding types if possible, and will seek to program projects to concentrate federal and state funding on as few projects as possible. Final programming recommendations are subject to review and consideration by the SJCOG committees before adoption by the SJCOG Board. Approval of ATP funding is subject to approval by the CTC.
I. Project Information

1. Project Title: ____________________________________________________________

2. Applicant Agency: _________________________________________________________

3. Agency Address: ___________________________________________________________

4. Project Manager ___________________________________________ Title: _______________

   Email: ___________________________________________ Phone Number: ________________

5. Project Description Briefly describe the existing conditions, scope, and expected benefits. If the project is a component within a larger or multi-phase project, describe the “parent” project as well:

6. Project Location Briefly describe the project location(s):

7. Project Type

   - Large Infrastructure
   - Large Infrastructure with Non-Infrastructure
   - Medium Infrastructure
   - Medium Infrastructure with Non-Infrastructure
   - Small Infrastructure
   - Small Infrastructure with Non-Infrastructure
   - Non-Infrastructure Only
   - Plan
   - Quick-Build Pilot Project

8. Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PA&amp;ED</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Infrastructure and Plans</td>
<td>_________</td>
<td>_________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Start Date</th>
<th>Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   1
9. Funding Requested: $_________________________

10. Total Project Cost: $_________________________

11. Fund Type Being Applied For:

   Select all that apply.

   - Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP)
   - Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Competitive Program
   - Measure K Smart Growth Incentive Program
   - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)

12. Did you submit this project for the 2021 Statewide Active Transportation Program?

   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, are you applying for a reduced scope from what was in your State ATP Application?

   - Yes
   - No

   If yes, revise these parts of your State ATP Application and submit it with your 2021 SJCOG Regional ATP Supplemental Application. This information is needed for Caltrans to process your project if awarded ATP funding.

   - Part A2: General Project Information
   - Part A4: Project Details
   - Part A5: Project Schedule
   - Part A6: Project Funding

14. Partial Scope Description If SJCOG could only partially fund your project, is there a reduced scope/usable partial stage of your project? Please describe the reduced or partial scope and cost(s).
**Infrastructure Type (only intended for Infrastructure projects)**

Note: do not double-count the improvements that benefit both Bicyclists and Pedestrian (i.e. new RRFB/Signal should only show as a Pedestrian or Bicycle Improvement).

- **Bicycle Improvements**
  - New Bicycle Facilities:
    - Class 1: __________ Linear Feet
    - Class 2: __________ Linear Feet
    - Class 3: __________ Linear Feet
    - Class 4: __________ Linear Feet
  - Signalized Intersections:
    - New Detection/Bike Boxes: ______ Number
  - Un-Signalized Intersections:
    - New RRFB/Signal: ______ Number
  - Mid-Block Crossing:
    - New RRFB/Signal: ______ Number
  - Lighting:
    - Intersection: ______ Number
    - Roadway Segments: ______ Linear Feet
  - Bike Share Program:
    - New Bike Share Station: ______ Number
  - Bike Racks/Lockers:
    - New Racks: ______ Number
    - New Lockers: ______ Number
  - Other Bicycle Improvements
    - #1: ______
    - #2: ______

- **Pedestrian Improvements**
  - Sidewalks:
    - New (4' to 8' wide): __________ Linear Feet
    - New (Over 8' wide): _________ Linear Feet
    - Widen Existing: _________ Linear Feet
    - Reconstruct/Enhance Existing: ______ Linear Feet
  - ADA Ramp Improvements:
    - New Ramp (none exist): ________ Number
    - Reconstruct Ramp to Standard: ______ Number
  - Signalized Intersections:
    - New Crosswalk: ______ Number
    - Enhance Existing Crosswalk: ________ Number
    - Pedestrian signal heads: ______ Number
    - Shorten Crossing: ______ Number
  - Un-Signalized Intersections:
    - New Traffic Signal: ______ Number
    - New Roundabout: _________ Number
    - New RRFB/Signal: ______ Number
  - Mid-Block Crossing:
    - New RRFB/Signal: ______ Number
  - Lighting:
    - Intersection: ______ Number
    - Roadway Segments: _________ Linear Feet
  - Pedestrian Amenities:
    - Benches: _________ Number
    - Trash Cans: _______ Number
    - Shade Trees: ________ Number
  - Other Ped Improvements
    - #1: ______
    - #2: ________

- **Multi-use Trail Improvements**
  - Class 1 Trails:
    - New (8’ or less wide): __________ Linear Feet
    - New (Over 8’ wide): _________ Linear Feet
  - Non-Class 1 Trails:
    - Widen Existing: _________ Linear Feet
  - Other Trail Improvements
    - #1: ______
    - #2: ________

- **Vehicular-Roadway Traffic-Calming Improvements**
  - Road Diets:
    - Remove Travel Lane: _________ Linear Feet
    - Remove Right-Turn Pocket: ______ Number
  - Speed Feedback Signs:
    - Speed Feedback Signs: _________ Number
  - Signalized Intersections:
    - Timing Improvements: ______ Number
    - New Roundabout: _________ Number
  - Un-Signalized Intersections:
    - New Traffic Signal: ______ Number
  - Other Traffic-Calming
    - #1: ______
    - #2: ________

- **Transit Amenities (only for Smart Growth Incentive Program Projects)**
  - Transit Facilities:
    - Passenger Benches: _________ Number
    - Passenger Shelters: _________ Number
    - Bus Turnout: _________ Number
    - Bus Pads: _________ Number
  - Other Transit Amenities
    - #1: ______
    - #2: ________
II. Supplemental Questions

**QUESTION #1: LEVERAGING OF OTHER FUNDING (0-15 POINTS FOR LARGE AND MEDIUM, 0-10 POINTS FOR SMALL INFRASTRUCTURE AND PLAN APPLICATIONS)**

(This question replaces Part B8 of the State ATP Application Form for Large and Medium Projects)

A. Describe the leveraged funding the applicant is committing to invest in the project if it is awarded competitive funding (total value in dollars). The application funding plan must show all federal, state, and local funding for the project. Non-competitive Measure K Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Safe Routes to School funds and other Measure K funds derived by formula may be used as matching funds. (0-20 POINTS)

**Leveraged Funds**

Funds either already expended by the applicant for a previous phase, or funds to be programmed for use on elements within the requested project. This funding can only be considered “leveraged” funding if it goes towards eligible participating project costs.

Total Project Cost: _______________

Leveraged Funds: _______________ % of Total Project Cost: _______________

Only direct funding and the direct expenses for completing project delivery milestones can be used. Please provide detailed information on actual costs for past milestones and estimated costs for future milestones.
QUESTION #2: PROJECT READINESS (0-20 POINTS)

A. Provide detailed information on any completed project milestones and the project schedule.

- Feasibility Study/Project Study Report or Equivalent (2 points for completion)
- Environmental Clearance (4 points for completion)
- Plans, Specifications, & Estimates (6 points for completion)
- Right of Way Acquisition (6 points for completion)
- Other pre-construction requirements (Permits, utility relocation, etc.) (2 points for completion)

*For completion of environmental clearance, attach a copy of the resolution or other signed documentation approving or adopting the environmental document.*
QUESTION #3: PROJECT LOCATION (0-20 POINTS)

A. Describe the location of the project. Describe how the project provides or improves connectivity across a combination of the following key Community Activity Centers (CACs): (0 to 10 POINTS)

- Employment centers
- Transit Hubs/Stations
- Schools
- Compact commercial areas
- Residential concentrations or downtown/community cores

*Attach a map of the location of the project and any Community Activity Centers.*
B. Describe how the project supports development that reinforces and logically extends existing and planned development. Describe whether adjacent sites have been previously developed, and on how many sides existing development already exists. Describe the status of water, sewer, and infrastructure to the project site, and whether the existing utilities are sufficient to accommodate development. Note whether the project site is within ¼ mile of a Measure K Smart Growth Project Infill Opportunity Site. (0-5 POINTS)

C. Describe how the project is located in an area (within a ¼ mile walk distance) with high levels of street connectivity for vehicles, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit. Describe the pattern of the street network, the spacing of streets, posted speeds, and whether streets are designed to accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists. (0-5 POINTS)
QUESTION #3: TRANSIT ACCESS (0-20 POINTS)

Attach a scaled map of the location of the project and all bus and rail transit routes, stops, and stations within ½ mile of the project vicinity. If transit service will be provided to an area in the future, include in the attachment a “will serve” letter from the transit operator that documents this.

A. Describe how the project is in an area with nearby passenger rail and/or bus transit service that is accessible and provides regular service, or if future transit service will be provided to the area as documented in a “will-serve” letter from the transit operator. Describe any existing or proposed passenger amenities at transit stops in the area and all existing or proposed headways between buses in the area. (0-20 POINTS)
QUESTION #4: HOUSING DIVERSITY AND AFFORDABILITY (0-10 POINTS)

- Single family detached
- Small lot single family detached
- Single family attached
- Townhouses
- Duplexes/Triplexes
- Apartments
- Senior housing
- Mobile Home Park

A. Describe how the project is in an area (within a ¼ mile walk of the project) that has a diverse array of housing types. Include all housing types from the list above that are in the project area. (0-5 POINTS)

B. Describe how the project would support development that has a diverse array of housing types. Include all housing types from the list above that are in the development in the project area. (0-5 POINTS)
C. Describe how the project is located in proximity to or supports development includes affordable housing. Describe the percentage of the development that would be affordable to each income category. (0-5 POINTS)

When considering housing affordability, use the following 2019 Income Limits for San Joaquin County as set by the Department of Housing and Community Development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Income Category</th>
<th>Number of Persons in Household</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Extremely Low</td>
<td>14700 16910 21330 25750 30170 34590 39010 43430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County 4-Person</td>
<td>Very Low Income</td>
<td>24500 28000 31500 35000 37800 40600 43400 46200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Median Income: $71,400</td>
<td>Low Income</td>
<td>39200 44800 50400 56000 60500 65000 69450 73950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>50000 57100 64250 71400 77100 82800 88550 94250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate Income</td>
<td>60000 68550 77150 85700 92550 99400 10625 113100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTION #5: MIXED LAND USES AND DEVELOPMENT INTENSITY (0-15 POINTS)

When describing the mix of land uses, refer to this list:

- Single-family housing
- Multi-family housing
- Commercial
- Office
- Recreation
- Education
- Institution
- Industrial

A. Describe how the project is in an area (within a ¼ mile walk of the project) that provides a variety of land uses. List any of the uses above that are within the project area. (0-5 POINTS)

Development Intensities are defined as follows:

- **Low Intensity**: Fewer than 12 Dwelling Units per acre AND/OR 0.29 or less Floor Area Ratio
- **Moderate Intensity**: 12 to 15 Dwelling Units per acre AND/OR 0.30-0.69 Floor Area Ratio
- **High Intensity**: 16 to 19 Dwelling Units per acre AND/OR 0.70-0.99 Floor Area Ratio
- **Very High Intensity**: 20 or more Dwelling Units per acre AND/OR 1.0 or higher Floor Area Ratio
B. Describe how the project is in an area (within a ¼ mile walk of the project) that exhibits a smart growth pattern of development intensity. Refer to the definitions above for intensities. Describe the percentage of the area that includes housing. Note if the project is located in a core area, such as a downtown, and whether the project is of the highest intensity found in the community. (0-5 POINTS)

C. Describe how the project would support private development that exhibits a smart growth pattern of development intensity. Refer to the definitions above for intensities. Describe the percentage of the area that includes housing. Note if the project is located in a core area, such as a downtown, and whether the project is of the highest development intensity found in the community. (0-5 POINTS)
III. Supplemental Application Checklist

☐ **Eligibility:** Potential applicants may check with SJCOG staff regarding their eligibility to apply for funding sources or the eligibility of their project.

☐ **Program Schedule:** Review the Regional ATP Schedule for important dates.

☐ **Application Contents:** Review pages for all needed elements:

  - Signed cover letter (electronic signature is accepted)
  - Completed Supplemental Application
    - Project Information – Section I
    - Supplemental Questions – Section II
      - Leveraging of Other Funding
      - Project Readiness
      - Project Location
      - Transit Access
      - Mixed Land Uses and Development Intensity
      - Housing Diversity and Affordability
  - Supplemental Application Checklist – Section III
  - Complete Appendix – in order
    - State ATP Application
    - Any additional exhibits not included in your State ATP Application
    - Misc. – Any other information not included in your State ATP Application

  *Please do not include a complete Master Plan or other local or regional planning document with your application.*

☐ **Submittal Deadline:** Please submit one (1) signed color hardcopy and (1) electronic copy via thumb drive, CD, or email/file sharing site of the complete grant application no later than 4:00 p.m. on August 28, 2020 to:

David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner
San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 E. Weber Avenue
Stockton, CA 95203
ripperda@sj cog.org
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Final Congested Corridor Plan

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend to the SJCOG Board that they accept the Final Congested Corridor Plan

SUMMARY:

The Congested Corridor Plan is a comprehensive multimodal study that assesses conditions along the I-205, I-5, State Route 120, and State Route 99 corridor, including parallel passenger rail, bus transit, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The plan identifies improvements that will help improve safety, congestion, accessibility, economic development, and air quality. In August 2018, the SJCOG Board authorized contracting with Mark Thomas & Company, Inc. to prepare the Congested Corridor Plan.

In September 2019, SJCOG held a series of community workshops in Manteca, Tracy, and Mountain House to gather input on plans for improvements. The preliminary draft Congested Corridor Plan was released for public review on November 14, 2019. A Project Development Team (PDT) meeting was held on December 11, 2019 and comments were requested by the end of December 2019. A number of agencies requested additional time to submit comments, so the comment period was extended into February 2020. Comments were received from the following agencies:

- Alameda County Transportation Commission
- Caltrans District 10
- Caltrans Division of Rail and Mass Transportation
- City of Manteca
- City of Ripon
- San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission
- San Joaquin Regional Transit District
- Tri-Valley San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority
- Metropolitan Transportation Commission

SJCOG staff and the consultant team prepared responses to the comments received, and a PDT meeting was held on February 27, 2020 to discuss the comments to ensure that the responses and changes made were adequate. Subsequently, SJCOG’s consultant team prepared the Final Congested Corridor Plan. The full document is available for download at: https://www.sjcog.org/DocumentCenter/View/5039.
RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff recommends that the TAC recommend to the SJCOG Board that they accept the Final Congested Corridor Plan.

DISCUSSION:

The Congested Corridor Plan contains 52 multimodal projects within the corridor. These projects were analyzed to develop a priority list of eleven projects that could be constructed in the Short-Term (2025), Mid-Term (2030) and Long-Term (2035) planning horizons that provide the greatest improvements for the I-205, I-5, SR 120 and SR 99 Corridor.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None.

BACKGROUND:

Senate Bill 1 created the Solutions for Congested Corridors Program. The Congested Corridor Program is intended to achieve a balanced set of transportation, environmental, and community access improvements within highly congested travel corridors throughout the state. All projects nominated for the Congested Corridors Program must be included in a Comprehensive Multimodal Corridor Plan.

SCHEDULE:

- November 14, 2019 – Preliminary Draft Congested Corridor Plan released for review
- November 2019 to February 2020 - Agency and public input on Congested Corridor Plan
- March 2020 – Committee input on Final Congested Corridor Plan
- March 26, 2020 – Final Congested Corridor Plan accepted by SJCOG Board

Prepared by: David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner
AGENDA ITEM 4E
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Federal Fiscal Year 2019/20 Delivery of Federal Funding

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion Only

SUMMARY:

SJCOG, in its role as the federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, distributes federal Congestion Mitigation Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) and Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) funds to local agencies. The partnerships—between SJCOG staff and the staff of cities/county and transit agencies in the San Joaquin region, and Caltrans Local Assistance—are the primary reasons behind the resounding success of the region’s transportation program. Continuing these strong partnerships to ensure the delivery of CMAQ and RSTP projects during Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2019/20 is critical to bring additional transportation funding to the region and provide improvements for the public sooner.

From October 1, 2019, through February 29, 2020, a total of four RSTP projects and two CMAQ projects have been obligated. This has used 44.54% of SJCOG’s obligation authority. SJCOG anticipates approximately 16 more CMAQ projects and 5 RSTP projects will be obligated during the remainder of this fiscal year. It is important to submit Requests for Authorization (RFA) to Caltrans District 10 as soon as possible. Funding availability for projects cannot be guaranteed later in the spring and summer as funding is made available to the rest of the state. All RFAs must be submitted no later than July 1, 2020, or they will not be processed until the next federal fiscal year in November 2020.

RECOMMENDATION:

This staff report is for discussion only.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time.

BACKGROUND:

The process of financing the Federal-aid Highway Program begins with approval of a Federal Transportation Authorization Act by Congress, which is currently the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act or “FAST Act”. The Fast Act is the primary instrument used by Congress to shape and redirect the federal-aid highway program. The federal-aid transportation funding process starts when the funds are “apportioned” to each state as shown in Figure 1 below:
The funds are then “allocated” by the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) or state agencies, depending on the type of federal-aid program. The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program (CMAQ) are two federal-aid programs that are allocated by the San Joaquin Council of Governments.

Once funds are allocated by the SJCOG Board, local agencies must get permission (also known as “authorization to proceed”) from Caltrans and Federal Highway Administration to move forward on a project before any expenditures are incurred. “Authorization” refers to the activation of funding for a project, allowing a given phase of a project to proceed with federal funding.

Funds that secure authorization to proceed are then considered “obligated” and that dollar amount is deducted from the “obligational authority” set for the region. “Obligational authority” is the total dollar figure within a given fiscal year that the federal government commits to pay to the region. Each year, regional agencies are provided with an obligation authority total for CMAQ and RSTP funding. As a result, each region’s obligation authority total dollar amount functions as a spending level expectation.
Caltrans encourages project delivery beyond established obligation authority target each year, because it demonstrates the need for funding in California, as well the ability to spend funds when they become available. Caltrans is then put in a better position to capture additional obligation authority from states unable to use it. This process is often known as “use it or lose it”.

**Previous Federal Fiscal Year 2018/19**

The San Joaquin County region has compiled a history of the meeting (and exceeding) its obligation targets for CMAQ and RSTP funded projects. In FFY 2018/19, 11 projects using CMAQ and 6 projects using RSTP funding were obligated. These projects amount to $14,588,080 in CMAQ and RSTP obligations, representing delivery of 163.4 percent of the region’s obligation authority. Further, this total represented the third-largest obligation percentage in the state.

At the end of each fiscal year, Caltrans assigns additional obligation authority (for use in the following fiscal year) to regions that over-delivered. The amount each region receives is based on the extent to which they over-delivered against their obligation authority targets. Caltrans refers to this process as “August Redistribution.” Based on performance in FY 18/19, San Joaquin County received $2,166,378 in additional obligation authority for FFY 19/20. In addition to this benefit, this over delivery means that a full year’s worth of projects will start early. These advanced projects can take advantage of today’s project costs and be available for the public’s benefit at least one year early.

*Prepared by: Ryan Niblock, Senior Regional Planner, and David Ripperda, Associate Regional Planner*
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: San Joaquin Regional Climate Summit Re-Cap

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information

SUMMARY:

On Wednesday, February 26, 2020, the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) hosted the San Joaquin Regional Climate Summit. The purpose of this summit was to share the results from the SJCOG Climate Adaptation and Resiliency Study. This year-long study draws primarily on climate data sets developed and applied in California’s Fourth Climate Change Assessment directly designed to inform State policies, plans, programs, and guidance to promote climate resiliency. The study examines climate impacts on existing transportation assets in San Joaquin County, such as roads, rail, bus systems, as well as airports and the Port of Stockton. Additional goals of the Regional Climate Summit were to highlight key transportation vulnerabilities and planning gaps in the region. The summit also informed participants about a second phase of the study, which aims to develop tools and resources for local and regional climate adaptation.

The summit gathered more than 50 participants representing a cross-disciplinary group of city and county planners, flood managers, transit agencies, local non-profits, and environmental groups. The summit also featured a panel of experts from partner agencies presenting their ongoing work related to climate vulnerability assessments and adaptation planning:

- Rachael Hartofelis, Resilience Planner, Metropolitan Transportation Commission;
- Sinaren Pheng, Sustainability & Asset Manager, Caltrans District 10; and
• Harriet Ross, Assistant Planning Director, Delta Stewardship Council.

In addition to highlighting related climate adaptation work at their agencies, panelists also shared lessons learned on integrating climate adaptation and resiliency in local plans, project development and delivery, as well as regional transportation plans. The panel was followed by small group discussions in which summit participants provided direct feedback for SJCOG’s ongoing work through a Phase 2 study. This phase aims to develop meaningful implementation guidance for partners to incorporate adaptation and resiliency at the local and regional level.

The following San Joaquin Regional Climate Summit materials are available for review and download:
• Draft Climate Adaptation & Resiliency Study
• San Joaquin Regional Climate Summit Presentations
• Summary Notes

SJCOG staff is welcoming comments on the Draft Report through Friday, March 13th. To submit comments, please send your feedback via Google Form.

RECOMMENDATION
This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:
In April 2017, Governor Brown signed into law Senate Bill 1 (SB 1) – The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017. This transportation funding bill provides a reliable source of funds to maintain and integrate the state’s multimodal transportation system. According to section 16321 of SB 1, a portion of the revenue is made available by formula for sustainable transportation planning grants to regional agencies. SJCOG has identified a portion of these funds for the Climate Resiliency and Adaptation Study.

Climate adaptation and resiliency planning seeks to identify infrastructure vulnerable to disruption due to changing climate, determine the risks and consequences of current climate trends, and propose investment priorities to mitigate identified risks. Climate adaptation plans vary in content as every region faces different changes to weather events and associated environmental impacts. This is one of several studies to aid SJCOG in implementation efforts for its recently adopted 2018 Regional Transportation Plan / Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS). This study is the first step in SJCOG’s commitment to addressing federal requirements incorporated into the most recent RTP guidelines (adopted January 2017) related to improvement of the resiliency and reliability of the transportation system.

In addition to federal requirements, there are several efforts addressing climate adaptation throughout California. These are largely in response to state mandates and requirements for state agencies. Two large-scale studies that are currently under development, or recently completed, have informed this SJCOG effort:
1. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) has committed resources to statewide climate change vulnerability assessments. The assessment for the San Joaquin region (District 10) was recently completed.

2. The Delta Stewardship Council is currently developing a Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Adaptation Strategy for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and Suisun Marsh. The portions of San Joaquin County within the Primary and Secondary Zones of the Delta will be within the scope of this study. SJCOG’s adaptation and resiliency planning will require close coordination with these current studies and should build upon previous efforts by local agencies and neighboring regional agencies to provide actionable recommendations for future planning and implementation.

**NEXT STEPS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Final Climate Adaptation &amp; Resiliency Study (Phase 1)</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Request for Proposals to develop Climate Adaptation &amp; Resiliency Study – Implementation Plan and Adaptation Guidance (Phase 2)</td>
<td>Spring 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Contract for Phase 2 Study</td>
<td>June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Launch Phase 2 Study</td>
<td>Fall 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Report prepared by Christine Corrales, Associate Regional Planner; Isaiah Anderson, Assistant Regional Planner; and Ashley Goldlist, Assistant Regional Planner*
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Update on Activities with Institute for Local Government on Homelessness and Affordable Housing

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information

DISCUSSION:

SUMMARY:

The BOOST pilot program is a partnership between the Institute of Local Government (ILG) and SJCOG with a goal of convening local jurisdictions to discuss the regional issue of homelessness and housing affordability. The working group created to discuss this issue had its first meeting in February.

FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time. There will be no exchange of monies between both agencies. ILG staff time is funded by a grant through the California Strategic Growth Council. SJCOG will be participating in the collaboration through SJCOG’s existing programmed activities for regional planning, interagency collaboration, and coordination. All these activities are budgeted in the Overall Work Program.

RECOMMENDATION: Information only.

BACKGROUND:

ILG was selected by the California Strategic Growth Council (SGC) to administer the BOOST pilot program on behalf of ten cities and two regions in California. The BOOST pilot program, which is a year-long effort, is designed to help local agencies:

- Build awareness of funding opportunities available to address climate action.
- Organize projects to be best positioned to meet goals.
- Optimize existing resources and build more capacity.
- Strengthen relationships with key stakeholders and identify new opportunities for regional engagement and collaboration.
- Transform their approach to addressing climate action.
SJCOG and ILG are working to build relationships and productive partnerships among local jurisdictions in the San Joaquin region on the homelessness subject matter and convene experts and strategic partners to build the capacity, skills, and knowledge needed to develop solutions. These efforts will increase understanding of local and regional efforts to address homelessness and will support the implementation of a forthcoming regional homelessness strategic plan.

In order to execute these efforts, a working group has been formed with one representative from each of our member agencies. The working group will also participate in a “speaker series” to bring partners, local leaders, and organizations together to discuss homelessness, potential funding sources, and BOOST work products. Membership of the working groups is comprised of the following representatives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representative Name</th>
<th>Agency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Schwabauer</td>
<td>City of Lodi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Wright</td>
<td>City of Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Cheshire</td>
<td>San Joaquin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Salvatore</td>
<td>City of Lathrop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda Lutzow</td>
<td>City of Manteca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carissa Higginbotham</td>
<td>City of Tracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Werner</td>
<td>City of Ripon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominque Romo</td>
<td>City of Escalon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first meeting convened on February 19th and was led by ILG staff with the support of SJCOG staff. The main discussion of the meeting was to identify what the working group would like to achieve and what a potential success would look like for the San Joaquin County region. Below is a summary of the group’s discussion:

**What would the working group like to achieve?**
- Better coordination for local responses
- Consensus building
- Strategy to empower local elected officials
- Unified action
- Break down silos among jurisdictions and departments
- Plan to better engage the State
- Identify what we should be doing as a region and bring that back down to a local level

**What would success look like?**
- A regional approach and coordinated effort that will have a local impact
- Jurisdictions agree to build low/no barrier shelter
- Identify common regional goals
- Cohesive strategy/action plan
NEXT STEPS:

During the next meeting, the group intends to discuss and understand the legal framework for what local jurisdictions can and cannot do. The working group meetings are scheduled to meet on a monthly basis until November 2020. A “speaker series” is scheduled for June or July and a white paper on homelessness best practices will be brought to the SJCOG board by December 2020.

Prepared by: Hailey Lang, Associate Regional Planner
AGENDA ITEM 4H
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: SJCOG Public Participation Plan Appendix A Update

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Information

SUMMARY:
As SJCOG begins the process of developing the 2022 Regional Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), staff has reviewed the SJCOG Public Participation Plan (PPP). Staff concluded that only minor changes were needed for Appendix A, which is a project specific guide for conducting public participation and outreach for developing the RTP/SCS. Updates to Appendix A include new contact information, updated website links, as well as improvements to grammar and overall readability. These revisions are considered minor as they do not aim to make any dramatic changes or amendments to the official structure of Appendix A. As stated on pg. 41 of the PPP, “SJCOG’s Public Participation Plan is not a static document, but an ongoing strategy that will be periodically reviewed and updated based on our experiences, changes in legislation, and the changing circumstances of the agency and the transportation community it serves...This Public Participation Plan may be subject to minor changes from time to time.” According to this minor change clause outlined in the PPP, the update does not require a formal comment period or review/approval by the SJCOG Board.

The updated PPP Appendix A is included as Attachment 1. As outlined in the document, public outreach for the RTP/SCS will feature elements such as social media content, participation in community events, survey distribution, and a mini-grant program to encourage broad and diverse participation. These activities are scheduled in two phases that will be implemented beginning Spring 2020 through the final adoption of the RTP/SCS in Summer 2022. For further details and updates on outreach activities, please visit: https://www.sjcog.org/319/2022-RTPSCS-Public-Outreach

RECOMMENDATION:
Information only.
FISCAL IMPACT:

None at this time.

BACKGROUND:

Throughout its history, SJCOG has engaged in a public involvement process to develop its regional transportation plans and programs. The SJCOG Public Participation Plan (PPP) serves as a guide for conducting public involvement processes as well as continuing, comprehensive and coordinated planning processes among stakeholders. The SJCOG PPP helps to ensure early and ongoing opportunities for broad-based participation by the general public, agency stakeholders, partners, and affected and interested parties in the development and review of regional plans and programs.

The SJCOG PPP also highlights opportunities for San Joaquin County residents to comment on the agency’s key plans and programs. It includes goals and strategies to help increase public engagement in the planning process and demonstrates how the agency will meet federal and state planning and public participation requirements, including the FAST Act and SB 375. The current PPP was adopted in 2016 to satisfy state and federal requirements for a transparent and inclusive public process.

NEXT STEPS:

SJCOG staff will post the updated document on the SJCOG website and make it available in print at our office.

ATTACHMENT:

Attachment 1: Updated Appendix A of the SJCOG Public Participation Plan

Prepared by Michelle Prince, Assistant Regional Planner
CONTACT US
San Joaquin Council of Governments
555 E. Weber Avenue
Stockton, CA 95202
(209) 235-0600
(209) 235-0438 fax
www.sjcog.org
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A COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM IS AN IMPORTANT COMPONENT FOR DEVELOPING THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN / SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES STRATEGY.
INTRODUCTION

Federal regulation (Title 23 USC Section 134) and State legislation (Government Code Section 65080 et seq.) require SJCOG, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), and Regional Planning Agency (RTPA) to prepare a long-range Regional Transportation Plan, or RTP. The purpose of the RTP is to combine transportation policies and projects to lay out the blueprint for San Joaquin County’s transportation network and how it can best handle the needs of the future. The RTP coordinates a balanced regional transportation system, identifies adequate funding for transportation projects, and meets federal air quality requirements. The plan is developed in cooperation with Caltrans; the cities of Escalon, Lathrop, Lodi, Ripon, Stockton, and Tracy; and other local and regional stakeholders.

In addition, California Senate Bill 375 (2008) requires SJCOG and other MPOs to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through development of a Sustainable Communities Strategy, or SCS, which integrates transportation and land-use planning. In addition to seeking to achieve a greenhouse gas target, the San Joaquin County region must also continue to work to accommodate anticipated population growth while keeping the region affordable for our residents, preserve open spaces, protect our environment, and get our residents where they need to go, when they need to get there.

A comprehensive public involvement program is an important component for developing the RTP/SCS. As SJCOG undertakes the development of the RTP/SCS, a major goal of the public outreach effort is to communicate with non-traditional as well as traditional audiences through outreach efforts and a series of workshops and public hearings. This program will help ensure that environmental justice issues are addressed and that interested members of the public have ample opportunity to understand and provide meaningful input throughout the RTP development process.
II SUMMARY OF RTP PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

A RTP PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS

TITLE 23 CFR PART 450.316(A) OUTLINES THE FOLLOWING CONCERNING PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION

“The MPO shall develop and use a documented participation plan that defines a process for providing:

- individuals,
- affected public agencies,
- representatives of public transportation employees,
- public ports,
- freight shippers,
- providers of freight transportation services,
- private providers of transportation (including intercity bus operators, employer-based commuting programs, shuttle program, vanpool program, transit benefit program, parking cash-out program, shuttle program, or telework program),
- representatives of users of public transportation,
- representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities,
- representatives of the disabled, and
- other interested parties

with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process.”
» When significant written and oral comments are received on the draft RTP and as a result of the participation process or the interagency consultation process a summary, analysis, and report of the proposed comments shall be made as part of the final RTP.

» The public participation plan should be prepared prior to the development of the RTP. The public participation plan should have public input during its preparation and have a 45-day comment period before the MPOs/RTPAs board adopts it.

» Title 23 CFR part 450.316(a)(1)(iii) requires the participation plan to use visualization techniques to describe the RTP. Visualization techniques range from a simple line drawing or hand written chart to technologically complex web cast public meetings and GIS modeling and computer generated maps. The specific type of visualization technique is determined by the MPO/RTPA.

» The public participation plan and both the draft and adopted RTP shall be posted on the MPO/RTPAs website to the maximum extent practicable and for the life of the RTP.

» It is also recommended MPOs/RTPAs place hard copies of the draft and adopted copies of RTPs in local libraries and/or other locations where the public would have access to them.

» The MPO shall, to the extent practicable, develop a documented process that outlines roles, responsibilities, and key decision points for consulting with other governments and agencies. Non-MPO public participation efforts shall at minimum develop a documented process that outlines roles, responsibilities and provides outreach efforts to all sectors of the local community.

» MPO’s and RTPA’s are also encouraged to involve the media, including ethnic media as appropriate, as a tool to promote public participation in the RTP development, review and commenting process.
B ADDITIONAL SCS PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS

Public participation and consultation for the development of the RTP remains an essential element of the overall RTP process. Mapping and visualization tools should be used, to the extent practicable, to create visual representations of proposed scenarios. Use of the tools will help facilitate more effective and meaningful public involvement in development and refinement of the SCS. A Public Participation Plan includes public outreach, public awareness, and public input beginning with the planning stage.

The MPO shall adopt a Public Participation Plan in advance of developing an SCS and/or APS to include:

1 Outreach efforts encouraging the active participation of a broad range of stakeholders in the planning process, consistent with the agency’s adopted Public Participation Plan. This includes, but is not limited to:
   - affordable housing advocates
   - transportation advocates
   - neighborhood and community groups
   - environmental advocates
   - home builder representatives
   - broad-based business organizations
   - landowners
   - commercial property interests
   - homeowner associations

2 Consultation with congestion management agencies, transportation agencies, and transportation commissions.

3 Regional public workshops with information and tools providing a clear understanding of policy choices and issues. To the extent practicable, each workshop shall include urban simulation computer modeling to create visual representations of the SCS.

4 Preparation and circulation of a draft SCS not less than 55 days before adoption of a final RTP.

5 For a single county MPO (such as SJCOG), at least two public hearings shall be held. To the maximum extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region to maximize the opportunity for participation by members of the public throughout the region.

6 A process enabling the public to provide a single request to receive notices, information and updates.
This (SCS) public participation plan is not required to be reviewed or approved by any state agency and is not necessary to be included as part of the RTP. However, the MPO should maintain a record of its public participation efforts relative to the SCS and APS if applicable, and therefore, it is recommended these additional requirements should be included in the federally required plan.

CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS

During the development of the SCS, the MPO must conduct at least two informational meetings in each county for members of the board of supervisors and city councils. Only one informational meeting is needed in each county if it is attended by representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. The purpose of this meeting (or meetings) shall be to present a draft of SCS, to the members of the board of supervisors and city council members in that county and to solicit and consider their input and recommendations.

Continuing with a collaborative transportation planning process, MPOs work and consult with local elected officials as key stakeholders in the regional transportation system. While local elected officials serve on regional agency boards, expanded consultation is required pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(E) and (F) to provide outreach to all local elected officials and their member jurisdictions affected by the SCS (and APS if applicable).

Pursuant to Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(G), in preparing an SCS, the MPO shall consider spheres of influence that have been adopted by Local Agency Formation Commissions (LAFCOs) within the region. MPOs should also consult with LAFCOs regarding special districts within the region that provide property-related services such as water or wastewater services, and should consult with these regional special districts, as appropriate, during development of an SCS.

Additionally, MPOs should consider consultation with school districts within their region during development of the RTP. School-related trips constitute a significant portion of all vehicle trips.
INTERAGENCY COORDINATION

As the MPO works on RTP development and approval, interagency coordination with both federal and state agencies provide necessary information for the RTP, and notification to all interested parties. Advanced and continuous coordination with all appropriate agencies is highly recommended. MPO development of the RTP should include interagency coordination with, but not limited to, the following entities:

1. Federal agencies including: Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
2. California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
3. California Air Resources Board (ARB)
4. California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
5. Appropriate Resources Agencies (see list in Section 4.9)
6. Adjacent MPOs and RTPAs with which the MPO shares a significant amount of interregional travel.

MPOs are also encouraged to work with HCD to incorporate the appropriate Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) within their RTPs.

OTHER CONSULTATION & COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT

Federal regulations require private sector involvement as a component of the regional transportation planning process. Title 23 USC Part 134 (g)(4), Title 23 USC Section 135(e) and Title 23 CRF Part 450.316 (a) require the transportation planning process include input from the goods movement industry and other transportation organizations.

CONSULTATION WITH INTERESTED PARTIES

Consulting with interested parties on plans, programs and projects shall include individuals or organizations that are mentioned in Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(a). Title 23 CFR Part 450.316(d) requires MPOs to consult with federal land use management agencies as appropriate during the development of RTP. RTPAs shall comply as well. Title 23 CFR part 450.322(g) states that MPOs shall consult as appropriate with state and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation during the development of their RTP. RTPAs shall comply with this as well.
Title 23 CFR part 450.316(c) requires MPOs to involve the federally recognized Native American Tribal Government in the development of the RTP. RTPAs shall comply as well. Title 23 CFR part 450.316(a)(1), the participation plan shall be developed by the MPO in consultation with all interested parties and shall, at a minimum, describe explicit procedures, strategies and desired outcomes. The requirement of including interested parties in the development of the participation plan and the RTP would include federally recognized or non-federally recognized tribes.

CONSULTATION WITH RESOURCE AGENCIES

Title 23 CFR part 450.322(g)(1) & (g)(2) requires that the MPO shall consult, as appropriate, with State and local agencies responsible for land use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation concerning the 2010 RTP Guidelines development of the transportation plan. The consultation shall involve, as appropriate: (1) Comparison of transportation plans with State conservation plans or maps, if available; or (2) Comparison of transportation plans to inventories of natural or historic resources, if available. In addition, the discussion of mitigation activities required by SAFETEA-LU Section 450.322(f)(7) (and described more fully in Section 5.3) shall be developed in consultation with Federal, State, and Tribal land management, wildlife, and regulatory agencies.
California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), consultation with agencies, governments or individuals that could potentially be impacted by transportation projects in the RTP. Government Code Section 65080(b)(2)(B)(v) requires that MPOs develop a sustainable communities strategy (which is part of the RTP) that shall gather and consider the best practically available scientific information regarding “resource areas” and “farmland” as defined in subdivisions (a) and (b) of Government Code Section 65080.01.
SJCOG will incorporate traditional & grassroots methods for public outreach in an effort to ensure public input and involvement is comprehensive and reflective of the region’s demographics.
SJCOG strongly encourages public involvement from individuals and groups of individuals who reside, have interest, or do business in a given area that may be affected by transportation decisions. They are the following:

**TRANSPORTATION SERVICE PROVIDERS**
Private and public providers of transportation services, including, but not limited to, the trucking and rail freight industries, rail passenger industry, transit operators, taxi cap operators, ports and airports.

**SPECIALIZED TRANSPORTATION SERVICE PROVIDERS**
Specialized transportation service operators, including schools and social service agencies providing transportation for seniors, and persons with disabilities.

**NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION USERS**
Those persons who utilize non-motorized modes of transportation such as bicyclists and pedestrians.

**HISTORICALLY UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS**
Those persons traditional underserved by existing transportation systems, such as low-income and/or minority households, who may face challenges accessing employment. Although these groups may be difficult to reach due to possible communication barriers, they should be explicitly encouraged to participate in the public involvement process.

**ADVOCATES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND SPECIAL INTERESTS**
Affordable housing advocates, neighborhood groups, transit and active transportation advocates, environmental advocates, home builder representatives, broad-based business organizations, landowners, commercial property interests, home owner associations and public health organizations.
As appropriate, SJCOG will incorporate traditional and grassroots methods for public outreach in an effort to ensure public input and involvement is comprehensive and reflective of the region’s demographics. SJCOG staff will work in conjunction with member jurisdictions in the region to coordinate communications and public involvement efforts with community-based organizations and individuals, including list sharing and developing public outreach efforts and documents together. SJCOG staff is responsible for developing and maintaining a mailing list with names of interested individuals and groups. The mailing list can be sorted by specific categories according to SJCOG sub regions.

PUBLIC HEARINGS & PUBLIC INFORMATION MEETINGS

A public hearing is a formal way to gather resident comments and positions for public record and input into the decision-making process. Decision-makers and leaders hear directly from the public prior to a decision point. SJCOG will hold public hearings as appropriate based on the actions required.
PUBLIC NOTICES

Public notices are used to inform the general public and media of public hearings. SJCOG will publish a public hearing notice in a general circulation newspaper and provide media releases to non-English media in the region citing the time, date, and location of the hearing as well as topics which will be discussed. Public notices will also be sent out to affected individuals and interested parties whose names are in the agency’s mailing list, as well as public libraries. SJCOG’s goal for mailing public hearing notices will be at least fifteen days in advance of the meeting, unless otherwise required by statute. SJCOG recognizes that the public notice period is effectively shortened for those who request formatted or translated materials. SJCOG’s goal for completion of formatted or translated materials is five days from the time the request is received.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Public hearings will occur during noted SJCOG meetings and will be held in accessible buildings as close as possible to public transportation. In addition, the time of the hearing can be critical in determining the success of the public input process. SJCOG will hold at least one evening public hearing on the RTP/SCS in order to give the public more opportunity to provide their input. To the extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region to maximize the opportunity for participation.

INFORMATIONAL MEETINGS

SJCOG may conduct one informational meeting if it is attended by representatives of the county board of supervisors and city council members representing a majority of the populations in the incorporated areas of that county. The purpose of the meeting shall be to present a draft RTP/SCS to the members of the board of supervisors and the city council to solicit and consider their input and recommendations.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

SJCOG will accept prepared comments from the public during the period between the notice and hearing dates. Comments received in languages other than English will be translated if possible. All comments will be considered part of the public record. Also, during this period, SJCOG will accept questions and provide clarification on issues raised by the public. The public comment period for the RTP/SCS will be in accordance with 23 CFR 450.
ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The SJCOG Board has established a number of advisory committees as a means of obtaining advice from residents and key interests in the community on a variety of subjects. Through its standing and ad hoc committees, SJCOG encourages the participation of all interest groups and residents in the region as well as representatives from member jurisdictions, local agencies, and the private sector. Advisory committee members are selected by the SJCOG Board, with staff providing recommendations. Staff uses SJCOG’s public outreach processes to identify interested parties, specifically with an interest in creating and maintaining diversity on these committees. SJCOG staff presents plans, data, and proposed programs to representative groups of the community for input and feedback early in the planning process. These committees are augmented, restructured, added to, or discharged from time to time based upon the issues and concerns faced by the Board.

The current federal transportation act, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST), provides that residents, affected public agencies, representatives of public transportation employees, freight shippers, providers of freight transportation services, private providers of transportation, representatives of users of public transportation, representatives of users of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities, representatives of the disabled, and other interested parties be provided with reasonable opportunities to be involved in the metropolitan transportation planning process, with regard to the RTP/SCS. Many of SJCOG’s advisory committees include representatives of these groups.

Regarding public participation, staff will provide appropriate standing and ad hoc advisory committees with Public Participation Plans for review and comment. Advisory committee members can offer invaluable information, strategies, and community contacts to increase participation in SJCOG programs. SJCOG staff will meet with the technical advisory committee that assisted with the development of the Public Participation Plan on an as-needed basis to address the plan’s effectiveness and periodic update. All SJCOG advisory committee meetings are open to the public.
Membership lists, committee terms, vacancies, and meeting times and locations will be made available on the SJCOG website. Similarly, each advisory committee will have a designated SJCOG staff person who will be identified on the website and in committee materials. The Brown Act requires at least 72 hours public notice citing the time, date, and location before regular meetings. SJCOG policy for posting notices for advisory committee meetings will be at least three days in advance of the meeting. The current committee list along with the name of the SJCOG staff person assigned to each committee is listed on the SJCOG website at www.sjcog.org/148/Our-Committees.
The SJCOG Public Participation Plan calls for setting and measuring progress on involving the public in SJCOG’s Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

### A OBJECTIVES

1. **Foster Relationships with Community Organizations, Stakeholders, Local Government, and Advisory Groups**

2. **Raise Awareness and Offer Opportunities for Public Input**

3. **Stimulate Dialogue About the Transportation Challenges Facing the San Joaquin County Region**

4. **Provide Information and Involve Residents Throughout the Region**

5. **Develop Realistic Solutions That Address the Diverse Needs of the Region**

6. **Build Public Support and Understanding of the RTP/SCS**
B PERFORMANCE MEASURES

DIVERSITY

Participants must represent a range of socioeconomic, ethnic and cultural, geographic and user (mode) groups. They must also include a range of people with varying interests: social service, business, environment, social justice/equity, etc.

» Targeted groups include all those listed under “Summary of Outreach Requirements,” including additional SJCOG contacts

» Participating citizens represent a cross-section of people of various interests, places of residence and primary modes of travel, as reported on surveys and comments or other communications received throughout the update process.

REACH

The program should make every effort to include the greatest number of people possible. Different levels of participation will make it more inviting for people with a range of involvement preferences to join the discussion. The success of the program will be measured by the following:

» Number of comments received

» Number of individuals who actively participated in the SJCOG RTP/SCS Public Outreach Program, as measured by survey responses, focus group attendance, comments received and community outreach involvement (excluding repeat attendance).

» Number of visits or “views” to the SJCOG RTP page on the website and/or requests for information during active periods of the public outreach and involvement program

» Number of online/electronic survey respondents

» Number of community organizations involved in the outreach process
ACCESSIBILITY

Every effort should be made to ensure that anyone who wants to participate can do so. This goal can be met by taking the participation activities to where people are already located, whenever possible. It can also be met by providing ways to participate, regardless of individuals’ language or ability to attend a meeting, access to the web, etc.

» Meetings are held in communities and during existing meeting dates/times whenever possible
» 100 percent of meeting locations are accessible by transit with the exception of rural unincorporated communities and other town pockets that lack the public transportation needed to access all viable meeting locations in the area.
» Meetings are linguistically accessible to 100 percent of participants, with 3 working days’ advance request for translation. Meeting announcements will offer translation services with advance notice to participants speaking any language with available professional translation services. At public workshops SJCOG will provide translators and Spanish language materials as requested.
» All meetings are accessible under the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

IMPACT

The feedback received through this Plan should be analyzed and provided to the SJCOG Policy Board wherever appropriate. Interested participants should be informed of Board’s actions. Decisions to not incorporate recommendations should be noted, with a rationale provided and ready to be discussed.

» 100 percent of written comments received are logged, analyzed, summarized and communicated in time for consideration by staff and the SJCOG Board
» 100 percent of written comments are acknowledged in the form received, so that the person making them knows whether his or her comment is reflected in the outcome of a Board action or, conversely, why the Board acted differently.
EDUCATION

This outreach program is an opportunity for SJCOG to inform a wide range of people about transportation issues in the San Joaquin County region, as well as the link to climate change and sustainable growth, among other issues. Each step of the process should include an educational element, whether it is about San Joaquin County area transportation in general, specific projects being considered for inclusion in the long-range plan or background on the outreach results to date.

PARTICIPANT SATISFACTION

People who take the time and energy to participate should feel it was worth their while to join in the discussion and debate. The following targeted performance measures are associated with each of the goal topics.

» Majority of participants rate the SJCOG RTP/SCS Outreach Program as Excellent or Good on each of the following performance dimensions (or other specific features to be determined):

• Accessibility (meeting locations, materials presented in appropriate languages for targeted audiences, etc.)
• Adequate notice
• Sufficient opportunity to comment
• Clear understanding of items that are established policy versus those that are open to public influence
• Clear information at an appropriate level of detail
• Educational value of presentations and materials
• Responsiveness to comments received
• Understanding of other perspectives and differing priorities
• Quality of the discussion
THESE STRATEGIES ARE DESIGNED TO NOT ONLY ADHERE TO REQUIRED PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES, BUT TO RUN A TRULY INCLUSIVE OUTREACH PROCESS THAT ENGAGES ALL INTERESTED STAKEHOLDERS, PARTICULARLY THOSE TRADITIONALLY UNDERREPRESENTED AND UNDERSERVED IN THE PLANNING PROCESS.
IMPLEMENTATION OF RTP/SCS
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN & OUTREACH STRATEGIES

Under state law (SB 375, Steinberg, Chapter 728, 2008 Statutes), SJCOG must develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) as part of their Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) to integrate planning for growth and housing with long-range transportation investments, including goals for reducing greenhouse gas emissions for cars and light trucks. The law also calls for a Public Participation Plan that addresses outreach for developing the RTP/SCS. Other statutory State, as well as Federal consultation and coordination requirements are further covered in Chapter 4 of the current Regional Transportation Plan Guidelines for Metropolitan Planning Organizations. These guidelines identify required actions, recommended actions, and best practices to be considered to achieve extensive, broad-based, and meaningful public engagement.

Below is a toolbox of strategies that SJCOG may implement throughout the development of the RTP/SCS. These strategies are designed to not only adhere to required public engagement activities, but to run a truly inclusive outreach process that engages all interested stakeholders, particularly those traditionally underrepresented and underserved in the planning process.

LOOK FOR THE GREEN BOX!
The side bars highlight how members of the public and other interested groups may participate in the transportation planning process.

RTP/SCS IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP

The purpose of the RTP/SCS Implementation Working Group is to support SJCOG staff and standing committees in the development, preparation, and subsequent implementation of the RTP/SCS. The Working Group is vital to the success of the process as members consider key issues in the development of the long-range transportation plan. The Working Group members are responsible for providing technical assistance and subject area expertise with the goal of achieving community-based consensus and support for the final RTP/SCS.
The RTP/SCS Working Group will be, ideally, comprised of representation from the following areas:
- Affordable housing advocates,
- Transportation advocates,
- Environmental advocates,
- Home Builder representatives,
- Infill Builder representatives,
- Broad-based business organizations,
- Landowners,
- Commercial Property Interests,
- Local Government Representatives,
- Environmental Justice Representatives,
- Public Health Agencies,
- Goods movement,
- Representatives of users of public transportation,
- Economic development,
- Airport operations,
- National disaster risk reduction, and
- Private providers of transportation

SJCOG will aim to expand representation on the working group to include additional representation. This may include community groups, walking and bicycling representatives, non-governmental organizations, the Native American community, other private sector interests (trucking, large employers, business organizations) and others identified in the future as not already represented through other committees or ad hoc groups.

The RTP/SCS Working Group will meet in person and or by phone regularly, at a time determined by a poll of members. All meetings will be open to the public.

SJCOG BOARD OF DIRECTORS & STANDING COMMITTEES

Along with the SJCOG Board of Directors, the following list of SJCOG Standing Committees will be involved in the development of the RTP/SCS as scheduled below.

SJCOG Board of Directors and Standing Committees usually meet monthly and will be provided regular updates and consultation opportunities during the RTP/SCS development process. Meeting agendas and packet materials are available on the SJCOG website. All meetings are open to the public. To view the agenda, packets, or access additional information, please visit www.sjcog.org.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMITTEE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>MEETINGS</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors</td>
<td>The Board of Directors is composed of city council members and county supervisors, appointed by the member jurisdictions.</td>
<td>Fourth Thursday of every month</td>
<td>4pm</td>
<td>SJCOG 555 E Weber Ave Stockton 95202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)</td>
<td>The CAC primarily provides community input on project priorities and other matters pertaining to the Measure K program.</td>
<td>Third Wednesday of every month</td>
<td>6pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Committee</td>
<td>The Executive Committee is made up of five SJCOG Board members and generally reviews selected agenda items and submits a recommendation to the Board of Directors.</td>
<td>Third Friday of every month</td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Technical Advisory Committee (HTAC)</td>
<td>The HTAC is responsible for verifying that the San Joaquin County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation and Open Space Plan is implemented correctly and for solving any issues that arise during implementation.</td>
<td>Second Wednesday of every month</td>
<td>9:30am</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency Transit Committee (ITC)</td>
<td>The ITC was created to improve communication and coordination among the transit agencies within the San Joaquin County.</td>
<td>First Monday of every month</td>
<td>1:30pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management &amp; Finance Advisory Committee (M&amp;F)</td>
<td>M&amp;F guides administrative and financial decisions of SJCOG as the Local Transportation Authority and is composed of city managers and the county administrator.</td>
<td>Third Wednesday of every month</td>
<td>12pm</td>
<td>Manteca Transit Center, 220 Moffat Blvd., Manteca, CA 95336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Delivery Committee (PDC)</td>
<td>The PDC is a subcommittee of the Board of Directors and guides policies, transportation programming recommendations, and monitors project delivery.</td>
<td>Second Monday of every month</td>
<td>4:30pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTP/SCS Working Group</td>
<td>The working group meets monthly to discuss a county wide strategy to meet community goals for coordinated transportation and land use.</td>
<td>Second Tuesday of every month</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services Transportation Advisory Committee (SSTAC)</td>
<td>The SSTAC monitors and promotes improvements to public transportation services for persons with disabilities and seniors residing in San Joaquin County.</td>
<td>First Monday of every other month</td>
<td>3pm</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)</td>
<td>The TAC advises the SJCOG Board on regional transportation planning and programming matters.</td>
<td>Second Thursday of every month</td>
<td>10am</td>
<td>SJCOG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 STAKEHOLDER FOCUS GROUPS

To consult and coordinate the development of the RTP/SCS with stakeholders specifically interested or involved with plans or projects identified in individual work elements, focus groups will be organized topically as needed during the planning process. These groups may be a sub-set of an existing SJCOG committee or group. These groups will be organized on an ad hoc basis depending on identified topics or issues requiring more in-depth focus than can be provided by existing committees or working groups.

Social media will be vital in sharing information with the public on the RTP/SCS and keeping them updated on important milestones throughout the process. Platforms give the agency an opportunity to release important information instantaneously to the public. This may include sharing educational materials, meeting dates/times, and surveys. Local organizations, businesses, and community members can share information onto their platforms and capture a larger audience. These sites also serve as a way to collect commentary from the public through interactive tools (i.e. question polls, direct messages).

4 ONLINE PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

In addition to social media, SJCOG may develop and administer web-based surveys to collect public input. To ensure broad participation, SJCOG will post notices on the agency website and social media platforms, work with the stakeholders and community partners to distribute surveys, and/or utilize additional marketing strategies as needed.
5 EMAILS

Regular updates regarding RTP/SCS development will be distributed via email, such as a e-newsletter or e-blast. Additional emails will be sent to government and other stakeholder agencies seeking their involvement and coordination as required by the Guidance document.

If you would like to submit a single request to receive all notices, information and updates regarding the RTP/SCS development you may do so by emailing RTP@sjcog.org.

6 ENSURING BROAD/DIVERSE OUTREACH

To ensure diverse and direct input from all populations, SJCOG will continue to build partnerships with community organizations and stakeholders to generate broad feedback throughout the RTP/SCS process.

The following strategies have yielded positive results in past outreach and engagement efforts and therefore remain key components of future planning and outreach activities:

- RTP/SCS Street Team: Activities include but are not limited to tabling at local community events, coordinating workshops with partners, meeting presentations, and developing and distributing outreach materials to community partners.
- Community Outreach Mini-Grants: Funding awards to community organizations and grassroots groups who can assist in reaching underserved, underrepresented, and disadvantaged communities throughout the region.
7 WEBSITE

Notices regarding RTP/SCS public meetings and workshops, agenda packets, and other public comment/participation opportunities will be available and accessible in the following areas of the SJCOG website:

- Homepage
- Events Calendar
- Agendas > RTP/SCS Working Group
- Programs>Regional Planning> RTP/Sustainable Communities Strategy

8 INTERAGENCY CONSULTATION & COORDINATION

» CONSULTATION WITH INTERESTED PARTIES

SJCOG is required by federal law to consult with federal land-use management, natural resources, environmental protection, conservation and historic preservation agencies during RTP development. Other interested parties for which a reasonable opportunity to comment on the document must be provided include public health agencies, public transportation employees, public ports, freight shippers, private transportation providers, users of walkway and bicycle transportation facilities, people with disabilities, and freight transport services. To the extent that any of these groups are not involved in the RTP/SCS development process through other working groups or committees, SJCOG will offer individual formal consultation opportunities.

» CONSULTATION WITH LOCAL ELECTED OFFICIALS

SJCOG will consult with local elected officials and member jurisdictions that are potentially affected by the RTP/SCS. Additionally, SJCOG will consult with the San Joaquin Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), and other regional specific districts (such as water/wastewater service providers, school districts).
» **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION**

SJCOG will provide advanced on-going coordination with Federal and State Agencies with plans or programs providing necessary information for the RTP/SCS. Interagency Coordination activities will include, but is not necessarily limited to the following:

- Federal agencies, including: Federal Highways Administration (FHWA), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and Federal Transit Administration (FTA)
- California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD)
- California Air Resources Board (ARB)
- California Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Resources Agencies (such as land use management, environmental protection, conservation, and historic preservation)
- Adjacent MPOs

» **SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY COORDINATION**

SJCOG has a long history of coordination with the other seven Metropolitan Planning Organizations in the San Joaquin Valley. The following is a list of current valley wide committees, groups, and programs that will be consulted during RTP/SCS development:

- Model Coordinating Committee
- Program Coordination Group
- San Joaquin Valley Greenprint Committee
- San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies - Regional Policy Council
- San Joaquin Valley Regional Planning Agencies - Executive Directors Committee
- Valley Blueprint Planners Network

9 **PUBLIC OUTREACH VIA MEMBER JURISDICTIONS**

SJCOG staff will work with Board members and their staff from each local jurisdiction to promote workshops and create interest among constituents about the RTP/SCS process. Some potential opportunities for cross promotion activities may include:

- Utilizing member agency call systems, email distribution lists, social media, and websites for posting and disseminating information
- Collaborating on informational meetings or coordinating an outreach table at local community events and gatherings
If your organization, business, or agency has another method of communication we may utilize for sharing information, please email RTP@sjcog.org.

10 ADDITIONAL RTP/SCS WORKSHOPS

» MEMBER AGENCY CONSULTATION & WORKSHOPS

SJCOG staff will provide regular updates for the SJCOG Board of Directors, Standing Committees, and Member Agencies throughout the RTP/SCS development. An overview of what will be expected of them and their local agency as SJCOG staff updates the RTP/SCS will be provided, as well as detailed background information on the SCS scenario planning process. Workshops will be scheduled as needed to delve deeper into key issues.

» SENATE BILL 375 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION REQUIREMENTS

• Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) requires that at least three regional public workshops are conducted to provide the public with clear information on policy choices and issues in the Draft RTP/SCS. These workshops will be held throughout San Joaquin County during the RTP/SCS process.

• One informational meeting is required in each county if it is attended by representatives of the county board of supervisors and city councils that represent a majority of the cities representing a majority of the population in the incorporated areas of that county. The purpose of this meeting (or meetings) shall be to present a Draft RTP/SCS to the members of the board of supervisors and the city council members to solicit and consider their input and recommendations.

• At least two public hearings shall be held on the Draft RTP/SCS. To the maximum extent feasible, the hearings shall be in different parts of the region to maximize the opportunity for participation by members of the public throughout the region.

All workshop, meeting, and hearing announcements will be announced via websites, email, meeting agenda items for various committees and through other strategies available as listed above. SJCOG staff will also utilize print media for some announcements provided funds are available.
ADDİTİONAL OPPORTUNITIES

As appropriate and effective opportunities arise during the RTP/SCS development process, each will be evaluated and discussed. If a viable approach to providing public education or receiving public input into the planning process is available, and if it is financially feasible, it will be strongly considered for implementation.
AGENDA ITEM 4I
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2020/21 State Transit Assistance Revenue Estimate & Apportionment Schedule

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend to the Board adopting the Preliminary FY20-21 STA Estimated Revenue and Apportionment Schedule

SUMMARY:

The State Controller’s Office released the preliminary revenue estimate of the State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to be allocated to San Joaquin Council of Governments on January 31, 2020. The total revenue estimate for San Joaquin County is $8,408,958. The estimate is comprised of $6,678,402 in Section 99313 funds and $1,730,556 in Section 99314 funds. It is anticipated that these estimates could change when the SCO issues final STA revenue apportionments.

Based on previous recommendations, the county’s two largest service providers, the San Joaquin Regional Transit District (RTD) and the San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission (RRC) will receive the 99313 portion using the formula under the 2010 STA Policy which utilizes the ridership to determine the allocation percentage for each agency.

Attached is a table detailing the FY 2020-21 STA Revenue Estimate and apportionments based on previously approved methods.

BACKGROUND:

The regional allocation of 99313 funds is based upon the ratio of population in San Joaquin County to the total population of the state. Each regional agency then determines how to sub-allocate those dollars to the transit operators in its jurisdiction. The allocation of 99314 funds is based on the ratio of the locally generated revenue of each transit operator in each region to the locally generated revenue of all transit operators in the state. Each regional agency is then required to sub-allocate those dollars to the transit operators in its jurisdiction based on the amounts published by the State Controller.

As previously approved by the Board, the Section 99313 funds are to be allocated using a formula for distribution that allocates the funds to the Transit District and the Rail Commission based on their relative ridership.
RECOMMENDATION:

SJCOG staff proposes that the TAC committee recommend to the Board adoption of the projected FY20/21 STA Revenue Estimate and apportionments.

FISCAL IMPACT:

These funds are a primary component in transit service delivery throughout the County. Adoption of this apportionment schedule allows the funds to be claimed by eligible recipients. This action will provide $8,408,958 in regional and local transit funding in San Joaquin County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTA</th>
<th>FY20-21 Estimate</th>
<th>PTA 99313</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESTIMATED REVENUE</td>
<td>6,678,402</td>
<td>6,719,558</td>
<td>-41,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA 99314</td>
<td>1,730,556</td>
<td>1,741,222</td>
<td>-10,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,408,958</td>
<td>8,460,780</td>
<td>-51,822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

I. LESS PUC 99314 ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTA</th>
<th>PUC 99314</th>
<th>PUC 99314</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escalon</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>3,531.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>52,341.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,493.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ripon</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,843.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>10,744.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Joint Powers Authority</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Regional Transit District</td>
<td>755,607</td>
<td>760,263.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin Regional Rail Commission</td>
<td>903,440</td>
<td>909,007.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. BALANCE AVAILABLE FOR APPORTIONMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BY AREA - PUC 99313</th>
<th>FY19-20</th>
<th>PUA 99314</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2% COG TRANSIT PLANNING</td>
<td>133,568</td>
<td>134,391.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONAL TRANSIT SYSTEM PURPOSES</td>
<td>6,544,834</td>
<td>6,585,167.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99313 Regional Transit Systems Apportionment</td>
<td>6,544,834</td>
<td>6,410,167.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## TABLE 2
APPORTIONMENT OF FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 STA REVENUE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLAIMANTS</th>
<th>Ridership FY 17/18</th>
<th>Ridership % FY 17/18¹</th>
<th>Transit Appt. PUC 99313</th>
<th>Area Appt. PUC 99314</th>
<th>TOTAL AGENCY APPORTIONMENT</th>
<th>FY19-20 Estimate</th>
<th>Total Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJRTD</td>
<td>3,403,527</td>
<td>70.87%</td>
<td>$ 4,638,336</td>
<td>755,607</td>
<td>5,393,943</td>
<td>5,478,160</td>
<td>-84,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LODI</td>
<td>301,666</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>52,020</td>
<td>52,341</td>
<td>-321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANTECA</td>
<td>61,679</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRACY</td>
<td>167,702</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>10,744</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIPON</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESCALON</td>
<td>3,262</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>3,509</td>
<td>3,531</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRRC</td>
<td>1,398,954</td>
<td>29.13%</td>
<td>$ 1,906,498</td>
<td>903,440</td>
<td>2,809,938</td>
<td>2,776,277</td>
<td>33,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIDERSHIP</td>
<td>5,338,475</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>6,544,834</td>
<td>1,730,556</td>
<td>8,275,390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJCOG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>133,568.00</td>
<td>-823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT PLANNING</td>
<td>133,568.00</td>
<td>133,568</td>
<td>134,391</td>
<td>-823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6,678,402</td>
<td>1,730,556</td>
<td>8,408,958</td>
<td>8,460,780</td>
<td>-51,822</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ¹ Audited FY 17/18 ridership figures
AGENDA ITEM 4J
STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Proposed Final Fiscal Year 2020/21 Overall Work Program (OWP)

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend Board approval of proposed final FY 2020/21 Overall Work Program

SUMMARY:

SJCOG presented this staff report to TAC in January seeking any comments member agencies might have. This report was presented to Management & Finance. Executive Committee and the Board. The Board adopted the OWP in draft. To date, only comments from Caltrans have been received. The comments are largely related to formatting and editorial. Therefore, the final version of the OWP may not look exactly as presented today, however, the substantive content regarding the work effort anticipated for the coming fiscal year is the same. Further, staff will continue to take comments until the Board mailout on March 19, 2020.

This staff report summarizes revenue highlights for FY 2020/21 and significant changes proposed for next year’s work program. The proposed draft document will be available at FY 2020-21 OWP.

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend Board approval of proposed final OWP.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Approval of the Final OWP identifies $13,693,493.84 in revenue for SJCOG operations in FY 20/21. This is an increase of $594,426.56 from the fiscal year 2019/20 amended OWP (amendment 2 adopted January 2020).

BACKGROUND:

The Overall Work Program is a management tool used to identify the tasks and products that the San Joaquin Council of Governments will undertake during fiscal year 2020/21. The OWP also identifies the funding sources and staff resources necessary to complete the overall work program.
The Overall Work Program is broken down into work elements that are unique to specific subject areas. For example, one work element is dedicated to the preparation and update of the Regional Transportation Plan. Each work element:

- Identifies work previously completed under that work element,
- The purpose of that work element in the subject matter,
- Tasks to be undertaken,
- A listing of products and the schedule for delivery of those products,
- The funding sources for each work element,
- The responsible agency,
- And the level of effort (staff allocation) required to undertake and deliver those tasks and products.

Revenue

For this draft, net SJCOG revenues are estimated to increase by approximately $594,426.56 from the amended FY 2019/20 OWP, from $13,099,067.28 to $13,693,493.84 or a 4.54% increase. By the time of the final approval of the OWP, this amount will likely change. As noted below, several significant work efforts are completed or nearing completion of the funding sources for them having been spent down and revenue associated with funding those work products has decreased. Significant revenue sources:

- Federal Highway Administration MPO Planning funds are increased by $86,262.00.
- Federal Transit Administration Section 5303 funds are increased by $29,639.00.
- The Stanislaus Association of Governments and Merced County Association of Governments (MCAG) are expected to once again contract with SJCOG’s dibs Program to operate a Transportation Demand Management program in their respective areas.
- Freeway Service Patrol on I-205 will continue to be fully funded. This year’s budget reflects a decrease of $368,996.58 as previous grants have been exhausted.
- SB1 funding for new Freeway Service Patrol routes is budgeted at $1,120,026.84.
- STIP for Planning and Program Management did not receive an allocation for FY 19/20 but resumed receiving it in FY 20/21 reflecting a budget increase of $342,000.00.
- SJCOG continues to receive a return on vehicle registration SAFE (Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies) funds to be used for Freeway Service Patrol match.
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (RPSTCML 6088-068) funds for the Project Approval and Environmental Document phases of the I-205 managed lanes widening increased by $651,202.00.

Again, the net change between the proposed draft and the adopted FY 20-21 OWP is an increase of $594,426.56.
Overall Work Program

Highlights of projects, activities, and/or planning documents at or nearing completion in FY 19/20 OWP period:

- Amendments to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program and the Regional Transportation Plan.
- 2019/20 Measure K Ordinance and Expenditure Plan Process and any approved amendments by SJCOG Board.
- Implementation of I-205, SR-120, SR 99, and I-5 Freeway Service Patrol (this is an ongoing activity that will continue into FY 20/21).
- Operations of the dibs program for the three-county area (San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced).
- Completion of Annual Reports for dibs (Travel Demand Management Program), Measure K, Freeway Service Patrol, and Regional Transportation Impact Fee.
- Participation with Valley Councils of Government (COG’s) on interregional modeling, transportation planning, and legislative issues (this is an ongoing activity that will continue into FY 20/21).
- Representation of SJCOG on California Councils of Governments, Regional Transportation Planning Agencies Group, and Self-Help Coalition (this is an ongoing activity that will continue into FY 20/21).
- Participation in the SJCOG-SACOG-MTC Mega-Region Group (this is a multi-year activity that will continue into FY 20/21).
- Publications of census and research information, in collaboration with the University of the Pacific and completed public workshop/seminars (this is an activity that will continue into FY 20/21).
- Completed trips to Washington D.C. for SJCOG One Voice® and Valley Voice DC as well as Valley Voice Sacramento.
- Adoption of the 2020 Federal Legislative Platform.
- Approval of Regional Transportation Impact Fee annual fee adjustment and third-party costs.
- Completion of (the SJCOG led) Sustainable Communities Strategy Implementation Study, Mega-Regional Economic Model, Climate Change Planning Study, and the Public Health Impact Analysis Study.
- Selection of a vendor for a regional Integrated Ticketing app.
- Initiation of a partnership with Institute of Local Government for the BOOST Program.
- Approval of funding list for the 2019 Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Program.
- Update of the Measure K Strategic Plan.
**Project Delivery - activities of capital projects that will continue in Fiscal Year 2020-21**

**OWP:**

- Project development (design) work will continue on Highway 99/120 and Route 99/Turner Road.
- Project development activities will continue on Measure K (and/or state Active Transportation Program) funded bike/pedestrian/safe routes to school or smart growth projects funded by Measure K.
- Monitoring of Measure K regional roadway projects.
- PA & ED for I-205 Managed Lanes

**Major New Studies and/or Ongoing Products Proposed for Fiscal Year 2020-21**

The new work products (below) are in addition to on-going programs and services, which will be either begin or continue in FY 2020/21 by SJCOG. These include:

- Participation in the Tri-Valley – San Joaquin Valley Regional Rail Authority Technical Advisory Group.
- Continue Partnership with the University of Pacific for economic analysis and modeling activities to various SJCOG planning efforts.
- Continue funding of Freeway Service Patrol (FSP) operations for I-205, SR 120, SR 99, and I-5 and preparation of the FSP Annual Report.
- Process amendments to the Federal Transportation Improvement Program and continue to provide technical assistance to local agencies on federal-aid project obligation and delivery.
- Continue efforts on two new planning studies—Gentrification and Displacement Risk Assessment of San Joaquin County, San Joaquin County Transportation Innovation Planning Study.
- Continue with I-205 Managed Lanes PA & ED.
- Work with the City of Lodi to assist in the award of a construction contract for Route 99/Turner Road.
- Three County Model update and enhancements for the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy update.
- Completion of partnership with Institute of Local Governments on homelessness and affordable housing issues in San Joaquin County.

**Next steps: Final FY 2020-21 OWP**

Comments will be considered in preparing the final FY 2020-21 OWP. Also, at the March SJCOG Board meeting, the FY 2020/21 Annual Financial Plan will be presented for adoption.

*Prepared by: Steve Dial, Deputy Executive Director/CFO, Diane Nguyen, Deputy Director, and Gracie Orosco, Chief Accountant*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Final</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Amendment #1</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Amendment #2</th>
<th>FY 2020-21 Final</th>
<th>+/- $ Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual FHWA PL</td>
<td>1,320,000.00</td>
<td>1,320,000.00</td>
<td>1,320,000.00</td>
<td>1,406,262.00</td>
<td>86,262.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual FTA MPO Planning (Section 5303)</td>
<td>316,633.00</td>
<td>316,633.00</td>
<td>316,633.00</td>
<td>346,272.00</td>
<td>29,639.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/18 Carvery Caltrans Sustainable Transp. Planning Grant (SB) 1</td>
<td>193,000.00</td>
<td>225,994.12</td>
<td>225,994.12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(225,994.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18/19 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (SB) 1</td>
<td>264,650.00</td>
<td>305,637.51</td>
<td>305,637.51</td>
<td>185,000.00</td>
<td>(120,637.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/20 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (SB) 1</td>
<td>353,812.00</td>
<td>353,812.00</td>
<td>353,812.00</td>
<td>125,000.00</td>
<td>(228,812.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19/20 Caltrans Adaptation Planning Grant (SB) 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>(100,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/21 Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grant (SB) 1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>341,671.00</td>
<td>341,671.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans Rural Planning Assistance (RPA) FY 2019-2022</td>
<td>250,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- StanCOG-CMAQ TDM</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced CAG TDM CMAQ</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
<td>85,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>(10,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STIP Planning &amp; Programming 20/21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>342,000.00</td>
<td>342,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Comm. FY 18/19 carryover (Enterprise)</td>
<td>30,998.40</td>
<td>19,074.00</td>
<td>11,139.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(11,139.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Comm. FY 19/20 carryover (Enterprise)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>(15,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Comm. FY 20/21 (Enterprise)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSTP SR99 and SR120 Ramps : STPL-6088(057)</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>100,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(100,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPSTCM 6088(068) I-205 Managed Lanes Widening from 6 to 8 lanes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,770,600.00</td>
<td>651,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Planning Contribution (LTF) (2.9%-2020/21)</td>
<td>1,009,200.00</td>
<td>1,009,200.00</td>
<td>1,009,200.00</td>
<td>1,111,289.00</td>
<td>102,089.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDA Administration</td>
<td>290,000.00</td>
<td>290,000.00</td>
<td>290,000.00</td>
<td>290,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Authority (Project Management)</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>1,000,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Authority (1% Administration)</td>
<td>662,000.00</td>
<td>662,000.00</td>
<td>662,000.00</td>
<td>680,000.00</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Transportation Authority (Dibs Rideshare)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>695,000.00</td>
<td>695,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans-FSP (I-205) FY 18-19 Carvery FSP19-6088(064)</td>
<td>491,524.00</td>
<td>398,750.58</td>
<td>398,750.58</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>(198,750.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans-FSP (I-205) FY 19-20 allocation FSP20-6088(069)</td>
<td>491,524.00</td>
<td>570,246.00</td>
<td>570,246.00</td>
<td>400,000.00</td>
<td>(170,246.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans-FSP18SB1-6088(063) Carryover</td>
<td>437,740.00</td>
<td>429,380.51</td>
<td>429,380.51</td>
<td>200,000.00</td>
<td>(198,380.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrans-FSP19SB1 (6088-070) FY 19-20 allocation</td>
<td>500,000.00</td>
<td>490,646.33</td>
<td>490,646.33</td>
<td>490,646.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley MPOs</td>
<td>181,100.00</td>
<td>181,100.00</td>
<td>181,100.00</td>
<td>181,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-County Travel Demand(San Joaquin, Merced, Stanislaus)</td>
<td>13,189.00</td>
<td>13,189.00</td>
<td>13,189.00</td>
<td>13,189.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COG Fees and Services</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29,000.00</td>
<td>29,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTIF</td>
<td>27,720.00</td>
<td>27,720.00</td>
<td>257,120.00</td>
<td>341,491.00</td>
<td>84,371.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Transit Assistance</td>
<td>88,597.00</td>
<td>88,597.00</td>
<td>88,597.00</td>
<td>134,391.00</td>
<td>45,794.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICOGI (Habitat)</td>
<td>561,000.00</td>
<td>605,000.00</td>
<td>605,000.00</td>
<td>605,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion Mitigation/Air Quality (6088-067)</td>
<td>1,100,000.00</td>
<td>1,100,000.00</td>
<td>1,280,000.00</td>
<td>845,000.00</td>
<td>(345,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced TDM CMAQ grant</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>75,000.00</td>
<td>43,000.00</td>
<td>(32,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFE (S11 &amp; FSP)</td>
<td>207,000.00</td>
<td>207,000.00</td>
<td>207,000.00</td>
<td>207,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACOG TDM(Trip Planning System)</td>
<td>95,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>150,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calaveras COG: RTPA Technical Support</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement on COI for 2018 Bond Refunding</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest/Other</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SICOGI Total</strong></td>
<td>10,789,687.40</td>
<td>11,027,001.70</td>
<td>13,099,067.28</td>
<td>13,693,493.84</td>
<td>594,426.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SJRTD FTA 5307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRTD Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRTD Match(STA)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy FTA 5307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi FTA 5307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodi Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRTD Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRC FTA 5307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJRC Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca FTA 5307</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manteca Planning Funds</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>10,789,687.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>FY 2019-20 Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SICOGI FTA 5303 Toll Credits</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SICOGI FHWA PL Toll Credits</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Kind match</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>STANCOG</th>
<th>MCAG CT (FSP)</th>
<th>TDA ALUC</th>
<th>Tri-County</th>
<th>FEES/INT CMAQ</th>
<th>MCAG SAFE</th>
<th>SJCOGI</th>
<th>VALLEY STATE</th>
<th>STATE STA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FY 20/21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Kind Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC COG FTA 5303 Toll Credit Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161,298.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC COG FHWA PL Toll Credit Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161,298.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 1 MPO Sustainable Communities Formula Grant Awarded in FY 19/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Ticketing Assisted Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJCOG Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Based Planning and Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COG OWP Management &amp; Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 1 MPO Sustainable Communities Formula Grant Awarded in FY 20/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transportation Impact Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion Management Program/Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviation and Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projections &amp; Forecasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley MPO Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination (Rural Planning Assistance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans. Air Quality Planning/Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Kind Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SC COG FTA 5303 Toll Credit Match</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>161,298.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 1 MPO Sustainable Communities Formula Grant Awarded in FY 19/20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Ticketing Assisted Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SJCOG Intern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freeway Service Patrol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performance Based Planning and Programming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COG OWP Management &amp; Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SB 1 MPO Sustainable Communities Formula Grant Awarded in FY 20/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transportation Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Planning Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Transportation Impact Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congestion Management Program/Sys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aviation and Land Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projections &amp; Forecasts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley MPO Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Habitat Implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intergovernmental Coordination (Rural Planning Assistance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trans. Air Quality Planning/Modeling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Funding sources include SC COG FTA 5303, SC COG FHWA PL, and SB 1 MPO.
- In-kind matches and toll credit matches are allocated separately.
- Funding is distributed across various transportation-related projects and programs.