

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, June 18, 2019, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Conference Call-In Option:
(925) 779-6155
Passcode: 567015

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.

Item 2: New Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”). *The TAC will discuss development of the new TEP, direction from the TRANSPLAN Committee and develop recommendations for the TRANSPLAN Committee’s consideration.* ♦ **Page 2**

List of Attachments:

1. Initial Draft TEP – Page 4
2. Policy Statements – Page 9
3. Sales Tax Revenue Estimate – Page 24
4. Proposed Performance Measures of the TEP – Page 34
5. Structure and Initial Content Proposed for the Initial Draft TEP – Page 40

Item 3: Other Business

Item 4: Adjourn to Tuesday, July 16, 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 2
NEW TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (“TEP”)

TRANSPLAN COMMITTEE

EAST COUNTY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING

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

TO: TRANSPLAN Technical Advisory Committee (“TAC”)

FROM: Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN staff 

DATE: June 18, 2019

SUBJECT: New Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”)

June 12, 2019, Contra Costa Transportation Authority (“CCTA”) staff introduced their most recent iteration of the proposed new TEP. Some of the highlights from the proposed new TEP provided at the June 12 CCTA Board Special Meeting the TAC should consider include:

1. Initial Draft TEP – Project/Program Categories and Funding Amounts.
 - a. Revisions to funding categories and funding amounts as reflected in the Draft TEP funding table.
2. Possible Changes and Additions to Policy Statements.
 - a. Revisions to Policies, including the Growth Management Program/Urban Limit Line (this may directly impact local jurisdictions) and inclusion of proposed Transit and Vision Zero Policies.
3. TEP Sales Tax Revenue Estimate and Regional Transportation Planning Committees (“RTPCs”) Funding Targets.
 - a. CCTA considering 30, 35 and 40 year tax measures (at ½ cent) and projected revenue broken down by RTPC sub-region.
4. Proposed Performance Measures of the TEP.
 - a. Model approach and methodology for analyzing the transportation system under the draft TEP.
5. Structure and Initial Content Proposed for the Initial Draft TEP
 - a. A brief outline of the body (text) of the Initial Draft TEP.

June 13, 2019, the TRANSPLAN Committee convened to discuss the proposed new TEP. However, the June 13 TRANSPLAN Committee agenda packet was published prior to the June 12 CCTA Board Special Meeting. Thus, the TRANSPLAN Committee did not have the information from the June 12 CCTA Board meeting.

TRANSPLAN staff will update the TAC on the discussion and direction from the June 13 TRANSPLAN Committee meeting. In addition, for discussion purposes the TAC will have benefit of the June 12 CCTA Board Special Meeting information. Using the information provided, the TAC will need to develop preliminary comments on the draft TEP for the TRANSPLAN Committee’s consideration at their July 11, 2019 meeting.

Attachments:

1. Initial Draft TEP – Page 4
2. Policy Statements – Page 9
3. Sales Tax Revenue Estimate – Page 24
4. Proposed Performance Measures of the TEP – Page 34
5. Structure and Initial Content Proposed for the Initial Draft TEP – Page 40



Contra Costa Transportation Authority *STAFF REPORT*

Meeting Date: June 12, 2019

Subject	Discuss Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) – Project/Program Categories and Funding Amounts
Summary of Issues	At its special meeting on June 5, 2019, staff presented to the Authority Board initial draft funding distribution and major expenditure categories. Based on input received from the Authority Board, staff has developed revised funding distributions for the Authority Board’s consideration for inclusion in the Initial Draft TEP that will be presented at the June 19, 2019 Authority Board special meeting.
Recommendations	Staff will provide an overview of the proposed funding distribution and major expenditure categories based on Authority Board direction. Staff seeks comments and direction for possible additional changes to be considered in the Initial Draft TEP.
Financial Implications	The expected revenue from a new transportation sales tax depends on the amount and term. As an example, a new half-cent sales tax would generate approximately \$3.06 billion in current dollars over a 30-year period.
Options	The Authority Board could elect to direct staff to develop the Initial Draft TEP using an alternative process.
Attachments	A. Proposed Initial Draft TEP Funding Categories and Amounts (<i>Revised Attachment may be provided at the meeting</i>)
Changes from Committee	N/A

Background

At its special meeting on June 5, 2019, staff presented to the Authority Board the initial draft funding distribution and major expenditure categories and discussed project/program requirements and expected outcomes. Based on input received from the Authority Board, staff

has developed revised funding distributions for the Authority Board’s consideration for inclusion in the Initial Draft TEP that will be presented at the June 19, 2019 Authority Board special meeting.

Attachment A provides an initial distribution of expected sales tax measure revenues across recommended funding categories. Revenues are based on a half-cent sales tax for a 30-year period (July 2020 through June 2050). The proposed initial draft funding distribution and major categories to be discussed at the Authority Board Special meeting provides the following distribution among local improvements, transit and alternative modes, and freeway and interchange improvements. Transit and Alternative Modes provides funding for 30.6% for transit, 7.4% for BART, and 10.3% for bike and pedestrian improvements.

Local Improvements	Transit and Alternative Modes	Freeway and Interchange Improvements
26.0	48.3	21.7

Based on Authority Board input, the following revisions were made to the Project/Program Categories and Funding Amounts:

- Project/Program Categories have been re-organized to reflect the following order and sorted the individual categories based on funding amount from highest to lowest.
 - Make Bus, Ferry, Commuter Rail and BART Safer, Cleaner, and more Reliable
 - Providing Affordable and Safe Transportation for Children, Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities
 - Local Improvements to Make Your Community Better and Protect the Environment
 - Relieve Traffic on Highways and Interchanges
- Moved “Improve Transit Reliability along I-80 and I-680 Corridors” from the “Relieve Traffic on Highways and Interchanges” funding category to the “Make Bus, Ferry, Commuter Rail and BART Safer, Cleaner, and more Reliable” funding category.

- Split the “Traffic Reliability along I-80 and I-680 Corridors” into the following two funding categories:
 - Improve Transit Reliability along the Interstate 80 Corridor
 - Improve Transit Reliability along the Interstate 680 and State Route 24 Corridors
- Moved the Complete Streets Demonstration Projects program (one project in each subregion) and the associated proposed funding of \$60 million from “Complete and Improve Traffic Flow on Local Streets” to the “Improve Walking and Biking on Streets and Trails” funding category, which increased the funding amount to \$213.8 million. Each of the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) will recommend one complete streets demonstration project within each subregion to be approved by the Authority Board.
- Modified the “Complete and Improve Traffic Flow on Local Streets” to “Improve Traffic Flow on Local Streets” and modified the funding amount from \$290 million to \$230 million (\$60 million moved to “Improve Walking and Biking on Streets and Trails” as noted above). Staff is proposing that the Authority would develop a new Countywide Local Street Improvement Program to address congestion relief on local streets within each sub-region. Implementation guidelines would be developed in coordination with the RTPCs and approved by the Authority Board.

Funding Category <small>(Improvements listed are examples and types of projects that may be funded)</small>	\$ millions	%	Distribution of Funding by Subregion				Eligibility	Competitive Project Selection Process	2016 TEP
			Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)			
Make Bus, Ferry, Commuter Rail and BART Safer, Cleaner, and more Reliable									
Provide Convenient and Reliable Transit Services in Central, East and Southwest Contra Costa	230.00	7.51%	90.00	78.00		62.00	Conform to New Expenditure Plan Policy for Transit	184.40	
Increase Bus Services and Reliability in West Contra Costa	110.55	3.61%			110.55		Conform to New Expenditure Plan Policy for Transit	110.55	
East County Transit Extension to Brentwood and Connectivity to Transit, Rail, and Parking	100.00	3.27%				100.00		70.00	
Transit Extension									
Brentwood Intermodal Station									
Shuttle Service and Shared Mobility Hubs									
Cleaner, Safer BART	100.00	3.27%	30.00	19.00	23.00	28.00	MOE, Systemwide Match Program, No New BART Cars		
Station Modernization									
Additional Trains cars for e-BART, Parking and Access Improvements to BART	100.00	3.27%	30.00	19.00	23.00	28.00	MOE, Conform to New Exp. Plan Policy for Transit	300.00	
e-BART cars									
Parking and Access improvements									
Enhance Ferry Service and Commuter Rail in Contra Costa	80.00	2.61%	30.00		30.00	20.00	Conform to New Expenditure Plan Policy for Transit	50.00	
Hercules Ferry Services									
Martinez to Antioch Ferry Services									
Hercules Regional Intermodal Station									
Connect Oakley San Joaquin Station to Antioch e-BART									
San Joaquin Rail Station and Park/Ride Lot in Oakley									
Transit Connection from Martinez Amtrak to Concord BART									
Improve Transit Reliability along the Interstate 80 Corridor	95.00	3.10%			95.00			55.00	
I-80 Transit Lane									
I-80 Shared Mobility Hubs									
Transit Connection between Richmond Ferry, BART, and Contra Costa College									
San Pablo Avenue Multimodal Improvements									
I-80 Express Bus Service Improvements									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Improve Transit Reliability along the Interstate 680 and State Route 24 Corridors	50.00	1.63%	25.00	25.00					
I-680 Transit Improvements and Shared Mobility Hubs									
I-680 Part-time Transit Lane									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Providing Affordable and Safe Transportation for Children, Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities									
Affordable Transportation for Seniors, Veterans, and People with Disabilities	150.00	4.90%	40.00	25.00	37.00	48.00		115.01	
Safe Transportation for Youth and Students	100.00	3.27%	13.60	31.40	40.00	15.00		63.96	
Local Improvements to Make Your Community Better and Protect the Environment									
Fix and Modernize Local Roads	465.23	15.20%	131.31	103.70	101.03	129.19	Growth Management Plan, MOE, Preservation	683.50	
Improve Traffic Flow on Local Streets	230.00	7.51%	93.13	26.59	34.93	75.35	New Countwide Local Street Improvement Program	290.00	
Widen Ygnacio Valley Road in Concord									
Sand Creek Rd in Brentwood and Antioch									
Viera Avenue in Antioch									
San Pablo BNSF in Richmond									
Cutting Blvd at UPRR in Richmond									
Harbor Way at BNSF in Richmond									
Willow Pass Road Widening in Concord									
Alhambra Avenue Improvements in Martinez and Contra Costa County									
Kirker Pass Road Truck Climbing Lane in Contra Costa County near Pittsburg									
Saint Mary/Bollinger Canyon Road Intersection Improvements and Roundabout in Moraga									
Camino Tassajara Road Widening in Contra Costa County									
Crow Canyon Road Widening in San Ramon									
Widening Main Street in Oakley									
Widening East Cypress in Oakley									
Deer Valley Road in Antioch									
West Leland Road Extension in Pittsburg									
Brentwood Blvd in Brentwood									
Lone Tree Way in Brentwood									
...and Others									

Funding Category (Improvements listed are examples and types of projects that may be funded)	\$ millions	%	Distribution of Funding by Subregion				Eligibility	Competitive Project Selection Process	2016 TEP
			Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)			
Improve Walking and Biking on Streets and Trails	213.87	6.99%	53.98	54.56	48.90	56.43	\$38m to EBRPD for Trails, Complete Streets Policy	x	115.00
Complete Street Demonstration Projects (One per Subregion)									
I-80/Central Avenue (Phase 3)									
23rd Street POC									
Bollinger Canyon Road POC for Iron Horse Trail									
Connect Iron Horse Trail and Contra Costa Trail									
...and Others									
Seamless Connected Transportation Options and Reduce Emissions	150.00	4.90%	51.00	25.40	38.60	35.00		x	65.00
Zero Emission Vehicle Program for Contra Costa									
Smart rideshare, carshare, and bikeshare services									
On-demand and guaranteed transit services									
Smart payment systems									
Data sharing to improve mobility choices									
...and Others									
Focused Growth, Support Economic Development and Create Jobs in Contra Costa	80.00	2.61%	20.21	13.16	16.00	30.63		x	100.00
Advance Mitigation Program							Conform to Expenditure Plan Advance Mitigation Policy		
...and Others									
Regional Transportation Priorities	18.63	0.61%	5.00	3.63	5.00	5.00			18.70
Relieve Traffic on Highways and Interchanges									
Relieve Congestion and Improve Local Access along Interstate 680 Corridor	200.00	6.53%	105.00	95.00					230.00
I-680 NB Express Lanes (Reducing bottlenecks, add auxiliary lanes and close HOV gap at SR-24 interchange)									
I-680 Advanced Technologies (Ramp widening and metering)									
Local interchange improvements									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Relieve Congestion on Highway 4 and State Route 242 between Martinez and Pittsburg	200.00	6.53%	154.20			45.80			108.00
Operational Improvements along Highway 4 from 242 to Bailey Road (SR4 OIP)									
I-680/Highway 4 Interchange (Future Phases)									60.00
SR-242/Clayton Road									
SR-4 ICM and Improve HOV Lanes									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Improve Local Access to Highway 4 and Byron Airport	150.00	4.90%				150.00	No new alignments and access restrictions outside ULL		117.00
Vasco-Byron Road Connector									
Vasco Road Widening									
Interchanges at Balfour, Marsh Creek, Walnut, Camino Diablo									
Byron Airport Enhancements									
Relieve Congestion and Improve Local Access along Interstate 80 Corridor	60.00	1.96%			60.00				60.00
Innovate 80 (Enhance Smart Corridor and HOV Lane, HOV enforcement)									
I-80/San Pablo Dam Road									
I-80/Pinole Valley Road									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Improve Traffic Flow on State Route 24 and Modernize the Old Bores of Caldecott Tunnel	35.00	1.14%		35.00					20.00
SR-24/Camino Pablo									
Modernization and Safety Improvements of Old Bores of Caldecott Tunnel									
Improve Traffic Flow and Local Access to Richmond-San Rafael Bridge	20.00	0.65%			20.00				
Extend HOV Lane on I-580									
Richmond Parkway Interchange Improvements									
Incentives for alternative modes									
Connector from I-580 to Point Molate									
Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services	91.82	3.00%	27.23	17.30	21.38	25.91			43.05
Administration	30.61	1.00%	8.00	5.06	8.19	9.36			14.35
TOTAL	3060.71	100.0%	907.66	576.80	712.58	863.67			2873.52
Population Based Share	3060.71		907.66	576.80	712.58	863.67	ULL: Urban Limit Line		
Population Share (2035 Estimate) of Total			29.66%	18.85%	23.28%	28.22%	MOE: Maintenance of Effort		
							EBRPD: East Bay Regional Park District		



Contra Costa Transportation Authority **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: June 12, 2019

Subject	Discuss Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) – Discussion of Possible Changes and Additions to Policy Statements
Summary of Issues	At its special meeting on June 5, 2019, the Authority Board packet included the Policy Statements that were developed for the 2016 TEP. Staff provided a brief summary of possible changes to the 2016 TEP Policy Statements and possible additional Policy Statements. This staff report contains specific possible changes and alternatives that the Authority Board may wish to consider for inclusion in the 2020 Initial Draft TEP
Recommendations	Staff seeks Authority Board comments on changes and additions to the Policy Statements.
Financial Implications	The cost to the Authority of implementing Policy Statements is included in the proposed 1% of anticipated sales tax revenue reserved for administration.
Options	The Authority could elect to direct staff to use the 2016 TEP Policy Statements in the Initial Draft TEP, or revise the Policy Statements based on input from the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), cities, towns and the county, stakeholders and the public.
Attachments	A. Initial Draft TEP, Summary of Possible Changes and Additions to Policy Statements
Changes from Committee	N/A

Background

The Authority has approved various administrative, financial and accountability policies beginning with the passage of Measure C in 1988 and the Authority's approval of Ordinance 88-01, which was subsequently amended in 2006 with the approval of Measure J. Ordinance

88-01, as amended, contains certain policies related to administrative and accounting practices, committee structures, local hiring preference, allocation of funds, and maintenance-of-effort, among others.

Over time, transportation sales tax measures included additional policies to expand accountability and transparency, increase public participation, impose certain requirements on the recipients of measure funds, and address future uncertainties. As it developed the 2016 TEP, the Authority reviewed other sales tax measures and received suggested policy considerations from stakeholders and advocates. After much debate and careful consideration, the Authority included the following Policy Statements in the 2016 TEP:

- Growth Management Program (GMP)/Urban Limit Line (ULL) Compliance Requirements
- Complete Streets Policy
- Advance Mitigation Program
- Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability

The GMP/ULL Compliance Requirements policy was an evolution of the original Growth Management Policy included in the Authority's Measure C (1988) and later amended and expanded to include ULL compliance as required by the Authority's Measure J (2004). The Complete Streets and Advance Mitigation Program were proposed new policies. The Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability policy statement was a collection of numerous policies regarding governance, administration of funds, financial and accountability measures, and other requirements. The Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability policy statement included many long-standing Authority policies, as well as several proposed new policies.

At the Authority Board Special meeting on June 5, 2019, staff advised the Authority that it may wish to consider three additional new Policy Statements for the 2020 TEP:

- Transit Policy
- Periodic (10-Year) TEP Program Review
- Vision Zero Policy and Framework

This staff report provides a summary of possible changes and additions, and alternative for consideration where applicable, to the 2016 TEP Policy Statements. Attachment A provides a more in-depth discussion of possible policy changes, as well as a detailed discussion of the changes in the proposed GMP/ULL policy compared with existing GMP/ULL policy under Measure J.

Discussion of Proposed Policy Changes

1) GMP/ULL Compliance Requirement

The 2016 TEP included several changes to the GMP/ULL policy from that included in Measure J. A detailed outline of these changes is included in Attachment A. Staff recommends that the Initial Draft TEP include these GMP/ULL Policy Statements with a few additional modifications described below.

At the Authority's special meeting on June 5, 2019, staff identified two potential changes to consider in the Initial Draft TEP:

a) Address the potential sunset of Contra Costa County's Urban Limit Line in 2026

Contra Costa County's ULL was adopted by the County's Measure C (1990) including a sunset date of 2010. Contra Costa County's Measure L (2006) extended the ULL sunset date to 2026. The Authority's Measure J includes compliance with a ULL to the Measure J sunset date of 2034.

One could assume that Contra Costa County will undertake an effort to extend the ULL sunset date prior to its current expiration in 2026. In this case, the GMP/ULL language in the 2020 TEP could be unchanged. Alternatively, the Authority could elect to direct staff to develop language to explicitly require compliance with a ULL even if the County does not extend the ULL sunset date. Many cities/towns have adopted the County ULL so the language would need to cover those cities/towns. Some cities/towns have adopted their own Urban Growth Boundaries or local ULL and the sunset dates, if any, for those would need to be addressed separately.

b) Modify process for minor 30-acre amendment of ULL

Amending the ULL requires voter approval with the exception of "Minor" amendment of 30 acres or less. Current policy, Measure J, allows Contra Costa County, cities, and towns that have adopted their own ULL to make Minor 30-acre amendments to the ULL by majority vote. The 2016 TEP included language for minor 30-acre amendments, however, it required approval by 4/5 of the Board of Supervisors or city/town council and the adoption of findings as listed in Attachment A. Certain advocates desire that all ULL amendments, including minor 30-acre amendments, require voter approval.

New options to amend the ULL have been identified and are shown as Options B and C below:

- A. Update ULL compliance policy as proposed in the 2016 TEP
- B. Allow amendments of the provisions for minor 30-acre adjustments, however, modify the voter requirements to only require approval by the voters in the affected region in Contra Costa County. Requiring a countywide vote for a minor 30-acre adjustment in a particular location may be unduly onerous. For example, a new requirement could be for voter approval of at least 10 percent, for example, of Contra Costa County residents living nearest to the proposed amendment or for approval by those voters who live in the nearest adjacent jurisdiction(s). Also, implement updates to the compliance policy developed for the 2016 TEP.
- C. Change the maximum size for minor amendments to something other than 30 acres and implement updates to the compliance developed for the 2016 TEP.
- D. Eliminate all minor amendment procedures, which means that every amendment would require voter approval.
- E. Leave ULL compliance policy as-is in Measure J

Staff seeks direction regarding which approach to place in the TEP.

2) Complete Streets Policy

The Complete Streets Policy proposed in the 2016 TEP recognizes the need to consider all users during the planning, development and operation of all transportation infrastructure. Staff recommends that the Initial Draft TEP include the same Complete Streets Policy with minor clarifications.

3) Advance Mitigation Program

The Advance Mitigation Program continues to develop as part of the East Bay Advance Mitigation Program sponsored by the Coastal Conservancy and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Staff does not recommend any substantive changes to the Advance Mitigation Program. The Policy Statement should be updated to reflect recently enacted statutes and accompanying guidelines. Staff recommends that the

Initial Draft TEP include the updated Advance Mitigation Program and any funding be determined subject to the conditions outlined in the policy.

4) Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability

Over time, the Authority has approved various administrative, financial and accountability policies beginning with Measure C and Ordinance 88-01, which was subsequently amended with the approval of Measure J. Ordinance 88-01, as amended, contains certain policies related to administrative and accounting practices, committee structures, local preference, allocation of funds, and maintenance-of-effort, among others. Over time, transportation sales tax measures included additional features to expand accountability and transparency. In 2016, the Authority elected to include a robust Policy Statement for Taxpayer Safeguard and Accountability in the 2016 TEP. Including this policy in the TEP provides greater accessibility to voters as they consider the merits of a new transportation sales tax. A detailed discussion of Taxpayer Safeguard and Accountability is included in Attachment A.

Staff recommends that the Initial Draft TEP include the robust Policy Statement for Taxpayer Safeguard and Accountability with minimum revisions.

- A. Staff has been approached by business and labor interests to amend the language in Article 20, Local Contracting and Good Jobs, of the Implementing Guidelines. Specific language is under development.
- B. Proposed new Policy Statements (see below) may lead to the deletion or modification to several articles in the Implementing Guidelines, including:
 - Article 22. Countywide Transit Plan may need to be amended or deleted, as applicable, based on the outcome of the new proposed Transit Policy.
 - Articles 23 to 27, collectively referred to as “Project Financing Guidelines and Managing Revenues” may need to be amended to be consistent with the proposed Periodic (10-Year) Review Policy.

Discussion of Proposed New Policy Statements

Staff identified several new policies that the Authority may consider for inclusion in the Initial Draft TEP.

1) Transit Policy

A Draft Transit Policy is under development for inclusion in the Initial Draft TEP. The draft policy includes a vision for a public transit system that provides convenient, safe, affordable and reliable service that offers an attractive alternative to private automobile usage. The draft policy includes the requirement for Contra Costa transit operators to collaborate in the development of an Integrated Transit Plan (ITP). The ITP would define how TEP funding could be used to achieve a Transit Vision. The ITP includes provisions for:

- A focus on delivering a streamlined and unified experience for the customer across all modes and transit operators.
- Inclusion of the elements of the ITP pertinent to each operator's service area into their respective Short-Range Transit Plans.
- Expectation that transit operating funds from the TEP be used to support new service, not to subsidize existing transit service.
- Expectation that public agencies and transit operators leverage new and emerging technologies to address first-mile/last-mile connections between transit stops and other traveler destinations.
- A goal for fare and schedule integration among transit operators.

2) Periodic (10-Year) TEP Program Review

Authority practice includes the development of a Strategic Plan approximately every 3 years to program funds for a 7- to 10-year horizon. The Strategic Plan reflects changes in revenue, however, it is constrained by the provisions of the TEP. Funding to specific projects and programs is subject to "caps" to reflect fluctuation in revenue, while other categories experience a large influx of leveraged funds. Opportunities to redirect funds across categories currently does not exist.

Staff has reviewed recently passed transportation sales tax measures for similar procedures. A possible strategy to manage the TEP, in addition to the Strategic Plan, could be the development of a Periodic TEP Program Review. The TEP Program Review could occur every 10 years, or at specific instances if warranted by major financial or programmatic changes.

The Periodic TEP Program Review Policy is under development and is envisioned to include:

- Update the financial forecast, progress made regarding meeting the commitments of the expenditure plan, and new opportunities that are becoming better defined.
- Assess impacts of leveraged funds.
- Adjust funding, if necessary, due to revenue shortfalls or surpluses.
- Invest increased revenues in projects and programs deemed by the Authority to best serve the residents of Contra Costa County.

The goal of the Periodic Program Review is to increase accountability of meeting TEP commitments, react to changing economic conditions (both plus and minus), leverage new funding opportunities, and reflect changed conditions.

The draft Periodic Program Review is under development.

3) Vision Zero Policy and Framework

Vision Zero is a strategy to eliminate all traffic-related deaths and severe injuries, while increasing safety, health, and mobility for all. The Vision Zero Framework will consist of the policies, goals and strategic action necessary to achieve Vision Zero, and the initiatives and actions jurisdictions and transit providers can take to advance Vision Zero.

The goals of the Vision Zero Policy and Framework include:

- Eliminate traffic-related severe injuries and fatalities in Contra Costa County through proactive engineering and design.
- Invest equitably in traffic safety improvement programs and projects.
- Expand traffic safety education for all users.

The draft Vision Zero Policy and Framework is under development.

Attachment A
Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)
Summary of Possible Changes and Additions to Policy Statements

Staff proposes that the Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan TEP include the following Policy Statements that enshrine the Authority's directions and expectations for the use of transportation sales tax revenue.

- Growth Management Program(GMP)/Urban Limit Line (ULL) Compliance Requirements
- Complete Streets Policy
- Advance Mitigation Program
- Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability
- Transit Policy
- Periodic (10-Year) TEP Program Review
- Vision Zero Policy and Framework

This document provides a summary of the Policy Statements and identifies the major changes to the Policy Statements recommended by staff compared with existing Policy Statements in Measure J and the proposed Policy Statements included in the 2016 TEP.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (GMP)/URBAN LIMIT LINE (ULL) COMPLIANCE

The Authority's Growth Management Program (GMP) has been an essential and successful part of TEPs since the passage of Measure C in 1988. The passage of Measure J in 2004 made several refinements to the Measure C GMP such as adding a requirement that each jurisdiction adopt a voter-approved Urban Limit Line (ULL). The Measure J GMP, as amended, is the current policy of the Authority.

The goals of the Measure J GMP are:

- Assure that new residential, business and commercial growth pays for the facilities required to meet the demands resulting from that growth.
- Require cooperative transportation and land use planning among Contra Costa County, cities, towns, and transportation agencies.
- Support land use patterns within Contra Costa County that make more efficient use of the transportation system, consistent with the General Plans of local jurisdictions.
- Support infill and redevelopment in existing urban and brownfield areas.

The 2016 TEP proposed additional elements that require each jurisdiction to adopt applicable growth management policies (hillside, ridgeline, wildlife corridor, creek development, etc.), modifies the process for a minor (30 acres or less) adjustment to the ULL to require various

findings, and requires that minor adjustments to accommodate residential or commercial development include permanent mitigation of environmental impacts.

Staff recommends that the Initial Draft TEP contains the same GMP/ULL Compliance as proposed in the 2016 TEP, except to update dates by which compliance to policies must be attained.

A summary of major proposed changes to the GMP/ULL Compliance, compared to existing policies approved under Measure J:

- New Growth Management Policies, as applicable

The 2016 TEP proposed to add an 8th element to the GMP requiring jurisdictions to adopt applicable growth management policies. The text below lists the existing requirements of the GMP (elements 1 – 7) and outlines the new 8th element for additional growth management policies.

To receive its share of return-to-source funds and be eligible for certain grant programs, each jurisdiction must meet all of the following:

1. Adopt a Growth Management Element (GME)
2. Adopt a Development Mitigation Program
3. Address Housing Options
4. Participate in an Ongoing, Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process
5. Continuously Comply with a ULL
6. Develop a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program
7. Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution
8. **Adopt Additional Growth Management Policies, as applicable (proposed new GMP element)**

Each jurisdiction shall adopt and thereafter continuously maintain the following policies (where applicable): a hillside development policy, a ridgeline protection policy, a wildlife corridor policy and a creek development policy. Where a jurisdiction does not have a developable hillside, ridgeline, wildlife corridor or creek, it need not adopt the corresponding policy. An ordinance that implements the East Contra Costa County Habitat Conservation Plan / Natural Community Conservation Plan (ECCC HCP/NCCP) shall satisfy the requirement to have an adopted wildlife corridor policy and creek development policy. In addition to the above, jurisdictions with Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance (as defined by the California Dept. of Conservation and mapped by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP)) within their planning areas but outside of their city/town shall adopt and thereafter continuously maintain an

Agricultural Protection Policy. The policy must ensure that potential impacts of converting Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance outside the ULL to other uses are identified and disclosed when considering such a conversion. The applicable policies are required to be in place by no later than July 1, 2021.

It should be noted that Element 7 was changed from “Adopt an Urban Limit Line” as included in Measure J to the proposed “Continuously Comply with an Urban Limit Line” with appropriate wording changes to reflect that every jurisdiction has adopted a ULL.

- Proposed Changes to the process to amend the ULL:

The requirement to adopt a voter-approved ULL was included in Measure J (2004). Once approved, an adjustment to the ULL requires voter approval, with the exception of minor (less than 30-acre) adjustments. Measure J included a simple process to approve minor amendments to the ULL. Paragraph 8.c. of Measure J (as amended) reads as follows:

Adjustment of 30 acres or less. A local jurisdiction can undertake adjustments of 30 acres or less to its adopted ULL, consistent with these principles, without voter approval.

Simply put, a jurisdiction can amend the ULL by up to 30 acres with a simple majority vote of its governing body (city/town council or Board of Supervisors). Some jurisdictions including Contra Costa County and the cities of Pittsburg, San Ramon and Oakley have included additional restrictions on minor amendments to the ULL. In its Measure K (2006), Contra Costa County established requirements of a 4/5 vote of the Board of Supervisors and the need to adopt applicable findings.

The 2016 TEP proposed to modify the process to approve a minor amendment to the ULL by establishing additional requirements of approval:

- **requires 4/5 majority vote of a jurisdictions’ governing body**
 - **requires adopting one or more findings as required by Contra Costa County's Measure L (2006)**
 - **requires a finding of "public benefit," as defined**
 - **requires permanent mitigation of environmental impacts if the minor amendment is to accommodate housing or commercial development.**
- In addition, the 2016 TEP clarified that minor amendments to the ULL cannot be continuous with other non-voter approved amendments to the ULL and that amendments cannot create isolated pockets of land outside the existing ULL.

The proposed changes increase the threshold for jurisdictions who have adopted the County's ULL but did not adopt a specific process to approve minor amendments to the ULL. The proposed changes do not supersede locally adopted processes to approve a minor amendment to the ULL that have a higher threshold (such as the City of Pittsburg, which does not allow for any non-voter approved amendment to the ULL.)

Considerations for amending the GMP / ULL Compliance Policy.

During the development of the 2016 TEP, three options for amendments to the ULL were discussed. These are shown as Options A, D and E below. Subsequently, a new fourth option to amend the ULL has been identified and is shown as Option D below:

- A. Update ULL compliance policy as proposed in the 2016 TEP
- B. Allow amendments of the provisions for minor 30-acre adjustments, however, modify the voter requirements to only require approval by the voters in the affected region in Contra Costa County. Requiring a countywide vote for a minor 30-acre adjustment in a particular location may be unduly onerous. For example, a new requirement could be for voter approval of at least 10 percent, for example, of Contra Costa County residents living nearest to the proposed amendment or for approval by those voters who live in the nearest adjacent jurisdiction(s). Also, implement updates to the compliance policy developed for the 2016 TEP
- C. Change the maximize size for minor amendments to something other than 30 acres and implement updates to the compliance developed for the 2016 TEP.
- D. Eliminate all minor amendment procedures which means that every amendment would require voter approval.
- E. Leave ULL compliance policy as is in Measure J

The new Option B reflects that a countywide vote may be onerous for Contra Costa County as a minor amendment would require approval by all county voters. A new possible approach would call for applications for minor amendments of up to 30 acres in the Contra Costa County ULL to be approved by a subset of county voters. For example, a vote could occur among the 10 percent of Contra Costa County voters who live closest to the area containing the amendment.

The new Option C discusses the option of changing the maximum size allowed for a minor amendment to a different number of acres. While there is little practical experience with minor amendments to inform any decision, there may be an opportunity to reach consensus if a different maximum size is used.

Since the 2016 TEP was discussed, there have been no amendments to the ULL of any size. In addition, the Board of Supervisors reviewed the boundary of the ULL in 2016. The purpose of

the year 2016 review was to determine whether a change to the boundary of Contra Costa County's ULL Map is warranted, based on facts and circumstances resulting from Contra Costa County's participation with the cities/towns in a comprehensive review of the availability of land in Contra Costa County sufficient to satisfy housing and jobs needs for 20 years thereafter. The ULL analysis concluded that sufficient capacity exists countywide inside the ULL to accommodate housing and job growth through 2036.

Staff seeks direction regarding how to structure the policy for the new measure.

COMPLETE STREETS POLICY

The Complete Streets Policy was a new Policy Statement proposed in the 2016 TEP. Staff recommends only minor changes for the Initial Draft TEP. The Complete Streets Policy included a Vision Statement (see below) and Policy. The Policy is as follows:

All recipients of funding through this Plan shall consider and accommodate, wherever possible and subject to the Exceptions listed in this Policy, the needs of all users in the planning, design, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation and maintenance of the transportation system.

The exceptions are facilities where:

1. Pedestrians, bicyclists, or other users are prohibited by law from using the transportation facility;
2. The cost of new accommodation would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use; or
3. The sponsor demonstrates that, based on objective factors, such accommodation is not needed.

Staff recommends that the Initial Draft TEP include the Complete Streets Policy from the 2016 TEP without any substantive changes.

ADVANCE MITIGATION PROGRAM

An Advance Mitigation Program was included as a new Policy Statement in the 2016 TEP resulting from an opportunity cosponsored by the Coastal Conservancy and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). In 2014, the MTC and the Coastal Conservancy launched an effort to develop a Regional Advance Mitigation Program (RAMP) initiative in the San Francisco Bay Area. MTC and the Coastal Conservancy are sponsoring the Bay Area RAMP, which was included as a strategy in Plan Bay Area 2040, MTC's most recent Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Transportation and natural resource agencies are collaborating to develop an innovative way to efficiently advance transportation infrastructure in the Bay Area while providing more effective conservation of natural resources and working lands through a RAMP process.

RAMP is a strategic mitigation approach that allows for natural resources (e.g., species, aquatic resources and natural communities) to be protected or restored as compensatory mitigation for estimated impacts before infrastructure projects are constructed, often years in advance. MTC and the Coastal Conservancy selected the Nature Conservancy to guide an effort bringing together transportation agencies, regulatory agencies and conservation groups to develop the East Bay RAMP pilot program. In Contra Costa County, the East Bay RAMP pilot aims to compliment the ECCC HCP/NCCP by providing opportunities to meet species mitigation needs on projects that cannot be met by ECCC HCP/NCCP. A draft Regional Conservation Investment Strategy (RCIS), a framework document that identifies areas of conservation priority for implementation of conservation actions and habitat enhancement actions by public agencies, conservation organizations, or private entities, has been developed and circulated. The RCIS was submitted to the Coastal Conservancy in March 2019 and the public comment period just ended on May 23, 2019. The Authority's Advance Mitigation Program would be further developed based on adoption of the RCIS by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. As such, the Advance Mitigation Policy is dependent on several future activities including:

- Development of a Project Impacts Assessment that identifies the specific projects to be included and estimated costs for mitigating of the environmental impacts of the projects.
- Development of the legislative and regulatory framework necessary to implement an Advance Mitigation Program in Contra Costa County.
- The identification of the Implementing Agency to administer the Advance Mitigation Program for Contra Costa County or portions of the Bay Area Including Contra Costa County.

There are no substantive changes proposed for the Advance Mitigation Program Policy Statement. Staff proposed to edit the text of the policy to reflect recently enacted statutes and guidelines and to update terminology.

TAXPAYER SAFEGUARDS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Authority has approved various administrative, financial and accountability policies beginning with Measure C and Ordinance 88-01, which was subsequently amended with the approval of Measure J. Ordinance 88-01, as amended, contains certain policies related to administrative and accounting practices, committee structures, local preference, allocation of funds, and maintenance-of-effort, among others. Over time, transportation sales tax measures included additional features to expand accountability and transparency. In 2016, the Authority elected to include a robust Policy Statement for Taxpayer Safeguard and Accountability in the 2016 TEP. Including this policy in the TEP provides greater accessibility to voters as they consider the merits of a new transportation sales tax.

The Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability Policy Statement defines the overall Governing Structure of the Authority with respect to the TEP and the Implementing Guidelines regarding the use of funds to deliver the projects and programs included in the TEP. A brief description and changes from existing policy for each section flows.

Governing Structure:

The Governing Structure addresses the Authority's Governing Body and Administration including membership, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs), Standing Committees and Advisory Committees, and establishes a new Public Oversight Committee comprised of members appointed from defined interest groups. The Public Oversight Committee would replace the current Citizen's Advisory Committee.

Implementing Guidelines:

The Implementing Guidelines include 27 Articles grouped under the following major categories:

- Administration of the Plan
- Taxpayer Safeguards, Audits and Accountability
- Restrictions on Funds
- Project Financing Guidelines and Managing Revenue

The Implementing Guidelines generally address topics related to transparency and open meeting laws, geographic equity, financial responsibility and fiscal auditing, cooperative planning and other responsibilities of recipient agencies, process to amend the plan and to address fluctuation in revenues, local preference for contracting and other miscellaneous topics.

Compared with prior policies, the 2016 TEP introduced the following new policies (based on Article numbering in the 2016 TEP):

7. Public Oversight Committee
9. Performance Audits
16. Performance-based Project Reviews
18. Complete Streets
22. Countywide Transit Plan (see note below)

The majority of the Taxpayer Safeguards and Accountability Policy Statement remains unchanged from the 2016 TEP with the following exceptions:

Article 20. Staff has been approached by business and labor interests to amend the language and is under development.

Article 22. Countywide Transit Plan is proposed to be deleted. The provisions of this article have been superseded by the new proposed Transit Policy.

Articles 23 to 27, collectively referred to as “Project Financing Guidelines and Managing Revenues” are proposed to be deleted. The provisions of these articles have been superseded by the new proposed 10-Year Review Policy.



Contra Costa Transportation Authority **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: June 12, 2019

Subject	Approval of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Sales Tax Revenue Estimate and Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) Funding Targets
Summary of Issues	<p>Section 180200 et seq. of the California Public Utilities Code states that a transportation sales tax shall 1) provide the tax rate; 2) specify the period during which the tax shall be imposed; and 3) specify the purposes for which the revenue derived from the tax will be used.</p> <p>At its June 5, 2019 special meeting, the board requested staff to bring back the item for future discussion but directed staff to start with a 30-year minimum duration for the development of the Initial Draft TEP, and to explore changes to the TEP if the tax duration is extended to 35- and 40-year periods.</p>
Recommendations	Staff seeks direction on the tax rate and duration of a new sales tax, and RTPCs funding targets, which if approved by the voters in March 2020, would take effect on July 1, 2020.
Financial Implications	A new half-cent sales tax would generate approximately \$3.06 billion in current dollars over a 30-year period.
Options	N/A
Attachments	<p>A. Summary of Revenue estimates from a new half-cent sales tax starting in July 1, 2020 (March 2020 Ballot) under various scenarios</p> <p>B. Revenue Estimates developed by HdL Companies</p>
Changes from Committee	

Background

At its meeting of May 15, 2019, the Authority Board directed staff to undertake tasks to develop a TEP for possible consideration on a ballot as early as March 2020. The TEP work plan calls for the Authority to release an initial draft of the TEP at the June 19 Authority Board meeting. The Authority plans to seek input from all affected stakeholders, including the RTPCs, Authority standing advisory committees, and the public on the Initial Draft TEP prior to adopting a final version at its August 21, 2019 meeting. An important element of developing a TEP is the estimate of funding that a new sales tax would generate.

New Measure Time Frame and Revenue Estimates

Staff seeks direction on the terms of a new sales tax measure. The new measure would start on July 1, 2020 if passed in March 2020. Attachment A provides the revenue estimates for 30, 35 and 40-year ½ cent sales tax measures along with their expiration dates, assuming a start date of July 1, 2020. For a start date of July 1, 2020 (March 2020 ballot), a new ½ cent 30-year measure is estimated to generate \$3.06 billion.

The Authority retained HdL Companies (HdL) to develop the revenue estimates (Attachment B). The revenue estimate uses the same financial assumptions proposed for the development of the *2019 Measure J Strategic Plan* through 2034. These assumptions included a near term flattening of revenue growth (possible modest recession) with a recovery thereafter. For the remaining longer portion of the estimate (years 2034 through 2060), HdL used a slower growth assumption as increases in population will likely soften compared to Contra Costa County's most recent history when more areas are fully developed, and future economic conditions will likely include additional uncertainties and recessionary periods that make using a more conservative approach prudent. For a 30-year measure, the forecast for the average nominal growth rate is still a healthy 3.1%. However, this rate is lower than the actual rate experienced in the last 28 years (1990 – 2018) of 3.48%.

Under Measure J, each subregional share of projected revenues was based on its population at the midpoint of the measure. Staff recommends applying the same methodology to establish subregional equity for the proposed new measure. Based on the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAGs') Projection 2013, each subregion population was estimated at 5-year intervals starting in 2015. For a new 30-year measure, year 2035 represents the midpoint of a new measure.

Population estimates for each subregion under different horizon years are shown in Table 1, while Tables 2, 3 and 4 show each subregion’s share of revenues from a new 30-year, 35-year and 40-year ½ cent measure, respectively.

Table 1: Population Estimates by Subregion*

Population/Year	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040
TRANSPLAN**	318,025	331,425	345,875	361,275	377,325
TRANSPAC**	322,525	340,925	359,575	379,675	400,325
WCCTAC**	260,725	272,225	284,775	298,075	312,125
SWAT**	222,225	228,025	234,175	241,275	248,625
COUNTYWIDE	1,123,500	1,172,600	1,224,400	1,280,300	1,338,400

* Based on ABAG Projection 2013.

**East County Transportation Planning (TRANSPLAN) Committee, Transportation Partnership and Cooperation (TRANSPAC), West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC), and Southwest Area Transportation Committee (SWAT)

Table 2: 30-Year Revenue Targets By Subregion – July 1, 2020 Start Date

Subregion	2035 POPULATION PERCENTAGES	30-year New Sales Tax Measure REVENUE ESTIMATE (x 1,000 in constant 2018 dollars)
TRANSPLAN	28.22%	\$ 863,671
TRANSPAC	29.66%	\$ 907,658
WCCTAC	23.28%	\$ 712,584
SWAT	18.85%	\$ 576,796
TOTAL*	100.00%	\$ 3,060,709

* may not add up due to rounding

Table 3: 35-Year Revenue Targets By Subregion – July 1, 2020 Start Date

	2037 POPULATION PERCENTAGES	35-year New Sales Tax Measure REVENUE ESTIMATE (x 1,000 in constant 2018 dollars)
TRANSPLAN	28.21%	\$1,017,758
TRANSPAC	29.78%	\$1,074,692
WCCTAC	23.30%	\$840,804
SWAT	18.71%	\$675,161
TOTAL	100.00%	\$3,608,416

* may not add up due to rounding

Table 4: 40-Year Revenue Targets By Subregion – July 1, 2020 Start Date

	2040 POPULATION PERCENTAGES	40-year New Sales Tax Measure REVENUE ESTIMATE (x 1,000 in constant 2018 dollars)
TRANSPLAN	28.19%	\$1,173,039
TRANSPAC	29.91%	\$1,244,542
WCCTAC	23.32%	\$970,343
SWAT	18.58%	\$772,933
TOTAL	100.00%	\$4,160,857

* may not add up due to rounding

At its June 5, 2019 special meeting, the board requested staff to bring back the item for future discussion but directed staff to start with a 30-year minimum duration for the development of the Initial Draft TEP, and to explore changes to the TEP if the tax duration is extended to 35- and 40-year periods. Staff seeks direction on the tax rate and duration of a new sales tax, which if approved by the voters in March 2020, would take effect on July 1, 2020.



Contra Costa Transportation Authority - New 0.5% Measure
EXTENDED SALES AND USE TAX BUDGET ESTIMATE

Industry Group	Actual		Projected		Projected		Projected		1		2		3		4		5	
	FY 2017-18		FY 2018-19		FY 2019-20		FY 2020-21		Projected FY 2021-22		Projected FY 2022-23		Projected FY 2023-24		Projected FY 2024-25		Projected FY 2025-26	
Autos And Transportation	18,900,585	2.0%	19,140,012	1.3%	18,124,112	-5.3%	18,396,012	1.5%	19,131,852	4.0%	20,279,764	6.0%	21,496,549	6.0%	22,786,342	6.0%	24,153,523	6.0%
Building And Construction	9,734,834	8.8%	10,124,860	4.0%	9,799,460	-3.2%	9,946,460	1.5%	10,344,318	4.0%	10,964,978	6.0%	11,622,876	6.0%	12,320,249	6.0%	13,059,464	6.0%
Business And Industry	15,391,985	3.4%	16,231,348	5.5%	15,921,248	-1.9%	16,160,048	1.5%	16,564,049	2.5%	17,143,791	3.5%	17,743,824	3.5%	18,364,857	3.5%	19,007,627	3.5%
Food And Drugs	5,581,703	1.7%	5,697,990	2.1%	5,578,990	-2.1%	5,673,790	1.7%	5,787,266	2.0%	5,931,947	2.5%	6,080,246	2.5%	6,232,252	2.5%	6,388,059	2.5%
Fuel And Service Stations	8,069,347	11.4%	9,915,837	22.9%	8,584,737	-13.4%	8,670,537	1.0%	8,930,653	3.0%	9,377,186	5.0%	9,846,045	5.0%	10,338,347	5.0%	10,855,265	5.0%
General Consumer Goods	23,882,239	0.7%	24,822,529	3.9%	24,134,129	-2.8%	24,375,429	1.0%	24,984,815	2.5%	25,734,359	3.0%	26,506,390	3.0%	27,301,582	3.0%	28,120,629	3.0%
Restaurants And Hotels	10,146,415	3.4%	10,441,376	2.9%	10,455,476	0.1%	10,769,176	3.0%	11,307,635	5.0%	11,986,093	6.0%	12,705,258	6.0%	13,467,574	6.0%	14,275,628	6.0%
Transfers & Unidentified	102,635	0.2%	182,379	77.7%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%
Subtotal Point of Sale	91,809,743	3.5%	96,556,331	5.2%	92,780,531	-3.9%	94,173,831	1.5%	97,232,968	3.2%	101,600,496	4.5%	106,183,568	4.5%	110,993,583	4.5%	116,042,574	4.5%
Administration Cost	(947,112)	-6.2%	(955,490)	0.9%	(1,020,586)	6.8%	(1,035,912)	1.5%	(1,069,563)	3.2%	(1,117,605)	4.5%	(1,168,019)	4.5%	(1,220,929)	4.5%	(1,276,468)	4.5%
Total	90,862,631	3.6%	95,600,841	5.2%	91,759,945	-4.0%	93,137,919	1.5%	96,163,405	3.2%	100,482,891	4.5%	105,015,549	4.5%	109,772,653	4.5%	114,766,105	4.5%



	6		7		8		9		10		11		12		13		14	
Industry Group	Projected FY 2026-27		Projected FY 2027-28		Projected FY 2028-29		Projected FY 2029-30		Projected FY 2030-31		Projected FY 2031-32		Projected FY 2032-33		Projected FY 2033-34		Projected FY 2034-35	
Autos And Transportation	25,602,734	6.0%	27,138,898	6.0%	28,767,232	6.0%	30,493,266	6.0%	32,322,862	6.0%	34,262,234	6.0%	36,317,968	6.0%	38,497,046	6.0%	39,459,472	2.5%
Building And Construction	13,843,031	6.0%	14,673,613	6.0%	15,554,030	6.0%	16,487,272	6.0%	17,476,508	6.0%	18,525,099	6.0%	19,636,605	6.0%	20,814,801	6.0%	21,439,245	3.0%
Business And Industry	19,672,894	3.5%	20,361,446	3.5%	21,074,096	3.5%	21,811,690	3.5%	22,575,099	3.5%	23,365,227	3.5%	24,183,010	3.5%	25,029,416	3.5%	25,530,004	2.0%
Food And Drugs	6,547,760	2.5%	6,711,454	2.5%	6,879,240	2.5%	7,051,221	2.5%	7,227,502	2.5%	7,408,190	2.5%	7,593,394	2.5%	7,783,229	2.5%	7,938,894	2.0%
Fuel And Service Stations	11,398,028	5.0%	11,967,929	5.0%	12,566,326	5.0%	13,194,642	5.0%	13,854,374	5.0%	14,547,093	5.0%	15,274,448	5.0%	16,038,170	5.0%	16,198,552	1.0%
General Consumer Goods	28,964,248	3.0%	29,833,175	3.0%	30,728,171	3.0%	31,650,016	3.0%	32,599,516	3.0%	33,577,502	3.0%	34,584,827	3.0%	35,622,372	3.0%	36,156,707	1.5%
Restaurants And Hotels	15,132,166	6.0%	16,040,096	6.0%	17,002,502	6.0%	18,022,652	6.0%	19,104,011	6.0%	20,250,252	6.0%	21,465,267	6.0%	22,753,183	6.0%	23,322,012	2.5%
Transfers & Unidentified	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%
Subtotal Point of Sale	121,343,241	4.6%	126,908,991	4.6%	132,753,976	4.6%	138,893,138	4.6%	145,342,252	4.6%	152,117,975	4.7%	159,237,897	4.7%	166,720,595	4.7%	170,227,265	2.1%
Administration Cost	(1,334,776)		(1,395,999)		(1,460,294)		(1,527,825)		(1,598,765)		(1,673,298)		(1,751,617)		(1,833,927)		(1,872,500)	
Total	120,008,466	4.6%	125,512,992	4.6%	131,293,683	4.6%	137,365,314	4.6%	143,743,487	4.6%	150,444,677	4.7%	157,486,280	4.7%	164,886,669	4.7%	168,354,765	2.1%



	15		16		17		18		19		20		21		22		23	
Industry Group	Projected FY 2035-36		Projected FY 2036-37		Projected FY 2037-38		Projected FY 2038-39		Projected FY 2039-40		Projected FY 2040-41		Projected FY 2041-42		Projected FY 2042-43		Projected FY 2043-44	
Autos And Transportation	40,445,959	2.5%	41,457,108	2.5%	42,493,536	2.5%	43,555,874	2.5%	44,644,771	2.5%	45,760,890	2.5%	46,904,912	2.5%	48,077,535	2.5%	49,279,474	2.5%
Building And Construction	22,082,422	3.0%	22,744,895	3.0%	23,427,242	3.0%	24,130,059	3.0%	24,853,961	3.0%	25,599,580	3.0%	26,367,567	3.0%	27,158,594	3.0%	27,973,352	3.0%
Business And Industry	26,040,604	2.0%	26,561,416	2.0%	27,092,644	2.0%	27,634,497	2.0%	28,187,187	2.0%	28,750,931	2.0%	29,325,950	2.0%	29,912,469	2.0%	30,510,718	2.0%
Food And Drugs	8,097,672	2.0%	8,259,625	2.0%	8,424,817	2.0%	8,593,314	2.0%	8,765,180	2.0%	8,940,484	2.0%	9,119,293	2.0%	9,301,679	2.0%	9,487,713	2.0%
Fuel And Service Stations	16,360,537	1.0%	16,524,142	1.0%	16,689,384	1.0%	16,856,278	1.0%	17,024,841	1.0%	17,195,089	1.0%	17,367,040	1.0%	17,540,710	1.0%	17,716,117	1.0%
General Consumer Goods	36,699,058	1.5%	37,249,544	1.5%	37,808,287	1.5%	38,375,411	1.5%	38,951,042	1.5%	39,535,308	1.5%	40,128,338	1.5%	40,730,263	1.5%	41,341,217	1.5%
Restaurants And Hotels	23,905,063	2.5%	24,502,689	2.5%	25,115,257	2.5%	25,743,138	2.5%	26,386,716	2.5%	27,046,384	2.5%	27,722,544	2.5%	28,415,608	2.5%	29,125,998	2.5%
Transfers & Unidentified	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%
Subtotal Point of Sale	173,813,694	2.1%	177,481,798	2.1%	181,233,546	2.1%	185,070,950	2.1%	188,996,077	2.1%	193,011,045	2.1%	197,118,023	2.1%	201,319,237	2.1%	205,616,967	2.1%
Administration Cost	(1,911,951)		(1,952,300)		(1,993,569)		(2,035,780)		(2,078,957)		(2,123,121)		(2,168,298)		(2,214,512)		(2,261,787)	
Total	171,901,743	2.1%	175,529,499	2.1%	179,239,977	2.1%	183,035,170	2.1%	186,917,120	2.1%	190,887,923	2.1%	194,949,725	2.1%	199,104,725	2.1%	203,355,180	2.1%



Industry Group	24		25		26		27		28		29		30		31		32	
	Projected FY 2044-45		Projected FY 2045-46		Projected FY 2046-47		Projected FY 2047-48		Projected FY 2048-49		Projected FY 2049-50		Projected FY 2050-51		Projected FY 2051-52		Projected FY 2052-53	
Autos And Transportation	50,511,461	2.5%	51,774,247	2.5%	53,068,603	2.5%	54,395,318	2.5%	55,755,201	2.5%	57,149,081	2.5%	58,577,808	2.5%	60,042,253	2.5%	61,543,310	2.5%
Building And Construction	28,812,553	3.0%	29,676,929	3.0%	30,567,237	3.0%	31,484,254	3.0%	32,428,782	3.0%	33,401,645	3.0%	34,403,695	3.0%	35,435,805	3.0%	36,498,880	3.0%
Business And Industry	31,120,932	2.0%	31,743,351	2.0%	32,378,218	2.0%	33,025,782	2.0%	33,686,298	2.0%	34,360,024	2.0%	35,047,224	2.0%	35,748,169	2.0%	36,463,132	2.0%
Food And Drugs	9,677,467	2.0%	9,871,016	2.0%	10,068,437	2.0%	10,269,806	2.0%	10,475,202	2.0%	10,684,706	2.0%	10,898,400	2.0%	11,116,368	2.0%	11,338,695	2.0%
Fuel And Service Stations	17,893,278	1.0%	18,072,211	1.0%	18,252,933	1.0%	18,435,463	1.0%	18,619,817	1.0%	18,806,016	1.0%	18,994,076	1.0%	19,184,016	1.0%	19,375,857	1.0%
General Consumer Goods	41,961,335	1.5%	42,590,755	1.5%	43,229,616	1.5%	43,878,060	1.5%	44,536,231	1.5%	45,204,275	1.5%	45,882,339	1.5%	46,570,574	1.5%	47,269,133	1.5%
Restaurants And Hotels	29,854,148	2.5%	30,600,501	2.5%	31,365,514	2.5%	32,149,652	2.5%	32,953,393	2.5%	33,777,228	2.5%	34,621,659	2.5%	35,487,200	2.5%	36,374,380	2.5%
Transfers & Unidentified	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%
Subtotal Point of Sale	210,013,552	2.1%	214,511,390	2.1%	219,112,937	2.1%	223,820,714	2.1%	228,637,303	2.2%	233,565,353	2.2%	238,607,579	2.2%	243,766,765	2.2%	249,045,765	2.2%
Administration Cost	(2,310,149)		(2,359,625)		(2,410,242)		(2,462,028)		(2,515,010)		(2,569,219)		(2,624,683)		(2,681,434)		(2,739,503)	
Total	207,703,403	2.1%	212,151,765	2.1%	216,702,695	2.1%	221,358,686	2.1%	226,122,293	2.2%	230,996,134	2.2%	235,982,896	2.2%	241,085,330	2.2%	246,306,261	2.2%



Industry Group	33		34		35		36		37		38		39	
	Projected FY 2053-54		Projected FY 2054-55		Projected FY 2055-56		Projected FY 2056-57		Projected FY 2057-58		Projected FY 2058-59		Projected FY 2059-60	
Autos And Transportation	63,081,893	2.5%	64,658,940	2.5%	66,275,413	2.5%	67,932,299	2.5%	69,630,606	2.5%	71,371,371	2.5%	73,155,656	2.5%
Building And Construction	37,593,846	3.0%	38,721,661	3.0%	39,883,311	3.0%	41,079,810	3.0%	42,312,205	3.0%	43,581,571	3.0%	44,889,018	3.0%
Business And Industry	37,192,395	2.0%	37,936,243	2.0%	38,694,968	2.0%	39,468,867	2.0%	40,258,244	2.0%	41,063,409	2.0%	41,884,677	2.0%
Food And Drugs	11,565,469	2.0%	11,796,778	2.0%	12,032,714	2.0%	12,273,368	2.0%	12,518,836	2.0%	12,769,212	2.0%	13,024,597	2.0%
Fuel And Service Stations	19,569,615	1.0%	19,765,311	1.0%	19,962,964	1.0%	20,162,594	1.0%	20,364,220	1.0%	20,567,862	1.0%	20,773,541	1.0%
General Consumer Goods	47,978,170	1.5%	48,697,842	1.5%	49,428,310	1.5%	50,169,734	1.5%	50,922,280	1.5%	51,686,115	1.5%	52,461,406	1.5%
Restaurants And Hotels	37,283,739	2.5%	38,215,833	2.5%	39,171,229	2.5%	40,150,510	2.5%	41,154,272	2.5%	42,183,129	2.5%	43,237,707	2.5%
Transfers & Unidentified	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%	182,379	0.0%
Subtotal Point of Sale	254,447,506	2.2%	259,974,988	2.2%	265,631,288	2.2%	271,419,561	2.2%	277,343,043	2.2%	283,405,049	2.2%	289,608,981	2.2%
Administration Cost	(2,798,923)		(2,859,725)		(2,921,944)		(2,985,615)		(3,050,773)		(3,117,456)		(3,185,699)	
Total	251,648,583	2.2%	257,115,263	2.2%	262,709,344	2.2%	268,433,946	2.2%	274,292,269	2.2%	280,287,593	2.2%	286,423,282	2.2%



Contra Costa Transportation Authority **STAFF REPORT**

Meeting Date: June 12, 2019

Subject	Proposed Performance Measures and Authorize Performance Analysis of the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)
Summary of Issues	In order to provide an assessment of the TEP benefits included in the guiding principles, staff proposes utilizing a set of outcomes-based performance measures and associated methodologies for extracting that information from the travel demand model. Staff recommends starting the performance analysis based on the Initial Draft TEP and to update and complete the final performance analysis using the final TEP scheduled to be approved on August 21, 2019.
Recommendations	Staff seeks Authority Board approval to utilize the proposed modeling tools and performance measures to provide an overall assessment of the performance of the TEP.
Financial Implications	The cost of the TEP performance analysis is estimated at \$200,000, which will be funded through Measure J Planning funds (Org. OCP 18a).
Options	Refine the proposed measures and methodologies.
Attachments	None
Changes from Committee	N/A

Background

At its meeting on May 15, 2019, the Authority Board directed staff to begin work on a proposed TEP to bring before the voters of Contra Costa County in March 2020. At that meeting, the Authority Board approved a number of consultant agreements to support the TEP development effort. Included in the Authority Board's authorizing action was funding a \$200,000 amendment to Kittelson & Associates, Inc. (Kittelson) existing Agreement No. 278 in order to conduct a travel model analysis of the performance of the proposed TEP. The work will be assigned to Kittelson on a task order basis. The goal of the analysis is to provide a quantitative County-level

assessment of the impacts of the implementation of the proposed TEP from both an environmental perspective (e.g., air quality, greenhouse gas [GHG] emissions) and for outcomes-based performance measures (e.g., commute time savings, modal shift).

Use of Performance Measures in Transportation Analysis

Performance measures are a quantitative method of assessing a single project, or program of projects' impacts using a variety of variables. For transportation, the assessment may include variables that address the environment, the user experience, system reliability, and equity issues, among others. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) has been using performance measures in its last three Regional Transportation Plans (RTPs), and measures from the 2017 RTP were used in the Authority's 2017 Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) environmental analysis. Historically, the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (Authority) has used performance measures to assess impacts of development on the transportation system through the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) in the sub-regional Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance, under the Measure J Growth Management Program (GMP). An outcomes-based performance assessment will focus on the user experience of commuting and travel in Contra Costa County for all modes.

The assessment of the proposed TEP would be performed using a travel demand forecasting model. The Authority maintains a nine-County model, with added detail in Contra Costa County, known as the Countywide Model. The model's inputs have been recently updated for consistency with MTC's Plan Bay Area 2040, and reflects the Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) for the Bay Area region as adopted by MTC in July 2017. The model provides forecasts for future conditions through 2040. Additionally, the Authority has access to MTC's travel demand model, known as Travel Model One (TM1). TM1 was developed for Plan Bay Area 2040 and was the tool used in evaluating the Plan's performance measures and equity analysis, and could be utilized for the proposed TEP evaluation using a regionally accepted and tested instrument. Staff believes the proposed TEP can be successfully evaluated using either platform, but recommends using the Countywide Model due to its added detail of land use inputs and the transportation network.

Measuring the Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Performance

The TEP is expected to be comprised of funding categories to support a combination of projects and programs. Some projects may involve specific physical changes to local streets, freeways, interchanges or increasing express bus service and can be directly reflected in the model by

modifying the model's representation of the road and transit network. Other projects and programs may involve changes to other elements of the transportation system, such as funding off-street trails for bicycle and pedestrian use, providing funding for bus passes or paratransit services, or disseminating information about commute alternatives to encourage use of modes other than single-occupant vehicles, among others. These types of changes are not reflected in the model's road and transit networks, but instead can be reflected in other model inputs and parameters or by refining model outputs.

The proposed evaluation approach will be to adjust the model networks and other inputs and parameters to capture the physical changes anticipated in a proposed TEP. To capture operation and program changes, other parameters will be adjusted, and some model post-processing will be employed. Below are descriptions of how the model's inputs, outputs, or parameters (which include lane capacity, value of time, cost of parking, among others), are proposed for various types of projects or programs.

Highway or Arterial Improvements: These types of projects may involve interchange modifications, addition of new lanes, construction of new roads, improving vehicle access to BART stations, and similar types of improvements. These projects can be reflected directly in the model roadway network.

Transit Projects and Programs: The proposed TEP could include funding for a range of projects related to transit service, such as additional e-Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) cars and various non-rail transit enhancements (e.g., bus on shoulder or express bus service), including transit investment options along major corridors, and projects to add park-and-ride capacity along with new intercity rail and ferry service. The proposed TEP could also include a range of transit-related programs, such as funding for bus operations and bus passes for certain user groups (e.g., seniors, persons with disabilities, and minors). It would be very time-intensive to make changes to individual transit lines represented in the model, and in many cases the exact transit lines that might be affected by a particular program are not currently defined. Instead, the modeling approach will be to add to the network those specific transit projects defined in the proposed TEP (for example, the extension of high capacity transit service from Antioch to Brentwood), and to increase service frequencies on bus lines for specific corridors in Contra Costa County. Higher transit service frequencies correspond with shorter headways and faster service, reflecting an increased investment in transit service, which would encourage greater usage of the transit system because it will be more convenient and timely.

Freeway Operations and Integrated Corridor Management (ICM): Projects designed to improve freeway traffic flow and operations, through ICM, are designed to optimize the performance of the freeway corridor through a combination of strategies such as adaptive ramp metering, variable speed limits, driver information systems, and other Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) techniques such as transit prioritization at traffic signals. Within the model, the effects of these types of projects can be reflected by increasing the hourly vehicle capacity of the freeway to reflect the increased throughput that could be achieved, consistent with published research on the effects of freeway management techniques.

Programs Supporting Active Transportation: The proposed TEP could include several funding categories to support programs for pedestrians and bicyclists (also known as active transportation), including multi-use trail projects, complete streets, vision zero, programs to enhance safe transportation for children and the elderly, and BART access improvements that promote first-and-last-mile connections to activity centers. While the model is not particularly sensitive to localized changes in the bicycle or pedestrian network, or to the effects of educational or encouragement programs, published research has demonstrated a strong relationship between investments in facilities and programs for active transportation and the likelihood that travelers will shift from driving to those other modes, as well as enhancing multimodal safety. The approach will be to refine the model outputs to reflect increased bicycling and walking as a result of more robust active transportation investments.

Maintenance and Repair Projects and Programs: These efforts are essential to keeping the transportation system in a state of good repair and functioning reliably for users. However, these types of investments are not model-able. The benefits of maintenance and repair programs will be analyzed separately. An assessment of the benefits expected from any proposed investments in maintaining the system will be performed using established best practices.

Measuring Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP) Performance

Applying the proposed techniques to the model and off-model tools provides output that will be used in the calculation of performance measures in order to assess the proposed TEP's impacts on the transportation system. The following measures related to system performance are proposed to be used in the proposed TEP and reported for the County as a whole, as opposed to smaller geographic areas (e.g., jurisdiction or Regional Transportation Planning Committee [RTPC]):

- Total Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) and VMT per capita
- Total Vehicle Hours of Travel (VHT) and VHT per capita
- Total emitted transportation-related GHGs
- Total vehicle hours of delay
- Average speeds on freeways and on expressways/major arterials
- Travel time reliability on freeways and on expressways/major arterials
- Mode share
- Total transit trips
- Total bicycling trips
- Total walking trips

The model data that informs these measures will also inform the outcomes-based communication of the proposed TEP's impacts on the residents of Contra Costa County and those who travel within and through Contra Costa County. Outcomes-based metrics may include:

- Average travel time for drivers on arterials/freeways, including average time savings
- Average travel time for bus and BART riders, including time savings
- Average frequency for transit service
- Transportation-related GHG emissions per capita
- Miles of repaired roadways
- Miles of separated/protected bicycle facilities
- Miles of pedestrian facilities/walkways
- Number of jobs accessible within a 30-minute commute
- Mobility options available to low-income communities
- Vehicular injury and fatal collision rates per capita
- Active transportation injury and fatal collision rates per capita

Based upon the model outputs, we can further develop specific outcome examples that relate to the commuters' day-to-day experience. Such examples include:

- Point-to-point travel time - How many minutes will it take to drive from Pleasant Hill to Pleasanton with and without the *Innovate 680* project?
- How much time will it take to ride the bus from Walnut Creek BART to Bishop Ranch with bus on shoulder?

- How would the commute travel time from Brentwood to Concord compare in a vehicle vs. transit?
- How many jobs are accessible within a 30-minute commute from Richmond?

These results would be estimated by isolating the model output for specific trip-making patterns and types of trips.

Authority staff recommends using the above approach in the assessment of the TEP. Staff recommends starting the performance analysis based on the Initial Draft TEP and to update and complete final performance analysis using the final TEP scheduled for approval on August 21, 2019.



Contra Costa Transportation Authority *STAFF REPORT*

Meeting Date: June 12, 2019

Subject	Proposed Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (TEP)
Summary of Issues	At its special meeting on June 5, 2019, the Authority Board reviewed and provided input on a proposed structure and strategies to develop an Initial Draft TEP. Based on input received from the Authority Board, staff has developed a proposed structure and initial content for the Initial Draft TEP for the Authority Board’s consideration.
Recommendations	Staff is seeking input from the Authority Board on the proposed structure and initial content proposed for the Initial Draft TEP.
Financial Implications	None
Options	The Authority Board could direct staff to not continue with the development of a proposed Initial Draft TEP.
Attachments	None
Changes from Committee	N/A

Background

At the June 5, 2019 Authority Board Special meeting, staff presented a framework for the proposed Initial Draft TEP and requested input from the Authority Board on the structure and strategies to develop the initial draft document. Based on input received from the Authority Board, staff has developed a proposed structure and initial content for the Authority Board’s consideration, which will be the basis for the Initial Draft TEP that will be presented to the Authority Board on June 19, 2019. The following summarizes the proposed structure of the Initial Draft TEP. The proposed initial content of the Initial Draft TEP will be provided as a handout at the Authority Board Special meeting on June 12, 2019.

A New Transportation Future for Contra Costa County

The TEP focus areas of innovative strategies and new technologies will promote a strong economy, protect the environment and enhance the quality of life for all of Contra Costa County's diverse communities. This plan outlines projects and programs that will:

- Relieve traffic on highways and interchanges.
- Make bus, ferry, commuter rail, and Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) safer, cleaner, and more reliable.
- Provide affordable and safe transportation for children, seniors, veterans, and people with disabilities.
- Make our communities better and protect the environment.

Three Decades of Transportation Improvements

- Discusses the Authority's roles and responsibilities for maintaining and improving the County's transportation system.
- Summarizes the Authority's success in delivering on previous Measure C and Measure J commitments while completing projects in an accelerated timeline.
- Highlights the need for additional funding over the coming three decades to meet the transportation needs in Contra Costa County.
- Reiterates the commitment for funding of local projects and the success Contra Costa County local agencies have had in leveraging Measure funds to secure additional State and federal transportation funding.

A Roadmap for the Future

- Summarizes what the proposed TEP will accomplish
- Details key elements of the TEP, including guiding principles
- Outcomes-based TEP incorporating input from Cities/Towns (through the Public Managers' Association (PMA), public and stakeholders
- Taxpayer safeguard and policy structure
- Priorities for TEP funding

Proposed Transportation Investments

Detailed description of each funding category, eligibility, outcomes and funding requirements. See agenda item 1.1 for additional discussion.

Program Policies

Recommended changes and additions to the 2016 TEP Program Policies. See agenda item 1.2 for additional discussion.