

**7. Presentation on the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program by Brad Beck, CCTA Senior Transportation Planner; Review of Staff discussion items by the TRANSPAC Manager and the TDM Program Manager**

**Attachments:**

- SWAT comment letter; April 6, 2011 CCTA Planning Committee Staff Report re: Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program and Approach to Allocating Funds from MTC;
- March 22, 2011 Memo from Randell H. Iwasaki, CCTA Executive Director re: Notice of "Forthcoming Call for Projects for Safe Routes to School Funding";
- March 2, 2011 CCTA Planning Committee Staff Report requesting authorization to issue the notice in the March 22, 2011 memo to convene the RTPC Managers and TDM Program Managers to craft options for allocation of the available funds and general background information on the SR2S



## Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: April 6, 2011

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program and Approach to Allocating SR2S Funds from MTC</b>
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	<p>The Authority has the responsibility for allocating the \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ funds that MTC has set aside for Safe Routes to School (SR2S) programs and projects in Contra Costa. Members of the SR2S Task Force and the RTPC managers have recommended that the Authority try to use these funds for another project and use freed-up Measure J funds for SR2S purposes. Measure J funds are somewhat more flexible and can be used to fund projects smaller than the \$500,000 minimum that MTC imposed. (They are open to allowing a lower minimum though no lower than \$250,000.) Staff is concerned, however, about the increased demands on Authority staff who will need to oversee many more projects, especially with the time needed to oversee projects funded that the Measure J TLC and PBTf programs.</p>
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>Keep the \$2.47 million as federal funds but pursue MTC approval of a lower minimum project size; select programs and projects for funding based on each RTPC's recommendation for its share of the \$2.47 million</p>
<b>Financial Implications</b>	<p>The federal funds will require an 11.47 percent match in local funds</p>
<b>Options</b>	<p>Exchange the federal funds for Measure J funds but hold back a portion of the Measure J funds to provide needed administration of the projects and programs funded</p>
<b>Attachments</b>	<p>A. MTC Resolution 3331</p>
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

## Background

As part of its *Climate Initiatives Program*, MTC has allocated \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ funds to support Safe Routes to School (SR2S) programs and projects. These funds have a number of restrictions on their use, both from their being federal funds and from the rules that MTC has set for Cycle 1 CMAQ funds. While SR2S activities are often defined as including “the 5 Es” — engineering, enforcement, encouragement, education and evaluation — the federal CMAQ requirements generally limit funding for SR2S activities to engineering, encouragement and education. The evaluation of specific projects or programs is allowable (and required by the MTC program) but the more general evaluation of needs — for example, conducting walkability audits or SR2S plans around schools — is not. Because they would be receiving federal funds, sponsors would need to go through the Caltrans local assistance process, a staffing-intensive effort.

The MTC program also requires that projects in Contra Costa, Alameda and Santa Clara counties have a minimum size of \$500,000. Because Contra Costa has minimized the number of projects funded through the three CMA Block Grant programs, MTC staff may allow projects as small as \$250,000 — the minimum for the other six Bay Area counties — for SR2S activities in Contra Costa.

Local and RTPC staff throughout Contra Costa have expressed an interest in funding both programmatic (education and encouragement) and engineering (design and construction of physical improvements) activities. The physical improvements mentioned — a sidewalk gap or improved signage near school entrances and drop-off locations, for example — often cost less than even the \$250,000 minimum. Authority staff’s rule-of-thumb is that projects that cost less than \$300,000 are usually not worth the administrative costs to go through the Caltrans local assistance process.

Because SR2S needs likely vary among the four subregions, the Authority has proposed dividing the \$2.47 million among the four subregions. Each RTPC would then have the responsibility for recommending how to allocate their share to a specific mix of eligible projects and programs. Authority staff would then create a SR2S program that combines those recommendations into a single list of activities for submittal to MTC.

## Recommended Approach

RTPC managers and the Safe Routes to School Task Force met Monday, March 28 to discuss how to allocate the \$2.47 million in SR2S funding. The staff at that meeting recommended that the Authority:

1. Try to exchange the \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ funds with another project and use freed-up Measure J funds to implement SR2S projects and programs. The other project would need to be already approved for federal funding and have at least \$2.47 million in CMAQ-eligible

components as part of the approved projects. Staff is looking at Segments 1 and 3a of the State Route 4 widening as possible candidates for this exchange.

2. The Measure J funds would be used only for programs and projects that further the purposes of the SR2S component of MTC's *Climate Initiatives Program*, namely, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by encouraging students to walk, bicycle or carpool to school.
3. Ask the RTPCs to recommend programs and projects using their share of the \$2.47 million. The mix could be all programs, all projects or a mix of the two.
4. Base the allocation of these funds among the subregions on a 50-50 split, that is, 50 percent based on the share of population (the most-common Measure J split) and 50 percent based on the share of K-12 enrollment. This split is outlined in the following table.

**Recommended Allocation of SR2S Funds Among the Subregions: 50% Population, 50% K-12 Enrollment**

Subregion	Share By Population		Share By Enrollment		"50-50"	
	2010	Share	2010	Share	Average	Allocation
West	249,612	24%	31,757	19%	21%	\$529,000
Central	307,859	29%	43,306	26%	28%	\$683,500
East	294,866	28%	51,035	31%	29%	\$726,000
Southwest	203,262	19%	39,297	24%	22%	\$531,500
	1,055,599	100%	165,395	100%	100%	\$2,470,000

5. To limit bureaucratic overhead, sponsors should be limited to one project although that project can include multiple locations throughout the jurisdiction.

**MTC Requirements**

MTC outlines its policy on fund exchanges in Resolution 3331. That resolution allows counties to direct their share of regional discretionary funds – federal or state – to local projects. That resolution sets three basic requirements for these exchanges:

1. All exchange projects should be consistent with the programming policy of the original MTC funding source. In this case, the policy is the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions through the development of SR2S projects and programs
2. All project sponsors must report of contract award to MTC through the applicable CMA, and
3. MTC must approve the list of specific projects or categories of activities to be funded with the exchanged local funds.

---

MTC staff notes that any exchanges are subject to MTC approval and that the CMA must provide both the details and justification for the request.

### **Staff Concerns**

As noted above, local staff have identified a number of potential projects much smaller than the \$500,000 minimum that MTC has set or even the \$250,000 minimum that they may allow. Every project funded will add to the workload of Authority staff who administer the program even though the local assistance process is primarily a Caltrans effort. Exchanging the federal funds for Measure J funds would add significantly to Authority workload, first, by making Authority staff solely responsible for overseeing projects and ensuring their timely completion and, second, by allowing much smaller projects and thus potentially multiplying the number that Authority staff would be responsible for substantially. With a \$250,000 minimum request, the federal funds could go to up to nine projects. With the Measure J funds and a \$100,000 minimum, the Authority could be responsible for up to 24 projects and would face a significant increase in demands on staff time.

Staff is also concerned about how the Authority can ensure that the projects funded will be delivered in a timely manner, as MTC will require as part of any exchange of federal funds. We have had issues recently with project deliverability which have resulted in the loss of federal funds to Contra Costa and substantial increases in demands on Authority staff will not help our ability to get projects delivered on time.

### **Recommendation**

Authority recommends that we keep the \$2.47 million as federal funds but pursue MTC approval of a lower minimum project request. We would still select programs and projects for funding based on each RTPC's recommendation for its share of the \$2.47 million. That share would be based on the "50-50" split outlined above. The sponsors of the projects and programs proposed would be responsible for identifying and committing to providing the required 11.47 percent match.

If the Planning Committee, however, recommends exchanging the federal funds — which will still require MTC approval — Authority staff would note that a share of those funds should be retained to fund additional staff oversight that will be needed for these new projects. Authority staff will also need to prepare a letter to MTC requesting this exchange of funds, describing justification for the exchange and the categories of projects that would be funded, and the Authority's commitment to ensure that the programs and projects funded are implemented consistent with the timelines required in Resolution 3331.

ATTACHMENT A

Date: January 24, 2001  
W.I.: 51.2.10  
Referred by: P&AC

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3331

This Resolution establishes the regional policy for fund exchanges for projects programmed with regional discretionary funds.

Further discussion of this action is contained in an MTC "Programming and Allocation Summary Sheet" dated January 10, 2001.

Date: January 24, 2001  
W.I.: 51.2.10  
Referred by: P&AC

Re: Policy for Funding Exchanges for Projects Programmed with Regional Discretionary Funds

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. 3331

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

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area Region (the region); and

WHEREAS, MTC, as the designated RTPA and MPO for the region, is responsible for programming and managing certain federal and state funding provided to the Bay Area for transportation purposes; and

WHEREAS, in some instances, project delivery may be streamlined through an exchange of federal Surface Transportation Program (STP), Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ), or State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds for local funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC supports the efficient use of transportation funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC must ensure that regional discretionary funds are used for priority projects in the region as identified in the Regional Transportation Program (RTP); and

WHEREAS, Attachment A to this resolution, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length, includes a policy for allowing exchanges of funding between regional discretionary programs and local programs in order to support both flexibility and control in the use of regional discretionary funds; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the policy set forth in Attachment A to this resolution.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

James T. Beall Jr., Chair

The above resolution was entered into  
by the Metropolitan Transportation  
Commission at a regular meeting of the  
Commission held in Oakland, California,  
on January 24, 2001



Date: January 24, 2001  
 W.I.: 51.2.10  
 Referred by: P&AC

Attachment A  
 MTC Resolution No. 3331  
 Page 1 of 1

## **Policy for Allowing Exchanges for Projects Programmed With Regional Discretionary Funds**

### **General Policy**

This policy allows counties, at the time of programming, to direct their share of regional discretionary dollars to projects that have already met state and federal requirements and retain local dollars for transportation projects that would be proportionately more costly to deliver with federal or state funds. The 'fund exchange' policy outlined below expands the flexibility for using regional discretionary funds and preserves regional transportation investment goals. This exchange policy does not apply to exchanges coordinated without the use of MTC's regional discretionary funds.

### **Specific Policy Provisions**

As used below, "exchange projects" refer to the projects funded with local dollars and "substitute projects" refer to the projects funded with federal or state funds.

#### Requirements for "exchange projects:"

- All exchange projects should be consistent with the programming policy of the original MTC funding source. For example, if the funding was intended to fund local road maintenance, the local exchange projects should meet the same transportation investment goal.
- Project delivery objectives should also be preserved. Because the regional policies are based on obligation deadlines – which does not have a local fund counterpart – MTC will require that counties report on contract award. This information would be advisory unless MTC staff finds that awards are lagging significantly.
- MTC must review and approve either the list of specific exchange projects or the categories of projects to be funded from an exchange program (such as transit rehabilitation or local road rehabilitation in a certain geographic area) depending on the nature of the regional discretionary program.

#### Requirements for "substitute projects:"

- All substitute projects must be consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).
- All substitute projects must adhere to the project delivery requirements associated with the funds programmed.

In order to compare regional investments against the goals of the RTP, MTC staff will also enter exchange projects into a funding database. Therefore, counties and sponsors making use of this fund exchange program will be asked to provide certain project information. In some cases, projects will be amended into the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). However, if a project is not regionally significant, MTC staff will not necessarily amend it into the TIP.

**Metropolitan Transportation Commission  
Programming and Allocations Committee**

January 10, 2001

Item Number 3f

**Resolution No. 3331**

---

- Subject:** Policy for Allowing Fund Exchanges for Projects Programmed with Regional Discretionary Funds
- Background:** Several counties have requested to use regional discretionary funds on locally-funded transportation projects that have already met certain federal and state funding requirements. In turn, "clean" local funds are directed to projects that have not yet met requirements for receiving state and federal funds. MTC staff is supportive of these fund exchanges to the extent that the exchange projects meet the spirit of MTC's original programming policy.
- Request:** Establish a fund exchange policy that will allow counties to direct their share of regional discretionary funds – federal or state – to local projects with the requirement that local funding is directed to projects consistent with MTC's original programming policy. This exchange policy supports flexibility in the use of transportation dollars and preserves regional transportation investment priorities. This policy is limited to fund exchanges involving regional discretionary funds.
- Issues:** None.
- Recommendation:** Refer Resolution No. 3331 to the Commission for approval as requested.
- Attachments:** MTC Resolution No. 3331  
Attachment A: Exchange Policy

J:\SECTION\ALLSTAFF\Resolution\RESOLUTIONS\MTC Resolutions\RES-3331.doc



CONTRA COSTA  
**transportation  
 authority**

COMMISSIONERS

March 22, 2011

David Durant, Chair

Don Tatzin,  
 Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Genevieve Calloway

Jim Frazier

Federal Glover

Dave Hudson

Karen Mitchoff

Julie Pierce

Karen Stepper

Robert Taylor

**From:** Randell H. Iwasaki, Executive Director *MRE for*

**To:** City Managers, Public Works Directors, RTPCs and Transit Operators

**Re:** Forthcoming Call for Projects for Safe Routes to School Funding

Through its *Climate Initiatives Program*, MTC has allocated \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ fund to support safe routes to school (SR2S) programs or projects in Contra Costa and given the Authority the responsibility for determining how those funds would be allocated. The Authority, in the CMA Block Grant Strategic Plan that it adopted in March 2010, proposed to develop a Safe Routes to School Master Plan. This plan was intended to establish an overall approach for supporting SR2S efforts in Contra Costa and criteria for setting priorities for selecting and implementing projects and programs. One of the implementation tasks was to have included an approach to allocating the \$2.47 million in CMAQ funds.

Randell H. Iwasaki,  
 Executive Director

These funds, however, are programmed for fiscal year 2011-12 which means that project sponsors will need to obligate the funds by February 1, 2012. While that date is still eleven months away, the Authority and its partners will need to decide on an approach to allocating the \$2.47 million before the Master Plan will be completed so that sponsors can meet the 2012 deadline. Future allocation cycles will benefit from having the completed master plan at hand to guide the effort. Authority staff will meet with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to develop a proposed approach for allocating the SR2S funds which the Authority will consider at its April 20 meeting.

The purpose of this letter is to give potential applicants for these CMAQ funds advanced warning about what programs and projects could be funded and what requirements sponsors will have to meet to use them.

#### FOCUS OF THE SR2S FUNDING

##### What Do Safe Routes to School Efforts Cover?

According to the National Center for Safe Routes to School, such programs are intended:

*...to improve safety and encourage more children, including children with disabilities, to safely walk and bicycle to school. In the process, programs are working to reduce traffic congestion and improve health and the environment, making communities more livable for everyone.*

2999 Oak Road  
 Suite 100  
 Walnut Creek  
 CA 94597  
 PHONE:  
 925.256.4700  
 FAX: 925.256.4701  
 www.ccta.net

The SR2S approach is often described as covering the 5Es: *education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement* and *evaluation*. A wide range of actions can be covered in those five categories:

<b>Education</b>	Curricula Scheduling and teaching classes or assemblies "Street Smarts" programs
<b>Encouragement</b>	Outreach to parents Support for "Walk to School Day" Maps of suggested routes to school "School pool"
<b>Engineering</b>	Conceptual designs Construction of pedestrian and bicycle improvements
<b>Enforcement</b>	Crossing guards † Speed monitoring †
<b>Evaluation</b>	Walkability audits † Project databases † Annual program evaluation

† Not a CMAQ-eligible activity

#### What Can the CMAQ Program Fund?

The \$2.47 million in SR2S funds will come through the federal CMAQ program, which imposes some limitations on what can be funded. This program will fund a variety of activities, some of which may fall under the SR2S rubric:

- **Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs**, including paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc. that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips, and non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use
- **Travel demand management** including traveler information and marketing
- **Public education and outreach activities** that educate the public, community leaders, and potential project sponsors about connections among trip making and transportation mode choices, traffic congestion, and air quality.
- **Carpooling and vanpooling** including marketing of existing, expanded, and new activities designed to increase the use of carpools..

*City Managers, Public Works Directors, RTPCs and Transit Operators*

*March 22, 2011*

*Page 3*

Some of "5Es" cannot be funded with CMAQ funds, specifically enforcement and planning activities such as walkability audits and conceptual designs. (The Authority, however, can use STP funds to support planning activities, education and outreach.)

Because they are federal funds, the CMAQ funds require an 11.47 percent local match. For many of the CMAQ- or STP-funded programs that the Authority is involved in — such as the Regional Bicycle Program and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program that were part of the 2010 CMA Block Grant — the project sponsors provided the match. For Measure J projects, such as the SR4 widening and the Caldecott Tunnel, local or state funds often provide the match. For the \$2.47 million available through the SR2S program, a local match of roughly \$320,000 from a non-federal source will be required.

#### **What Does MTC Require?**

MTC adds its own limitations on the funding. As its name implies, the SR2S component of the "Climate Initiatives Program" is limited to SR2S activities that significantly reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions generated by school-related travel. MTC, however, also requires every project proponent to conduct a "before-and-after" assessment of each individual project or program. For example, a project that fills a sidewalk gap would require the fund recipient to measure how many students used the street to get to and from school before and after the improvement and report those findings to MTC. To summarize, eligibility for this funding source requires that the project or program:

1. Help support or encourage walking or bicycling to school,
2. Include before-and-after evaluation as part of their proposals, and
3. Be an eligible activity under the CMAQ program.

In addition, sponsors of these projects and programs must be able to:

1. Submit their request for allocation to Caltrans (obligate the funds) by February 1, 2012
2. Receive federal CMAQ funds, and
3. Provide (or at least arrange to provide) the required local match.

#### **PROPOSED APPROACH**

Because SR2S needs likely vary among the four subregions, we are proposing to divide the \$2.47 million among the four subregions. Each RTPC would then have the responsibility for recommending how to allocate their share to a specific mix of eligible projects and programs.

The following table outlines three methods of determining the subregional shares of the \$2.47 million. In other programs where funds are allocated among the subregions, population is perhaps the most common method of determining subregional shares. Another method — the method used, in fact, to divide the funds among the counties — would be to split them by K-12 enrollment. Using enrollment instead of population would give less funding to West and Central County and more to East and Southwest County. A third alternative would be to allocate the funding based half on population and half on enrollment.

### Potential Methods for Allocating SR2S Funds Among the Subregions

Subregion	By Population			By Enrollment			50-50	
	2010	Share	Allocation	2010	Share	Allocation	Share	Allocation
West	249,612	24%	\$584,000	31,757	19%	\$474,000	21%	\$529,000
Central	307,859	29%	\$720,000	43,306	26%	\$647,000	28%	\$683,500
East	294,866	28%	\$690,000	51,035	31%	\$762,000	29%	\$726,000
Southwest	203,262	19%	\$476,000	39,297	24%	\$587,000	22%	\$531,500
	1,055,599	100%	\$2,470,000	165,395	100%	\$2,470,000	100%	\$2,470,000

### LOCAL MATCH

As noted above, the \$2.47 million in CMAQ funds will require a local match of around \$320,000. For physical improvements, the project sponsor could be required to provide the local match as is normally required in capital programs. The RTPCs will need to identify where the local match for their mix of programs and projects will come from.

cc: Superintendent, Contra Costa County Office of Education



**Planning Committee STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: March 2, 2011

<b>Subject</b>	Contra Costa Safe Routes to School Program and Approach to Allocating SR2S Funds from MTC
<b>Summary of Issues</b>	As the designated Congestion Management Agency (CMA) for Contra Costa, the Authority has accepted delegation from MTC for the Safe Routes to School (SR2S) program, including allocation of \$2.47 million in federal CMAQ funds. To meet upcoming federal and State deadlines, decisions must be made soon on how to allocate those funds. In consultation with local stakeholders, CCTA staff has generated some preliminary ideas on how to allocate these funds.
<b>Recommendations</b>	Staff recommends that the Authority release a letter alerting jurisdictions and agencies of the upcoming "call for projects" for the SR2S funds. Concurrently, Authority staff will hold a meeting with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to flesh out options for allocating the SR2S funds, and will bring those options back through the TCC and to the PC/Authority for review and discussion.
<b>Financial Implications</b>	Since these funds come out of the federal CMAQ program, an 11.47 percent match will be required from project sponsors
<b>Options</b>	
<b>Attachments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Use of SR2S Funds by Other CMAs</li> <li>B. SR2S Task Force Roster</li> </ul>
<b>Changes from Committee</b>	

**Background**

Through its *Climate Initiatives Program*, MTC has allocated \$2.47 million to fund safe routes to school programs or projects in Contra Costa and gave the Authority the responsibility for determining how those funds would be allocated. The funds are programmed for fiscal year 2011-12 which means that

---

project sponsors will need to obligate the funds by February 1, 2012. While that date is still eleven months away, some decisions will need to be made soon so that sponsors can meet the deadline.

In addition to the \$2.47 million for SR2S projects and programs, the Authority has allocated \$345,000 in federal STP funds for consultant support to assess the overall SR2S needs in Contra Costa, and prepare an SR2S Master Plan that documents and prioritizes those needs. In December 2010, the Authority committed the first \$100,000 of the \$345,000 to engage the services of Parisi Associates. The initial Parisi contract includes only the first of four tasks. Task One is to perform the upfront work of refining the overall SR2S approach for preparing the Master Plan, developing procedures for a technical assistance program, and assisting Authority staff in developing an approach to allocating Cycle 1 funds. Tasks 2, 3 and 4 involve crafting the SR2S Master Plan, providing the technical assistance to local proponents, and supporting Cycle 1 project development activities.

The major challenge we face is that the allocation of Cycle 1 funds (the \$2.47 million) occurs well in advance of the completion of a long-range SR2S master plan. Consequently, we must proceed with allocating the funds even though overall needs have yet to be identified, documented, and prioritized through the Master Plan. To address this challenge, Authority staff will meet with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to develop a proposed approach for allocating the SR2S funds. Future allocation cycles will benefit from having the completed master plan at hand to guide the effort.

The remainder of this board letter describes what projects and programs can be included in SR2S efforts, funding eligibility, a look at existing programs, both in Contra Costa and for the Bay Area region, and some preliminary options for fund allocation.

## **FOCUS OF THE SR2S FUNDING**

### **What Do Safe Routes to School Efforts Cover?**

According to the National Center for Safe Routes to School, such programs are intended:

*...to improve safety and encourage more children, including children with disabilities, to safely walk and bicycle to school. In the process, programs are working to reduce traffic congestion and improve health and the environment, making communities more livable for everyone.*

The SR2S approach is often described as covering the 5Es: *education, encouragement, engineering, enforcement and evaluation*. A wide range of actions can be covered in those five categories:



*Planning Committee STAFF REPORT**March 2, 2011**Page 3 of 10*


---

<b>Education</b>	Curricula Scheduling and teaching classes or assemblies "Street Smarts" programs
<b>Encouragement</b>	Outreach to parents Support for "Walk to School Day" Maps of suggested routes to school "School pool"
<b>Engineering</b>	Conceptual designs Construction of pedestrian and bicycle improvements
<b>Enforcement</b>	Crossing guards Speed monitoring
<b>Evaluation</b>	Walkability audits Project databases Annual program evaluation

---

**What Can the CMAQ Program Fund?**

The \$2.47 million in SR2S funds will come through the federal CMAQ program, which imposes some limitations on what can be funded. This program will fund a variety of activities, some of which may fall under the SR2S rubric:

- **Bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs**, including paths, bike racks, support facilities, etc. that are not exclusively recreational and reduce vehicle trips, and non-construction outreach related to safe bicycle use
- **Travel demand management** including traveler information and marketing
- **Public education and outreach activities** that educate the public, community leaders, and potential project sponsors about connections among trip making and transportation mode choices, traffic congestion, and air quality.
- **Carpooling and vanpooling** including marketing of existing, expanded, and new activities designed to increase the use of carpools..

Some of "5Es" cannot be funded with CMAQ funds, specifically enforcement and planning activities such as walkability audits and conceptual designs. (The Authority, however, can use STP funds to support planning activities, education and outreach.)

Because they are federal funds, the CMAQ funds require an 11.47 percent local match. For many of the CMAQ- or STP-funded programs that the Authority is involved in — such as the Regional Bicycle Program and the Local Streets and Roads Shortfall Program that were part of the 2010 CMA Block Grant — the project sponsors provided the match. For Measure J projects, such as the SR4 widening and the Caldecott Tunnel, local or state funds often provide the match. For the \$2.47 million available through the SR2S program, a local match of roughly \$320,000 from a non-federal source will be required.

#### What Does MTC Require?

MTC adds its own limitations on the funding. As its name implies, the SR2S component of the “Climate Initiatives Program” is limited to SR2S activities that significantly reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions generated by school-related travel. MTC, however, also requires every project proponent to conduct a “before-and-after” assessment of each individual project or program. For example, a project that fills a sidewalk gap would require the fund recipient to measure how many students used the street to get to and from school before and after the improvement and report those findings to MTC. To summarize, eligibility for this funding source requires that the project or program:

1. Help support or encourage walking or bicycling to school,
2. Include before-and-after evaluation as part of their proposals, and
3. Be an eligible activity under the CMAQ program.

In addition, sponsors of these projects and programs must be able to:

1. Submit their request for allocation to Caltrans (obligate the funds) by February 1, 2012
2. Receive federal CMAQ funds, and
3. Provide (or at least arrange to provide) the required local match.

#### EXISTING SR2S EFFORTS IN CONTRA COSTA

Agencies in Contra Costa have implemented both SR2S projects and programs. Since the first State SR2S program in 2001, 11 of the 20 Contra Costa jurisdictions have received funding grants, a total of 19 separate grants altogether. Most of the projects included sidewalks and curbs and gutters but the improvements have also included upgraded signals and lighting; traffic signs, striping and pavement; speed feedback signs; and bicycle facilities.

Contra Costa has “Street Smarts” programs in the San Ramon Valley, West Contra Costa and, more recently, in East County. The purpose of these programs is to educate drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians on issues related to traffic safety through outreach. These programs carry out bike rodeos, assemblies

on walking and bicycling, poster contests, and organizing “walking school buses”<sup>1</sup> and Walk to School Days. Besides supporting the Street Smarts programs, 511 Contra Costa also runs a “schoolpool” program that helps set up carpools to school and encourage use of transit to school.

#### WHAT ARE THE OTHER CMAs DOING?

Each Bay Area Congestion Management Agency has taken a somewhat different approach to allocating the SR2S funding they get through MTC. The CMAs are, however, putting the overwhelming majority of the funds they have control of towards programs, and not projects. Attachment A summarizes how the other eight CMAs are planning to use their SR2S funds.

#### QUESTIONS

Staff has identified several questions whose answer will determine what approach the Authority will take in allocating the SR2S funds.

1. **Projects vs. Programs.** What mix of projects and programs will the Authority allocate funding to? Should it go only to projects, only to programs, or to a mix of projects and programs?
2. **Role of Subregions.** Should the funds be allocated differently in different subregions?
3. **Local Match.** For programs, who would provide the required 11.47 percent local match? (Sponsors of capital projects would be expected to provide the match for their project.)

#### Projects versus Programs

There is a continuing need for both projects and programs to encourage more walking or bicycling to school in Contra Costa, even with the existing efforts being made. Using the SR2S program to fund these two actions raise somewhat different issues.

Projects are relatively straightforward to allocate funding to, at least for the Authority. Once the funds are allocated, project sponsors take on the responsibility for providing the local match, going through the local assistance process (though Authority staff helps where it can), and overseeing actual construction. With programs, the Authority may need to play a more active role over a longer time period unless the agency running the program is able to receive CMAQ funds directly. (For example, the Alameda County Transportation Commission will administer an education and outreach program in which TRANSFORM will provide the actual services needed.)

<sup>1</sup> *Walking School Bus: A “safety in numbers” strategy where groups of 20-30 young children walk down the sidewalk in rows of 2 or 3, holding hands in a formation that creates a long rectangular shape similar to that of a school bus.*

**Subregional Roles**

In discussions with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC staff and based on the preliminary work on the SR2S Master Plan, Authority staff understands that needs vary among the four subregions. Some areas have well-established programs although they may not cover all of the subregion. Subregions would like to provide additional services but lack funding to do so. Access to a number of schools in Contra Costa could be greatly improved with new sidewalks, crosswalks, and signage.

One option for the Authority to consider is to have the RTPCs identify the mix of projects and programs as well as the agencies charged with implementing those projects and programs. Staff estimates that the four subregions would have between \$400,000 and \$750,000 to allocate between projects and programs.

**Local Match**

As noted above, the \$2.47 million in CMAQ funds will require a local match of around \$320,000. For physical improvements, the project sponsor could be required to provide the local match as is normally required in capital programs.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Authority release a letter alerting jurisdictions and agencies of the upcoming call for projects for the \$2.47 million in SR2S funds. Concurrently, Authority staff will hold a meeting with the SR2S Task Force and RTPC managers to flesh out options for allocating the SR2S funds, and will bring those options back through the TCC and to the PC/Authority for review and discussion.

---

**Attachment A****Use of SR2S Funds by Other CMAs****San Francisco**

San Francisco will split their \$1.79 million share into two parts. They are allocating \$500,000 to fund outreach efforts through a previously established coalition of schools, public works, police, parents and other groups. This work will focus on education and outreach related to their anti-idling campaign and parent outreach. The fiscal agent is the Department of Health, which is federal-aid eligible, unlike most health departments. The education and outreach work will focus on 15 pilot schools. The remaining \$579,000 will be allocated to capital projects. They will release their call for projects soon. San Francisco chose this particular split because 1) they had an existing SR2S coalition (schools, policies, public works, etc.) funded with a federal SRTS grant and with programmatic needs and 2) they had unfunded project needs (identified through walking audits) and CMA experience with handling capital calls for projects.

**San Mateo**

All \$1.4 million available to San Mateo will be allocated to the San Mateo County SR2S Program. This program will provide "modularized safe routes to school programs and projects that focus on education, encouragement, evaluation and enforcement components to all interested schools." The City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo (CCAG), the San Mateo CMA, was originally going to be the agency responsible for implementing the program using steering committees (both policy and technical). The County Office of Education, however, suggested that CCAG contract with the COE to carry out the program.

The program will go entirely to fund non-infrastructure activities. They shifted about \$200,000 in STP funds into the SR2S program so that it could fund walking audits and possibly some enforcement activities. CCAG will remain the project sponsor and fiscal agent and will also serve on the various steering committees.

**Santa Clara**

The Santa Clara Valley Transportation Agency has put \$1 million of its funds into a SR2S program for Santa Clara County. The program will "provide a comprehensive Safe Routes to Schools education and awareness program, countywide outreach, and a teen-centered middle/high school project." It put about \$945,000 into the "San Jose Walk N Roll" program which will "develop and implement a walking and biking encouragement program, partnered with the City's nationally-recognized pedestrian and bicycle safety education program."

---

In addition, the program will provide \$500,000 each to the Mountain View, Palo Alto and Santa Clara VERBS Programs. In the Mountain View and Palo Alto programs, each city, in partnership with local school districts and individual schools, will develop and implement comprehensive programs to promote the benefits of safe walking, biking and carpooling to reduce traffic congestion and greenhouse gas emissions around schools. In the Santa Clara program, the city will develop Safe Routes to School walking route maps along with educational and encouragement programs for Santa Clara schools to make bicycling and walking to school a safer and more appealing transportation alternative

### **Alameda**

In Alameda County, the CMA is putting all \$2.7 million of its share into its Countywide SR2S Program. These funds will expand the existing SR2S program to include more areas and more activities. The CMAQ-funded activities will include four components:

1. Education and outreach efforts in various elementary and middle schools with the target of reaching 30 percent of elementary and middle schools in the county
2. Similar outreach in up to 13 high schools
3. Outreach to encourage commute alternatives to parents at those schools
4. Funding for capital projects and technical assistance to local schools and jurisdictions

### **Solano**

All \$942,000 available to the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) has been allocated to the Countywide Solano Safe Routes to School Program, which will fund planning, education, and encouragement events and materials. \$35,000 in STP will help fund engineering assistance to draft project concepts and cost estimates for seven schools, one for each city in Solano County. \$607,000 in SR2S CMAQ funds and \$520,000 in Eastern Solano CMAQ funds Education & Encouragement events, including Bicycle Rodeo Equipment & Education Materials, Walk & Roll Encouragement events, marketing, walking school bus program, and program coordination through a Solano County Public Health/STA Partnership.

### **Napa**

In Napa County, the CMA has the \$315,000 available to expand existing SR2S program from six to 15 schools and enhance program offerings. Only non-infrastructure activities — marketing, education, and outreach activities — will be funded.

---

**Sonoma**

The Sonoma County Transportation Authority (SCTA) has allocated the roughly \$1 million available through the MTC program to a comprehensive SR2S program to shift mode away from single family vehicular trips to bicycle/pedestrian/carpooling. The SCTA/RCPA has developed a countywide SR2S program with the overall goal of reducing emissions related to school related travel. Specific goals are to:

1. Reduce traffic congestion around schools;
2. Create safer, calmer streets and neighborhoods;
3. Improve air quality and provide a cleaner environment;
4. Increase physical activity for children and youth; and
5. Increase the range of options for travel to school for all Sonoma County students.

SCTA is now working on organizing the program, including determining who will carry the work and what activities will be funded.

**Marin**

The Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) already has a Safe Routes to School program, funded with their sales tax measure, which was in place before MTC created its SR2S program. The sales tax measure funds both capital and programmatic activities. TAM will receive \$475,000 in CMAQ funds through MTC's SR2S program. TAM plans on dedicating these funds to a school infrastructure improvement project in Marin County that was developed with broad stakeholder support through its SR2S program. This will "free up" an equivalent amount of sales tax measure school infrastructure funds, which TAM will then redirect to its program activities to potentially carry out expansion of its SchoolPool trip-match program, preparation of school walking route maps, development of school area traffic control plans, and other programmatic tasks.

## Attachment B

## SR2S Task Force Roster

FIRST NAME	LAST NAME	JURISDICTION/ ORGANIZATION	PHONE
Nat	Rojanasathira	Town of Danville	925-314-3382
Lynn	Osborn- Overcashier	511 Contra Costa/TRANSPAC	925-969-0841 x 202
Nancy	Baer	Contra Costa Health Svcs	925-313-6837
John	Hild	Contra Costa Office of Education	925-942-3388
Catalin	Kaser	West Contra Costa Unified School District	510-231-1100
Shannon	Ladner-Beasley	Contra Costa Health Svcs	925-313-6813
<b>CONSULTANT</b>			
David	Parisi	Parisi Associates	415-388-8978
<b>AUTHORITY STAFF</b>			
Brad	Beck	CCTA	925-256-4726