



METROPOLITAN  
TRANSPORTATION  
COMMISSION

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter  
101 Eighth Street  
Oakland, CA 94607-4700  
TEL 510.817.5700  
TDD/TTY 510.817.5769  
FAX 510.817.5848  
E-MAIL [info@mtc.ca.gov](mailto:info@mtc.ca.gov)  
WEB [www.mtc.ca.gov](http://www.mtc.ca.gov)

## *Memorandum*

TO: RBWG, PDWG and PTAC

DATE: November 12, 2009

FR: Sean Co

W. I.

RE: Regional Bikeway Network Program in New Act

As part of the development of the New Act STP/CMAQ program, guidelines for the Regional Bikeway Network Program are being developed. This framework will cover six years of programming subject to the reauthorization of SAFETEA-LU and the next Regional Transportation Plan. MTC staff seeks input on a few policy issues before we can finish the draft guidelines, which we will take to the Programming and Allocations Committee (PAC) for approval on December 9:

1. Formula for allocating funds among counties
2. Reconciliation of county program amounts from SAFETEA-LU
3. Flexibility for funding projects not on the Regional Bikeway Network

Please review the issues and options as outlined and provide your feedback to assist staff in developing recommendations to the Programming and Allocations Committee.

### **1. Allocation of Funds**

In the prior Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, funds for the non-competitive county program were allocated based on the population share of each county. This approach was consistent with the program's overall policy framework in the *Transportation 2030 Plan* and the program goal that a quarter of funds go to pedestrian improvements.

The Regional Bikeways Network Program is guided by the policy framework in *Transportation 2035*, and it is appropriate to review the basis for allocating funds to each county. Below are three options for allocating New Act funds: the unbuilt need from the 2009 Bicycle Plan, county population share or a hybrid of both. Table 1 shows each county's share of the cost to complete the Regional Bikeway Network and Table 2 shows the allocation of Cycle 1 funds to counties under each approach.

#### **A. Bikeway Need**

As part of the update to the 2009 Bicycle Plan, counties were asked to provide updated cost and mileage estimates of their portion of the Regional Bikeway Network. These updated project costs were the basis of the commitment in the *Transportation 2035 Plan* to complete the Regional Bikeway Network, with the exception of bicycle access over bridges. These cost estimates are the most accurate measure of the shortfall to complete the network.

This approach would allocate funds in both New Act cycles based on the shortfall to complete the Regional Bikeway Network in each county as per *Transportation 2035*. This approach is consistent with the Transportation 2035 policy framework and a performance based approach for planning likely to be reflected in the new transportation funding act. It also rewards counties for updating their individual bicycle networks to achieve connectivity within and between their jurisdictions.

### **B. County Population Share**

This approach, while consistent with past policies, would seem to reflect an assumption that the larger counties have more bicycle use or more funding need. Neither assumption is validated by available data, and neither is consistent with the commitment in the *Transportation 2035 Plan* to complete the regional network. Compared to the need based approach, some counties such as Marin would receive less funding than needed to address their share of the Regional Bikeway Network costs. Alameda, Napa, Santa Clara and Sonoma would also receive slightly less under this scenario.

### **C. Hybrid Share (25% Population and 75% Bikeway Need)**

The share of the network costs and population are generally not that different with the exception of Marin, which would receive 14% less under the population based share. Contra Costa (+10%), San Francisco (+8%) and San Mateo (+5%) would all receive more funding under a population-based approach. A hybrid of population and costs of the network would address 75% of the costs of the network in each county and even out the gains and losses by using 25% of the population share. This hybrid approach may be attractive to those CMAs that did not update their portions of the bikeway network during the Bicycle Plan update. At the same time, it would not penalize counties that did their best efforts to provide updated mileage and costs for their portions of the network. MTC staff is inclined to recommend this option.

## **2. Reconciliation from SAFETEA-LU**

The Regional Bicycle Pedestrian Program, guided by the *Transportation 2030 Plan* and funded under SAFETEA-LU, included \$32 million over six years divided up into two portions: 25% of the total funds towards a regionally competitive program (\$8 million) and the remaining 75% of the funds designated to the counties (\$24 million) based on their population share. All of these funds have been programmed. MTC Resolutions 3615, 3644 and 3625 call for all counties to receive their population share of the regional share (\$8 million) over twelve years. Due to the program's competitive nature, the mix of projects selected under the regional program resulted in over-programming to three counties by a total of \$1.8 million more than their population shares and under-programming to the remaining counties relative to their population shares. (See Table 3a)

A recommendation to PAC will be developed whether to use New Act funding for the Regional Bikeway Network Program to reconcile the over/under programming from the last program. Below are two options for proceeding with respect to this matter:

### **A. No Reconciliation**

MTC staff believes it is not necessarily appropriate to use the New Act Regional Bikeway Network Program, guided by the *Transportation 2035 Plan*, to reconcile over/under programming from the regional share of the Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program:

- The new RTP, *Transportation 2035*, and new Federal Act represent a new policy context and justify starting with a clean slate.

- Allocation by population share is not necessarily the most appropriate model for the new Regional Bikeway Network Program.
- The Commission already chose to forgo the opportunity to reconcile county amounts in the 3rd cycle Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian program in 2005.

**B. Take \$1.8 million off the top of Cycle 1 and make-up funds to the six counties underfunded in the last program.**

Reconciliation for the amount credited and debited to each county would first deduct the \$1.8 million from the total \$27 million available in Cycle 1 and use it to repay each of the six counties the amount it was under funded in the Regional Bike and Pedestrian Program. The remaining \$25.2 million would be allocated to each county by the formula adopted for the new Regional Bikeway Program. (See issue #1.) Under this approach, all counties would be made whole for their population share of the prior program; however, all counties would also see a small reduction in new program funds. The resulting amount available to each county is shown in Table 3b.

**3. Flexibility for Project Selection**

CMAs and the Commission expressed a desire to offer flexibility in programming funds for bicycle projects that are not currently listed in the Regional Bicycle Plan as part of the Regional Network. A proposal developed in cooperation with the Regional Bicycle Working Group would allow such projects to be funded, provided they meet the Regional Bikeway Network eligibility criteria. The proposed project would require the review of the county Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee and the Regional Bicycle Working Group before it is programmed by MTC. Any new projects submitted to the network will be indentified for inclusion in the next update to the Regional Bikeway Network prior to the next Regional Transportation Plan update. It is expected that Cycle 2 will be programmed after the RTP update and at that time we will decide whether to require a substitution process to constrain the network to the current cost estimates or to allow the network to grow in both mileage and costs.

**4. Schedule**

Below is a proposed schedule for development and approval of guidelines for the Regional Bikeway Network Program. The guidelines and funding recommendations would be brought to the December Programming and Allocations Committee for approval. Since FY 09/10 funds will be programmed for regional programs, the first funds for the Regional Bikeways Program would be available in FY 10/11. CMAs could program funds starting immediately after PAC approves the funding levels in either January or February, however they earliest they are able to access the funds is October 2010.

<b>STP/CMAQ Cycle 1 Regional Bikeways Network Schedule Committee Schedule</b>	
RBWG	November 19
PTAC	December 7
PDWG	December 7
PAC/Commission Approves Guidelines	December 9/16
PAC/Commission Approves County Funding Levels	January 2010
<b>Timeline for use of funds</b>	
Earliest CMAs can obligate funds	October 2010
Obligation deadline Cycle 1	April 30, 2011
Obligation deadline Cycle 2	April 30, 2012

J:\COMMITTEE\Regional Bicycle Working Group\2009 Meetings\November 19\RBN new act RBWG\_1k.doc

**Table 1: Regional Bikeway Network in T-2035**

County	Bikeway Need	
	RBN %	Costs in Bike Plan
Alameda	23%	\$233,152,000
Contra Costa	4%	\$36,546,000
Marin	18%	\$181,522,000
Napa	3%	\$25,676,000
San Francisco	3%	\$34,280,000
San Mateo	5%	\$48,257,000
Santa Clara	29%	\$289,189,000
Solano	6%	\$57,265,000
Sonoma	9%	\$94,113,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$1,000,000,000</b>

Note: Excludes bikeways on bridges  
All costs are in escalated dollars

**Table 2: Potential Allocation Approaches for New Act Programming Cycle 1 \$27 Million**

County	Bikeway Need		Population Share		75% Bikeway Network and 25% Population	
	RBN %	Funding	Population Share %	Funding	Hybrid %	Funding
Alameda	23%	\$6,295,000	21%	\$5,746,000	23%	\$6,158,000
Contra Costa	4%	\$987,000	14%	\$3,776,000	6%	\$1,684,000
Marin	18%	\$4,901,000	4%	\$984,000	15%	\$3,922,000
Napa	3%	\$693,000	2%	\$495,000	2%	\$644,000
San Francisco	3%	\$926,000	11%	\$3,091,000	5%	\$1,467,000
San Mateo	5%	\$1,303,000	10%	\$2,815,000	6%	\$1,681,000
Santa Clara	29%	\$7,808,000	25%	\$6,697,000	28%	\$7,530,000
Solano	6%	\$1,546,000	6%	\$1,570,000	6%	\$1,552,000
Sonoma	9%	\$2,541,000	7%	\$1,825,000	9%	\$2,362,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>

Note: All costs are in escalated dollars  
Population is based on Census 2000  
\$27 million includes \$7.5 million in ARRA backfill (TE) and \$19.4 million in CMAQ Cycle 1

**Table 3a: SAFETEA-LU/T-2030 Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Regional Competitive Program (\$8 million)**

County	Census 2000 population	% Population share	Programmed projects	% of total programmed	Cycle 2 by population share	Population share	Total RBPP Over/Under payment
Alameda	1,443,741	21%	\$ 1,915,000	24%	\$ 1,702,585	\$ 1,703,000	\$ 212,000
Contra Costa	948,816	14%	\$ 572,000	7%	\$ 1,118,926	\$ 1,119,000	\$ (547,000)
Marin	247,289	4%	\$ -	0%	\$ 291,625	\$ 292,000	\$ (292,000)
Napa	124,279	2%	\$ -	0%	\$ 146,561	\$ 147,000	\$ (147,000)
San Francisco	776,733	11%	\$ 1,891,000	24%	\$ 915,991	\$ 916,000	\$ 975,000
San Mateo	707,161	10%	\$ 537,000	7%	\$ 833,946	\$ 834,000	\$ (297,000)
Santa Clara	1,682,585	25%	\$ 1,565,000	20%	\$ 1,984,251	\$ 1,984,000	\$ (419,000)
Solano	394,542	6%	\$ 330,000	4%	\$ 465,278	\$ 465,000	\$ (135,000)
Sonoma	458,614	7%	\$ 1,190,000	15%	\$ 540,838	\$ 541,000	\$ 649,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,783,760</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 8,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$ 8,000,000</b>	<b>\$ 8,000,000</b>	
<b>Total under (6 counties)</b>							<b>\$ (1,837,000)</b>
<b>Total over (3 counties)</b>							<b>\$ 1,837,000</b>

**Table 3b. Reconciliation from Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (RBPP) Applied to New Act**  
**\$1.8 Million deducted from \$27 in Cycle 1**

County	Credit/Debit	Bikeway Need			Population Share			75% Bikeway Network and 25% Population		
		RBN %	Costs in Bike Plan	Total after repayment (A+C)	Population Share	Population Share Total after Costs repayment (A+C)	% Hybrid	Hybrid Costs	Total after repayment (A+C)	
	A	B	C	D	B	C	D	B	C	D
Alameda	\$ -	23%	\$5,867,000	\$5,867,000	21%	\$5,363,000	\$5,363,000	23%	\$5,747,000	\$5,747,000
Contra Costa	\$ 547,000	4%	\$920,000	\$1,467,000	14%	\$3,525,000	\$4,072,000	6%	\$1,572,000	\$2,119,000
Marin	\$ 292,000	18%	\$4,568,000	\$4,860,000	4%	\$919,000	\$1,211,000	15%	\$3,660,000	\$3,952,000
Napa	\$ 147,000	3%	\$646,000	\$793,000	2%	\$462,000	\$609,000	2%	\$601,000	\$748,000
San Francisco	\$ -	3%	\$863,000	\$863,000	11%	\$2,885,000	\$2,885,000	5%	\$1,369,000	\$1,369,000
San Mateo	\$ 297,000	5%	\$1,214,000	\$1,511,000	10%	\$2,627,000	\$2,924,000	6%	\$1,569,000	\$1,866,000
Santa Clara	\$ 419,000	29%	\$7,277,000	\$7,696,000	25%	\$6,250,000	\$6,669,000	28%	\$7,028,000	\$7,447,000
Solano	\$ 135,000	6%	\$1,441,000	\$1,576,000	6%	\$1,466,000	\$1,601,000	6%	\$1,449,000	\$1,584,000
Sonoma	\$ -	9%	\$2,368,000	\$2,368,000	7%	\$1,704,000	\$1,704,000	9%	\$2,205,000	\$2,205,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$ 1,837,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$25,200,000</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$25,200,000</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>\$25,200,000</b>	<b>\$27,000,000</b>