

TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee

30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

Participating entities: Cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
Tri Delta Transit • 511 Contra Costa • Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) • Caltrans District 4 • BART
TRANSPLAN • State Route 4 Bypass Authority • East Contra Costa Regional Fee & Financing Authority (ECCRFFA)

Meeting Location:

Antioch City Hall, Third Floor Conference Room

Tuesday, January 15, 2019, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

*NOTE: The Technical Advisory Committee (“TAC”) agenda/packet is only distributed digitally, **no paper copies will be sent.** If you need a printed copy please contact TRANSPLAN staff.*

Action/Discussion Items (see attachments where noted [♦])

Item 1: STANDING ITEM: Concord Community Reuse Project (former Concord Naval Weapons Station) Update. ♦ Page 2

Item 2: Draft Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) for the Accessible Transportation Strategic (“ATS”) Plan. *The Contra Costa Transportation Authority was awarded a Caltrans Sustainable Communities Transportation Planning Grant to conduct the Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan. The Countywide Transportation Plan includes the ATS Plan as an Implementation Action. The goal is to ensure that transportation services to seniors and persons with disabilities are delivered in a coordinated system. The ATS Plan is a comprehensive examination of transportation, paratransit, and related operations serving seniors and persons with disabilities. CCTA requests review and comment of the MOU by RTPCs, with the expectation that RTPCs will sign the MOU as local partners.* ♦ Page 7

Item 3: Additional Safe Routes to School Funding: *As part of the extension of the first cycle of the One Bay Area Grant (“OBAG”) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (“SRTS”) projects and programs. The TAC will recommend allocation of these funds.* ♦ Page 15

Item 4: Other Business

Item 5: Adjourn to Tuesday, February 19, 2019 at 1:30 p.m.

The TAC meets on the third Tuesday of each month, 1:30 p.m., third floor conference room at Antioch City Hall. The TAC serves the TRANSPLAN Committee, the East Contra Costa Regional Fee & Financing Authority, and the State Route 4 Bypass Authority.

Persons needing a disability-related accommodation should contact Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN staff person, at least 48 hours prior to the starting time of the meeting.

ITEM 1
CONCORD COMMUNITY REUSE PROJECT (FORMER CONCORD
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION) UPDATE

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

December 13, 2018

Joan Ryan, AICP
Community Reuse Area Planner
City of Concord – Community and Economic Development Department
1950 Parkside Drive, MS/53
Concord, CA 94519

RE: Notice of Preparation of a Draft Environmental Impact Report – Concord Reuse Project Specific Plan

Dear Miss Ryan:

On behalf of the TRANSPLAN Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the City of Concord’s (“City”) Reuse Project Specific Plan (“proposed project”) Notice of Preparation (“NOP”). TRANSPLAN is the sub-regional transportation planning committee (“RTPC”) in eastern Contra Costa County and includes five member agencies (cities of Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley and Pittsburg, and Contra Costa County). TRANSPLAN coordinates the transportation interests of the communities in eastern Contra Costa County and administers the East County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance (“Action Plan”). The Action Plan facilitates establishment of goals, performance measures (called Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives, or “MTSOs”) for designated Routes of Regional Significance (“RRS”), and outlines a set of projects, programs, measures, and actions that will support achievement of the MTSOs. TRANSPLAN recommends the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) consider the following comments:

TRANSPLAN Roadway Network

1. The following are designated Routes of Regional Significance (“RRS”) that may be affected by the subject project and are therefore recommended for inclusion in the traffic impact analysis:
 - a. State Route 4
 - b. West Leland Road
 - c. Willow Pass Road
 - d. Bailey Road
 - e. Kirker Pass Road
 - f. Railroad Avenue
 - g. Pittsburg-Antioch Highway
 - h. East Leland Road
 - i. Buchanan Road
 - j. James Donlon Boulevard (future road)
 - k. Evora Road*
 - l. San Barco Boulevard*

* Not a RRS, however it is a high-volume parallel route to SR-4 near the project site.

Recommended intersections for the traffic impact analysis include the SR-4 interchanges at Willow Pass Road, San Marco Boulevard and Bailey Road, and any intersections within the TRANSPLAN sub-region where the proposed project contributes 50 or more net new vehicle trips. The DEIR should also analyze impacts to existing freeway ramp metering operations and queues.

The MTSOs for freeways and arterial routes are as follows:

MTSOs on Freeways:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Delay Index should not exceed 2.5 during the AM or PM peak period.• HOV lane utilization should exceed 600 vehicles per lane in the peak direction during the peak hour.
MTSOs on Suburban Arterial Routes:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintain LOS D or better at all signalized intersections, except:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• On Bailey Road, where LOS E will be acceptable; or,• At Traffic Management Program (“TMP”) sites that use performance measures other than average intersection delay.• Within Priority Development Areas, any physical improvement identified as a result of applying the above standard shall be evaluated for its effects on all intersection users, including pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users.

Transit Service

2. Transit productivity is an east county area-wide objective of the Action Plan. Therefore, the traffic impact analysis should consider the proposed project’s potential impacts on transit service. The Action Plan’s measures for the purpose of monitoring this objective include:

Bus Riders per Service Hour:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The average number of riders boarding a fixed-route bus during an hour of scheduled bus service when persons may board with a fare or pass.
BART Ridership:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The average number of weekday riders on all BART trains between Bay Point and North Concord Stations.

Several Tri-Delta Transit bus routes as well as BART serve areas at or near the proposed project site. The proposed project will likely induce demand on existing transit systems. The traffic impact analysis should determine if existing transit service from the aforementioned providers is adequate, would need augmentation or new service to accommodate transit demand from the proposed project.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

3. The Action Plan encourages active transportation to improve multi-modal mobility and decrease single-occupant vehicle travel. TRANSPLAN supports the proposed project's intent to provide a high-quality non-motorized transportation network. The traffic impact analysis should identify opportunities to provide appropriate infrastructure to eliminate physical barriers (i.e. freeway interchanges, dead-end roads, trails or paths, etc.) to bicycle and pedestrian travel to and from the project area.

Transportation Demand Management

4. The proposed project is the quintessential transit-oriented development ("TOD"). The proposed project should implement transportation demand management ("TDM") strategies, which can benefit the region by promoting the use of travel modes that are more efficient and environmentally friendly. TDM strategies can potentially decrease the number of single-occupant auto trips, and therefore the proposed project's impact on roadway network congestion.

Management of Effects of New Growth and Maintenance

5. Section 4.3 of the "Measure J Growth Management Implementation Guide" states: "*Each jurisdiction must adopt, or maintain in place, a development mitigation program to ensure that growth is paying its share of the cost associated with that growth. This program shall consist of both a local program to mitigate impacts on local streets and other facilities and a regional program to fund regional and sub-regional transportation projects consistent with the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan.*"

Concord and all Contra Costa Cities should be held strictly to this requirement so that others do not undermine Growth Management efforts of some regions within the county. Regional fees collected in East County to date are over \$400 Million. These funds, as required by Measure J, have been put toward regional projects to ensure that growth is paying its share. East Contra Costa expects all cities within the County follow the same rules established by Measure J and that those who do not forfeit their return to source funds.

The East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Finance Authority ("ECCRFFA") administers the sub-regional transportation impact fee for East County, which is designed to use revenues generated by new growth to improve the regional transportation system that serves the travel demands of that growth. The Concord Reuse Project Area Plan contains a policy that states the City will prepare a nexus study to develop a traffic impact fee program. TRANSPLAN supports this and encourages the City to, where there are opportunities, coordinate with TRANSPLAN for transportation projects that may benefit both the East and Central County sub-regions in alleviating the project's impacts.

In addition, the City and East County jurisdictions should work towards, when appropriate, securing adequate funds to maintain the transportation system. This applies to RRS, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and park-and-ride lots.

Thank you for your consideration, TRANSPLAN appreciates the opportunity to participate in the environmental review process for the proposed project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact TRANSPLAN staff at jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us or (925) 674-7832.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Stamps".

Jamar Stamps, AICP
TRANSPLAN staff

cc: TRANSPLAN TAC

ITEM 2
DRAFT MOU FOR THE ATS PLAN

DRAFT FOR REVIEW/COMMENT

CCTA AGREEMENT ###.##.##

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Between

THE CONTRA COSTA TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

AND

LOCAL AGENCIES & ORGANIZATIONS

FOR THE

ACCESSIBLE TRANSPORTATION STRATEGIC PLAN

(Funded by Caltrans: Sustainable Communities - Transportation Planning Grant)

1. Introduction

This MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING (hereafter “MOU”), effective as of ***** ##, 2018, is meant to establish a common understanding of: 1) the need for Contra Costa Accessible Transportation Strategic (ATS) Plan (hereafter “ATS Plan”), 2) the procedures for the conduct of the ATS Plan, and 3) the collaborative intent of the ATS Plan and parties to this MOU.

Parties to this MOU include the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (hereafter “CCTA”), a local transportation authority, County of Contra Costa, a political subdivision of the State of California (hereafter “COUNTY”), and the following LOCAL AGENCY PARTNERS:... [TBD]

The ATS Plan: 1) is an assessment of transportation and transportation related services to seniors and persons with disabilities, 2) addresses a diverse array of impacted organizations, 3) implements local and regional plans and policies, 4) is necessary because services to this vulnerable population are being compromised by rising costs, demographic shifts/decreasing public health resulting in increased demand, 5) is intended to address a system that developed unsystematically over a long time frame, and 6) is an implementation action¹ in CCTA’s adopted 2017 Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

The need for the ATS Plan and this MOU is further magnified by the intersection of public transit, public health, social service, civil rights interests and philosophies held by the entities and persons using and providing accessible transportation services. It is this complex intersection that results in diffused leadership and authority that further confirms the need for this MOU.

The ATS Plan has three broad tasks: 1) Study of existing, individual programs with recommendations. 2) Study of alternative countywide system designs. 3) Development of a phased implementation plan. At every stage, the ATS Plan will include expansive outreach responsive to, and designed for, the subject population.

¹ 2017 CCTA CTP: Table 5-1 “Initiate the Accessible Transportation Service Strategic Plan...To ensure that services are delivered in a coordinated system...”

2. Definitions

- A. **Accessible Transportation:** An umbrella term used to describe the broad range of transportation related services typically provided to seniors and persons with disabilities. For the purposes of this MOU and the ATS Plan, accessible transportation is defined as a range of transportation/transit and related supportive services such as; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandated public paratransit service, city/community transportation programs, transportation provided by private non-profits, mobility management programs, volunteer based transportation programs, travel training, as well as funding and governance mechanisms associated with the preceding activities.
- B. **Subject Population:** The ATS Plan addresses services to the most acutely disadvantaged and fragile communities, seniors and persons with disabilities. These populations are typically also low income.

3. MOU Purpose

- A. **Structure:** The system of accessible transportation in Contra Costa County has been described as “developed organically” with a “lack of a structural platform” being a “major impediment to action”². Given these characteristics, this MOU (and Oversight Structure referenced herein) provides a temporary structure and forum to more effectively conduct the ATS Plan. The ATS Plan Scope of Work includes a task, “*Establishment or designation of an organization and/or structure to act as advocate and administrator for this transit transportation sector on an ongoing basis*” which is intended to address the “lack of a structural platform” issue once the ATS Plan is complete.
- B. **Understanding:** This MOU is intended to ensure consistent understanding of the need for, and the intent of, the ATS Plan. This understanding should be consistent across the range of impacted agencies and organizations as well as across responsible staff and elected decision makers.
- C. **Commitment:** In response to the three previous, similar efforts in the past³, this MOU establishes a commitment of the parties to take formal action relative to the final recommendations of the study as further described in the **Understanding** section below.

4. Recitals

- A. During the 2015-2016 development of the Measure X Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) CCTA conducted substantial outreach and convened the Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee (EPAC) which identified “*Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities*” as a high priority category⁴ in the TEP.
- B. CCTA and all member agencies (nineteen Cities and the County) unanimously approved the Measure X Transportation Expenditure Plan in 2016. Recognizing the aforementioned EPAC prioritization and testimony from advocates, the TEP included a requirement to conduct an “*Accessible Transportation Service Strategic Plan*” to “...ensure services are delivered in a coordinated system that maximizes both service delivery and efficiency...”.
- C. In 2017, with Measure X failing to gain voter approval but recognizing the standing need to improve accessible transportation, CCTA approved the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan which included the following actions, “*ensure that services are delivered in a coordinated system...*” and “*Initiate the Accessible Transportation Service Strategic Plan*” as an implementation activity.

² 2013 Contra Costa County Mobility Management Plan

³ 1990 Contra Costa County Paratransit Plan, 2004 Contra Costa County Paratransit Improvement Study, 2013 Contra Costa County Mobility Management Study

⁴ <http://www.cccounty.us/DocumentCenter/View/46455/EPAC-Input-Exercise-Results>

- D. The 2018 *Coordinated Public Transit-Human Services Transportation Plan* from the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) supports (from a regional perspective) the need to address accessible transportation issues “*Current senior-oriented mobility services do not have the capacity to handle the increase in people over 65 years of age...the massive growth among the aging...points to a lack of fiscal and organizational readiness...will place heavy demands on an already deficient system...*”.
- E. MTC, on February 28, 2018, passed Resolution 4321 which established that Alameda, **Contra Costa**, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Clara Counties “...*must establish or enhance mobility management programs to help provide equitable and effective access to transportation.*” The ATS Plan will inform CCTA’s response to this policy.
- F. Parties recognize that governance relative to accessible transportation services involves diverse industries, organizations, geographic responsibilities, regulatory requirements and varying organizational philosophies and goals. This diversity creates an environment characterized by diffused responsibility and authority. To address this situation, and building on lessons learned from previous, similar planning efforts, parties acknowledge they are taking steps to ensure progress in the accessible transportation sector. These steps include conducting the ATS Plan and authorizing this MOU.
- G. As described by the American Public Transportation Association⁵, the parties recognize that the largest number of providers operating this type of service are non-profit organizations. As such, representative organizations who receive Measure J (2004) funding are included in this agreement and in the ATS Plan.
- H. Parties acknowledge the significant and increasing fiscal exposure to the public transit districts and nongovernmental transportation service providers due to increasing demand for service to the subject population.
- I. In 2018 CCTA, with assistance from the COUNTY, submitted a grant application to Caltrans under the Sustainable Communities – Transportation Planning Grant Program to fund the “*Accessible Transportation Strategic Plan*”. The grant received “conditional award status” in May 2018. In July 2018 the CCTA Board adopted a resolution authorizing agreements with Caltrans. In September 2018 the CCTA Board approved the ATS Plan Scope of Work, Release of a Request for Proposals, the ATS Plan Oversight Committee Structure, and the release of a DRAFT MOU for review and comment.
- J. Parties agree that, as a result of the ATS Plan, public transit operators shall not be encumbered with additional responsibilities without corresponding, concurrent increase in resources nor should revenue be reduced without corresponding, concurrent decrease in obligations.
- K. In the event that implementation activities proceed after the completion of the ATS Plan, Parties commit to insulate the paratransit client population from service degradation or disruption to the greatest extent possible.

5. Understanding

- A. Due to the acknowledged need for improvement in the accessible transportation sector in Contra Costa County, the extreme vulnerability of the subject population, and to mitigate the history of previous efforts, CCTA, COUNTY and LOCAL AGENCY PARTNERS hereby agree as follows:

⁵ 2015/2016 American Public Transportation Association *Fact Book*

- i. To collaboratively, expeditiously, and in good faith support and participate in the conduct of the ATS Plan at all organizational levels and in all forums.
- ii. To resolve technical, policy, operational and other matters considered by the ATS Plan at the lowest possible policy working level in the following order of hierarchy from low to high: lead staff⁶, ATS Plan Technical Advisory Committee, ATS Plan Policy Advisory Committee, CCTA Planning Committee, CCTA Board of Directors.
- iii. To consider the Final Recommendations of the study, once available, at a meeting of the Board of Directors (or equivalent body) and take action supported by a stated rationale.

B. Responsibilities of CCTA, County and LOCAL AGENCY PARTNERS.

- i. CCTA agrees:
 - a) To administer the ATS Plan using the established Oversight Structure and as described in the Scope of Work.
 - b) To expeditiously take formal Board action on the ATS Plan final recommendations **after** LOCAL AGENCY PARTNERS have acted, and **with consideration** of those actions.
 - c) Should the ATS Plan be approved, to expeditiously pursue any implementation steps assigned to CCTA.
 - d) To proactively pursue resources to support implementation of the ATS Plan.
- ii. COUNTY agrees:
 - a) To track and report staff hours consistent with Caltrans requirements for grant match funding.
 - b) To continue to support CCTA staff in the administration of the ATS Plan.
- iii. LOCAL AGENCY PARTNERS and COUNTY agree:
 - a) To participate in the ATS Plan by way of their respective roles in the established Oversight Structure.
 - b) To expeditiously take formal Board action, accompanied by stated, well-supported rationale addressing the ATS Plan final recommendations.
 - c) Should the ATS Plan be approved by CCTA, to expeditiously pursue any implementation steps assigned to the respective agencies/organizations.
 - d) To support CCTA in seeking and securing resources to implement the ATS Plan.

- 6. **MOU Modification.** This MOU may be modified only by the written approval of the legislative bodies of all parties.
- 7. **MOU Termination.** Unless terminated earlier, this MOU will terminate immediately after all parties take action on the ATS Plan final recommendations.
- 8. Counterparts. The parties hereto recognize and agree that separate counterpart signature pages may be used to execute this MOU, but that all such pages constitute one and the same MOU.
- 9. Construction. The section headings and captions of this MOU are, and the arrangement of this instrument is, for the sole convenience of the parties to this MOU. The section headings, captions and arrangement of this instrument do not in any way affect, limit, amplify or modify the terms and provisions of this MOU. This MOU will not be construed as if it had been prepared by one of the parties, but rather as if both parties have prepared it. The parties to this MOU and their respective counsel have read and reviewed this MOU and agree that any rule of construction to the effect that ambiguities are to be resolved against

⁶ Peter Engel, Director of Programs – Contra Costa Transportation Authority, pengel@ccta.net, 925.256.4741
 John Cunningham, Principal Planner – Contra Costa County: john.cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us, 925-674-7833

the drafting party will not apply to the interpretation of this MOU. The recitals of this MOU are, and will be enforceable as, a part of this MOU.

Attachments: ATS Plan Scope of Work

Signatures appear on following pages

DRAFT

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have set their hands and seals the day and year first above written.

CONTRA COSTA
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

By: _____

Federal D. Glover
Chair

By: _____

Karen Mitchoff
Chair

Attest:

Attest:

By: _____

Randell H. Iwasaki
Executive Director

By: _____

David Twa
County Administrator

Approved as to form:
Best Best & Krieger LLP

Approved as to form:
County Counsel

By: _____

Malathy Subramanian
Authority Counsel

By: _____

Sharon L. Andersen
County Counsel

[insert Local Agency Partner Name]

[insert Local Agency Partner Name]

By: _____

[name]
Chair

By: _____

[name]
Chair

Attest:

Attest:

By: _____

[name]
Executive Director

By: _____

[name]
Executive Director

Approved as to form:
Agency Counsel

Approved as to form:
Agency Counsel

By: _____

Malathy Subramanian
Counsel

By: _____

[name]
Counsel

ITEM 3
ADDITIONAL SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL FUNDING

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

Antioch • Brentwood • Oakley • Pittsburg • Contra Costa County
30 Muir Road, Martinez, CA 94553

TO: TRANSPLAN Committee

FROM: TRANSPLAN TAC

DATE: February 14, 2019

SUBJECT: Additional One Bay Area Grant 2 Safe Routes to School Funding

Recommendation

APPROVE allocation of \$246,000 in additional One Bay Area Grant (“OBAG”) Safe Routes to School to the “L Street Pathway to Transit-Bike Pedestrian Improvements” project (City of Antioch), as recommended by the TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee (“TAC”) and DIRECT TRANSPLAN staff to forward the recommended allocation to the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (“CCTA”).

Background

August 2018, CCTA issues a memorandum to the regional transportation planning committees (“RTPCs”) regarding additional OBAG Safe Routes to School (“SRTS”) federal funding. This funding became available due to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (“MTC”) extending cycle 1 of OBAG for an additional year. The funds were not included in OBAG 2 due to timing. However, the funds are now available for programming and CCTA is seeking recommendations from the RTPCs on the allocation process.

September 2018, CCTA staff met with the TRANSPLAN TAC to discuss the August 2018 memo. The TAC discussed several options for allocating the additional funding, including: 1) allocate the additional SRTS funds among the four RTPCs for new projects, 2) add additional funding to projects already in the Transportation Improvement Program (“TIP”), or 3) program funding for SRTS projects that were not awarded in OBAG 2. CCTA staff discussed the matter with the other RTPCs.

December 2018, after meeting with all of the RTPCs CCTA issued a second memorandum outlining the process for allocating the additional SRTS funds. The consensus process approach is to add the additional funds to projects already programmed (projects must meet 11.47% match requirement). CCTA wants to minimize the number of projects going through the Caltrans Local Assistance process, which can be onerous for a relatively small amount of funding. Adhering to this logic would exclude projects that are not already in the TIP. Considering the City of Antioch is the only TRANSPLAN agency with a project on the OBAG 2 list, the TAC recommended allocating the funding to the City. The City also indicated they could meet the 11.47% funding match requirement.

att: CCTA memo 8/1/2018
CCTA memo 12/28/2018

MEMORANDUM

Date August 1, 2018

To Safe Routes to School Task Force, RTPC Managers

From Brad Beck

RE **Additional Safe Routes to School Funding**

As part of the extension of the first cycle of the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) for an additional year, MTC allocated an additional \$822,000 to Contra Costa in funding for Safe Routes to School (SRTS) projects and programs. These federal funds, unfortunately, were not included in the OBAG 2 call for projects. They remain available to Contra Costa and Authority staff has prepared the following memo outlining potential options for allocating these funds.

BACKGROUND

Previous Funding Cycles

MTC has allocated funding to CMAs for SRTS projects and programs through several funding cycles. The first OBAG cycle allocated \$3,289,000 to Contra Costa for SRTS projects and programs. It was used to fund 10 projects and one program. The funding was allocated by formula to the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) which recommended which projects to fund. The formula was based 50 percent on school enrollment and 50 percent on population.

Through the second cycle of OBAG funding — OBAG2 — MTC allotted \$4.088 million to Contra Costa for SRTS. As in OBAG 1, the Authority used the same 50 percent enrollment and 50 percent population formula. The funding share are shown below:

<i>Region</i>	<i>Share</i>
West	\$881,000
Central	\$1,077,000
East	\$1,223,000
Southwest	\$907,000
TOTAL	\$4,088,000

Based on the RTPC recommendations and some subsequent fund swapping, the Authority allocated the SRTS funding to the following four projects and two programs:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>SRTS Funding</i>
Willow Pass Road Repaving and 6 th Street SRTS *	Concord	\$1,077,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements **	Moraga	\$607,000
L Street Pathway to Transit-Bike Ped Improvement	Antioch	\$1,223,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Ped Enhancements	Richmond	\$320,000
Street Smarts San Ramon Valley	San Ramon	\$300,000
West Contra Costa Walk and Bike Leaders	Contra Costa County	\$561,000
TOTAL		\$4,088,000

* This project combines components from two projects that were originally separate

** Originally named "Strategic Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safe Routes to School Improvements"

The first two projects combine both SRTS improvements and other roadway improvements. The third and fourth projects focus on physical improvements for safe bicycle and pedestrian access to schools. The final two will fund SRTS programs at schools in the San Ramon Valley and West County.

Eligible Projects and Programs

The \$822,000 in SRTS funds comes from the federal CMAQ program. While they may fund a wide range of projects and programs, they do impose some limits. One of the key limits is that, overall, each activity must lead to changes in travel behavior that result in air quality benefits. Some of the main limitations include:

- **Planning activities** are ineligible, including walking audits. Project development activities that support a tangible improvement or program, however, are eligible.

- **Safety improvements** such as crossing guards and mobile radar trailers are ineligible for CMAQ funding since they specifically address safety but do not directly lead to changes to travel behavior that lead to air quality improvement. Also safety improvements such as signage, warning lights, etc. that are oriented to motorists are not eligible. In contrast, safety improvements specifically oriented to bicyclists and pedestrians, such as street crossings, actuated signals are eligible.
- **Material incentives** have limitations regarding the use of federal funds to pay for items such as raffles, prizes, gift cards, etc. Federal statutes prohibit using federal funds to provide gifts and free incentives. The exceptions to the rule are low-cost gifts such as pencils, stickers, paper pads, magnets, helmets, etc. that have little or no monetary value.

The requirements that apply to other OBAG-funded projects apply to SRTS projects as well. These include:

- The CMAs average OBAG funding request can't be less than \$500,000 and no individual request can be less than \$100,000.
- Sponsor must provide a local match of at least 11.47% of eligible project costs
- Sponsor must maintain eligibility for the funding including complete streets, pavement management and housing element requirements

OPTIONS

Staff has identified a few options for allocating the \$822,000 in additional SRTS funds that we would like your feedback on.

Option 1

Allocate the additional SRTS funds among the four RTPCs for new projects. This is the same as the previous approach; in it, the RTPCs would identify new projects to be funded with their share of the funds. Using the same 50% population/50% enrollment formula, the funds would be apportioned as shown on the following table. MTC requires, among other things, that no funding grant be less than \$100,000 and all of the following allocations would meet this requirement.

<i>Subarea</i>	<i>Population Share</i>	<i>Enrollment Share</i>	<i>Average</i>	<i>Funding Share</i>
West	24.1%	19.0%	21.6%	\$177,000
Central	28.7%	24.0%	26.3%	\$217,000
East	28.6%	31.2%	29.9%	\$246,000
Southwest	18.6%	25.7%	22.2%	\$182,000
				\$822,000

Pros: This option would be consistent with the approaches used for OBAG 1 and 2, and it would expand the number of SRTS improvements that could be made in Contra Costa.

Cons: This option would increase the number of projects that must go through the Caltrans local assistance process. (One of the Authority’s goals in the Coordinated Call was to minimize the number of projects that had to go through Caltrans.) This option would also require RTPCs to go through another application and review process.

Option 2a

Add funding to projects already in the TIP. In the second option, the Authority would use the \$822,000 to modify one or more of the projects funded through the Coordinated Call. (This is consistent with the Authority’s goal of minimizing the number of projects that needed to go through the Caltrans process.) In this option, the Authority could use the \$822,000 to either:

- Replace some of the local match where the match exceeds the 11.47 percent minimum, or
- Expand the budget of projects to address cost overruns or to add new scope items

The table on Option 2a below lists the seven SRTS projects now funded through OBAG 2; the amounts of funding from federal, local and Measure J sources they will use; and the local match share. All but one of the projects provides a significantly larger match than the 11.47 percent required. Those six projects could use a portion of the \$822,000 to replace at least some of the local match. For example, the Moraga Way and

Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements project could use the \$822,000 to replace all of the Town of Moraga's local match, leaving the \$603,00 in Measure J funding to serve as the local match.

To use the SRTS funding to replace local or Measure J funding, sponsors would need a sufficiently high local match and enough eligible SRTS components funded by the local match. For example, the Moraga project uses both OBAG SRTS and LSRP funds to both improve bicycle and pedestrian access to nearby schools and to preserve streets. The latter component would not specifically improve access to school and thus is not eligible for CMAQ funding.

The Option 2a table shows the funding committed to each project, the part of that funding that represents the required local match, and potential additional CMAQ funding that could be used to backfill the local match fall down to the required 11.47 percent.

Pros Option 2a would not increase the number of projects going through the Local Assistance process and would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute. Depending on how the funding is allocated, it could be used to defray the costs of sponsors that have proposed the most significant local contributions.

Cons The Authority would need to identify a way to determine how much of the \$822,000 would go to each project. These methods might include allocating the funds by the relative size of the sponsor's local contribution to total of all local contributions. Or it might be determined by the relative share of the total project cost each sponsor contributed. There are likely to be other alternatives.

Option 2b

Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP. Option 2b combines Options 1 and 2a. In it, the RTPC shares of the additional SRTS funding would be added to funding for the projects that were already selected for OBAG 2 SRTS funding. A potential allocation of the \$822,000 in funds is shown in the Option 2b table. In both the Central and East subregions, only one project was allocated SRTS funding; those projects would get the full share of the subregion's funds. The SRTS funding in both the West and

Southwest regions was allocated to two projects. The Option 3 table shows the Southwest potential share of funding split 50/50 between the two Southwest projects. In West County, however, the maximum amount of additional funding that can be allocated to one of the projects — Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements — is \$63,000 without the local match dropping below the 11.47 percent requirement.

Pros Option 2b would not add any new projects, thus meeting one of the Authority's goals, it would be consistent with previous approach of allocating funding among the RTPCs, and — like Option 2a — would reduce the amount of funding that local agencies must contribute.

Cons The increase in fund allocations would not be tied to an agency's current local contribution, the cost of the project itself, or to budgetary issues, thereby somewhat arbitrarily rewarding sponsors with a windfall.

Option 3

Use the funding on a SRTS project that didn't receive funding through OBAG 2. In Option 3, the \$822,000 in funding would go to a SRTS project that applied for, but did not receive, funding during the initial OBAG 2 round. Three of the 11 projects that applied for SRTS funding did not receive any funding:

1. Empire Avenue at Amber Lane Traffic Signal (Brentwood) – \$366,000 requested;
2. Arlington Boulevard Pedestrian Safety Improvements, Phase 1, (El Cerrito) – \$345,000 requested; and
3. Safe Routes to Orchard Park Elementary School (Oakley) – \$1,22, million requested.

The remaining eight received either SRTS or Measure J TLC funds. In this option, the additional SRTS funding would be allocated to one or more of these projects.

Pros Option 3 would expand the number of SRTS projects funded through OBAG 2 and the facilities provided to create safe routes to walk or bicycle to school.

Cons This option would add a new project and thus another project that must go through the local assistance process. The funding available doesn't fit neatly with

the funding needed to make the projects whole; staff may need to work with sponsors to adjust project scopes, though this is often done.

Option 2a: Add funding to projects already in the TIP

	<i>SRTS</i>	<i>Other OBAG</i>	<i>Measure J</i>	<i>Local</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Current Match</i>		<i>Minimum Match</i>	<i>Potential Add</i>
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000	4,183,000	120,000	1,137,000	6,517,000	1,257,000	19.3%	747,000	510,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000	596,000	603,000	822,000	2,628,000	1,425,000	54.2%	301,000	1,124,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			1,777,000	3,000,000	1,777,000	59.2%	344,000	1,433,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000		63,000	50,000	433,000	113,000	26.1%	50,000	63,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000			102,000	402,000	102,000	25.4%	46,000	56,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000			561,000	1,122,000	561,000	50.0%	129,000	432,000
	4,088,000	4,779,000	786,000	4,449,000	14,102,000	5,235,000		1,617,000	3,618,000

Option 2b: Add regional share of funding to projects already in the TIP

	Current SRTS Amount	Regional SRTS Shares				Potential SRTS Funds	Total Potential SRTS Funds
		West	Central	East	Southwest		
Willow Pass Repaving and 6th Street SRTS	1,077,000		217,000			217,000	1,294,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements	607,000				91,000	91,000	698,000
L Street Pathway to Transit	1,223,000			246,000		246,000	1,469,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Pedestrian Enhancements	320,000	63,000				63,000 *	383,000
San Ramon Valley Street Smarts	300,000				91,000	91,000	391,000
West County Walk and Bike Leaders	561,000	114,000				114,000	675,000
	4,088,000	177,000	217,000	246,000	182,000	822,000	4,910,000

* This is the maximum additional SRTS funding that can be added while still meeting the 11.47 percent match requirement



CONTRA COSTA
transportation
authority

COMMISSIONERS

December 28, 2018

Federal Glover, Chair

Robert Taylor,
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson

Newell Americh

Tom Butt

Loella Haskew

David Hudson

Karen Mitchoff

Julie Pierce

Kevin Romick

Dave Trotter

Randell H. Iwasaki,
Executive Director

To: RTPC Managers

From: Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner

Subject: Process for Allocating Additional One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) 2 Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Funding

An additional \$822,000 in federal Congestion Management-Air Quality (CMAQ) funding is available to Contra Costa for SRTS projects and programs. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) allocated these funds to Contra Costa when it extended the first cycle of OBAG for an additional year. The Authority, however, did not include these federal funds in the call for projects for the second cycle of OBAG.

On November 21, 2018, the Authority approved a process for allocating those additional funds. This process reflects input from the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), their Technical Advisory Committees (TACs), and members of the SRTS Task Force. This process has two parts:

1. The Authority allocates the funds to the RTPCs using the same formula used previously in the Coordinated Call for Projects.
2. The RTPCs recommend to the Authority how to apply that funding to projects already programmed in the federal Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

RTPC ALLOCATIONS

Based on the formula used in OBAG 2, the Authority is allocating the \$822,000 in additional SRTS funding to the RTPCs as follows:

2999 Oak Road
Suite 100
Walnut Creek
CA 94597
PHONE: 925.256.4700
FAX: 925.256.4701
www.ccta.net

<i>Region</i>	<i>Share</i>
West	\$177,000
Central	\$217,000
East	\$246,000
Southwest	\$182,000
TOTAL	\$822,000

Sponsors may use the funds for any eligible SRTS activities consistent with the limitations in the MTC Resolution 4202 and the original Call for Projects.

TIP PROJECTS

Six Contra Costa projects in the TIP received SRTS funds through OBAG 2:

<i>Project</i>	<i>Sponsor</i>	<i>SRTS Funding</i>
Willow Pass Road Repaving and 6 th Street SRTS *	Concord	\$1,077,000
Moraga Way and Canyon/Camino Pablo Improvements **	Moraga	\$607,000
L Street Pathway to Transit-Bike Ped Improvements	Antioch	\$1,223,000
Lincoln Elementary SRTS Ped Enhancements	Richmond	\$320,000
Street Smarts San Ramon Valley	San Ramon	\$300,000
West Contra Costa Walk and Bike Leaders	Contra Costa County	\$561,000
TOTAL		\$4,088,000

* This project combines components from two projects that were originally separate

** Originally named "Strategic Bicycle, Pedestrian and SRTS Improvements"

As long as enough local funds remain to provide the 11.47 percent minimum match, RTPCs and project sponsors have two options for using the additional SRTS funds:

1. Add to the total funds programmed to the project to expand its scope, or
2. Replace some of the local match with additional SRTS funds where the local funds currently exceed 11.47 percent of the total project cost.

RTPC Managers

December 28, 2018

Page 3

RTPCs may decide whether to apply all of its allocation of SRTS funds to one SRTS project in the TIP or to split its allocation to multiple projects. As noted above, the components funded must be consistent with the requirements of MTC's Resolution 4202 and the Call for Projects and sponsors must provide a local match of at least 11.47 percent.

A proposal to the Authority consistent with these recommendations would allocate the additional SRTS funds to the RTPCs for allocation to SRTS projects currently programmed in the TIP, either to expand the project scope or to replace local matching funds.

We are asking for RTPC recommendations by the end of February 2019.

If you have questions, feel free to contact James Hinkamp, Associate Transportation Planner, at jhinkamp@ccta.net or 925 256-4726.