

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, 3rd Floor Conference Room
Tuesday, March 15, 2016, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

AGENDA

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

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

1:30 Item 1: Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”): *The TAC will discuss the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (“CCTA”) Initial Draft Transportation Expenditure Plan (“TEP”). ♦*
Page 2

2:30 Item 2: Senate Bill 743 (“SB 743”): *The TAC will discuss the discontinuation of LOS or Delay-Based Traffic Measurements as an Indicator of Significant Impact on the Environment and the possible effect on the East County Action Plan for Routes of Regional Significance. ♦*
Page 47

3:20 Announcements:

“OneBayAreaGrant” (“OBAG”) Call for Projects: *The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (“MTC”) has released the second round of the One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2) covering Fiscal Years (FYs) 2017–18 through FY 2021–22. ♦* Page 52

3:30 Item 3: Adjourn to Tuesday, April 19, 2016 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 Jamar Stamps, TRANSPLAN staff person, at least 48 hours prior to the starting time of the meeting. Mr. Stamps can be reached at (925) 674-7832 or at jamar.stamps@dcd.cccounty.us.

g:\transportation\committees\transplan\tplan_year\2015-16\meetings\tac\03_mar 2016\tac agenda mar2016.doc

ITEM 1
TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (“TEP”)

INITIAL DRAFT

**Transportation Sales Tax
Expenditure Plan (TEP)**

Comment [MT1]: Version 1 - Posted with EPAC agenda on 2/22/2016

Version 1.1 (This Version) – was posted with EPAC agenda on 2/24/2016. Version 1.1 corrected the allocation assigned to the Community Development Investment Program (added \$50 million) and the Regional Choice Category (deducted \$50 million) and made other non-substantive changes.

INITIAL DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes Only

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
For Discussion purposes only
DraftTEP_20160222_EPACmtng_Version1.1

Page 1 of 30

TEP Outline

- Executive summary (**to be completed at a later date**)
- The Contra Costa Transportation Sales Tax Expenditure Plan
 - Table of Expenditure Plan Allocations
 - Summary of Projects and Programs (**to be completed at a later date**)
 - Detailed Descriptions of Funding Categories
 - Growth Management Program
 - Attachment A - Principles of Agreement for Establishing the Urban Limit Line
 - Complete Streets Program
 - Regional Advance Environmental Mitigation Program
 - Governing Structure
 - Implementing Guidelines

Comment [MT2]: A brief Executive Summary will be included in the final TEP document. This was a one page summary in the 2004 Measure J TEP document

TABLE OF EXPENDITURE PLAN ALLOCATIONS

Funding Category	\$ (millions)	%
Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	540	23.1%
Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants	200	8.6%
BART Capacity, Access and Parking Improvements	300	12.8%
East Contra Costa Transit Extension	70	3.0%
Transit & Interchange Improvements along the I-80 Corridor in West County	110	4.7%
Improve traffic flow & implement high capacity transit in the I-680 corridor	140	6.0%
Improve traffic flow along the SR 242 and SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern County	70	3.0%
Interstate 680 and State Route 4 Interchange Improvements	60	2.6%
East County Corridor - provide a high	117	5.0%
Advance Mitigation Program	TBD	TBD
Non-Rail Transit Enhancements	200	8.6%
Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	50	2.1%
Safe Transportation for Children	50	2.1%
Intercity Rail and Ferry Service	50	2.1%
Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities	60	2.6%
Community Development Investment Grant Program	140	6.0%
Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program	65	2.8%
Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services	23	1.0%
Regional Choice	70	3.0%
Administration	23	1.0%
TOTAL	2338	100.0%

Notes

- Advance Mitigation Program - Projects that would be included in an Advance Mitigation Program will be called out/ identified
- Regional Choice – This category is a placeholder for funds intended to be assigned by the RTPCs either to 1) high priority local projects/ programs unique to that subregion or 2) to augment funding assigned to other categories in this draft TEP to better reflect local priorities and needs

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
 For Discussion purposes only
 DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtnng_Version1.1

Page 3 of 30

in that subregion. Projects / program descriptions will ultimately be blended in to the final draft TEP) (version 1.1 includes the reduction of \$50m to this category, bringing total program to \$70m)

- Commute Alternatives – This program is not proposed in TEP as a countywide funded category. Funds may be assigned from Regional Choice category for this type of program.
- TLC – This program not proposed in TEP. A new program (Community Development Investment Grant Program) is proposed to be included in TEP.
- CDI – Community Development Investment Program is a new category. It is intended to provide funding for housing incentives and job creation programs/ investments (see details on following pages) (version 1.1 includes the addition of \$50m to this category, bringing total program to \$140m).

INITIAL DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes Only

Detailed Descriptions of Funding Categories

The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is responsible for maintaining and improving the county's transportation system by planning, funding, and delivering critical transportation infrastructure projects and programs. The funding categories detailed below will provide needed improvements to connect our communities, foster a strong economy, increase sustainability, and safely and efficiently get people where they need to go.

Funding Categories

- 1. Local Streets Maintenance & Improvements ----- 23.1% (\$540m)**

Funds from this category will fund maintenance and improvement projects on local streets and roads and may be used for any eligible transportation purposes as defined under the Act and to comply with the GMP requirements. The Authority will distribute 23.1 percent of the annual sales tax revenues to all local jurisdictions with a base allocation of \$100,000 for each jurisdiction, the balance will be distributed based 50 percent on relative population and 50 percent on road miles for each jurisdiction, subject to compliance with the Authority's reporting, audit and GMP requirements, consistent with the current Measure J program. Population figures used shall be the most current available from the State Department of Finance. Road mileage shall be from the most current State Controller's Annual Report of Financial Transactions for Streets and Roads.

Funds shall be used by each jurisdiction to maintain and enhance existing roadway and other transportation facilities. Jurisdictions shall comply with the Authority's Maintenance of Effort (MOE) policy as well as Implementation Guidelines of this TEP. Local agencies will report on the use of these funds, such as the amount spent on roadway maintenance, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit facilities, and other roadway improvements.

- 2. Major Streets/ Complete Streets/ Traffic Signal Synchronization Grant Program ----- \$200m**

Funds from this category shall be used to fund improvements to major thoroughfares throughout Contra Costa to improve the safe, efficient and reliable movement of buses, vehicles, bicyclists and pedestrians along said corridors (i.e. traffic smoothing). Eligible projects include but, are not limited to installation of bike and pedestrian facilities, synchronization of traffic signals and other technology solutions to manage traffic, traffic calming and pedestrian safety improvements, shoulders, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, streetscapes and bus transit facility enhancements such as bus turnouts and passenger amenities. As an element of this program, the CCTA will adopt a 'traffic signal synchronization' program and award grants for installation of 'state of the art' technology oriented at smoothing the flow of traffic along major arterial roadways throughout the county. Funding from this program will be prioritized to projects that improve access (all modes) to transit stations and transit

oriented communities. Priority will be given to projects that can show a high percentage of 'other funding' allocated to the project (i.e. – leverage). All projects funded through this program must demonstrate compliance with CCTA's Complete Streets program and include complete street elements whenever possible.

3. BART Capacity, Access and Parking Improvements ---- \$300m

Funds from this category shall be used to construct improvements to the BART system such as: station access improvements; station related safety and operational improvements; additional on or off site parking; development and implementation of last mile connections (including shuttles, transit stops, and bicycle / pedestrian facilities – complete streets) oriented at providing BART users alternatives to driving alone / parking single occupant vehicles. Funds in this category may be used for the acquisition of new BART cars and/or advanced train control systems that can be shown to increase capacity on BART lines serving Contra Costa, provided that 1) BART agrees to fund CCTA identified improvements from other BART revenues and 2) a regional approach, that includes funding commitments from both Alameda and San Francisco Counties, must be developed and implemented prior to any funds from this measure being used to fund the acquisition of BART cars.

Comment [WRG3]: For discussion only – amount subject to change. \$300m is consistent with discussions w/ BART to date.

4. East Contra Costa Transit Extension (BART or alternative) ----- \$70m

Funding from this category shall be used to extend BART or other high capacity transit service easterly from the existing Hillcrest Station in Antioch through Oakley to a new station in Brentwood. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. Funds from this category may be used to complete an interim transit station in Brentwood as well as to fund improvements to the Pittsburg and /or Antioch stations. Funds in this category may be used for the acquisition of new BART cars and/or advanced train control systems that can be shown to increase capacity on BART lines serving Contra Costa, provided that 1) BART agrees to fund CCTA identified improvements from other BART revenues and 2) a regional approach, that includes funding commitments from both Alameda and San Francisco Counties, must be developed and implemented prior to any funds from this measure being used to fund the acquisition of BART cars. RAMP eligible project.

5. Transit and Interchange Improvements along the I-80 Corridor in West Contra Costa ----- \$110m

Funding from this category shall be allocated by the Authority to projects/ programs (including state of the art technology) that improve traffic flow along the Interstate 80 corridor as well as nearby major streets and/or intersections and reduce congestion, increase mobility and provide alternatives for single occupant vehicle travel. Final determination on the scope of the improvements to be constructed will be based on the final recommendations in the West County High Capacity Transit Study. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. RAMP eligible project.

Comment [MT4]: Eligibility for this project will include projects and programs that result from the West County High Capacity Transit Study (including transit operational costs).

-
- 6. Improve traffic flow and implement high capacity transit along the Interstate 680 corridor in Central and Southwest County ----- \$140m**
Funding from this category shall be used to implement the I-680 corridor express lane and operational improvement project to facilitate car pools and/or increased transit use in the corridor and discourage single occupant driving; funding may also be used implement high capacity transit improvements in the corridor (including those identified in the I-680 transit options and other relevant studies); funding may also be used to complete improvements to the mainline freeway and/or local interchanges as may be required to implement express lane and/or transit projects as well as advanced traffic management programs and/or other projects or programs that encourage the use of connected vehicle and/or autonomous vehicles in the corridor provided that the project sponsor can show that they reduce congestion, increase mobility and provide alternatives to single occupant vehicle travel. Selection of final project to be based on a performance analysis of project alternatives consistent with CCTA requirements. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. RAMP eligible project.
- 7. Improve traffic flow along the SR 242 and SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern Contra Costa County ----- \$70m**
Funding from this category shall be used to improve traffic flow and reduce congestion between Concord and Brentwood along the State Route 242 and State Route 4 to reduce congestion, increase mobility and provide alternatives to single occupant vehicle travel. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. Advanced traffic management programs and/or other projects or programs that encourage the use of connected vehicle and/or autonomous vehicles in the corridor are eligible for funding from this category provided that the project sponsor can demonstrate that they reduce congestion, increase mobility and provide alternatives to single occupant vehicle travel. Selection of final project to be based on a performance analysis of project alternatives consistent with CCTA requirements. RAMP eligible project.
- 8. Interstate 680 / State Route 4 Interchange ----- \$60m**
Funding from this category shall be used to implement the Interstate 680/ State Route 4 interchange improvement project as necessary to improve traffic flow and enhance traffic safety along both the I-680 and SR 4 corridors. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. CCTA shall prioritize local funding commitments to this project in such a way as to encourage carpools and vanpools, public transit usage and other alternatives to the single occupant vehicle. RAMP eligible project.
- 9. East County Corridor (Vasco Rd and/or Byron Highway Corridors) ----- \$117m**
Funding from this category shall be used to complete capacity and/or safety improvements to the Vasco Road and/or the Byron Highway (Tri-Link) Corridors oriented at providing better connectivity between eastern Contra Costa and the Interstate 580 corridor in Alameda and San Joaquin counties. Funds from this category may be used to upgrade existing facilities and to complete a new connection

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM

For Discussion purposes only

DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtng_Version1.1

Page 7 of 30

between the two corridors provided such a connection can be demonstrated to improve traffic flow and/or safety along either or both of the corridors. Selection of final project to be based on a performance analysis of project alternatives consistent with CCTA requirements. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. At its sole discretion, the Authority may allocate up to 5% of funding from this category to the study and implement high capacity transit along either or both of these corridors.

Prior to the use of any local sales tax funds to implement capacity improvements to either or both of these corridors, the Authority must find that the project includes measures to prevent growth outside of the Urban Limit Lines (ULL) in effect at the time of passage of this measure. Such measures might include, but not necessarily be limited to, limits on roadway access in areas outside the ULL, purchase of abutters' rights of access, preservation of critical habitat and/or the acquisition of open space. Any investments affecting facilities in Alameda or San Joaquin Counties will be done in partnership with those jurisdictions. RAMP eligible project.

10. Advance Mitigation Program ---- TBD

The Authority will develop a policy supporting the creation of an advance mitigation program to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation. This policy will identify projects that will benefit from the program and the financial contribution associated with those projects. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans, including the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservation Plan. The benefit of this policy will include an early comprehensive project delivery review, reduced costs attributed to mitigation, opportunity to significantly improve conservation benefits, and accelerated project delivery. If this approach cannot be fully implemented, then the identified funds shall be used for environmental mitigation purposes on a project by project basis.

11. Non-Rail Transit Enhancements ---- 8.6% (\$200m)

This category of funding is intended to provide funding to non-rail transit service alternatives that can be shown to reduce total vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and/or greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Funding will be provided to non-rail transit services/projects that can demonstrate innovative approaches to maximizing the movement of people within the existing transportation infrastructure. Funding can be used to deliver transit capital projects or implement service to transit stations, congested corridors, last mile service to transit hubs and established transit integrated communities. Funding will be allocated by the Authority to Contra Costa transit operators based on performance criteria established by the Authority in consultation with local and regional transit operators and key stakeholders. Funding allocations will be reviewed on a regular basis. Said performance criteria shall require a finding that any proposed new or enhanced services demonstrate the ability to improve regional and/or local mobility for Contra Costa residents. Funds may be used to

deliver transit capital projects or operate service improvements identified in the adopted plans of an operator or of the Authority.

Guidelines will be established so that revenues will fund service enhancements in Contra Costa. The guidelines may require provisions such as; operational efficiencies including greater coordination; promoting and developing a seamless service; increasing service frequencies on appropriate routes; and specified performance criteria and reporting requirements. Services funded in this program will be reviewed every two years to ensure the goals of the program are being met.

Recipients of funding under this category are required to participate in the development of the Accessible Transportation Services Strategic Plan included in Category 12. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities.

12. Transportation for Seniors & People With Disabilities ----- 2.1% (\$50m)

Transportation for Seniors & People With Disabilities or what is often referred to as “Paratransit” services or Accessible Transportation Services (ATS) can be broadly divided into two categories: (1) services required to be provided by transit operators under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to people functionally unable to ride fixed route service; and (2) services not required by law but necessary for frail seniors and people with disabilities whose needs are beyond the requirements of the ADA (for example, extra hours of service or greater geographic coverage or requirement for service beyond curb-to-curb), or for non-ADA eligible seniors.

Projections indicate that people that would be eligible for these services is the fast growing segment of our population and will likely (blank) over the next (blank) years.

Funding in this category will be used to fund accessible transportation services. These services shall support both non-ADA and ADA services for eligible participants. To ensure services are delivered in a coordinated system that maximizes both service delivery and efficiency an Accessible Transportation Service (ATS) Strategic Plan will be developed and periodically updated during the term of the measure. No funding under this category will be allocated until the ATS Strategic Plan has been developed and adopted.

An overarching component in the development and delivery of the ATS Strategic Plan is using mobility management to ensure coordination and efficiencies in accessible service delivery. The plan will evaluate the appropriate model for our local structure including how accessible services are delivered by all agencies and where appropriate coordination can improve transportation services, eliminate gaps in service and find efficiencies in the service delivered. The ATS Strategic Plan would also determine the investments and oversight of the program funding and identify timing, projects, service delivery options, administrative structure, and fund leverage opportunities.

Comment [MT5]: Continuing to refine language for this item to better reflect consistency with the other sections of the TEP

13. Safe Transportation for Children ----- 2.1% (\$50m)

Programs and projects which promote safe transportation options for children to access schools or after school programs. Eligible projects include but are not limited to transit passes and transit incentive programs, school bus programs, and projects for pedestrian and bicycle safety that provide school-related access.

14. Intercity Rail/ Ferries ---- \$50m

Funds from this category shall be used to construct station and/or track improvements to the Capitol Corridor and/or the San Joaquin corridors as well as to implement new or improved ferry services (including both capital and operations) in Richmond, Hercules, Martinez and/or Antioch. To the greatest degree possible, local funds generated by this measure shall be used to leverage additional regional, state and/or federal funds for this project. Any projects funded in this category will be evaluated by CCTA and demonstrate progress toward the Authority's goals of reducing VMT and green-house gas reductions. Selection of final project to be based on a performance analysis of project alternatives consistent with CCTA requirements. Sponsors of projects requesting funding from this category will be required to demonstrate to the Authority that sufficient funding is available to operate the proposed project and/or service over a long period of time.

15. Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities ---- 2.6% (\$60m)

Two-thirds of the funds from this program will be used implement projects in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, consistent with the current Measure J program. These funds will be allocated competitively to projects that improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, serve the greatest number of users and significant destinations, and remove missing segments and existing barriers to walking and bicycling. The review process shall also consider project feasibility and readiness and the differing needs of the sub-regions when identifying projects for funding. Funding available through this program shall be primarily used for the construction, maintenance, and safety or other improvements of bicycle, pedestrian and trail projects. No design, project approval, right-of-way purchase and environmental clearance may only shall be funded as part of a construction project. Planning to identify a preferred alignment for major new bicycle, pedestrian or trail connections may also be funded through this program.

One third of the funds are to be allocated to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails. EBRPD is to spend its allocation proportionally in each sub-region, subject to the review and approval of the applicable sub-regional committee, prior to funding allocation by the Authority. The Authority in conjunction with EBRPD will develop a maintenance-of-effort requirement for funds under this category.

Consistent with the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan and the complete streets policy established in this expenditure plan, project sponsors receiving funding through other funding categories in this Plan shall incorporate, whenever possible, pedestrian, bicycle, and trail facilities into their projects.

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM

For Discussion purposes only

DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtnng_Version1.1

Page 10 of 30

16. **Community Development Incentive (CDI) Program**----- **3.86.0% (\$90m140m)**
Funds from this category will be used implement this new Community Development Incentive program, administered by the Authority's Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPC's). Funds will be allocated on a competitive basis to transportation projects or programs that promote economic development, job creation and/or housing within established (or planned) transit supportive community centers. Project sponsors must demonstrate that at least 20% of the project is funded from other than local transportation sales tax revenue and the Authority will prioritize funding to projects that demonstrate over 50% funding from other sources. Additional priority will be given to projects where the sponsor can demonstrate that the project supports and facilitates development of housing for all income levels. Working with the RTPCs, the Authority will prepare guidelines and establish overall criteria for the program.

Comment [WG6]: UNRESOLVED ISSUE

This is a proposed new grant program that was developed as an alternative to augmenting the existing Transportation for Livable Communities program.

This new program is intended to stimulate infill development and would complement another proposal to augment a jurisdiction's return to source funding in exchange for compliance with specified housing goals or other 'to be determined' actions intended to incentivize the development of housing.

Augmenting return to source for this purpose is an unresolved issue that is not included in this initial Draft TEP.

17. **Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Program** ----- **2.8% (\$65m)**
Funding from this category will be allocated for the planning and development of projects and programs that include innovative solutions intended to (a) develop and demonstrate transportation innovation through real-world applications, (b) reduce GHG emissions, and (c) implement connected transportation solutions and integrate this approach with other community services such as public safety, public services, water, communications and energy to promote economic development and jobs opportunities by increasing government efficiency and reducing consumption. Examples of eligible projects include but are not limited to expanding opportunities for electric vehicle charging; smart rideshare, carshare and bikeshare services; on-demand and personal transit services that compliment traditional fixed-route transit; smart and automated parking; intelligent, sensor-based infrastructure; smart payment systems; and data sharing to improve mobility choices for all users. Projects are intended to promote connectivity between all users of the transportation network (cars, pedestrians, bikes, buses, trucks, etc.) and automation technologies that collectively facilitate the transformation toward connected communities. Funding is intended to match State, federal, or regional grants and private-sector investment to achieve maximum benefits. By investing in these solutions Contra Costa County can become a national model in sustainable, technology-enabled transportation.

A minimum of twenty-five percent shall be allocated to each sub-program (a, b and c above) over the life of the measure. The Authority will prepare guidelines and establish overall criteria for the Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Program and provide technical resources to project sponsors. The RTPC's will submit programs/projects for the Authority to consider allocating funds to on a competitive basis for each of the sub-programs. Project sponsors must demonstrate that the programs provide highly efficient services that are cost effective, integrated and responsive to the needs of the community.

18. Transportation Planning, Facilities and Services ----- 1.0% (\$23m)

Implement the countywide GMP, prepare the countywide transportation plan; and support the programming and monitoring of federal and state funds, as well as the Authority's Congestion Management Agency functions.

19. Regional Choice ---- ~~\$120m~~70m

This category is a placeholder for funds intended to be assigned by the RTPCs either to 1) high priority local projects/ programs unique to that subregion or 2) to augment funding assigned to other categories in this draft TEP to better reflect local priorities and needs in that subregion. NOTE – these project/ program descriptions will ultimately be blended in to the final draft TEP

20. Administration ---- 1.0% (\$23m)

Funds administration of new measure.

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM

For Discussion purposes only

DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtng_Version1.1

Page 12 of 30

The Growth Management Program

Goals and Objectives

The overall goal of the Growth Management Program is to preserve and enhance the quality of life and promote a healthy, strong economy to benefit the people and areas of Contra Costa through a cooperative, multi-jurisdictional process for managing growth, while maintaining local authority over land use decisions.¹

The objectives of the Growth Management Program are to:

- 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 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.

Components

To receive its share of Local Transportation Maintenance and Improvement funds and to be eligible for Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities funds, each jurisdiction must:

1. Adopt a Growth Management Element

Each jurisdiction must adopt, or maintain in place, a Growth Management Element as part of its General Plan that outlines the jurisdiction's goals and policies for managing growth and requirements for achieving those goals. The Growth Management Element must show how the jurisdiction will comply with sections 2–7 below. The Authority will refine its model Growth Management Element and administrative procedures in consultation with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees to reflect the revised Growth Management Program.

Each jurisdiction is encouraged to incorporate other standards and procedures into its Growth Management Element to support the objectives and required components of this Growth Management Program.

¹The Authority will, to the extent possible, attempt to harmonize the Growth Management and the State-mandated Congestion Management Programs. To the extent they conflict, Congestion Management Program Activities shall take precedence over Growth Management activities.

Comment [WRG7]: This language reflects the current CCTA Growth Management program as approved with Measures C and J and subsequently updated by the Authority.

CCTA staff will be suggesting updates to align this program with current practice.

Comment [WG8]: Some EPAC members have asked for clarification on schedule for periodic review/ update of GM elements (5yr, 10yr, ??).

2. Adopt a Growth Management Mitigation Program

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, consistent with the Countywide Comprehensive Transportation Plan.

The jurisdiction's local development mitigation program shall ensure that revenue provided from this measure shall not be used to replace private developer funding that has or would have been committed to any project.

The regional development mitigation program shall establish fees, exactions, assessments or other mitigation measures to fund regional or subregional transportation improvements needed to mitigate the impacts of planned or forecast development. Regional mitigation programs may adjust such fees, exactions, assessments or other mitigation measures when developments are within walking distance of frequent transit service or are part of a mixed-use development of sufficient density and with necessary facilities to support greater levels of walking and bicycling. Each Regional Transportation Planning Committee shall develop the regional development mitigation program for its region, taking account of planned and forecast growth and the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives and actions to achieve them established in the Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance. Regional Transportation Planning Committees may use existing regional mitigation programs, if consistent with this section, to comply with the Growth Management Program.

3. Address Housing Options

Each jurisdiction shall demonstrate reasonable progress in providing housing opportunities for all income levels as part of a report on the implementation of the actions outlined in its adopted Housing Element. The report will demonstrate progress by:

- a. Comparing the number of housing units approved, constructed or occupied within the jurisdiction over the preceding five years with the number of units needed on average each year to meet the housing objectives established in the jurisdiction's Housing Element; or
- b. Illustrating how the jurisdiction has adequately planned to meet the existing and projected housing needs through the adoption of land use plans and regulatory systems which provide opportunities for, and do not unduly constrain, housing development; or
- c. Illustrating how a jurisdiction's General Plan and zoning regulations facilitate the improvement and development of sufficient housing to meet those objectives.

In addition, each jurisdiction shall consider the impacts that its land use and development policies have on the local, regional and countywide transportation system, including the

Comment [MT9]: Some EPAC members are recommending a review and enhancement of the reporting requirements, such as actual housing production compared against targets.

Comment [WG10]: EPAC has suggested a number of edits to align the Authority's requirements related to the provision of Affordable Housing with current statutory requirements.

level of transportation capacity that can reasonably be provided, and shall incorporate policies and standards into its development approval process that support transit, bicycle and pedestrian access in new developments.

4. Participate in an Ongoing Cooperative, Multi-Jurisdictional Planning Process.

Each jurisdiction shall participate in an ongoing process with other jurisdictions and agencies, the Regional Transportation Planning Committees and the Authority to create a balanced, safe and efficient transportation system and to manage the impacts of growth. Jurisdictions shall work with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees to:

- a. Identify Routes of Regional Significance, and establish Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives for those routes and actions for achieving those objectives.
- b. Apply the Authority's travel demand model and technical procedures to the analysis of General Plan Amendments (GPAs) and developments exceeding specified thresholds for their effect on the regional transportation system, including on Action Plan objectives.
- c. Create the development mitigation programs outlined in section 2 above.
- d. Help develop other plans, programs and studies to address other transportation and growth management issues.

Comment [MT11]: Though not necessarily needed in the GMP document, propose that the Authority's travel demand model and technical procedures be amended/ updated to reflect current statutory requirements (VMT analysis vs LOS analysis) as well as industry 'best practices'. Explore with EPAC, CCTA staff and technical experts.

In consultation with the Regional Transportation Planning Committees, each jurisdiction will use the travel demand model to evaluate changes to local General Plans and the impacts of major development projects for their effects on the local and regional transportation system and the ability to achieve the Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives established in the Action Plans.

Jurisdictions shall also participate in the Authority's ongoing countywide comprehensive transportation planning process. As part of this process, the Authority shall support countywide and subregional planning efforts, including the Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance, and shall maintain a travel demand model. Jurisdictions shall help maintain the Authority's travel demand modeling system by providing information on proposed improvements to the transportation system and planned and approved development within the jurisdiction.

5. Adopt an Urban Limit Line (ULL)

Beginning on April 1, 2009, each jurisdiction must continuously comply with an applicable, voter approved ULL ("applicable ULL") defined as one of the following:

- a. A new mutually-agreed upon countywide ULL (MAC-ULL) approved by the voters countywide; or
- b. A Contra Costa County, voter approved ULL ("County ULL") that has also

been approved by a majority of the voters voting on the measure in the local jurisdiction seeking to rely upon the line as the growth boundary for local development, provided that the local jurisdiction's legislative body has adopted the County ULL before or after the election at which the "County ULL" was approved; or

- c. A measure placed on the ballot and approved by a majority of the voters within a local jurisdiction fixing a local voter approved ULL ("LV-ULL") or equivalent urban growth boundary for the jurisdiction. A jurisdiction may establish or revise its LV-ULL with local voter approval at any time prior to or during the term of Measure J. The LV- ULL will be used as of its effective date to meet the Measure J GMP ULL requirement.

Each of the above options is more fully defined in the Principles of Agreement, which are attached and incorporated by reference as Attachment "A".

Submittal of an annexation request by a local jurisdiction to LAFCO outside the applicable ULL will constitute non-compliance with the Measure J Growth Management Program.

6. Develop a Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

Each jurisdiction shall prepare and maintain a capital improvement program that outlines the capital projects needed to implement the goals and policies of the jurisdiction's General Plan for at least the following five-year period. The Capital Improvement Program shall include approved projects and an analysis of the costs of the proposed projects as well as a financial plan for providing the improvements. The jurisdiction shall forward the transportation component of its capital improvement program to the Authority for incorporation into the Authority's database of transportation projects.

7. Adopt a Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Ordinance or Resolution

To promote carpools, vanpools and park and ride lots, each jurisdiction shall adopt a local ordinance or resolution that conforms to the model Transportation Systems Management Ordinance that the Transportation Authority has drafted and adopted. Upon approval of the Authority, cities with a small employment base may adopt alternative mitigation measures in lieu of a TSM ordinance or resolution.

Allocation of Funds

Portions of the monies received from the retail transaction and use tax will be returned to the local jurisdictions (the cities and the county) for use on local, subregional and/or regional transportation improvements and maintenance projects. Receipt of all such funds requires compliance with the Growth Management Program described below. The funds are to be distributed on a formula based on population and road miles.

Each jurisdiction shall demonstrate its compliance with all of the components of the Growth Management Program in a completed compliance checklist. The jurisdiction shall submit, and the Authority shall review and make findings regarding the jurisdiction's compliance with the requirements of the Growth Management Program, consistent with the Authority's adopted policies and procedures.

If the Authority determines that the jurisdiction complies with the requirements of the Growth Management Program, it shall allocate to the jurisdiction its share of local street maintenance and improvement funding. Jurisdictions may use funds allocated under this provision to comply with these administrative requirements.

If the Authority determines that the jurisdiction does not comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Program, the Authority shall withhold those funds and also make a finding that the jurisdiction shall not be eligible to receive Contra Costa Transportation for Livable Communities until the Authority determines the jurisdiction has achieved compliance. The Authority's findings of noncompliance may set deadlines and conditions for achieving compliance.

Withholding of funds, reinstatement of compliance, reallocation of funds and treatment of unallocated funds shall be as established in adopted Authority's policies and procedures.

Comment [MT12]: This portion of the Authority's Growth Management Program will need to be updated to reflect the projects/ programs defined this this TEP.

INITIAL DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes Only

Attachment A

Principles of Agreement for Establishing the Urban Limit Line

Comment [WRG13]: This is a major discussion point – various options being considered. No changes to ULL principals are proposed for consideration at this point in time.

An applicable ULL shall be defined as an urban limit line, urban growth boundary, or other equivalent physical boundary judged by the Authority to clearly identify the physical limits of the local jurisdiction's area, including future urban development.

Initial Action

1. The Board of Supervisors shall have, with the concurrence of each affected city, adjusted the existing County ULL on or before September 30, 2004, or as expeditiously as possible given the requirements of CEQA, to make the existing County ULL coterminous with city boundaries where it previously intruded inside those incorporated boundaries.

Establishing a Mutually Agreed-Upon Countywide urban limit line ("MAC-ULL")

2. The process to develop a MAC ULL shall have begun by July 1, 2004 with meetings in each sub region between one elected representative of each city and the county. The subregional meeting(s) will be followed by meetings between all of the cities and the county, each being represented by one elected representative. The discussion will include both the suggested ULL as well as criteria for establishing the line and future modifications to the ULL.
3. On or before December 31, 2004, the County and the cities will cooperate in the development of a new MAC-ULL and criteria for future modifications. To be considered a final proposal, the plan must be approved by 4 members of the Board of Supervisors and $\frac{3}{4}$ of the cities representing $\frac{3}{4}$ of the incorporated population.
4. The County will be the lead agency in connection with any required environmental review and clearance on the proposed MAC-ULL.
5. After completion of the environmental review process, the proposal shall be submitted to the voters for ratification by November 2006.
6. The MAC-ULL will include provisions for periodic review (5 years) as well as provisions for minor (less than 30 acres) nonconsecutive adjustments.
7. If there is a MAC-ULL, and a Town or City disagrees with that MAC-ULL, it may develop and submit a "LV- ULL" (see 8.b, below), or rely upon an existing voter approved ULL.

Comment [WG14]: Some on EPAC have suggested that the exemption for minor (less than 30 acres) adjustments be eliminated.

Alternatives if there is no Voter Approved MAC-ULL or if a Local Jurisdiction chooses Not to Concur with a Voter-Approved MAC-ULL

8. If no MAC-ULL is established by March 31, 2009, only local jurisdictions with one of the following applicable voter approved ULLs will be eligible to receive the 18% return to source funds or the 5% TLC funds.
- a. County ULL. A ULL placed on the ballot by the Contra Costa County Board of Supervisors, adopted at a countywide election and in effect through the applicable GMP compliance period, as its boundaries apply to the local jurisdiction, if:
 - i. That ULL was approved by a majority of the local jurisdiction's voters, either through a separate ballot measure or as part of the countywide election at which the measure was approved;
 - ii. The legislative body of the City or Town has accepted and approved, for purposes of compliance with the Measure J GMP, the County ULL boundaries for urban development as its applicable, voter approved ULL;
 - iii. Revisions to a City or Town's adopted County ULL boundary requires fulfillment of provisions (8.a.i) and (8.a.ii) above in their entirety; and
 - iv. A City or Town may adopt conditions for revising its adopted County ULL boundary by action of the City or Town's legislative body, provided that the conditions limit the revisions of the physical boundary to adjustments of 30 or fewer acres, and/or to address issues of unconstitutional takings, or conformance to state and federal law. Such conditions may be adopted at the time of adoption of the County ULL, or subsequently through amendment to the City or Town's Growth Management Element to its General Plan.
 - b. Local Voter ULL (LV-ULL). A local ULL or equivalent measure placed on the local jurisdiction ballot, approved by the jurisdiction's voters, and recognized by action of the local jurisdiction's legislative body as its applicable, voter approved ULL. A jurisdiction may revise or establish a new LV-ULL at any time using the procedure defined in this paragraph.
 - c. Adjustments 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. However, any adjustment greater than 30 acres requires voter approval and completion of the full County ULL or LV-ULL procedure as outlined above.

Comment [MT15]: This portion of the Authority's Growth Management Program will need to be updated to reflect the projects/ programs defined in this TEP.

Comment [WG16]: See prior note, some on EPAC have suggested that the exemption for minor (less than 30 acres) adjustments be eliminated.

Comment [WG17]: See prior note

Conditions of Compliance

9. Submittal of an annexation request by a local jurisdiction to LAFCO outside of an applicable voter approved ULL will constitute non-compliance with the new Measure J Growth Management Plan.
10. For each jurisdiction, an applicable ULL shall be in place through each Measure J Growth Management Program compliance period in order for the local jurisdiction to be eligible to receive the 18% return to source and the TLC funds for that period.

Comment [MT18]: This portion of the Authority's Growth Management Program will need to be updated to reflect the projects/ programs defined this this TEP.

INITIAL DRAFT - For Discussion Purposes Only

Complete Streets Policy

Vision

This Plan envisions a transportation system in which each component provides safe, comfortable and convenient access for every user allowed to use it. These users include pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, automobile drivers and their passengers, and truckers, and people of varying abilities, including children, seniors, people with disabilities and able-bodied adults. Every transportation project is an opportunity to create safer, more accessible streets for all users and shall be planned, designed, constructed and operated to take advantage of that opportunity.

Comment [WRG19]: This entire section is currently under review and will be updated

Policy

To achieve this vision, all recipients of funding through this Plan shall consider and accommodate, wherever feasible, the needs of all users in the planning, design, construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation, maintenance, and operation of the transportation system. The determination of feasibility shall be consistent with the exceptions listed below. Achieving this vision will require balancing the needs of different users, and may require reductions in capacity for automobiles.

The Authority shall revise its project development guidelines to require the consideration and accommodation of all users in the design, construction and operation of projects funded with Measure funds. The revised guidelines will allow flexibility in responding to the context of each project and the needs of users specific to the project's context.

To ensure that this policy is carried out, the Authority shall prepare a checklist that sponsors of projects using Measure funds must submit that documents how the needs of all users were considered and how they were accommodated in the design, construction and operation of the project. If the proposed project or program will not improve conditions for all users, the sponsor shall document the reasons why in the checklist, consistent with the following section on "exceptions" below. The completed checklist shall be made part of the approval of programming of funding for the project or funding allocation resolution for construction or operation.

Recipients of Local Street Maintenance and Improvement funds shall adopt procedures that ensure that all agency departments consider and accommodate the needs of all users when projects or programs affecting public rights of way for which the agency is responsible. These procedures shall be consistent with and be designed to implement each agency's general plan policies once that plan has been updated to comply with the Complete Streets Act of 2008. These procedures shall involve all agency departments whose projects will affect the public right of way and will incorporate opportunities for review by potential users of proposed projects. This review could be done through an advisory committee such as a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee or as part of the review of the agency's capital improvement program.

As part of their biennial Growth Management Program checklist, agencies shall also list projects funded with Measure funds and detail how those projects accommodated all allowed users of the facilities.

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
For Discussion purposes only
DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtng_Version1.1

Page 21 of 30

As part of the multi-jurisdictional planning required by the Growth Management Program, agencies shall work with the Authority and the Regional Transportation Planning Committees to harmonize the planning, design, construction and operation of streets within their jurisdiction with the plans of adjoining and connecting jurisdictions.

Exceptions

Sponsors may forgo complete street accommodations when the public works director or equivalent agency official finds that:

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
3. The sponsor demonstrates that, based on factors including current and future land use, current and projected user volumes, population density, and collision data, such accommodation is not needed

Local complete streets procedures shall require that exceptions be made explicit as part of the approval of the project.

Regional Advance Mitigation Program

An estimated \$xx million will be used to fund habitat-related environmental mitigation activities required in the implementation of the major highway, transit and regional arterial and local street and road improvements identified in the Transportation Expenditure Plan. Of this total, an estimated \$xx million is related to mitigation requirements for local transportation projects and an estimated \$xx million is related to mitigation requirements for the major highway and transit projects identified in the Transportation Expenditure Plan. The intent is to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation improvements thereby reducing future costs and accelerating project delivery. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans, including the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservation Plan. If this approach cannot be fully implemented, then these funds shall be used for environmental mitigation purposes on a project by project basis.

Governing Structure

Governing Body and Administration

CCTA is governed by a Board composed of 11 members, all elected officials, with the following representation:

- Two members from the Central County Regional Transportation Planning Commission (RTPC) also referred to as TRANSPAC
- Two members from the East County RTPC, also referred to as TRANSPLAN
- Two members from the Southwest County RTPC, also referred to as SWAT
- Two members from the West County RTPC, also referred to as WCCTAC
- One member from the Conference of Mayors
- Two members from the Board of Supervisors

The CCTA Board also includes three (3) ex-officio, non-voting members, appointed by the MTC, BART and the Public Transit Operators in Contra Costa County.

Citizens Oversight Committee

The Citizens Oversight Committee (Committee) shall provide diligent, independent and public oversight of all expenditures of Measure funds by CCTA or recipient agencies (County, cities and towns, transit operators, etc). The Committee will report to the public and focus its oversight on the:

- Review of allocation and expenditure of Measure funds to ensure that all funds are used consistent with the Measure ballot measure.
- Review of fiscal audits of Measure expenditures.
- Review of performance audits of projects and programs relative to performance criteria established by the CCTA, and if performance of any project or program does not meet its established performance criteria, identify the reasons why and make recommendations for corrective actions that can be taken by the CCTA Board for changes to project or program guidelines.
- Review of the maintenance of effort compliance requirements of local jurisdictions for local streets, roads and bridges funding.
- Review of each jurisdiction's Growth Management Checklist and compliance with the Growth Management Plan policies.

The Committee shall prepare an annual report including an account of the Committee's activities during the previous year, its review and recommendations relative to fiscal or performance audits, and any recommendations made to the CCTA Board for implementing the expenditure plan. The report will be published in local newspapers and local media outlets throughout Contra Costa County, posted to the CCTA Website and continuously available for public inspection at CCTA offices. The report shall be composed of easy to understand language not in an overly technical format. The Committee shall make an annual presentation to the CCTA Board summarizing the annual report subsequent to its release.

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
For Discussion purposes only

Page 24 of 30

DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtng_Version1.1

Committee members shall be selected to reflect community and business organizations and interests within the County. The CCTA Board will solicit statements of interest from the individuals representing the stakeholder groups listed below, and will appoint members to an initial Committee with the goal to provide a balance of viewpoints including but not limited to geography, age, gender, ethnicity and income status to represent the different perspectives of the residents of Contra Costa County. In establishing the initial Committee, the CCTA Board will solicit statements of interest from groups or individuals that represent professional expertise in civil or traffic engineering, accounting, municipal finance, and project management; and groups or individuals that represent taxpayer accountability, voter accountability, business development, labor, senior or paratransit services, non-motorized active transportation, transit advocacy and social justice. The Committee will include one member each appointed by the County Board of Supervisors and the councils of each of the incorporated cities and towns in Contra Costa County. Beginning two years after the appointment of the initial Committee and every two years thereafter, the CCTA Board will solicit statements of interest for new appointment or re-appointment of approximately one-third of the Committee membership and will appoint or re-appoint members in an attempt to maintain the diversity of the Committee. Any individual member can serve on the Committee for no more than 6 consecutive years.

Committee members will be private citizens who are not elected officials at any level of local government, nor public employees from agencies that either oversee or benefit from the proceeds of the Measure. Membership is limited to individuals who live in Contra Costa County. Membership is restricted to individuals with no economic interest in any of CCTA's projects or programs. If a member's status changes so that he/she no longer meet these requirements, or if a member resigns his/her position on the Committee, the CCTA Board will issue a new statement of interest from the same stakeholder category to fill the vacant position.

The Committee shall meet up to once a month to carry out its responsibility, and shall meet at least once every 3 months. Meetings shall be held at the same location as the CCTA Board meetings are usually held, shall be open to the public and must be held in compliance with California's open meeting law (Brown Act). Meetings shall be recorded and the recordings shall be posted for the public.

Members are expected to attend all meetings. If a member, without good reason acceptable to the Chair of the Committee, fails to attend either (a) two or more consecutive meetings or (b) more than 3 meetings a year, the CCTA Board will request a replacement from the stakeholder categories listed above.

CCTA commits to support the oversight process through cooperation with the Committee by providing access to project and program information, audits, and other information available to the CCTA, and with logistical support so that the Committee may effectively perform its oversight function. The Committee will have full access to CCTA's independent auditors, and may request CCTA staff briefings for any information that is relevant to the Measure. The Committee Chair shall inform the CCTA Board Chair and Executive Director of any concern regarding CCTA staff's commitment to open communication, the timely sharing of information, and teamwork.

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
For Discussion purposes only
DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtnng_Version1.1

Page 25 of 30

The Committee shall not have the authority to set policy or appropriate or withhold funds, nor shall it participate in or interfere with the selection process of any consultant or contractor hired to implement the expenditure plan.

The Committee shall not receive monetary compensation except for the reimbursement of travel or other incidental expenses, in a manner consistent with other CCTA advisory committees

In order to ensure that the oversight by the Committee continues to be as effective as possible, the efficacy of the Committee's Charter (ie this document) will be evaluated on a periodic basis and a formal review will be conducted by the CCTA Board, Executive Director and the Committee every five years to determine if any amendments to this Charter should be made. The formal review will include a benchmarking of the Committee's activities and charter with other best-in-class citizen oversight committees. Amendments to this Charter shall be proposed by the Committee and adopted or rejected by the CCTA Board.

The Committee replaces CCTA's existing Citizens Advisory Committee.

Advisory Committees

The Authority will continue the committees that were established as part of the Transportation Partnership Commission organization as well as other committees that have been utilized by the CCTA to advise and assist in policy development and implementation. The committees include:

- The Regional Planning Transportation Committees that were established to develop transportation plans on a geographic basis for sub-areas of the County, and
- The Technical Coordinating Committee that will serve as the Authority's technical advisory committee.
- The Paratransit Coordinating Council
- The Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- The Transit Committee

Implementing Guidelines

Duration of the Plan

25 years, April 1, 2017 to March 31, 2042

Administration of the Plan

1. **Funds only Projects and Programs in the Plan:** Funds are only for purposes identified in the expenditure plan.
2. **All Decisions Made in Public Process:** The Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) is given the fiduciary duty of administering the transportation sales tax proceeds in accordance with all applicable laws and with the Plan. Activities of the CCTA will be conducted in public according to state law, through publically noticed meetings. The annual budgets of CCTA, strategic plans and annual reports will all be prepared for public review. The interest of the public will be further protected by a Citizens Oversight Committee, described previously in the Plan.
3. **Salary and Administration Cost Caps:** Revenues may be expended by the Authority for salaries, wages, benefits, overhead and those services including contractual services necessary to administer the Measure; however, in no case shall the annual expenditures for the salaries and benefits of the staff necessary to perform administrative functions for the Authority exceed one percent (1%) of the annual revenues. The allocated costs of CCTA staff who directly implement specific projects or programs are not included in the administrative costs.
4. **Expenditure Plan Amendments Require Majority Support:** The Authority may review and propose amendments to the Expenditure Plan and the Growth Management Program to provide for the use of additional federal, state and local funds, to account for unexpected revenues, or to take into consideration unforeseen circumstances. Affected Regional Planning Transportation Committee(s) will participate in the development of the proposed amendment(s). All jurisdictions within the county will be given a 45 day period to comment on any proposed Expenditure Plan amendment.
5. **Augment Transportation Funds:** Funds generated pursuant to the Measure are to be used to supplement and not replace existing local revenues used for transportation purposes. Any funds already allocated, committed or otherwise included in the financial plan for any project on the Expenditure Plan shall be made available for project development and implementation as required in the project's financial and implementation program.

Taxpayer Safeguards, Audits and Accountability

6. **Citizens Oversight Committee:** The Citizens Oversight Committee will provide diligent, independent and public oversight of all expenditures of Measure funds by CCTA or recipient agencies (County, cities and towns, transit operators, etc). The Committee will report to the public and focus its oversight on annual audits, the review and allocation of Measure funds,

the performance of projects and programs in the Plan, and compliance by local jurisdictions with the maintenance of effort and Growth Management Program described previously in the Plan

7. **Fiscal Audits:** All Funds expended by CCTA directly and all funds allocated by formula or discretionary grants to other entities are subject to fiscal audit. Recipients of Local Streets Maintenance & Improvements or transit (Non-Rail Transit Enhancements, Transportation for Seniors & People With Disabilities programs) funding (County, cities and towns and transit operators) will be audited at least once every five (5) years, conducted by an independent CPA. Any agency found to be in non-compliance shall have its formula sales tax funds withheld, until such time as the agency is found to be in compliance.
8. **Performance Audits:** Each year, the CCTA shall select and perform a focused performance audit on approximately one-fourth of the elements of the transportation expenditure plan. This process shall commence two years after passage of the new sales tax measure. The performance audits shall provide an accurate quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the programs or projects in question and specific recommendations for corrective action in the future.
9. **Maintenance of Effort (MOE):** The average of last three full fiscal years of expenditures of annual transportation funds on local streets, roads and bridges before the vote on new sales tax measure will be the basis of the MOE. The average dollar amount will then be increased once every three years by the construction cost index of that third year. Penalty for non-compliance of meeting the minimum MOE is immediate loss of all local formula money (Local Streets Maintenance and Improvement funds) until MOE compliance is achieved. The audit of the M.O.E. contribution shall be at least once every five years. Any agency found to be in non-compliance shall be subject to annual audit for three years after they come back into compliance.
10. **Requirements for Fund Recipients:** All recipients of funds allocated in this expenditure plan will be required to complete certain requirements including: reporting, implementing local hiring policy, tracking and reporting performance and accountability standards and requirements, and completing audits.
11. **Geographic Equity:** The proposed projects and programs to be funded through the expenditure plan constitute a “balanced” distribution of funding allocations to each subregion in Contra Costa County. However, through the course of the Measure, if any of the projects prove to be infeasible or cannot be implemented, the affected subregion may request that the Authority reassign funds to another project in the same subregion, as detailed in a CCTA Fund Allocations policy, and to maintain a “balanced” distribution of funding allocations to each subregion.

Restrictions On Funds

12. **No Expenditure Outside of Contra Costa County:** Under no circumstance may the proceeds of this transportation sales tax be applied for any purpose other than for transportation improvements benefitting Contra Costa County. Under no circumstance may

DRAFT 3/1/2016 4:33:28 PM 2/24/2016 3:46:41 PM
For Discussion purposes only

Page 28 of 30

DraftTEP_20160222_EPACMtng_Version1.1

these funds be appropriated by the State of California or any other local government agency, as defined in the implementing guidelines.

13. **Environmental Review:** All projects funded by sales tax proceeds are subject to laws and regulations of federal, state, and local government, including but not limited to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).
14. **Performance based review:** Before the allocation of any measure funds for the actual construction of capital projects with an estimated capital construction cost in excess of \$25 million, the Authority will conduct a performance based review of project alternatives.
15. **Complete Streets:** All plan investments will conform to Complete Streets requirements, so that there are appropriate investments that fit the function and context of facilities that will be constructed, as further detailed in the Part ___ of the Plan.
16. **Advance Mitigation Program:** CCTA will develop a policy supporting the creation of an advance mitigation program to establish a program to provide for large-scale acquisition and management of critical habitat areas and to create a reliable approach for funding required mitigation for future transportation. This policy will identify projects that will benefit from the program and the financial contribution associated with those projects. This approach would be implemented by obtaining coverage for transportation projects through existing and proposed multiple species conservation plans, including the East Contra Costa Habitat Conservation Plan. The benefit of this policy will include an early comprehensive project delivery review, reduced costs attributed to mitigation, opportunity to significantly improve conservation benefits, and accelerated project delivery. If this approach cannot be fully implemented, then the identified funds shall be used for environmental mitigation purposes on a project by project basis.
17. **Safe Transportation for Children:** CCTA will allocate funds and will establish guidelines (in cooperation with project sponsors) to define priorities and maximize effectiveness. The guidelines may require provisions such as parent contributions; operational efficiencies; specific performance criteria and reporting requirements.
18. **Compliance with the GMP/ULL Policy:** If the Authority determines that a jurisdiction does not comply with the requirements of the Growth Management Program, the Authority shall withhold funds and also make a finding that the jurisdiction shall not be eligible to receive Local Streets Maintenance & Improvements or Community Development Incentive (CDI) Program funding until the Authority determines the jurisdiction has achieved compliance, as detailed in the GMP/ULL section of the Plan.
19. **Local Contracting and Good Jobs:** CCTA will develop a policy supporting the hiring of local contractors and businesses, apprenticeship programs for Contra Costa residents, and good jobs.
20. **New Agencies:** New cities or new entities (such as new transit agencies) that come into existence in Contra Costa County during the life of the Plan may be considered as eligible recipients of funds through a Plan amendment.

Comment [WG20]: This provision is intended provide the residents of Contra Costa County with information as to how project alternatives rank with respect to GHG emissions, VMT and other factors (TBD). This requirement is intended as a disclosure process and not in any way to restrict the ability of the Authority to allocate measure funds to a project after completion of the required analysis.

Comment [MT21]: Discussing with representatives of the labor community how to address topics such as:

- Apprentice Program(s)
- Local Hiring goals
- Veteran and DBE Hiring Goals

Project Financing Guidelines and Managing Revenue

- 21. Fiduciary Duty:** Funds may be accumulated for larger or longer term projects. Interest income generated will be used for the purposes outlined in the Plan and will be subject to audits.
- 22. Project and Program Financing:** The CCTA has the authority to bond for the purposes of expediting the delivery of transportation projects and programs. CCTA will develop a policy to identify financing procedures for the entire plan of projects and programs.
- 23. Programming of Higher than Expected Revenue:** Actual revenues may, at times be higher than expected in this Plan due to changes in receipts and additional funds may become available due to the increased opportunities for leveraging or project costs less than expected. Revenue may be lower than expected as the economy fluctuates. Determination of when the contingency funds become excess will be established by a policy defined by the CCTA. Funds considered excess will be prioritized first to expenditure plan projects and programs, and second to other projects of regional significance that are consistent with the expenditure plan. The new project or program will be required to be amended into the expenditure plan.
- 24. Fund Allocations:** Through the course of the Measure, if any of the projects do not require all funds programmed for that project or have excess funding, or should a planned project become undeliverable, infeasible or unfundable due to circumstances unforeseen at the item the expenditure plan was created, funding for that project will be reallocated to another project or program. The subregion where the project or program is located may request that the CCTA reassign funds to another project in the same subregion. In the allocation of the released funds, the CCTA will in priority order consider: 1) a project or program of the same travel mode (i.e. transit, bicycle/pedestrian, or road) in the same subregion, 2) a project or program for another modes of travel in the same subregion, 3) other expenditure plan projects, and 4) other projects or programs of regional significance. The new project or program or funding level may be required to be amended into the expenditure plan.
- 25. Leveraging Funds:** Leveraging or matching of outside funding sources is strongly encouraged. Any additional transportation sales tax revenues made available through their replacement by matching funds will be spent based on the principles outlined for fund allocations describe above.

**NEW TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX MEASURE
SUMMARY OF SUBMITTALS BY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEES**

(1/2 cent for 25 Years, in million of 2014 dollars)

Categories	All	Central	Southwest	West	East	Notes
1. Highways/Interchanges						
I-680 Transit Corridor and Congestion Relief	95.0	15.0	80.0			Mostly Transit Infrastructure
I-680 Transit Investment						
I-680 Northbound Carpool Lane Completion (Livorna to N. Main)						
I-680 Direct Access Ramps for Buses and Carpools						
Park and Ride Expansions						
SR24/Camino Pablo Interchange Improvements	20.0		20.0			
I-680/SR242/SR4 Corridor Congestion Relief and Traffic Smoothing						
I-680/SR4 Interchange	60.0	60.0				
SR242/Clayton Road Off- and On-Ramps	17.7	17.7				
SR4 Operational Improvements (SR242 and Port Chicago)	60.0	30.0			30.0	
I-680/Contra Costa Blvd/Concord Avenue Interchange Improvements	24.0	24.0				
I-80 Interchange Improvements	59.8			59.8		WCCTAC: Priority for funding is for 80/SPDR and 80/Central Avenue
I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange						
I-80/Central Avenue Interchange						
I-80/Pinole Valley Road ramp extensions and widening						
SR4 and Willow Avenue eastbound on and off-ramps						
SR239 - Brentwood to Tracy Expressway	120.0				120.0	
Subtotal	456.5	146.7	100.0	59.8	150.0	
2. Rail/Ferry Total						
eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)	80.0				80.0	
Ferry Service - Central County (Martinez)	8.0	8.0				
Ferry Service - West County (Hercules and Richmond)	27.2			27.2		WCCTAC: Can be used for capital and/or operations to be split equally between Richmond and Hercules.
Ferry Service - East County (Antioch)	6.6				6.6	
BART Parking, Access, Safety, Reliability, Car Replacement and Other Improvements	101.5 or 123.5	10.0	28 or 50	43.5	20.0	TRANSPAC: Expanded BART Service (new cars & upgraded capacity controllers). TRANSPLAN: BART Parking/Access/Other Improvements (\$10), BART Safety and System Reliability (\$10). WCCTAC: Can be used for capital improvements, and not operations, that clearly and directly benefit West County. SWAT: Board entertained two options for this category pending amount to Local Streets and Roads: 6.3% and 11.2%. A final recommendation for this category was not made.
Hercules Intermodal Transit Center	10.9			10.9		
High Capacity Transit Improvements in West County	54.4			54.4		WCCTAC: Support the development, advancement, or implementation of high capacity transit improvements in West County, such as BART extension, Bus Rapid Transit, Improvements to Rapid Bus Corridors, Expanded or new Express Bus Service, improvements to passenger rail service and ferry service.
Subtotal	288.6 or 310.6	18.0	28 or 50	136.0	106.6	
3. Bus Transit						
Bus Service Improvements	205.3	57.9	60.0	54.4	33.0	SWAT: Expanded Transit Access to BART. TRANSPAC: Increased Transit Frequency to BART. WCCTAC: Can be used for capital and/or operations with 50% of the funds to be used for improvements in Priority Development
Express Bus	13.9				13.9	
Subtotal	219.2	57.9	60.0	54.4	46.9	

Categories	All	Central	Southwest	West	East	Notes
4. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	105.4	21.3	10.0	27.2	46.9	WCCTAC: Can be used for capital or operations
Subtotal	105.4	21.3	10.0	27.2	46.9	
5. Local Streets & Roads						
Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	690.6 or 668.6	206.1	134 or 112	152.3	198.2	WCCTAC: Local Streets and Sidewalks (Maintenance, Improvements, and Complete Streets). TRANSPLAN: Local Streets Maintenance and Multi-modal Improvements (Vehicle, Bike, Ped & Transit). TRANSPLAN: Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements. SWAT: Local Streets and Roads. Note that SWAT entertained two options for this category pending amount to BART: 30% and 25%. A final recommendation for this category was not made.
Major Roads, Bridges, Grade Separations, and Intersections	201.1	151.5	16	13.6	20	SWAT: A preliminary list includes funding for Moraga Intersection Improvements, Alamo Intersection Improvements, Lafayette Downtown Area Corridor/Intersection Improvements. TRANSPLAN: Includes funding for Clayton Rd/Treat Blvd Intersection Capacity Improvements (\$1), YVR Traffic Smoothing and Complete Streets (\$20), Concord Blvd Complete Streets (\$8), Willow Pass Rd Capacity and Complete Streets Improvements (\$5), Galindo St. Corridor Efficiency Improvements (\$4.4), Contra Costa Blvd Complete Streets (\$12.8), Gregory Lane Complete Street (\$17.7), Pleasant Hill Road Complete Streets (\$16.6), Olympic Corridor Bike/Ped Connector (\$11.7), Alamo West Downtown Public Improvements (\$24), Pacheco Blvd Widening (\$20.3), Alhambra Avenue Widening (\$10). WCCTAC: Eligible projects include major road improvements, bridges, rail safety/quiet zone improvements, intersections/grade separations, and any combination of roadway, rail, bike/ped pathways
Vasco Road Improvements	40.0				40	
Richmond Parkway Maintenance	13.6			13.6		
Lafayette Downtown Congestion Relief	25.0		25			
Subtotal	970.3 or 948.3	357.6	175 - 153	179.5	258.2	
6. Pedestrian/Bicycle/Trail Projects						
Bike/Pedestrian/Regional Trails enhancement and maintenance	97.1	20.0	40.0	27.2	9.9	SWAT: Includes TLC. Projects to be funded include Olympic Corridor (county), Diablo Rd Circulation (Danville), Iron Horse Ocercrossings (San Ramon), Acqueduct Trail (Lafayette). WCCTAC: No carve out for EBRPD but can still compete.
Transportation for Livable Communities (Bike, Pedestrian & Transit Enhancements)	41.2	24.7			16.5	WCCTAC: Program was replaced by adding "Complete Streets" to Local Streets and Roads
Subtotal	138.3	44.7	40.0	27.2	26.4	
7. Student Transportation						
School Bus Programs	25.0		25			SWAT: Expand Traffix and Lamorinda School Bus Programs
Student Bus Pass Program	27.2			27.2		WCCTAC: Expands existing program by making bus passes available to middle schools, and/or removing income limitation on high and/or middle schools students eligible to receive passes.
Safe Routes to Schools	16.2	10.8		5.4		WCCTAC: Supplements County's planning and outreach program. Can be used to improve sidewalks and bicycle access to schools with concurrence of WCCTAC and local jurisdictions.
Safe Transportation for Children/"Street Smarts"	8.3				8.3	
Subtotal	76.7	10.8	25.0	32.6	8.3	
8. Commute Alternatives	24.3	10.0	5.0	2.7	6.6	Promote alternatives to commuting in SOVs. Eligible projects include P&R facilities, carpooling, vanpooling, transit incentives, bike/ped facilities (sidewalks, lockers, racks, etc.), guaranteed ride home, congestion mitigation and employer outreach.
Subtotal	24.3	10.0	5.0	2.7	6.6	
9. Other						
Clean Transportation	10.9			10.9		WCCTAC: For projects that have air quality/GHG reduction benefit, such as car-sharing, bike-sharing, electric car infrastructure, alternative fuel vehicles, and non-motorized (bike/ped) improvements.
Technology Upgrades	25.0	20.0	5.0			SWAT: Signal coordination, signal preemption, integrated corridor management, incident management
No Displacement from Priority Development Areas	10.9			10.9		WCCTAC: For development, preservation and operation of low income affordable housing to ensure high-propensity transit riders can live near transit stops, and to combat poverty.
Subregional Transportation Needs	12.8			2.7	10.1	WCCTAC/TRANSPLAN: Can be used on any project/program identified in expenditure plan.
Subtotal	59.6	20.0	5.0	24.5	10.1	
Grand Total	2339.0	687.0	448.0	544.0	660.1	

NEW TRANSPORTATION SALES TAX MEASURE
SUMMARY OF SUBMITTALS BY REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING COMMITTEES

(1/2 cent for 25 Years, in % of Subregion Share)

Categories	All	Central	Southwest	West	East	Notes
1. Highways/Interchanges						
I-680 Transit Corridor and Congestion Relief	4.1%	2.2%	17.9%			Mostly Transit Infrastructure
I-680 Transit Investment						
I-680 Northbound Carpool Lane Completion (Livorna to N. Main)						
I-680 Direct Access Ramps for Buses and Carpools						
Park and Ride Expansions						
SR24/Camino Pablo Interchange Improvements	0.9%		4.5%			
I-680/SR24/SR4 Corridor Congestion Relief and Traffic Smoothing						
I-680/SR4 Interchange	2.6%	8.7%				
SR242/Clayton Road Off- and On-Ramps	0.8%	2.6%				
SR4 Operational Improvements (SR242 and Port Chicago)	2.6%	4.4%			4.5%	
I-680/Contra Costa Blvd/Concord Avenue Interchange Improvements	1.0%	3.5%				
I-80 Interchange Improvements	2.6%			11.0%		WCCTAC: Priority for funding is for 80/SPDR and 80/Central Avenue
I-80/San Pablo Dam Road Interchange						
I-80/Central Avenue Interchange						
I-80/Pinole Valley Road ramp extensions and widening						
SR4 and Willow Avenue eastbound on and off-ramps						
SR239 - Brentwood to Tracy Expressway	5.1%				18.2%	
Subtotal	19.5%	21.4%	22.3%	11.0%	22.7%	
2. Rail/Ferry Total						
eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)	3.4%				12.1%	
Ferry Service - Central County (Martinez)	0.3%	1.2%				WCCTAC: Can be used for capital and/or operations to be split equally between Richmond and Hercules.
Ferry Service - West County (Hercules and Richmond)	1.2%			5.0%		
Ferry Service - East County (Antioch)	0.3%				1.0%	
BART Parking, Access, Safety, Reliability, Car Replacement and Other Improvements	4.3% or 5.3%	1.5%	6.3% or 11.2%	8.0%	3.0%	TRANSPAC: Expanded BART Service (new cars & upgraded capacity controllers). TRANSPLAN: BART Parking/Access/Other Improvements (\$10), BART Safety and System Reliability (\$10). WCCTAC: Can be used for capital improvements, and not operations, that clearly and directly benefit West County. SWAT: Board entertained two options for this category pending amount to Local Streets and Roads: 6.3% and 11.2%. A final recommendation for this category was not made.
Hercules Intermodal Transit Center	0.5%			2.0%		
High Capacity Transit Improvements in West County	2.3%			10.0%		
Subtotal	12.3% or 13.3%	2.6%	6.3% or 11.2%	25.0%	16.1%	
3. Bus Transit						
Bus Service Improvements	8.8%	8.4%	13.4%	10.0%	5.0%	SWAT: Expanded Transit Access to BART. TRANSPAC: Increased Transit Frequency to BART. WCCTAC: Can be used for capital and/or operations with 50% of the funds to be used for improvements in Priority Development Areas.
Express Bus	0.6%				2.1%	
Subtotal	9.4%	8.4%	13.4%	10.0%	7.1%	

Categories	All	Central	Southwest	West	East	Notes
4. Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	4.5%	3.1%	2.2%	5.0%	7.1%	WCCTAC: Can be used for capital or operations
Subtotal	4.5%	3.1%	2.2%	5.0%	7.1%	
5. Local Streets & Roads						
Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	29.5% or 28.6%	30.0%	30% or 25%	28.0%	30.0%	WCCTAC: Local Streets and Sidewalks (Maintenance, Improvements, and Complete Streets). TRANSPAC: Local Streets Maintenance and Multi-modal Improvements (Vehicle, Bike, Ped & Transit). TRANSPLAN: Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements. SWAT: Local Streets and Roads. Note that SWAT entertained two options for this category pending amount to BART: 30% and 25%. A final recommendation for this category was not made.
Major Roads, Bridges, Grade Separations, and Intersections	8.6%	22.1%	3.6%	2.5%	3.0%	SWAT: A preliminary list includes funding for Moraga Intersection Improvements, Alamo Intersection Improvements, Lafayette Downtown Area Corridor/Intersection Improvements. Other projects can be added. TRANSPAC: Includes funding for Clayton Rd/Treat Blvd Intersection Capacity Improvements (\$1), YVR Traffic Smoothing and Complete Streets (\$20), Concord Blvd Complete Streets (\$8), Willow Pass Rd Capacity and Complete Streets Improvements (\$5), Galindo St. Corridor Efficiency Improvements (\$4.4), Contra Costa Blvd Complete Streets (\$12.8), Gregory Lane Complete Street (\$17.7), Pleasant Hill Road Complete Streets (\$16.6), Olympic Corridor Bike/Ped Connector (\$11.7), Alamo West Downtown Public Improvements (\$24), Pacheco Blvd Widening (\$20.3), Alhambra Avenue Widening (\$10). WCCTAC: Eligible projects include major road improvements, bridges, rail safety/quiet zone improvements, intersections/grade separations, and any combination of roadway, rail, bike/ped pathways.
Vasco Road Improvements	1.7%				6.1%	
Richmond Parkway Maintenance	0.6%			2.5%		
Lafayette Downtown Congestion Relief	1.1%		5.6%			
Subtotal	41.5% or 40.5%	52.1%	39.2 or 34.2%	33.0%	39.1%	
6. Pedestrian/Bicycle/Trail Projects						
Bike/Pedestrian/Regional Trails enhancement and maintenance	4.2%	2.9%	8.9%	5.0%	1.5%	SWAT: Includes TLC. Projects to be funded include Olympic Corridor (county), Diablo Rd Circulation (Danville), Iron Horse Oerccrossings (San Ramon), Acqueduct Trail (Lafayette). WCCTAC: No carve out for EBRPD but can still
Transportation for Livable Communities (Bike, Pedestrian & Transit Enhancements)	1.8%	3.6%			2.5%	WCCTAC: Program was replaced by adding "Complete Streets" to Local Streets and Roads
Subtotal	5.9%	6.5%	8.9%	5.0%	4.0%	
7. Student Transportation						
School Bus Programs	1.1%		5.6%			SWAT: Expand Traffix and Lamorinda School Bus Programs
Student Bus Pass Program	1.2%			5.0%		WCCTAC: Expands existing program by making bus passes available to middle schools, and/or removing income limitation on high and/or middle schools students eligible to receive passes.
Safe Routes to Schools	0.7%	1.6%		1.0%		WCCTAC: Supplements County's planning and outreach program. Can be used to improve sidewalks and bicycle access to schools with concurrence of WCCTAC and local jurisdictions.
Safe Transportation for Children/"Street Smarts"	0.4%				1.3%	
Subtotal	3.3%	1.6%	5.6%	6.0%	1.3%	
8. Commute Alternatives	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.5%	1.0%	Promote alternatives to commuting in SOVs. Eligible projects include P&R facilities, carpooling, vanpooling, transit incentives, bike/ped facilities (sidewalks, lockers, racks, etc.), guaranteed ride home, congestion mitigation and employer outreach.
Subtotal	1.0%	1.5%	1.1%	0.5%	1.0%	
9. Other						
Clean Transportation	0.5%			2.0%		WCCTAC: For projects that have air quality/GHG reduction benefit, such as car-sharing, bike-sharing, electric car infrastructure, alternative fuel vehicles, and non-motorized (bike/ped) improvements.
Technology Upgrades	1.1%	2.9%	1.1%			SWAT: Signal coordination, signal preemption, integrated corridor management, incident management
No Displacement from Priority Development Areas	0.5%			2.0%		WCCTAC: For development, preservation and operation of low income affordable housing to ensure high-propensity transit riders can live near transit stops, and to combat poverty.
Subregional Transportation Needs	0.5%			0.5%	1.5%	WCCTAC/TRANSPLAN: Can be used on any project/program identified in expenditure plan.
Subtotal	2.5%	2.9%	1.1%	4.5%	1.5%	
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

NEW MEASURE TRANSPORTATION EXPENDITURE PLAN (DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION ONLY)

February 24, 2016

No.	Funding Category	\$ millions	%	Distribution of Funding By Subregion			
				Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)
1	Local Streets Maintenance and Improvements	540.0	23.1%	156	120	119	145
2	Major Streets and Complete Streets Project Grants	200.0	8.6%	108.3	29.3	19.4	42.9
3	BART Capacity, Access and Parking Improvements	300.0	12.8%	88.1	57.4	69.8	84.7
4	East Contra Costa Transit Extension	70.0	3.0%				70
5	Transit & Interchange Improvements along the I-80 Corridor in West County	110.0	4.7%			110	
6	Improve traffic flow & implement high capacity transit in the I-680 corridor & SR 24 ⁴	140.0	6.0%	40	100		
7	Improve traffic flow along the SR 242 & SR 4 Corridors in Central and Eastern County	70.0	3.0%	40			30
8	Interstate 680 and State Route 4 Interchange Improvements	60.0	2.6%	60			
9	East County Corridor	117.0	5.0%				117
10	Advance Mitigation Program ³	TBD	TBD				
11	Non-Rail Transit Enhancements	200.0	8.6%	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0
12	Transportation for Seniors and People with Disabilities	50.0	2.1%	10.1	4.7	12.9	22.2
13	Safe Transportation for Children	50.0	2.1%	7.0	16.3	21.3	5.4
14	Intercity Rail and Ferry Service	50.0	2.1%	8		35	7
15	Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities	60.0	2.6%	12.4	24.7	16.8	6.1
16	Community Development Investment Grant Program ¹	140.0	6.0%	41.1	26.8	32.6	39.5
17	Innovative Transportation Technology / Connected Communities Grant Program ²	65.0	2.8%	21.8	5.5	26.7	11.0
18	Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services	23.4	1.0%	6.9	4.5	5.4	6.6
19	Regional Choice	70.3	3.0%	30.2	3.7	19.7	16.7
20	Administration	23.4	1.0%	6.9	4.5	5.4	6.6
	Commuter Alternatives	0.0	0.0%				
	TOTAL	2339.1	100.0%	686.9	447.4	544.0	660.8



Requests Submitted by RTPCs in July/August 2015				
Central (a)	Southwest (b)	West (c)	East (d)	SUM
206.1	134 or 112	152.3	198.2	668.6 or 690.6
151.5	41	27.2	60	279.7
10	28 or 50	43.5	20	101.5 or 123.5
			80	80
		114.2		114.2
39	100			139
47.7			30	77.7
60				60
			120	120
				0
57.9	60	54.4	46.9	219.2
21.3	10	27.2	46.9	105.4
10.8	25.0	32.6	8.3	76.7
8		38.1	6.6	52.7
20	40	27.2	9.9	97.1
24.7			16.5	41.2
20	5	24.5	10.1	59.6
				0
				0
				0
10	5	2.8	6.6	24.4
687.0	448.0	544.0	660.0	2339

Population Based Share	2339.1	686.9	447.4	544.0	660.8
Population Share (2030 Estimate) of Total		29.37%	19.13%	23.26%	28.25%

Notes:

- ¹ RTPCs requests under TLC program are shown here
- ² RTPCs requests for clean transportation, technology upgrades, subregional needs and anti-displacement are shown here
- ³ Projects that would be included in an Advance Mitigation Program will be identified/called-out
- ⁴ SR 24 was left out of the description in the draft TEP issued on February 22, 2016.

Amounts shown are reflected in DRAFT TEP Version 1.1

-  Preliminary Draft TEP Issued on February 22, 2016 showed \$90M in error. Proposed amount is \$140M as shown.
-  Preliminary Draft TEP Issued on February 22, 2016 showed \$120.3M in error. Proposed amount is \$70.3M as shown.

Category No. 1 was distributed based on population and road miles formula
Categories 2, 12, 13, 15 & 17 split proportional to RTPCs requests
Categories 3, 16, 18 & 20 distributed based on population share
Category No. 11 split equally between subregions

East County Measure J Capital Projects (TRANSPLAN Proposed ("TPLAN") and CCTA Proposed) (\$ x 1,000)

Project/Program	TPLAN Proposed	CCTA Draft TEP 2/24/15	Difference	% Change
BART - East County Extension				
TPLAN eBART (Antioch to Brentwood)	\$80,000	\$70,000	(\$10,000)	-13%
Subtotal	\$80,000	\$70,000		
State Route 4 Widening				
TPLAN SR4 Operational Improvements	\$30,000	\$30,000		
Subtotal	\$30,000	\$30,000		
East County Corridors				
TPLAN Vasco Rd Improvements	\$40,000	\$29,000	(\$11,000)	-28%
TPLAN SR239 - Brentwood to Tracy Expressway	\$120,000	\$88,000	(\$32,000)	-27%
Subtotal	\$160,000	\$117,000	(\$43,000)	-27%
BART Parking/Access/Other Improvements				
10004 East County	\$10,000	\$42,350	\$32,350	
BART Safety and System Reliability				
10004 East County	\$10,000	\$42,350	\$32,350	
Total BART Parking/Safety	\$20,000	\$84,700	\$64,700	324%
Total Projects	\$310,000	\$301,700		
Measure J Programs (Existing and CCTA Proposed)				
Local Streets Maint. & Improv.	\$198,227	\$145,000	(\$53,227)	-27%
DELETE Transportation for Livable Communities ("TLC")	\$16,519	\$0	(\$16,519)	-100%
Ped/Bike	\$9,911	\$6,100	(\$3,811)	-38%
DELETE Bus Service	\$33,038	\$0	(\$33,038)	-100%
Transp. For Seniors/Ppl with Disabilities	\$46,914	\$22,200	(\$24,714)	-53%
DELETE Express Bus	\$13,876	\$0	(\$13,876)	-100%
DELETE Commute Alternatives	\$6,608	\$0	(\$6,608)	-100%
TPLAN Safe Transp. For Children/"Street Smarts"	\$8,259	\$5,400	(\$2,859)	-35%
DELETE Subregional Transp. Needs	\$10,110	\$0	(\$10,110)	-100%
TPLAN Ferry Service in East County	\$6,608	\$7,000	\$392	6%
NEW Major Streets and Complete Streets Grants		\$42,900		(Major Sts in East County)
NEW Non-Rail Transit Enhancements		\$50,000		(Bus Svc, Ex Bus, Comm Alts)
NEW Community Development Investment Grant Prog.		\$39,500		(TLC)
NEW Innovative Transp. Tech./Connected Communities Grant Prog.		\$11,000		(Subreg. Transp Needs)
NEW Transportation Planning, Facilities & Services		\$6,600		
NEW Regional Choice		\$16,700		
NEW Administration (CCTA Admin of New Measure)		\$6,600		
Total Programs	\$350,069	\$359,000		
Grand Total	\$660,069	\$660,700		
Projected 25-year Measure Revenue (TRANSPLAN)	\$660,756	\$660,756		
Remaining Projected Revenue	\$687	\$56		



SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT
 300 Lakeside Drive, P.O. Box 12688
 Oakland, CA 94604-2688
 (510) 464-6000

2015

February 16, 2016

Thomas M. Bialock, P.E.
 PRESIDENT

Tom Radulovich
 VICE PRESIDENT

Grace Crunican
 GENERAL MANAGER

Honorable Julie Pierce
 Chair
 Contra Costa Transportation Authority
 2999 Oak Road, Suite 100
 Walnut Creek, CA 94597

RE: Contra Costa Transportation Authority Potential Sales Tax Measure and
 Transportation Expenditure Plan

DIRECTORS

Gail Murray
 1ST DISTRICT

Joel Keller
 2ND DISTRICT

Rebecca Saltzman
 3RD DISTRICT

Robert Raburn, Ph.D.
 4TH DISTRICT

John McPartland
 5TH DISTRICT

Thomas M. Bialock, P.E.
 6TH DISTRICT

Zakary Mallett, MCP
 7TH DISTRICT

Nicholas Josefowitz
 8TH DISTRICT

Tom Radulovich
 9TH DISTRICT

Dear Chair Pierce:

As the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) considers a potential half-cent sales tax for the November 2016 ballot, BART remains committed to working together to develop an expenditure plan that meets the needs of all Contra Costa residents. We recognize that it is critical for BART and CCTA, along with the many other Contra Costa stakeholders, to collaborate and compromise to bring forward a winning expenditure plan.

As you know, the BART board is considering placing a general obligation (GO) bond on the November 2016 ballot, the focus of which is "*fix-it-first*" – for passenger safety and system reliability. BART has always significantly self-funded its maintenance and rehabilitation program, but the replacement and upgrade needs of a 40+ year old system far exceed the funds BART has available.

Currently under development, BART's draft Transportation Expenditure Plan, a summary of which is attached, devotes over 90% of the proposed \$3.5 billion bond to replacing aging rail tracks, modernizing systems, improving security on trains, in stations and along trackway, and investing in efficient and strategic projects to provide more service to our customers. This large public investment will fund a modern new train control system and a new traction power (electrical) system, both of which are essential to serving BART's growing ridership. The remaining 10% of the bond would be dedicated to strategies to reduce overcrowding and for local station and access improvements in Contra Costa and the other BART counties.

New rail cars, however, cannot be funded with proceeds from the BART bond as the California State Constitution, Article XIII A, prohibits using GO revenues to acquire rolling stock (i.e., rail cars) or any other non-fixed asset. BART has determined it needs 306 rail cars, in addition to the fleet of 775 cars currently on order, to meet the projected ridership growth over the next 25 years and to maximize the public investment in new train control and other system improvements.

February 17, 2016
 Authority Special TEP Meeting
 Handout Agenda Item 1.1

As memorialized in the recently-adopted Resolution 5308 (attached), BART is requesting each of the three counties in the BART district – Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco – to contribute to funding the cost of 102 of the 306 new rail cars (or one-third of the total) by paying 75% of the cost of the 102 cars, which is equal to approximately \$343 million; BART and the region shall fund the remaining 25%. **As Contra Costa’s share of new rail car funding, BART asks that CCTA include \$343 million in its 2016 TEP for new BART rail cars.**

BART believes the best way to get both the CCTA and the BART tax measures passed this November is for the two measures to work together to present a compelling picture of how they will reduce congestion on local roads and freeways, enhance the economic vitality of the county, provide integrated transit service to residents, and improve air quality in Contra Costa County. The following are points highlighting BART’s contributions to Contra Costa, with more detail on the enclosed attachment.

More Seats, More Service for Contra Costa Residents: BART can increase system capacity by 30% by implementing critical replacement and renovation projects. Systemwide, these improvements could result in approximately 16,500 more seats in the fleet (an increase of approximately 50%), as many as 214,000 new weekday trips, and trains every 4-5 minutes during the peak commute hours on most lines. Specifically, Contra Costa residents could see significant service improvements on their BART line:

	Potential Capacity Increase	Peak Headway	Estimated Additional Riders per Hour, Peak Commute Direction	Peak Commute Train Length
Pittsburg/Bay Point	15%-20%	4-5 minutes	800-1000 riders	10 car trains
Richmond-SF	50%-80%	5 minutes	550-700 riders	10 car trains on most runs
Dublin/Pleasanton	50%-80%	4-5 minutes	700-900 riders	10 car trains

Making CCTA’s TEP Investments Work: To realize the new transportation infrastructure investments proposed by the regional transportation planning committees (RTPCs) and being considered by CCTA, BART needs additional rail cars.

BART Relieves Traffic Congestion on Contra Costa Freeways: The projected new 214,000 trips, served by the new rail cars, could remove up to 79,000 cars per day from Contra Costa roads and freeways.

More BART Service Means Better Air Quality: BART significantly helps Contra Costa meet greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goals. The estimated 214,000 new BART trips per day could result in a net new weekday reduction in GHG emissions of 610,000 pounds of CO².

February 16, 2016
Page 3

Contra Costa's Investment in BART Cars Leverages over \$1 Billion in Other Local and Regional Funds: Contra Costa's investment will leverage similar investments from Alameda and San Francisco counties and the region.

Contra Costa Residents Support BART: In recent CCTA and BART polls, BART and its system needs continue to poll very highly in Contra Costa.

BART Boosts Contra Costa's Economy: Homes and businesses near BART stations generate both higher market values and significant local tax revenues for Contra Costa County.

For more than forty years, BART has efficiently, reliably and safely brought workers, families and friends to their destinations. As Contra Costa County's largest transit provider, BART plays a key role in connecting Contra Costa residents to jobs, airports, medical appointments, sporting events, recreational activities, shopping, entertainment, and cultural destinations, while reducing congestion on local roads and freeways. We now ask CCTA to help BART continue in the fine tradition of providing high quality transit service to the residents of Contra Costa and the San Francisco Bay Area.

Thank you for considering our request.

Sincerely,



Gail Murray
Vice President



Joel Keller
Director, District 2



Rebecca Saltzman
Director, District 3

Attachments

Summary of Investments

	\$ Millions	% of Total Bond	Benefits		
			 Safety	 Reliability	 Crowding + Traffic Relief
REPAIR AND REPLACE CRITICAL SAFETY INFRASTRUCTURE	\$3,165	90%	✓	✓	✓
Renew track	\$625	18%	✓	✓	
Renew power infrastructure	\$1,225	35%	✓	✓	
Repair tunnels and structures	\$570	16%	✓	✓	
Renew mechanical infrastructure	\$135	4%	✓	✓	
Renew stations	\$210	6%	✓	✓	✓
Upgrade train control and other major system infrastructure to increase peak period capacity	\$400	12%	✓	✓	✓
DESIGN FUTURE CROWDING RELIEF AND EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES TO SAFELY ACCESS STATIONS	\$335	10%	✓	✓	✓
Design and engineer future projects to relieve crowding, increase system redundancy, and reduce traffic congestion	\$200	6%		✓	✓
Expand opportunities to safely access stations	\$135	4%	✓	✓	✓
TOTAL	\$3,500	100%			

BART'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONTRA COSTA COUNTY

More Seats, More Service for Contra Costa Residents: BART can increase system capacity by 30% by implementing critical replacement and renovation projects: modern train control, additional maintenance facilities, upgraded electrical power and 306 more rail cars. Systemwide, these improvements could result in approximately 16,500 more seats in the fleet (an increase of approximately 50%), as many as 214,000 new weekday trips, and trains every 4-5 minutes during the peak commute hours on most lines. Contra Costa residents could see significant increases on their BART lines. Differences in projected service increases are due to current train set length, service demand and operational issues.

Making CCTA's TEP Investments Work: The current CCTA TEP request (August 2015), submitted by the regional transportation planning committees (RTPCs), includes over \$200 million for new transit connections and infrastructure in key freeway corridors – I-80, I-680 and Highway 4 – in addition to the over \$200 million earmarked for improved bus transit throughout the county. New technology solutions are also proposed to provide the critical “last mile” trip for commuters. All of these services and projects rely on connections to BART, and depend on BART's ability to serve tens of thousands of new riders. BART needs additional rail cars in order to make Contra Costa's new transit investments work.

BART Relieves Traffic Congestion on Contra Costa Freeways: BART's current daily ridership of 430,000 removes approximately 330,000 cars from local roads and freeways.¹ An additional 214,000 BART trips per day could take an additional 165,000 cars off of freeways and local roads. This could result in an additional 79,000 cars per day off of local Contra Costa freeways and roads.²

More BART Service Means Better Air Quality: Each day, BART riders save 280,000 gallons of gas and keep 5 million pounds of carbon emissions from entering the atmosphere. The estimated 214,000 added new trips per day would result in approximately 1.3 million fewer miles driven by cars with a net new reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per weekday of 610,000 pounds of CO₂. Contra Costa needs BART to help meet GHG emissions reduction goals.

Contra Costa's Investment in BART Cars Leverages over \$1 Billion in Other Local and Regional Funds: BART is working with elected officials and transportation leaders at CCTA, in the other BART counties and at the regional level to secure a funding strategy for the additional 306 rail cars. Contra Costa's investment will leverage similar investments from Alameda and San Francisco counties and the region.

Contra Costa Residents Support BART: In a recent Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA) countywide poll, “replacing BART's 40-year old rail cars” received a 77% approval rating (Feb 2015) and the BART “brand” has a 72% favorable rating. In addition, CCTA's

¹ Assuming 1.3 people per car on average

² Freeway miles in Contra Costa County represent 37% of total freeway miles in Alameda, Contra Costa and San Francisco counties.

online tool, (www.keepcontracostamoving.net) reported that as of November 2015, BART ranked as the highest priority of all categories presented. Four (4) out of fifteen (15) specific improvements were for BART-related projects – BART parking (#2), new BART cars (#4), updated BART train controls (#9), and more buses to BART (#15). BART projects and support are critical to a successful local sales tax measure in Contra Costa County.

BART Boosts Contra Costa's Economy: Recent studies have shown that homes and condominiums near BART have significantly higher market values (up to nearly 13% greater) than homes beyond five miles from a BART station. In addition, higher property values generated by homes and businesses within half a mile of a BART station contribute over \$750 million each year in general property tax revenues for local governments – money to put to work locally.

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE SAN FRANCISCO
BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT**

**In the Matter of Support for the Funding
Of Additional BART Rail Vehicles by the
County Congestion Management Agencies
in Alameda, Contra Costa and
San Francisco Counties _____ /**

Resolution No. 5308

WHEREAS, BART ridership is near capacity and is expected to grow by nearly 50 percent (50%) over the next 25 years and capacity and system improvements will be needed to maintain quality and service standards for BART customers in light of that growth in demand; and

WHEREAS, in order to meet the growing demand for BART service, BART needs 306 additional rail vehicles beyond the current commitment of 775 vehicles; and

WHEREAS, BART is unable to fund the additional 306 needed rail vehicles with existing fund sources, and transit vehicles cannot be funded by a potential general obligation bond that BART is considering placing on the November 2016 ballot; and

WHEREAS, BART acknowledges that its unmet capital need, such as rail vehicles, is a regional issue requiring a partnership among local and regional agencies; and

WHEREAS, BART has initiated discussions with its regional funding partners to develop a collaborative funding solution; and

WHEREAS, BART has proposed that the congestion management agencies (CMAs) in the three BART counties- the Alameda County Transportation Commission (ACTC), the Contra Costa Transportation Authority (CCTA), and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) - each provide funding, in an estimated amount of \$400 million, to provide approximately 75% of the cost of 102 vehicles; and

WHEREAS, BART acknowledges that, in November 2014, the voters of Alameda County allocated over \$800 million for BART projects and programs, including various rehabilitation needs, in revenues generated by a half-cent transportation sales tax measure, known as Measure BB; and

WHEREAS, the ACTC may have additional funding sources in the future that could be used for new additional rail vehicles;

WHEREAS, the CCTA is considering placing on the November 2016 ballot a new 25-year, ½-cent transportation sales tax; and

WHEREAS, the SFCTA is also considering future revenue-generating measures for transportation projects and programs; and

WHEREAS, BART will seek regional, state and federal funding sources for the remaining 25% funding needed to complete the purchase of these additional rail vehicles;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that BART requires committed funding through resolutions from the ACTC, CCTA, SFCTA, and other regional and local partners, to purchase additional rail vehicles so that BART may continue to provide high levels of service to the residents of the District; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that BART will request the ACTC, the CCTA, and the SFCTA to each fund 75% of the cost of 102 additional BART rail vehicles; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that BART will seek other regional, state and federal fund sources to close the gap in funding for the additional 306 vehicles; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the ACTC, the CCTA, and the SFCTA.

###

ITEM 2
SENATE BILL 743 (“SB 743”)



TECHNICAL

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 26, 2016

To: RTPC Managers

From: Martin R. Engelmann, Deputy Executive Director, Planning

RE: Action Plan Updates: Discontinuation of LOS or Delay-Based Traffic Measurements as an Indicator of Significant Impact on the Environment in the Action Plans

The purpose of this technical memo is to request that the RTPCs revisit the Draft Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance in light of recent changes to State law and proposed revisions to project analysis methodologies pursuant to SB 743.

SB 743

The passage of Senate Bill (SB) 743 (Steinberg, 2013) will change the way that public agencies evaluate the transportation impacts of projects under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It will prohibit the use of vehicle delay and level-of-service standards in infill opportunity zones and transit priority areas, and it directs the California Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to revise the CEQA Guidelines to establish “alternative metrics” for identifying transportation impacts in those areas. The legislation also permits OPR to establish alternative metrics for transportation impacts outside transit priority areas. These changes are intended to further the Legislature’s commitment to encouraging land use and transportation planning decisions and investments that reduce vehicle miles travelled and contribute to the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions as defined in SB 375.

OPR's revised draft CEQA Guidelines, released on January 20, 2016, reflect an across-the-board elimination of congestion-based metrics as a threshold of significance in CEQA and replaces them with a new Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) metric. We note that these revisions are presently in draft format only. They will not have the force of law until and unless they are adopted; however, the across-the-board elimination of LOS for all areas is consistent with OPR's previously released draft Guidelines. It appears, therefore, that OPR is continuing to endorse a statewide transition from LOS to VMT.

While OPR proposes to prohibit the use of vehicle delay as a threshold of significance in CEQA and replace it with VMT, SB 743 itself does not preclude agencies from using vehicle delay when applying local general plan policies, zoning codes, conditions of approval, thresholds, or any other planning requirements.

The Measure J Growth Management Program

ACTION PLANS

The voter-approved Measure J (2004) Growth Management Program (GMP) requires that local jurisdictions participate in a cooperative, multijurisdictional planning process to develop Action Plans for Routes of Regional Significance and establish Multimodal Transportation Service Objectives (MTSOs) for major arterials and freeways. All five of the recently completed draft Action Plans for the 2014 CTP include MTSOs of LOS and delay index standards. The Lamorinda Action Plan also includes "Stop Time at Cross Streets." The TVTC Action Plan includes duration of congestion.

PROJECT REVIEW PROCEDURE: APPLYING AN ACTION PLAN MTSO AS A THRESHOLD OF SIGNIFICANCE IN CEQA

One criticism that arose during the first 15 years of the Measure C GMP process was that project approvals required two separate impact studies. Measure C introduced new requirements for local jurisdictions to follow to receive their Local Streets Maintenance funds. These requirements involved analysis of the

impact of proposed major development projects and general plan amendments on local performance standards and MTSOs. Many of those standards did not lend themselves to use in an EIR. The successful passage of Measure J in 2004 streamlined the project-review process, first by eliminating the requirement for local performance measures, and later (through amendments to the GMP Implementation Documents) by aligning the action Plan MTSOs with CEQA thresholds of significance.

OPR's newly released draft CEQA Guidelines, if adopted, will prohibit the use of LOS or delay-based metrics as a threshold of significance in CEQA following an initial phase-in period. Since many of the Action Plan MTSOs use LOS and delay, we are essentially back to where we started with the two-study requirement. One study would address traffic impacts under a VMT metric, and (potentially) other studies would address non-traffic impacts under existing delay-based metrics consistent with any land use requirements. Consequently, the Authority now wishes to re-examine its Measure J GMP transportation analysis procedure, and consider re-tooling it in an effort to restore the efficiency achieved earlier through consolidation of the GMP and CEQA processes.

Request to RTPCs

Given the anticipated repercussions of SB 743, the Authority asks that the RTPCs revisit their Action Plans to determine if any changes are warranted. Table 1 below shows where each of the five draft Action Plans contain congestion-based MTSOs. As noted above, OPR's proposed CEQA Guidelines do not "prohibit" project evaluation using these metrics, but (if adopted) would prohibit their use as a threshold of significance in CEQA analyses for evaluating traffic impacts. The RTPCs could therefore continue using LOS and delay-based metrics within the Action Plans. If a project proponent's traffic analysis found that a project resulted in an exceedance of any of the MTSOs shown in Table 1, however, that exceedance could not warrant a finding of significant traffic impact on the environment under CEQA.

Table 1. LOS and Delay-Based Action Plan MTSOs by Subregion

Subregion	Intersection LOS or V/C	Arterial LOS or Delay Index	Freeway LOS or Delay Index	Side Street Signal Cycle Wait	Hours of Congestion
West	✓		✓		
Central	✓		✓	✓	
East	✓	✓	✓		
Lamorinda		✓	✓	✓	
Tri-Valley	✓	✓	✓		✓

Last December, the Authority decided to postpone adoption of the CTP. This allows the RTPCs time to consider changes to the Action Plans. Consequently, the RTPCs could, in response to SB 743, change from delay-based MTSOs to VMT-based MTSOs. The implications of making this change are yet to be determined. Clearly, additional work will be involved with changing the metrics and re-evaluating the MTSOs. The cost and schedule for this effort will be assessed after we hear from you.

ITEM 3
“ONEBAYAREAGRANT” (“OBAG”) CALL FOR PROJECTS



MEMORANDUM

Date February 10, 2016

To Interested Parties

From Brad Beck, Senior Transportation Planner

RE **Upcoming OBAG 2 and Measure J Call for Projects**

The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) is responsible for establishing the procedures for allocating expected federal funding for transportation purposes. Similarly, the Authority is responsible for establishing procedures for allocating expected transportation sales tax revenues generated by Measure J.

In November 2015, MTC adopted Resolution 4202 that established the “project selection criteria and programming policy for the second round of the One Bay Area Grant Program (OBAG 2) covering Fiscal Years (FYs) 2017–18 through FY 2021–22.” Through the OBAG 2 program, Contra Costa will receive a substantial amount of federal funding that the Authority must program in compliance with these criteria and policies. At the same time, the Authority is considering the next call for projects for Measure J Program 12, Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC), and Program 13, Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities (PBTF).

Because the three programs have overlapping purposes, the Authority is interested in issuing a coordinated call for projects for them. They are not, however, identical and the coordination might be limited only to having a single application. On the other hand, coordination could allow us to use the different programs to fund larger projects than might be possible by the programs alone.

The remainder of this memo outlines the requirements of each program and the questions that remain to be answered in how Contra Costa implements them. The OBAG 2 requirements were established by MTC in November 2015. Several issues remain, however, including the potential addition of anti-displacement policies. The basic requirements of the TLC and PBTF programs were established in the Measure J Expenditure Plan. Guidelines were prepared for to both clarify and define those requirements. The Authority expects to refine those guidelines as part of developing the call for projects.

The Authority is interested in hearing from you about:

- How the Authority should address the issues outlined in this memo
- Other issues you believe the Authority needs to address in putting together the call for projects
- The kinds of projects — or specific projects — that you would recommend that the Authority give priority to when selecting projects for funding

We're asking for your comments by *March 18, 2016* so that they may be reflected in the call for projects.

The Programs

OBAG 2

Forty percent of the total funding available through OBAG 2 will be distributed to each county according to the county formula established in Resolution 4202. This formula uses county population, housing production between 1999 and 2006 and between 2007 and 2014, and the Regional Housing Needs Allocation for the counties. The details of the distribution formula are included in the attached MTC materials. Using this formula, Contra Costa would get 14.6 percent of the available CMA funding through OBAG 2, or \$51,461,000. (In January 2016, MTC informed the CMAs that they expect the amount of federal funding available to the region to increase; MTC, however, has not yet decided how much would go to the CMAs.)

Eligible Project Types and Available Funding

The CMA component of OBAG 2 can fund any of the following project types (and must fund some of them):

- Planning and Outreach Activities
- Local Streets and Roads Preservation
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements
- Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC)
- Safe Routes to School (SR2S)
- Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs)
- Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) Improvements

Resolution 4202 set aside specific amounts for CMA planning and outreach activities, Safe Routes to School (SR2S), and Federal Aide Secondary, although CMAs are free to allocate more to those categories, as shown in the following table:

<i>Program</i>	<i>Amount</i>
OBAG 2 Allocation	\$51,461,000
Safe Routes to School	\$4,088,000
Federal Aid Secondary	\$1,343,000
Planning and Outreach	\$4,342,000
Remaining available for funding to eligible project types	\$41,688,000

The funding comes from two federal programs, the Surface Transportation Program (STP) and the Congestion Mitigation-Air Quality (CMAQ) program. The former may be used for a broad range of transportation purposes including transportation planning and street maintenance and improvements. The CMAQ program is focused on the mitigation of congestion to improve air quality; projects funded through this program must benefit air quality. Four of the eligible project types — planning and outreach, Local Streets and Roads Preservation, Priority Conservation Areas and Federal Aid Secondary — may only be funded

through the STP program. SR2S, TLC and Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements may be funded through either program. The following table shows the STP and CMAQ funding available to Contra Costa for programming. After accounting for the mandatory \$5.7 million for planning and FAS, the Authority has \$25.5 million in STP and \$20.3 million in CMAQ funds to program to SR2S and other project types.

	<i>STP</i>	<i>CMAQ</i>	<i>Total</i>
Contra Costa OBAG 2 Allocation	\$31,181,000	\$20,280,000	\$51,461,000
Planning and Outreach + Federal Aid Secondary	\$5,685,000	—	\$5,685,000
Safe Routes to School or any other eligible project types	\$25,496,000	\$20,280,000	\$45,776,000

Minimum Request

Resolution 4202 requires that “Funding grants per project must be a minimum of \$500,000 for counties with a population over 1 million” which includes Contra Costa. When the 11.47 percent local match is added in, projects must cost at least \$565,000.

Priority Development Areas

One of the key objectives of the OBAG 2 program is to target project investments into Priority Development Areas (PDAs). These districts are areas that communities have identified as possible growth areas. They are generally areas of at least 100 acres where there is local commitment to developing more housing along with amenities and services to meet the day-to-day needs of residents in a pedestrian-friendly environment served by transit. To be eligible to become a PDA, an area had to be within an existing community, near existing or planned fixed transit or served by comparable bus service, and planned for more housing.

CMAAs in the larger Bay Area counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, San Mateo, San Francisco, and Santa Clara) must use at least 70 percent of their OBAG 2 funding

for project in PDAs. The guaranteed minimums for Safe Routes to School (SR2S) and Federal Aid Secondary (FAS) and the amount set aside for planning and outreach do not count towards PDA targets, however. That means that of the other \$41.7 million, \$29.2 million must be programmed for projects that support the development of PDAs.

Projects that support the development of PDAs include both projects within PDAs and those that provide “proximate access” to PDAs. The CMAs must map those latter projects and provide a “policy justification for designating the project as supporting a PDA through proximate access.” For the first OBAG cycle, the Authority established the following criteria for determining “proximate access”:¹

1. ***In or Directly Connects To*** — The proposed project is wholly or partially within the limits of a PDA or directly connects to a PDA
2. ***“Bright-Line” Tests***
 - a. The project improves access to the PDA and is:
 1. within ½ mile of a PDA, or
 2. within 1 mile of a PDA and within a designated community of concern (COC), or
 3. within 2 miles of a PDA and is a project that improves transit access, including bicycle or pedestrian access to transit, on a transit route that serves and connects a PDA
 - b. The project improves or completes a gap on the Countywide Bikeway Network designated in the Authority’s Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, is within the designated Contra Costa Urban Limit Line, and improves bicycle and pedestrian access to one or more PDAs.
 - c. The project connects a PDA either to a transit station or transit center or to a significant concentration of jobs, either of which is within 1 mile of the PDA
3. ***Other Justification*** — The Project is greater than ½ mile from any PDA and does not meet any of the above criteria, but does provide critical

¹ “Initial Priority Development Area Investment & Growth Strategy”, April 17, 2013 **TRANSPLAN TAC Page: 57**

improvements in access to a PDA, such as removing a barrier in gaining access to a PDA and providing substantially more direct bicycle or pedestrian access to the PDA.

At present, we assume that the above definition will be retained for OBAG 2.

Factors to Be Used When Selecting Projects

Resolution 4202 sets out several factors that the Authority and other CMAs must use to select projects for funding through OBAG 2:

- 1) ***Projects located in high impact project areas.*** Favorably consider projects in high impact areas, defined as:
 - a) PDAs taking on significant housing growth in the SCS (total number of units), including RHNA allocations, as well as housing production, especially those PDAs that are delivering large numbers of very low, low and moderate income housing units,
 - b) Dense job centers in proximity to transit and housing (both current levels and those included in the SCS) especially those which are supported by reduced parking requirements and TDM programs,
 - c) Improved transportation choices for all income levels (reduces VMT), proximity to quality transit access, with an emphasis on connectivity (including safety, lighting, etc.)
- 2) ***Projects located in Communities of Concern (COC)*** – favorably consider projects located in a COC as defined by MTC or as defined by CMAs or Community Based Transportation Plans.
- 3) ***PDAs with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies*** – favorably consider projects in jurisdictions with affordable housing preservation, creation strategies and community stabilization policies.
- 4) ***Investments that are consistent with Air District's Planning Healthy Places***
- 5) ***PDAs that overlap or are co-located with: 1) populations exposed to outdoor toxic air contaminants as identified in the Air District's Community Air Risk Evaluation (CARE) Program and/or 2) freight***

transport infrastructure – Favorably consider projects in these areas where local jurisdictions employ best management practices to mitigate PM and toxic air contaminants exposure.

These factors are similar to but not exactly the same as the factors used in OBAG 1.

Although not listed, Resolution 4202 and federal policies will require the Authority to consider project feasibility and ability to meet program deadlines. If a sponsor is unable to meet those deadlines, the county could lose the funding we programmed for the sponsor's project.

Local Requirements

To be eligible for OBAG 2 funds, local jurisdictions must meet several requirements.

Complete Streets: Jurisdictions must either adopt a complete streets resolution that complies with MTC's model resolution OR have updated the circulation element of their general plan after January 1, 2010 to comply with the requirements of the Complete Streets Act of 2008. MTC found that only four Contra Costa jurisdictions were out of compliance with these requirements; staff from those jurisdictions have informed the Authority that they are working to come into compliance.

Housing Elements: Jurisdictions (cities and counties) must have a general plan housing element adopted and certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) for 2014–2022 RHNA by May 31, 2015. All Contra Costa jurisdictions have met this requirement.

Local Streets Maintenance: To be eligible, jurisdictions must 1) have a certified Pavement Management Program that they have updated at least once every three years, 2) participate in the statewide local streets and road needs assessment survey, and 3) Provide updated information to the Highway Performance Monitoring System (HPMS) at least once every 3 years.

Anti-Displacement Policies: MTC asked staff to develop potential anti-displacement and affordable housing policies for possible consideration for OBAG 2, and return to the Commission in February 2016 with proposed language. While staff has heard advocacy groups suggest that OBAG 2 should require recipients to include specific policies in their housing elements, MTC staff has not yet identified what types of policies and requirements it will propose. We expect to have some information sometime in mid- to late-January.

Outreach

MTC requires CMAs to plan and execute an effective public outreach and local engagement process during the solicitation and project selection for the OBAG 2 program. To meet this requirement, the Authority must:

1. Conduct countywide outreach to stakeholders and the public to solicit project ideas and report on the process to MTC
2. Work closely with local jurisdictions, transit agencies, MTC, Caltrans, federally recognized tribal governments, and stakeholders to identify projects for consideration in the OBAG 2 Program
3. Ensure the public involvement process provides underserved communities access to the project submittal process in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Other Federal and MTC Requirements

Because the OBAG 2 program uses federal funds, recipients must meet federal requirements. These include meeting project delivery deadlines and ensuring that projects are eligible for either the STP or CMAQ funding. One key federal requirement is that sponsors must provide an 11.47 percent match of local funds, that is, sponsors must fund at least 11.47 percent of the project's cost using non-federal funds. (Sponsors cannot use other federal funds to match the STP or CMAQ funds.) The local match could come from a jurisdiction's general fund or development fees, for example. Measure J funds can also be used — and have been used — as the local match.

MTC has applied some other requirements as well. They include a minimum grant size of \$500,000 which, with the 11.47 percent local match, would mean that projects must cost at least \$565,000.

MEASURE J TLC PROGRAM

The CC-TLC program has six goals:

1. Help create walkable, pedestrian-friendly neighborhoods and business districts;
2. Promote innovative solutions, including compact building design and context-sensitive site planning that is integrated with the transportation system;
3. Help create walkable, pedestrian-friendly access linking housing and job centers to transit;
4. Help create affordable housing;
5. Encourage a mixture of land uses and support a community's development or redevelopment activities; and
6. Provide for a variety of transportation choices to enhance a community's mobility, identity, and quality of life.

Projects funded through the Measure J TLC program must achieve one or both of the following purposes:

1. Facilitate, support or catalyze more compact, mixed-use development that includes affordable housing, and development that is pedestrian-friendly or integrated into transit networks, or
2. Encourage the use of alternatives to the single occupant vehicle and promote walking, bicycling and/or transit usage.

Projects can include a variety of bicycle, pedestrian, transit and related projects, included plans and studies.

Allocation of Funding and Project Selection

Measure J gives the four Regional Transportation Planning Committees (RTPCs) the responsibility of reviewing project proposals and determining which projects applying for CC-TLC funds would best meet the goals of Measure J and the criteria in the CC-TLC guidelines. The amount of funding available to each RTPC is determined solely by the population in each subregion. According to the current Measure J TLC guidelines, RTPCs must use the following criteria to select projects:

1. To what extent would the project meet the six goals of the TLC program?
2. Is the project feasible and ready to implement within the time frame proposed, that is, has the sponsor completed earlier project stages?
3. Is the project consistent with locally adopted policies?
4. Does the project leverage the requested CC-TLC funding, that is, to what extent will the sponsor commit other funds to implement the project beyond the minimum required?

MEASURE J PBTF PROGRAM

Measure J sets aside 1.54 percent of sales tax revenues to fund the PBTF program. The purpose of these revenues is to fund the "construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities including regional trails throughout Contra Costa." The PBTF program has three components:

1. **Countywide Share:** One percent will go to "complete projects in the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan" (CBPP). The countywide share of PBTF funds may be used to fund the design and construction of *facilities* that support and encourage walking or bicycling and that are identified in the *Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan*. The guidelines specify how to determine whether a project meets this requirement.
2. **EBRPD Share:** One-half percent will go to the East Bay Regional Park District (EBRPD) for the "development and rehabilitation of paved regional trails". Measure J requires that the half-percent EBRPD share of PBTF funds be spent "equally in each subregion" and that the RTPCs must review and approve how the funding is spent in their subregion.

3. **West County Share:** The remaining 0.04 percent will go exclusively for “additional trail/pedestrian/bicycle capital projects, and/or facility maintenance in West County”. The West County RTPC, WCCTAC, will determine how this funding is used.

The criteria for selecting projects for funding with the Countywide Share include:

1. Safety
2. Range and number of users
3. Countywide or regional significance
4. Destinations served
5. Latent demand
6. Improved connectivity
7. Feasibility
8. Local and policy support
9. Matching funds

The Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee are reviewing these criteria and their weighting, and may suggest changes to the Authority for the next call for projects.

Issues

To prepare the coordinated call for projects, the Authority will need to resolve a number of issues.

MEETING THE 70% PDA REQUIREMENT

Of the \$51.5 million available to projects in Contra Costa through OBAG 2 program, about \$41.7 million is subject to the requirement that 70 percent of funding — or \$29.2 million — be used to fund projects in or in “proximate access” to PDAs, that is, projects that “serve” PDAs. In the first OBAG program, about 84 percent of the funding went to such projects.

The factors to be used in selecting projects (listed above), if also used by local sponsors in determining the projects to apply for, might mean that the Authority would not need to take further steps to ensure that the 70 percent minimum is met. If, after ranking project applications using those factors, the highest ranking projects would *not* meet the 70 percent minimum, the Authority would likely need to move up lower ranked projects. The Authority would need to ensure at the time it receives applications that at least 70 percent of the funding requested could be used to meet the PDA requirement.

MINIMUM GRANT SIZE

In addition to the 70 percent PDA requirement, Resolution 4202 requires that OBAG 2 grants that the Authority recommends must average \$500,000 and that no grant may be less than \$100,000. In OBAG 1, the Authority did not need to address this issue as the average project grant was about \$1,110,000, even with the eleven SR2S grants averaging only about \$300,000 and 18 of the 41 project grants totaling less than \$500,000.

While the minimum grant size may not be an issue in OBAG 2, the Authority will need a policy for dealing with it if recommended projects would not meet the 70 percent requirement.

LOCAL STREET MAINTENANCE

Local street maintenance is eligible for funding through OBAG 2, consistent with MTC's "fix it first" policy, and substantial, ongoing funding will be needed to keep local streets in good repair. The OBAG 2 program, however, directs federal funding towards projects — including local street maintenance projects — towards projects that encourage the development of PDAs. This emphasis is seen in both the minimum 70 percent PDA requirement and the factors that CMAs must use in selecting projects for OBAG 2 funding.

In OBAG 1, the Authority allocated all the STP funds left after funding CMA planning and outreach to local street maintenance. These funds were then allocated by formula to local jurisdictions. Fortunately, 59 percent of the local

streets maintenance funds were used on projects that would serve PDAs so that Contra Costa met the 70 percent PDA requirement. It is not clear, however, whether jurisdictions have enough street maintenance projects that would serve PDAs to meet the 70 percent minimum if the Authority again decides to allocate available STP funding to local jurisdictions by formula. Three jurisdictions have no PDAs in which they could use local maintenance funds. The Authority will need to address how to ensure that the county will meet the 70 percent requirement if it decides to use a portion of the available STP funds for local streets maintenance.

FUNDING FOR PRIORITY CONSERVATION AREAS

Besides the county programs, Resolution 4202 establishes two regional programs that would fund projects in Priority Conservation Areas (PCAs). The first program sets aside funding specifically for the four North Bay counties. The second sets aside funding for a competitive program for the remaining five Bay Area counties. In either program, projects must preserve and enhance the “natural, economic and social value of rural lands and open space amidst a growing population across the Bay Area, for residents and businesses.” Both programs are separate from and in addition to the county programs.

Resolution 4202, however, also allows counties to fund projects that support PCAs using their OBAG 2 funding. In OBAG 1, the Authority did not choose to fund PCA projects; only the following projects types could apply for funding:

1. Local streets and roads preservation
2. Bicycle and pedestrian improvements
3. Transportation for livable communities
4. Safe routes to school/transit

While the Authority could allow add PCA projects to apply for county OBAG 2 funds, staff recommends keeping the OBAG 2 approach and not adding the

PCA projects are markedly different from the other eligible project types. The latter focus more on urban sites and urban travel. The PCA program focuses on projects that help preserve and support rural areas. If PCA projects are made

eligible for OBAG 2 funds, the Authority will likely need to set aside a minimum amount for these projects from the OBAG 2 pot. While possible, it would be difficult to create criteria for OBAG 2 that would treat PCA projects equally.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL

Resolution 4202 sets aside about \$4 million, or about eight percent of all OBAG 2 funds, for SR2S projects and programs in Contra Costa. In OBAG 1, the Authority allocated the \$3.3 million available for SR2S projects among the four subareas, based on population and school enrollment. The guidelines for the OBAG 1 program asked the RTPCs to submit a prioritized list of projects for funding through the program.

In OBAG 2, the Authority could continue the process of allocating the SR2S funding to the RTPCs or hold a separate, countywide competitive selection process. Also, the Authority could continue to allow SR2S projects to compete for funding beyond that set aside specifically for those projects or could eliminate them as eligible project types.

CRITERIA FOR SELECTING PROJECTS

In OBAG 1, the Authority, building on the required factors set by MTC, used 28 criteria in scoring applications. The screening and scoring criteria are included in the attachments to this memo. Half of those criteria evaluated the project's *context* consistent with MTC's factors, all of which relate the places that projects serve. The other half evaluated the benefits of the project to achieve the program's purposes. The criteria used quantitative measures — for example, whether the project was located in a Community of Concern or whether the local jurisdiction has adopted an appropriate range of affordable housing programs — wherever possible. To limit the work involved in preparing applications, the Authority developed much of that information itself.

The Authority is reviewing those criteria to ensure they comply with MTC requirements and identify projects that best achieve the OBAG 2 objectives.

MELDING OBAG 2 AND MEASURE J FUNDING

As noted above, Measure J funding can be used to provide the local match for the federal funds available through OBAG 2 and a few projects have used TLC or PBTF funds as part of that match. Using Measure J funds as a match can help jurisdictions that have less funding available to become eligible for federal funding and can help fund larger projects than would otherwise be possible.

The difficulty is in making that possible. Any project that gets both OBAG 2 and Measure J funds will need to get high rankings against the criteria of both programs. While the purposes and goals of all three programs overlap in many areas, they are not completely the same. Measure J TLC funding, for example, could match OBAG 2 funding for a TLC and bicycle-pedestrian projects but not, in most cases, OBAG 2 funding for local street maintenance. Street maintenance is not an eligible use for Measure J TLC funds. Similarly, Measure J TLC could be used to match OBAG 2 funding for a transit-supportive project but Measure J PBTF funding cannot.

The Authority is looking for suggestions on how to match Measure J and OBAG 2 funds and whether that is a good idea.

Proposed Schedule

The table on the following pages outlines the proposed schedule for the joint call for projects for MTC's One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) Program and Measure J Program 12 (Transportation for Livable Communities) and Program 13 (Pedestrian, Bicycle and Trail Facilities).

The process will involve the following steps:

1. **Prepare the Call for Projects.** In this step, Authority staff will work with a working group of local staff to develop an approach for a coordinated call for projects, including updates for the guidelines for the CC-TLC program. Authority staff will also work with the Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee to refine the guidelines for the PBTF program. The coordinated call for projects will go to the TCC in May 2016. The TCC will

if necessary, review the coordinated call for projects a second time at its June 2016 meeting. The Planning Committee will review the call for projects the following month, either June or July 2016.

2. **Preparation of Applications.** The call for projects would be released by the Authority at its June 15 meeting, with applications due on September 23, about fourteen weeks after the release of the call for projects. If a second meeting with the TCC is needed, the Authority would release it on July 20. The application due date would remain September 26. Sponsors, however, would still have about ten weeks to complete their applications.
3. **Review of Applications.** Authority staff will review the applications for completeness and determine their eligibility for funding through the three programs. Project applications for TLC funding will be forwarded to the RTPCs for review, which will have about two months to review the applications and submit their recommended list of projects to be funded. The CBPAC would likewise review the applications for PBTF funding and recommend projects for funding. The applications for OBAG funding will be reviewed by a subcommittee of the TCC.
4. **Development of Funding Program.** Working with the OBAG/Measure J Working Group, Authority staff will review the recommendations for the TLC and PBTF funding and the ratings of projects for the TLC funding to identify a funding program that makes the best use of the available funding.
5. **Approval and Submittal of Funding Recommendations.** Authority staff will forward the proposed funding program to the TCC for review in January 2017. Staff will forward the TCC's recommendation to the Planning Committee for its review. The Authority would approve the funding program in February 2017. While MTC has not yet decided when the proposed recommendations for OBAG funding would be due, we expect the deadline to be around the end of March 2017. Project sponsors would then have a month to enter their projects into MTC's FMS.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Action</i>
September 17	TCC	Review draft OBAG 2 guidelines
November 9	OBAG/Measure J Working Group	Begin preparing the coordinated call for projects
November	TCC	Mail out proposed OBAG 2 guidelines
November 23	CBPAC	Review PBTF Guidelines
December 17	TCC	Present update on OBAG 2 program
2016 – January 6	PC	Present update on OBAG 2 program; review release information to RTPCs and general public
January 20	Authority	Present update on OBAG 2 program; release information to RTPCs and general public
March 28	CBPAC	Finalize updates to PBTF guidelines
March–June	OBAG/Measure J Working Group	Finalize call for projects, including revised Measure J TLC and PBTF Guidelines
May 19	TCC	Review proposed OBAG and Measure J call for projects
May	MTC	Adopts final guidelines for OBAG 2
June 1	PC	Review proposed OBAG/Measure J call for projects
June 15	Authority	Release call for projects (or delegate to TCC & PC)
June 16 *	TCC	Second meeting to review proposed OBAG and Measure J call for projects (if needed)
July 6 *	Planning Committee	Recommend release of call for projects (if second meeting of TCC is needed)
July 20 *	Authority	Release call for projects (if second meeting of TCC is needed)
September 26	Sponsors	Applications due
September 28	Staff	Forward applications to RTPCs and CBPAC
October – November	RTPCs, CBPAC and OBAG/Measure J	Review and rate applications

<i>Date</i>	<i>Group</i>	<i>Action</i>
	Working Group	
November 28	CBPAC	Review and recommend projects
November 28	RTPCs	Submit list of projects for TLC funding
December	Staff	Prepare coordinated list of projects
2017 – January 19	TCC	Recommend list of projects
February 1	Planning Committee	Recommend list of projects
February 16	Authority	Approve list of projects
February	Staff	Submit projects for OBAG funding to MTC
March	Sponsors & staff	Enter projects into FMS

* If needed.