

TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee

651 Pine Street, 4th Floor, North Wing, Martinez, CA 94553-0095

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

Antioch City Offices

Tuesday, July 20, 2010 from 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Antioch City Hall, 3rd Floor Conference Room

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.*

1:30 Item 1: City of Pittsburg Withdrawal from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority: See attached CCTA staff report re: the City of Pittsburg's 08-09 Biennial Growth Management Compliance Checklist. City of Pittsburg staff will distribute material prior to the TAC meeting. ♦

2:30 Item 2: Environmental Notices

2:45 Item 3: Communication:

2010 Land Use Update Presented to the July Planning Directors Meeting:

http://www.transplan.us/tac_download/2010%20Land%20Use%20Update.pdf

3:00 Item 4: Adjourn to Tuesday, August 17, 2010 at 1:30 p.m.

The Technical Advisory Committee meets on the third Tuesday afternoon of each month, starting at 1:30 p.m. in the third floor conference room of the Antioch City Hall building. The Technical Advisory Committee 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 John Cunningham, TRANSPLAN staff person, at least 48 hours prior to the starting time of the meeting. Mr. Cunningham can be reached at (925) 335-1243 or at john.cunningham@dcd.cccounty.us.

g:\transportation\committees\transplan\tplan_year\2010-11\meetings\tac\july\tac agenda jul10.doc

Planning Committee **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: July 7, 2010

Subject	The City of Pittsburg's Calendar Years (CY) 2008 & 2009 Growth Management Program (GMP) Compliance Checklist
Summary of Issues	<p>The City of Pittsburg has submitted its Calendar Years 2008 & 2009 Biennial Growth Management Program Compliance Checklist for allocation of local street maintenance and improvement funds. <u>Pittsburg's recent decision to withdraw from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (ECCRFFA) has raised compliance issues that require further discussion. Consequently, review of the Checklist has been held over to September, 2010.</u> An allocation of \$609,542 is <u>subject to the following-Authority's approval of the GMP Compliance Checklist finding that the City of Pittsburg complies with the GMP.</u></p>
Recommendations	<p><u>Staff recommends 1) Approval of the City of Pittsburg's CY 2008 & 2009 GMP Checklist, and payment of \$609,542 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds, and 2) Continued monitoring of the City of Pittsburg's participation in the Regional Mitigation Program, with the off-year payment (FY 2010-11 funds, scheduled for payment in July 2011) subject to Pittsburg's continued participation in ECCRFFA or a similar program that fulfills the Measure J requirement for a Regional Mitigation Program. In light of the City of Pittsburg's adoption of a resolution to withdraw from ECCRFFA, the Planning Committee recommends continuing this item for discussion to September to allow adequate time for Authority staff and legal counsel to assess the implications of this action.</u></p>
Financial Implications	<p>A total of \$11,574,000 is estimated to be available for Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds in FY 2009-10, based on actual sales tax receipts to date. <u>The City of Pittsburg's share, based on a 50/50 road miles and population formula, is estimated at \$609,542.</u></p>
Options	<p>The Authority has the option to disapprove a checklist; request additional information, such as an audit of a specific checklist question; grant conditional approval, or otherwise apply flexibility to individual circumstances.</p>
Attachments (See PC Packet, dated 7/7/2010 for B & C. New Attachment D.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Background on the ECCRFFA issue. B. Acknowledgement letter from Martin Engelmann to Paul Reinders, June 3, 2010

Changes from Committee

C. City of Pittsburg’s CY 2008 & 2009 GMP Compliance Checklist. (abridged – full version available at www.ccta.net)

~~C.D.~~ **D.** Draft Letter from Randy Iwasaki to Paul Reinders at the City of Pittsburg indicating that the Authority has continued discussion of Pittsburg’s Checklist to September 2010 and requesting additional compliance-related information.

The Planning Committee requested that staff continue this item to the September 1st Planning Committee meeting to allow staff and Authority legal counsel adequate time to provide further information on the Measure C/J GMP compliance implications of Pittsburg’s decision to withdraw from ECCRAFA. The Committee also requested that the Executive Director transmit a letter to the City of Pittsburg conveying the decision to continue the item to the September 1st, 2010 PC meeting and requesting additional information.

Background

The Measure C Growth Management Program (GMP), as amended, requires that every two years the Authority review and allocate funds to cities, towns and the county, subject to submission of a Statement of Compliance by the local jurisdiction and findings made by the Authority. The Measure C program ended on March 31, 2009. On April 1, 2009, Measure J began, with the continued requirement for biennial GMP compliance reporting.

The *Biennial Compliance Checklist* provides a vehicle for measuring local jurisdictions’ fulfillment of the requirements of the Growth Management Program. The Final Measure C Checklist covers the reporting period for Calendar Year (CY) 2008 plus the first quarter of CY 2009. The initial Measure J Checklist covers the three remaining quarters of CY 2009. Jurisdictions in compliance with the GMP will receive FY 09-10 funds for local street maintenance and improvements. The second-year’s funding, also known as the “off year” (in this case, FY 10-11) will be allocated automatically on the one-year anniversary of the current year’s allocation, without requiring any further checklist submittals from the local jurisdiction.

A summary of the completed checklist submitted by the subject jurisdiction is attached.

Regional Fee Issue

In July 2009, the City of Pittsburg started withholding payment of regional fee revenues to the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Finance Authority (ECCRFFA). Following this action, through a series of correspondence, the City of Pittsburg proposed to withdraw from ECCRFFA unless fee revenues collected in the City of Pittsburg were redirected toward projects that are located within Pittsburg, specifically the James Donlon Boulevard Extension project (formerly the Buchanan Road Bypass). On Friday, June 25, 2010, the City of Pittsburg made full payment to ECCRFFA of unpaid fees in the amount

of \$2,474,560.16. Then, on July 6, 2010, the City Council adopted a resolution to withdraw from ECCRFFA. Attachment A provides details on the discussions between ECCRFFA and Pittsburg.

The Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that each local jurisdiction participate in both a local and a regional mitigation program to ensure that new growth pays its share of the costs associated with that growth. The City of Pittsburg's ~~potential~~ withdrawal from ECCRFFA on July 6, 2010 would constitute a significant compliance issue with the regional mitigation requirement of Measure J.

~~On Friday, June 25, 2010, the City of Pittsburg made full payment to ECCRFFA of unpaid fees in the amount of \$2,474,560.16 (see Attachment A). Consequently, for the reporting period of CY 2008 & 2009, The City is in compliance with the Measure J GMP requirements.~~

~~The City is continuing to work with ECCRFFA to find a workable funding mechanism for the James Donlon Boulevard Extension. Resolution of this issue may involve ECCRFFA amending its Strategic Plan to address Pittsburg's concern. How this issue gets resolved will determine whether or not the City remains in compliance during the reporting period of CY 2010 & 2011, the next Checklist.~~

Citizens Advisory Committee Review

The full Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) reviewed the City of Pittsburg's Checklist on June 23, 2010, and expressed serious concerns with the City of Pittsburg's possible withdraw from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (ECCRFFA). The CAC agreed that if the City of Pittsburg withdrew from ECCRFFA, it would be in violation of the Measure J GMP, which requires each local jurisdiction to participate in both a local and a regional mitigation program. The full CAC recommended to deny approval of the City of Pittsburg's Checklist and withhold FY 2009-10 LSM funds until the issue with ECCRFA was resolved. (Note: Pittsburg's action to repay withheld fees and withdraw from ECCRFFA occurred after the CAC meeting).

Third Revision Housing Element Update

The City of Pittsburg submitted its adopted third revision housing element to State Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) in November 2004. In a letter dated October 15, 2004, HCD stated that the jurisdiction's adopted Housing Element complied with State law. Furthermore, according to HCD's website, the jurisdiction currently remains in compliance with State law.

Recommendation

~~Staff recommends 1) approval of the City of Pittsburg's CY 2008 & 2009 GMP Checklist, and payment of \$609,542 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2009-10 Local Street Maintenance and Improvement (LSM) funds, and 2) Continued monitoring of the City of Pittsburg's participation in the Regional Mitigation Program, with the off-year payment (FY 2010-11 funds, scheduled for payment in July 2011). The Planning Committee recommended that the Authority carry this item over to the September 2010 Planning Committee meeting to allow adequate time for Authority staff and legal counsel to assess the ramifications of~~

~~subject to Pittsburg's continued participation in withdrawal from ECCRFFA, or a similar program that fulfills the Measure J requirement for a Regional Mitigation Program. Furthermore, the Planning Committee recommended that the Executive Director send a letter to Pittsburg indicating that the discussion is being continued into September, and requesting additional information regarding GMP compliance.~~

Planning Committee (PC) Discussion (NEW SUBSECTION)

At its meeting on July 7, 2010, the PC discussed the following three options:

1. Find the City of Pittsburg out of compliance with the GMP and withhold funding for both FY 2010 and 2011 until Pittsburg can demonstrate compliance with the Measure J GMP; or
2. Allocate FY 2009-2010 funds, and remain in a "watch" position regarding the "off-year" allocation of FY 2010-11 funds; or
3. Carry the discussion over to September to allow Authority staff and legal counsel adequate time to assess the policy implications of Pittsburg's actions.

Following a significant discussion, the PC selected Option 3, to carry the discussion over to September. Below is a summary of some of the comments that were made.

Commissioner Bonilla agreed that the PC did not have enough information to come to a decision and recommended Option 3. Ms. Bonilla also asked whether Pittsburg was in agreement up to a certain point in time and when things changed, or whether there were any opportunities for this issue to come forward before it reached this point? Ms. Bonilla further observed that it appeared that the reason that Pittsburg had withdrawn was because all of the projects were not within the City of Pittsburg.

Commission Frazier noted that through TRANSPAN and ECCRFFA, both he and Federal Glover had participated in negotiations that had taken place over the past year. He further asked whether the action Pittsburg had taken (to withdraw from ECCRFFA) was consistent with Pittsburg's General Plan. He also requested that Authority staff explore the ramifications with MTC and others of the funding shortfall that would be created by Pittsburg's actions on the SR 4 widening, the SR 4 Bypass, and e-BART.

Commissioner Abelson noted that in a regional setting, each jurisdiction individually may not win everytime, but that the concept of a regional body was to do what the majority of the region wanted to do for the greater benefit of all. Commissioner Abelson further asked for an explanation of how Pittsburg's actions could be construed as regional in nature if the requirement for that process was for each city to get what it individually desires. Furthermore, Commissioner Abelson asked the question: What would be required for Pittsburg to get back into compliance with the GMP?

Commissioner Arnerich noted that in the case of each subarea, and countywide, some local jurisdiction are donors, and others are recipients. Within the RTPCs, we have had policies that show evidence of significant cooperation among the local jurisdictions within each RTPC. In addition, there has been

support across regional boundaries to fund regional projects. Working together gets us greater funding, while each of us going it alone results in fewer overall benefits. Commissioner Arnerich also inquired whether Pittsburg was aware of any matching funds (federal or state) that could be at risk.

Paul Reinders, Senior Civil Engineer for the City of Pittsburg, was present at the PC meeting. He responded that for the CY 2008 and 2009 reporting period, Pittsburg was a member of ECCRFFA, and that the fees withheld had been paid with interest. Mr. Reinders acknowledged that there could be a compliance issue by not having a regional fee, however, Pittsburg intended to take action to continue to collect a fee within its jurisdictional boundaries to fund projects that were regional in nature. He further noted that the Buchanan Road Bypass (a.k.a. the James Donlon Extension) was written into the ECCRFFA agreement as a first priority for funding, but ECCRFFA did not honor that priority. Mr. Reinders stated that he did not see a compliance issue for CY 2008 and 2009, and was optimistic that compliance for CY 2010 and 2011 could be worked out. Furthermore, Mr. Reinders stated that the James Donlon Extension project: a) was not located within the City of Pittsburg [it is located in unincorporated Contra Costa County], and b) will primarily serve traffic that has neither an origin nor a destination within Pittsburg. Mr. Reinders framed the issue as one where Pittsburg sought to fund regional projects that would benefit the City of Pittsburg, such as the James Donlon Extension and e-BART, and that the primary issue was not whether or not to fund regional projects, but rather ECCRFFA's priorities for those projects.

Ms. Dana Hoggat, planning staff for the City of Pittsburg, responded to Commissioner Frazier's question by stating that there were no policies within Pittsburg's General Plan that specifically spoke to ECCRFFA, however there were policies to encourage regional transportation and regional transportation improvements.

Following this discussion, the PC instructed Authority staff to:

1. Carry the item over to the September 1, 2010 PC meeting.
2. Prepare a letter to Pittsburg indicating that the discussion would be continued, the reasons for continuing the discussion, requests for further information, and an allowance for adequate time so that Pittsburg staff could fully respond.
3. Proceed with its investigation into all of the questions raised, including to seek a legal opinion, historical reference points, chronology of the issue, impacts of funding for CCTA and how this will affect our ability to deliver projects in east County.

A draft letter from Randell Iwasaki to Paul Reinders is included in new Attachment D.

CITY OF PITTSBURG [REVISED-JULY 13, 2010]
BIENNIAL COMPLIANCE CHECKLIST SUMMARY Calendar Years 2008 & 2009
OVERALL FINDING: ON HOLD

According to the jurisdiction's Checklist, the following findings have been made:

1. **Action Plans: Subject to Discussion**
The jurisdiction needs to demonstrate how it has implemented the actions and followed procedures as called for in its Action Plan, specifically with regard to participation in the regional mitigation program through ECCRFFA.
2. **Regional Transportation Mitigation Program (RTMP): Subject to Discussion**
Since submittal of the Checklist, the jurisdiction has withdrawn from ECCRFFA, bringing into question compliance with the requirement to participate in a RTMP. The jurisdiction has been requested to re-submit its response to this Checklist question.
3. **Housing Options and Job Opportunities: Complies**
The jurisdiction's third-cycle Housing Element has been judged by HCD to be in compliance with State law (Measure C), and the jurisdiction has submitted a housing report that meets the requirements of Measure J.
4. **Growth Management Element (GME) Performance Standards: Complies**
The jurisdiction has adopted a Growth Management Element as part of its General Plan. The jurisdiction also complies, or will comply through implementation of its CIP, with its adopted performance standards. Furthermore, the jurisdiction's GME was updated to comply with Measure J.
5. **Growth Management Element (GME) Traffic Level of Service (LOS) Standards: Complies**
As required, traffic impact studies were conducted on development projects generating more than 100 peak hour trips. Reporting intersections met LOS standards. No intersections were subject to Findings of Special Circumstances.
6. **Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning: Complies**
The jurisdiction regularly participated in RTPC meetings; the jurisdiction's representative to the RTPC regularly reported to the council on RTPC activities; and the jurisdiction made land use and traffic data available for the countywide model.
7. **Five-Year Capital Improvement Program: Complies**
The jurisdiction has an adopted CIP that meets Measure C and J requirements. (December 21, 2009)
8. **Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Program: Complies**
The jurisdiction has an adopted TSM Resolution or Ordinance that conforms with the Authority's Model TSM Resolution or Ordinance. Reso. 97-1139 (December 2, 1997)
9. **Maintenance of Effort (MoE): Complies.**
The jurisdiction met the MoE requirements of Measure C. The MoE requirement for the City of Pittsburgh is \$961,877 per year. Expenditures were \$11,708,936 for FY 2007-08, and \$11,532,629 for FY 2008-09.
10. **Posting of Signs: Complies.**
11. **Other Considerations: N/A**

Certified By: Salvatore N. Evola **Date:** 5/20/2010

Date Received by CCTA: May 26, 2010

ATTACHMENT A

Issues Regarding Pittsburg/ECCRFFA

BACKGROUND

In August 1994, the local jurisdictions of East County (Pittsburg, Antioch, Brentwood, and Contra Costa County) entered into a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement (JEPA) that established a uniform regional development fee program within East County to finance transportation projects that included the widening of the SR-4 freeway, construction of the James Donlon Extension (formerly the Buchanan Bypass), and completion of the SR-4 Bypass (formerly the Delta Expressway).

The estimated total cost of the projects as stated in the ECCRFFA JEPA was \$403 million (1994 \$), of which \$189 million was to be funded through the regional fee. Upon inception of the JEPA, the regional fee was set at \$1,730/Dwelling Unit. The JEPA included a schedule that graduated up the fee amount to \$4,475/Dwelling Unit by July 1997.

In October 1999, following the incorporation of the City of Oakley, the ECCRFFA JEPA was amended to include the City of Oakley as party to the agreement. Shortly thereafter, in 2001, another joint powers agency was created. Called the East County Transportation Improvement Authority (ECTIA) JEPA, it included Antioch, Brentwood, Oakley, and the County, but did not include the City of Pittsburg.

In July 2005, the activities of ECCRFFA and ECTIA were consolidated by having ECCRFFA take over the uniform regional development fee program, and by terminating ECTIA and the ECTIA agreement. Today, the member agencies of ECCRFFA include all of the east county jurisdictions (Pittsburg, Antioch, Oakley, Brentwood, and the County), the fee for a single family home is currently set at \$17,795 per dwelling unit, and gross fee revenues since inception are in excess of \$200 million [Measure C Regional Transportation Mitigation Program, Summary Status Report, February 2008].

The Measure J Growth Management Program

Measure J includes a growth management program that allocates 18 percent of annual sales tax revenues to local jurisdictions that demonstrate compliance with the Growth Management Program (GMP). The GMP as described in the Measure J Expenditure Plan, includes seven categories for compliance. Two of those components are particularly relevant to the East County regional transportation mitigation program:

2. Adopt a Development Mitigation Program: This component includes the provision that “each jurisdiction must adopt, or maintain in place, a development mitigation program to ensure that new growth is paying its share of the costs 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 subregional transportation projects...”

4. Participate in an ongoing cooperative, multi-jurisdictional planning process: "...to manage the impacts of growth."

Policies and procedures specifying how a local jurisdiction is to fulfill the above requirements are elaborated upon in the Authority's Growth Management "Implementation Documents." The Authority reviews each jurisdiction's participation in the GMP through a biennial "compliance checklist" which the local jurisdiction submits to demonstrate its compliance. Jurisdictions found in compliance with the GMP receive a share of the 18 percent local street maintenance and improvement funds, and become eligible to receive 5 percent funds for Transportation for Livable Communities.

Actions Taken by the City of Pittsburg

During 2009, the City of Pittsburg took the following series of actions to request that ECCRFFA exclusively program fees that are collected by Pittsburg towards projects that are located within Pittsburg:

- The City of Pittsburg notified ECCRFFA that Pittsburg was considering withdrawing from ECCRFFA if funding for the James Donlon Boulevard Extension was not authorized in the next five years [letter dated April 30, 2009].
- The City of Pittsburg submitted a proposal to ECCRFFA requesting that all fees collected in Pittsburg stay within Pittsburg, for allocation to projects located within Pittsburg's limits, but not including the SR-4 freeway widening project. Projects specifically mentioned in the letter are as follows [letter dated October 2, 2009]:
 - The James Donlon Boulevard Extension Project (formerly the Buchanan Road Bypass)
 - The Pittsburg-Antioch Highway
 - California Avenue
 - Willow Pass Road
 - West Leland Road; and
 - Commuter Rail (e-BART – including the Railroad Avenue Station)
- According to ECCRFFA staff, the City of Pittsburg stopped forwarding proceeds of fees collected since the end of July 2009, and the amount of the withheld fees has not been reported [letter from ECCRFFA staff to Pittsburg staff, January 14, 2010].
- Pittsburg requested that ECCRFFA adopt a resolution that would re-direct all ECCRFFA fees collected by Pittsburg exclusively to projects located within Pittsburg (as listed above), and further indicated that if ECCRFFA did not adopt the proposed resolution or otherwise respond favorably to Pittsburg's request, that it would begin the procedures to withdraw from ECCRFFA [letter dated January 29, 2010].

Response from ECCRFFA

At its meeting of February 11, 2010, the ECCRFFA Board discussed the City of Pittsburg's request that ECCRFFA obligate all fees collected by Pittsburg exclusively to Pittsburg. ECCRFFA staff raised the following issues in their report to the Board:

- Complying with Pittsburg's request to have the James Donlon Boulevard Extension Project as the first and highest priority project could negatively affect the delivery of ECCRFFA's highest priority projects – the SR 4 East Freeway Widening, the SR 4 Bypass, and e-BART.
- Pittsburg's action to withhold ECCRFFA fees since July 2009 is in conflict with the ECCRFFA JEPA, which requires that all members of ECCRFFA forward fee proceeds on a monthly basis to the designated ECCRFFA fiscal agent (in this case, the County of Contra Costa Public Works Department).

Resolution Subsequent Withdrawal by the City of Pittsburg from ECCRFFA

Since February 2010, a number of closed session meetings ~~have been~~were held in an effort to bring this issue to resolution. On June 25, 2010, the City of Pittsburg paid ECCRFFA all outstanding fee revenues in the amount of \$2,474,560.16. Furthermore, Pittsburg and ECCRFFA ~~are~~continuing to discuss a cost sharing plan that would be acceptable to all parties to the ECCRFFA JEPA. However, July 6, 2010, the Pittsburg Council adopted a resolution to withdraw from ECCRFFA effective immediately.



DRAFT

COMMISSIONERS

Robert Taylor
Chair

David Durant
Vice Chair

Janet Abelson
Newell Arnerich

Ed Balico

Susan Bonilla

Jim Frazier

Federal Glover

Mike Metcalf

Julie Pierce

Maria Viramontes

Randell H. Iwasaki
Executive Director

July 22, 2010

Mr. Paul Reinders, Sr. Civil Engineer
Engineering Division
City of Pittsburg
65 Civic Avenue
Pittsburg, CA 94565

Subject: Measure C/J Growth Management Program (GMP) Compliance Issues for the
City of Pittsburg

Dear Mr. Reinders,

The purpose of this letter is to inform you that the City of Pittsburg's CY 2008 & 2009 Growth Management Compliance Checklist has been held over for further discussion at the September 1, 2010 Planning Committee (PC) meeting. Carrying the discussion over to September should allow adequate time for Authority staff and legal counsel to assess the implications of the City of Pittsburg's withdrawal from the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (ECCRFFA) on its compliance with the Measure C/J Growth Management Program.

In preparation for the PC meeting on September 1, 2010 we ask that you submit the following information to Authority staff:

1. Documentation of the actions leading up to Pittsburg's withdrawal from ECCRFFA, and any opportunities along the way that would have allowed for discussion of this issue by the Authority prior to Pittsburg's submittal of its GMP Checklist on May 26, 2010;
2. How Pittsburg proposes to comply with the Measure C/J requirement for participation in a regional transportation mitigation program that involves fees and mitigations collected and implemented among the local jurisdictions within TRANSPLAN;
3. How Pittsburg proposes to comply with the following TRANSPLAN Action Plan requirements:
 - a. That Pittsburg "[c]ontinue to participate in the fee program through the East Contra Costa Regional Fee & Financing Authority" [Final East County Action Plan, August 13, 2009, p. 35, Item 3-b],

3478 Buskirk Avenue,
Suite 100
Pleasant Hill, CA 94523
Phone: 925.256.4700
Fax: 925.256.4701
www.ccta.net

- b. Complete the study, design, and construction of the SR 4 Freeway from Loveridge Road to SR 160 [p. 33, Items 1-a],
 - c. Support completion of the SR 4 Bypass from SR 4 to Discovery Bay and Vasco Road [Item 1-b], and
 - d. Continue to design and implement plans for rail service for East County, including a linkage for rail corridor from Bay Point BART to Hillcrest Avenue [p. 37, Item 6-b].
4. A revised response to Question 2 in the Compliance Checklist, which asks: "Has the jurisdiction adopted and implemented a regional transportation mitigation program, including regional traffic mitigation fees, assessments, or other mitigation as appropriate."
5. A revised response to the corresponding Checklist Attachment to Question 2, which states: "Describe progress on implementation of the regional transportation mitigation program."

Your submittal of this information to the Authority by August 18, 2010, will enable Authority staff to include your revised responses into the September 1 PC Agenda packet.

Should you have any questions regarding the Measure C/J Growth Management Program, please do not hesitate to call Martin Engelmann of my staff at (925)256-4729.

Sincerely,

DRAFT

Randell H. Iwasaki
Executive Director

cc: Marc Grisham, City of Pittsburg
Tina Olson, City of Pittsburg
Dana Hoggatt, City of Pittsburg

File: 2.15.02