

8. FUNDING

This chapter focuses on implementation and funding for the Chula Vista Pedestrian Master Plan. This plan sets out an ambitious list of projects to be implemented over the next 20 years and outlines federal, state, regional and local sources of pedestrian funding, as well as some non-traditional funding sources that have been used by local agencies to fund pedestrian infrastructure and programs. The Pedestrian Master Plan and future updates should serve as a guide in the allocation of capital, maintenance, administrative, and matching funds. The Plan is also designed to provide staff and the public with flexibility as opportunities and needs arise. The Pedestrian Master Plan should be updated every five years as necessary, to reflect changes in needs and conditions.

Capital Improvement Program

Pedestrian projects and enhancements identified in this Pedestrian Master Plan and in future revisions should be included in the City of Chula Vista's Capital Improvement Program. This may be accomplished by a combination of funding capital and maintenance efforts, providing matching monies for competitive grants, and/or integrating pedestrian features into larger public projects. The City should actively seek competitive grant sources and allocate adequate matching monies to implement pedestrian projects.

Cost Elements

A summary of projected cost estimates is presented in the following tables. Each of the improvement recommendations (infrastructure or program related projects) is presented in a separate table, along with an estimate of the total capital and average annual cost. All cost estimates are planning level estimates, and amounts are subject to further refinement once feasibility and engineering work has been completed, or as budget conditions change within the City.

Pedestrian unit costs are presented in **Table 8.1**. These costs are the basis for the planning-level cost estimates used in the following tables.

Table 8.1
Pedestrian Improvement Basic Unit Costs

| Item | Unit | Unit Cost |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Striping/Painted Lanes/Median | LF | \$12 |
| Class I Path Construction | LF | \$100 |
| Landscaping | SF | \$2 |
| Crosswalk - High Visibility | EA | \$1,200 |
| Crosswalk - Traverse | EA | \$500 |
| Curb Extension | EA | \$20,000 |
| Curb & Gutter | LF | \$40 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit (diagonal) | EA | \$5,000 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit (perpendicular) | EA | \$5,000 |
| Parking Restrictions -- Red Curb | per 20 FT | \$80 |
| Remove Curb | LF | \$4 |
| Remove Sidewalk | SF | \$4 |
| Remove Striping | LF | \$3.60 |
| Remove Sign/Mast Arm | EA | \$120 |
| Sidewalk - 10' Wide | LF | \$150 |
| Sidewalk - 5' Wide | LF | \$45 |
| Sidewalk Widening | LF | \$46 |
| Signs, Warning | EA | \$300 |
| Truncated Domes (retrofit plastic) | EA | \$400 |

Source: City of Chula Vista, March 2010

Citywide Project Costs

Table 8.2 shows the total cost for citywide improvement projects along with the average annual cost over the next 20 years. The total cost for the citywide projects is estimated at approximately \$22.8 million, while the average annual cost over the next 20 years would be approximately \$1.14 million per year.

Top 30 High Priority Projects Costs

Costs for the top 30 high priority pedestrian projects are presented in **Table 8.3**. **Appendix E** presents detailed line-item cost estimates for the 30 high priority projects. The total cost for these improvements is estimated at approximately \$8.5 million. The costs for these projects may vary considerably depending on a variety of conditions and assumptions. Further feasibility and design work are required to refine these estimates.

Table 8.2
Estimated Citywide Project Costs

| Project Category | Total Cost | Average Annual Cost over 20 Years |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Sidewalk Gap Infill | \$18,131,900 | \$906,595 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit | \$4,630,000 | \$231,500 |
| TOTAL ESTIMATED COST FOR CITYWIDE PROJECTS (2010 Dollars) | \$22,761,900 | \$1,138,095 |

Source: Alta Planning + Design; March 2010

Table 8.3
Cost Estimates for High Priority Intersection and Corridor Projects

| | Location | Project Type | Estimated Project Cost |
|-----|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 1 | Palomar Street (Orange Ave. to Second Ave.) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$342,260 |
| 2.1 | Third Avenue (Moss Street to Orange Avenue) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$567,485 |
| 2.2 | Third Avenue (Orange Avenue to Main Street) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, curb ramps, and ped islands | \$553,691 |
| 3.1 | Palomar Street (Bay Blvd. to Orange Avenue) | Missing sidewalks, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$118,108 |
| 3.2 | Orange Avenue (Palomar St. to Second Ave.) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$349,025 |
| 4 | Industrial Blvd. (L Street to Anita Street) | Missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$701,135 |
| 5 | Fourth Avenue (Moss Street to Main Street) | Crosswalks and missing sidewalks | \$97,895 |
| 6 | Quintard Street (Orange Ave. to First Ave.) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$436,558 |
| 7 | Broadway (D Street to H Street) | Crosswalks and pedestrian signalization | \$76,940 |
| 8 | Anita Street (Broadway to Third Avenue) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$291,259 |
| 9 | E. Orange Avenue (Max to I-805) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$195,872 |
| 10 | Third Avenue (H Street to K Street) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, restriping, and curb ramps | \$297,000 |
| 11 | Third Avenue (E Street to H Street) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$350,510 |
| 12 | C Street/Third Avenue (Fifth Avenue to E Street) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, ped island, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$552,759 |
| 13 | Broadway (Moss Street to Main Street) | Crosswalks and pedestrian signalization | \$136,051 |
| 14 | G Street (Broadway to Third Avenue) | Sidewalk widening, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$465,680 |
| 15 | H Street (I-5 to Second Avenue) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$156,470 |
| 16 | Fourth Avenue (SR-54 to H Street) | Sidewalk widening, curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$127,925 |
| 17 | Fifth Avenue (F Street to H Street) | Crosswalks | \$28,100 |
| 18 | Oxford Street (Broadway to Second Avenue) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$269,619 |
| 19 | Broadway (H Street to Moss Street) | Pedestrian signalization and crosswalks | \$95,420 |
| 20 | E Street (I-5 to Third Avenue) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$193,925 |
| 21 | Moss Street (Industrial Blvd. to Third Avenue) | Missing sidewalks and curb ramps | \$486,016 |

Table 8.3
Cost Estimates for High Priority Intersection and Corridor Projects (continued)

| | Location | Project Type | Estimated Project Cost |
|----|---|--|------------------------|
| 22 | Fourth Avenue (H Street to Moss Street) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$237,980 |
| 23 | I Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, and curb ramps | \$269,000 |
| 24 | Naples Street (Industrial Blvd. to Fifth Avenue) | Curb extensions, crosswalks, missing sidewalks, and curb ramps | \$854,280 |
| 25 | L Street (Industrial Blvd. to Fifth Avenue) | Ladder crosswalks and signage in front of school | \$84,324 |
| 26 | J Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | Crosswalks | \$28,100 |
| 27 | K Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | Crosswalks | \$24,800 |
| 28 | Paseo Ranchero/Heritage Road and Telegraph Canyon Road Intersection | Ladder crosswalks and pedestrian signalization | \$38,990 |
| 29 | Otay Lakes Road/Bonita Road Intersection | Raised median, crosswalk, and restriping | \$41,795 |
| 30 | Medical Center Drive/Telegraph Canyon Road | Ladder crosswalks and restriping | \$27,440 |
| | TOTAL COST TOP 30 PROJECTS (2010 Dollars) | | \$8,496,412 |

Source: Alta Planning + Design; March 2010

Program Costs

Costs associated with program recommendations are shown in **Table 8.4**. The budgets for recommended programs, while annualized in the table, are likely to vary considerably from year to year and are subject to grant awards and budget conditions.

Table 8.4
Estimated Cost for Recommended Programs

| Program Name | Average Annual Cost | Cost over 20 Years |
|---|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Maintenance</i> (see note) | \$100,000 | \$2,000,000 |
| <i>Promotional Efforts</i> | | |
| Printed material (posters, brochures, maps) | \$20,000 | \$400,000 |
| Public Service Announcements | \$2,000 | \$40,000 |
| Website | \$2,000 | \$40,000 |
| Annual Events | \$50,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| Presentations | \$5,000 | \$100,000 |
| <i>Enforcement</i> | \$10,000 | \$200,000 |
| TOTAL COST PROGRAMS | \$189,000 | \$3,780,000 |

Source: Alta Planning + Design, March 2010

Note: Maintenance is for new facilities recommended in the Plan. This estimate does not include costs to alleviate sidewalk repair backlog or emergency repairs. Costs are based upon base year 2009 and do not account for inflation.

Financial Plan

A 20 year financial plan has been developed for Chula Vista's pedestrian capital and program recommendations. The financial plan has been organized by short (years 1-5), medium (years 6-10), and long (years 11-20) term pedestrian capital and program costs. **Table 8.5** presents the short term financial plan, **Table 8.6** presents the medium term financial plan and **Table 8.7** presents the long term financial plan. The long-term costs are based on very broad assumptions about needs in the City, and will be refined as the Pedestrian Master Plan is updated. The total 20-year cost for pedestrian improvements and programs in Chula Vista is estimated to be approximately \$37.8 million or \$1.89 million per year. For sidewalk construction, the City typically relies on grants from Housing and Urban Development Grants which provide financial assistance to local Assessment District programs to fill sidewalk gaps in residential areas. The City also has a separate Public Works fund of about \$100,000 which is used to maintain existing sidewalks damaged by City owned trees, though this is not related to new construction. Based upon the assumption that 70 percent of the total capital project costs, or roughly \$26.5 million, could come from competitive grants, this leaves an additional local match needed of \$11.35 million over 20 years, or about \$567,500 annually.

This page intentionally left blank

**Table 8.5
City of Chula Vista 5-Year Funding Plan for Pedestrian Improvements**

| | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | Year 4 | Year 5 | 5-Year Total |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| High Priority Projects | | | | | | |
| Project 1 - Palomar Street (Orange Ave. to Second Ave.) | \$ 342,260 | | | | | \$ 342,260 |
| Project 2.1 - Third Avenue (Moss Street to Main Street) | \$ | \$ 567,485 | | | | \$ 567,485 |
| Project 2.2 - Third Avenue (Orange Avenue to Main Street) | | | \$ 553,691 | | | \$ 553,691 |
| Project 3.1 - Palomar Street (Bay Blvd. to Orange Avenue) | \$ 118,108 | | | | | \$ 118,108 |
| Project 3.2 - Orange Avenue (Palomar St. to Second Ave.) | | | \$ | \$ 349,025 | | \$ 349,025 |
| Project 4 - Industrial Blvd. (L Street to Anita Street) | | | | \$ 174,795 | \$ 526,340 | \$ 701,135 |
| Subtotal | \$ 460,368 | \$ 567,485 | \$ 553,691 | \$ 523,820 | \$ 526,340 | \$ 2,631,704 |
| | | | | | | |
| Citywide Projects Recommended in Plan | | | | | | 5-Year Total |
| Sidewalk Gap Infill | \$ 906,595 | \$ 906,595 | \$ 906,595 | \$ 906,595 | \$ 906,595 | \$ 4,532,975 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit | \$ 231,500 | \$ 231,500 | \$ 231,500 | \$ 231,500 | \$ 231,500 | \$ 1,157,500 |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 5,690,475 |
| | | | | | | |
| Programs Recommended in Plan | | | | | | 5-Year Total |
| Promotion | \$ 79,000 | \$ 79,000 | \$ 79,000 | \$ 79,000 | \$ 79,000 | \$ 395,000 |
| Enforcement | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 10,000 | \$ 50,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 445,000 |
| | | | | | | |
| Soft Costs (incl. Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 1,210,000 |
| | | | | | | |
| Summary of Costs | | | | | | 5-Year Total |
| High Priority Projects | \$ 460,368 | \$ 567,485 | \$ 553,691 | \$ 523,820 | \$ 526,340 | \$ 2,631,704 |
| Citywide Projects | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 5,690,475 |
| Program Costs | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 89,000 | \$ 445,000 |
| Soft Costs (Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 242,000 | \$ 1,210,000 |
| Total Costs | \$ 1,929,463 | \$ 2,036,580 | \$ 2,022,786 | \$ 1,992,915 | \$ 1,995,435 | \$ 9,977,179 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 5-Year Total |
| Annual Funding Requirement | \$ 1,929,463 | \$ 2,036,580 | \$ 2,022,786 | \$ 1,992,915 | \$ 1,995,435 | \$ 9,977,179 |
| Estimated Competitive Grant Revenue (70% of Capital) | \$ 1,350,624 | \$ 1,425,606 | \$ 1,415,950 | \$ 1,395,041 | \$ 1,396,805 | \$ 6,984,026 |
| Additional Local Match Needed Annually | \$ 578,839 | \$ 610,974 | \$ 606,836 | \$ 597,874 | \$ 598,630 | \$ 2,993,153 |

Note: All costs based upon base year 2010 and do not account for inflation

Source: Alta Planning + Design; March, 2010

This page intentionally left blank

Table 8.6
City of Chula Vista Mid-Term Funding Plan for Pedestrian Improvements

| | | Total Cost over Years 6-10 |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Tier 1 High Priority Projects (Projects 5-12) | | 2,298,793 |
| | | |
| Citywide Projects Recommended in Plan | Annual | Total |
| Sidewalk Gap Infill | \$ 906,595 | \$ 4,532,975 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit | \$ 231,500 | \$ 1,157,500 |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 5,690,475 |
| | | |
| Programs Recommended in Plan | Annual | Total |
| Promotion | \$ 79,000 | \$ 395,000 |
| Enforcement | \$ 10,000 | \$ 50,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 89,000 | \$ 445,000 |
| | | |
| Soft Costs (incl. Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 1,210,000 |
| | | |
| Summary of Costs | Annual | Total |
| High Priority Projects | \$ 459,759 | \$ 2,298,793 |
| Citywide Projects | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 5,690,475 |
| Program Costs | \$ 89,000 | \$ 445,000 |
| Soft Costs (Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 1,210,000 |
| Total Costs | \$ 1,928,854 | \$ 9,644,268 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 5-Year Funding Requirement | \$ | \$ 9,644,268 |
| Estimated Competitive Grant Revenue (70% of Capital) | \$ | \$ 6,750,988 |
| Estimated Additional Local Match Needed over 5 Years | \$ | \$ 2,893,280 |
| Additional Local Match Needed Annually | \$ | \$ 578,656 |

All costs based upon base year 2010 and do not account for inflation

Source: Alta Planning + Design, March 2010

Table 8.7
City of Chula Vista 20-Year Funding Plan for Pedestrian Improvements

| | | Total Cost over Years 11-20 |
|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|
| Tier 2 High Priority Projects (Projects 13-30) | | 3,528,955 |
| | | |
| Citywide Projects Recommended in Plan | Annual | Total |
| Sidewalk Gap Infill | \$ 906,595 | \$ 9,065,950 |
| Curb Ramp Retrofit | \$ 231,500 | \$ 2,315,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 11,380,950 |
| | | |
| Programs Recommended in Plan | Annual | Total |
| Promotion | \$ 79,000 | \$ 790,000 |
| Enforcement | \$ 10,000 | \$ 100,000 |
| Subtotal | \$ 89,000 | \$ 890,000 |
| | | |
| Soft Costs (incl. Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 2,420,000 |
| | | |
| Summary of Costs | Annual | Total |
| High Priority Projects | \$ 352,896 | \$ 3,528,955 |
| Citywide Projects | \$ 1,138,095 | \$ 11,380,950 |
| Program Costs | \$ 89,000 | \$ 890,000 |
| Soft Costs (Personnel) | \$ 242,000 | \$ 2,420,000 |
| Total Costs | \$ 1,821,991 | \$ 18,219,905 |
| | | |
| | | |
| 10-Year Funding Requirement | \$ | \$ 18,219,905 |
| Estimated Competitive Grant Revenue (70% of Capital) | \$ | \$ 12,753,933 |
| Estimated Additional Local Match Needed over 10 Years | \$ | \$ 5,465,972 |
| Additional Local Match Needed Annually | \$ | \$ 546,597 |

All costs based upon base year 2010 and do not account for inflation

Source: Alta Planning + Design, March 2010

Funding Sources

Federal Funding Sources

The primary federal source of surface transportation funding, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities, is SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. SAFETEA-LU is the fourth iteration of the transportation vision established by Congress in 1991 with the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) and renewed in 1998 and 2003 through the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, and Efficient Transportation Equity Act of 2003 (SAFETEA). Also known as the federal transportation bill, the \$286.5 billion SAFETEA-LU bill passed in 2005 and authorizes Federal surface transportation programs for the five-year period between 2005 and 2009. As of September 30, 2009, SAFETEA-LU has expired, though the bill's programs have been kept alive at a 30 percent reduction in funding by Congress through a series of continuing resolutions. Congress is aiming to have a 6-month extension of SAFETEA-LU in place before the current seven week continuing resolution is set to expire on December 18, 2009 in order to have more time to complete and ratify the successor surface transportation bill by the Spring of 2010.

Administration of SAFETEA-LU funding occurs through the State (Caltrans and the State Resources Agency) and through regional planning agencies. Most, but not all, of these funding programs are oriented toward utilitarian transportation versus recreation, with an emphasis on reducing auto trips and providing inter-modal connections. SAFETEA-LU programs require a local match of 11.47 percent.

Specific funding programs under SAFETEA-LU include, but are not limited to:

- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) – Funds projects that are likely to contribute to the attainment of national ambient air quality standards
- Recreational Trails Program—\$370 million nationally through 2009 for non-motorized trail projects
- Safe Routes to School Program—\$612 million nationally through 2009
- Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program—\$270 million nationally over five years
- Federal Lands Highway Funds—Approximately \$4.5 billion dollars are available nationally through 2009

Federal Lands Highway Funds

Federal Lands Highway Funds may be used to build pedestrian facilities in conjunction with roads and parkways at the discretion of the department charged with administration of the funds. The projects must be transportation-related and tied to a plan adopted by the State. Federal Lands Highway Funds are for project planning and construction.

Land and Water Conservation Fund

Land and Water Conservation Fund is a federally funded program that provides grants for planning and acquiring outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including trails. The Fund is administered by

the National Parks Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation and has been reauthorized until 2015.

Cities, counties and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate and maintain park and recreation facilities are eligible to apply. Applicants must fund the entire project, and will be reimbursed for 50 percent of costs. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use. The grant process for local agencies is competitive, and 60 percent of grants are reserved for Southern California.

In 2009, approximately \$1.25 million was allocated to fund recommended projects in California.

Recreational Trails Program

The Recreational Trails Program of SAFETEA-LU provides funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both non-motorized and motorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail uses include hiking, bicycling, in-line skating, and equestrian use. In California, the funds are administered by the California Department of Parks and Recreation. RTP projects must be ADA compliant. Recreational Trails Program funds may be used for:

- Maintenance and restoration of existing trails;
- Purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment;
- Construction of new trails; including unpaved trails;
- Acquisition of easements or property for trails;
- State administrative costs related to this program (limited to seven percent of a State's funds); and
- Operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails (limited to five percent of a State's funds).

\$4.6 million dollars was available to California jurisdictions through the Recreational Trails Program in 2009. More information is available at www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/rectrails/index.htm.

Regional Surface Transportation Program

The Regional Surface Transportation Program (RSTP) is a block grant program established by the State of California utilizing federal funding made available for surface transportation projects. Though most of this funding gets earmarked for highway and transit projects, pedestrian and bicycle projects are still eligible to receive funds from this source. In California, \$225 million (76 percent) of RSTP funds are allocated annually to California's 11 largest urbanized areas with populations greater than 200,000 people. Under the RSTP, the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) is authorized to prioritize and approve projects that receive RSTP funds in the San Diego region. Agencies can transfer funding from other federal transportation sources to the RSTP program in order to gain more flexibility in the way the monies are allocated.

Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program

The Rivers, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program (RTCA) is a National Parks Service program which provides technical assistance via direct staff involvement, to establish and restore greenways, rivers, trails, watersheds and open space. The RTCA program provides only for

planning assistance—there are no implementation monies available. Projects are prioritized for assistance based upon criteria which include conserving significant community resources, fostering cooperation between agencies, serving a large number of users, encouraging public involvement in planning and implementation and focusing on lasting accomplishments.

Transportation, Community and System Preservation Program

The Transportation, Community and System Preservation (TCSP) Program provides federal funding for transit oriented development, traffic calming and other projects that improve the efficiency of the transportation system, reduce the impact on the environment, and provide efficient access to jobs, services and trade centers. The program is intended to provide communities with the resources to explore the integration of their transportation system with community preservation and environmental activities. TCSP Program funds require a 20 percent match.

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Activities

Transportation Enhancement (TE) Activities are a subset of federal Surface Transportation Program funds whose aim is to help expand travel choice and enhance the transportation experience. Included in the list of activities eligible for funding are the provision of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and the provision of pedestrian and bicycle safety and educational activities. California's annual allocation of TE funds through the end of the SAFETEA-LU bill was \$74.5 million. In 2007, about \$6.7 million dollars of federal TE funds were spent in the San Diego region, mostly on pedestrian and bicycle projects.

State Funding Sources

The State of California uses both federal sources and its own budget to fund the following pedestrian projects and programs.

California Conservation Corps

The California Conservation Corps (CCC) is a public service program which occasionally provides assistance on construction projects. The CCC may be written into grant applications as a project partner. In order to utilize CCC labor, project sites must be public land or be publicly accessible. CCC labor cannot be used to perform regular maintenance; however, they will perform annual maintenance, such as the opening of trails in the spring. More information is available at <http://www.ccc.ca.gov>.

California Safe Routes to School (SR2S)

Caltrans administers funding for Safe Routes to School projects through two separate and distinct programs: the state-legislated program (SR2S) and the federally-legislated program (SRTS). Both programs competitively award reimbursement grants with the goal of increasing the number of children who walk or bicycle to school. The programs differ in some important respects.

The California Safe Routes to School Program, which has been extended indefinitely with the passage of Assembly Bill 57, requires a 10 percent local match, is eligible to cities and counties and targets children in grades K-12. The fund is primarily for construction, but up to 10 percent of the program funds can be used for education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation activities. Forty-eight million dollars are available for Cycle 8 (FY 08/09 and 09/10).

The State Safe Routes to School Program, reimburses 100 percent, is eligible for cities, counties, school districts, non-profits, and tribal organizations, and targets children in grades K-8. Program funds can be used for construction or for education, encouragement, enforcement and evaluation activities. Construction must be within 2 miles of a grade school or middle school. Forty-six million dollars are available for Cycle 2 (FY 08/09 and 09/10). More information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/saferoutes/saferoutes.htm>.

Coastal Conservancy Non-Profit Grants Program

The Coastal Conservancy provides grants to non-profit organizations for projects providing access to the California coast and preserving coastal lands, including the construction of trails, public piers, urban waterfronts, and other public access facilities. It should be noted that the Bayshore Bikeway in Chula Vista is being considered as part of the California Coastal Trail.

Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program

This fund is administered by Caltrans and provides assistance for projects that exemplify livable community concepts including pedestrian improvement projects. Eligible applicants include local governments, Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Agencies (RTPA). A 20 percent local match is required and projects must demonstrate a transportation component or objective. There are \$3 million dollars available annually statewide. More information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html>.

Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning Grants

The Caltrans-administered Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning Grants promotes context sensitive planning in diverse communities and funds planning activities that assist low-income, minority and Native American communities to become active participants in transportation planning and project development. Grants are available to transit districts, cities, counties and tribal governments. This grant is funded by the State Highway Account at \$1.5 million annually state-wide. Grants are capped at \$250,000. More information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/grants.html>.

Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grants

The California Office of Traffic Safety distributes federal funding apportioned to California under the National Highway Safety Act and SAFETEA-LU. Grants are used to establish new traffic safety programs, expand ongoing programs or address deficiencies in current programs. Pedestrian safety is included in the list of traffic safety priority areas. Eligible grantees are governmental agencies, state colleges, and state universities, local city and county government agencies, school districts, fire departments and public emergency services providers. Grant funding cannot replace existing program expenditures, nor can traffic safety funds be used for program maintenance, research, rehabilitation or construction. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis, and priority is given to agencies with the greatest need. Evaluation criteria to assess need include: potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics and rankings, seriousness of problems, and performance on previous OTS grants. OTS had \$56 million in funding available statewide for FY 2006/07. More information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/saferesr>.

State Highway Operations & Protection Program

The State Highway Operations and Protection Program (SHOPP) is a Caltrans funding source. There are different categories of funds for improvements that could relate to pedestrian

improvements. SHOPP projects are capital improvements relative to maintenance, safety, and rehabilitation of State highways and bridges. These can include bridge sign and lighting rehabilitation and mobility improvements. Jurisdictions work with Caltrans' districts to have projects placed on the ten-year SHOPP list. \$193 million of State Highway Operation and Protection Program funds were allocated in San Diego County in 2010. This amount varies annually. More information is available at <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/transprog/shopp.htm>.

TDA Article 3

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds are available for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in California. According to the Act, pedestrian and bicycle projects are allocated two percent of the revenue from a ¼ cent of the general state sales tax, which is dedicated to local transportation. These funds are collected by the State, returned to each county based on sales tax revenues, and typically apportioned to areas within the county based on population. Eligible pedestrian projects include construction and engineering for capital projects and development of comprehensive pedestrian facilities plans. A city or county is allowed to apply for funding for pedestrian plans not more than once every five years. These funds may be used to meet local match requirements for federal funding sources. In the San Diego region, this revenue source is bolstered by an additional ½ cent sales tax called TransNet, which will be discussed in Section 8.3.3.

Wildlife Conservation Board Public Access Program

Funding for the acquisition of lands or improvements that preserve wildlife habitat or provide recreational access for hunting, fishing or other wildlife-oriented activities. Up to \$250,000 dollars is available per project and applications are accepted quarterly. Projects eligible for funding include interpretive trails, river access, and trailhead parking areas. The State of California must have a proprietary interest in the project. Local agencies are generally responsible for the planning and engineering phases of each project. More information is available at <http://www.wcb.ca.gov>.

Regional Funding Sources

Regional pedestrian grant programs come from a variety of sources, including SAFETEA-LU, the State budget, vehicle registration fees, bridge tolls and local sales tax. Most regional funds are allocated by regional agencies such as SANDAG.

TDA and TransNet Call for Pedestrian and Bicycle Projects

In addition to TDA revenue which comes from state sales tax, the San Diego region levies an additional ½ cent local sales tax to fund transportation projects under the TransNet program. In 2004, TransNet was extended for 40 years by voters. Each year, the SANDAG Board of Directors allocates funds under the Transportation Development Act (TDA) and the TransNet local sales tax program to support non-motorized transportation projects in the San Diego region. For FY 2010, approximately \$7.7 million was available for allocation. These funds serve as part of the Regional Housing Needs Incentive Program. The *Implementation Guidelines for SANDAG Regional Housing Needs Assessment Memorandum* (Board Policy No. 33) sets forth guidelines for incentives related to the Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) for the 2005-2010 Housing Element cycle. Eligibility for the TDA/TransNet bicycle and pedestrian funds depend upon compliance with Board Policy No. 033, TDA Project Eligibility, and TransNet Project Eligibility.

In addition to the eligibility requirements, if applicable, certain SANDAG Claim Requirements must be met. The application must be completed and received in early February.

Key Pedestrian Criteria required for the application include:

- Community Support/Consistency with Community Plan
- Minimum Design Standards
- Connect to Regional Transportation Corridor/Transit Linkage
- Completes Connection/Linkage in Existing Pedestrian Network
- Project Readiness
- Geographic Factors/GIS Analysis
- Safety Improvements
- Innovation and Design
- Regional Housing Needs Incentive
- Matching Funds
- Cost Benefit

TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program

The TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program (SGIP) funds transportation and transportation related infrastructure improvements and planning efforts that support smart growth development. This program is a longer-term version of SANDAG's Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program, which uses funding incentives to encourage coordinated regional planning to bring transit service, housing, and employment together in smart growth development. The pilot program distributed \$22.5 million in grants to 16 smart growth projects in the San Diego region in 2005.

The program funds two grant types: capital projects and planning projects. The goal of SGIP is to fund public infrastructure projects and planning activities that will support compact, mixed use development focused around public transit, and will provide more housing and transportation choices. The projects funded under this program will serve as models for how good infrastructure and planning can make smart growth an asset to communities in a variety of settings. Grants range from \$200,000 to \$2,000,000 for capital projects and \$50,000 to \$400,000 for planning projects.

Chula Vista has 15 Smart Growth Place Type classifications within the Smart Growth Concept Map 7: two Existing/Planned Urban Centers, two Existing/Planned Town Centers, two Potential Town Centers, two Potential Special Use Centers, five Existing/Planned Community Centers and two Potential Community Centers. These designations qualify for application for future incentive program funds.

Project Screening Criteria include:

- Local Commitment/Authorization
- Funding Commitment
- Funding Eligibility

Project Evaluation Criteria include:

- Project Readiness (Level of Project Development)
- Smart Growth Area Land Use Characteristics (Intensity of Development; Land Use and Transportation Characteristics of Project Area; Urban Design Characteristics of Project Area; Related Land Development Projects; Affordable Housing)
- Quality of Proposed Project (Pedestrian Access Improvements; Bicycle Access Improvements; Transit Facility Improvements; Streetscape Enhancements; Traffic Calming Features; Parking Improvements)
- Matching Funds
- Low Income Household Bonus Points

To date, the City of Chula Vista has received nearly \$2.7 million in smart growth incentive funds. The City received a \$683,900 grant through the Pilot Smart Growth Incentive Program for pavement, pedestrian and bicycle improvements along Palomar Street and Industrial Boulevard and enhancements to the Palomar Transit Station and surrounding area. Under the longer-term Smart Growth Incentive Program, the City was awarded \$2 million toward the Third Avenue Streetscape Project, First Phase. This first phase of the project features street beautification, pedestrian and bicycle improvements along Third Avenue between H Street and Madrona Street.

Local Funding Sources

General Funds

One of the local revenue sources of cities, towns, and counties available for use on pedestrian improvements are general funds resulting from sales taxes, property taxes, and other miscellaneous taxes and fees. There are generally few restrictions on the use of these funds, which are utilized for a large variety of local budget needs. As such, there is typically high demand for these funds for numerous government services. Design and construction of sidewalks and pathways, through use of this funding source usually receives limited support from local governments unless their constituents lobby effectively for such use. In some cases, a component of local general funds can be dedicated to transportation improvements including the construction and repair of sidewalks.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act was passed by the State Legislature in 1982 in response to reduced funding opportunities brought about by the passage of Proposition 13. The Mello-Roos Act allows any county, city, special district, school district, or joint powers of authority to establish a Community Facility Districts (CFD) for the purpose of selling tax-exempt bonds to fund public improvements within that district. CFDs must be approved by a two-thirds margin of qualified voters in the district. Property owners within the district are responsible for paying back the bonds. Pedestrian facilities are eligible for funding under CFD bonds.

Parks and Recreation Funds

Local parks and recreation funds are generally derived from property and sales taxes and some fee revenues, and they are sometimes used directly for pathway or pathway related facilities, including bathrooms, pocket parks, lighting, parking, and landscaping. Parks and recreation funds are also utilized to cover pathway maintenance costs incurred by these departments.

Residential Construction Tax (RCT)

The City of Chula Vista has a Residential Construction Tax (RCT) which is paid in conjunction with the construction of new residential dwelling units. This revenue source has been used to fund infrastructure improvements. Between 2006 and 2007, the City used \$2.2 million from this revenue to fund capital projects.

Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF) and Western Transportation Development Impact Fee (WTDIF)

The City of Chula Vista currently has a Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF) and a Western Transportation Development Impact Fee (WTDIF) which are both utilized to fund capital improvement projects. The TDIF is used to fund street and highway improvements east of I-805 and the WTDIF is used to fund street and highway improvements west of I-805. TDIFs are typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a new development project. A new development may attempt to reduce the number of trips (and hence impacts and cost) by paying for on- and off-site pedestrian improvements designed to encourage residents, employees and visitors to the new development to walk rather than drive. Future road widening and construction projects are a means of providing sidewalks and other pedestrian facilities. To ensure that roadway construction projects provide facilities where needed, it is important that an effective review process be in place so that new roads meet the County's and cities' standards and guidelines for the development of sidewalks and pedestrian facilities. Establishing a clear nexus or connection between the impact fee and the project's impacts is critical for avoiding a potential lawsuit.

Non-Traditional Funding Options

Integration into Larger Projects

The State of California's "routine accommodation" policy requires Caltrans to design, construct, operate, and maintain transportation facilities using best practices for pedestrians. Local jurisdictions can begin to expect that some portion of pedestrian project costs, when they are built as part of larger transportation projects, will be covered in project construction budgets. This applies primarily to Caltrans facilities.

Requirements for New Development

With the increasing support for "routine accommodation" and "complete streets," requirements for new development, road widening, and new commercial development provide opportunities to efficiently construct pedestrian facilities.

Community Development Block Grants (CDBG)

The City of Chula Vista has used funds from the CDBG program for building and infrastructure projects, including sidewalks improvements and streetscape revitalization. The funds are targeted at low-income census tracts and census blocks that meet the threshold set by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Federal Community Development Block Grant Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include (but are not limited to) acquiring real property; building public facilities and improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, and recreational facilities; and planning and administrative expenses, such as costs related to developing a consolidated Plan and managing CDBG funds.

Approximately \$39 million in CDBG funds were distributed statewide in 2008. Between 2006 and 2007, Chula Vista obtained \$1.5 million dollars from CDBGs to do ten infrastructure projects. More information is available at:

<http://www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/>

Assessment Districts

In 1983, the Chula Vista City Council adopted Policy No. 505-01 to establish guidelines for forming Assessment Districts under the 1911 Block Act Program. The City amended this policy in 2004. Under this policy, the City's Assessment District program has primarily been used to construct infill street improvements, including sidewalk installation, in primarily residential neighborhoods. To create an Assessment District, 60 percent of the affected property owners must agree to its formation. Decisions requiring financial commitments need approval of 50 percent of the property owners weighted by financial commitment who are in the assessment district. Property owners in the district are assessed for the improvements and can pay the amount immediately or over a span of 10 years.

Table 8.8 displays relevant potential funding sources for each of the top 30 high priority project areas.

This page intentionally left blank

**Table 8.8
Potential Funding Sources by High Priority Project Location**

| Potential Funding Sources by Project Location | | Federal | | | State | | | | Regional | Local | Non-Traditional | |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------|------------------------------------|
| Rank | Project Location | SAFETEA-LU funding programs | RSTP / Transportation Enhancement Activities | Federal Safe Routes to School (SRTS) | TDA Article 3 | California SR2S | Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning Grants | Community Based Transportation Planning Demonstration Grant Program | TDA and TransNet call for Bike and Pedestrian Projects | TransNet Smart Growth Incentive Program | General Fund | Community Development Block Grants |
| 1 | Palomar Street (Orange Ave. to Second Ave.) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 2.1 | Third Avenue (Moss Street to Orange Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 2.2 | Third Avenue (Orange Avenue to Main Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 3.1 | Palomar Street (Bay Blvd. to Orange Avenue) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 3.2 | Orange Avenue (Palomar St. to Second Ave.) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 4 | Industrial Blvd. (L Street to Anita Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 5 | Fourth Avenue (Moss Street to Main Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 6 | Quintard Street (Orange Ave. to First Ave.) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 7 | Broadway (D Street to H Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 8 | Anita Street (Broadway to Third Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 9 | E. Orange Avenue (Max to I-805) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | |
| 10 | Third Avenue (H Street to K Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 11 | Third Avenue (E Street to H Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 12 | C Street/Third Avenue (Fifth Avenue to E Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 13 | Broadway (Moss Street to Main Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 14 | G Street (Broadway to Third Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 15 | H Street (I-5 to Second Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 16 | Fourth Avenue (SR-54 to H Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 17 | Fifth Avenue (F Street to H Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 18 | Oxford Street (Broadway to Second Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 19 | Broadway (H Street to Moss Street) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X |

**Table 8.8
Potential Funding Sources by High Priority Project Location**

| Potential Funding Sources by Project Location | | Federal | | | State | | | | Regional | | Local |
|--|--|----------------|---|---|--------------|---|---|---|-----------------|---|--------------|
| 20 | E Street (I-5 to Third Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 21 | Moss Street (Industrial Blvd. to Third Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| 22 | Fourth Avenue (H Street to Moss Street) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 23 | I Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X |
| 24 | Naples Street (Industrial Blvd. to Fifth Avenue) | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| 25 | L Street (Industrial Blvd. to Fifth Avenue) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X |
| 26 | J Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X |
| 27 | K Street (Fourth Avenue to Second Avenue) | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X |
| 28 | Paseo Ranchero/Heritage Road and Telegraph Canyon Road | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | X |
| 29 | Otay Lakes Road/Bonita Road Intersection | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X |
| 30 | Medical Center Drive/Telegraph Canyon Road | X | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X |