APPENDIX A – 7

Regional Policies: Long-Range Planning / Plan Bay Area

Regional Transit Expansion Program (RTEP)

MTC Resolution No. 3434

Date:	December 19, 2001	
W.I.:	12110	
Referred by:	POC	
Revised:	01/30/02-C	07/27/05-C
	04/26/06-C	10/24/07-C
	09/24/08-C	

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3434, Revised

This resolution sets forth MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects.

This resolution was amended on January 30, 2002 to include the San Francisco Geary Corridor Major Investment Study to Attachment B, as requested by the Planning and Operations Committee on December 14, 2001.

This resolution was amended on July 27, 2005 to include a Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy to condition transit expansion projects funded under Resolution 3434 on supportive land use policies, as detailed in Attachment D-2.

This resolution was amended on April 26, 2006 to reflect changes in project cost, funding, and scope since the 2001 adoption.

This resolution was amended on October 24, 2007 to reflect changes in the Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy in Attachment D-2.

This resolution was amended on September 24, 2008 to reflect changes associated with the 2008 Strategic Plan effort (Attachments B, C and D).

Further discussion of these actions are contained in the MTC Executive Director's Memorandum dated December 14, 2001, July 8, 2005, April 14, 2006, October 12, 2007 and September 10, 2008.

Date: December 19, 2001
W.I.: 12110
Referred by: POC

RE: Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 3434, Revised

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

WHEREAS, MTC adopted Resolution No. 1876 in 1988 which set forth a new rail transit starts and extension program for the region; and

WHEREAS, significant progress has been made in implementing Resolution No. 1876, with new light rail service in operation in San Francisco and Silicon Valley, new BART service extended to Bay Point and Dublin/Pleasanton in the East Bay, and the BART extension to San Francisco International Airport scheduled to open in 2002; and

WHEREAS, MTC's long range planning process, including the Regional Transportation Plan and its *Transportation Blueprint for the 21st Century*, provides a framework for comprehensively evaluating the next generation of major regional transit expansion projects to meet the challenge of congestion in major corridors throughout the nine-county Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the Commission adopted Resolution No. 3357 as the basis for assisting in the evaluations of rail and express/rapid bus projects to serve as the companion follow-up program to Resolution No. 1876; and

WHEREAS, local, regional, state and federal discretionary funds will continue to be required to finance an integrated program of new rail transit starts and extensions including those funds which are reasonably expected to be available under current conditions, and new funds which need to be secured in the future through advocacy with state and federal legislatures and the electorate; and

WHEREAS, the Regional Transit Expansion program of projects will enhance the Bay Area's transit network with an additional 140 miles of rail, 600 miles of new express bus routes, and a 58% increase in service levels in several existing corridors, primarily funded with regional and local sources of funds; and

WHEREAS, MTC recognizes that coordinated regional priorities for transit investment will best position the Bay Area to compete for limited discretionary funding sources now and in the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC adopts a Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects, consistent with the Policy and Criteria established in Resolution No. 3357, as outlined in Attachment A, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and be it further

RESOLVED, that this program of projects, as set forth in Attachment B is accompanied by a comprehensive funding strategy of local, regional, state and federal funding sources as outlined in Attachment C, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the regional discretionary funding commitments included in this financial strategy are subject to the terms and conditions outlined in Attachment D, attached hereto and incorporated herein as though set forth at length.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Sharon J. Brown, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the
Metropolitan Transportation Commission
at a regular meeting of the Commission held
in Oakland, California, on December 19, 2001.

ATTACHMENT A - Regional Transit Expansion Policy Criteria Evaluation Matrix

			Resolution 1876-Tier 1	TEA-21 Funds	TCRP	Dedicated Local Funding	Operations/ Maintenance	Supportive Land Use		Cost-Effectiveness	System Connectivity			System Access	Project Readiness
Project	**Sponsor**	**Project Cost 2001 $ Millions**	prior 1876 Tier 1 commitment	TEA-21 authorization or other federal appropriations	TCRP or other state level commitments	Local funds as a percent of total capital cost	Demonstrated operating plan	Residential densities around stations	Employment densities around stations	Cost per new transit rider	# connecting operators	Frequency	Regional gap closures	# of modal access options	# of pre-construction activities completed or in progress
BART to Warm Springs	BART	$ 634	Yes	Yes	Yes	H	Yes	M	M	M	M	H	No	H	M
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose	VTA	$ 3,710	No	Yes	Yes	H	Yes	H	M	M	H	H	Yes	H	L
MUNI 3rd St. LRT Phase 2 - New Central Subway	SFCTA/Muni	$ 647	No	Yes	Yes	M	Yes	H	H	L	H	H	No	H	H
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	$ 232	No	Yes	No	M	Yes	M	M	H	M	H	Yes	H	M
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	SFCTA	$ 1,885	Yes	Yes	No	H	Yes	H	H	L	H	H	Yes	H	M
Caltrain Rapid Rail/Electrification	JPB	$ 602	No	No	No	H	Yes	M	H	L	H	M	No	H	M
Caltrain Express: phase 1	JPB	$ 127	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	M	H	H	H	M	No	H	H
Downtown East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VTA	$ 518	No	No	No	H	Yes	H	M	L	H	H	No	H	M
Capitol Corridor: Phase 1 Expansion	CCJPA	$ 129	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	H	M	H	H	L	No	H	M
AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1 (Enhanced Bus)	AC Transit	$ 151	No	No	No	L	Yes	H	H	H	L	H	No	H	L
Regional Express Bus Phase 1	MTC/Operators	$ 40	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	-	-	H	M	-	Yes	H	H
Dumbarton Rail	JPB	$ 129	No	No	No	H	No	M	M	L	H	L	Yes	H	L
BART/East Contra Costa Rail Extension	CCTA	$ 345	No	No	Yes	L	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L
BART/Tri-Valley Rail Extension	ACCMA	$ 345	No	No	Yes	L	No	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	L
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	ACE	$ 121	No	No	No	L	-	M	M	H	M	L	No	M	-
Caltrain Express Phase 2	JPB	$ 330	No	No	No	H	-	M	H	-	H	-	No	H	-
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	$ 284	No	No	Yes	L	Yes	H	M	-	H	L	No	H	M
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	$ 200	No	No	Yes	L	No	L	M	-	H	L	No	H	L
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	AC Transit	$ 90	No	No	No	L	-	H	M	H	L	H	No	H	-

Note: "--" indicates that complete information is not available.

Resolution No. 3357 Criteria: Definitions and Measurement

Financial Criteria:

Honor 1876 commitments: Priority assigned to those projects of the original seven "Tier 1" Resolution No. 1876 projects that do not yet have a defined and secured financial agreement.
Rating: "Yes" or "No"

TEA-21/federal reauthorization: Current federal financial support exists for the project, through TEA-21 authorizing language for New Starts funding, or other federal appropriation commitments.
Rating: "Yes" or "No"

TCRP/State commitments: Current state financial commitment is secured by the project, through Traffic Congestion Relief Program funds, or other existing state funding commitments.
Rating: "Yes" or "No"

Dedicated local commitments: Local financial commitment for the project, based on percentage of local funds to total capital costs.
Rating: "High": Greater than 50%; "Medium": 30% to 50%; "Low": under 30%

Operations/Maintenance: Project can be maintained and operated once built, based on financial plans and policies submitted by the project sponsor, outlining sources and commitments of funds for the period of operations through the end of the RTP (2025) or for at least 10 years, whichever is longer. Any financial burden imposed by the transit expansion project may not undermine core bus service within the same system, especially that needed by transit dependent persons.
Rating: "Yes" or "No"

Performance Criteria:

Land Use: Evaluate potential system benefits accrued as a result of adjacent land uses along rail/bus corridors, based on year 2025 projected net residential and employment land use densities around planned stations or transit corridors.
Rating: "High": urban or urban core/CBD; "Medium": suburban; "Low": rural or rural suburban, as measured below:

Net Population Density	Total Population/ Residential Area square miles	Net Employment Density	Total Employment/ Commercial Area square miles
Rural	< 5,000	Rural	< 5,000
Rural-Suburban	5,000-10,000	Suburban	5,000-20,000
Suburban	10,000-20,000	Urban	20,000-50,000
Urban	20,000-50,000	Urban Core	50,000-100,000
Urban Core	>50,000	Urban CBD	>100,000

Cost-effectiveness: "Cost per new rider", measured as dollars per new rider (shifting from auto to transit; not transit to transit).
Rating: "High": $0 - $15/new rider; "Medium": $16 - $30/new rider; "Low": over $30/new rider

Note: Resolution No. 3357 also provides for another measure of cost effectiveness: "transit user benefits" that will be incorporated into this analysis at a later date once the methodology is available from the Federal Transit Administration.

System Connectivity: Assess the interconnected relationship of the transit expansion and the existing transit network, through measures of connections, service frequency and gap closures.
Rating:
A. Number of Connecting Operators: "High": 5 or more; "Medium": 3 to 4; "Low": 1 to 2

B. Frequency: Peak Period Headways: "High": 10 minutes or less; "Medium": 20 minutes to 11 minutes; "Low": Greater than 20 minutes

C. Gap Closures: " Yes" or "No" for completion of a major closure in the regional network.

System Access: Determine the ability of users to easily access (via walking, biking, auto or transit transfers) the new extensions, based on number of modal access options
Rating: "High": 4 or more; "Medium": 3; "Low": 1 to 2

Project Readiness: Priority assigned to projects that are able to proceed expeditiously to implementation, based on pre-construction activities completed or in progress as of December 2001.
Rating: "High": corridor evaluation+environmental analysis+preliminary design and engineering; "Medium": corridor evaluation+environmental analysis; "Low": Sketch planning or corridor evaluation only.

Date: December 19, 2001
W.I.: 12110
Referred by: POC
Revised: 01/30/02-C
04/26/06-C
09/24/08-C

Attachment B
Resolution No. 3434

Regional Transit Expansion Policy: Recommended Program of Projects

PROJECT	COST (millions of YOE $)
AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit	250
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Hesperian/Foothill/MacArthur corridors	41
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	459
Tri-Valley Transit Access Improvements to BART	168
East Contra Costa BART Extension (eBART)	525
BART to Warm Springs	890
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose/Santa Clara	6,133
Caltrain Express: Baby Bullet ** OPEN FOR SERVICE**	128
Caltrain Electrification	785
Caltrain Express: Phase 2	427
Transbay Transit Center: Phase 1	1,189
Transbay Transit Center: Phase 2	2,996
Capitol Corridor Expansion	108
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	89
Regional Express Bus **OPEN FOR SERVICE**	102
MUNI Third Street Light Rail Transit Project - Central Subway	1,290
SFCTA and SFMTA: Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	88
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE): service expansion	150
Sonoma-Marin Rail	646
Dumbarton Rail	596
Downtown to East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	465
Expanded Ferry Service to Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay, Hercules, Richmond, and South San Francisco; and other improvements.	180

Attachment C: Regional Transit Expansion Policy - Funding Strategy

Project Capital Cost/Funding in Millions and Year of Expenditure $ Alphabetical by Tier			*Committed Funding*						*Regional Discretionary Funding*												
Project	**Sponsor**	**Project Cost (YOE $)**	TCRP	Sales Tax	Resolution 1876	RTIP	Federal Earmarks	Other [see notes]	Section 5309 New Starts	Section 5309 Small Starts	Section 5309 Fixed Guideway Modernization	Ferryboat Discretionary	RM1	RM 2	AB 1171	Prop 1B - Transit	Prop 1B - SLPP	ITIP	ITIP Intercity Rail	CARB/ AB 434	**Capital Shortfall**
Caltrain Express: Baby Bullet ** OPEN FOR SERVICE**	Caltrain JPB	128	127					1													-
Regional Express Bus **OPEN FOR SERVICE**	MTC	102	40											62							-
Tier 1 - No Current Scope, Schedule, Budget Issues as Reported By Sponsors																					
AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit	AC Transit	250		24		50	2	35		75				65							-
BART to Warm Springs	BART	890	100	221	205	69		26					53	85	5	40	86				-
East Contra Costa BART Extension (eBART)	BART/CCTA	525	7	196		14		6					52	96	115	40					-
Capitol Corridor Expansion	CCJPA	108	24			4		15											64		-
Capitol Corridor: Phase 2 Enhancements	CCJPA	89	1											3					85		-
MUNI Third Street Light Rail Transit Project - Central Subway	SFMTA	1,290	14	126		92		45	762							250					-
SFCTA and SFMTA: Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit	SFCTA and SFMTA	88		18						70											-
Transbay Transit Center: Phase 1	TJPA	1,189		105		28	64	646					53	142	150						-
Tri-Valley Transit Access Improvements to/from BART	BART/ACCMA/ LAVTA	168	3	10				14		11			16	16	95	2					-
Downtown to East Valley: Light Rail and Bus Rapid Transit Phase 1 and 2	VTA	465		318		58										90					-
Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay, Hercules, Richmond, and South San Francisco; and other improvements.	WETA	180		47			19					25		89							-
Tier 2 - Projects Needing More Scope/Cost Refinement																					
BART/Oakland Airport Connector	BART	459		99		21		231					31	68				10			TBD
Caltrain Electrification	Caltrain JPB	785		360		28		23			4									29	341
Tier 3 - Projects Needing Ongoing Operating Funds																					
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	646	37	24			7	65						35							478
BART: Warm Springs to San Jose/Santa Clara	VTA	6,133	649	4,734					750												-
Tier 4 - Shortfall is equal to or greater than 50% project cost																					
AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Grand-MacArthur corridor	AC Transit	41				7		1						3							30
Caltrain Express: Phase 2	Caltrain JPB	427						13			41					15					358
Dumbarton Rail	SMTA, ACCMA, VTA, ACTIA, Capitol Corridor	596		113		15								135					39		295
Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Right-of-Way Acquisition for Service Expansion	SJRRC, ACCMA, VTA	150		67				3			5										75
Transbay Transit Center: Phase 2	TJPA	2,996		73				868						8							2,047
TOTAL		**$ 17,703**	**$ 1,002**	**$ 6,533**	**$ 205**	**$ 385**	**$ 92**	**$ 1,994**	**$ 1,512**	**$ 156**	**$ 50**	**$ 25**	**$ 205**	**$ 807**	**$ 365**	**$ 437**		**$ 10**	**$ 188**	**$ 29**	**$ 3,624**

Attachment C: Regional Transit Expansion Policy - Funding Strategy (cont.)

Notes: For all projects, see Terms and Conditions.

Detail on 'other' funding is provided below:

1. AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: $35 million in CMAQ bonus funds programmed in 2008.
2. BART to Warm Springs: $2.2 M local CMA funds. $24 M in BART agency contribution. Prop 1B Transit funds are 50% MTC and 50% BART. Of the $205 million in Resolution 1876 commitment, $145 million is SFO Extension Revenues. Then SFO Extension revenues are subject to the provisions outlined in Attachment D, subsection 5.
3. East Contra Costa BART Extension: $6 million in developer fees. Prop 1B Transit funds are 50% MTC and 50%
4. Capitol Corridor Expansion: Other includes $10 million in ACE funds, $.5 million in Caltrain funds, $2.1 million in CCJPB funds, $2.3 million in State PTA funds and $0.5 million in Prop 116 funds.
5. Muni Third Street Light Rail Project: New Starts request is $762 million in Year of Expenditure dollars. Prop 1B Transit funds are 40% MTC and 60% SFMTA.
6. Transbay Transit Center Phase 1: Other funds include $411 million in land sales and tax increment revenue, $8.8 million in FTA 1601 funds, and $227 million in TIFIA loan proceeds.
7. Tri-Valley Transit Access Improvements to BART: $6 million in federal CMAQ funds, $6.4 million in federal 5307 funds, and $1.6 million in TDA funds. Prop 1B Transit funds are LAVTA Revenue-based.
8. VTA Downtown to East Valley: Prop 1B Transit funds are 50% MTC and 50% VTA.
9. BART/Oakland Airport Connector: $31.5 million is Port of Oakland funds, $25 million federal Public/Private Pilot Program and $174 million private financing.
10. Caltrain Electrification: $12 million in regional STP/CMAQ funds and $11.3 million in PJPB funds.
11. Sonoma-Marin Rail: Other includes $28 million in Prop. 116 and $37.2 million in North Coast Rail Authority funds
12. BART: Warm Springs to San Jose/Santa Clara: New Starts request is $750 million in Year of Expenditure dollars. Confirmation of RTIP commitment pending reconciliation by VTA between the Santa Clara county-wide plan and MTC's Transportation 2030.
13. AC Transit Enhanced Bus: Grand MacArthur Corridor: $.8 million is Transportation Fund for Clean Air funds through BAAQMD
14. Caltrain Express: $13.2 million is Joint Powers Board member contributions.
15. ACE Service Expansion: Other includes $3 million in San Joaquin federal fund contributions.
16. Transbay Transit Center Phase 2: Other funds include $424 million in land sales and tax increment revenue and $445 million in TIFIA loan proceeds.

Definitions and Assumptions of Regional Discretionary Funding

- Federal Section 5309 New Starts: the total shown is an estimate for the 25-year RTP period. This estimate trends against recent historical averages of the Bay Area's New Starts funding compared to the nation, an average of 7% over the last 10 years. This represents a target for advocacy in Washington, D.C.; actual authorizations and appropriations are at the discretion of Congress.

- Federal Section 5309 Small Starts: estimate for the 25-year RTP period, beginning with the federal reauthorization in 2005. Small Start Capital Grants may not exceed $75 million under law. This represents a target for advocacy in Washington D.C.; actual authorization and appropriations are at the discretion of Congress. This estimate does not include the Very Small Starts program.

- Federal Section 5309 Rail Modernization: These Federal Transit Administration formula funds are eligible for fixed guideway infrastructure projects. In the MTC region these funds are by policy devoted to capital replacement. The funding would replace diesel locomotives with electric locomotives when eligible for the Caltrain Electrification project.

- Federal Ferryboat Discretionary Program: estimate for the 25-year RTP period, beginning with the federal reauthorization in 2005; provides a special category for the construction of ferry boats and ferry terminal facilities. This represents a target for advocacy in Washington D.C.; actual authorization and appropriations are at the discretion of Congress.

- Regional Measure 1 Rail Reserve: the total shown is an estimate for the 25-year RTP period, net of existing commitments to the BART Warm Springs extension. These funds from the base $1 Bay Bridge toll are directly allocated by the Commission to rail projects in the bridge corridor according to a statutory formula splitting the funds 70% to East Bay projects, and 30% to West Bay projects. This funding estimate assumes debt financing against this revenue stream. This estimate was revised as part of the 2008 Strategic Plan effort.

- Regional Measure 2: Regional voter-approved measure providing $812 million to Resolution 3434 projects. The specific amounts are identified in statute for each project. This funding estimate assumes debt financing against this revenue stream.

- AB 1171: This is a discretionary funding source passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in October 2001. AB 1171 (Dutra) extends the $1 seismic surcharge (the second half of the current $2 auto toll) on the seven state-owned Bay Area toll bridges for up to 30 years to finance retrofit work. Under certain financing provisions, a portion of that toll revenue will return to MTC acting as the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA). This funding can be used for projects consistent with the voter approved Regional Measure 1 program—including congestion relief projects in corridors served by some proposed transit expansion projects—and is estimated over the 25-year period of the RTP to total $570 million; $370 million of this amount is being assigned to the Regional Transit Expansion program of projects. This estimate was revised as part of the 2008 Strategic Plan effort.

- Proposition 1B Transit: Proposition 1B, approved by California voters in November 2006, directed $3.6 billion toward transit capital improvements, including about $1.3 billion for projects in the Bay Area. Within this $1.3 billion, roughly $1 billion is distributed directly to the transit operators, and about $347 million is anticipated to come directly to MTC through statutorily defined formulas. On June 27th, 2007 the Commission adopted the MTC Proposition 1B Regional Transit Program - Resolution 3814. Resolution 3814 committed $185 million in Proposition 1B - Population-based funds conditioned upon operators committing $185 million in Propostion 1B - Revenue-based funds. Operator contributions may exceed the matching requirement of Resolution 3814.

- Proposition 1B State Local Partnership: Proposition 1B, approved by California voters in November 2006, directed $1 billion toward the State/Local Partnership Program (SLPP). This program was included in the bond measure to reward local jurisdictions for their financial contributions to California's transportation system. The program may match county sales taxes, transit sales taxes, and voter-approved bridge tolls such as Regional Measures 1 and 2. Should the eligible match element of the program include bridge tolls, MTC commits the initial $40 million to Resolution 3434 projects conditioned on SLPP contributions from partner agencies, as outlined in Attachment D. The remaining amount, estimated to be roughly $26 million, would be held in an unrestricted reserve.

- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program: the total shown is an estimate for the 25-year RTP period; other ITIP funding is assumed for highway and other projects. As ITIP funds are the state's discretionary portion of the State Transportation Improvement Program, this represents a target for advocacy in Sacramento. Actual programming commitments and allocations are at the discretion of the California Transportation Commission.

- CARB/AB 434: Both the California Air Resources Board (CARB) and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (AB 434) administer discretionary funding programs focused in whole or in part on reducing emissions from diesel engines. $29 million is assumed from the two programs combined to help fund the Caltrain electrification project. This funding target for advocacy over the RTP period is sized to the annual funding levels of the two programs.

Terms and Conditions

General Terms

1. Operating Funding – In order for an extension of service to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), the project sponsor must provide evidence of its ability to fund operation of the service for a minimum of 10 years, or the duration of operations within the 25-year RTP time horizon, whichever is longer. These financial capacity determinations must also include a demonstration of the transit operator's ability to sustain levels of core bus services to low-income and minority populations, as required under MTC Resolution No. 3357. Should the transit operator's financial stability deteriorate, or the expansion project in question experience significant cost increases, these financial capacity determinations will be revisited in MTC's review of the operator's applicable Short Range Transit Plan.

2. Cost Increases – Commitments of regional discretionary funds (Section 5309 New Starts, Small Starts, and Fixed Guideway Modernization, Regional Measure 1 Rail Reserve, ITIP, AB 1171, CARB/AB 434, Regional Measure 2, Ferry Boat Discretionary) are capped at the amounts shown in Attachment C in year of expenditure dollars. Project sponsors are responsible for funding any cost increases (including financing costs) above the estimates shown in Attachment C from other sources. Funding shortfalls must be addressed for projects to be included in the Regional Transportation Plan.

3. Amendment – The Commission shall consider amending this regional transit expansion program following the passage of major new funding sources that could advance projects with current shortfalls into the RTP. New funding sources also could be used to offset cost increases for projects already included in the RTP.

4. Station Access Planning: Consistent with recommendations of MTC's Regional Bicycle Plan, all new transit stations that are built as result of Resolution No. 3434 investments must provide direct and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access from adjacent walkways and bicycle facilities. Station access planning shall be consistent with the conclusions reached from the evaluation of FSM 5 in the 2001 Bay Area Ozone Attainment Plan.

Specific Conditions

1. Section 5309 New Starts – The region's priorities for federal New Starts funds are the BART Extension to Silicon Valley and the Muni Central Subway project, with equal priority.

2. Section 5309 Small Starts – The region's priorities for federal Small Starts funds are the AC Transit Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit project and the Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit project in San Francisco, with equal priority.

3. AB 1171 – These funds will be subject to terms and conditions established by MTC acting as the Bay Area Toll Authority (BATA). The balance of these funds not committed in Attachment C will be reserved as follows:

   - **Corridor Improvements Adjacent to the I-80/680 Interchange:** $100 million reserved for improvements in the vicinity of the I-80/680 interchange. These AB1171 funds are in addition to the $100 million approved through Regional Measure 2 (RM2) for corridor improvements in the vicinity of the I-80/680 interchange.
   - **Other Improvements:** $100 million for other corridor improvements.

4. BART Warm Springs to San Jose – In addition to the general terms for operating funding imposed on all projects, the BART Warms Springs to San Jose project is included in the RTP contingent upon approval by the BART and VTA Boards of an operating and maintenance agreement regarding extension of service into Santa Clara County and associated impacts of the extension on the core BART system. If a TDA "lien" is implemented pursuant to the BART/VTA agreement after 2009, MTC will condition allocation of the remaining TDA funds subject to the following:

   At the time that the BART to San Jose extension commences revenue service, or at any point thereafter, should VTA's bus service levels have not achieved, or later fall below, a 600 fleet/500 peak target, then MTC shall hold public hearings at which VTA must demonstrate that services to Title VI communities have been assured, based on MTC's Lifeline Transportation analysis, as validated and amended by transit operators and the Congestion Management Agencies.

Should VTA choose to identify TDA funds as the guaranteed operating and maintenance subsidy pursuant to the BART/VTA agreement and demonstrate that it has secured other funding sources

to replace the TDA revenue so guaranteed, then MTC shall not condition its allocation of TDA funds as described above.

5. BART Extension to Warm Springs: MTC commits the following funds subject to availability: $40 million from MTC's share of Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program, $29 million in RM1 and $5 million in AB 1171. These funding commitments are conditioned upon: 1) BART contributing an additional $24 million; 2) Alameda and Santa Clara Counties contribute $30 million and $16 million, respectively, from Proposition 1B State Local Partnership Program proceeds; and 3) VTA's Board committing to a full funding plan for an operable BART segment in Santa Clara County.

   To address the cash flow challenges wherein the $145 million surplus fare revenue on the BART SFO Extension are not expected to be available during the BART to Warm Springs construction period, $91 million of Regional Measure 2 (RM2) and $54 million, shared equally, in funding advanced from MTC and BART/ACTIA are proposed. This proposal is conditioned on the following: 1) the Commission holding a public hearing and approving reassignment of $91 million in RM2 funds from the Dumbarton Rail project to the BART to Warm Springs project; and 2) first priority and equivalent repayment of $27 million each to MTC and ACTIA/BART from the surplus BART SFO Extension revenues

6. AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: MTC commits $35 million in CMAQ funds subject to the following conditions: 1) Alameda County Congestion Management Agency (ACCMA) adopts an RTIP funding commitment plan and explores a strategy to advance the $40 million RTIP funds commitment; 2) AC Transit submits documentation for inclusion into the 2009 Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Small Starts report; and 3) AC Transit adopts a board resolution committing to the following: a) use the $35 million to deliver a useable bus rapid transit segment; and b) develop a phasing plan to deliver the full Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit project, if the entire project as submitted to FTA for the Small Starts program, is not immediately deliverable.

7. Dumbarton Rail: Should the Commission hold an RM2 Public Hearing and reassign $91 million in RM2 funds from the Dumbarton Rail project to the BART to Warm Springs project, the $91 million will be replaced with $91 million in Alameda Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) funds. The reassignment is conditioned on the Alameda County Congestion Management Agency adopting a board resolution committing the RTIP funds to the project. MTC, in cooperation with Caltrain and the other funding partners, shall:

1. Support completion of the alternatives analysis and environmental phase
2. Support steps toward the purchase of Right-of-Way in the ACE, Capitol, and Dumbarton Corridors
3. Support expanded cost-effective express bus service in the corridor to build ridership
4. Explore other funding opportunities, including the potential for future bridge tolls, to accelerate repayment of the reassigned $91 million in RM2 funds.
5. In conjunction with all funding partners, explore other funding opportunities, including the potential for future bridge tolls, to close the $300 million project shortfall.

MTC RESOLUTION 3434 TOD POLICY FOR REGIONAL TRANSIT EXPANSION PROJECTS

1. Purpose

The San Francisco Bay Area—widely recognized for its beauty and innovation—is projected to grow by almost two million people and one and a half million jobs by 2030. This presents a daunting challenge to the sustainability and the quality of life in the region. Where and how we accommodate this future growth, in particular where people live and work, will help determine how effectively the transportation system can handle this growth.

The more people who live, work and study in close proximity to public transit stations and corridors, the more likely they are to use the transit systems, and more transit riders means fewer vehicles competing for valuable road space. The policy also provides support for a growing market demand for more vibrant, walkable and transit convenient lifestyles by stimulating the construction of at least 42,000 new housing units along the region's major new transit corridors and will help to contribute to a forecasted 59% increase in transit ridership by the year 2030.

This TOD policy addresses multiple goals: improving the cost-effectiveness of regional investments in new transit expansions, easing the Bay Area's chronic housing shortage, creating vibrant new communities, and helping preserve regional open space. The policy ensures that transportation agencies, local jurisdictions, members of the public and the private sector work together to create development patterns that are more supportive of transit.

There are three key elements of the regional TOD policy:

(a) Corridor-level thresholds to quantify appropriate minimum levels of development around transit stations along new corridors;

(b) Local station area plans that address future land use changes, station access needs, circulation improvements, pedestrian-friendly design, and other key features in a transit-oriented development; and

(c) Corridor working groups that bring together CMAs, city and county planning staff, transit agencies, and other key stakeholders to define expectations, timelines, roles and responsibilities for key stages of the transit project development process.

2. TOD Policy Application

The TOD policy only applies to physical transit extensions funded in Resolution 3434 (see Table 1). The policy applies to any physical transit extension project with regional discretionary funds, regardless of level of funding. Resolution 3434 investments that only entail level of service improvements or other enhancements without physically extending the system are not subject to

TABLE 1
Resolution 3434 Transit Extension Projects Subject to Corridor Thresholds

Project	Sponsor	Type	Threshold is met with current development?
BART East Contra Costa Rail Extension	BART/CCTA	Commuter Rail	No
BART – Downtown Fremont to San Jose / Santa Clara (a) Fremont to Warm Springs (b) Warm Springs to San Jose/Santa Clara	(a) BART (b) VTA	BART extension	No
AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1	AC Transit	Bus Rapid Transit	Yes
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	TJPA	Commuter Rail	Yes
MUNI Third Street LRT Project Phase 2 – New Central Subway	MUNI	Light Rail	Yes
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	Commuter Rail	No
Dumbarton Rail	SMTA, ACCMA, VTA, ACTIA, Capitol Corridor	Commuter Rail	No
Expanded Ferry Service to Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay, Hercules, Richmond, and South San Francisco; and other improvements.	WTA	Ferry	No

** Ferry terminals where development is feasible shall meet a housing threshold of 2500 units. MTC staff will make the determination of development feasibility on a case by case basis.*

the TOD policy requirements. Single station extensions to international airports are not subject to the TOD policy due to the infeasiblity of housing development.

3. Definitions and Conditions of Funding

For purposes of this policy "regional discretionary funding" consists of the following sources identified in the Resolution 3434 funding plan:

- FTA Section 5309- New Starts
- FTA Section 5309- Bus and Bus Facilities Discretionary
- FTA Section 5309- Rail Modernization
- Regional Measure 1- Rail (bridge tolls)
- Regional Measure 2 (bridge tolls)
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program
- Interregional Transportation Improvement Program-Intercity rail
- Federal Ferryboat Discretionary
- AB 1171 (bridge tolls)
- CARB-Carl Moyer/AB434 (Bay Area Air Quality Management District) [1]

These regional funds may be programmed and allocated for environmental and design related work, in preparation for addressing the requirements of the TOD policy. Regional funds may be programmed and allocated for right-of-way acquisition in advance of meeting all requirements in the policy, if land preservation for TOD or project delivery purposes is essential. No regional funds will be programmed and allocated for construction until the requirements of this policy have been satisfied. See Table 2 for a more detailed overview of the planning process.

4. Corridor-Level Thresholds

Each transit extension project funded in Resolution 3434 must plan for a minimum number of housing units along the corridor. These corridor-level thresholds vary by mode of transit, with more capital-intensive modes requiring higher numbers of housing units (see Table 3). The corridor thresholds have been developed based on potential for increased transit ridership, exemplary existing station sites in the Bay Area, local general plan data, predicted market demand for TOD-oriented housing in each county, and an independent analysis of feasible development potential in each transit corridor.

[1] The Carl Moyer funds and AB 434 funds are controlled directly by the California Air Resources Board and Bay Area Air Management District. Res. 3434 identifies these funds for the Caltrain electrification project, which is not subject to the TOD policy.

TABLE 2 **REGIONAL TOD POLICY IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS FOR TRANSIT EXTENSION PROJECTS**		
Transit Agency Action	**City Action**	**MTC/CMA/ABAG Action**
All parties in corridors that do not currently meet thresholds (see Table 1) establish Corridor Working Group to address corridor threshold. Conduct initial corridor performance evaluation, initiate station area planning.		
Environmental Review/ Preliminary Engineering /Right-of-Way	Conduct Station Area Plans	Coordination of corridor working group, funding of station area plans
Step 1 Threshold Check: the combination of new Station Area Plans and existing development patterns exceeds corridor housing thresholds .		
Final Design	Adopt Station Area Plans. Revise general plan policies and zoning, environmental reviews	Regional and county agencies assist local jurisdictions in implementing station area plans
Step 2 Threshold Check: (a) local policies adopted for station areas; (b) implementation mechanisms in place per adopted Station Area Plan by the time Final Design is completed.		
Construction	Implementation (financing, MOUs) Solicit development	TLC planning and capital funding, HIP funding

TABLE 3: CORRIDOR THRESHOLDS
HOUSING UNITS – AVERAGE PER STATION AREA

Project Type / Threshold	BART	Light Rail	Bus Rapid Transit	Commuter Rail	Ferry
Housing Threshold	3,850	3,300	2,750	2,200	2,500*

Each corridor is evaluated for the Housing Threshold. For example, a four station commuter rail extension (including the existing end-of-the-line station) would be required to meet a corridor-level threshold of 8,800 housing units.

Threshold figures above are an average per station area for all modes except ferries based on both existing land uses and planned development within a half mile of all stations. New below market rate housing is provided a 50% bonus towards meeting housing unit threshold.

** Ferry terminals where development is feasible shall meet a housing threshold of 2500 units. MTC staff will make the determination of development feasibility on a case by case basis.*

- Meeting the corridor level thresholds requires that within a half mile of all stations, a combination of existing land uses and planned land uses meets or exceeds the overall corridor threshold for housing (listed in Table 3);
- Physical transit extension projects that do not currently meet the corridor thresholds with development that is already built will receive the highest priority for the award of MTC's Station Area Planning Grants.
- To be counted toward the threshold, planned land uses must be adopted through general plans, and the appropriate implementation processes must be put in place, such as zoning codes. General plan language alone without supportive implementation policies, such as zoning, is not sufficient for the purposes of this policy. Ideally, planned land uses will be formally adopted through a specific plan (or equivalent), zoning codes and general plan amendments along with an accompanying programmatic Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as part of the overall station area planning process. Minimum densities will be used in the calculations to assess achievement of the thresholds.
- An existing end station is included as part of the transit corridor for the purposes of calculating the corridor thresholds; optional stations will not be included in calculating the corridor thresholds.

- New below-market housing units will receive a 50 percent bonus toward meeting the corridor threshold (i.e. one planned below-market housing unit counts for 1.5 housing units for the purposes of meeting the corridor threshold. Below market for the purposes of the Resolution 3434 TOD policy is affordable to 60% of area median income for rental units and 100% of area median income for owner-occupied units);
- The local jurisdictions in each corridor will determine job and housing placement, type, density, and design.
- The Corridor Working Groups are encouraged to plan for a level of housing that will significantly exceed the housing unit thresholds stated here during the planning process. This will ensure that the Housing Unit Threshold is exceeded corridor-wide and that the ridership potential from TOD is maximized.

5. Station Area Plans

Each proposed physical transit extension project seeking funding through Resolution 3434 must demonstrate that the thresholds for the corridor are met through existing development and adopted station area plans that commit local jurisdictions to a level of housing that meets the threshold. This requirement may be met by existing station area plans accompanied by appropriate zoning and implementation mechanisms. If new station area plans are needed to meet the corridor threshold, MTC will assist in funding the plans. The Station Area Plans shall be conducted by local governments in coordination with transit agencies, Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), MTC and the Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).

Station Area Plans are opportunities to define vibrant mixed use, accessible transit villages and quality transit-oriented development – places where people will want to live, work, shop and spend time. These plans should incorporate mixed-use developments, including new housing, neighborhood serving retail, employment, schools, day care centers, parks and other amenities to serve the local community.

At a minimum, Station Area Plans will define both the land use plan for the area as well as the policies—zoning, design standards, parking policies, etc.—for implementation. The plans shall at a minimum include the following elements:

- Current and proposed land use by type of use and density within the ½ mile radius, with a clear identification of the number of existing and planned housing units and jobs;
- Station access and circulation plans for motorized, non-motorized and transit access. The station area plan should clearly identify any barriers for pedestrian, bicycle and wheelchair access to the station from surrounding neighborhoods (e.g., freeways, railroad tracks, arterials with inadequate pedestrian crossings), and should propose strategies that will remove these barriers and maximize the number of residents and employees that can access the station by these means. The station area and transit village public spaces shall be made accessible to persons with disabilities.
- Estimates of transit riders walking from the half mile station area to the transit station to use transit;
- Transit village design policies and standards, including mixed use developments and pedestrian-scaled block size, to promote the livability and walkability of the station area;

- TOD-oriented parking demand and parking requirements for station area land uses, including consideration of pricing and provisions for shared parking;
- Implementation plan for the station area plan, including local policies required for development per the plan, market demand for the proposed development, potential phasing of development and demand analysis for proposed development.

The Station Area Plans shall be conducted according to the guidelines established in MTC's Station Area Planning Manual.

6. Corridor Working Groups

The goal of the Corridor Working Groups is to create a more coordinated approach to planning for transit-oriented development along Resolution 3434 transit corridors. Each of the transit extensions subject to the corridor threshold process, as identified in Table 1, will need a Corridor Working Group, unless the current level of development already meets the corridor threshold. Many of the corridors already have a transit project working group that may be adjusted to take on this role. The Corridor Working Group shall be coordinated by the relevant CMAs, and will include the sponsoring transit agency, the local jurisdictions in the corridor, and representatives from ABAG, MTC, and other parties as appropriate.

The Corridor Working Group will assess whether the planned level of development satisfies the corridor threshold as defined for the mode, and assist in addressing any deficit in meeting the threshold by working to identify opportunities and strategies at the local level. This will include the key task of distributing the required housing units to each of the affected station sites within the defined corridor. The Corridor Working Group will continue with corridor evaluation, station area planning, and any necessary refinements to station locations until the corridor threshold is met and supporting Station Area Plans are adopted by the local jurisdictions.

MTC will confirm that each corridor meets the housing threshold prior to the release of regional discretionary funds for construction of the transit project.

7. Review of the TOD Policy

MTC staff will conduct a review of the TOD policy and its application to each of the affected Resolution 3434 corridors, and present findings to the Commission, within 12 months of the adoption of the TOD policy.