

DATE:	May 28, 2020
TO:	Transportation Authority of Marin Board of Commissioners
FROM:	Anne Richman, Executive Director And Richard David Chan, Programming and Legislation Manager Scott McDonald, Senior Transportation Planner
SUBJECT:	Program Cycle 3 Local Partnership Program (LPP) Formula Funds to TAM's Bellam Blvd Off-Ramp Project (Action), Agenda Item No. 6c

RECOMMENDATION

The TAM Board approves the programming of the Local Partnership Program (LPP) Cycle 3 Formula funds to the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project.

On May 11, 2020, the Funding, Programs & Legislation (FPL) Executive Committee reviewed and recommended the approval of programming Local Partnership Program (LPP) Cycle 3 Formula funds to the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project.

BACKGROUND

The Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 (SB1) is a \$5.24 billion annual transportation funding package aimed at improving the state's local roads, freeways and bridges and investing more funding toward transit and safety projects. The revenues collected to fund the SB1 Programs come from increased taxes on fuel and vehicle registration fees.

The Local Partnership Program (LPP) is one of the newly created SB1 Programs that rewards counties, cities, districts, and regional transportation agencies with voter-approved fees or taxes solely dedicated to transportation improvements. LPP is divided into two programs of funding – a Formulaic Program in which a specific amount of funding is set aside by formula for eligible recipients, and a Competitive Program whereby agencies compete for statewide funds. Both Programs of LPP are administered by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

LPP Formula funds are distributed by cycle, instead of annual allocation. Cycle 1 of LPP included funding from FY 17/18 and FY 18/19, Cycle 2 of LPP included only FY 19/20, and Cycle 3 will include funding from FY 20/21, FY 21/22, and FY 22/23. TAM received approximately \$500,000 annually for the first three years of funding but the amount will increase to approximately \$580,000 annually under Cycle 3 because of the percentage change adopted by the CTC in March 2020, which dedicates more funds to the Formula program.

TAM is an eligible recipient of the SB1 LPP Formula funds because of the voter approved Measure A/AA ¹/₂-Cent Transportation Sales Tax and \$10 Measure B Vehicle Registration Fee. Whereas, the towns, cities, and County receive annual Local Street and Road (LSR) funding from SB1, TAM receives LPP Formula funds from SB1.

For the LPP Competitive Program, eligible applicants include agencies with voter approved taxes, tolls, or fees. TAM as an eligible applicant can apply on behalf of a local jurisdiction, which, through a nomination, can be the project implementing agency. The implementing agency assumes responsibility and accountability for the use and expenditure of the funds. Nearly \$190 million is available through a highly competitive statewide solicitation during Cycle 3.

DISCUSSION/ANALYSIS

Prior Cycles of LPP Funds

In Cycle 1, the TAM Board approved the programming of LPP Formula funds in the amounts of \$500,000 to the Marin-Sonoma Narrows (MSN) Project and \$502,000 to San Rafael's Francisco Boulevard West Multi-Use Path (2nd to Andersen).

Additionally, in Cycle 1 TAM submitted competitive applications for TAM's Bellam Blvd Offramp Project, County of Marin's Sir Francis Drake Blvd Project, and TAM's Northern Segment of the North-South Greenway Project. However, these applications were not awarded funding from the LPP Competitive Program.

In Cycle 2, the TAM Board approved the programming of \$483,000 in LPP Formula funds to Novato's Downtown SMART Station Phase II project to complete the construction of the SMART station located at the corner of Grant Avenue and Railroad Avenue in downtown Novato. TAM did not submit applications for LPP Competitive Funds in Cycle 2.

Proposal on Programming Cycle 3 LPP Formula Funds

In Cycle 3, TAM will receive approximately \$1,737,000 in LPP Formula funds as shown in Attachment A. The funds must be applied to projects that can exhibit a one-to-one match of non-CTC approved funds.

Based on a thorough review of TAM's projects capable of providing a one-to-one match, the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project is being recommended for the programming of the LPP Formula Funds. The Project will be ready to proceed to construction in 2021. The completion of the Project will offer much needed improvements in San Rafael and provide relief for many residents and workers that travel along the offramp.

Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project

The safety improvements at the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp from Highway 101 will help to separate regional traffic from local traffic. Pre-COVID, daily rush hour back-ups were present in the right lane of Northbound Highway 101 with stopped traffic waiting to exit. The improvements will reduce the back-up and rear end collisions in the lane.

The primary improvements are adding a lane to the off-ramp to provide more storage. Also, the weave will be improved where the traffic exiting Highway 101 merges with the traffic exiting from eastbound I-580 by the introduction of an additional right turn lane. Vehicles exiting from Highway 101 will be directed into the left lane of the off-ramp if they wish to turn left at Bellam Boulevard, while traffic continuing on to eastbound I-580 or making a right at Bellam Boulevard will be directed to the right lane. The addition of the extra right turn lane will allow Highway 101 traffic to turn right at Bellam with the dedicated right turn lane while an optional straight/right lane next to it will reduce the lane changes required of I-580 traffic turning right at Bellam. The crosswalk in front of the post office will also be realigned to reduce the crossing time.

Cycle 3 LPP Competitive Program

TAM staff contacted Marin local jurisdictions and transit agencies in March to solicit interest in having TAM apply on behalf of their respective projects for the LPP Competitive Program. TAM initially received one request from the County of Marin to apply for the Sir Francis Drake Boulevard Project. However, based on the project's bid opening on April 23, 2020, the project schedule did not align with the LPP Competitive Program schedule. Additionally, based on reviewing the requirements of the highly competitive program, including the one-to-one match required for the construction component of projects, TAM did not identify additional projects and therefore is not recommending to apply for the LPP Competitive Program in Cycle 3.

FISCAL IMPACTS

Pending approval from the TAM Board, TAM's Proposed FY 20/21 Annual Budget includes \$1,000,000 of the LPP Formula funds programmed to the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project, while the remaining \$737,000 will be included in the FY 21/22 budget based on the estimated construction schedule.

NEXT STEPS

Upon approval from the TAM Board, staff will submit an application to CTC for the amount available in LPP Formula Funds for the Bellam Boulevard Off-Ramp Project.

ATTACHMENT

Attachment A – Cycle 3 LPP Formula Shares

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

2020 Local Partnership Formulaic Program 6c - Attachment^AA^{d: March 25, 2020} Funding Distribution

			-	1100			-	
Local Partnership Program			-	2020-21 200,000	-	21-22		022-23
Local Partnership Program Annual Appropriation						00,000	-	200,000
Set-Aside Incentive Funding						20,000	\$	20,000
Competitive Program (40%)						72,000	\$	72,000
2018 Competitive Over			\$	(2,944) (6,667)		(2,944)	\$	(2,944)
2019 Formulaic Program Incentives (\$20 Million)						<u> </u>	\$	(6,667)
Subtotal Available for Competitive Program						52,389	\$	62,389
Formulaic Program (60%)	\$	108,000	\$ 10	08,000	\$	108,000		
Proposed Annual Formulaic Funding Distribution					11	1	Î -	- C
Tolls + VRF + parcel/property tax 8.62%					\$	9.307	\$	9,307
North sales tax 25.8						27.900	\$	27,900
South sales tax 65.55						70,793	\$	70,793
				10,100	Ψ	0,755	Ψ	10,135
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Tolls, VRF, Parcel/Property Tax Revenue Revenue					20	21-22	2	022-23
(100%)								
				Funding		nding	<u> </u>	unding
Bay Area Toll Authority (RM1,RM2) (RM3 eff. 1/1/19)		\$ 428,243	\$	6,059	\$	6,059	\$	6,059
Alameda County Transportation Commission (Measure F-VRF) \$ 13,034				200	\$	200	\$	200
Transportation Authority Marin County (Measure B-VRF) \$ 2,386				200	\$	200	\$	200
City and County of San Francisco (Prop. D)		\$ 32,000	\$	453	\$	453	\$	453
San Francisco County Transportation Authority (Prop AA-VRF)		\$ 4,956	\$		\$	200	\$	200
City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (Measure M-VRF)		\$ 7,471 \$ 16,545	\$	200	\$	200	\$	200
				234	\$ -	234	\$	234
Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District (Parcel Tax)				417	\$	417	\$	417
Bay Area Rapid Transit District (Parcel Tax)			\$	944 200	\$	944	\$	944
Yuba County Depletion Surcharge-Measure D (Parcel Tax)			\$		\$	200	\$	200
	T-4-1-		\$		\$	200	\$	200
	IOTAIS	\$ 602,640	\$	9,307	\$	9,307	\$	9,307
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - North				2020-21	202	21-22	2	022-23
County (Agonov)	Revenue	Population			E	a al lun au	-	
County (Agency)	(25%)	(75%)	F	Funding	Fur	nding	FL	unding
Alameda (Alameda County Transportation Commission)	\$ 326,329	1,669,301	\$	3,803	\$	3,803	\$	3,803
Contra Costa (Contra Costa Transportation Authority)	\$ 95,310	1,155,879		2,182	\$	2,182	\$	2,182
City of El Cerrito	\$ 1,581	N/A	\$	200	\$	200	\$	200
City of Martinez	\$ 3,668	N/A	\$	200	\$	200	\$	200
Fresno (Fresno County Transportation Authority)	\$ 78,812	1,018,241		1,904	\$	1,904	\$	1,904
Lake (City of Clearlake)	\$ 2,002	14,828		200	\$	200	\$	200
Madera (Madera County Transportation Authority)	\$ 10,564	159,536	\$	306	\$	306	\$	306
Marin (Transportation Authority Marin County)	\$ 28,334	262,879		379	\$	379	\$	379
Marin (Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit District)	\$ 19,941	-	\$	209	\$	209	\$	209
Mendocino (City of Fort Bragg)	\$ 890	7,478		200	\$	200	\$	200
Mendocino (City of Point Arena)	\$ 49	463		200	\$	200	\$	200
Mendocino (City of Willits)	\$ 839	4,996		200	\$	200	\$	200
Merced (Merced County Transportation Authority)	\$ 19,360	282,928	1\$	520	\$	520	\$	520
Monterey (Transportation Agency for Monterey County) Monterey (Monterey-Salinas Transit District)	\$ 29,982	445,414		639		639	\$	639
Napa (Napa Valley Transportation Authority)	\$ 9,703		\$	228		228		228
Nevada (Nevada City)	\$ 20,340 \$ 683	140,779 3,122		296 200	\$	296		296
Nevada (Town of Truckee)	\$ 2,627	16,434			\$	200	\$	200
Sacramento (Sacramento Transportation Authority)	\$ 130,647	1,546,174		200	\$	200	\$	200 2,930
San Benito (Council of San Benito County Governments) (eff. 4/1/19)	\$ 130,047	62,296		2,930	\$	2,930	\$ \$	2,930
San Francisco (San Francisco County Transportation Authority)	\$ 112,465	883,869		1,805	\$	1,805	э \$	1,805
San Joaquin (San Joaquin County Transportation Authority)	\$ 64,984	770,385		1,459	\$	1,459	э \$	1,805
San Mateo (San Mateo County Transportation Authority)	\$ 98,386	774,485		754	\$	754	э \$	754
San Mateo (San Mateo County Transit District)	\$ 98,386		\$	754	\$	754	\$	754
San Mateo (San Mateo County Transit District) (add'I measure eff. 7/1/19)	\$ -		\$	414	\$	414	\$	414
Santa Clara (Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority)	\$ 515,156	1,954,286	\$	4,911		4,911	\$	4,911
Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz County Regional Transportation Commission)	\$ 21,783		\$	296	\$	296	\$	296
Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District)	\$ 21,949		\$	296	\$	296	\$	296
Sonoma (Sonoma County Transportation Authority)	\$ 25,854	500,675	\$	491	\$	491	\$	491
Sonoma (Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit District)	\$ 19,941		\$	470	\$	470	\$	470
Stanislaus (Stanislaus County Transportation Authority)	\$ 45,959	558,972		1,055	\$	1,055	\$	1,055
			_	27,900	-	7,900	_	27,900
Totals							-	
	1 + 1,000,021	T.		2020-21	202	1-22	-22 2022-23	
	0		-					
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency)	Revenue	Population		unding	Fun	ding	Fu	Inding
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency)	Revenue (25%)	(75%)	F	unding	-			
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356	(75%) 190,266	F \$	unding	\$	507	\$	507
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716	F \$ \$	unding 507 37,506	\$ \$3	507 7,506	\$ \$	507 37,506
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498	F \$ \$	unding 507 37,506 8,851	\$ \$3	507 57,506 8,851	\$ \$	507 37,506 8,851
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority) Riverside (Riverside County Transportation Commission)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347 \$ 196,393	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498 2,440,124	F S S S S S	Funding 507 37,506 8,851 6,495	\$ \$ \$	507 57,506 8,851 6,495	\$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority) Riverside (Riverside County Transportation Commission) San Bernardino (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347 \$ 196,393 \$ 181,837	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498 2,440,124 2,192,203	F \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 57,506 8,851 6,495 5,856	\$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority) Riverside (Riverside County Transportation Commission) San Bernardino (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority) San Diego (San Diego Regional Transportation Commission)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347 \$ 196,393 \$ 181,837 \$ 314,260	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498 2,440,124 2,192,203 3,351,786	F \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093	\$ 3 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 7,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority) Riverside (Riverside County Transportation Commission) San Bernardino (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority) San Diego (San Diego Regional Transportation Commission) Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara County Local Transportation Authority)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347 \$ 196,393 \$ 181,837 \$ 314,260 \$ 40,917	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498 2,440,124 2,192,203 3,351,786 454,593	F \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$ \$\$	Funding 507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093 1,227	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 7,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093 1,227	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093 1,227
Funding Based on Voter-Approved Sales Tax Revenue and Population - South County (Agency) Imperial (Imperial County Local Transportation Authority) Los Angeles (Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority) Orange (Orange County Transportation Authority) Riverside (Riverside County Transportation Commission) San Bernardino (San Bernardino County Transportation Authority) San Diego (San Diego Regional Transportation Commission)	Revenue (25%) \$ 15,356 \$ 3,470,554 \$ 330,347 \$ 196,393 \$ 181,837 \$ 314,260	(75%) 190,266 10,253,716 3,222,498 2,440,124 2,192,203 3,351,786 454,593	F \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 7,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	507 37,506 8,851 6,495 5,856 9,093

17

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY