

**APPENDIX I:**  
**MTC Guidance**

**GUIDANCE FOR CONSISTENCY OF  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS  
WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

Metropolitan Transportation Commission

June 2007

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 2 of 12

## **GUIDANCE FOR CONSISTENCY OF CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS WITH THE REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN**

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	3
A. Purpose Of This Guidance .....	3
B. Legislative Requirement for Congestion Management Programs .....	3
C. The Role of CMPs in the Metropolitan Planning Process .....	4
<b>II. MTC's ROLE and RESPONSIBILITIES</b> .....	4
A. MTC's Responsibilities regarding CMPs.....	4
B. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).....	5
C. Consistency Findings .....	6
1) Goals and objectives established in the RTP.....	6
2) Consistency of the system definition with adjoining counties. ....	7
3) Consistency with pertinent Air Quality Plans, as incorporated in the RTP. ..	8
4) Consistency with the MTC Travel Demand Modeling Databases and Methodologies.....	8
5) RTP Financial Requirements and Projections. ....	9
D. Consistency and Compatibility of the Programs within the Region.....	9
E. Incorporation of the CMP Projects into the RTIP .....	9
<b>III. CMP PREPARATION AND SUBMITTAL TO MTC</b> .....	11
A. CMP Preparation.....	11
B. Regional Coordination.....	11
C. Submittal to MTC .....	11
D. MTC Consistency Findings for CMPs.....	11
<b>APPENDICES (Attachment B to MTC Resolution No. 3000)</b>	
APPENDIX A	Federal and State Transportation Control Measures
APPENDIX B	Checklist for Modeling Consistency for CMPs
APPENDIX C	MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects (MTC Res. No. 3434)
APPENDIX D	MTC's Res. No. 3434 TOD Policy

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 3 of 12

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

### **A. Purpose Of This Guidance**

The Congestion Management Program (CMP) statutes establish specific requirements for the content and development process for CMPs, for the relationship between CMPs and the metropolitan planning process, for CMA monitoring and other responsibilities, and for the responsibilities of MTC as the regional transportation agency. CMPs are not required in a county if a majority of local governments and the Board of Supervisors adopt resolutions electing to be exempt from this requirement (AB 2419 (Bowler) Chapter 293, Statutes of 1996). This Guidance is for those counties that prepare a CMP in accordance with state statutes. For counties that opt out of preparing a CMP, MTC will directly work with the appropriate county agencies to establish project priorities for funding.

CMP statutes also specify particular responsibilities involving CMPs for the regional transportation agency, in the Bay Area, MTC. These responsibilities include review of the consistency of the CMPs with the RTP, evaluation of the consistency and compatibility of the CMPs in the Bay Area, and inclusion of the CMP projects in the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP).

The purpose of this guidance is to focus on the relationship of the CMPs to the regional planning process and MTC's role in determining consistency of CMPs with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP).

### **B. Legislative Requirement for Congestion Management Programs**

Congestion Management Programs were established as part of a bi-partisan legislative package in 1989, and approved by the voters in 1990. This legislation also increased transportation revenues and changed state transportation planning and programming processes. The specific CMP provisions were originally chartered by the Katz-Kopp-Baker-Campbell Transportation Blueprint for the Twenty-First Century AB 471 (Katz); (Chapter 106, Statutes 1989) and AB 471 (Katz) (Chapter 106, Statutes of 1989). They were revised by AB 1791 (Katz) (Chapter 16, Statutes of 1990), AB 3093 (Katz) (Chapter 2.6, Statutes of 1992), AB 1963 (Katz) (Chapter 1146, Statutes of 1994), AB 2419 (Bowler) (Chapter 293, Statutes of 1996), AB 1706 (Chapter 597, Statutes of 2001), and SB 1636 (Figueroa)(Chapter 505, Section 4, Statutes of 2002), which defines and incorporates "infill opportunity zones".

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 4 of 12

CMP statutes establish requirements for local jurisdictions to receive certain gas tax subvention funds. Additionally, CMPs play a role in the development of specific project proposals for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program.

### **C. The Role of CMPs in the Metropolitan Planning Process**

CMPs play a role in the countywide and regional transportation planning processes:

- CMPs can identify specific near term projects to implement the longer-range vision established in a countywide plan.
- Through CMPs, the transportation investment priorities of the multiple jurisdictions in each county can be addressed in a countywide context.
- CMPs establish a link between local land use decision making and the transportation planning process.
- CMPs are a building block for the federally required Congestion Management System.

## **II. MTC's ROLE and RESPONSIBILITIES**

### **A. MTC's Responsibilities regarding CMPs**

MTC's direct responsibilities under CMP statutes are concentrated in the following provisions:

*“The regional agency shall evaluate the consistency between the program (i.e., the CMP) and the regional transportation plans required pursuant to Section 65080. In the case of a multicounty regional transportation planning agency, that agency shall evaluate the consistency and compatibility of the programs within the region. (Section 65089.2 (a))*

*The regional agency, upon finding that the program is consistent, shall incorporate the program into the regional transportation improvement program as provided for in Section 65082. If the regional agency finds the program is inconsistent, it may exclude any project in the congestion management program from inclusion in the regional transportation improvement program. (Section 65089.2(b))*

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 5 of 12

*It is the intent of the Legislature that the regional agency, when its boundaries include areas in more than one county, should resolve inconsistencies and mediate disputes which arise between agencies related to congestion management programs adopted for those areas.”* Section 65089.2.(d)(1))

## **B. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

Federal transportation statutes require that the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), in partnership with the State and local agencies, develop and periodically update a long-range Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), and a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which implements the RTP by programming federal funds to transportation projects contained in the RTP. The RTP is the principal regional transportation policy and planning document for the region, and covers a 25-year period, as mandated by federal statutes. The CMA may submit project proposals for consideration by MTC in developing future financially constrained RTPs. Legal requirements for the RTP are established by State law (Gov. Code Section 66500 *et seq.*, & Gov. Code Section 65080) and Federal law, as established in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (TEA-21) (P.L. 105-178, 6-98) and Metropolitan Planning Regulations (23, U.S.C., Sec. 134 *et. Seq.*).

Under State law, the three elements of the RTP are:

- The **Policy Element**, which identifies the Commission’s goals, policies and objectives.
- The **Financial Element**, which projects the operating and maintenance costs for the existing transportation system, and estimates reasonably assumed revenues for transportation over the next 25 years. Twenty five year revenue estimates are developed for each Bay Area county.
- The **Action Element**, which outlines a financially constrained investment strategy for the continued maintenance and operation of the MTS, and defines certain strategic expansions for the system. The region’s investment is specified for each county.

Under federal metropolitan planning requirements, the RTP must be continuous, cooperative and comprehensive, and must consider the eight SAFETEA transportation factors, Management Systems, federal and State air quality requirements, and the Americans with Disabilities Act. SAFETEA requires the

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 6 of 12

consideration of additional issues and programs, including job access programs and consistency with the Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) national architecture. The RTP elements shall address the following modes of travel: highway, mass transportation, bicycle, pedestrian, goods movement, railroad, maritime, and aviation.

### **C. Consistency Findings**

MTC's findings for the consistency of CMPs focus on five areas:

- Goals and objectives established in the RTP,
- Consistency of the system definition with adjoining counties,
- Consistency with federal and state air quality plans,
- Consistency with the MTC travel demand modeling database and methodologies; and
- RTP financial assumptions.

#### **1) Goals and objectives established in the RTP**

The RTP includes the following goals; objectives, current efforts and key measures of progress are included in MTC's Transportation 2030 Plan:

- Safety - Improve safety for system users  
Ensuring the safety of travelers is a priority for all governmental agencies engaged in transportation, whether the trip is by car, transit, bike or walking. Protecting transportation facilities from terrorism is also a new safety area for federal, state and local law enforcement officials and requires the cooperation of all major Bay Area transportation agencies.
- Reliability – A Reliable Commute  
Travelers will benefit by having an expanded range of choices for making trips based on their personal requirements for travel time, cost, convenience and reliability. In addition to expanded choices, traffic management and operations strategies, increased use of new technologies, improved connections, and greater information and predictability of trip time provide important benefits to travelers.
- Access to Mobility  
MTC must consider the needs of all travelers in order to determine equitable distribution of mobility benefits. Removing barriers to mobility for older adults, the disabled, low-income persons and school children is a

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 7 of 12

shared responsibility among many organizations, including transportation and social service agencies.

- Livable Communities – A Region of Vibrant Neighborhoods  
Transportation and land-use decisions affect regional land use patterns as well as opportunities within communities for biking, walking or using transit. MTC supports more development around major transit lines and in other infill locations within the urban core to increase regional housing stock and improve transportation options, especially through incentives to local jurisdictions.
- Clean Air – Clearing the Skies  
The federal and state governments have set standards to maintain healthy air – certain types of transportation investments can help reduce the number of vehicle trips and lower emissions through more efficient traffic flows on freeways and local streets. New challenges include reducing small particulate matter and further collaboration with the Central Valley.
- Efficient Freight Travel – Moving Goods to Market  
Innovation in intermodalism has transformed the movement of freight, but ultimately the region’s major freight corridors will need expansion. Key issues to be addressed include congestion on vital routes, trip time reliability both within the region and into /out of the region, and the cost of moving freight.

#### Regional Transit Expansion Program

The Regional Transit Expansion Program – adopted by the Commission as Resolution 3434 –calls for a nearly \$12 billion investment in new rail and bus projects that will improve mobility and enhance connectivity for residents throughout the Bay Area. MTC has adopted a Transportation and Land Use Platform that calls for supportive land use plans and policies to support transit extensions in Res. 3434. Further, MTC has adopted a Transit Oriented Development Policy, as part of Res. 3434, that established specific housing thresholds for these extensions, station area plans and corridor working groups . These regional policies and specific projects within the county should be recognized in the CMP (attached as Appendix C and Appendix D).

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 8 of 12

## **2) Consistency of the system definition with adjoining counties**

The CMP statutes require that the CMA designate a system of highways and roadways which shall be subject to the CMP requirements. Consistency requires the regional continuity of the CMP designated system for facilities that cross county borders.

### **Infill Opportunity Zones**

Cities and counties may designate “Infill Opportunity Zones” in order to support development of infill housing and mixed use developments in proximity to transit (SB 1636 (Figueroa)(Chapter 505, Section 4, Statutes of 2002). Traffic Level of Service (LOS) standards shall not apply to the streets and highways within an infill opportunity zone. Rather, an alternative level of service standard, multimodal composite, or personal level of service standard may be used, or a list of flexible level of service mitigation options, including transit, pedestrian and other infrastructure, may be approved. Infill opportunity zones may serve as a valuable tool as the CMAs continue to work to connect land use and transportation planning. MTC encourages the exchange of information between the CMAs regarding approaches to alternative levels of service.

## **3) Consistency with pertinent Air Quality Plans, as incorporated in the RTP**

The RTP incorporates Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) contained in the federal and state air quality plans to achieve and maintain the respective standards for ozone and carbon monoxide. The statutes require that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) of the CMP conform to transportation related vehicle emission air quality mitigation measures. CMPs should promote the region's adopted transportation control measures (TCMs) for the Federal and State Clean Air Plans.

- A reference to the lists of federal and state TCMs is provided in Attachment B, Appendix A. The lists may be updated from time to time to reflect changes in the list of TCMs.
- In particular, TCMs that require local implementation should be identified in the CMP, specifically in the CIP. If needed MTC will indicate TCMs that need to be emphasized to help achieve federal and state air quality standards.

## **4) Consistency with the MTC Travel Demand Modeling Databases and Methodologies**

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 9 of 12

***The agency, (i.e., the CMA) in consultation with the regional agency, cities, and the county, shall develop a uniform data base on traffic impacts for use in a countywide transportation computer model . . . The computer models shall be consistent with the modeling methodology adopted by the regional planning agency. The data bases used in the models shall be consistent with the data bases used by the regional planning agency. Where the regional agency has jurisdiction over two or more counties, the data bases used by the agency shall be consistent with the data bases used by the regional agency.*** (Section 65089 (c))

MTC desires the development of highly consistent travel demand models, with coordinated regional and subregional models and shared databases, to provide a common foundation for transportation policy and investment analysis.

The Modeling Coordination Working Group of the Bay Area Partnership serves as a forum for sharing data and expertise, and providing peer review for issues involving the models developed by or for the CMAs, MTC, and other parties.

The Modeling Coordination Working Group of the Partnership reports to the Partnership Technical Advisory Committee. The MTC Checklist for Modeling will be used to guide the consistency assessment of CMA models with the MTC model.

The Checklist is included in Attachment B, and addresses:

- Demographic/econometric forecasts
- Pricing assumptions
- Network assumptions
- Auto ownership assumptions
- Trip generation methodology
- Trip distribution methodology
- Mode choice methodology
- Traffic assignment methodologies

##### **5) RTP Financial Requirements and Projections**

Under the federal Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA), the actions, programs and projects in the RTP must be financially deliverable within reasonable estimates of public and private resources.

While CMPs are not required by legislation to be financially constrained, recognition

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 10 of 12

of financial constraints, including the costs for maintaining, rehabilitating, and operating the existing multi-modal system and the status of specific major projects, will strengthen the consistency and linkage between the regional planning process and the CMP.

#### **D. Consistency and Compatibility of the Programs within the Region**

The CMP statutes require that, in the case of a multi-county regional transportation agency, that agency shall evaluate the consistency and compatibility of the congestion management programs within the region. Further, it is the Legislature's stated intention that the regional agency (i.e., MTC in the San Francisco Bay Area) resolve inconsistencies and mediate disputes between congestion management programs within a region.

To the extent useful and necessary, MTC will identify differences in methodologies and approaches between the CMPs on such issues as performance measures and land use impacts.

#### **E. Incorporation of the CMP Projects into the RTIP**

State transportation statutes require that the MTC, in partnership with the State and local agencies, develop the Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) on a biennial cycle. The RTIP is the regional proposal for State and federal funding, adopted by MTC and provided to the California Transportation Commission (CTC) for the development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). In 1997, SB 45 (Statutes 1997, Chapter 622) significantly revised State transportation funding policies, delegating project selection and delivery responsibilities for a major portion of funding to regions and counties. Subsequent changes to state law (AB 2928 – Statutes 2000, Chapter 91) made the RTIP a five-year proposal of specific projects, developed for specific fund sources and programs. The RTIP is required to be consistent with the RTP, which is currently in effect. The RTP is revised periodically.

The CMP statutes establish a direct linkage between CMPs that have been found to be consistent with the RTP, and the RTIP. MTC will review the projects in the CIP for consistency with the RTP. MTC's consistency findings for projects in the CMPs will be limited to those projects that are included in the RTP, and do not extend to other projects that may be included in the CMP. Some projects may be found consistent with a program category in the RTP. MTC, upon finding that the CMP is consistent

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 11 of 12

with the RTP, shall incorporate the program into the RTIP, subject to specific programming and funding requirements. If MTC finds the program inconsistent, it may exclude any project in the program from inclusion in the RTIP. Since the RTIP must be consistent with the RTP, projects that are not consistent with the RTP will not be included in the RTIP. MTC may include certain projects or programs in the RTIP which are not in a CIP, but which are in the RTP. In addition, SB 45 requires projects included in the Interregional Transportation Improvement Program (ITIP) to be consistent with the RTP.

MTC will establish funding targets for specific funds, based upon the fund estimate as adopted by the California Transportation Commission (CTC). Project proposals can only be included in the RTIP within these funding bid targets. MTC will also provide information on other relevant RTIP processes and requirements, including coordination between city, county, and transit districts for project applications, schedule, evaluations and recommendations of project submittals, as appropriate for the RTIP.

### **III. CMP PREPARATION AND SUBMITTAL TO MTC**

#### **A. CMP Preparation**

If prepared, the CMP shall be developed by the CMA in consultation with, and with the cooperation of, MTC, transportation providers, local governments, Caltrans, and the BAAQMD, and adopted at a noticed public hearing of the CMA. As established in SB 45, the RTIP is scheduled to be adopted by December 15 of each odd numbered year. If circumstances arise that change this schedule, MTC will work with the CMAs and substitute agencies in determining an appropriate schedule and mechanism to provide input to the RTIP.

#### **B. Regional Coordination**

In addition to program development and coordination at the county level, and consistency with the RTP, the compatibility of the CMPs with other Bay Area CMPs would be enhanced through identification of cross county issues in an appropriate forum, such as Partnership and other appropriate policy and technical committees. Discussions would be most beneficial if done prior to final CMA actions on the CMP.

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC  
Revised: 06/13/03-POC

Attachment A  
Resolution No. 3000  
page 12 of 12

### **C. Submittal to MTC**

To provide adequate review time, draft CMPs should be submitted to MTC in accordance to a schedule MTC will develop to allow sufficient time for incorporation into the RTIP for submittal to the California Transportation Commission. Final CMPs must be adopted prior to final MTC consistency findings.

### **D. MTC Consistency Findings for CMPs**

MTC will evaluate consistency of the CMP every two years with the RTP that is in effect when the CMP is submitted. MTC will evaluate the consistency of draft CMPs when received, based upon the areas specified in this guidance, and will provide staff comments of any significant concerns. MTC can only make final consistency findings on CMPs that have been officially adopted.

## **Appendix A: Federal and State Transportation Control Measures (TCMs)**

### **Federal TCMs:**

For a list and description of current Federal TCMs, see the “Federal Ozone Attainment Plan for the 1-Hour National Ozone Standard” adopted Oct. 24, 2001, and “2004 Revision to the California State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide, Updated Maintenance Plan for Ten Federal Planning Areas,” approved January 30, 2006.

### **State TCMs:**

For a list and description of current State TCMs, see “Bay Area 2005 Ozone Strategy,” or subsequent revisions as adopted by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

## **Appendix B: MTC Checklist for Modeling Consistency for CMPs**

### **Overall approach**

MTC's goal is to establish a regionally consistent model "set" for application by MTC and the CMAs. The Partnership has finalized a report on modeling consistency issues recommending MTC develop and the CMAs incorporate a consistent set of model components on desktop computers (termed BAYCAST). For immediate use for the 2007 CMPs, the study recommended that the current Checklist format be utilized, and proposed specific tolerances. This revised Checklist incorporates the results of testing those specific tolerances, as well as additional analyses.

### **Checklist**

This Checklist guides the CMAs through their model development and consistency review process by providing an inventory of specific products to be developed and submitted to MTC, and by describing standard practices and assumptions to be followed. North Bay counties are not subject to Products 3, 5, 12, and 15, although the assumptions used should be described.

Because of the complexity of the topic, the Checklist may need additional detailed information to explain differences in methodological approach or data. Significant differences will be resolved between MTC and the CMA, taking advantage of the Modeling Coordination Working Group (MCWG). Standard formats for model comparisons will be developed.

### **Incremental updates**

The CMA forecasts must be updated every two years to be consistent with MTC's forecasts. Alternative approaches to fully rerunning the entire model are available, including incremental approaches through the application of factors to demographic inputs or to trip tables. Similarly, the horizon year must be the same as the TIP horizon year, however, interpolation and extrapolation approaches are acceptable, with appropriate attention to network changes. These alternatives to full re-running of the model should be reviewed with MTC.

### **Defining the MTC model sets**

Unless otherwise specified, the MTC model sets referred to below will be defined as those in use on October 1st of the year preceding the CMP update.

## **Using MTC Data for Key Assumptions**

Key "bundles of assumptions" are needed for developing travel forecasts. These include Pricing Assumptions, Demographic Assumptions, Travel Behavior Assumptions, and Highway and Transit Network Assumptions.

### **A. Discuss the General Approach to Travel Demand Modeling by the CMA**

Describe the model, and its relationship to the MTC model. If the model is based on MTC's model, describe any adjustments to model constants, coefficients, k-factor or friction factor re-estimation, market segmentation, and trip purposes.

**PRODUCT 1:** Description of the above.

### **B. Demographic/Economic/Land Use Forecasts:**

Use exact ABAG Projections 2005 or Projections 2007 (preferred) for other Bay Area counties, and control totals (within 1 percent) for the county for population, households, jobs and employed residents. CMAs may reallocate growth forecasts within their own county in consultation with cities, MTC and ABAG. The latest set of ABAG's Projections must be used for all new demographic databases developed for baseline travel demand forecasting purposes after August 1 of the year preceding the CMP update. Future year forecasts should address the latest available ABAG Projection series. MTC, in consultation with the MCWG, will develop factors that may be used to achieve consistency with the most recent ABAG demographics. CMAs may also, of course, analyze alternative land use scenarios in addition to these forecasts. If a land use based model is utilized, production and attraction comparisons will be made with the MTC model.

**PRODUCT 2:** Summary sheet comparing ABAG Projections economic and demographic data (using the most current series) and CMP input data for population, households, jobs and employed residents for the 9 Bay Area counties for the base and forecast years (the year for comparison to the appropriate TIP must be included), and a statement establishing that the differences between the ABAG variables and those of the CMA input file do not exceed 1 percent at the county level for the subject county, and that no differences exist for the other 8 counties for a base case scenario.

### **C. Pricing Assumptions:**

Use MTC's auto operating costs, transit fares, and bridge tolls.

**PRODUCT 3:** Statements establishing satisfaction of the above.

**D. Network Assumptions:**

Use MTC's regional highway and transit network assumptions for the other Bay Area counties. CMAs should include more detailed network definition relevant to their own county in addition to the regional highway and transit networks. For the CMP horizon year, to be compared with the TIP interim year, regionally significant network changes in the base case scenario shall be limited to the current Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for projects subject to inclusion in the TIP.

**PRODUCT 4:** Statement establishing satisfaction of the above.

**E. Auto Ownership Assumptions:**

Use MTC auto ownership models or forecasts, or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment.

**PRODUCT 5:** County and district level table(s) showing households by vehicle ownership level (0, 1, 2+ vehicle/household), and autos per household summaries at county and district levels, or autos per worker and total autos by district, and other pertinent auto ownership data if more appropriate. (Note that the term "district" used in these Guidelines may be interpreted as either MTC superdistricts or CMA defined districts.)

**F. Trip Generation:**

Use the BAYCAST person trip generation models for home-based work and non-work, and non-home based trips, or submit alternative models to MTC for review and comment. Results may be adjusted sub-regionally through calibration or modal constant adjustments.

**PRODUCTS:** 6) County and district level table(s) summarizing trip productions and trip attractions out of the trip generation model. Differences in trip productions and attractions for total person trips and for home based work trips should be no greater than 1% or 10,000 trips, whichever is higher, for comparisons for the subject county, each other county, and overall for the region or study area. For North Bay counties, figures are to be within 10% deviation for daily home based vehicle trips, using conversion factors as appropriate. Base year comparisons should be made with the Census data when available and appropriate.

7) Trip rate analysis, including home-based work trips per employed resident, home-based non-work trips per household, and non-home-based trips per total job.

8) Description of sub-regional adjustment factors, if any.

**G. Trip Distribution:**

Work trip distribution models must be calibrated to the 2000 Census Journey-to-Work commuter matrices. Trip distribution results must be balanced to productions, and attraction balancing problems should be discussed with MTC.

MTC, in consultation with the MCWG, will develop factors that may be used to achieve consistency with the most recent MTC trip distribution tables.

**PRODUCTS:** 9) County and district level table(s) showing attraction balancing analysis, i.e., comparison of “modeled” attractions from the trip distribution model to “desired” attractions from the trip generation (trip attraction) models.

10) County-to-county level trip tables. Differences in trip productions and attractions for total person trips and for home based work trips from and to the subject county should be no greater than 5% or 10,000 trips, whichever is higher, for comparisons for the subject county, interactions with each other county, and overall for the regional interaction with the subject county. For rural counties, CMAs should develop appropriate comparisons to MTC’s model system, in consultation with MTC, using conversion factors as appropriate. Base year comparisons should be made with the Census data when available and appropriate.

11) District-to-district level trip tables for intra-county trips.

All trip distribution analyses are to be stratified by trip purpose.

#### **H. Mode Choice:**

If a logit mode choice model is to be used, MTC’s BAYCAST models should be used, or submit alternative methodology for MTC review.

**PRODUCTS:** 12) County-to-county and district-to-district (intra-county) level table(s) showing mode choice forecasts by trip purpose and travel mode. There is no need to document the county-to-county mode choice forecasts for trips that do not start, end, or pass through the particular county of interest.

13) Vehicle trip tables, county-to-county and intra-county district-to-district, stratified by trip purpose.

Differences in trips for drive alone for total daily person trips and for home based work trips from and to the subject county should be no greater than 10% or 10,000 trips, whichever is higher, for each county interaction, and overall for the region/study area. For North Bay counties, conversion factors may be needed.

Differences in trips for transit, shared ride 3+, and shared ride 2 for total person trips and for home based work trips from and to the subject county - should be no greater than 10,000 trips for each county interaction, and 10% overall for the region/study area.

Base year comparisons should be made with the Census data when available and appropriate.

## **I. Traffic Assignment**

Use capacity restrained assignment for peak hour or peak period traffic assignments, or submit alternative methodology for MTC review.

**PRODUCTS:** 14) Description of trip assignment methodology for daily and/or peak hour (period) assignment for both transit and highway.

15) Description of peaking factors and vehicle occupancy assumptions utilized.

Alternatively, CMAs may elect to utilize MTC zone-to-zone person/vehicle trip tables, adding network and zonal details within the county as appropriate, and then re-run the assignment. In this case, only Products 14 and 15 are applicable if vehicle trip tables are utilized, and additionally Products 12 and 13 if person trip tables are utilized.

## **Appendix C: MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects (MTC Resolution 3434)**

Note that Res. No. 3434, revised, is reproduced below with the TOD Policy attached; other associated appendices are not attached here – the other appendices are available upon request from the MTC library.

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

### ABSTRACT

Resolution No. 3434, Revised

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

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

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

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

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

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

RE: Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RESOLUTION NO. 3434, Revised

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

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, local, regional, state and federal discretionary funds will continue to be required to finance an integrated program of new rail transit starts and extensions including those funds which are reasonably expected to be available under current conditions, and new funds

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

which need to be secured in the future through advocacy with state and federal legislatures and the electorate; and

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

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

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

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

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

METROPOLITAN TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

---

Sharon J. Brown, Chair

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

**Appendix D: MTC's Regional Transit Expansion Program of Projects (MTC Res. No. 3434)  
TOD POLICY FOR REGIONAL TRANSIT EXPANSION PROJECTS**

Date: July 27, 2005  
W.I.: 12110  
Referred by: POC

Attachment D-2  
Resolution No. 3434  
Page 3 of 7

**1. Purpose**

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

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

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

There are three key elements of the regional TOD policy:

- (a) Corridor-level thresholds to quantify appropriate minimum levels of development around transit stations along new corridors;
- (b) Local station area plans that address future land use changes, station access needs, circulation improvements, pedestrian-friendly design, and other key features in a transit-oriented development; and

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

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

## 2. TOD Policy Application

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

**TABLE 1  
Resolution 3434 Transit Extension Projects Subject to Corridor Thresholds**

Project	Sponsor	Type	Threshold is met with current development?
BART East Contra Costa Rail Extension	BART/CCTA	Commuter Rail	No
BART – Downtown Fremont to San Jose / Santa Clara  (a) Fremont to Warm Springs (b) Warm Springs to San Jose/Santa Clara	(a) BART (b) VTA	BART extension	No
AC Transit Berkeley/Oakland/San Leandro Bus Rapid Transit: Phase 1	AC Transit	Bus Rapid Transit	Yes
Caltrain Downtown Extension/Rebuilt Transbay Terminal	TJPA	Commuter Rail	Yes
MUNI Third Street LRT Project Phase 2 – New Central Subway	MUNI	Light Rail	Yes
Sonoma-Marin Rail	SMART	Commuter Rail	No
Dumbarton Rail	SMTA, ACCMA, VTA, ACTIA, Capitol Corridor	Commuter Rail	No
Expanded Ferry Service Phase 1: Berkeley, Alameda/Oakland/Harbor Bay, and South San Francisco to SF ( <i>Note 1</i> )	WTA	Ferry	No
Expanded Ferry Service Phase 2: Alameda to South San Francisco, and Hercules, Antioch, Treasure Island, Redwood City and Richmond to SF ( <i>Note 1</i> )	WTA	Ferry	No
Note 1: The WTA Ferry Expansion "Corridor" for the purposes of the TOD policy consists of all new terminals planned in Phase 1 and Phase 2.			

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

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

### 3. Definitions and Conditions of Funding

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

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

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

### 4. Corridor-Level Thresholds

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

---

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
 W.I.: 30.5.10  
 Referred By: WPC  
 Revised: 06/11/99-W  
 Revised: 05/11/01-POC

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
 W.I.: 30.5.10  
 Referred By: WPC  
 Revised: 06/11/99-W  
 Revised: 05/11/01-POC

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

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

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

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

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

- An existing end station is included as part of the transit corridor for the purposes of calculating the corridor thresholds; optional stations will not be included in calculating the corridor thresholds.
- New below-market housing units will receive a 50 percent bonus toward meeting the corridor threshold (i.e. one planned below-market housing unit counts for 1.5 housing units for the purposes of meeting the corridor threshold. Below market for the purposes of the Resolution 3434 TOD policy is affordable to 60% of area median income for rental units and 100% of area median income for owner-occupied units);
- The local jurisdictions in each corridor will determine job and housing placement, type, density, and design.
- The Corridor Working Groups are encouraged to plan for a level of housing that will significantly exceed the housing unit thresholds stated here during the planning process. This will ensure that the Housing Unit Threshold is exceeded corridor-wide and that the ridership potential from TOD is maximized.

## 5. Station Area Plans

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

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

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

- Current and proposed land use by type of use and density within the ½ mile radius, with a clear identification of the number of existing and planned housing units and jobs;
- Station access and circulation plans for motorized, non-motorized and transit access. The station area plan should clearly identify any barriers for pedestrian, bicycle and wheelchair access to the station from surrounding neighborhoods (e.g., freeways, railroad tracks, arterials with inadequate pedestrian crossings), and should propose strategies that will

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

remove these barriers and maximize the number of residents and employees that can access the station by these means. The station area and transit village public spaces shall be made accessible to persons with disabilities.

- Estimates of transit riders walking from the half mile station area to the transit station to use transit;
- Transit village design policies and standards, including mixed use developments and pedestrian-scaled block size, to promote the livability and walkability of the station area;
- TOD-oriented parking demand and parking requirements for station area land uses, including consideration of pricing and provisions for shared parking;
- Implementation plan for the station area plan, including local policies required for development per the plan, market demand for the proposed development, potential phasing of development and demand analysis for proposed development.

The Station Area Plans shall be conducted using existing TOD design guidelines that have already been developed by ABAG, local jurisdictions, transit agencies, the CMAs and others. MTC will work with ABAG to provide more specific guidance on the issues listed above that must be addressed in the station area plans and references and information to support this effort. MTC is conducting an analysis of parking policies that will be made available when complete, and shall be considered in developing local parking policies for TODs.

## 6. Corridor Working Groups

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

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

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

Date: June 25, 1997  
W.I.: 30.5.10  
Referred By: WPC  
Revised: 06/11/99-W  
Revised: 05/11/01-POC

### 7. Review of the TOD Policy

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