



Scott Haggerty, Chair
Alameda County

July 2, 2020

Alfredo Pedroza, Vice Chair
Napa County and Cities

Eddie Abn
San Francisco Bay Conservation
and Development Commission

RE: FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Call for Projects

Jeannie Bruins
Cities of Santa Clara County

Dear Interested Applicant:

Damon Connolly
Marin County and Cities

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is soliciting transit projects from eligible federal grantees for programming:

Dave Cortese
Santa Clara County

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307 Urbanized Area Formula, 5337 State of Good Repair, and 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities formula funds apportioned to the San Francisco Bay Area in FY2020-21 through FY2024-25,

Carol Dutra-Vernaci
Cities of Alameda County

- Federal Highway Administration STP and CMAQ funds dedicated to Transit Capital Rehabilitation and Transit Priorities projects by the One Bay Area Grant Program (MTC Resolution No. 4202), and

Dorene M. Giacomini
U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal D. Glover
Contra Costa County

- Bridge tolls and other regional revenues dedicated to transit capital projects by the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (CCCGP, MTC Resolution No. 4123).

Nick Josefowitz
San Francisco Mayor's Appointee

Applications are due to MTC by **Friday, September 4, 2020**. A complete application includes:

- Completed FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Project Template and
- Supporting documentation (explained below)

Sam Liccardo
San Jose Mayor's Appointee

Jake Mackenzie
Sonoma County and Cities

Gina Papan
Cities of San Mateo County

David Rabbitt
Association of Bay Area Governments

Hillary Ronen
City and County of San Francisco

Libby Schaaf
Oakland Mayor's Appointee

Warren Slocum
San Mateo County

James P. Spering
Solano County and Cities

James Stracner
U.S. Department of Housing
and Urban Development

Tony Tavares
California State
Transportation Agency

Amy R. Worth
Cities of Contra Costa County

Proposed projects will be used to develop a preliminary TCP program for FY2020-21 through FY2024-25. The preliminary program will be based on estimated revenues using FAST Act authorization levels, and will be revised to correspond with authorizations in the next surface transportation authorization once passed by Congress. Each year of the program would then be revised to match final FTA apportionments for that year. MTC typically adopts a multi-year program to assist transit operators with multi-year capital budgeting and enable a longer-term regional perspective of capital replacement needs. This five-year program will allow MTC to plan for and assist with regional transit capital needs.

As part of the application, operators should include Board-adopted Capital Improvement Plan, Short-range Transportation Plan, Transit Asset Management Plan, or other Board-approved documentation that includes the project for which operators are requesting funding.

Transit Capital Priorities Policy

Project selection will be based on MTC's TCP Policy once adopted by the Commission later this fall. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, staff are collecting operator project submissions in advance of the formal adoption of the updated policy to inform both the final development of that policy and the work of the Blue Ribbon Transit Recovery Task Force. Such considerations could include additional flexibility on a time-limited basis for operating or preventive maintenance programming to help maintain transit service levels.

Therese W. McMillan
Executive Director

Alix Bockelman
Deputy Executive Director, Policy

Andrew B. Fremier
Deputy Executive Director, Operations

Brad Paul
Deputy Executive Director,
Local Government Services

For now, operators should refer to the existing TCP Process and Criteria used for the FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 TCP Program (MTC Resolution No. 4242, included as Attachment 1) for high-level policy elements. MTC has been working with the transit operators through the Bay Area Partnership's Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG) during 2019 and 2020 to update these policies. A discussion of key policy updates for potential inclusion in the final TCP Policy is included below and summarized in Attachment 1-A.

Policy Updates:

1. Length of Next Program Cycle

The length of this program is anticipated to be three to five years, starting in FY2020-21. Ultimately, the length will be determined by a number of factors, including the length of the next surface transportation authorization (FAST Act-successor) once passed by Congress, discussions with transit operators through TFWG, and discussion among stakeholders in the Blue Ribbon Transit Recover Task Force.

2. Bus-Van Pricelist

The FY2020-21 pricelist was developed using operator responses to a bus-van pricelist survey conducting in FY2019-20. Prices for FY2021-22 through FY2024-25 are calculated by escalating the FY2020-21 amounts using the Producer Price Index for buses. Double-decker and zero emission buses have been newly added to the pricelist.

3. Fixed Guideway Caps

New fixed guideway (FG) caps are established based on each FG operator's share of projected FG replacement and rehabilitation needs in the Transit Capital Needs Assessment prepared for Plan Bay Area 2050. For now, the total amount project to be available for FG caps remains \$120 million per year, but will be reevaluated upon enactment of a successor to the FAST Act.

4. ADA Set-Aside Formula & Policy

The ADA Set-Aside distribution formula is proposed to be revised to more heavily weight demand-response factors of ridership and operating expenses. Additionally, eligibility to receive a distribution among the participating urbanized areas will be revised to require a non-zero value for either demand-response factor in the agency's National Transit Database (NTD) reporting. These revisions were made to reflect the intent of these funds to support paratransit operators. Finally, the programming flexibility is proposed to be revised to allow operators to reprogram their ADA Set-Aside allotment to any other capital project (instead of Score 16 projects only) if the operator certifies that their ADA paratransit operating needs are otherwise met locally.

5. Project Funding Caps

Once Congress passes a new surface transportation authorization to replace the FAST Act, the project caps will be evaluated for possible increase. Vehicle replacement caps will be prioritized for increase first, followed by FG caps, then other remaining project caps. The amount of increase will be determined based on estimated revenues.

6. FG Grant Spend-down Policy

For this next program, the proposed spend-down policy will be increased from a 3-year spend-down cycle to a 4-year one, covering FG grants awarded in FY2017-18 or earlier. Programming for FY2020-21 will be based on results from the current cycle, evaluating spending on grants

awarded in FY2014-15 or earlier, with a target for 100% disbursement by September 30, 2020. For FY2021-22 through FY2024-25, FG programming will be based on the new 4-year cycle.

The proposed policy will also clarify the following points:

- Voluntarily-deferred caps: continue existing policy of programming the voluntarily-deferred caps in the year of the operator's choosing, programmed as a prior-year commitment.
- Involuntarily-deferred caps: in years when additional funding is available, after meeting debt service payment requirements, a subcommittee of the FG operators would be called to evaluate proposals to restore prior-year involuntarily deferred caps. The recommendations of this subcommittee would be subject to MTC staff and Commission review and approval.
- Restoration of any deferred caps to an operator, whether voluntary or involuntary, would be rescinded if that operator does not meet their spend-down target in the same year.
- Operators who do not meet their spend-down target in the year of a proposed restoration or the immediately-prior year would not be eligible for cap restoration.

7. Operator Urbanized Area (UZA) Eligibility

Sonoma-Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) has been added to the eligibility table for the San Francisco-Oakland and Santa Rosa UZAs, consistent with eligibility requirements of the TCP Policy. SMART's eligibility reflects reporting to NTD in those two UZAs, in addition to a revenue sharing agreement in the Santa Rosa UZA among SMART, the City of Santa Rosa, and Sonoma County Transit.

8. Facilities Programming

At this time, we are not proposing to change the TCP policy on facilities programming. However, in the event that federal revenues increase significantly in the next authorization (perhaps \$50M+ annually), we would return to TFWG to discuss options for the use of those funds, including the possibility of formally amending the TCP Policy to include a Bus Facilities & Infrastructure (BF&I) Cap, which could be guided by the following principles:

- The amount of the BF&I Cap would be based on the amount of the FG Cap. Based on the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transit Capital Needs Assessment, 75% of the region's non-vehicle transit state of good repair needs are related to fixed guideway assets. The remaining 25% is bus-related facilities and infrastructure. This 75/25 split would be reflected in the overall total for FG and BF&I project caps, with the in-place FG caps held harmless.
- Each bus operator's cap would be based on its share of the bus facilities and infrastructure needs in the RTCI used for Plan Bay Area 2050 Capital Needs Projections, with a minimum amount applied so that all operators get a level of funding for investment in bus facilities and infrastructure.
- Not all operators or UZAs would be required to participate. Operators in exclusive UZAs (Fairfield, Napa, SolTrans, etc.) already have flexibility to fund traditionally lower-scoring projects like facilities.
- Some operators would have both a FG Cap and a BF&I Cap (SFMTA, VTA, GGBHTD) since they operate both fixed guideway and bus service.
- Eligible project types will be aligned with the definitions of facilities and infrastructure in the FTA Section 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities Formula program or other relevant FTA programs.

Proposed Programming Timeline

The timeline for adopting the TCP program is outlined below.

TCP Policy / Programming	Start Date	Finish/Due Date
Call for projects	July 1, 2020	September 4, 2020
Policy Adoption by Commission	Fall 2020	
First Draft of Preliminary TCP Program to TFWG	November 2020	
Preliminary TCP Program to PAC/Commission	February 2021	
Preliminary TCP Program TIP amendment to PAC/Commission	February 2021	

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Rob Jaques, Transit Capital Priorities Program Manager (rjaques@bayareametro.gov or (415) 778-5378).

Sincerely,



Theresa Romell
Director, Funding Policy & Programs

TR:RJ

/Volumes/J_Drive-3/PROJECT/Funding/FTA/Section 5307 and 5309/FY2020-21 and later/Call for Projects/0. TCP Call for Projects cover letter.docx

Attachments

1. MTC Resolution 4242, Revised. FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 TCP Process & Criteria
 - a. Summary of Proposed Policy Revisions for TCP Policy beginning FY2020-21
2. Project Submission Template
3. Template Instructions
4. Regional Transit Capital Inventory Asset Classes and Codes
5. FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 TCP Apportionment Estimates
6. FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Regional Bus/Van Pricelist
7. Fixed Guideway Project Caps
8. ADA Set-Aside Formula and Distribution

Date: July 27, 2016
W.I.: 1512
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 12/21/16-C
12/20/17-C
05/22/19-C

ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 4242, Revised

This resolution approves the process and establishes the criteria for programming:

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307 Urbanized Area Formula, 5337 State of Good Repair, and 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities formula funds apportioned to the San Francisco Bay Area in FY2016-17 through FY2019-20,
- Federal Highway Administration STP and CMAQ funds dedicated to Transit Capital Rehabilitation and Transit Priorities projects by the One Bay Area Grant Program (MTC Resolution Nos. 4035 and 4202), and
- Bridge tolls and other regional revenues dedicated to transit capital projects by the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (MTC Resolution 4123), and
- Proceeds of financing required to advance future FTA or STP/CMAQ revenues to fund annual TCP or CCCGP programs of projects.

This resolution includes the following attachment:

Attachment A - San Francisco Bay Area Transit Capital Priorities Process and Criteria
for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20

This resolution was revised on December 21, 2016 to add double-decker buses and low-floor cut-away vehicles to the vehicle list, correct errors to the ADA set-aside percentages, clarify the process for setting zero emission bus prices and implementing the Transit Asset Management Rule, and adjust the program development schedule.

This resolution was revised on December 20, 2017 to make changes to the time period for the second cycle of the grant spend-down policy.

ABSTRACT

MTC Resolution No. 4242, Revised

Page 2

This resolution was revised on May 22, 2019 to update the ADA Set-Aside tables for FY2018-19 and FY2019-20 consistent with the Policy and Procedures set forth for those tables.

Further discussion of the Transit Capital Priorities Policy is contained in the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee Summary Sheets dated July 13, 2016, December 14, 2016, December 13, 2017, and May 8, 2019.

Date: July 27, 2016
W.I.: 1512
Referred By: PAC

RE: San Francisco Bay Area Transit Capital Priorities Process and Criteria for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
RESOLUTION NO. 4242

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

WHEREAS, MTC is the designated Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the nine-county Bay Area and is required to prepare and endorse a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which includes a list of priorities for transit capital projects; and

WHEREAS, MTC has worked cooperatively with the cities, counties and transit operators in the region to establish a process and a set of criteria for the selection of transit capital projects to be included in the TIP; and

WHEREAS, the process and criteria to be used in the selection and ranking of projects are set forth in Attachment A, which is incorporated herein as though set forth at length; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that MTC approves the Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Process and Criteria as set forth in Attachment A; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that MTC will use the process and criteria to program Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307, 5337 and 5339 funds or any successor programs for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20, Federal Highway Administration STP and CMAQ funds dedicated to Transit Capital Rehabilitation and Transit Priorities projects by the One Bay Area Grant Program (MTC Resolution Nos. 4035 and 4202), bridge tolls and other regional revenues dedicated to transit capital projects by the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (MTC Resolution 4123), and proceeds of financing required to advance future FTA or STP/CMAQ revenues to fund annual TCP programs of projects to finance transit projects in the San Francisco Bay Area region; and, be it further

RESOLVED, that the Executive Director of MTC is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and such agencies as may be appropriate.

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Dave Cortese, Chair

The above resolution was entered into by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission at a regular meeting of the Commission held in San Francisco, California on July 27, 2016.

Date: July 27, 2016
W.I.: 1512
Referred By: PAC
Revised: 12/21/16-C
12/20/17-C
05/22/19-C

Attachment A
Resolution No. 4242
Page 1 of 49

**San Francisco Bay Area Transit Capital Priorities Process Criteria for FY2016-17 through
FY2019-20**

**For Development of the FY2016-17 through FY2019-20
Transit Capital Priorities and Transit Performance Initiative Project Lists**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Bay Area Metro Center
375 Beale Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94105

Table of Contents

I. BACKGROUND.....3

II. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES4

III. FTA FORMULA FUNDS5

A. TCP Application Process..... 5

B. Project Eligibility..... 8

C. Programming Policies 28

IV. ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROGRAM TRANSIT CAPITAL PROGRAM ...43

APPENDIX 1 – BOARD RESOLUTION45

APPENDIX 2 – OPINION OF COUNSEL48

I. BACKGROUND

The Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Process and Criteria applies to the programming of:

- Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Sections 5307 Urbanized Area Formula, 5337 State of Good Repair, and 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities formula funds apportioned to the San Francisco Bay Area in FY2016-17 through FY2019-20,
- Federal Highway Administration STP and CMAQ funds dedicated to Transit Capital Rehabilitation and Transit Priorities projects by the One Bay Area Grant Program (MTC Resolution Nos. 4035 and 4202), and
- Bridge tolls and other regional revenues dedicated to transit capital projects by the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (MTC Resolution No. 4123), and
- Financing required to advance future FTA or STP/CMAQ revenues to fund annual TCP or CCCGP programs of projects.

The FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 TCP Criteria are the rules, in part, for establishing a program of projects for eligible transit operators in the San Francisco Bay Area Region's large urbanized areas (UA) of San Francisco/Oakland, San Jose, Concord, Santa Rosa, and Antioch; and the small urbanized areas of Vallejo, Fairfield, Vacaville, Napa, Livermore, Gilroy-Morgan Hill, and Petaluma.

On December 4, 2015, President Obama signed the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act into law. The FAST Act provides funding authorizations for FY2016 through FY2020. The Act maintains the same FTA formula programs as the previous authorization, Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century (MAP-21). The FAST Act includes few modifications to FTA programs or policies. These modifications have been included in the TCP Criteria as appropriate.

As of the date of the adoption of the TCP Process and Criteria, FTA has not yet issued revised guidance for the implementation of the its programs that reflects changes to the programs made by the FAST Act. MTC and the Partnership will revisit and recommend updates to the policy if required to conform to future FTA rules and guidance.

In December 2013, MTC adopted Resolution No. 4123 for the Transit Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (CCCGP), which establishes a policy commitment of approximately \$7.4 billion in federal, state, regional and local funds to high-priority transit capital projects that will improve the capacity and state of good repair of transit services in the urban core of the region. The CCCGP will determine the TCP program amounts for certain projects and sponsors. A more detailed description of the CCCGP is provided on Page 37 of Attachment A to this resolution.

II. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of the TCP Process and Criteria is to fund transit projects that are most essential to the region and consistent with Plan Bay Area, the region's current long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and Plan Bay Area 2040, the updated RTP currently under development. The TCP Process and Criteria also implements elements of the Transit Sustainability Project recommendation (MTC Resolution No. 4060). Among the region's objectives for the TCP Process and Criteria are to:

Fund basic capital requirements: All eligible projects are to be considered in TCP Process and Criteria score order, with emphasis given to the most essential projects that replace and sustain the existing transit system capital plant. MTC will base the list of eligible replacement and expansion projects on information provided by the transit operators in response to a call for projects, or on information provided through the CCCGP. Operator-proposed projects should be based on Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) service objectives or other board-approved capital plans. Also, after FTA publishes and adopts the final Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule, requests for replacement/rehabilitation of assets should be consistent with FTA-required Transit Asset Management (TAM) plans. All projects not identified as candidates for the TCP Program are assumed to be funded by other fund sources and are so identified in operators' SRTPs or capital plans.

Maintain reasonable fairness to all operators: Tests of reasonable fairness are to be based on the total funding available to each operator over a period of time, the level and type of service provided, timely obligation of prior year grants, and other relevant factors. (A proportional share distributed to each operator is specifically not an objective.)

Complement other MTC funding programs for transit: MTC has the lead responsibility in programming regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funds. Transit capital projects are also eligible for funding under these federal and state programs. Development of the TCP Program of Projects ("TCP Program") will complement the programming of STP, CMAQ, and STIP funds to maximize the financial resources available in order to fund the most essential projects for the San Francisco Bay Area's transit properties.

III. FTA FORMULA FUNDS

A. TCP Application Process

The Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG) serves as the forum for discussing the TCP Process and Criteria, the TCP POP, and other transit programming issues. Each transit operator in the MTC region is responsible for appointing a representative to staff the Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG). The TFWG serves in an advisory capacity to the MTC Partnership Technical Advisory Committee (PTAC). All major policy revisions and programming-related decisions are to be reviewed with PTAC. In general, the MTC Programming and Allocations Committee and the full Commission take action on the TCP Program and any other transit-related funding programs after the TFWG and PTAC has reviewed them.

Capital Program Submittal

For the purposes of programming, project sponsors will submit requests for funding in accordance with detailed instructions in MTC's call for projects. The level of detail must be sufficient to allow for MTC to screen and score the project.

Board Approval

MTC requires that operators seek board approval prior to programming projects in the TIP. The board resolution for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 programming should be submitted by January 11, 2017, the planned date when the Programming and Allocations Committee will consider the proposed program. If a board resolution cannot be provided by this date due to board meeting schedule constraints, applicants should indicate in a cover memo with their application when the board resolution will be adopted. Appendix 1 is a sample resolution of board support.

Opinion of Counsel

Project sponsors have the option of including specified terms and conditions within the Resolution of Local Support as included in Appendix 1. If a project sponsor elects not to include the specified language within the Resolution of Local Support, then the sponsor shall provide MTC with a current Opinion of Counsel stating that the agency is an eligible sponsor of projects for the FTA Section 5307, 5337, 5339, and/or STP/CMAQ programs; that the agency is authorized to perform the project for which funds are requested; that there is no legal impediment to the agency applying for the funds; and that there is no pending or anticipated litigation which might adversely affect the project or the ability of the agency to carry out the project. A sample format is provided in Appendix 2.

Screening projects

MTC staff will evaluate all projects for conformance with the Screening Criteria (Section III) below. Certain requirements must be met for a project to reach the scoring stage of the Transit Capital Priorities process. Operators will be informed by MTC staff if a

project has failed to meet the screening criteria, and will be given an opportunity to submit additional information for clarification.

Scoring projects

MTC staff will only score those projects that have passed the screening process. Based on the score assignment provided in Table 6, MTC staff will inform operators of the score given to each project. Operators may be asked to provide additional information for clarification.

Programming Projects/Assigning projects to fund source

Projects passing screening and scoring criteria will be considered for programming in the TCP Program in the year proposed, however, projects will only be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) if the following conditions are met: 1) funding is available in the year proposed, and 2) funds can be obligated by the operator in the year proposed. Project fund sources will be assigned by MTC staff and will be based on project eligibility and the results of the Multi-County Agreement model.

FTA Public Involvement Process and the TIP

FTA Public Involvement Process: To receive an FTA grant, a grant applicant must meet certain public participation requirements in development of the FTA programs. As provided for in FTA Circular 9030.1E (revised January 16, 2014), FTA considers a grantee to have met the public participation requirements associated with the annual development of the Program of Projects when the grantee follows the public involvement process outlined in the FHWA/FTA planning regulations for the TIP. In lieu of a separate public involvement process, MTC will follow the public involvement process for the TIP.

Annual Programming in the TIP: MTC, in cooperation with the state and eligible transit operators, is required to develop a TIP for the MTC Region. The TIP is a four-year programming document, listing federally funded transportation projects, projects requiring a federal action, and projects deemed regionally significant. TCP programming in each year of the TIP will be financially constrained to the estimated apportionment level. Programming adjustments in the TIP will be done in consultation with eligible transit operators in the MTC region.

Changes to the Transit Capital Priorities Program

Each year after FTA releases apportionments for its formula funding programs, the preliminary TCP Program for the year will be revised if necessary to fit within the available revenues. The annual program revisions and corresponding amendment to the TIP is referred to as the Program of Projects (POP) Amendment, and finalizes the program for the year.

As part of the POP amendment, project sponsors may also request discretionary amendments to the preliminary program that conform to the TCP Process and Criteria

programming policies. Discretionary amendments may be allowed only in certain circumstances. The following general principles govern changes:

- Amendments are not routine. Any proposed changes will be carefully studied.
- Amendments are subject to MTC and TFWG review.
- Amendments which adversely impact another operator's project will not be included without the prior agreement of other operators to the change.
- Amendments will be acceptable only when proposed changes are within the prescribed financial constraints of the TIP.
- Emergency or urgent projects will be considered on a case-by-case basis as exceptions.

Operators proposing the change must provide relevant information to substantiate the urgency of the proposed amendment. Projects that impede delivery of other projects will be considered only if an agreement can be reached between the affected operators for deferring or eliminating the affected projects from consideration.

Following the POP Amendment for the FY2017-18 program, the program for the final two years, FY2018-19 and FY2019-20, will be reopened and project sponsors will be able to make revisions to the preliminary program that conform to TCP Process and Criteria programming policies in advance of the POP amendment for FY2018-19.

Funding Shortfalls

If final apportionments for the FTA formula programs come in lower than MTC has previously estimated, MTC staff will first redistribute programming to other urbanized areas with surplus apportionments in which the projects are eligible, and, second, negotiate with operators to constrain project costs or defer projects to a future year. If sufficient resolution is not possible, MTC will consider additional information, including project readiness, prior funding (if the project is a phased multi-year project), whether the project had been previously deferred, and the amount of federal funds that each of the concerned operators received in recent years, before making reductions to programming. As a final option for closing any shortfalls, staff may institute an across-the-board reduction in programming, proportionally allocated within each affected urbanized area.

Project Review

Each operator is expected to complete their own Federal grant application using FTA's Transit Award Management System (TrAMS). MTC staff will review grant applications and submit concurrence letters to FTA on behalf of project sponsors as needed.

Program Period

The TCP Criteria will be used to develop a program of projects for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 FTA Formula Funds. The number of years covered by each TCP policy update

is generally aligned with the years covered by the current federal authorization, and the region typically adopts multi-year programs to help operators with multi-year capital budgeting, and to help the region take a longer-term view of capital replacement needs. With the passage of the FAST Act, MTC is able to develop a four-year policy program to support multi-year capital planning. While the FAST Act is a five-year authorization (FY2016 through FY2020), the TCP Program will cover four years, as the first year of FAST was programmed under the previous TCP Program.

TCP Policy and Program Development Schedule

To the extent possible, the region will adhere to the schedule proposed in the table below in developing the FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 TCP program. If a change in the schedule is required, MTC will notify participants of the TCP program development process in a timely fashion.

TCP Policy / Programming	Start Date	Finish/Due Date
TFWG TCP Policy Discussions	March 2016	June 2016
TCP Policy to PAC/Commission	July, 2016	
Call for projects	late July, 2016	September, 2016
Draft Preliminary TCP Program Summary to TFWG	November, 2016	
Draft Preliminary TCP Program to TFWG	December, 2016	
Final Preliminary TCP Program to TFWG	January, 2017	
Preliminary TCP Program to PAC/Commission	February, 2017	
Preliminary TCP Program TIP amendment to PAC/Commission	February, 2017	

B. Project Eligibility

Federal Requirements and Eligibility

Federal and State Legislation

Projects selected will conform to the requirements of the FAST Act, Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 (CAAA), the California Clean Air Act (CCAA), and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Project sponsors shall agree to comply with federal law, including all applicable requirements of the FAST Act, CAAA, ADA, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, in implementing their Projects.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Architecture Policy

Project sponsors will be required to meet the Federal Transit Administration’s National ITS Architecture Policy as established by FTA Federal Register Notice Number 66 FR 1455 published January 8, 2001 and as incorporated by the regional architecture policy which can be accessed at: <http://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/operate-coordinate/intelligent-transportation-systems-its>.

1% Security Policy

Project sponsors are also required to meet the FTA 1% security set-aside provisions as established in the FY2004-05 Certifications and Assurances, FTA Federal Register Notice Number 69 FR 62521 published on October 26, 2004, and as it may be refined by FTA in future notifications. An updated circular (FTA Circular 9030.1E - January 16, 2014) includes additional certification requirement by designated recipients at the urbanized area level. As the designated recipient, MTC will review the grant applications for each appropriations year for compliance and certification to FTA. The security programming may not apply to all eligible operators in a UA, depending on need for security projects. Refer to the applicable FTA circulars for additional information.

Program Eligibility

Program eligibility is based on the statutory eligibility for the FTA Section 5307, 5337 and 5339 programs. Following are the program eligibility for each of the three funding programs authorized by the FAST Act. If revisions to eligibility for these programs are adopted as part of reauthorizing legislation of FTA circulars or other guidance issued by FTA, the region will consider conforming amendments to the TCP Process and Criteria.

FTA Section 5307 Urbanized Area Federally Defined Program Eligibility (Statutory Reference: 49USC5307): Capital projects; planning; job access and reverse commute projects; and operating costs of equipment and facilities for use in public transportation in urbanized areas with a population of fewer than 200,000, and, in certain circumstances, in urbanized areas with a population greater than 200,000. Eligible capital projects include—

- (A) acquiring, constructing, supervising, or inspecting equipment or a facility for use in public transportation, expenses incidental to the acquisition or construction (including designing, engineering, location surveying, mapping, and acquiring rights-of-way), payments for the capital portions of rail trackage rights agreements, transit-related intelligent transportation systems, relocation assistance, acquiring replacement housing sites, and acquiring, constructing, relocating, and rehabilitating replacement housing;
- (B) rehabilitating a bus;
- (C) remanufacturing a bus;
- (D) overhauling rail rolling stock;
- (E) preventive maintenance;
- (F) leasing equipment or a facility for use in public transportation
- (G) a joint development improvement that meet specified requirements
- (H) the introduction of new technology, through innovative and improved products, into public transportation;

- (I) the provision of nonfixed route paratransit transportation services in accordance with section 223 of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12143), under specified circumstances;
- (J) establishing a debt service reserve to ensure the timely payment of principal and interest on bonds issued by a grant recipient to finance an eligible project
- (K) mobility management; and
- (L) associated capital maintenance.

FTA Section 5337 State of Good Repair Federally Defined Program Eligibility (Statutory Reference: 49USC5337): Capital projects to maintain fixed guideway and high intensity motorbus public transportation systems in a state of good repair, including projects to replace and rehabilitate—

- (A) rolling stock;
- (B) track;
- (C) line equipment and structures;
- (D) signals and communications;
- (E) power equipment and substations;
- (F) passenger stations and terminals;
- (G) security equipment and systems;
- (H) maintenance facilities and equipment;
- (I) operational support equipment, including computer hardware and software; and
- (J) development and implementation of a transit asset management plan.

The term 'fixed guideway' means a public transportation facility:

- (A) using and occupying a separate right-of-way for the exclusive use of public transportation;
- (B) using rail;
- (C) using a fixed catenary system;
- (D) for a passenger ferry system; or
- (E) for a bus rapid transit system.

The term 'high intensity motorbus' means public transportation that is provided on a facility with access for other high-occupancy vehicles.

FTA Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Federally Defined Program Eligibility (Statutory Reference: 49USC5339): Capital projects—

- (1) to replace, rehabilitate, and purchase buses and related equipment; and
- (2) to construct bus-related facilities.

Regional Requirements and Eligibility

Urbanized Area Eligibility

Transit operators are required to submit annual reports to the National Transit Database. Service factors reported in large urbanized areas partially determine the amounts of FTA Section 5307, 5337 and 5339 funds generated in the region. MTC staff will work with members of the Partnership to coordinate reporting of service factors in order to maximize the amount of funds generated in the region and to determine urbanized area eligibility. An operator is eligible to claim FTA funds only in designated urbanized areas as outlined in Table 1 below. Eligibility is based on geographical operations, NTD reporting, and agreements with operators.

Table 1. Urbanized Area Eligibility

Urbanized Area	Eligible Transit Operators
San Francisco-Oakland	AC Transit, ACE, BART, Caltrain, GGBHTD, Marin County Transit District, SFMTA, SamTrans, Union City Transit, Water Emergency Transportation Authority, WestCAT
San Jose	ACE, Caltrain, VTA
Concord	ACE, BART, CCCTA, LAVTA
Antioch	BART, ECCTA
Santa Rosa	GGBHTD, Santa Rosa City Bus, Sonoma County Transit
Vallejo	Napa Vine on behalf of American Canyon, Solano County Transit
Fairfield	Fairfield-Suisun Transit
Vacaville	Vacaville Transit
Napa	Napa VINE
Livermore	ACE, LAVTA
Gilroy-Morgan Hill	Caltrain, VTA
Petaluma	GGBHTD, Petaluma Transit, Sonoma County Transit

- (i) Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) is eligible to claim funds in four of the San Francisco Bay Area’s urbanized areas according to Federal Transit Administration statute. ACE has entered into an agreement with other operators eligible to claim funds in the San Jose UA, which prevents ACE from claiming funds in that UA. Likewise, ACE has also determined that they will be reporting their Livermore area revenue miles in the Stockton UA and have elected not to seek funding from the Livermore UA. The project element that the Regional Priority Model would apportion to these two urbanized areas will be deducted from the total amount of their capital request. ACE operates on track privately owned by Union Pacific. Requests for track rehabilitation, maintenance, and or upgrades for funding in the San Francisco-Oakland and Concord UAs will be assessed for eligibility upon review of the ACE and Union Pacific agreement.

- (ii) Santa Rosa City Bus and Sonoma County will apportion Santa Rosa urbanized area funding in accordance with an updated agreement that took effect in FY2014 (58% Santa Rosa City Bus and 42% Sonoma County).
- (iii) Golden Gate Bridge and Highway Transportation District (GGBHTD) is eligible to claim funds in the Santa Rosa Urbanized Areas. However, as a result of an agreement between the operators and discussion with the TFWG, GGBHTD will not claim funds from the Santa Rosa UA at this time. However, should it become advantageous to the region for GGBHTD to report revenue miles in the Santa Rosa UA and thereby claim funds in that UA, agreements between the operators will be re-evaluated. Golden Gate is an eligible claimant for funds in the Petaluma UA, and in years where extensive capital needs in other urbanized areas in the region is high; Golden Gate's projects could be funded in the Petaluma UA.
- (iv) Funding agreements between operators in the San Jose and Gilroy-Morgan Hill UAs are subject to the conditions outlined in the Caltrain Joint Powers Board Agreement and any agreements negotiated between the Board and MTC.
- (v) MTC staff will review the Comprehensive Agreement between the Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) and the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) in connection with the proposed Santa Clara County BART Extension and any related agreements (Comprehensive Agreement) with VTA and BART staff, and will recommend to the Commission how to incorporate these understandings into the TCP policy elements of the Comprehensive Agreement pertaining to urbanized area eligibility and programming for replacement and rehabilitation of capital assets associated with Santa Clara County BART extensions.

Eligibility for New Operators

New operators will be required to meet the following criteria before becoming eligible for TCP funding:

- The operator provides public transit services in the San Francisco Bay Area that are compatible with the region's Regional Transportation Plan.
- The operator is an FTA grantee.
- The operator has filed NTD reports for at least two years prior to the first year of programming, e.g., has filed an NTD report for 2015 services and intends to file a report for 2016 to be eligible for FY 2016-17 TCP funding.
- The operator has executed a Cooperative Planning Agreement with MTC.
- The operator has submitted a current SRTP or other board-approved capital plan to MTC.

Screening Criteria

A project must conform to the following threshold requirements before the project can be scored and ranked in the TCP Program's project list. Screening criteria envelopes three basic areas. The following subheadings are used to group the screening criteria.

- Consistency Requirements;
- Financial Requirements;
- Project Specific Requirements;

Consistency Requirements: The proposed project must be consistent with the currently adopted Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Smaller projects must be consistent with the policy direction of the RTP, as the RTP does not go into a sufficient level of detail to specifically list them.

The proposed project must be consistent with the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution 3866.

Projects near or crossing county boundaries must be consistent/complementary with the facility (or proposed facility) in the adjacent county.

Projects must be included in an operator's Short Range Transit Plan or other board-approved capital plan, or in an adopted local or regional plan (such as Congestion Management Programs, Countywide transportation plans pursuant to AB3705, the Seaport and Airport Plans, the State Implementation Plan, the Ozone Attainment Plan, the Regional Transportation Plan, and local General Plans). Also, after FTA publishes and adopts the final Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule, requests for replacement/rehabilitation of assets should be consistent with TAM plans required by the final TAM rule.

Financial Requirements: The proposed project has reasonable cost estimates, is supported by an adequate financial plan with all sources of funding identified and a logical cash flow, and has sensible phasing. Transit operators must demonstrate financial capacity, to be documented in the adopted TIP, as required by the FTA. All facilities that require an ongoing operating budget to be useful must demonstrate that such financial capacity exists.

Project Specific Requirements: All projects must be well defined. There must be clear project limits, intended scope of work, and project concept. Planning projects to further define longer range federally eligible projects are acceptable. Examples of projects include:

- Replacement/rehab of one revenue vehicle sub-fleet or ferry vessel; a sub-fleet is defined as the same bus size, manufacturer, and year; or any portion of a train set that reaches the end of its useful life at a common time.

- Train control or traction power replacement/rehab needs for a given year.
- Fixed guideway replacement/rehab needs for a given year (e.g., track replacement and related fixed guideway costs, ferry fixed guideway connectors).

All projects must be well justified, and have a clear need directly addressed by the project. All assets that would be replaced or rehabilitated must be included in the Regional Transit Capital Inventory (RTCI), a database of all transit capital assets in the region. Vehicle replacement projects, in particular, must identify the specific vehicles being replaced as listed in the RTCI.

A proposed project includes an implementation plan that adequately provides for any necessary clearances and approvals. The proposed project must be advanced to a state of readiness for implementation in the year indicated. For this requirement, a project is considered to be ready if grants for the project can be obligated within one year of the award date; or in the case of larger construction projects, obligated according to an accepted implementation schedule.

Asset Useful Life

To be eligible for replacement or rehabilitation, assets must meet the following age requirements in the year of programming:

Table 2. Useful Life of Assets

Heavy-Duty Buses, other than Over-the-Road-Coaches*	12 years (or 500,000 miles in service)
Over-the-Road-Coaches*	14 years (or 500,000 miles in service)
Medium-Duty Buses*	10 years (or 500,000 miles in service)
* (or an additional 5 years for buses rehabilitated with TCP funding)	
Van ¹	4, 5, or 7 years, depending on type
Light Rail Vehicle (LRV)	25 years
Electric Trolleybus	15 years
Heavy Railcar ²	25 years
(or an additional 20 years for railcars rehabilitated with TCP funding)	
Locomotive	25 years
(or an additional 20 years for locomotives rehabilitated with TCP funding)	
Heavy/Steel Hull Ferries	30 years
(or an additional 20 years for ferries rehabilitated with TCP funding)	
Lightweight/Aluminum Hull Ferries ³	25 years
Used Vehicles ⁴	Varies by type
Tools and Equipment	10 years
Service Vehicle	7 years
Non-Revenue Vehicle	7 years
Track	Varies by track type
Overhead Contact System/3 rd Rail Facility	Varies by type of OCS/3 rd rail replaced

Notes:

- 1) A paratransit van is a specialized van used in paratransit service only such as service for the elderly and handicapped. Three general categories of vans are acceptable in Transit Capital Priorities: Minivans, Standard Conversion Vans, and Small Medium-Duty Coaches. The age requirements for each type are 4, 5, and 7 years respectively.
- 2) *Includes Caltrain and ACE commuter rail and BART urban rail cars.*
- 3) *Lightweight ferries will not generally last beyond a 25-year useful life. Propulsion and major component elements of lightweight ferries can be replaced in TCP without extending the useful life beyond its anticipated useful life of 25 years.*
- 4) *Used vehicles are eligible to receive a proportionate level of funding based on the type of vehicle and number of years of additional service. (See "used vehicle replacement" Section IV, Definition of Project Categories).*

Early Replacement Programming Requests

Requests to program vehicle replacement funds one or two years prior to the first eligible year in order to advance procurements or to replace vehicles with higher than normal

maintenance costs will be considered if the proposal has minimal impacts on other operators and can be accommodated within the region's fiscal constraints.

Exceptions for replacement of assets prior to the end of their useful life may be considered only if an operator has secured FTA approval for early retirement, which must occur before the annual apportionment has been released.

Compensation for Deferred Replacement (Bus Replacement beyond Minimum Useful Life)

Operators that voluntarily replace buses or vans beyond the minimum federally eligible useful life specified in Table 2 will be eligible for either of two financial compensations:

Option 1. Operators receive all of the savings, but need to apply the savings to capital replacement and rehab projects (Score 10-16).

Option 2. Operators receive half of the savings to the region created by later replacement of vehicles, which may be programmed to lower scoring eligible projects.

Savings to the region are calculated based on the pricelist cost and minimum useful life of the vehicle type. For example, if replacement of a bus with a 12-year useful life and a \$600,000 replacement cost (federal share) is deferred for two years, the savings to the region would be $2/12 \times \$600,000 = \$100,000$. Under Option 1, the operator would receive \$100,000 for eligible Score 10-16 capital projects. Under Option 2, the operator would receive \$50,000, which could be programmed for any eligible project. The region would retain the other \$50,000 in savings to be programmed to other needs in accordance with the TCP policy. Operators may choose between Option 1 and Option 2.

For operators that are proposing to take advantage of the bus replacement compensation, the vehicles being replaced must be older than the age requirements listed above. It is the operator's responsibility to ensure that vehicle replacement requests beyond the minimum useful life maintain a state of good repair for the assets. Requests to activate this policy option should be noted when transmitting project applications to MTC.

Project Funding Caps

In order to prevent committing a significant portion of the programming to an operator in any one year, the following annual funding ceilings for projects are established:

Revenue vehicle replacement projects cannot exceed \$20 million for buses or \$30 million for rail car or ferry vessel replacement and rehabilitation projects, in the aggregate, for all funding programs. If the cost of the vehicle procurement exceeds the annual cap, the difference will be programmed in subsequent years subject to availability of funds.

Fixed guideway replacement and rehabilitation projects in the aggregate cannot exceed the amounts specified for each fixed guideway (FG) operator in Table 3. The total amount of the caps is \$120 million (3% escalation) based on the updated CIP projections. Each operator’s cap is based on its share of the updated fixed guideway need projections included in the adopted Plan Bay Area 2040 RTP, with a floor applied so that no operator’s cap is reduced by more than 5% from their prior cap.

When developing the proposed TCP programs for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20, the fixed guideway caps may be increased or decreased proportionally, depending on the aggregate demand for Score 16 projects compared to projected revenues. Operators have the option of submitting contingent fixed guideway programming requests equal to 20% of the operator’s cap, in addition to requests for programming the cap amount. The contingent requests will be programmed if the program’s fiscal balance allows the region to increase the caps.

Additionally, in an attempt to better align FG needs and FG cap programming, in the call for projects for this program, operators may request more than their annual cap in a particular year if the increase is offset by a lower request in another year (i.e. as long as the total requested for FG projects over the four-year program does not exceed the annual cap times four). When developing the program, staff will attempt to program FG caps as requested. However, in order to balance needs across operators within each UA, programming may be adjusted to match available funds and project needs.

Table 3. Fixed Guideway Caps

FG Operator	Project Category	Fixed Guideway Cap
ACE	All Eligible FG Categories	\$1,490,000
BART	All Eligible FG Categories	50,211,000
Caltrain	All Eligible FG Categories	14,393,000
GGBHTD	All Eligible FG Categories	5,108,000
SFMTA	All Eligible FG Categories	34,026,000
VTA	All Eligible FG Categories	8,529,000
WETA	All Eligible FG Categories	6,642,000

The cap amount may be programmed to any projects that are eligible for FTA Section 5337 funding and that fall into one of the following categories:

- Track/Guideway Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Traction Power Systems Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Train Control/Signaling Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Dredging
- Ferry Fixed Guideway Connectors Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Ferry Major Component Replacement/Rehabilitation

- Ferry Propulsion Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Cable Car Infrastructure Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Wayside or Onboard Fare Collection Equipment Replacement/Rehabilitation for Fixed Guideway vehicles

Programming for all projects that fall within these categories must be within the operator's cap amount with the exception of fixed guideway infrastructure projects included in the CCCGP program of projects. Such projects may be funded with a combination of fixed guideway cap funds and additional TCP funds above the operator's fixed guideway cap.

Operators may request a one-year waiver to use fixed guideway cap funds for other capital needs that are not included in one of the eligible project categories listed above if the operator can demonstrate that the other capital needs can be addressed by the one-year waiver, or that the use of fixed guideway cap funds is part of a multi-year plan to address the other capital needs. The operator must also demonstrate that the waiver will have minimal impact on the operator's ability to meet its fixed guideway capital needs.

Other replacement projects cannot exceed \$5 million. This cap applies to non-vehicle and non-fixed guideway Score 16 projects, including communications systems, bus fare collection equipment (fixed guideway wayside fare collection equipment is covered under the fixed guideway caps), and bus emission reduction devices; and lower scoring replacement projects. Vehicle rehabilitation projects that are treated as Score 16 because the life of the asset is being extended (see Asset Useful Life above) are also subject to this cap. Exceptions to this cap include those projects included in the CCCGP. Replacement of Clipper® fare collection equipment that is centralized under MTC will be treated as a separate project for each operator whose Clipper® equipment is being replaced, including MTC for the replacement of back-end equipment and systems, for the purposes of applying this project funding cap. If project costs exceed the cap, the difference will not automatically be programmed in subsequent years; the region will assess its ability to program additional funding year-by-year based on projected revenues and demand for other Score 16 needs.

Expansion or enhancement projects cannot exceed \$3.75 million.

Vanpool Support Program programming cannot exceed the amount of apportionments per UA generated by vanpool reporting to the NTD.

As part of the development of the program, project caps may be increased or decreased on an annual basis in order to better match programming to available revenues, subject to negotiation and agreement among operators and MTC.

Exceptions to these annual funding ceilings will be considered by MTC and the TFWG on a case-by-case basis after evaluating programming requested through the call for projects, and the region's estimated fiscal resources. For large rehabilitation programs, MTC may conduct negotiations with the appropriate sponsor to discuss financing options and programming commitments.

Bus-Van Pricelist

Requests for funding for buses and vans cannot exceed the prices in the Regional Bus-Van Pricelist for each year of the TCP program as shown in Tables 4 through 7. If an operator elects to replace vehicles with vehicles of a different fuel type, the price listed for the new fuel type vehicle applies, e.g., if an operator is replacing diesel buses with diesel-electric hybrid buses, the operator may request funds up to the amount listed for hybrid buses.

The pricelist is based on a survey of prices paid by operators in the Bay Area, and was initially developed for the FY2014-15 program. Since FY2014-15, the prices have been escalated using the Producer Price Index (PPI) for buses. This escalation rate is noted in the tables. After FY2017-18, the pricelists for FY2018-19 and FY2019-20 may be revised using more current PPI data and other information.

Operators have indicated interest in procuring double-decker buses and low-floor cut-away vehicles in the program. However, there is little history to use for developing pricelist amounts. Therefore, the projected prices for these types of vehicles will be developed by the operator based on the best available information, and a justification for the projected price will be submitted together with the operator's TCP programming request. If the justification does not adequately support the projected price, the programmed amount will be subject to negotiation between MTC staff and the operator. Additionally, the Transit Finance Working Group members shall have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed prices and programming for these vehicles when the TFWG reviews the proposed program.

Note that the bus prices do not include allowances for radios and fareboxes; they will be considered a separate project under the TCP policy. The price of electronic fareboxes varies approximately between \$10,000 and \$14,000 whereas the price of radios varies from \$1,000 to \$5,000. Requests for funding radios and fareboxes should be within the price range mentioned above. Requests above these ranges will require additional justification. Fareboxes for/on fixed guideway vehicles will be funded out of the operators' fixed guideway cap amounts (see Table 3). Operators are expected to include Clipper® wiring and brackets in all new buses, so the buses are Clipper®-ready without requiring additional expenses.

Compensation for Cost Effective Bus Purchases

Under this element of the TCP policy, operators that request less than the full pricelist amount for vehicle replacements would be eligible for either of two financial compensations:

Option 1* Operators receive all of the savings, but need to apply the savings to capital replacement and rehab projects (Score 10-16).

Option 2* Operators receive half of the savings to the region created by cost effective vehicle purchases, which may be programmed to lower scoring (below score 10) eligible projects, including preventive maintenance.

The intent of this policy element is to ensure that the region's limited funds can cover more of the region's capital needs while targeting funding to the vehicles most in need of replacement.

*If the amount of federal apportionments received does not allow us to fully program all Score 16 projects, MTC reserves the right to reduce the percentage of savings that would go back to the operator.

Zero-Emission Buses

With zero-emission buses (ZEBs) just starting to be commercially available, there is little history to use for developing pricelist amounts, and while increasing sales of ZEBs is expected to lead to lower prices, the rate of price decline is difficult to predict.

Therefore, the projected prices for ZEBs will be developed by the operator based on the best available information, and a justification for the projected price will be submitted together with the operator's TCP programming request. If the justification does not adequately support the projected price, the programmed amount will be subject to negotiation between MTC staff and the operator.

The programmed amount for ZEBs will be 82% of the projected price (or negotiated price), except as noted below. If an operator requests funds for ZEBs through the TCP Process and Criteria, the operator will agree to make a good faith effort to obtain other non-TCP funds, such as FTA Lo-No funds, FTA Section 5339 Discretionary Program funds, CARB Heavy Duty Zero Emission Pilot Project funds, California Energy Commission funds, county sales tax funds, or other local funds for at least the difference between the projected price for ZEBs and the TCP Process and Criteria pricelist price for a comparable diesel-electric hybrid bus. If the operator is successful in securing non-TCP funds, the TCP request for ZEBs will be reduced by the amount of non-TCP funds secured. Additionally, the Transit Finance Working Group members shall have an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed prices and programming for these vehicles when the TFWG reviews the proposed program.

Table 4: Regional Bus-Van Pricelist, FY2016-17

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal	Local	Federal %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	\$52,000	\$42,640	\$9,360	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	\$89,000	\$72,980	\$16,020	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	\$109,000	\$89,380	\$19,620	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	\$123,000	\$100,860	\$22,140	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	\$123,000	\$100,860	\$22,140	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	\$152,000	\$124,640	\$27,360	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	\$172,000	\$141,040	\$30,960	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	\$478,000	\$391,960	\$86,040	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	\$529,000	\$433,780	\$95,220	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	\$735,000	\$602,700	\$132,300	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	\$493,000	\$404,260	\$88,740	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	\$544,000	\$446,080	\$97,920	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	\$735,000	\$602,700	\$132,300	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	\$537,000	\$440,340	\$96,660	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	\$621,000	\$509,220	\$111,780	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	\$780,000	\$639,600	\$140,400	82%	18%
Over the Road 45' Diesel	\$625,000	\$512,500	\$112,500	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Diesel	\$872,000	\$715,040	\$156,960	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	\$1,068,000	\$875,760	\$192,240	82%	18%

Notes:

Prices escalated 1.23% annually over FY2015-16, rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to Total (\$41,000 Federal, \$9,000 Local).

For vehicle procurements more than 20 in number, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

Table 5: Regional Bus-Van Pricelist, FY2017-18

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal	Local	Federal %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	\$53,000	\$43,460	\$9,540	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	\$90,000	\$73,800	\$16,200	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	\$110,000	\$90,200	\$19,800	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	\$125,000	\$102,500	\$22,500	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	\$125,000	\$102,500	\$22,500	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	\$154,000	\$126,280	\$27,720	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	\$174,000	\$142,680	\$31,320	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	\$484,000	\$396,880	\$87,120	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	\$536,000	\$439,520	\$96,480	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	\$744,000	\$610,080	\$133,920	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	\$499,000	\$409,180	\$89,820	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	\$551,000	\$451,820	\$99,180	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	\$744,000	\$610,080	\$133,920	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	\$544,000	\$446,080	\$97,920	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	\$629,000	\$515,780	\$113,220	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	\$790,000	\$647,800	\$142,200	82%	18%
Over the Road 45' Diesel	\$633,000	\$519,060	\$113,940	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Diesel	\$883,000	\$724,060	\$158,940	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	\$1,081,000	\$886,420	\$194,580	82%	18%

Notes:

Prices escalated 1.23% annually over FY2016-17 prices, rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to Total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).

For vehicle procurements more than 20 in number, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

Table 6: Regional Bus-Van Pricelist, FY2018-19

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal	Local	Federal %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	\$ 54,000	\$ 44,280	\$ 9,720	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	\$ 91,000	\$ 74,620	\$ 16,380	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	\$ 111,000	\$ 91,020	\$ 19,980	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	\$ 127,000	\$ 104,140	\$ 22,860	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	\$ 127,000	\$ 104,140	\$ 22,860	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	\$ 156,000	\$ 127,920	\$ 28,080	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	\$ 176,000	\$ 144,320	\$ 31,680	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	\$ 490,000	\$ 401,800	\$ 88,200	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	\$ 543,000	\$ 445,260	\$ 97,740	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	\$ 753,000	\$ 617,460	\$ 135,540	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	\$ 505,000	\$ 414,100	\$ 90,900	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	\$ 558,000	\$ 457,560	\$ 100,440	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	\$ 753,000	\$ 617,460	\$ 135,540	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	\$ 551,000	\$ 451,820	\$ 99,180	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	\$ 637,000	\$ 522,340	\$ 114,660	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	\$ 800,000	\$ 656,000	\$ 144,000	82%	18%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	\$ 641,000	\$ 525,620	\$ 115,380	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Diesel	\$ 894,000	\$ 733,080	\$ 160,920	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	\$ 1,094,000	\$ 897,080	\$ 196,920	82%	18%

Notes:

Prices escalated 1.23% annually over FY2017-18 prices, rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to Total (\$41,000 Federal, \$9,000 Local).

For vehicle procurements more than 20 in number, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

Table 7: Regional Bus-Van Pricelist, FY2019-20

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal	Local	Federal %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	\$ 55,000	\$ 45,100	\$ 9,900	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	\$ 92,000	\$ 75,440	\$ 16,560	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	\$ 112,000	\$ 91,840	\$ 20,160	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	\$ 129,000	\$ 105,780	\$ 23,220	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	\$ 129,000	\$ 105,780	\$ 23,220	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	\$ 158,000	\$ 129,560	\$ 28,440	82%	18%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	\$ 178,000	\$ 145,960	\$ 32,040	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	\$ 496,000	\$ 406,720	\$ 89,280	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	\$ 550,000	\$ 451,000	\$ 99,000	82%	18%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	\$ 762,000	\$ 624,840	\$ 137,160	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	\$ 511,000	\$ 419,020	\$ 91,980	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	\$ 565,000	\$ 463,300	\$ 101,700	82%	18%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	\$ 762,000	\$ 624,840	\$ 137,160	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	\$ 558,000	\$ 457,560	\$ 100,440	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	\$ 645,000	\$ 528,900	\$ 116,100	82%	18%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	\$ 810,000	\$ 664,200	\$ 145,800	82%	18%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	\$ 649,000	\$ 532,180	\$ 116,820	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Diesel	\$ 905,000	\$ 742,100	\$ 162,900	82%	18%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	\$ 1,107,000	\$ 907,740	\$ 199,260	82%	18%

Notes:

Prices escalated 1.23% annually over FY2018-19 prices, rounded to the nearest \$1,000.

For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to Total (\$41,000 Federal, \$9,000 Local).

For vehicle procurements more than 20 in number, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

Project Definition and Scoring

Project Scoring

All projects submitted to MTC for TCP programming consideration that have passed the screening process will be assigned scores by project category as indicated in Table 8.

Table 8. Project Scores

<u>Project Category/Description</u>	<u>Project Score</u>
Debt Service	17
Debt service – repayment of financing issued against future FTA revenues. Debt service, including principal and interest payments, for any financing required to advance future FTA or STP revenues to fund annual TCP or CCCGP programs of projects will be treated as score 17.	
Revenue Vehicle Replacement	16
Vehicle Replacement - replacement of a revenue vehicle at the end of its useful life (see Asset Useful Life above). Vehicles previously purchased with revenue sources other than federal funds are eligible for FTA formula funding as long as vehicles meet the replacement age. Vehicles are to be replaced with vehicles of similar size (up to 5’ size differential) and seating capacity, e.g., a 40-foot coach replaced with a 40-foot coach and not an articulated vehicle. If an operator is electing to purchase smaller or larger buses (above or below a 5’ size differential), or do a sub-fleet reconfiguration, the replacement sub-fleet will have a comparable number of seats as the vehicles being replaced. Paratransit vehicles can be replaced with the next larger vehicle providing the existing vehicle is operated for the useful life period of the vehicle that it is being upgraded to. Any other significant upgrade in size will be considered as vehicle expansion and not vehicle replacement. For urgent replacements not the result of deferred maintenance and replacement of assets 20% older than the usual replacement cycle (e.g., 12 or 16 years for buses depending on type of bus), a project may receive an additional point.	
Revenue Vehicle Rehabilitation	16
Vehicle Rehabilitation - major maintenance, designed to extend the useful life of a revenue vehicle (+5 years for buses, +20 years for railcars, +20 years for locomotives, +20 years for heavy hull ferries). Rehabilitation of historic railcars, which have, by definition, extended useful lives, is included in this category.	
Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program Projects	16
Projects proposed for TCP funding in the CCCGP (MTC Resolution No. 4123) that are not otherwise Score 16.	
Used Vehicle Replacement	16
Used Vehicle Replacement - replacement of a vehicle purchased used (applicable to buses, ferries, and rail cars) is eligible for federal, state, and local funding that MTC administers. Funds in this category include FTA Section 5307, STP, CMAQ, STIP, and Net Toll Revenues. However, funding for replacement of the used vehicle will be limited to a proportionate share of the total project cost, equal to the number of years the used vehicle is operated beyond its standard useful life divided by its standard useful life (e.g., if a transit property retained and operated a used transit bus for 5 years, it is eligible to receive 5/12 th of the allowable programming for the project).	
Fixed Guideway Replacement / Rehabilitation	16
Rehabilitation/Replacement Fixed Guideway - projects replacing or rehabilitating fixed guideway equipment at the end of its useful life, including rail, guideway, bridges, traction power systems, wayside train control systems, overhead wires, cable car infrastructure, and computer/communications systems with a primary purpose of communicating with or controlling fixed guideway equipment. Projects in this category are subject to fixed guideway project caps.	

Ferry Propulsion Systems	16
Ferry Propulsion Replacement—projects defined as the mid-life replacement and rehabilitation of ferry propulsion systems in order that vessels are able to reach their 25-year useful life. Projects in this category are subject to fixed guideway project caps.	
Ferry Major Component	16
Ferry Major Components—projects associated with propulsion system, inspection, and navigational equipment required to reach the full economic life of a ferry vessel. Projects in this category are subject to fixed guideway project caps.	
Ferry Fixed Guideway Connectors	16
Ferry Fixed Guideway Connectors—floats, gangways, and ramps associated with the safe moorage and boarding of passengers to/from ferry vessels. Projects in this category are subject to fixed guideway project caps.	
Revenue Vehicle Communication Equipment	16
Communication Equipment – Includes on-board radios, radio base stations, and computer/communications systems with a primary purpose of communicating with and/or location/navigation of revenue vehicles, such as GPS/AVL systems.	
Non-Clipper® Fare Collection/Fareboxes	16
Revenue vehicle and wayside fare equipment are eligible for replacement as score 16. The maximum programming allowance for revenue vehicle fare equipment purchased separately from revenue vehicles is outlined in Section III, Project Funding Caps, providing the fare equipment is not replaced prior to the 12-year replacement cycle for buses. Fare equipment must be compatible with the Clipper® fare collection system.	
Clipper®	16
Clipper® - replacement of Clipper® fare collection equipment and systems.	
Bus Diesel Emission Reduction Devices	16
Bus diesel emission reduction devices or device components required to meet or exceed California Air Resources Board requirements, including first-time retrofits, upgrades, replacements and spares. Devices or components must be installed on buses that will remain in service for at least five (5) years following year programming in order to be treated as Score 16. Only spares up to 10% of the operator’s current device inventory will be treated as Score 16. Bus diesel emission device projects treated as Score 16 require a 50% local match. Devices or components installed on buses scheduled to be replaced within five (5) years of programming, and spares in excess of 10% of the operator’s inventory, will be treated as Preventive Maintenance (Score 9). See Section V. Programming Policies, Bus Diesel Emission Reduction Device Funding Program.	
Vanpool Support Program	16
Turnkey vanpool services contracted by MTC. This program will have eligibility beginning FY2019-20, and is subject to funding cap at levels no greater than the projected apportionments generated by vanpool reporting in the urbanized area.	
Safety	15
Safety/Security - projects addressing potential threats to life and/or property. The project may be maintenance of existing equipment or new safety capital investments. Includes computer/communications systems with a primary purpose of communicating with/controlling safety systems, including ventilation fans, fire suppression, fire alarm, intruder detection, CCTV cameras, and emergency “blue light” phones. Adequate justification that the proposed project will address safety and/or security issues must be provided. The TFWG will be provided an opportunity to review proposed projects before a project is programmed funds in a final program. Projects that contribute to a 1% security requirement will be considered Score 16.	

ADA/Non Vehicle Access Improvement	14
ADA - capital projects needed for ADA <i>compliance</i> . Does not cover routine replacement of ADA-related capital items. Project sponsor must provide detailed justification that the project is proposed to comply with ADA. Subject to TFWG review.	
Fixed/Heavy Equipment, Maintenance/Operating Facilities	13
Fixed/Heavy equipment and Operations/Maintenance facility - replacement/rehabilitation of major maintenance equipment, generally with a unit value over \$10,000; replacement/rehabilitation of facilities on a schedule based upon the useful life of the components.	
Station/Intermodal Stations/Parking Rehabilitation	12
Stations/Intermodal Centers/Patron Parking Replacement/Rehab - replacement/rehabilitation of passenger facilities. Includes computer/communications systems with a primary purpose of communicating with/controlling escalators or elevators, and public address or platform display systems at stations or platforms.	
Service Vehicles	11
Service Vehicles - replacement/rehabilitation of non-revenue and service vehicles based on useful life schedules.	
Tools and Equipment	10
Tools and Equipment - maintenance tools and equipment, generally with a unit value below \$10,000.	
Administrative Computer Systems and Office Equipment	9
Office Equipment - computers, copiers, fax machines, etc. Includes administrative - MIS, financial, HR, scheduling, transit asset management, and maintenance management systems.	
Preventive Maintenance	9
Preventive Maintenance - ongoing maintenance expenses (including labor and capital costs) of revenue and non-revenue vehicles that do not extend the life of the vehicle. This includes mid-life change-out of tires, tubes, engines and transmissions that do not extend the life of the vehicle beyond the twelve years life cycle. Preventive Maintenance may be treated as Score 16 under certain circumstances; see Section V. Programming Policies, Preventive Maintenance Funding.	
Operational Improvements/Enhancements	8
Operational Improvement/Enhancements - any project proposed to improve and/or enhance the efficiency of a transit facility.	
Operations	8
Operations—costs associated with transit operations such as the ongoing maintenance of transit vehicles including the cost of salaries. See Section V, Limited Use of FTA Funds for Operating Purposes.	
Expansion	8
Expansion - any project needed to support expanded service levels.	

C. Programming Policies

Project Apportionment Model for Eligible Urbanized Areas

There are four elements that need to be considered to determine operators' urbanized area apportionment: multi-county agreements, high-scoring capital needs, the 10% ADA set-aside amounts, the Lifeline set-aside amounts, and the Unanticipated Costs Reserve. The Regional Priority Model, as explained in paragraph (a), establishes funding priority for apportioning high-scoring capital projects to eligible urbanized areas. Funding may be limited by multi-county agreements as explained in paragraph (b) below. Eligible programming revenues are net of the 10% ADA set-aside discussed in paragraph (c) below, and the Vehicle Procurement Reserve, if any, described at the end of this section.

- a) *Regional Priority Programming Model*: The 2000 Census changes to the region's urbanized areas made numerous operators eligible to claim funds in more than one urbanized area. This has necessitated a procedure for apportioning projects to eligible urbanized areas. The *Regional Priority Model*, as described below, was fashioned to prioritize funds for the replacement of the region's transit capital plant, while minimizing the impact of the 2000 Census boundary changes. The 2010 Census did not result in any major changes to the region's urbanized areas.

The model assumes a regional programming perspective and constrains regional capital demand to the amount of funds available to the region, prior to apportioning projects to urbanized areas. It then apportions projects to urbanized areas in the following order:

- i. Funds are apportioned first for operators that are the exclusive claimant in a single UA (e.g., LAVTA, Fairfield, etc.)
 - ii. Fund projects for operators that are restricted to receiving funds in one urbanized area (e.g., SFMTA, AC, WestCAT, CCCTA, etc.)
 - iii. Fund balance of operator projects among multiple urbanized areas, as eligibility allows, with the objective of fully funding as many high scoring projects as possible.
 - iv. Reduce capital projects proportionately in urbanized areas where need exceeds funds available.
 - v. Fund lower scoring projects (additional programming flexibility) to operators in urbanized areas where apportionments exceed project need.
- b) *Multi-County Agreements*: For some operators, urbanized area (UA) apportionments are guided by multi-county agreements. Aside from the

acknowledged agreements, funds are apportioned based on the regional priority model.

There are three specific agreements that are being honored under the negotiated multi-county agreement model: the Caltrain Joint Powers Board Agreement, the Altamont Commuter Express (ACE) Cooperative Services Agreement and the Sonoma County-Santa Rosa City Bus Agreement.

Consideration for future agreements will include representation from each interested county, interested transit property, or an appointed designee, and be approved by all operators in the affected UA and MTC.

- c) *10% ADA Paratransit Service Set-Aside*: The FAST Act caps the share of each urbanized area's Section 5307 apportionment that can be programmed for ADA paratransit service operating costs at 10%. An amount equal to 10% of each participating urbanized area's FTA Section 5307 apportionment will be set-aside to assist operators in defraying ADA paratransit operating expenses. The purpose of this set-aside is to ensure that in any one year, a transit operator can use these funds to provide ADA service levels necessary to maintain compliance with the federal law, without impacting existing levels of fixed route service. ADA set-aside programmed to small UA operators will not impact eligible programming amounts in large UAs.

The formula for distributing the 10% ADA operating set-aside among the eligible operators in each UA is based on the following factors:

- (i) Annual Demand Response (DR) Operating Expenses (40%),
- (ii) Annual Demand Response (DR) Ridership (40%), and
- (iii) Annual Overall Ridership (20%).

Table 7 shows the percentages by operator and urbanized area for FY 2016-17 and FY2017-18 (Data Source: NTD, Year: 2014). The table will be used for the preliminary program for FY2018-19 and FY2019-20, and will be revised based on updated NTD data after FY2017-18.

Table 7: ADA Set-aside Amounts by Urbanized Area and Operator

New Formula – FY17 and FY18 ADA Set-Aside Percentages by Urbanized Area and Operator

Operator	San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Vallejo	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
AC Transit	29.24%							
ACE	0.10%		1.8%					
BART	12.44%		32.6%	13.3%				
Caltrain	0.28%	3.7%						
CCCTA			56.8%					
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	Not Applicable							
GGBHTD ⁴	1.33%							
LAVTA			8.8%			100.0%		
Marin County Transit ⁴	5.32%							
Napa VINE					17.9%			
Petaluma Transit								77.9%
SamTrans	13.45%							
SFMTA	34.81%							
SolTrans					82.1%			
Sonoma Cty Transit								22.1%
SR City Bus	Not Applicable							
Tri-Delta				86.7%				
Union City	1.02%							
Vacaville	Not Applicable							
VTA		96.3%					100.0%	
WestCAT	1.96%							
WETA	0.06%							
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

- 1) Updated with 2014 NTD reporting
- 2) Urbanized Areas not shown are not participating in 10% ADA set-aside policy.
- 2) Formula based on three factors weighted as shown: a) Operator's Annual Demand Response Expenses (40%); b) Operators Demand Response Ridership (40%); and c) Operator's Annual Overall Ridership (20%)
- 3) To calculate funding amounts, multiply 10% of related urbanized area revenue estimate against percentages shown for operators in that urbanized area.
- 4) GGBHTD share split with Marin County Transit per agreement between the two operators. 20/80 split.
- 5) If operator was eligible for funds in multiple UA's, we used GIS spatial analysis to calculate percentage of operator's share (based on no. of stops) in each UA.

Table 7-A: ADA Set-aside Amounts by Urbanized Area and Operator – Updated for FY2019- and FY2020

New Formula – FY19 & FY20 ADA Set-Aside Percentages by Urbanized Area and Operator

Operator	San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Vallejo	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
AC Transit	31.83%							
ACE	0.03%		0.44%					
BART	13.73%		34.66%	13.87%				
Caltrain	0.44%	4.22%						
CCCTA			53.92%					
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	Not Applicable							
GGBHTD ⁴	1.24%							
LAVTA			10.98%			100.0%		
Marin County Transit ⁴	4.98%							
Napa VINE					18.82%			
Petaluma Transit								73.01%
SamTrans	13.43%							
SFMTA	31.46%							
SolTrans					81.18%			
Sonoma Cty Transit								26.99%
SR City Bus	Not Applicable							
Tri-Delta				86.13%				
Union City	0.96%							
Vacaville	Not Applicable							
VTA		95.78%					100.0%	
WestCAT	1.77%							
WETA	0.12%							
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

- 1) Updated with 2016 NTD reporting
- 2) Urbanized Areas not shown are not participating in 10% ADA set-aside policy.
- 2) Formula based on three factors weighted as shown: a) Operator's Annual Demand Response Expenses (40%); b) Operators Demand Response Ridership (40%); and c) Operator's Annual Overall Ridership (20%)
- 3) To calculate funding amounts, multiply 10% of related urbanized area revenue estimate against percentages shown for operators in that urbanized area.
- 4) GGBHTD share split with Marin County Transit per agreement between the two operators. 20/80 split.
- 5) If operator was eligible for funds in multiple UA's, we used GIS spatial analysis to calculate percentage of operator's share (based on no. of stops) in each UA.

An operator may use its share of the FTA Section 5307 set-aside for other Score 16 projects if the operator can certify that:

- Their ADA paratransit operating costs are fully funded in its proposed annual budget;
- For jointly-funded paratransit services, operators' FTA Section 5307 ADA set-aside shares have been jointly considered in making decisions on ADA service levels and revenues.

If MTC is satisfied with the operator's certification, the operator may re-program its set-aside for any Score 16 project(s), including those projects funded under FG caps. To ensure that the Section 5307 10% set-aside funding is duly considered for annual ADA paratransit needs, there will be no multi-year programming of the 10% ADA set-aside to capital-only purposes.

- d) *Lifeline Set-Aside*: MAP-21 eliminated the Job Access and Reverse Commute (JARC) program (Section 5316) and combined JARC functions and funding with the Urbanized Area Formula (Section 5307) and the Non-urbanized Area Formula (Section 5311) programs. JARC projects were made eligible for 5307 funding, and 3.07% of 5307 appropriations are apportioned by the JARC low-income formula. However, there are no minimum or maximum amounts that can be programmed for JARC projects.

The region has historically used JARC funds apportioned to large urbanized areas to support the Lifeline program. In recognition of the changes to the JARC program and the continued need for funding for the Lifeline program:

- The first priority for 5307 funds apportioned by the JARC formula is the Lifeline program;
- In the FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 Section 5307 programs, funds will be set aside for the Lifeline program based on an analysis of the amount of apportionments in each UA that is apportioned by the low-income formula;
- Section 5307 funds programmed for JARC projects shall be subject to the Lifeline Program guidelines in effect for that year of programming, rather than to the TCP Policies, provided such projects are consistent with federal laws and regulations related to Section 5307.

- e) *Unanticipated Costs Reserve*: Unanticipated costs, such as capital improvements required to comply with new regulations, can be difficult to accommodate in the TCP program after the preliminary program has been developed and adopted. To improve the region's ability to provide funding to meet such unanticipated costs, a reserve of approximately \$2 million of TCP funds will be set aside before developing the preliminary programs for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20. The reserve will be set aside from all urbanized areas proportional to each urbanized area's projected apportionments in each program. Any proposals to program

from the reserve will be reviewed with the Transit Finance Working Group. Any Unanticipated Cost Reserve funds that are not programmed will roll over and be available for programming in the following year.

Limited Use of FTA Funds for Operating Purposes

FTA permits the use of FTA Section 5307 small urbanized funds to be used for operating purposes. For operators eligible to claim in both large and small urbanized areas, the amount of funds used for operating will be deducted from the amount of capital claimed in the large UA.

MAP-21 provided new eligibility for small and medium-sized bus operators in large urbanized areas to use Section 5307 funds for operating assistance. For operators with up to 75 buses, 75% of the urbanized area's apportionment attributable to the operator (as measured by vehicle revenue hours) may be programmed for operating assistance. For operators with 76 to 100 buses, 50% of the urbanized area's apportionment attributable to the operator (as measured by vehicle revenue hours) may be programmed for operating assistance. Eligible operators may request operating assistance up to the maximum eligible amount, but operating assistance will be programmed only after higher scoring projects in the urbanized area are funded. Operating assistance requests will be treated at Score 8 in the programming process (see Table 6 Project Scores above).

Specified Urbanized Area Flexibility

In urbanized areas with only one transit operator (Fairfield, Vacaville, Napa) greater flexibility for funding lower scoring projects will be allowed, providing that other operators in the region are not impacted. These operators will also be allowed to use funds for operating, without reduction of funding for capital projects, providing that capital is adequately maintained and replaced on a reasonable schedule as outlined in each operator's SRTP or other board-approved capital plan, and in accordance with goals outlined in the RTP for maintaining the region's capital plant (maintenance of effort).

Associated Transit Improvements

The FAST act eliminated the requirement that 1% of the FTA section 5307 apportionments in large urbanized areas be programmed for Associated Transit Improvements (formerly referred to as transit enhancements). However, designated recipients must still submit an annual report listing projects carried out in the preceding year with these funds as part of the Federal fiscal year's final quarterly progress report in TrAMS. The report should include the following elements:

- (A) Grantee name;
- (B) UZA name and number;
- (C) FTA project number;
- (D) Associated transit improvement category;

- (E) Brief description of improvement and progress towards project implementation;
- (F) activity line item code from the approved budget; and
- (G) Amount awarded by FTA for the project. The list of associated transit improvement categories and activity line item (ALI) codes may be found in the table of Scope and ALI codes in TrAMS. To assist MTC staff in preparing this report, grantees should continue to identify associated transit improvement projects that will receive funding from the Urbanized Area Formula Program.

Preventive Maintenance Funding

Preventive maintenance will be considered a Score 9 funding priority in Transit Capital Priorities, unless the conditions for one of the following four policy elements are met, in which case preventive maintenance will be treated as Score 16. For an individual operator to make use of preventive maintenance funding, other operators in the region must be able to move forward with planned capital replacement. It is the intent of this policy that funding for preventive maintenance will not increase the region's transit capital shortfall.

- a) *Funding Exchange*: Operators who wish to exchange a capital project for preventive maintenance funding in order to use their local or state funds to ease federal constraints or strictly as a financing mechanism may do so providing that the replacement asset funded with local funds is comparable to the asset being replaced and is maintained in service by the purchasing operator for its full useful life as outlined in Section V. The Funding Exchange element can be applied to lower scoring capital projects as well as preventive maintenance. Operators using the Funding Exchange element must certify in writing that the assets will be replaced with non-federal funds.
- b) *Capital Exchange*: In this option, an operator could elect to remove an eligible capital project from TCP funding consideration for the useful life of the asset in exchange for preventive maintenance funding. The funding is limited to the amount of capital funding an operator would have received under the current TCP policy in a normal economic climate. If an operator elects to replace the asset - removed from regional competition for funding under these provisions – earlier than the timeline established for its useful life, the replacement will be considered an expansion project. Operators using the Capital Exchange element will be limited to two years preventive maintenance funding within a 12-year period.
- c) *Negotiated Agreement within an Urbanized Area*: In the third option, an operator may negotiate with the other operators in the affected urbanized areas to receive an amount of preventive maintenance funding, providing that a firewall is established between the affected urbanized area(s) and all other urbanized areas. This will ensure that other operators' high-scoring capital replacement projects are not jeopardized.

d) *Budgetary Shortfalls*: Requests for preventive maintenance to meet budgetary shortfalls will be considered on a case-by-case basis if a fiscal need can be demonstrated by the requesting operator based on the guidelines outlined below. MTC must declare that a fiscal need exists to fund preventive maintenance where such action would displace higher scoring capital projects ready to move forward in a given fiscal year. A fiscal need can be declared if the following conditions exist:

- An operator must demonstrate that all reasonable cost control and revenue generation strategies have been implemented and that a residual shortfall remains.
- An operator can demonstrate that the shortfall, if not addressed, would result in a significant service reduction.

The Commission will consider the severity of the shortfall and the scope and impact of the service cuts in determining whether fiscal need exists. Operators establishing a fiscal need must also adhere to the following four requirements in order to be eligible to receive funding for preventive maintenance:

- i. Operators must successfully show a board approved bridging strategy that will sustain financial recovery beyond the year for which preventive maintenance is requested.
- ii. The bridging strategy should not rely on future preventive maintenance funding to achieve a balanced budget. In other words, should a service adjustment be required to balance the budget over the long run, preventive maintenance should not be invoked as a stopgap to inevitable service reductions.
- iii. Funds programmed to preventive maintenance should not be considered as a mechanism to sustain or replenish operating reserves.
- iv. Operators requesting FTA formula funds will be limited to two years preventive maintenance funding within a 12-year period.

The requesting operator will enter into an MOU with MTC or other formal agreement or action, such as Board approvals, and if applicable, with other transit properties affected by the preventive maintenance agreement. The agreement or actions will embody the four eligibility requirements outlined above as well as any other relevant terms and conditions of the agreement.

Bus Diesel Emission Reduction Device Funding Program

MTC provided approximately \$14 million in CMAQ funds in FY2003-04 and FY2004-05 to assist with the procurement of approximately 1,600 bus emission reduction devices to help operators meet California Air Resources Board (CARB) requirements. The devices or

their components may need to be replaced periodically. New upgraded devices also provide greater NO_x reduction benefits than the original devices.

In response to the need to install or replace bus diesel emission reduction devices to comply with CARB requirements, the Transit Capital Priorities policy includes a bus emission reduction device funding program. The elements of this policy attempt to strike a balance between facilitating operators' ability to remain in compliance with CARB requirements and to exceed those requirements by achieving greater NO_x reductions on the one hand, and making the most effective use of the region's limited capital funds on the other. The elements of bus emission reduction device replacement program are:

- Requests to replace bus emission reduction devices or device components in order to maintain compliance with or exceed CARB requirements, including first-time retrofits, upgrades, replacements and spares, will be treated as Score 16 projects, subject to the following requirements:
 - Devices or components must be installed on buses that are scheduled to remain in service for at least five (5) years from year of programming. Devices or components to be installed on buses that are scheduled to be replaced prior to the specified years will be treated as Preventive Maintenance (Score 9).
- Requests to procure spare devices or components up to 10% of the operators' current device inventory will be treated as Score 16. Spare devices or components in excess of 10% of the inventory will be treated as Preventive Maintenance (Score 9)
- Projects treated as Score 16 under the bus emission reduction device funding program require a 50% local match, rather than the standard 20%. The intent of this element is to encourage cost-effective use of the region's limited capital funding, and to align with the original policy for procuring the devices, which had the regional contribution to NO_x reduction and the local contribution for PM reduction.
- Participation in the program is entirely voluntary. It is the responsibility of each operator to determine the best approach to achieving and maintaining compliance with CARB requirements.

Vehicle Procurement Reserves

The TCP Program may reserve funds for future programming for major vehicle replacement/procurement projects (e.g. BART, SFMTA, Caltrain). The programming of such reserves will be based on the cash-flow needs of the projects and available revenue streams.

Grant Spend-down Policy

This policy conditions new programming on the expenditure of prior year grants in order to direct the region’s limited funds to the projects most in need of additional resources and accelerate the delivery of TCP projects.

The focus of this policy is on fixed guideway (FG) projects, as vehicle procurement projects are generally completed in a timely manner. Each year, MTC staff will calculate the balance of older FG grants from TrAMS data in consultation with each operator. The goal amounts will be compared against TrAMS grant balances for the appropriate grants in September of each year to determine if the goals have been met. The policy establishes a target for spending a specified percentage of the grant balance each year. Table 9 below explains the spend-down goals for each program year.

If the goals for each operator are met, the full FG cap amounts specified for that operator in the relevant section above will be programmed, subject to funding availability. However, if the target is not met, staff will defer the FG funding for those operators not meeting their goals proportionate to the percentage of the prior-year grants unexpended. If the goal is then met in subsequent years, the full FG cap would be programmed, subject to funding availability. Additionally, operators will have the opportunity to request deferred FG cap amounts in later years, subject to meeting their grant spend-down goals and availability of funding. Programming of these deferred caps will be treated as a lower priority than other Score 16 projects.

Fixed guideway programming for FY2016-17 will be based on an analysis of grant spending in September of 2016. The preliminary program for FY2017-18 through FY2019-20 will include the full cap amounts, but will be conditioned on meeting the grant spend-down goals in the appropriate year. Should an operator not meet its target in a given year, the FG cap amount in the preliminary program would be reduced accordingly in that year’s POP amendment.

Table 9: FY2016-17 to FY2019-20 Program Grant Spend-Down Policy

Program Year	Basis for Balance	Spend-Down Target	Spend-Down Period
FY2015-16	Undisbursed balance of FG grants awarded FY2011-12 or earlier, as of 9/ 2014	1/3 of balance	9/2014 to 9/2015
FY2016-17		½ of remaining balance, as of 9/2015	9/2015 to 9/2016
FY2017-18		Remaining balance, as of 9/2016	9/2016 to 9/2017
FY2018-19	Undisbursed balance of FG grants awarded FY2014-15 or earlier, as of 9/2017	1/3 of balance	9/2017 to 9/2018
FY2019-20		½ of remaining balance, as of 9/2018	9/2018 to 9/2019
FY2020-21		Remaining balance, as of 9/2019	9/2019 to 9/2020

Joint Procurements

In recognition of the policy direction of the Transit Sustainability Project Resolution No. 4060, before TCP funds are programmed for revenue vehicles, non-revenue vehicles, communications and vehicle location systems, fare collection equipment, bus emission reduction devices, computer systems, including management information systems and maintenance/asset management systems, or other equipment, operators must evaluate and pursue, as appropriate, opportunities for joint procurements and integrated operations with other operators. The “Compensation for Cost Effective Bus Purchases” that was introduced into the TCP Policy with the prior update will provide operators an extra incentive to pursue joint procurement opportunities. MTC will coordinate discussions if requested.

Transit Asset Management

FTA issued a final rule related to transit asset management and NTD reporting for transit providers in July, 2016; the effective date of the rule is October 1, 2016. The rule establishes a National Transit Asset Management (TAM) System in accordance with the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21). The National TAM System elements include the definition of “state of good repair”, a requirement that providers develop and carry out a TAM plan, performance measures and targets for capital assets, reporting requirements, and the application of analytical processes and decision support tools.

Implementation Timeline & Rule Compliance

TAM Plans

A provider’s initial TAM plan must be completed **no later than two years after the effective date of the final rule i.e. by September 2018**. A TAM Plan must cover a horizon period of at least four (4) years and must be updated at least once every four years. The Plan update should coincide with the planning cycle for the relevant Transportation Improvement Program or Statewide Transportation Improvement Program.

TAM Plan Requirements

TAM Plan Requirements apply to all direct recipients and sub-recipients of Federal financial assistance under 49 U.S.C. Chapter 53 that own, operate, or manage capital assets used for providing public transportation. The TAM Plan requirements also vary based on whether the provider is a Tier 1, or Tier 2 provider:

- Tier 1 Providers – All rail transit providers and all recipients that own, operate or manage 101 or more vehicles in revenue service during peak regular service across all fixed route modes or in any one non-fixed route mode. Tier 1 providers must develop TAM plans including elements 1 – 9 listed below.
- Tier 2 Providers – A recipient that owns, operates, or manages 100 or fewer vehicles in revenue service during peak regular service across all non-rail fixed

route modes or in any one non-fixed route mode, or is a sub-recipient under the 5311 Rural Area Formula Program. Tier 2 operators may develop their own TAM plan or participate in a group TAM plan and need only include elements 1 – 4 as listed below. A sponsor must develop a group TAM plan for its Tier 2 sub-recipients, except those sub-recipients that are also direct recipients under 49 U.S.C. 5307.

TAM Plan Elements

- i. An inventory of the number and type of capital assets owned by the provider except equipment with an acquisition value under \$50,000 that is not a service vehicle. The inventory must include third-party owned or jointly procured exclusive-use maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, rolling stock, and guideway infrastructure used by a provider in the provision of public transportation. The asset inventory must be organized at a level of detail commensurate with the level of detail in the provider's program of capital projects.
- ii. A condition assessment of those inventoried assets for which a provider has direct capital responsibility.
- iii. A description of the analytical processes or decision-support tools that a provider uses to estimate capital investment needs over time and develop its investment prioritization.
- iv. A provider's project-based prioritization of investments
- v. A provider's TAM and SGR policy
- vi. A provider's TAM plan implementation strategy
- vii. A description of key TAM activities that a provider intends to engage in over the TAM plan horizon period
- viii. A summary or list of the resources, including personnel, that a provider needs to develop and carry out the TAM plan; and
- ix. An outline of how a provider will monitor, update, and evaluate, as needed, its TAM plan and related business practices to ensure continuous improvement of TAM practices

MTC is proposing that the region take a coordinated approach in complying with the rule, in order to maximize the potential for region-wide benefits, including, but not limited to, the development of a group plan for Tier 2 operators.

Performance Targets

Additionally, recipients need to report on the condition of their system and performance targets. The final rule establishes SGR standards and four SGR performance measures. Targets for the following fiscal year must be set, for each applicable asset class, within **three months of the effective date of the final rule (January 1, 2017) and each subsequent year thereafter**. To the extent practicable, a provider must coordinate with the States and MPOs in the selection of State and MPO

performance targets. In addition, MTC will need to set regional performance targets for transit asset condition.

The individual operator targets will also serve as the basis of the regional performance targets. To facilitate the translation of operator to regional performance targets, MTC is proposing some parameters for operators to follow in the setting of their agency TAM targets, including:

- Consistency with Plan Bay Area and Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) Policies – With a goal of establishing a nexus between performance targets and MTC’s programming and planning policies, transit operator performance targets should be as consistent as possible with Plan Bay Area investments and current programming policies.
- Limited/Consistent Asset Classes – Since targets are required to be set for each relevant asset class, MTC is proposing to limit or consolidate the number of motor bus asset classes that have associated targets to be consistent with the bus/van price list used in the TCP process and guidance from the FTA on target-setting by asset class for facilities. Without some standardization of asset classes, the variations of asset classes among operators would result in an unwieldy number of targets.

MTC, as a designated recipient, is required to report to the Department of Transportation on the condition of its recipients’ public transportation systems and performance targets. Therefore, all operators are required to report their targets to MTC prior to the end of each calendar year.

Transit Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program: Resolution No. 4123

The Transit Core Capacity Challenge Grant program (CCCGP) makes a policy commitment of approximately \$7.4 billion in federal, state, regional and local funds over the FY2014-15 to FY2029-30 period to high-priority transit capital projects that will improve the capacity and state of good repair of transit services in the urban core of the region.

The \$7.4 billion Core Capacity Challenge Grant program:

- * Focuses on the SFMTA, BART, and AC Transit – the three transit operators that carry 80% of the region’s passengers as well as more than three-quarters of the minority and low-income passengers.
- * Leverages regional discretionary funds and local contributions, including proposed Cap and Trade revenue.
- * Accelerates and solidifies funding for fleet replacement projects, and identifies new funding for key enhancement projects.
- * Requires that the participating operators meet the performance objectives of the Transit Sustainability Project.

TCP programming for all projects identified in the CCCGP will be consistent with the funding amounts, local match requirements and other terms and conditions specified in MTC Resolution No. 4123.

All projects proposed for TCP funding in the CCCGP that are not otherwise Score 16 will be treated as Score 16. CCCGP fixed guideway infrastructure projects included in the CCCGP program of projects may be funded with a combination of fixed guideway cap funds and additional TCP funds above the operator's fixed guideway cap. Programming for CCCGP projects is based on cash flow needs, funding availability, and other policy elements.

In order to meet cash flow needs of the CCCGP and other TCP projects in years in which project funding needs exceed the region's annual FTA apportionments, financing may be required to advance future FTA/STP revenues. Debt service, including principal and interest payments, for any such financing will be treated as Score 17.

Financing

MTC staff, working with financial and legal advisors, and transit operator staff through the Partnership's Transit Finance Working Group, has been developing plans to finance one or more transit capital projects by borrowing against future Federal Transit Administration (FTA) formula funds. The projects would be funded all or in part with proceeds of the financing, rather than annual FTA apportionments programmed through the Transit Capital Priorities (TCP) program. A portion of the region's apportionments would be used to make debt service payments. The objective of financing is to accelerate the funding and delivery of critical capital projects by advancing FTA funds from future years when annual apportionments are projected to exceed high-priority needs, to the next four-year TCP programming cycle, when needs are projected to exceed annual apportionments.

The need for financing was anticipated when MTC adopted the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (Resolution 4123) in 2013, which established a \$7.5 billion, 16-year funding framework for a set of key projects designed to increase capacity and improve the state of good repair of transit service in the urban core of the region, including fleet replacement and expansion for BART, SFMTA and AC Transit, and related infrastructure projects. The Core Capacity funding plan includes \$3.5 billion in FTA and other federal funds, of which a portion would be advanced through financing to accelerate completion of the projects.

The specific terms of any financing would be subject to agreements between the operator and MTC, MTC, the operator, and FTA, and MTC and bondholders. Debt service, including principal and interest payments, will have the highest priority among programming needs and will receive a Score 17 in developing the program. Debt service will be paid from apportionments in the same urbanized area(s) in which the operator

whose project(s) are being financed is eligible. It is expected that any debt would be repaid over a 10-15 year period.

Vanpool Reporting & Programming

Vanpool service providers under contract to MTC will report vanpool miles and other data to NTD starting in NTD Reporting Year 2018 (i.e., starting with vanpool services provided from July 2017 through June 2018). As part of the development of the TCP program, starting with the FY2019-20 program, staff will present to TFWG an analysis of the projected amount of 5307 apportionments generated in each urbanized area by vanpool mileage reporting (5307 apportionments are based on NTD data from two years earlier, i.e., data reported to NTD in Reporting Year 2018 will be used to calculate apportionments for FY20). Staff will propose to include in the TCP program, starting with the FY2019-20 program, 5307 funds for the Vanpool Support Program.

The amount proposed for programming from each urbanized area will not exceed the projected apportionments generated by vanpool reporting in the urbanized area. Any apportionments that are generated by vanpool reporting but are not programmed for the Vanpool Support Program will be available for programming to transit operator projects following the TCP programming guidelines. Staff anticipates submitting its own 5307 grants to FTA to request funds programmed for the Vanpool Support Program, but may elect to ask one or more transit operators to request the funds on MTC's behalf, and enter into a pass-through agreement with MTC.

IV. ONE BAY AREA GRANT PROGRAM TRANSIT CAPITAL PROGRAM

The Commission's Cycle 2 / One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 1) Program Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for FY2012-13 through FY 2016-17, MTC Resolution No. 4035, Revised, included \$201 million in STP/CMAQ funding for transit capital needs, including Clipper® Fare Collection Media, Transit Capital Rehabilitation, and the Transit Performance Initiative (TPI) Program. Specific projects are included in Attachment B-1 to MTC Resolution No. 4035, Revised.

The Commission's One Bay Area Grant Program Second Round (OBAG 2) Project Selection Criteria and Programming Policy for FY2017-18 through FY 2021-22, MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised, includes \$189 million in STP/CMAQ funding for transit priorities, including BART car replacement and expansion, replacement of Clipper equipment and development of Clipper 2.0, and the TPI Program. Specific projects will be included in Attachment B-1 to MTC Resolution No. 4202, Revised.

This section specifies the programming policies for OBAG 1 and OBAG 2 funds for TPI and TCP projects.

Transit Performance Initiative

Under OBAG 1, this program includes investment and performance incentive elements. The investment element implements transit supportive investments in major transit corridors that can be carried out within two years. The focus is on making cost-effective operational improvements on significant trunk lines which carry the largest number of passengers in the Bay Area including transit signal prioritization, passenger circulation improvements at major hubs, and boarding/stop improvements. Under OBAG 1 (FY2012-13 through FY2016-17), a total of \$82 million has been made available for this program.

The incentive program provided financial rewards to transit agencies that improve ridership and/or productivity. For FY2012-13, \$15 million was distributed based on each operator's share of ridership based on final audited FY2010-11 ridership figures. For FY2013-14 through FY2015-16, \$15 million was available annually based on a formula distribution factoring in ridership increase, passenger per hour increase, and ridership. The incentive program is proposed to be discontinued after FY2015-16, as OBAG 2 funding is proposed to be focused on transit capital needs and as the incentive program was generally found to not be as effective as was hoped in incentivizing productivity improvements.

Transit Capital Priorities

OBAG 1 and OBAG 2 funds that are not programmed for Transit Performance Initiative projects are programmed for transit capital replacement and rehabilitation projects to supplement the FTA funds in the Transit Capital Priorities program. STP/CMAQ funds for

TCP projects from OBAG 1 were programmed in the TCP programs for FY2012-13 through FY2015-16. STP/CMAQ funds for TCP projects from OBAG 2 will be programmed in the TCP program for FY2016-17 through FY2019-20. OBAG 2 funds for TCP projects will be programmed using the same policies and procedures as used for the FTA formula funds, as specified in Section III. FTA Formula Funds, with priority given to Score 16 projects that meet the eligibility criteria for STP or CMAQ, and that cannot be fully funded with FTA funds within the program's fiscal constraints.

APPENDIX 1 – BOARD RESOLUTION

***Sample Resolution of Board Support
FTA Section 5307, 5337, and 5339, and Surface Transportation Program Project Application***

Resolution No. _____

**AUTHORIZING THE FILING OF AN APPLICATION FOR FTA FORMULA PROGRAM AND SURFACE
TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS FUNDING FOR (project name) AND COMMITTING THE
NECESSARY LOCAL MATCH FOR THE PROJECT(S) AND STATING THE ASSURANCE OF (name of
jurisdiction) TO COMPLETE THE PROJECT**

WHEREAS, Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST, Public Law 114-94) continues and establishes new Federal Transit Administration formula programs (23 U.S.C. §53) and continues the Surface Transportation Program (23 U.S.C. § 133); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to FAST, and the regulations promulgated there under, eligible project sponsors wishing to receive Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5307 Urbanized Area, Section 5337 State of Good Repair, or Section 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities (collectively, FTA Formula Program) grants or Surface Transportation Program (STP) grants for a project shall submit an application first with the appropriate metropolitan transportation planning organization (MPO), for review and inclusion in the MPO's Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

WHEREAS, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission is the MPO for the San Francisco Bay region; and

WHEREAS, (applicant) is an eligible project sponsor for FTA Formula Program or STP funds; and

WHEREAS, (applicant) wishes to submit a grant application to MTC for funds from the FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 FTA Formula Program or STP funds, for the following project(s):
(project description) .

WHEREAS, MTC requires, as part of the application, a resolution stating the following:

- 1) the commitment of necessary local matching funds (18-50% for FTA Formula Program funds, depending on project type, and 11.47% for STP funds); and
- 2) that the sponsor understands that the FTA Formula Program and STP funding is fixed at the programmed amount, and therefore any cost increase cannot be expected to be funded from FTA Formula Program or STP funds; and

- 3) the assurance of the sponsor to complete the project as described in the application, and if approved, as programmed in MTC's TIP; and
- 4) that the sponsor understands that FTA Formula Program funds must be obligated within three years of programming and STP funds must be obligated by January 31 of the year that the project is programmed for in the TIP, or the project may be removed from the program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by (governing board name) that (applicant) is authorized to execute and file an application for funding under the FTA Formula Program and/or Surface Transportation Program in the amount of (\$request) for (project description); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that (governing board) by adopting this resolution does hereby state that:

- 1) (applicant) will provide (\$ match amount) in local matching funds; and
- 2) (applicant) understands that the FTA Formula Program and STP funding for the project is fixed at (\$ actual amount), and that any cost increases must be funded by the (applicant) from local matching funds, and that (applicant) does not expect any cost increases to be funded with FTA Formula Program and Surface Transportation Program funds; and
- 3) (project name) will be built as described in this resolution and, if approved, for the amount shown in the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) with obligation occurring within the timeframe established below; and
- 4) The program funds are expected to be obligated by January 31 of the year the project is programmed for in the TIP; and
- 5) (applicant) will comply with FTA requirements and all other applicable Federal, State and Local laws and regulations with respect to the proposed project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, that (agency name) is an eligible sponsor of projects in the program for FTA Formula Program and STP funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, that (agency name) is authorized to submit an application for FTA Formula Program and STP funds for (project name); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, that there is no legal impediment to (agency name) making applications for FTA Formula Program and STP funds; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED*, that there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed project, or the ability of (agency name) to deliver such project; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that (agency name) agrees to comply with the requirements of MTC's Transit Coordination Implementation Plan as set forth in MTC Resolution 3866; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a copy of this resolution will be transmitted to the MTC prior to MTC programming the FTA Formula Program or Surface Transportation Program funded projects in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP); and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the MTC is requested to support the application for the project described in the resolution and to program the project, if approved, in MTC's TIP.

*** Not required if opinion of counsel is provided instead.**

APPENDIX 2 – OPINION OF COUNSEL

***Sample Opinion of Legal Counsel
FTA Section 5307, 5337, 5339 and STP Project Application***

(Date)

To: Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Fr: (Applicant)
Re: Eligibility for FTA Section 5307 Program, FTA 5337 State of Good Repair Program, FTA 5339 Bus and Bus Facilities Program, and Surface Transportation Program (STP)

This communication will serve as the requisite opinion of counsel in connection with the application of (Applicant) _ for funding from the FTA Section 5307, 5337 or 5339 programs, or STP, made available pursuant to the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation federal transportation authorization (FAST, Public Law 114-94) or successor legislation.

1. (Applicant) is an eligible sponsor of projects for the FTA Section 5307, 5337 or 5339 programs, or the STP program.
2. (Applicant) is authorized to submit an application for FTA Section 5307, 5337 or 5339 funding, or STP funding for (project).
3. I have reviewed the pertinent state laws and I am of the opinion that there is no legal impediment to (Applicant) _making applications FTA Section 5307, 5337 or 5339 program funds, or STP funds. Furthermore, as a result of my examinations, I find that there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed projects, or the ability of (Applicant) to carry out such projects.

Sincerely,

Legal Counsel

Print name

Optional Language to add to the Resolution for Local Support

Project sponsors have the option of consolidating the 'Opinion of Legal Counsel' within the Resolution of Local Support, by incorporating the following statements into the Resolution of Local Support:

Resolved, that (agency name) is an eligible sponsor of projects in the FTA Formula Program and STP Programs; and be it further

Resolved, that (agency name) is authorized to submit an application for FTA Formula Program and STP funds for (project name); and be it further

Resolved, that there is no legal impediment to (agency name) making applications for FTA Formula Program and STP funds; and be it further

Resolved, that there is no pending or threatened litigation which might in any way adversely affect the proposed project, or the ability of (agency name) to deliver such project; and be it further

If the above language is not provided within the Resolution of Local Support, an Opinion of Legal Counsel is required as provided (Appendix 2).

Policy Element Previously Discussed	Summary of Proposed Changes
ADA Set-Aside Formula	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Revise the reprogramming flexibility to allow operators to reprogram to any other transit capital project if the operator certifies that the ADA Paratransit needs are otherwise met locally. •Revise the formula factor weighting from 40% Demand Response (DR) ridership, 40% DR operating expenses, and 20% systemwide ridership to 45% DR ridership, 45% DR operating expenses, and 10% systemwide ridership, and add a requirement of a non-zero value for either of the DR factors. As a reminder, the allotments are determined based on NTD Reporting. <p>Under this revision, ACE, Caltrain and WETA would not receive an ADA Set-Aside apportionment.</p>
Debt Service Programming Policy	No changes will be proposed.
Project Funding Caps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Increases to caps will be made from estimated available revenues, prioritizing vehicle caps first, followed by FG caps. •Amount of increases will be determined based on estimated revenues and after bus/van pricelist policy has been finalized. •Existing staff-level flexibility for applying or waiving caps will be maintained. •Contingencies for changes to revenue expectations as a result of the next federal transportation authorization will be established, using the above priorities.
Grant Spend-down Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •4-year spend-down period (increased from a 3-year cycle). While the FY21 fixed guideway (FG) cap programming will be based on results from the current spend-down cycle, the FY22, FY23, FY24, and FY25 programming would be based on the new cycle. •For restoration of deferred caps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> --Voluntarily-deferred caps: continue existing policy of programming the voluntarily-deferred cap in the year of the operator’s choosing, programmed as a prior-year commitment. --Involuntarily-deferred caps: in years when additional funding is available, after meeting Debt Service payment requirements, a subcommittee of the FG operators would be called to evaluate proposals to restore prior-year involuntarily deferred caps. The recommendations of this subcommittee would be subject to MTC staff and Commission review and approval. --Restoration of any deferred caps to an operator, whether voluntary or involuntary, would be rescinded if that operator does not meet their spend-down target in the same year. --Operators who do not meet their spend-down target in the year of a proposed restoration or the immediately-prior year would not be eligible for cap restoration. •Reorganize and clarify incentives and flexibility provisions.
Operator Eligibility	Add SMART eligibility to San Francisco-Oakland and Santa Rosa urbanized areas (UZAs). Other operator eligibility unchanged, with final UZA eligibility table pending discussion on revenue sharing agreements.
Lifeline Set Aside	No changes to the set-aside methodology are proposed.

Policy Element Previously Discussed	Summary of Proposed Changes
Program Timing & Revenues	3-5 year program, tied to the length of the next federal transportation authorization.
Project Scoring	Policy generally unchanged. Operator funding requests must be consistent with agency TAM plans and regional TAM performance metrics.
Facilities Programming	<p>No revisions to incorporate Bus Facilities & Infrastructure (BF&I) Cap at this time. In the event that federal revenues increase significantly in the next authorization (perhaps \$50M+ annually), we would return to TFWG to discuss options for the use of those funds, including the possibility of formally amending the TCP Policy to include a BF&I Cap, which could be guided by the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The amount of the BF&I Cap would be based on the amount of the FG Cap. Based on the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transit Capital Needs Assessment, 75% of the region’s non-vehicle transit state of good repair needs are related to fixed guideway assets. The remaining 25% is bus-related facilities and infrastructure. This 75/25 split would be reflected in the total for FG and BF&I project caps. •Each bus operator’s cap would be based on its share of the bus facilities and infrastructure needs in the RTCI used for Plan Bay Area 2050 Capital Needs Projections, with a minimum amount applied so that all operators get a level of funding for investment in bus facilities and infrastructure. •Not all operators or UZAs would be required to participate. Operators in exclusive UZAs (Fairfield, Napa, SolTrans, etc.) already have flexibility to fund traditionally lower-scoring projects like facilities. •Some operators would have both a FG Cap and a BF&I Cap (SFMTA, VTA, GGBHTD) since they operate both fixed guideway and bus service. •Eligible project types will be aligned with the definitions of facilities and infrastructure in the FTA Section 5339 Bus & Bus Facilities Formula program.
Revenue Sharing Agreements	Existing agreements continue to be recognized ("grandfathered"). No new agreements are proposed for inclusion/recognition in the new policy.

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects

Attachment 3: Application Instructions

Below are comprehensive instructions and guidelines for responding to the FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects. This document explains each attachment included in the packet, along with detailed directions for completing the project template. Any questions about responding to this Call for Projects should be directed to Rob Jaques at rjaques@bayareametro.gov or at (415) 778-5378.

Attachment 1: FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 Transit Capital Priorities Process and Criteria

Attachment 1 is the final FY2016-17 through FY2019-20 TCP Process and Criteria as approved by the MTC Commission. Attachment 1-A summarizes proposed changes to the Policy to be considered by the Commission in the fall, which will culminate in the adoption of the final TCP Policy to guide the programming for the FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 TCP Program. Contained within both attachments are the policies governing the programming and project selection process.

Attachment 2: Project Template

Project sponsors should apply for funds using the Excel project template included as **Attachment 2**. Further instructions regarding the template are included below and on **Attachment 4**. Related materials can be downloaded from MTC's website at <https://mtc.ca.gov/our-work/fund-invest/calls-projects-funding-opportunities>. Completed templates, along with all supporting documentation, should be emailed to Rob Jaques at rjaques@bayareametro.gov by 5:00 p.m. on **Friday, September 4, 2020**.

Attachment 2: Project Template has five tabs, one each for FY2021, FY2022, FY2023, FY2024, and FY2025. All projects for which you are requesting TCP funds should be entered in the appropriate worksheet, including ADA paratransit operating assistance projects funded by the 10% ADA set-aside. See Attachment 8 for estimated ADA set-aside amounts.

There is no need to indicate which FTA funding program you are applying for, i.e., Section 5307, 5337 or 5339. Funding sources will be assigned during the program development process based on the project's eligibility for each program, projected revenues, and urbanized area constraints. See Attachment 1, Section III B, Program Eligibility, and Section III B, Urbanized Area Eligibility for more information. See Attachment 5 for projected revenues for each program and urbanized area.

Please do not include requests for funding from the Lifeline or Transit Performance Initiative programs. These programs have separate calls for projects and program development processes.

Please enter **ALL** information in the un-highlighted columns for each requested project. The amounts in the columns shaded **yellow** are calculated for you. Do not enter anything in these fields.

For the FY21, FY22, and FY23 tabs only, please indicate your FY21, FY22, and FY23 estimated operating shortfall or revenue need and FY21, FY22, and FY23 estimated preventive maintenance budget in the **blue-shaded** fields at the bottom of the sheets. Below that, please indicate (also in the blue field) the basis for those estimates and the relative priority of meeting these needs from the TCP program compared to capital needs. This information will help to inform and changes to TCP Policy provisions for operating/preventive maintenance flexibility.

Agency Project Priority: Please indicate your agency's prioritization rank of each project submitted in consideration for inclusion in each year of the TCP Program.

Operator: Please copy the name of your agency to all lines with projects.

TIP ID: If the project is already in the TIP, please enter the TIP ID number, e.g. ALA01003. If the project is not already in the TIP, please enter "New."

Project Title: Please enter a short title for the project, *up to 50 characters long*. If the project is already in the TIP, please use the same title as is used in the TIP.

Project Description: Project sponsors should complete a separate line on the Excel template for each discrete project. All projects must be well defined. There must be clear project limits, an intended scope of work, and a project concept. Examples of score 16 projects include:

- Replacement/rehab of one revenue vehicle sub-fleet or ferry vessel; a sub-fleet is defined as the same bus size, manufacturer, and year; or any portion of a train set that reaches the end of its useful life at a common time.
- Train control or traction power replacement/rehab needs for a given year.
- Fixed guideway replacement/rehab needs for a given year (e.g., track replacement and related fixed guideway costs, ferry fixed guideway connectors).

The description should be sufficiently detailed to determine which FTA program(s) the project is eligible for, demonstrate that the project meets the screening criteria, and to assign a TCP score. See Attachment 1, Section III B, Program Eligibility, Section III B, Screening Criteria, and Section III B, Project Scoring for more information.

For vehicle replacement requests, project descriptions should include the number, type (over-the-road coach, standard bus, paratransit van, etc.), length, fuel type (diesel, gas, CNG, or hybrid), year and manufacturer for both the vehicles being replaced and the vehicles being procured.

Regional Transit Capital Inventory (RTCI) Asset Class: If the project would replace or rehabilitate a capital asset, please enter the appropriate RTCI Asset Type Code and TRSID/NTD ID. A list of the current RTCI asset classes and corresponding RTCI Asset Type Codes, as well as your agency's TRSID, is included in Attachment 4.

The Seating Capacity field is for revenue vehicles only. The Quantity field refers to the quantity reported in the RTCI, which may differ from the quantity being requested in the project (see Project Quantity below). This data is being requested for information and comparison purposes only, and to provide additional justification for the project.

TCP Score: Please enter the relevant TCP score (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Scoring). If you are not sure of the correct scoring category for your project, leave the score blank. MTC staff will verify all scores.

Project Quantity: Please enter the quantity of assets being purchased, e.g., the number of buses being procured. The quantity may differ from the total quantity reported in your asset inventory (see Regional Transit Capital Inventory Asset Class above). If you are procuring more than one type of vehicle as part of a single project, please enter the quantity of each type on a separate line. For construction, rehab or operating projects that cannot be divided into identical discrete units, such as track rehab, dredging or preventive maintenance, enter a quantity of 1.

Unit Cost – Federal: Enter the amount the amount of federal funding requested per unit, e.g., the federal share of the price for each bus. If the project is for procuring buses or vans, this amount cannot exceed the amount specified for that vehicle type in the regional bus-van pricelist (see Attachment 6). If buses or vans are projected to cost more than the pricelist amount, please indicate that in the Notes column. If you are procuring more than one type of vehicle as part of the project, please enter the federal share for each type on a separate line.

Unit Cost – Local: Enter the amount of the local matching funds per unit, e.g., the local share of the price for each bus. If you are procuring more than one type of vehicle as part of the project, please enter the local share for each type on a separate line.

Unit Cost – Total, Total Cost – Federal, Local and Total, Federal/Local Split: These amounts (shaded in yellow) are calculated for you based on the quantity and federal/local unit costs, and do not need to be entered. The Federal/Local Split columns should be checked to make sure you have entered the correct federal and matching amounts. For bus and van procurements, the split should match the 80%/20% split on the bus-van pricelist unless the total cost for the procurement is higher than the pricelist total, in which case the local share will be higher than 20% (see Attachment 6). For all other capital projects, including ADA operating assistance, the federal amount should not exceed 80% of the total amount. For operating assistance, the federal amount should not exceed 50% of the total amount.

For projects subject to project caps, including fixed guideway project caps, the total cost should reflect the total estimated cost of the project before applying the cap. We are requesting total project costs that exceed the caps for informational purposes only, to help assess capital needs in the region and the TCP program’s ability to fund those needs. For vehicle procurements, other replacement projects, and expansion or enhancement projects, project caps will be applied in the program development process. See Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Funding Caps for more information.

Example 1: If you are requesting funds to purchase 100 buses with a bus-van pricelist federal share of \$400,000 and local share of \$100,000 in FY2021, enter 100, \$400,000 and \$100,000 in the appropriate columns in the FY2021 worksheet. The worksheet will calculate the total cost of \$50 million with a federal share of \$40 million. MTC staff will apply the \$20 million annual vehicle project cap by programming \$20 million in each year (subject to funding availability). If the project is not fully funded by the end of the program period, the balance will be noted as a prior-year commitment with priority for funding in the subsequent TCP round.

Example 2: If you are requesting to replace a communications/AVL system with a total cost of \$10 million in FY2024, enter 1 for quantity, \$8 million for federal share, and \$2 million for local share in the FY 2024 worksheet. MTC staff will apply the Other Replacement Projects cap by programming \$5 million in FY 2024 (subject to funding availability). Staff will recommend whether to program additional funding for the system project in the subsequent year based on demand for other Score 16 projects compared to available funds.

FG Cap Federal Amount: For projects subject to fixed guideway project caps (see Attachment 7), please enter the amount of your agency’s annual fixed guideway cap that you are applying to each project. The total of the amounts in this column should equal your agency’s cap amount in each year, unless you are using the flexibility to program additional caps in one year that are offset in another. If you are using this flexibility, please provide an explanation and justification in a cover memo with your application and ensure that the total of your five-year FG requests do not exceed the total of your five-year FG caps.

Additionally, if you are requesting contingency funding based on involuntarily deferred caps from prior years or for other reasons, indicate these requests in the notes section. Projects in the following categories must be funded within the fixed guideway cap:

- Track/Guideway Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Traction Power Systems Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Train Control/Signaling Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Dredging
- Ferry Fixed Guideway Connectors Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Ferry Major Component Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Ferry Propulsion Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Cable Car Infrastructure Replacement/Rehabilitation
- Wayside or Onboard Fare Collection Equipment Replacement/Rehabilitation for Fixed Guideway vehicles

If you are requesting a waiver to use fixed guideway cap funds for other capital needs not included in the list above, please indicate the amount of the cap that you are applying to the non-FG project, and include a justification in your cover memo that explains how the waiver meets the conditions specified in the TCP policy (see Attachment 1, Section II B, Project Funding Caps).

1% Security Set-Aside: Enter the amount of your project that could qualify as a security project in order for MTC to meet the 1% security requirement at an urbanized area level. Project sponsors are required by FTA to meet the 1% security set-aside provisions. FTA requires designated recipients to comply with this requirement at an urbanized area level and for operators to comply at the individual grant level.

Local Match Source: Please list the source(s) of matching funds you anticipate using for the local share of project costs, e.g., AB 664, TDA, county sales tax, Prop 1B.

Included in TAM Plan: Since FY2018-19, FTA requires projects receiving FTA Section 5337 funds to be included in a TAM Plan. In this column, indicate if the project you are requesting to be funded is included in your agency's TAM Plan.

Notes: Please use the Notes column to explain any of the following that apply, or to provide other information that will help staff understand your request. You can refer to a more detailed explanation in your cover memo or a separate attachment if you prefer.

- Requests for programming that were deferred from a previous year's program;
- Requests for programming that were partially funded in a previous year's program due to annual project funding caps;
- Requests to program vehicle replacement funds prior to the first eligible year in order to advance procurements or to replace vehicles with higher than normal maintenance costs (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Asset Useful Life);
- Requests for compensation for bus replacement beyond the minimum useful life (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Compensation for Bus Replacement Beyond Minimum Useful Life);

- Requests to advance fixed guideway cap funds for future years (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Funding Caps);
- Requests for a one-year waiver to use fixed guideway cap funds for other capital needs that are not included in one of the eligible fixed guideway project categories listed above (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Funding Caps);
- Requests to program contingent fixed guideway caps (amounts involuntarily deferred in prior years or 10% contingency amounts);
- Requests for replacement of buses or vans with projected costs less than the bus-van pricelist amount (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Bus-Van Pricelist);
- Requests for compensation for cost-effective bus purchases (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Compensation for Cost Effective Bus Purchases);
- Requests for replacement of revenue vehicle types that are not listed in the bus-van pricelist, including how you estimated costs (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Bus-Van Pricelist);
- Requests to replace revenue vehicles with a different number or size of vehicles, e.g., a request to replace 10 40' buses with 12 35' buses; in such cases, please provide the total seating capacity of the old and new fleets;
- Requests to treat vehicle rehabilitation projects (including mid-life overhauls and rebuilds) as Score 16 because the life of the vehicles will be extended beyond the standard useful life (See Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Scoring);
- Requests for operating assistance for operators with 100 or fewer buses that operate in large urbanized areas (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Limited Use of FTA Funds for Operating Purposes);
- Projects that qualify as Associated Transit Improvements, formerly known as Transit Enhancements (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Associated Transit Improvements);
- Requests to treat preventive maintenance funding as Score 16 under the Funding Exchange, Capital Exchange, Negotiated Agreement or Budgetary Shortfalls elements of the TCP policy (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Preventive Maintenance Funding);
- Requests to treat replacement of bus diesel emission reduction devices, or purchase of spare devices, as Score 16 (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Bus Diesel Emission Reduction Device Funding Program);
- Requests for funding for projects that have unexpended balances from prior-year FTA grants (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Conditioning Programming on Expenditure of Prior Grants);
- Any plans or potential for procuring the requested assets through a joint procurement or piggyback with other operators (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Joint Procurements);
- Requests to procure, replace or upgrade maintenance management or asset management systems (see Attachment 1, Section III C, Transit Asset Management).
- Requests to transfer ADA set-aside funds to capital projects if the operator certifies that its ADA operating costs are covered by other funding sources.

Attachment 4: Regional Capital Transit Inventory

Attachment 4 provides information needed to fill out the RCTI fields in Attachment 2. RCTI related reference files such as the updated RCTI asset type codes can also be downloaded from <https://mtcdrive.box.com/s/macfg0g20c4e489jj63la6wbkt05guxm>.

Attachment 5: TCP Apportionment Estimates

Revenue estimates for the FTA formula programs included in TCP are provided in **Attachment 5**, and are used for determining amounts for the Lifeline Transportation Program and 10% ADA operating set-asides, and 1% security requirements. The revenues available for programming include projected apportionments for FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 as well as any prior-year unprogrammed carryover funds.

Because the FAST Act expires on September 30, 2020, and we do not yet know the details of the next national authorization, urbanized area (UZA) amounts are based on the annual FAST Act authorizations, escalated from FY2020-21 through FY2024-25. In projecting revenues for the TCP programming, staff assumed that each UZA's share of the national authorization would remain constant through the life of the program. Additionally, prior year Small Transit Intensive Cities (STIC) funds were removed from the 5307 apportionments when calculating the UZA share of the national available funds.

Staff will update the revenue projections during the program development process as better information becomes available. If actual apportionments exceed or fall below the projections, additional funds can be programmed or reduced in the annual Program of Projects amendment, which reconciles the preliminary program with the apportionments, or excess funds may be carried over and programmed in the following year. Funding availability is also subject to pre-existing programming commitments and project deferments.

Attachment 6: Bus-Van Pricelist

The costs for bus and van procurements, including the federal/local split, cannot exceed the prices in the regional bus-van pricelist, a draft of which is included as **Attachment 6**, and which will be included as part of the updated TCP Policy. If an operator elects to replace vehicles with vehicles of a different fuel type, the price listed for the new fuel type vehicle applies, e.g., if an operator is replacing diesel buses with diesel-electric hybrid buses, the operator may request funds up to the amount listed for hybrid buses.

Note that bus prices do not include allowances for radios and fareboxes; operators may request funding for radios and fareboxes as a separate project from the vehicle procurement. Operators are expected to include Clipper wiring and brackets in all new buses, so that buses are Clipper-ready without requiring additional expenses.

Match Amounts: The MTC/local splits in the bus-van pricelist are uniformly 80%/20% across all vehicle types. Operators party to the Core Capacity Challenge Grant Program (MTC Resolution 4123, Revised) have an MTC/local split for vehicles of 75%/25%. All other capital projects for all operators should reflect a federal share of not more than 80%. Requests for operating assistance should reflect a federal share of not more than 50%. On the application spreadsheet, enter the appropriate amounts in the federal and local columns, and indicate the expected sources of matching funds.

Attachment 7: Fixed Guideway Caps

For vehicle procurements, fixed guideway replacement/rehab projects, other replacement projects, and expansion or enhancement projects subject to the programmatic financial caps detailed in Attachment

1, Section III B, Project Funding Caps, and in **Attachment 7**, project sponsors should submit total project costs for MTC staff review. The caps will be applied by MTC staff in the programming process.

When developing the proposed TCP programs for each year, the fixed guideway caps may be increased or decreased proportionally, depending on the aggregate demand for Score 16 projects compared to projected revenues. Each fixed guideway operator's fixed guideway cap amounts are listed in Attachment 7. Please use the project template to indicate how much of your agency's fixed guideway cap to apply to each project.

The caps are intended to be as flexible as possible, and requests to advance caps from future years will be accommodated to the extent allowed by the fiscal constraints of the program. Operators may request more than their annual cap in a particular year if the increase is offset by a lower request in another year, i.e., as long as the total amount requested for FG projects over the five years of the program does not exceed the annual cap times five. Please indicate any requests to advance or defer caps in a cover memo with your project application.

Fixed guideway cap amounts may be programmed to any of the eligible project categories listed in Attachment 1, Section III B, Project Funding Caps. Programming for all projects that fall within these categories must be within the operator's cap amount. Operators may request a one-year waiver to use fixed guideway cap funds for other capital needs that are not included in one of the eligible project categories if the operator can demonstrate that the other capital needs can be addressed by the one-year waiver, or that the use of fixed guideway cap funds is part of a multi-year plan to address the other capital needs. The operator must also demonstrate that the waiver will have minimal impact on the operator's ability to meet its fixed guideway capital needs. Requests for multi-year waivers will be considered in extenuating circumstances and must be well justified.

Prior Year FG Cap Deferrals: The portion of FG caps that were involuntarily deferred in previous years due to undispersed grant balances may be programmed in any of the years of the program if sufficient funds are available. Please indicate the dollar amount and the FG Cap project that you would like to program the prior year Cap deferrals to in the Notes section for the appropriate year. Programming of these contingent amounts is dependent on sufficient revenues, and will be treated as a lower priority than other Score 16 projects.

Voluntary deferrals from prior years may be programmed in the year agreed upon when the voluntary deferral was taken. These years and amounts are indicated on Attachment 7. If no year was previously specified, staff will make all efforts to meet the requested year of programming, and operators should indicate a first and second preference for programming.

Attachment 8: ADA Set-Aside

Attachment 8 provides ADA set-aside percentages and estimated annual amounts by UZA and operator. ADA set-aside projects should be entered in the project template. Operators can request to transfer their ADA set-aside funds to other capital projects if they certify that their ADA operating costs are covered by other funding sources. This certification will need to be provided in the form of a separate letter included as part of the application packet. This request should also be explained with appropriate detail in the corresponding notes section.

Other Notes

Asset Useful Life: Projects for normal asset replacement or rehabilitation of revenue vehicles, non-revenue vehicles, service vehicles, or maintenance tools and equipment, must meet the minimum age

requirements specified in the TCP policy (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Asset Useful Life.) However, requests to program vehicle replacement funds prior to the first eligible year in order to advance procurements or replace vehicles with higher than normal maintenance costs will be considered if the proposal has minimal impacts on other operators and can be accommodated within the region's fiscal constraints. Operators that voluntarily replace buses or vans beyond the specified minimum useful life, or request less than the full pricelist amounts, are eligible for financial compensation (see Attachment 1, Section III B, Compensation for Deferred Replacement & Compensation for Cost Effective Bus Purchases).

For vehicle replacement requests, project descriptions should include the number, type (over-the-road coach, standard bus, paratransit van, etc.), length, fuel type (diesel, gas, CNG, or hybrid), year and manufacturer for both the vehicles being replaced and the vehicles being procured.

Further, the template includes asset classification fields developed for the Regional Transit Capital Inventory to link proposed projects to the region's capital replacement and rehab needs. Providing this information will strengthen the justification for projects and improve consistency across operators.

Preventive Maintenance: Preventive maintenance will be considered a Score 9 funding priority in Transit Capital Priorities unless the conditions for one of the following four policy elements are met, in which case preventive maintenance will be treated as Score 16.

- Funding Exchange
- Capital Exchange
- Negotiated Agreement within an Urbanized Area
- Budgetary Shortfalls

See Attachment 1, Section III C, Preventive Maintenance Funding for details on each of these policy elements. For an individual operator to make use of preventive maintenance funding, other operators in the region must be able to move forward with planned capital replacement. The policy's intent is that funding for preventive maintenance will not increase the region's unfunded transit capital needs.

Operating Assistance: FTA permits the use of FTA Section 5307 small urbanized funds to be used for operating purposes. MAP-21 provided new eligibility for small and medium-sized operators in large urbanized areas to use Section 5307 funds for operating assistance. For operators with up to 75 vehicles operated in maximum service (VOMS), 75 percent of the urbanized area's apportionment attributable to the operator (as measured by vehicle revenue hours) may be programmed for operating assistance. For operators with up to 76 to 100 VOMS, 50 percent of the urbanized area's apportionment attributable to the operator (as measured by vehicle revenue hours) may be programmed for operating assistance. This allowance is anticipated to be reduced in the next surface transportation authorization. Eligible operators may request operating assistance up to the maximum eligible amount, but operating assistance will be programmed only after higher scoring projects in the urbanized area are funded. Operating assistance requests will be treated as Score 8 in the programming process.

Grant Spend-down Policy: This policy conditions new programming on the expenditure of prior-year grants in order to direct the region's limited funds to the projects most in need of additional resources and accelerate the delivery of TCP projects.

The focus of this policy is on fixed guideway (FG) projects, as vehicle procurement projects are generally completed in a timely manner. Each year, MTC staff will calculate the balance of older FG grants from TrAMS data in consultation with each operator. The goal amounts will be compared against TrAMS grant

balances for the appropriate grants in September of each year to determine if the goals have been met. The policy establishes a target for spending a specified percentage of the grant balance each year. The table below outlines the spend-down goals for each program year, and may be updated from time to time to reflect ongoing policy and program updates.

If the goals for each operator are met, the full FG cap amounts specified for that operator in the relevant section above will be programmed, subject to funding availability. However, if the target is not met, staff will defer the FG funding for those operators not meeting their goals proportionate to the percentage of the prior-year grants unexpended. If the goal is then met in subsequent years, the full FG cap would be programmed per the FG cap policy above.

In order to meet cash flow needs for various FG projects, operators may voluntarily defer cap amounts to future years, which would then be programmed as a prior-year commitment. For operators whose caps were involuntarily deferred, the following principles will guide the restoration of those cap amounts:

- In years when additional funding is available, after meeting Debt Service payment requirements, a subcommittee of the FG operators would be called to evaluate proposals to restore prior-year involuntarily deferred caps. The recommendations of this subcommittee would be subject to staff and Commission review and approval.
- Restoration of any deferred caps to an operator, whether voluntary or involuntary, would be rescinded if that operator does not meet their spend-down target in the same year.
- Operators who do not meet their spend-down target in the year of a proposed restoration or the year prior would not be eligible for cap restoration.

Fixed guideway programming for the first fiscal year of the program will be based on an analysis of spending on grants at least four years old in September of the preceding fiscal year. For example, programming for FY2020-21 funds will be based on spending of grants awarded through FY2014-15, as of September 2020. The preliminary program for the remaining years of the program will include the full cap amounts, but will be conditioned on meeting the grant spend-down goals in the appropriate year. Should an operator not meet its target in a given year, the FG cap amount in the preliminary program would be reduced accordingly in that year’s POP amendment.

FY2020-21 to FY2024-25 Program Grant Spend-Down Policy

Program Year	Basis for Balance	Spend-down Target	Spend-down Period
FY2020-21	Undisbursed balance of FG grants awarded FY2014-15 or earlier, as of 9/2017	Remaining balance, as of 9/2019	9/2019-9/2020
FY2021-22	Undisbursed balance of FG grants awarded FY2017-18 or earlier, as of 9/2020	1/4 of balance	9/2020-9/2021
FY2022-23		1/3 of remaining balance, as of 9/2021	9/2021-9/2022
FY2023-24		1/2 of remaining balance, as of 9/2022	9/2022-9/2023
FY2024-25		Remaining balance, as of 9/2023	9/2023-9/2024

Joint Procurements: In recognition of the policy direction of the Transit Sustainability Project, before TCP funds are programmed for revenue vehicles, non-revenue vehicles, communications and vehicle location systems, fare collection equipment, bus emission reduction devices, computer systems, including management information systems and maintenance/asset management systems, or other equipment, operators must assess the opportunities for joint procurements and integrated operations with other operators. MTC will coordinate discussions as necessary.

Transit Asset Management: Requests for replacement/rehabilitation of assets should be consistent with the FTA Transit Asset Management (TAM) rule and agency TAM plans. A field is included on the project template asking operators to indicate if their request is included in their TAM plan.

Board Approval: MTC requires that operators seek board approval prior to programming projects in the TIP. The board resolution for each year's programming should be submitted by **February 2021**, the same month MTC's Programming and Allocations Committee will consider the proposed program. If a board resolution cannot be provided by this date due to board meeting schedule constraints, please indicate in a cover memo with your application when the board resolution will be adopted. Attachment 1, Appendix 1 provides a sample resolution of board support.

Opinion of Counsel: Project sponsors have the option of including specified terms and conditions within the Resolution of Local Support. If a project sponsor elects not to include the specified language within the Resolution of Local Support, then the sponsor shall provide MTC with a current Opinion of Counsel stating that the agency is an eligible sponsor of projects for the FTA formula funds; that the agency is authorized to perform the project for which funds are requested; that there is no legal impediment to the agency applying for the funds; and that there is no pending or anticipated litigation which might adversely affect the project or the ability of the agency to carry out the project. A sample format is provided in Attachment 1, Appendix 2.

Attachment 5 - FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 TCP Apportionment Estimates

Year	Program	Total	Large Urbanized Areas					Small Urbanized Areas						
			San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-Morgan Hill	Petaluma
Balance after FY2019-20 Final Programming	\$5307	8,866,784	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8,866,784	-	-	-	-
	\$5337	3,929,022	-	3,929,022	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	4,398,984	-	-	2,001,853	528,500	317,219	-	-	1,306,300	-	245,112	-	-
	Total	17,194,790	-	3,929,022	2,001,853	528,500	317,219	-	-	10,173,084	-	245,112	-	-
FY2020-21	\$5307	244,269,185	150,864,134	39,989,969	23,987,997	6,913,693	7,500,156	3,857,226	2,851,353	1,964,540	1,735,715	1,688,134	1,657,401	1,258,868
	\$5337	221,292,721	148,843,157	31,728,672	34,745,429	5,975,464	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	16,603,165	8,926,697	3,605,050	1,056,462	544,355	563,337	490,531	360,763	251,882	220,633	217,803	204,997	160,655
	Total	482,165,072	308,633,987	75,323,692	59,789,887	13,433,511	8,063,493	4,347,758	3,212,116	2,216,422	1,956,348	1,905,937	1,862,398	1,419,523
FY2021-22	\$5307	249,154,569	153,881,417	40,789,769	24,467,756	7,051,967	7,650,159	3,934,371	2,908,380	2,003,830	1,770,429	1,721,897	1,690,549	1,284,045
	\$5337	225,718,575	151,820,020	32,363,246	35,440,337	6,094,973	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	16,935,229	9,105,231	3,677,151	1,077,591	555,242	574,604	500,342	367,978	256,920	225,046	222,159	209,097	163,868
	Total	491,808,373	314,806,667	76,830,166	60,985,685	13,702,182	8,224,763	4,434,713	3,276,358	2,260,750	1,995,475	1,944,055	1,899,646	1,447,914
FY2022-23	\$5307	254,137,661	156,959,045	41,605,564	24,957,112	7,193,006	7,803,162	4,013,058	2,966,548	2,043,907	1,805,838	1,756,335	1,724,360	1,309,726
	\$5337	230,232,947	154,856,420	33,010,510	36,149,144	6,216,872	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	17,273,933	9,287,335	3,750,695	1,099,143	566,347	586,096	510,349	375,337	262,058	229,547	226,602	213,279	167,146
	Total	501,644,541	321,102,801	78,366,769	62,205,398	13,976,225	8,389,258	4,523,407	3,341,885	2,305,965	2,035,384	1,982,937	1,937,638	1,476,872
FY2023-24	\$5307	259,220,414	160,098,226	42,437,675	25,456,254	7,336,866	7,959,226	4,093,320	3,025,879	2,084,785	1,841,954	1,791,461	1,758,847	1,335,921
	\$5337	234,837,606	157,953,548	33,670,721	36,872,127	6,341,210	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	17,619,412	9,473,082	3,825,708	1,121,126	577,674	597,818	520,556	382,844	267,300	234,138	231,134	217,544	170,489
	Total	511,677,432	327,524,857	79,934,104	63,449,506	14,255,750	8,557,043	4,613,875	3,408,723	2,352,085	2,076,092	2,022,595	1,976,391	1,506,410
FY2024-25	\$5307	264,404,822	163,300,190	43,286,429	25,965,379	7,483,603	8,118,410	4,175,186	3,086,396	2,126,481	1,878,794	1,827,290	1,794,024	1,362,639
	\$5337	239,534,358	161,112,619	34,344,135	37,609,570	6,468,034	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	17,971,800	9,662,544	3,902,223	1,143,548	589,227	609,774	530,967	390,501	272,646	238,820	235,757	221,895	173,898
	Total	521,910,980	334,075,354	81,532,787	64,718,497	14,540,865	8,728,184	4,706,153	3,476,897	2,399,126	2,117,614	2,063,047	2,015,919	1,536,538
Five-Year Totals (including FY20 carryover)	\$5307	1,280,053,435	785,103,012	208,109,407	124,834,497	35,979,134	39,031,114	20,073,161	14,838,556	19,090,327	9,032,730	8,785,117	8,625,180	6,551,200
	\$5337	1,155,545,230	774,585,764	169,046,306	180,816,607	31,096,553	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	\$5339	90,802,523	46,454,889	18,760,827	7,499,722	3,361,345	3,248,847	2,552,745	1,877,423	2,617,106	1,148,184	1,378,566	1,066,811	836,057
	Total	2,526,401,188	1,606,143,665	395,916,540	313,150,826	70,437,032	42,279,960	22,625,906	16,715,979	21,707,433	10,180,914	10,163,683	9,691,992	7,387,256

Notes:

Estimates based on Final FY2019-20 FTA Apportionments, less any funds apportioned to small UZAs via the small transit-intensive cities (STIC) incentive program. Estimates also assume that each UZA will maintain its relative share of the national apportionment totals in the next surface transportation authorization. FY2020-21 escalated by 3% over FY2019-20 amounts and remaining years escalated 2% over prior year, consistent with Plan Bay Area 2050.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 6a: Regional Bus/Van Pricelist FY2020-21**

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal/MTC	Local	FederalMTC %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	71,000	56,800	14,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	101,000	80,800	20,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	114,000	91,200	22,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	131,000	104,800	26,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	114,000	91,200	22,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	161,000	128,800	32,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	214,000	171,200	42,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	523,000	418,400	104,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	597,000	477,600	119,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	782,000	625,600	156,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Battery	900,000	720,000	180,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	578,000	462,400	115,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	686,000	548,800	137,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	835,000	668,000	167,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Battery	912,000	729,600	182,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	554,000	443,200	110,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	611,000	488,800	122,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	847,000	677,600	169,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Battery	1,088,000	870,400	217,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Fuel-Cell	1,218,000	974,400	243,600	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	659,000	527,200	131,800	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' CNG	866,000	692,800	173,200	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Battery	1,145,000	916,000	229,000	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Diesel	888,000	710,400	177,600	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	1,265,000	1,012,000	253,000	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Battery	1,363,000	1,090,400	272,600	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Fuel-Cell	1,543,000	1,234,400	308,600	80%	20%
Double-Decker Diesel	1,049,000	839,200	209,800	80%	20%

Notes:

- Prices escalated 1.887% over FY2019-20 Pricelist Survey responses, rounded to the nearest \$1,000. If survey responses were not available for a given Vehicle Type, the adopted FY20 Pricelist Total was used as the baseline.
- For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to the total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).
- For vehicle procurements over 20, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 6b: Regional Bus/Van Pricelist FY2020-21**

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal/MTC	Local	FederalMTC %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	72,000	57,600	14,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	103,000	82,400	20,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	116,000	92,800	23,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	133,000	106,400	26,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	116,000	92,800	23,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	164,000	131,200	32,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	218,000	174,400	43,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	533,000	426,400	106,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	608,000	486,400	121,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	797,000	637,600	159,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Battery	917,000	733,600	183,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	589,000	471,200	117,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	699,000	559,200	139,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	851,000	680,800	170,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Battery	929,000	743,200	185,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	564,000	451,200	112,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	623,000	498,400	124,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	863,000	690,400	172,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Battery	1,109,000	887,200	221,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Fuel-Cell	1,241,000	992,800	248,200	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	671,000	536,800	134,200	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' CNG	882,000	705,600	176,400	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Battery	1,167,000	933,600	233,400	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Diesel	905,000	724,000	181,000	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	1,289,000	1,031,200	257,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Battery	1,389,000	1,111,200	277,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Fuel-Cell	1,572,000	1,257,600	314,400	80%	20%
Double-Decker Diesel	1,069,000	855,200	213,800	80%	20%

Notes:

- Prices escalated 1.887% over FY2020-21 Pricelist Survey responses, rounded to the nearest \$1,000. If survey responses were not available for a given Vehicle Type, the adopted FY20 Pricelist Total was used as the baseline.
- For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to the total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).
- For vehicle procurements over 20, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 6c: Regional Bus/Van Pricelist FY2022-23**

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal/MTC	Local	FederalMTC %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	73,000	58,400	14,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	105,000	84,000	21,000	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	118,000	94,400	23,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	136,000	108,800	27,200	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	118,000	94,400	23,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	167,000	133,600	33,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	222,000	177,600	44,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	543,000	434,400	108,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	619,000	495,200	123,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	812,000	649,600	162,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Battery	934,000	747,200	186,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	600,000	480,000	120,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	712,000	569,600	142,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	867,000	693,600	173,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Battery	947,000	757,600	189,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	575,000	460,000	115,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	635,000	508,000	127,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	879,000	703,200	175,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Battery	1,130,000	904,000	226,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Fuel-Cell	1,264,000	1,011,200	252,800	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	684,000	547,200	136,800	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' CNG	899,000	719,200	179,800	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Battery	1,189,000	951,200	237,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Diesel	922,000	737,600	184,400	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	1,313,000	1,050,400	262,600	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Battery	1,415,000	1,132,000	283,000	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Fuel-Cell	1,602,000	1,281,600	320,400	80%	20%
Double-Decker Diesel	1,089,000	871,200	217,800	80%	20%

Notes:

1. Prices escalated 1.887% over FY2021-22 Pricelist Survey responses, rounded to the nearest \$1,000. If survey responses were not available for a given Vehicle Type, the adopted FY20 Pricelist Total was used as the baseline.
2. For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to the total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).
3. For vehicle procurements over 20, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 6d: Regional Bus/Van Pricelist FY2023-24**

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal/MTC	Local	FederalMTC %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	74,000	59,200	14,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	107,000	85,600	21,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	120,000	96,000	24,000	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	139,000	111,200	27,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	120,000	96,000	24,000	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	170,000	136,000	34,000	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	226,000	180,800	45,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	553,000	442,400	110,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	631,000	504,800	126,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	827,000	661,600	165,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Battery	952,000	761,600	190,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	611,000	488,800	122,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	725,000	580,000	145,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	883,000	706,400	176,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Battery	965,000	772,000	193,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	586,000	468,800	117,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	647,000	517,600	129,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	896,000	716,800	179,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Battery	1,151,000	920,800	230,200	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Fuel-Cell	1,288,000	1,030,400	257,600	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	697,000	557,600	139,400	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' CNG	916,000	732,800	183,200	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Battery	1,211,000	968,800	242,200	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Diesel	939,000	751,200	187,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	1,338,000	1,070,400	267,600	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Battery	1,442,000	1,153,600	288,400	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Fuel-Cell	1,632,000	1,305,600	326,400	80%	20%
Double-Decker Diesel	1,110,000	888,000	222,000	80%	20%

Notes:

- Prices escalated 1.887% over FY2022-23 Pricelist Survey responses, rounded to the nearest \$1,000. If survey responses were not available for a given Vehicle Type, the adopted FY20 Pricelist Total was used as the baseline.
- For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to the total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).
- For vehicle procurements over 20, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 6e: Regional Bus/Van Pricelist FY2024-25**

Vehicle Type	Total	Federal/MTC	Local	FederalMTC %	Local %
Minivan Under 22'	75,000	60,000	15,000	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Gas	109,000	87,200	21,800	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, Diesel	122,000	97,600	24,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 4 or 5-Year, CNG	142,000	113,600	28,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Gas	122,000	97,600	24,400	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, Diesel	173,000	138,400	34,600	80%	20%
Cut-Away/Van, 7-Year, CNG	230,000	184,000	46,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Diesel	563,000	450,400	112,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' CNG	643,000	514,400	128,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Hybrid	843,000	674,400	168,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 30' Battery	970,000	776,000	194,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Diesel	623,000	498,400	124,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' CNG	739,000	591,200	147,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Hybrid	900,000	720,000	180,000	80%	20%
Transit Bus 35' Battery	983,000	786,400	196,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Diesel	597,000	477,600	119,400	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' CNG	659,000	527,200	131,800	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Hybrid	913,000	730,400	182,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Battery	1,173,000	938,400	234,600	80%	20%
Transit Bus 40' Fuel-Cell	1,312,000	1,049,600	262,400	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Diesel	710,000	568,000	142,000	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' CNG	933,000	746,400	186,600	80%	20%
Over-the-Road 45' Battery	1,234,000	987,200	246,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Diesel	957,000	765,600	191,400	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Hybrid	1,363,000	1,090,400	272,600	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Battery	1,469,000	1,175,200	293,800	80%	20%
Articulated 60' Fuel-Cell	1,663,000	1,330,400	332,600	80%	20%
Double-Decker Diesel	1,131,000	904,800	226,200	80%	20%

Notes:

1. Prices escalated 1.887% over FY2023-24 Pricelist Survey responses, rounded to the nearest \$1,000. If survey responses were not available for a given Vehicle Type, the adopted FY20 Pricelist Total was used as the baseline.
2. For buses with dual-side doors, add \$50,000 to the total (\$40,000 Federal, \$10,000 Local).
3. For vehicle procurements over 20, 5% of the cost of the buses can be added to the pricelist amounts to account for soft costs.

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Program

Attachment 7: Fixed Guideway Project Caps

Operator	FY17-FY20 FG Caps	FY21-FY25 Annual FG Cap ¹	5-Year Total	Voluntary Deferrals ²	Total Available	10% Contingency Amount	Involuntary Deferrals ³
ACE	\$ 1,490,000	\$ 1,594,000	\$ 7,970,000	\$ -	\$ 7,970,000	\$ 797,000	\$ 146,190
BART	50,211,000	52,646,000	\$ 263,230,000	-	\$ 263,230,000	26,323,000	13,631,849
Caltrain	14,393,000	13,673,000	\$ 68,365,000	-	\$ 68,365,000	6,836,500	5,481,023
GGBHTD	5,108,000	5,350,000	\$ 26,750,000	-	\$ 26,750,000	2,675,000	-
SFMTA	34,026,000	32,324,000	\$ 161,620,000	4,250,000	\$ 165,870,000	16,162,000	42,312,698
VTA	8,529,000	8,103,000	\$ 40,515,000	-	\$ 40,515,000	4,051,500	-
WETA	6,642,000	6,310,000	\$ 31,550,000	11,801,652	\$ 43,351,652	3,155,000	-
Total	\$ 120,399,000	\$ 120,000,000	\$ 600,000,000	\$ 16,051,652	\$ 616,051,652	\$ 60,000,000	\$ 61,571,760

Notes:

1. FG Caps calculated based on operators share of fixed guideway capital asset rehabilitation and replacement needs through 2050, from the Plan Bay Area 2050 Transit Capital Needs Assessment. Total of all caps subject to change based on next surface transportation authorization, which will also affect operator cap amounts. Operators may include a contingency request of 10% more than their 5-year cap total to account for any additional available FG cap funding.
2. Voluntary deferrals for SFMTA and WETA available for programming any year within the 5-year period. Operator should indicate a first and second preference year for programming. All attempts will be made to meet requested programming timing.
3. The portion of FG caps that were deferred in prior years may be programmed in any year of this program if sufficient funds are available and consistent with the TCP Policy.

**FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8a: 10% ADA Operating Set-Aside Formula Shares**

Operator	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
	San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
AC Transit	35.6%											
ACE	0.0%		0.0%									
BART	12.3%		27.7%	21.1%								
Caltrain	0.0%	0.0%										
CCCTA			61.0%									
Fairfield-Suisun Transit							100.0%					
GGBHTD	1.9%											
LAVTA			11.2%							100.0%		
Marin County Transit	5.5%											
Napa VINE						19.7%			100.0%			
Petaluma Transit												65.0%
SamTrans	13.7%											
SFMTA	28.2%											
Santa Rosa CityBus					41.0%							
SolTrans						80.3%						
Sonoma County Transit					59.0%							35.0%
SMART	0.0%				0.0%							0.0%
Tri Delta Transit				78.9%								
Union City	1.0%											
Vacaville								100.0%				
WestCat	1.9%											
WETA	0.0%											
VTA		100.0%									100.0%	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Notes:

- 1) For small UZAs of Fairfield, Vacaville, and Napa, ADA Paratransit Programming is optional, as funds may be otherwise programmed for other operating expenses.
- 2) Formula based on three weighted factors: a) Operator's Annual Demand Response Expenses (45%), b) Operator's Annual Demand Response Ridership (45%), and c) Operator's Overall Annual Systemwide Ridership (10%).
- 3) To calculate funding amounts, multiply 10% of related urbanized area revenue estimate against percentages shown for operators in that urbanized area.
- 4) ACE, Caltrain, SMART, and WETA do not report Demand Response service statistics to NTD, and are therefore ineligible for an ADA Set-Aside share.
- 5) Percent shares are based on the 2018 NTD Report.

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8b: FY2020-21 ADA Operating Set-Aside Amounts

Operator	Total	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
		San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
Estimated FTA §5307 Apportionment	\$ 244,269,185	\$ 150,864,134	\$ 39,989,969	\$ 23,987,997	\$ 6,913,693	\$ 7,500,156	\$ 3,857,226	\$ 2,851,353	\$ 1,964,540	\$ 1,735,715	\$ 1,688,134	\$ 1,657,401	\$ 1,258,868
10% ADA Operations Limit	\$ 24,426,919	15,086,413	3,998,997	2,398,800	691,369	750,016	385,723	285,135	196,454	173,571	168,813	165,740	125,887
AC Transit	\$ 5,370,476	5,370,476	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACE	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BART	\$ 2,665,875	1,854,357	-	665,620	145,899	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrain	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CCCTA	\$ 1,463,931	-	-	1,463,931	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	\$ 285,135	-	-	-	-	-	-	285,135	-	-	-	-	-
GGBHTD	\$ 281,647	281,647	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAVTA	\$ 438,062	-	-	269,249	-	-	-	-	-	-	168,813	-	-
Marin County Transit	\$ 829,550	829,550	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa VINE	\$ 249,567	-	-	-	-	-	75,995	-	-	173,571	-	-	-
Petaluma Transit	\$ 81,771	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	81,771
SamTrans	\$ 2,067,289	2,067,289	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SFMTA	\$ 4,251,011	4,251,011	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa CityBus	\$ 307,171	-	-	-	-	307,171	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SolTrans	\$ 309,727	-	-	-	-	-	309,727	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	\$ 486,960	-	-	-	-	442,845	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,115
SMART	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri Delta Transit	\$ 545,470	-	-	-	545,470	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	\$ 146,627	146,627	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	\$ 196,454	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	196,454	-	-	-	-
WestCat	\$ 285,458	285,458	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WETA	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VTA	\$ 4,164,737	-	3,998,997	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	165,740	-
Total	\$ 24,426,919	\$ 15,086,413	\$ 3,998,997	\$ 2,398,800	\$ 691,369	\$ 750,016	\$ 385,723	\$ 285,135	\$ 196,454	\$ 173,571	\$ 168,813	\$ 165,740	\$ 125,887

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8c: FY2021-22 ADA Operating Set-Aside Amounts

Operator	Total	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
		San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
Estimated FTA §5307 Apportionment	\$ 249,154,569	\$ 153,881,417	\$ 40,789,769	\$ 24,467,756	\$ 7,051,967	\$ 7,650,159	\$ 3,934,371	\$ 2,908,380	\$ 2,003,830	\$ 1,770,429	\$ 1,721,897	\$ 1,690,549	\$ 1,284,045
10% ADA Operations Limit	\$ 24,915,457	15,388,142	4,078,977	2,446,776	705,197	765,016	393,437	290,838	200,383	177,043	172,190	169,055	128,405
AC Transit	\$ 5,477,885	5,477,885	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACE	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BART	\$ 2,719,193	1,891,444	-	678,933	148,817	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrain	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CCCTA	\$ 1,493,209	-	-	1,493,209	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	\$ 290,838	-	-	-	-	-	-	290,838	-	-	-	-	-
GGBHTD	\$ 287,280	287,280	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAVTA	\$ 446,823	-	-	274,634	-	-	-	-	-	-	172,190	-	-
Marin County Transit	\$ 846,141	846,141	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa VINE	\$ 254,558	-	-	-	-	-	77,515	-	-	177,043	-	-	-
Petaluma Transit	\$ 83,407	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	83,407
SamTrans	\$ 2,108,635	2,108,635	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SFMTA	\$ 4,336,031	4,336,031	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa CityBus	\$ 313,314	-	-	-	-	313,314	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SolTrans	\$ 315,922	-	-	-	-	-	315,922	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	\$ 496,699	-	-	-	-	451,702	-	-	-	-	-	-	44,998
SMART	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri Delta Transit	\$ 556,380	-	-	-	556,380	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	\$ 149,559	149,559	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	\$ 200,383	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200,383	-	-	-	-
WestCat	\$ 291,167	291,167	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WETA	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VTA	\$ 4,248,032	-	4,078,977	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	169,055	-
Total	\$ 24,915,457	\$ 15,388,142	\$ 4,078,977	\$ 2,446,776	\$ 705,197	\$ 765,016	\$ 393,437	\$ 290,838	\$ 200,383	\$ 177,043	\$ 172,190	\$ 169,055	\$ 128,405

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8d: FY2022-23 ADA Operating Set-Aside Amounts

Operator	Total	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
		San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
Estimated FTA §5307 Apportionment	\$ 254,137,661	\$ 156,959,045	\$ 41,605,564	\$ 24,957,112	\$ 7,193,006	\$ 7,803,162	\$ 4,013,058	\$ 2,966,548	\$ 2,043,907	\$ 1,805,838	\$ 1,756,335	\$ 1,724,360	\$ 1,309,726
10% ADA Operations Limit	\$ 25,413,766	15,695,905	4,160,556	2,495,711	719,301	780,316	401,306	296,655	204,391	180,584	175,633	172,436	130,973
AC Transit	\$ 5,587,443	5,587,443	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACE	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BART	\$ 2,773,577	1,929,273	-	692,511	151,793	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrain	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CCCTA	\$ 1,523,074	-	-	1,523,074	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	\$ 296,655	-	-	-	-	-	-	296,655	-	-	-	-	-
GGBHTD	\$ 293,025	293,025	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAVTA	\$ 455,760	-	-	280,126	-	-	-	-	-	-	175,633	-	-
Marin County Transit	\$ 863,064	863,064	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa VINE	\$ 259,649	-	-	-	-	-	79,066	-	-	180,584	-	-	-
Petaluma Transit	\$ 85,075	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,075
SamTrans	\$ 2,150,808	2,150,808	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SFMTA	\$ 4,422,751	4,422,751	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa CityBus	\$ 319,581	-	-	-	-	319,581	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SolTrans	\$ 322,240	-	-	-	-	-	322,240	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	\$ 506,633	-	-	-	-	460,736	-	-	-	-	-	-	45,898
SMART	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri Delta Transit	\$ 567,507	-	-	-	567,507	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	\$ 152,550	152,550	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	\$ 204,391	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	204,391	-	-	-	-
WestCat	\$ 296,991	296,991	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WETA	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VTA	\$ 4,332,992	-	4,160,556	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	172,436	-
Total	\$ 25,413,766	\$ 15,695,905	\$ 4,160,556	\$ 2,495,711	\$ 719,301	\$ 780,316	\$ 401,306	\$ 296,655	\$ 204,391	\$ 180,584	\$ 175,633	\$ 172,436	\$ 130,973

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8e: FY2023-24 ADA Operating Set-Aside Amounts

Operator	Total	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
		San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
Estimated FTA §5307 Apportionment	\$ 259,220,414	\$ 160,098,226	\$ 42,437,675	\$ 25,456,254	\$ 7,336,866	\$ 7,959,226	\$ 4,093,320	\$ 3,025,879	\$ 2,084,785	\$ 1,841,954	\$ 1,791,461	\$ 1,758,847	\$ 1,335,921
10% ADA Operations Limit	\$ 25,922,041	16,009,823	4,243,768	2,545,625	733,687	795,923	409,332	302,588	208,479	184,195	179,146	175,885	133,592
AC Transit	\$ 5,699,192	5,699,192	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACE	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BART	\$ 2,829,048	1,967,858	-	706,361	154,829	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrain	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CCCTA	\$ 1,553,535	-	-	1,553,535	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	\$ 302,588	-	-	-	-	-	-	302,588	-	-	-	-	-
GGBHTD	\$ 298,886	298,886	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAVTA	\$ 464,875	-	-	285,729	-	-	-	-	-	-	179,146	-	-
Marin County Transit	\$ 880,325	880,325	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa VINE	\$ 264,842	-	-	-	-	-	80,647	-	-	184,195	-	-	-
Petaluma Transit	\$ 86,776	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86,776
SamTrans	\$ 2,193,824	2,193,824	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SFMTA	\$ 4,511,207	4,511,207	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa CityBus	\$ 325,972	-	-	-	-	325,972	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SolTrans	\$ 328,685	-	-	-	-	-	328,685	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	\$ 516,766	-	-	-	-	469,950	-	-	-	-	-	-	46,816
SMART	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri Delta Transit	\$ 578,858	-	-	-	578,858	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	\$ 155,601	155,601	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	\$ 208,479	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	208,479	-	-	-	-
WestCat	\$ 302,930	302,930	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WETA	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VTA	\$ 4,419,652	-	4,243,768	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	175,885	-
Total	\$ 25,922,041	\$ 16,009,823	\$ 4,243,768	\$ 2,545,625	\$ 733,687	\$ 795,923	\$ 409,332	\$ 302,588	\$ 208,479	\$ 184,195	\$ 179,146	\$ 175,885	\$ 133,592

FY2020-21 through FY2024-25 Transit Capital Priorities Call for Projects
Attachment 8f: FY2024-25 ADA Operating Set-Aside Amounts

Operator	Total	Large UZAs					Small UZAs						
		San Francisco-Oakland	San Jose	Concord	Antioch	Santa Rosa	Vallejo	Fairfield	Vacaville	Napa	Livermore	Gilroy-MH	Petaluma
Estimated FTA §5307 Apportionment	\$ 264,404,822	\$ 163,300,190	\$ 43,286,429	\$ 25,965,379	\$ 7,483,603	\$ 8,118,410	\$ 4,175,186	\$ 3,086,396	\$ 2,126,481	\$ 1,878,794	\$ 1,827,290	\$ 1,794,024	\$ 1,362,639
10% ADA Operations Limit	\$ 26,440,482	16,330,019	4,328,643	2,596,538	748,360	811,841	417,519	308,640	212,648	187,879	182,729	179,402	136,264
AC Transit	\$ 5,813,175	5,813,175	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACE	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
BART	\$ 2,885,629	2,007,215	-	720,489	157,926	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Caltrain	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
CCCTA	\$ 1,584,606	-	-	1,584,606	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Fairfield-Suisun Transit	\$ 308,640	-	-	-	-	-	-	308,640	-	-	-	-	-
GGBHTD	\$ 304,864	304,864	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
LAVTA	\$ 474,173	-	-	291,444	-	-	-	-	-	-	182,729	-	-
Marin County Transit	\$ 897,931	897,931	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Napa VINE	\$ 270,139	-	-	-	-	-	82,260	-	-	187,879	-	-	-
Petaluma Transit	\$ 88,512	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,512
SamTrans	\$ 2,237,700	2,237,700	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SFMTA	\$ 4,601,431	4,601,431	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Santa Rosa CityBus	\$ 332,492	-	-	-	-	332,492	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
SolTrans	\$ 335,259	-	-	-	-	-	335,259	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sonoma County Transit	\$ 527,101	-	-	-	-	479,349	-	-	-	-	-	-	47,752
SMART	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tri Delta Transit	\$ 590,435	-	-	-	590,435	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Union City	\$ 158,713	158,713	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vacaville	\$ 212,648	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	212,648	-	-	-	-
WestCat	\$ 308,989	308,989	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
WETA	\$ -	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
VTA	\$ 4,508,045	-	4,328,643	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	179,402	-
Total	\$ 26,440,482	\$ 16,330,019	\$ 4,328,643	\$ 2,596,538	\$ 748,360	\$ 811,841	\$ 417,519	\$ 308,640	\$ 212,648	\$ 187,879	\$ 182,729	\$ 179,402	\$ 136,264